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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

January, 1923

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

"The Churchman."

OUR readers will observe—we trust with pleasure—that the size of this number of THE CHURCHMAN is increased by eight pages, and it is hoped the enlargement may be maintained throughout the year. The occasion is one of which advantage may well be taken to bring the Magazine to the notice of any Evangelical Churchman who does not at present see it, and we venture to ask regular readers to co-operate with us in increasing the circulation. If each subscriber would secure one other the Magazine would soon be placed in an impregnable position. Will readers very kindly make an effort in that direction? Without any attempt at self-laudation, we think we may quite reasonably claim that THE CHURCHMAN deserves the strong support of Evangelical Churchpeople. It is the only magazine of its kind entirely devoted to Evangelical interests, and in view of the happenings in the Church at the present time it is of importance that Evangelicals should possess an organ of this character which gives expression to the Evangelical point of view. A subscription of ten shillings a year entitles the subscriber to receive a copy of each of the four issues of THE CHURCHMAN, and we trust that, with the New Year, many additional subscriptions will be received at the Church Book Room, 6 Grosvenor Mansions, 82 Victoria Street, S.W.1.

Prayer Book Revision.

The adjournment—or more properly the abandonment—of the Autumn Session of the National Assembly on account of the General Election postponed the consideration of the Report on Prayer Book Revision until the Spring Session which opens on January 29; and it is now

believed that anything in the way of effective action may be still further deferred—probably till June. These postponements are all to the good, for it is of the very first importance that Churchpeople should acquire an intelligent appreciation of what is involved in the changes proposed in the Schedule to Committee's Report. From time to time it is stated that this and that Parochial Church Council has discussed the Report and passed certain resolutions concerning it, but, at present, there is no indication whatever that Parochial Church Councils as a whole have taken the matter in hand or that the general body of Churchpeople has the slightest idea of the nature or extent of the proposals. The fact is that there is hardly a portion of the Prayer Book which is left untouched. The Lectionary, the Psalter, the Calendar, Morning Prayer, Evening Prayer, the Athanasian Creed, the Litany, the Special Prayers and Thanksgivings, the Collects, Epistles and Gospels, the Holy Communion Service, the Baptismal Offices, the Catechism, the Order for Confirmation, the Marriage Service, the Visitation of the Sick, the Communion of the Sick, the Order for the Burial of the Dead, the Commination Service, and the Ordination Service—these have all come under the hands of the Revisers and changes of varying degrees of importance have been introduced. We urge again, as we urged in our last issue, that Churchpeople, and particularly Evangelicals, should obtain a copy of the Report—it may be had from the Church Book Room, 82 Victoria Street, S.W.1, price 1s. net—and study it carefully. It will help them immensely in the understanding of the nature and effect of the proposals if they obtain also a copy of the leaflet issued by the National Church League which presents a brief but sufficient summary of the main proposals; and a copy of the Lecture given at the Church House by Bishop E. A. Knox (late of Manchester) in which he deals exhaustively with the whole question. These publications may be ordered from the Church Book Room, the leaflet at 3*s.* per 100 post free, and the lecture at 3*d.* net per copy.

Bishop Knox's Position.

Evangelical Churchpeople owe a deep debt of gratitude to Bishop Knox for the pains he has taken to safeguard the Protestant character of the Prayer Book. Even when he was Bishop of Manchester he stood out boldly in Convocation and elsewhere against any alteration being

made in the Service of Holy Communion; and now in his Church House Lecture we find that among other lines of practical action suggested by him is the following: "Failing other attempts to defeat Romeward proposals, strong effort should be made to secure from the National Assembly the answer which the whole Convocation of York, Upper and Lower Houses combined, made to the Royal Letters of Business, that no change should be made in 'the structure and sequence of the Order of Holy Communion.'" The proposal is one so eminently reasonable and so strictly in accord with the wishes of large sections of Churchpeople of varying schools of thought—however much they may differ in their reasons for maintaining the Service as it is—that we hope a determined effort will be made in the Assembly to secure it being carried into effect. Nor must it be forgotten that it is to Bishop Knox that Churchmen are indebted for a fuller knowledge than they hitherto possessed of the meaning and significance of the *Epiklesis* which was introduced into the Prayer of Consecration by the Convocation of Canterbury, and may reappear—though in a somewhat different form—when the Report of the Committee is discussed in the National Assembly. It is a great pleasure to us to be able to include in this number a scholarly and able paper by Bishop Knox dealing exhaustively with this very important question.

Powers for the Laity.

There is one point in Bishop Knox's Lecture to which special attention should be directed. Discussing what practical action is possible at this stage of revision, he gives the first place to the following suggestion:—

(1) The measure on Prayer Book revision should have passed through Parliament concurrently with it, a measure (1) giving to the laity of the parish the right to inquire of a minister before he is appointed, in what manner he proposes to conduct the services, and, if his answers are unsatisfactory, to present to the Bishop a complaint to that effect, and providing that such complaint must be accepted by the Bishop as a ground for refusing institution; (2) that a clergyman departing from his promises to the congregation should, after sufficient warning, if he continues in such departure, be deprived of his benefice; (3) that laity dissatisfied with the options accepted should have the right of forming a congregation, and, on giving security for his maintenance to the Bishop, of appointing a clergyman of their own, with full powers of conducting services, administering Sacraments, presenting Con-

firmation candidates and visiting within his own congregation. Such a measure would, in fact, go a long way towards Disestablishment. But a Church which comprises in its ministry Puritans, Modernists, and Anglo-Catholics, if it has *Life and Liberty*, may be expected to fit its ministry to its congregations, when it abandons the principle of uniformity.

The Bishop's proposal goes to the very heart of the difficulty that is causing so much heartburning at the present time. The Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure, as originally drafted, contained provisions designed to meet the difficulty of having forced upon the parish an Incumbent whose teaching and practices were not acceptable to the people. They were not perfect, but they could have been amended in any direction desired, and it was, in the view of many, a bad blunder to postpone them so that they could be dealt with in a separate Measure. In the meantime the opposition of sections of the clergy developed, with the result that the Further Powers Measure was so emasculated in the discussion that it was passed eventually in a form that was not of much value to any one, and finally the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament reported adversely upon it. What the future may be of the proposal to give the laity further power of objection in the case of an unsuitable appointment and a voice in proposals to alter the character of the Services, cannot be predicted with any certainty, but it may be stated with absolute confidence that unless some further powers of a substantial character are given to the laity there will be a great increase of restlessness in the Church, and the results of the use of a Revised Prayer Book may easily become fraught with real disaster. In the interests of peace we trust that Bishop Knox's proposal may receive attention and that a measure on some such lines as he indicates may be passed.

London Diocesan Conference.

A Special Session of the London Diocesan Conference was held to consider the Report on Revision. It is greatly to be regretted that more of the Evangelical members of the Conference did not sufficiently appreciate the importance of remaining throughout the debates, and particularly of taking part in the divisions. Past experience ought to have taught them that Anglo-Catholic members of the Conference are very highly organized, and are scrupulously obedient to the party whips. On the first day of the Conference a motion was

considered for giving a sort of general approval to the Report, and a rider was moved asking the Assembly to incorporate the Amendments suggested by the Report of the English Church Union Revision Committee. This, unfortunately, was carried, but under circumstances which led Prebendary E. N. Sharpe the next day to make a strong protest. "He said that although 373 members attended the Conference, only 210 took part in the division. As the vote was taken half-an-hour later than was expected, and members of the English Church Union knew that it was coming forward and sent round invitations to their friends to vote—he should feel bound to call the attention of the National Assembly to the circumstances under which the vote was taken." The E.C.U. section interjected cries of "No, No" when he was describing what happened, but no one who was present at the Conference when the vote was taken could doubt that Prebendary Sharpe's protest was justified, and he deserves the thanks of Evangelicals for his courage in making it. When on the second day the subject of "Reservation" was under discussion an amendment was moved as follows: "That in the place of these Rubrics there be substituted the Rubric taken from the Scottish rite, in the following terms: 'According to long existing custom in the Catholic Church, the priest may reserve so much of the consecrated gifts as may be required for the Communion of the Sick and others who could not be present at the celebration in Church.'" This was carried by 185 to 120, and thereby a serious situation is created. The decisions of the London Diocesan Conference naturally carry weight with those who do not know how carefully the strings are pulled, and it is unfortunate that the Conference is committed to the practice of Reservation without any of the safeguards suggested by the Committee of the National Assembly. Evangelical Churchpeople are, of course, opposed to Reservation in any form, but it would be absolutely intolerable if it were left to the unrestricted discretion of the incumbent. The abuses connected with the practice are serious enough already; they would then be multiplied ten-fold.

Lord's Day Recreation.

Some Church Councils in South London are discussing the following resolution: "That this Conference, whilst strongly affirming that Divine Worship is the Christian's first duty on the Lord's Day, yet holds that whole-

some recreation on that day, free from organized competitions or monetary gain, is not contrary to Christian principles, so long as it does not involve the neglect of public worship or the employment of others." Upon this we may be permitted to express our surprise and regret that, at a time when the Christian feeling of all London has been challenged by the opening of Parks for the playing of games on Sunday, any Church body representative of communicants should have no more definite guidance to offer than that "wholesome recreation" on the Lord's Day is "not contrary to Christian principles." This is begging the whole question. The point to be determined is *not* what is "not contrary to," but rather what is enjoined by, Christian principles; and it seems to us to be incontestable that those principles demand that, as the Lord's Day is the one day in seven when, alike by ancient custom and the statute law of England—and above all, of course, by the Divine Law—secular pursuits whether of work or play should be laid aside, it should be spent wholly in the worship of God and the culture of the soul, and that such observance should be rendered not grudgingly or of necessity, but with ready mind and will, for as in everything else that is offered to Him, God loveth a cheerful giver. Moreover, those responsible for the resolution do not seem to have considered the difficulty which must arise over what is meant by "wholesome recreation." Many people—including many doctors—believe that dancing is a "wholesome recreation"; so with billiards and many other games which it would be a shame to associate with the Lord's Day. There is evidently very great need for guidance on questions of this kind, but it should be sound and safe.

Reunion in Australia.

It is essential that those who are interested in reunion should be acquainted with the progress of the movement beyond the seas. In Australia the Anglican Communion is relatively stronger than in other parts of the English-speaking world, but it has not the pre-eminence it possesses in England. Last March a Conference, presided over by the Archbishop, was held in Sydney, at which members of the Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches met on equal terms and discussed with frankness the present situation. The official Report of the proceedings is before

us,[1] and we may at once say it is a *vade-mecum* to the subject. There is in the papers a desire to understand differences and to see clearly what is at stake. The men who attended were really representative, and the ability shown by the speakers and readers of papers was only equalled by the earnestness of all to see steadily and whole the problem they had met to discuss. The Bishop of Willochra, who presented the Lambeth Appeal, maintained that there is at present no insuperable bar to union, and it ought to be possible to agree to "such a basis of Faith and Order as has been already agreed upon by the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational Churches. The opportunities for practical co-operation are much greater than has been understood. The need of the world and Christian Missions, as well as the will of Christ, all combine to make union a duty." Professor Harper (Presbyterian) argued that the conscientious labours of High Church Anglican scholars had largely got rid of the idea that Episcopacy has been divinely commanded. Bishops should be elected by the Christian people of the diocese. Bishop Long maintained that Anglicans were not one whit less democratic than Presbyterians. He believed that the Anglican people did not think of it for one moment in that way. Perhaps the one thing that was going to save democracy was the capacity of leaders. The Rev. J. T. Robertson pointed to the ambiguity in "the Lambeth Appeal on the question of the transmission of grace being limited to the Episcopate," and the Archbishop of Sydney remarked "that some at Lambeth interpreted the Appeal as Mr. Robertson did, but others did not." For our part we may say that this ambiguity must be removed before any real progress is made. To start and continue negotiations or discussions in which words are used in conflicting senses is not the path to union. It contains in it the seeds of future disruption. The Conference resolved: "That while the right of the Church to determine its own policy at any time is recognized, in the opinion of this Conference in view of all the circumstances, it is expedient that the polity of the reunited Catholic Church be Episcopal, provided that (1) the appointment to the office of a Bishop be shared in by ministry and laity; (2) that such office be exercised in a representative and constitutional manner, i.e. that in all adminis-

[1] *Australia and Reunion*. Sydney: Angus & Robertson. (Copies can be had at the Church Book Room, 82 Victoria Street. 3s.)

trative actions the Bishop should be responsible to the representative assembly, conference, or synod of the Church; and (3) that such acceptance of Episcopacy does not necessarily imply that ministerial authority cannot be otherwise obtained, or that Episcopacy is the only channel of Divine grace."

LIVES ENSHRINED IN LANGUAGES. By T. Stenhouse, Ph.D. (*Walter Scott Publishing Co.*, 4*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The capacity of single words for storing up forgotten facts and often through them of conveying moral lessons, has been a wonder and delight to readers and students in all ages; and those who popularize the results of such studies do more than collect a number of curious and interesting examples—they assist us to greater precision and force in the use of words by showing how they acquired their meanings. Isaac Taylor's *Words and Places*, and Trench's *Study of Words* and *English Past and Present* are excellent examples of this class of book. Dr. Stenhouse, in his *Lives Enshrined in Languages*, has given us another. It is an account of personal names which have become part of our ordinary language, and it is made more interesting by the inclusion of examples so recent and so strictly relating to temporary circumstances that it has yet to be seen whether they will retain their positions. "Marconigram" may be superseded by "wireless" and go the way of "daguerreotype" into the limbo of disused and forgotten words. But their inclusion shows plainly to the most casual reader how language is continualy being recruited from this source. Many of us can remember the treatment of Col. Boycott, which added a new verb to our vocabulary so securely that it has received a place in the Oxford Dictionary and has almost superseded "ostracize."

In the verb to "burke" we have one which is a generation older and has already begun to lose the memory of its origin. This is perhaps as well, for it is not pleasant to dwell upon. Happily, the same word, though from a different source, has given us a noun with more dignified and impressive associations. To "lynch," to "mesmerize," to "bowdlerize"; a "mackintosh," a "brougham," a "garibaldi" (shall we some day have a "fascisti" ?), a "martini," a "Remington" (with both civil and military significance), a "jehu"; the electricians' jargon of "amps." and "watts," all remind us of the large place which personal names have made for themselves in our common speech. Dr. Stenhouse tells us of these and of more like them, adding a few from the many which may be drawn from place names.

The book will certainly stimulate the appetite for more of the same kind, and we suggest that future editions would be enhanced in value by a brief bibliography to assist further study; but whether with or without this, we cordially commend Dr. Stenhouse's most interesting book.

THE EPIKLESIS, OR INVOCATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT ON THE EUCHARISTIC BREAD AND WINE[1]

By the Rt. Rev. E. A. KNOX, D.D.
(Formerly Bishop of Manchester)

I ONCE had conversation with Dr. Pusey, having occasion to call on him on a matter of business. The business dispatched I rose to leave him, when he surprised me by saying, "You people who read the *Record* cannot answer this question, 'How is it that people who were no further in time from the Apostles than I am from my own grandfather, taught what I teach with reference to the Lord's Supper?' What have you to say to that?" A poser certainly for a young deacon of about four-and-twenty, still quite innocent of theological reading beyond the then very meagre curriculum for Holy Orders. In my confusion I fell back on a sermon which I had heard from Dr. Heurtley, Margaret Professor of Divinity, and a brother Canon of the same Cathedral as Dr. Pusey. Pusey's reply was "Pooh! Heurtley." After that I had no more to say, but humbly accepted a copy of Dr. Pusey's sermon on the words, "This is My Body." Alas! that copy is lost. It would be interesting reading now.

If I do not in this paper follow the ordinary course of producing links in a chain of evidence—catenæ as they are called—it is because experience has taught me the futility of this process. One side produces evidence of sacrificial language used by the Fathers in speaking of the Eucharist; the other produces quotations of an opposite tendency. Each says to the other—of course, quite politely—"Pooh!" The wood is overlooked, while each side examines from its own standpoint the bark of each separate tree. For our purpose it is enough that all agreed that there was a development of Eucharistic doctrine and rite spread over many centuries. Some will say that the development was due to the guidance of the Holy Spirit unfolding the true contents of the original rite. Others

[1] Being the substance of a Paper read to the Beckenham and Bromley Clerical Union.

will attribute it to the force of superstition. But it will be useful (1) to contrast (*a*) the original rite with (*b*) an Eastern Homily of the fifth century upon the Eucharist; (2) to indicate some of the forces that contributed to the change that will be thus manifested; (3) to examine the consistency of our own service with our Lord's own institution, and to point out the consequences that must follow the introduction of the consecratory Epiklesis.

(1) The Original Rite.

(*a*) We are accustomed to think of the Last Supper as an event in our Lord's life quite unique and designed wholly for the institution of the Eucharist. But it is quite certain that as a devout Jew with His Apostolic band He must have frequently observed the ceremony of the Kiddush, or sanctification of the Sabbath. For this purpose He would find the table spread, and on it a cup and two loaves. As Head of the Apostolic company He must have filled the cup and, after solemn thanksgiving (eucharistia), have given it to the disciples. Then followed a ceremony of washing the hands, which has left its trace in some liturgies, though with a different intention. After this another thanksgiving over the bread, which was then cut and distributed. This weekly sanctification became on the great annual feasts a yet more solemn observance, though with the same ceremonies. Nor is this all. With pious Jews every meal by the act of thanksgiving became a sacrifice, and the table an altar. It is suggested by modern Judaism that the Pharisees' objection to "eating with sinners" lay in their fear of improper or irreverent talk which would disturb the sacrificial aspect of the meal—a suggestion which illuminates St. Paul's word (1 Tim. iv. 4, 5): "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be rejected, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified through the word of God and prayer." We have also a clue to the recognition of the Risen Lord in His "breaking of Bread." Instead of thinking of some manual trick or habit, our thoughts are turned to the solemn thanksgiving, the word of God and prayer. Very different, we may well believe, was His thanksgiving from those that fell from the lips of a Peter, or even of a John.

Whether the Last Supper was a Passover, or eaten on the eve of a Passover, Dr. Sanday declared to be a question on which we can only acknowledge our ignorance. But for our purpose in this paper

the question is not very material. What is material is that we shall not think of the solemn thanksgiving or of the breaking of the bread, of the pouring out of the wine, or of their distribution, as constituents of a wholly new and unknown service. The element of novelty was the use of the words, "This is My Body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of Me. This cup is the New Testament in My Blood which is poured out for you" (St. Luke xxii. 19–21). About the exact form even of these words we cannot be certain. But we cannot doubt that our Lord did use the equivalent of the words, "This is My Body. This is My Blood of the covenant." Nor can we doubt that these words pointed to His atoning Sacrifice about to be accomplished on the Cross of Calvary—a sacrifice which was to be the basis of a new covenant. It is equally certain that He did not institute a new service, but added a new and solemn meaning to that sacrificial element which the pious Israelite found in every family meal. We cannot separate the words "This do," from the words, "As oft as ye drink it." A sacrifice there was, in so far as every meal was a sacrifice, and every Israelite a priest in his own home. This domestic sacrifice of thanksgiving was made the occasion of remembering our Lord's unique sacrifice of Atonement on the Cross. The Bread and Wine were made channels by which the Lord imparted to the faithful the spiritual food of His precious Body and Blood, that is, of union with Himself. May we not find in this fact an explanation of the comparative silence of the first century with reference to the Eucharist? References to Holy Baptism are abundant in the New Testament. References to the Eucharist are comparatively rare. In the Epistle of Barnabas Baptism is dwelt upon with emphasis, but the Eucharist is not mentioned. The same is true even of the Shepherd of Hermas half a century later. This silence does not mean that our Lord's command was disobeyed. St. Paul tells us quite clearly that it was obeyed. But its association with daily meals and the continuance of worship in the Temple (Acts ii. 46; iii. 1, etc.) would naturally keep the Eucharist in the category of family worship in Jerusalem; and to some extent in the Gentile cities also, if, and wherever, a Christian household "broke bread" as they had been taught to break it by the Jewish Apostle or missionary to whom their Church owed its conversion. Holy Baptism would be an extraordinary assembly, and the Eucharist in comparison with it ordinary. The

first mention of it as a sacrifice (thusia) occurs in the Didache which belongs to the first half of the second century. There it bears a closer resemblance to what we call "a service." "On the Lord's Day assemble ye, and break the bread and give thanks, confessing your sins that your sacrifice (thusia) be not defiled." But even this service was often as truly a sacred meal as a gathering for worship. The Eucharist was still even in the third century, in Alexandria, an incident in a meal.

THE EASTERN HOMILY.

(*b*) I suggested that we should contrast the original institution with a later development. Let us pass on, then, to the fifth century Homily, the Homily of Narsai of Nisibis, commenting on one of the earliest complete liturgies that we possess, in which the Invocation of the Holy Spirit on the Bread and Wine for purpose of consecration occurs. You will ask why this particular Homily, belonging to a Nestorian Church, and not altogether in agreement with some other contemporary Churches of the East, is selected. Let me answer in the words of Mr. E. Bishop: "(We should notice) the rapidity of ritual development in this Syriac Church (i.e., of Nisibis) as compared to some extent even with the Greek-speaking Churches, but most remarkably with the West. Just as, e.g., the Syriac Church had in the fourth century advanced in the cult of the Blessed Virgin in a way which we find but just being entered on in the West in the seventh; so, too, in regard to the Eucharist, the common, the ignorant, vulgar are, at the end of the fifth century, at least according to the rite followed by Narsai, already in possession, not merely of full ritual splendours, but also, as it were, through physical acts that must strike the eye of every beholder, in actual possession of that certitude as to the 'moment of consecration' which was only to be acquired by the common people in the West in the twelfth century or, at earliest, in the eleventh. To the ritual of this Syriac Church may be applied the sentence, 'being perfected in a short time it fulfilled a long time.' . . ."

In other words, the Syriac ritual, owing to the rapidity of its development, has preserved for us precisely what we want to know, that is, the nature of the force or forces from without which wrought to change the sacred meal into the consummation of a sacrifice offered by a priest on behalf of a non-communicating congregation.

In reading the Homily we are at once confronted with the name, "the Holy Mysteries"—a significant name, as we shall find presently. The Church, Narsai tells us, is first cleared of all who may not communicate; "the hearers" or catechumens being allowed to guard the doors. "In that hour . . . let us see Jesus Who is being led to death on our account. On the paten and in the cup He goes forth with the deacon to suffer. The bread on the paten and the wine in the cup are a symbol of His death. A symbol of His death the deacons bear, and when they have set it on the altar and covered it they typify His burial." Then enter the priests in beauteous adornment. The celebrating priest bears the image of our Lord, and like Him performs a mediation. The other priests in the sanctuary represent the apostles, and the deacons with their fans are a symbol of the angels at the head and feet of the tomb. The faith of the Fathers is recited. Prayer is bidden. "Pray, brethren, over the oblation which we offer, that it may be acceptable to God to Whom it is offered, and that by the brooding of the Holy Ghost it may be consecrated that it may become unto us a cause of life in the Kingdom on high. The priest now offers the mystery of the redemption of our life, full of awe and covered with great fear and dread. . . . Trembling and fear for himself and for his people lie upon the priest in that dread hour. . . . (See) the awful King mystically slain and buried, and the awful watchers, standing in fear in honour of their Lord. The ranks of watchers surround the altar in that hour, as Chrysostom has borne witness who saw them." Then follows at length a description of the Pax, and after that the reading of the Diptychs (the two sets of the names of the living and the dead). After a solemn call by the herald "the dread mysteries are being consecrated by the priest: let every one be in fear while they are being performed," the priest uncovers the adorable mysteries. The removal of the veil is the rolling away of the stone from the tomb. "Lift up your hearts." "Unto Thee, O Lord, our minds are lifted up." "The acceptable and pure oblation, lo, is offered to the Lord. . . . It is sacrificed that it may blot out and forgive your sins. . . . Lo! it is offered for the dead and for the living. Lo! it is offered to the God of all as a pledge that He will save us from the torment of Gehenna. The people answer, 'It is most right and worthy . . . to offer this oblation for all creatures.'"

Then follows a silence. "The mysteries are set in order, the lamps are shining, the censers are smoking, the deacons are hovering. The priest prays secretly. He adds (aloud), All the watchers are standing in fear to praise the Father, the Son and the Spirit. The angels, too, offer up their worship, the Cherubim applaud, the Seraphim sanctify . . . all at once cry and say to one another. And the people answer, 'Holy, Holy, Holy.'" Another silence follows, during which the priest communes with God, recounting in memory incidents in the life of our Lord, including the institution of the Lord's Supper, but all is said in secret. He raises his voice at the end, and the people say, Amen. Then the priest makes earnest supplication to God that He will accept the sacrifice that is being offered to Him, and after this he summons the Spirit to come down and dwell in the Bread and Wine and make them the Body and Blood of King Messiah, and make the congregation worthy to receive them. "Three bows does the priest make before God, and by them he openly adores His Majesty . . . with one he prays, with one he gives thanks, with one he calls down the Spirit to dwell and light down upon the oblation. Three days did our Lord remain in the bosom of the earth: and on the third He arose in great glory. And in like manner the priest bows three times, and *by the third bow he symbolizes the resurrection of our Lord Jesus.*"

Without this analysis of the Homily it would have been difficult to convey any real sense of the significance of the Eastern Eucharist in this Syriac Homily of the early fifth century. We are assisting at mysteries in which the dead and buried body of Christ is brought into the Church. They are then offered by the priest as an act of mediation with God, the words of Institution being recited secretly at this stage. The culmination of the mystery is the bringing down of the Holy Spirit to quicken the dead body into life. That is the moment of Consecration. In the Eucharist the Western Liturgy leads up to the Crucifixion, in the Eastern to the Resurrection. In the Western the moment of consecration is the recital of the words of Institution. At that moment the mystical Person of our Ascended Lord is on the Altar. He is presented to the Father in the Anamnesis, in the words recalling all that He did for us. By the priests' consumption of the elements the sacrifice is slain and consummated. In the Eastern Church, as in the Western, the Person of Christ, but of the dead Christ, is laid on the altar and offered in the Anam-

nesis to the Father, but after that brought to life by the Holy Spirit that His Life-giving Person may minister life to the communicants. In both Churches the Bread and Wine cease to be bread and wine. They are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ. The Western Church adores the Crucified, the Eastern the Risen Lord.

It is not, of course, suggested that the exposition of Narsai is that which would have been given in all Churches of the East, for, as has been already pointed out, the development of doctrine and ritual was far more rapid in this Church than in other churches, Western as well as Eastern, which used the Epiklesis. Thus, Cyril of Jerusalem, half a century earlier than Narsai, and the first who teaches explicitly the change of the elements effected by the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, does not, so far as I have discovered, explicitly distinguish, as Narsai does, the dead Christ from the risen Christ in the Sacrament. Yet his language carefully examined goes a long way in that direction. "We offer," he says, "the Christ Who was slain on behalf of our sins." But with this statement Narsai, in fact, agrees. It is the slain Christ that he *offers* to God, but it is the risen Christ, raised by the Holy Spirit in response to the Invocation, Whom he adores and receives as spiritual food. So Cyril teaches that in the figure of bread is given the Body, and in the figure of wine is given the Blood, that by partaking the Body and Blood of Christ we may become of one body and one blood in the Christ—assuredly he means with the living Christ. The bread, he says plainly, is not bread, and the wine is not wine. "Cannot He Who changed the water into wine, change wine into blood?" It is the official teaching of the Greek Church to-day that the change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ takes place "through the Holy Ghost in exactly the same way as our Lord became flesh from the Holy Virgin through the Holy Ghost." But that way was a way of life, not of death. The Holy Spirit is the Lord of Life. With life He fills the Baptismal Font. With life He fills the Body and Blood of the crucified Lord, that have been offered as a propitiatory sacrifice by the priest.

It needs no profound theological training to discern a vast difference between the Last Supper in the Upper Room in Jerusalem and the awe-inspiring mystery that first offers to God the crucified Christ and then calls down the Holy Spirit to bring Him to life again. But here let me anticipate an objection. It may be asked

whether the Eucharistic development is really greater than that which separates the Nicene Creed from the New Testament? Have we not in both cases the play of false doctrine upon the mind of the Church, clearing it of its haziness, giving sharpness to its definitions, purging its dross, bringing out of God's treasury the truth that lay hidden there until the time came to bring it to light through the action of the very forces that would have destroyed it? This is a question which cannot really be answered by quotations from the Fathers, for even they were liable to error and were not always consistent with themselves. The Creed, as Lord Balfour points out, was not an attempt to explain or define what is not explained or defined in Scripture, but to hold fast to all that Scripture has taught: not an attempt to explain how the Godhead and Manhood were united in Christ, but to express faith in Jesus Christ perfect God and perfect Man; not an attempt to show how God could suffer or how the buried Christ could rise from the dead, but to affirm the truth that it was indeed Jesus Christ, God and Man, Who verily suffered, was buried and rose again the third day. The Creed was not moulded to suit philosophic thought or to offer metaphysical explanations, but to assert the Gospel revelation as against such influences, and to keep it pure from them. Can we say the same of the development of Eucharistic doctrine and ritual? Up to a certain point—roughly the end of the third century—we can.

Dr. Swete (*J. Th. S.*, III, p. 176) sums up the Eucharistic belief of the Church in the second and third centuries thus: "There is a significant absence in the Anti-Nicene monuments of any reference to the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist; indeed, it is scarcely possible that Eucharistic adoration can have been practised by an age which sent the Eucharist from Church to Church, kept it in private houses for daily use, and in emergencies was prepared to convey and administer it to the dying by the hands of a child. The Anti-Nicene Church took Christ's words as true, and revered the Bread and Cup which He called His Body and His Blood; but so far as our evidence extends, it does not lead us to conclude that she based on this belief and reverent attitude a system of practical devotions such as that which was afterwards built upon them. She was satisfied with the knowledge that in the Holy Eucharist she had an unfailing supply of the Bread of Life."

There was, in fact, a good and sufficient reason, arising out of the controversies of the time, and acting strongly, to prevent any attempt to explain the Eucharistic gift by a change wrought in the elements through consecration.

During the second and third centuries the controversies of the Church were mainly with Docetics, Gnostics and Manicheans. At the root of all these heresies was the conception that matter was evil, and that the Incarnation was fundamentally inconceivable. The Church appealed to the Eucharist as an assurance that our Lord had linked up the highest blessings in His bestowal with material Bread and Wine. Ignatius always speaks when he can of the Flesh of Christ and the Blood of Christ, where he might have said simply Christ. Thus he writes: "Create yourselves anew in faith, which is the Flesh of the Lord, and in love which is the Blood of Christ." The famous passage in Justin Martyr, interpret it how you will, and there are many interpretations, has in view the correspondence between the Eucharist and the Incarnation: "We do not receive these as common bread and wine. But as Christ our Saviour was made flesh by the Word of God, so the nourishment that has received Eucharistic benediction by prayer and the Word of God proceeding from Him is the Flesh and Blood of Jesus made Flesh." It was essential to the soundness of this argument that the bread should be real bread, as the Flesh of Christ was real flesh. Conversion of the elements into something else would have been fatal to the whole analogy.

(2) Forces that Contributed to the Change.

What, then, were the forces which combined in the fourth century to transfer the sacrificial idea from that of a sacred family meal to that of a sacrifice offered by a priest upon an altar? And, further, to fix upon a particular moment as the moment in which what had been food consecrated by the family thanksgiving ceased to be material food and became, by Divine action duly invoked, what it had not been before.

We must distinguish between (*a*) the culmination of agencies previously at work; and (*b*) the operation of agencies acquiring a new power.

(*a*) Agencies previously at work. One of the chief of these

was the necessity of making a plain distinction between the Church and the heretics. Lightfoot tells us that between the first and second of the Apostolic Fathers, Clement of Rome and Ignatius—there is "a wide chasm." "The interval of time, indeed, is not great. Twenty years at the outside separated the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians from the letter of Ignatius. But these two decades were a period of exceptionally rapid progress. . . . There are epochs in the early history of a great institution, as there are times in the youth of an individual man, when the increase of stature outstrips and confounds by its rapidity the expectation founded on the average rate of growth." The insidious poisons of Gnosticism and Docetism forced the Church to such positions as that taken by Ignatius, that there could be no Eucharist without a Bishop. That position tended to convert the sacred meal into a Church service. The Bishop could not preside at a number of meals in a number of households in one day. As the meal took on the character of a service, so a formal offering of bread and wine began to replace the contribution by each communicant of his own share, and piety would soon construe this formal offering into the bringing in the Lord Himself into the assembled congregation.[1]

Another agency at work before the fourth century was the growing insistence of the Church on the value of the Old Testament. As the heretics depreciated it so, the Church found in it a Divine barrier against Gnosticism, a bulwark of monotheism. Also, as its Psalms and prophecies spoke more and more plainly to the Church of Christ, it was not unnatural that types of Him began to be suggested in the services of the Temple, types all the more dear when the Temple had been destroyed. From this it was but a step to identify the Christian with the Mosaic priesthood. That step was all the easier when Alexandria became a school of divinity. The very name Eucharist would, in Alexandria, contribute to sacerdotal interpretation. For in Alexandrine Greek—in Philo,

[1] An interesting survival of the transition from the meal to the service and of the connection between the two is to be found in the practice of sending a portion of the consecrated element of bread (fermentum) from the Pope's Mass to all the chief churches of Rome in order to connect the Mass said in all the other churches with the Pope's Mass. It needs very little exercise of imagination to perceive how by such a practice as this the Ignatian rule of "no eucharist without a Bishop" could be reconciled with the necessity of domestic eucharists that must have been felt often enough in times of persecution. The unity of the Eucharist could be maintained without superseding altogether the "house to house" breaking of bread.

though not in the LXX or New Testament—*eucharistein* was to "offer a sacrifice," and *eucharistia* was "a victim." Something also must be put down to the sorely misinterpreted passage of Malachi—used, we doubt not, by our Lord in its proper sense, but alienated from that sense to serve a point of controversey with Judaism.[1] These were some of the transforming tendencies at work in the second and third centuries.

(*b*) But with the fourth century came another momentous epoch in the development of the Church. The end of persecution brought in a flood of untrained adherents, carrying with them their old beliefs and practices. New forms of heresy became rife, new pressure was exercised by surviving relics of superstition.

The controversies of the fourth century turned upon the essence of the Godhead, and the relations of the Three Persons or Hypostaseis of the Godhead to one another. These controversies established in a new manner the distinctness, if such a term may be used in connection with the Blessed Trinity, of the Holy Spirit and a defining of His action. Correspondences were sought between His action in the Incarnation, in Holy Baptism and in the Eucharist. The whole tendency of the inquiry was contrary to that which had insisted on the reality of the elements in the Eucharist. It is not unlikely that the Pneumatomachian controversy, i.e., the controversy as to the Godhead of the Holy Ghost, contributed to give a new emphasis and new meaning to older forms of Invocation of the Holy Spirit.

Still, we cannot help asking ourselves how it came to pass that while the doctrine of the Godhead of the Holy Ghost was received alike in East and West, and at the same time, the liturgic effect of the change was more rapidly visible in the East, and more far-

[1] Malachi i. 11 from its use among the "Testimonia" may very probably have been one of the Scriptures which our Lord quoted in His discourse with His disciples. Its meaning is not very different from what our Lord said to the woman of Samaria, "the hour cometh when neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem shall ye worship the Father. The hour cometh and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth." So Malachi taught that "God had at that time His worshippers, His true sacrifices, His true incense offering even among the Gentiles." To Christian Israelites scattered among the Gentiles, after the destruction of Jerusalem, this verse easily adapted itself to their eucharist sacrifice—although the prophets and surely our Lord Himself had in mind that which was in a sense more wonderful than any Eucharist—the existence of God's Israel among the heathen, and in spite of their heathenism, even before the coming of the Christ.

reaching in its implication. The answer must be found in the stronger survival in the East of what Dr. Dill calls "the surging spiritual energy which in the second and third century was seeking for expression and appeasement in the Mystery religions," the religion of the Great Mother from Phrygia, of Isis from Egypt, and of Mithra from the Far East. Common to all of these was the mystery of life out of death. Defiled as they were by licentiousness, and hated by Christian apologists for their licentiousness and their travesties of Christian truth, as, for instance, in the Taurobolium (the cleansing bath of bull's blood), they made their appeal also to a better side of humanity, to that very side which ultimately gave its triumph to Christianity. Mr. T. C. Lawson, who has made a profound study of Greek religion, after pointing out in its modern rites and religious customs many survivals of primitive folklore, goes on to speak of the mysteries and says (*Primitive Folklore and Modern Greek Religion*, p. 566): "Let us suppose that the general assurances openly given concerning both the Eleusinian and other mysteries are fairly summed up in the promise of being God-beloved and sharing the life of the gods. Such a promise appealed to those innate hopes of the whole Greek race, which manifested themselves in their constant striving after close intercourse and communion with their gods; in other words, the happier hopes concerning the hereafter, which the mysteries sought to appropriate and to reserve to the initiated alone, had for their basis the natural religion of the Hellenic folk." It was inevitable that the far-spread Greek world in Asia, as well as Europe, should seek to find in Christianity what they had found in the mysteries. The very word mystery was carried over to the Eucharist. From the Eucharist the unbaptized (the uninitiated) were excluded. The elements of awe and solemn fear were accentuated. In holy procession, in the Eucharist as in the mysteries, the god who had been slain was borne. Around him was the gorgeously robed attendance of priests (hierophants). It was impossible for Greek religion that such a mystery as this should not culminate in a resurrection from the dead wrought by the descent of the Holy Spirit. Mr. Lawson gives a vivid description of the celebration of Easter in a Greek village. No one can read it without being impressed by the resemblance between the modern Easter and the ancient festival of Demeter. The influence of ancient superstition on Christian ceremonial is undeniable. It is true that

the ceremony which Mr. Lawson describes is not a Eucharist, but it has wonderful resemblances to the Homily of Narsai.

The Consistency of Our Own Service.

What, then, is the conclusion of the whole matter? It is this. The introduction of the invocation of the Holy Spirit in the prayer of consecration is a far more serious doctrinal change than it is commonly supposed to be. It is commonly argued that our Baptismal Service contains a prayer for the consecration of the water, "sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin." No one, it is said, has argued in consequence of this prayer that the element of water is changed. Why, then, should a prayer for the consecration of the bread and wine involve any doctrine of transubstantiation, or other theory of the conversion of the bread and wine into something that they were not before?

In this argument are involved many errors. In the first place, the prayer in our Baptismal Service is not an invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the water, nor even a prayer to God the Father that the water may be sanctified by the Holy Spirit. In this respect it is strongly contrasted with the pre-Reformation prayers for the consecration of the Font, which did definitely ask that the element of water might be purged from all evil influences and become living water, regenerating water, purifying water. Oil and wax were poured upon it with prayer that "the virtue of the Holy Spirit might descend into the fulness of the water and fertilize the whole substance of this water with regenerating power." The water so consecrated was to be kept till the font was corrupt, and not till then was it to be renewed, and renewed with the aforesaid ceremonial. It is clear that even in the case of baptismal water there was room for superstitious ideas consequent upon or growing up with invocation of the Holy Spirit for the purpose of consecration.

In the next place the argument suggests that the object of the introducing an invocation is that of setting apart the elements of bread and wine from common use and dedicating them or fitting them to be channels of mystical union with our Blessed Lord. If anywhere the proper place for the introduction of such words is in conjunction with the petition that we may be partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ, or in the prayer of consecration *before* the words of Institution. Words in such a position, limiting the object of consecration

by the Holy Spirit to the object and purpose of reception, would be in accordance with some ancient liturgies. But there has been no proposal, so far as I am aware, at all events no successful proposal, to introduce an invocation of this sort. Yet this is the kind of invocation which may fairly claim to be universal—the kind of invocation which may reasonably be compared with the consecration of the baptismal water. Though it may be doubted whether even here the omission of the words " by Thy Holy Spirit " is not desirable, in consequence of the controversies that have arisen respecting the substance of the consecrated Bread and Wine. Is it not because use of the consecrated elements for *adoration* is, in fact, desired, that consecration in this form has found no supporters ?

On the other hand, the introduction of an invocation of the Holy Spirit into the prayer of consecration, at the point where it is proposed to introduce that invocation, cannot really have any such, may we say, " innocent " meaning. Liturgies have their history. We cannot rid them of it. A consecratory invocation after the words of Institution has, and must have, the implications of its history, and we only take advantage of the liturgical ignorance of the average Englishman, and of some 70 per cent. of the clergy, when we pretend that the words at this particular point in the consecration service have no other meaning than their surface meaning. The invocation of the Holy Spirit at this point can only be for the purpose of consecration. This consecratory invocation is neither original nor universal (see Cabrol's *Dictionary of Archæology and Liturgy*, article " Epiklesis "). There is no instance of it before the middle of the fourth century. When it was introduced it marked definitely the moment of consecration, and led on rapidly to theories of conversion of the elements, and to acts of adoration. It would be *absolutely legitimate* to contend that its introduction now into the prayer of consecration was for the same purpose, and that our Church intended those consequences to follow which did follow from its original use.

Further, the introduction of the words would not bring us one step nearer to the Eastern Church, unless we used them with the intention with which the Eastern Church uses them, that is, of publicly proclaiming to the congregation that the Bread and Wine have been changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, and changed by the same action of the Holy Spirit as that which brought about

the Incarnation in the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary. To use the words in any other meaning would not be a *rapprochement* to the East, but a condemnation of it.

At the same time we should be throwing ourselves into the controversy between East and West, and whether we so intended or not, we should be pronouncing all Western consecration of the elements, and all our own up to the present time, to be defective.

What is here said is greatly strengthened by the proposal to introduce words recalling the Death, Passion, Resurrection and ascension of the Lord immediately after the invocation, or, as the Report of the National Assembly has it, after the words of Institution. For these words are, in fact, the old anamnesis, which is the presentation to the Father of the Body and Blood of Christ, into Which the Bread and Wine have been converted. Here, again, the attempt to represent these words as having no more than their surface meaning is really a trading upon the liturgical ignorance of the average Englishman. They are words of the highest import. They are the signal for elevation, genuflexions, censing, and acts of adoration. They will be so used, and the clergy and congregations who so use them will be liturgically correct. It is in vain to pretend that they will not. The official pronouncement of the Church of England will be in favour of practices and doctrines discarded at the Reformation. Those who attach to them some other private meaning of their own will be disloyal to the Church, and, as clergy, will be receiving its pay while not teaching its doctrine.

The only release from this position will be that for a time use of the present Prayer Book will be lawful and the Articles unchanged. "The Church will be comprehensive and tolerant of varieties of opinion." Now, it is true that as long as the State decides that the Church shall be comprehensive, the Church will have to submit, as a condition of retaining its status and endowments. But the position will not be a very honourable position. It will give enormous advantages to the Roman controversialist, who will not fail to point out that our Church has no consistent, no defensible, doctrine of the Eucharist, that its Eucharistic services are not in agreement one with the other, and that one of the services is violently at variance with the official teaching of the Church. If there is any such quality as ecclesiastical self-respect the Church will have to escape from this position at any cost. For a Church to be unable to teach her children the meaning of the Eucharist is the lowest humiliation. The only true toleration is that which the Prayer Book already accords, that is—the prayer of consecration which, pointing to the Cross, prays that our Lord will give all that He would have us receive, when He instituted and ordained these holy mysteries, and recalls the solemn acts and words of Institution. Here we are united on what He did, and are left free in our interpretation of His act. It is when we force our explanation on others by significant rite and ceremony that we are divided. The present Liturgy of our Church is the only liturgy that can claim to be truly primitive and catholic.

TEACHING WITH A VIEW TO EVANGELISM.

By the Rev. Bernard C. Jackson, M.A.

ST. MARK closes his account of our Lord's ministry at Nazareth with these significant words: "He could there do no mighty works, save that He laid His hands upon a few sick folk and healed them. And He marvelled because of their unbelief. And He went round about the villages teaching" (St. Mark vi. 5, 6).

Teaching was His remedy for the unbelief which held back the forces of the Kingdom then. It is our remedy for a like situation to-day. The question is: "*What must the teaching be?*"

A Preliminary Point.

There is one preliminary and fundamental thing which I feel ought to be an axiom of all our thinking on this matter. Christianity is primarily a religion of experience; a religion in which things happen; and the other side of this truth is that God is, not a philosophical abstraction, but a real Person who does things. That leads me to the first part of my subject—

I. Our Teaching about God.

We must teach people about God, because our aim is to bring them to God; and "he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him" (Heb. xi. 6). It is *no good taking too much for granted* on this point. Though science is not, and cannot be, antagonistic to belief in God, the modern emphasis on natural law has temporarily eclipsed the sense of the reality of God. Our aim must be to restore this. We can of course only do it in so far as God is a living reality to ourselves. But I want to submit *two other considerations which I think need special attention in our teaching about God to-day.*

(*a*) *Our presentation of God must be great enough to commend itself to the modern world-outlook.*

The thoughts of men have widened immensely during the last fifty years. We must take care that the thought of God underlying our evangelism has at least kept pace with that widening process.

The Bible, as archæology has made increasingly clear, comes to us from periods of great world-outlook. Therefore we have only to go back to our Bibles to discover afresh by the revealing of the Holy Spirit those great thoughts about God needed for the great world of to-day.

(*b*) *We must present God in the environment of a real spiritual world or unseen kingdom.*

We have grown too Sadducean in our theology. We are too silent about the unseen world and its ordered life. One lamentable reaction from this is seen in the growth of spiritism. It is true that otherworldliness has been distasteful to the practical temper of modern times; and people have not hesitated to tell us so. But after all, if there is, as Jesus taught, a real unseen world, to which all are swiftly moving, and which closely affects life here, we ought to tell people about it. My reason, however, for speaking of this now is that it is indispensable to our teaching about God. We want to make God real to people. But the mind cannot properly realize a person apart from his environment. And I believe one difficulty people feel about the realization of God is that, if I may use such an expression without irreverence, they cannot "place" God. Even if they recognize that His presence pervades the whole material universe, that does not really meet the difficulty. They know God is eternal and perfect, and they know the material universe is neither. We must give them back a real heaven or they will not be able to grasp the fundamental truth of evangelism, that God is a real Person.

II. Our Teaching about Salvation.

This is rooted in our teaching about God. Out of the two great truths of His righteousness and His love—out of their eternal union—springs the glorious Gospel of Salvation. The earliest Apostolic preaching was careful to relate its evangel very closely to the eternal fact of God. We cannot be too careful to do the same. There must never be the least suspicion that the Gospel is an afterthought of God, or that God only began to love and forgive sinners when Christ died. The Atonement itself is as eternal as God is eternal. The Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world (Rev. xiii. 8). What the Cross expressed and did in history was in the mind of God throughout eternity.

Now if the content of the Gospel is eternal, what is it that makes it "news"? *What new thing has happened?*

St. Mark tells us that our Lord began His ministry "proclaiming the good news of God and saying the time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God has come near" (i. 14 and 15). The new thing, then, was that the kingdom of God had come near. But what is the kingdom of God?

A Divergence—the Gospel of the Kingdom and the Gospel of Salvation.

Here I must diverge for a moment. There has been a rather unfortunate tendency during the last few years to draw a distinction between the Gospel of the Kingdom and the Gospel of Salvation. It arose out of the special circumstances of our time. For various reasons, some intellectual, some practical, many people had been looking for the coming of a better social order, and they naturally seized on the phrase—"the kingdom of God"—to give religious expression to this great hope. The rise of a better social order is, of course, closely connected with the kingdom of God. It can only come through the coming of God's kingdom; and when it comes it will be a part of that kingdom. But the kingdom of God is not merely a synonym for a better social order. For it is clear that our Lord thought of it as already in existence, or He could not have said that it had come near. Besides, on two occasions (St. Luke xvii. 20, and St. John xviii. 36), He distinctly said that the kingdom is spiritual. It is, in fact, the unseen world where God is, where His will is done and where righteousness, peace and joy are the ruling features of life (Rom. xiv. 17). There can be no real distinction between the Gospel of such a kingdom and the Gospel of Salvation. The coming of that kingdom is salvation. For it is the coming of righteousness, peace and joy—the coming of God Himself, by the Holy Ghost, into the hearts of men and into the social order.

Now this divine work of Salvation has *two parts*—first, what God has done for us; and, second, what God does in us.

(*a*) *What God has done for us.*—The opening words of our Lord's public ministry implied that the kingdom of God had come into a new relation with human life. The reason of that lies in His Incarnation, using that word for the moment in its widest meaning. By the birth of the Son of God a permanent point of contact and communication had been established between God and man (St. John i. 51). By His atoning death the veil was rent in twain (St.

Matt. xxvii. 51) and a new and living way into the holiest was consecrated (Heb. x. 20) for us. As we sing in the Te Deum:

"When Thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death
Thou didst open the kingdom of heaven to all believers."

This is the news which makes Christianity a Gospel. Something has happened. God's love has triumphed. He has effected an entrance into a world estranged by sin. He has put away the barrier which sin had created. He has thrown open the kingdom with all its boundless resources of grace and truth, of life and power (Eph. i. 19). Salvation on its objective side is a "finished" work. And yet this is not all. The other side of salvation is—

(*b*) *God's Work in us.*—It isn't enough to tell men that the kingdom is open. The world, the flesh, and the devil drag them back. The memory of past failures quickly quenches new-born hopes. Worst of all, they have no real appetite for the things of God. The natural heart is cold and dead. "Unless you can tell me of a God who can change me," they say, "your Gospel is no use." Thank God that is exactly what we can tell them. "God who commanded light to shine out of darkness hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. iv. 6). There is the answer of the true evangelist: "God has changed me: He can change you." The nature of the change is sometimes described as awakening from sleep, sometimes as the breaking in of light, sometimes as a new birth or resurrection, that is as the coming of a new life. The last appears to be the most fundamental. The essential change needed is the gift of life. "Except a man be born again He cannot see the kingdom of God" (St. John iii. 3).

1. *The Truth of the New Birth—God's Gift of Life.*

There can be no revival in our day until the truth of the new birth is restored to its right place. But that is no easy thing. Though the heart needs it, the heart shrinks from it. And though in reality one of the most splendid truths of Christianity, the Devil contrives unceasingly to discredit it. May I venture two suggestions?—

(*a*) *Show the reasonableness of it.*—Our Lord taught it in close connection with the truth of the kingdom of God; and it is in this setting that the reasonableness of the doctrine of the new

birth is most readily seen. The kingdom is spiritual. Human nature in its fallen state is not spiritual. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." "The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit, neither can he know them" (1 Cor. ii. 14). It may be a humiliating fact. But it shows the necessity and the reasonableness of the new birth. It would help to win for this great truth its right place, if it were not used too exclusively as a subject for personal appeal, but more often treated as the subject of thoughtful teaching. We must show its reasonableness, and so "justify the ways of God to men."

(*b*) *We must show its Blessedness.*—It is in reality a most wonderful bit of the "good news" that God can, and desires to, make us new creatures. Our destiny is not limited to the bettering of our natural state. There is a higher life here and hereafter. Sin has left us spiritually dead; but God can give us life. Sin has made us spiritually blind; but God can open our eyes. "Things which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, and which have not entered into the heart of man to conceive, things which God hath prepared for them that love Him, He hath revealed unto us by His Spirit" (1 Cor. ii. 9 and 10). O, that we could let men see the surpassing beauty and attractiveness of this higher life! Surely it would make them welcome the good news that we can be born again. And then there is the eternal side of the matter. We are immortal. Death does not end life. What about the life beyond? God has designed it as a life that is not only spiritual in its conditions, but spiritual in its character. Surely it is a blessed thing to know that we can become spiritual now; that we can have within us now the Holy Spirit, as "the earnest of our inheritance" (Eph. i. 14); and that the full heritage beyond is no longer a strange land but a home to which we already belong in heart and mind.

Closely related to teaching about the new birth is teaching about repentance and faith, which, like the former, need to be made the subject of teaching as well as of appeal. People do not know how to repent and to believe.

2. *Repentance and Faith.*

And, first, what is repentance? It is, as our Catechism puts it, that "whereby we forsake sin." Before I repent I am more or less

on the side of my sin. Even though I hate it, I defend it, I excuse it. However secret and almost unperceived even by myself, there is something that links me to it. But when I repent, the link is broken. I forsake it. I condemn it. I begin to see my life without it. I have caught a glimpse of something higher.[1] But this change of attitude towards sin is rooted in something deeper. There is an inner hardness of the natural heart, of which we may be quite unaware. St. Paul associates it very closely with impenitence in Romans ii. 5, and points to it in Eph. iv. 18, as the deepest cause of the natural man's alienation from the life of God. When we repent, this hardness begins to break up. Like the ploughed field, it becomes receptive of the living seed.[2]

There we touch the point in the soul's experience where repentance and faith meet. Faith is trust in a personal God and Saviour. Trust in God involves much that is implicit in repentance—the abandonment of all suspicion or self-will, or pride, or enmity towards God, a real surrender to Him, an acknowledgment that we are in the wrong, a readiness to be at peace with Him on His terms. But faith is more than all this. It rests itself on God's mercy. It yields itself to God's love, unknown or resisted before. It clasps, with the two hands of love and need, God in Christ, the Incarnate Saviour. It claims His merits. It hides itself in Him. It opens all the avenues of its being to the inflow of His cleansing and His life. And like "the violent" in our Lord's parable, it takes the kingdom of heaven by force and claims its blessings and its powers for salvation and victory, holiness and service. In fact, repentance and faith are respectively the negative and the positive sides of that changed attitude of soul towards God which, not only at the beginning but throughout Christian discipleship, is the indispensable condition of salvation and of life.

There are three things I should like to add about the teaching of this subject:—

(1) We must be careful not to represent repentance as a gloomy thing. It is often stern, but never gloomy (Lam. iii. 21). It is in reality a release, a relief, a joy. It is "repentance unto remission

[1] It should be added that teaching on repentance must insist on action—calling on people "to do works meet for repentance" (Acts xxvi. 20).

[2] For a singularly beautiful description of this experience of repentance see Masefield's poem, "The Everlasting Mercy," pp. 72–75.

of sins" (St. Luke xxiv. 47), "repentance unto life" (Acts xi. 18).

(2) We must be careful not to represent faith as something abnormal. Sin and the repentance which sin necessitates do indeed introduce into faith certain abnormal elements. But faith itself and in its essence is not something abnormal but rather a return to man's right and normal attitude towards God.

(3) We must be careful to make plain (for this is an important part of the good news) that both repentance and faith are God's gifts (Acts v. 31 and xi. 18, and Eph ii. 8). We can neither truly repent nor truly believe, but by the help of the Holy Spirit. He only can,

> "Convince us all of sin
> Then lead to Jesus's blood
> And to our wondering souls reveal
> The secret love of God."

When Jesus spoke to Nicodemus of the new birth into the kingdom, and of repentance[1] and of faith, He led his thoughts to the uplifting of the brazen serpent in the wilderness as a picture of the great truth of Calvary. The Lamb of God uplifted first on the Cross and then on the Throne is the one hope of a world perishing through sin. To that central truth the Holy Spirit ever seeks to lead men's hearts and minds. There only are true repentance and living faith found and renewed. There only is eternal life received. The words of the old mission hymn are abidingly true in experience:

> "There is life for a look at the Crucified One,
> There is life at this moment for thee."

I once asked a Chaplain who was preaching every week to a thousand Army Cadets during the war, what was the line of preaching he found best to use. After a moment's thought he answered: "The easiest is to preach Christ as our Example. The hardest is to preach the Cross." "But," he added, "that is the thing that tells."

I come now to the third and last part of our subject.

III. Our Teaching about the Sacraments.

This is an integral part of teaching that has evangelism as its objective. The sacraments are inseparable from the Gospel. They are the Gospel in outward sign as preaching is the Gospel in spoken word. They centre in the person of Christ. They present in clear

[1] The words of St. John iii. 5, "born of water"—would suggest this to Nicodemus.

and vivid outline the fact of redemption by His death. They are His own appointed means of grace, whereby God "doth work invisibly in us and doth not only quicken but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him" (Article XXV). Let us use them to the full in the work of evangelism.

First, Baptism. It is God's act. Its outward sign is a visible assurance of the reality of God's gifts of cleansing and of life. The words of the service point the soul to the Cross and Resurrection as the secret of salvation. They call to a life of dying from sin and rising to righteousness through union with Christ, into whose body, the Church, baptism incorporates; and the very fact of its administration in infancy is a standing witness of the doctrine of free grace, showing us concretely that truth which lies at the heart of the Gospel, that it is always God who takes the first step in man's salvation.

Second, Confirmation. I take leave to speak of it at this point. Though not a Sacrament according to the teaching of our Church, it is the natural link between the sacraments—itself, as I think the late Bishop Handley Moule described it, "quasi-sacramental" in character. It witnesses to a most important evangelistic truth—the gift of the Holy Spirit, which is not the privilege of the few but the birthright of all believers. There would be fewer lapses and backslidings, if it were made clearer in our evangelism both that none can live the Christian life without the Holy Spirit and that all may have that gift by faith. Here lies the opportunity of Confirmation.

Just in the moment of public confession of Christ by the renewal of the baptismal vow comes the offer and the assurance of the gift of the Holy Ghost in the laying-on of hands. Moreover, it comes with that suggestion of service to which we have been learning lately to give a larger place in the preaching of the Gospel. For confirmation is, as it has been sometimes called, the ordination of the laity, the definite commissioning of the believer for active service in the Church; reminding him that the Church is not merely an ark of safety, nor merely the home of spiritual life, but God's fighting force for the conquest of evil and the extension of His kingdom of truth and love.

Third, the Holy Communion. Its importance for evangelism lies in this—it expresses in outward sign and act God's giving and

man's taking of salvation. Every true Communion is a coming to Jesus. If we were propagating Christianity in a new country, the climax of our evangelism would be a call to Baptism. But here in England we are dealing with people who for the most part have been baptized in infancy, and many of whom have been confirmed. We bid them come to Christ. We offer them in His name the gift of salvation. But we are speaking of things unseen. Here lies the difficulty with many seeking souls. They crave for something that helps to actualize the gift and their reception of it. Surely our answer is to bid them to the Lord's Supper. There is no more powerful presentation of the Gospel than the Service of Holy Communion. There the penitent sinner confesses his sin. There he receives the declaration of divine forgiveness, and listens to the comfortable words of assurance. There he acknowledges his unworthiness and utter dependence on God's mercy. And then after the great corporate act of commemoration of redemption there are given into his hands and he receives and appropriates the very signs and seals of the new covenant of forgiveness and of life. "Now I know," he can say, "that God's promise is true and that its blessings are mine."

> "Here, O my Lord, I see Thee face to face;
> Here faith can touch and handle things unseen;
> Here would I grasp with firmer hand Thy grace,
> And all my weariness upon Thee lean."

Surely it is the uniquely fitting opportunity for the awakened soul to make the great venture of faith and claim the gift of salvation and of life. The Church's best penitent form is the kneeling place before the Holy Table. This need not involve an administration at the time. But as a place of decision it has a great value. There the convert comes the next Sunday, or it may be after Confirmation or special preparation, to renew that first coming or return to Christ, under the same hallowed associations. It helps to correlate those three elements of individual discipleship which ought never to be separated—our coming to Christ, our feeding upon Christ, and our consecration to His service, and it invests our discipleship with that true dignity and inspiration which comes from the realization of our fellowship in the worshipping life of the whole Church of God throughout this world and within the veil.

CONTEMPORARY FICTION.

BY A REVIEWER.

FOR many years the writer has had the duty of reviewing three novels at least weekly. This has led him to dip into many more, and therefore he may claim to have some slight acquaintance with current Fiction. It may be said that he has wasted valuable time, and received no benefit from the attention he has devoted to the ephemeral products of ready pens given to chronicling the records of their imagination. He does not agree. Fiction is the most widely read form of literature contained between covers. It is read in the popular daily press, and the journals of largest circulation contain their daily instalment of fiction. It is found in the religious weeklies of large circulation, and the magazines that are the creation of the last generation consist mainly of stories short or continued. Novels are read by all classes. We have seen men in the highest position in Church and State turn out of their cases the "best seller" and devour it with as much interest as the girl who makes her daily journey to and from town. We have known scientists and scholars of the front rank to find recreation in the stories from the pens of those who are most admired in their kitchens—we cannot say "servants' halls"—for even in England scientists and scholars of the type we mention are not rich. There is not a class in the country that does not indulge in novel reading, and therefore it is of the highest importance that those who are in a position to reach the ear of even a small section of the public should know what to recommend and what to avoid recommending.

Our publications are the best reflection of national life. We find in our books the echo of the thoughts, actions and even imaginations of all classes. Time was when theological books were the largest portion of the year's publishing output. Now this is changed, and Fiction bulks more than any two divisions of the year's publications. Take up any number of *The Times* Literary Supplement, which gives the best list of books published week by week, and note the number under the head Fiction, and compare it with that in any other division. The excellent summaries of contents give a fair clue to the character of the books, which will be found to deal

with every department of life. Whatever men do is treated with a frankness that is often repelling and with a sympathy that frequently makes the reader sympathize unconsciously with evil. The characters that pass through the pages may be lay figures or men of flesh and blood. Every one of them has some contact with life as it is lived, and the person who reads with attention is sure to learn something of human nature—although it may only be the imputation of the writer in the pages he or she writes—that will serve him in good stead when he comes into touch with other people. The conscientious reviewer performs a real service if he succeeds in directing readers to the books that will teach and interest most, and by so doing keep them from those that are morally or otherwise harmful.

There are many books that are distinctly hurtful to faith and morals. Unfortunately we have reached a period in which it is necessary to disregard the name of the publisher and even of the author before pronouncing on the character of a book. Time was when the names on the title-page were a guarantee of the cleanness of a volume. That day has largely passed, and some of the best houses and most widely read writers have been responsible for novels that can do nothing but harm. The same fountain seems to be able to give forth sweet and bitter water. The authors who have charmed us by their high idealism disgust us by their low conceptions of morality and by their salacious descriptions of sex relations. One writer brought to task for the coarse patches in his work said, " I cannot help it. I see life as it is, and I am unconscious of abetting immorality or inciting imagination by these paragraphs. They are descriptions of what men and women think and do. Life would not be truly portrayed without them. Honest art demands their insertion." The eminent man who said this has the deserved reputation of living a self-denying life, and devoting himself unselfishly to public service. If art force him to write as he sometimes writes, we seem to be in the presence of a Mr. Hyde in the Dr. Jekyll of the day. We may find something in his apology—for as a rule his work is clean—but we are not convinced that it is right to be coarse in order to be true to life as it ought to be described by our best writers. We are fully aware of the passages in Shakespeare, and the " calling spades spades " in Henry Fielding. But they are not the leading features of their works, and they are a reflection of

the common talk of the day. We can do without the Zolaesque in our present-day fiction.

But these patches that defile in the books of the otherwise clean are not the worst feature of our contemporary fiction. The New Psychology is responsible for a great deal that is subversive of pure thinking and clean living. The over-stressing of the sex element has made its appeal to the weaknesses of a very large number of people. Sex, whether as a complex or as a recognized single factor, lies at the very root of all human life. We are born male or female, and we remain so till the end of our lives. The normal man or woman is not sex obsessed. Sex is persistent in its presentation of itself at the right as well as at the wrong time. This does not mean that the uncontrolled manifestations of sex are something to be recorded and published. It is no reason why the writings of men and women should make the illicit indulgence of sex something to be palliated, and sin to cease to be sin because after all it is the fruit of the strongest motives in our lives. The analysis of sex feelings, and the throwing into relief of sex, awaken in the readers feelings and thoughts that are naturally dormant, and insensibly lead to a lowering of the sense of duty and prepare the way to a downward course. Women are the worst offenders in this respect. They seem to take an unholy pleasure in analysing the steps that lead to yielding to passion and to describe surroundings that had best be left undescribed. Compare the story of the fall of Hetty Sorrel with the similiar incidents in some recent works. We have just laid down a brilliant tale—written with insight into human nature and with the greatest skill. But it is ruined and spoiled for home reading by the long passages that should never have been written and by the apologies for sin, that does not cease to be sin, because otherwise high characters fall into it. And this book is no exception. Another story of the year by an accomplished writer is ruined for those who believe in Christian morality by similar passages. Both of these books stand in the first rank of contemporary novels. They have been welcomed as such by the best judges. They are well written and skilfully constructed. But their influence on the minds of readers cannot fail to be bad. Therefore the reviewer does not notice them, and by so doing tries to render a service to morality. There are some things that ought not to find the entrance into fiction. And reticence on these matters has long

ceased to be observed by a considerable number of writers. The appeal to the imagination in cold print may be as harmful as the appeal by improper photographs.

One of the most striking features of some of the novels we have in memory is the implied sanction of God to lawless unions. The argument runs somewhat thus: "Love is of God; the fact that we love and are all the world to one another proves that we were destined by God for one another, therefore as God is love, He must approve our loving." The thought of sin is wiped out by the strength of emotion. It never crosses the horizon. Pain caused to others is regretted, but as for sin, strong natures do not think about it when they are swept by passion and sustained by the conviction that their love is the greatest thing in a universe ruled by a God of Love who must, in accordance with his character, sanction the love that satisfies twin souls. We see in fiction the danger that is besetting theology. Men everywhere fix their eyes on what they believe to be most in accordance with their own ideas, and by excluding all other thoughts find themselves landed in wrong views of life and God. This return to Paganism in fiction is very often unconscious—at times it is deliberate and even propagandist.

Some of the most discussed of recent novels are frankly pagan in their ultimate conception of life. They return to Hellenism—the cult of the beautiful and pleasant. They give the story of man's quest after what he conceives to be the highest, and after finding Christianity in all its forms to be a failure and unsatisfying, he returns to a Paganism that is purely materialistic. Hedonism in one form or another is the sole end of being, and man can find this end by adapting himself to his surroundings and making pleasure the chief end of living. Some of these works are remarkably well written and show their writers to be possessed of literary charm and ability. Their destructive side is much more convincing than their constructive, and they show that the simplicity of Christ is forgotten in the one-sidedness of His followers. Other writers of this school introduce Christians who put into practice what they believe to be the essentials of religion. We cannot possibly refrain from admiring them in their genuine faith, but they are not only fools for Christ, but are fools in meeting the emergencies of life. They all fail at crises when the men and women who are worldly wise, but at the same time human, come victorious through the struggle. The tendencies

of these two types of books are decidedly anti-Christian, and unconsciously sap the foundations of faith. We are faced by a deliberate anti-Christian propaganda in literature that is calculated to do much injury in the minds of the readers who are by no means aware of the aims and motives of the writers. The return to Hedonism is in many cases a yielding to the easy and pleasant in preference to the hard and unpleasant. In some instances it is part of a distinct propaganda in the heart of the writer who has learned to dislike Christianity and is determined to put in its place a rationalism that is not coldly intellectual, but offers with it roses and raptures—not of vice—but of living in accordance with nature.

There has been a revival of Roman propaganda also in some of the novels that are widely read. These are definitely propagandist. The writers make no secret of their aims. They hold that they have a mission in fiction to commend the Roman Church and to rebuild in England a Church that holds with all that made England "Catholic" in the Middle Ages. Man looks for peace. He struggles vainly against his passions and desires to have his conscience at peace with himself. He has sought this peace in many directions and the sense of sin pursues him. The old Church with its age-long experience of the weaknesses of human nature has learned how to apply the Divine remedy, and therefore the haggard overwrought soul finds in the Mass the meeting-place of God and Man and in the Church the home where all struggle ceases and certainty is secured. There is not only a public for these books, but there is a body of reviewers that recommend them. We wonder whether the reviewers are part of that large body of clever Irishmen who have acquired such influence in the secular Press. It is not so much a deliberate policy of the Church of Rome to control the Press as the willing service of men who are under Roman Catholic influences and believe that by doing the Church service they add to their own merit. This motive has a far larger part in the writing of Fiction and in the commendation of Roman Catholicism than is generally believed. It is more individualistic than organized, and is the direct result of the training given by the Roman Church that to help the Church means the acquisition of spiritual merit.

Lately a type of book has won immense favour. The times are sad. Disappointment is with us all. The dreams of better things after the war have been unrealized and the sense of failure broods

over the souls of men. We know we have failed ourselves although "we have acted for the best"—we see the world is failing us and the times are out of joint. Somehow we feel in some sense responsible for the universal failure, and find in the failures of others that consolation that is expressed in the old saying, "Friends in distress make misery less." Accordingly the poignant stories of the failure of the good or the breakdown of the idealist come home to heart and mind and bring many thousands of admiring readers to the man or woman that has written in this style. Perhaps this phase will pass when men will learn that by earnest work, and women will find that by doing their duty as women, the present sentimentalism —making a luxury of grief—will end. But we do not see what can be done for Society by real good books that show the weaknesses of the neurotic who either does the right thing the wrong way or does the wrong thing the wrong way. Much ability is displayed by the writers we have in mind. They have mastered a style that corresponds with their subject. They may not be grammatical, but this does not do much harm, for their very lack of observation of the rules of syntax makes the books more in touch with the subjects they treat. The sentimentalist who breaks down, the idealist woman who loses the real joy of living, and the dreamer who always is a day late, may have a place in life. But when we have kept too much company with them we are apt to imitate their faults.

Pure romance is not dead. It has taken two forms of late. We have ably revived for us life of a hundred years ago, and when we enter into its spirit we are impressed by its wholesomeness and—if at times—violence as a contrast to the sickliness of much of contemporary life presented in fiction. Some of our authors have not been touched by the decadence that has invaded our shores, and we are thankful they are still with us. But have they the circulation the writers who are more in the public eye command? We are inclined to think not, and this is not as it should be. Then we are flooded with stories of man fighting nature in the wilds. The Far West and distant lands and islands are brought near to us. The triumph of human fortitude, endurance and courage are told us in language that is vivid, and some of the nature description is of a high order. We are thrilled as we read, and are now and again pulled up by the invasion of the illicit love that seems to add spice to the tale. Fortunately this is not a usual ingredient in these

tales. As a rule, even when their language is somewhat coarse, there is a wholesome love strain that makes the books wholesome. One point deserves emphasizing. The influence of women in the undeveloped districts is almost uniformly healthy. But then the writers are men. If women are to be seen at their worst their sisters do not hesitate to describe them in language that is at times far from edifying.

It must be said with regret that the new detective tales are not of the first order. They tend to become more and more mechanical, and when science is introduced or legal procedure described, the science is inaccurate and the law is impossible. A well-known lawyer lately said, " Give me a book without any law in it. I have yet to find a novel that is aware of the elements of law." He immediately began to dissect the law of some works he had recently read, and made his hearers laugh at the ignorance of procedure and the law of evidence shown by the writers. A few American, and at least one English, detective yarn pass muster, but the majority prove very disappointing.

Charles Garvice has left no successor. His books were the best sedative for a tired reader. To take him up when the mind was weary was a real comfort. The chapters went from step to step with a uniform development that was always foreseen, and the man or woman who had been wrestling with difficulties which could not be solved or had been vexed by the perversity of human nature, could feel that after all some brains had been left, for Charles Garvice made his characters do what they ought to have done, being who they were. Those who try to follow in his footsteps are guilty of the most flagrant absurdities, and they have not the charm that came from his love of country life and his intimate acquaintance with dogs and horses. It is supposed to be a proof of a commonplace mind to enjoy Garvice—if that be so, then many who are far from commonplace must come down from their pedestals and acknowledge themselves to be men of the people. Why should they not ? Is it not simply a recognition that human beings are in the rough hewn from the one tree and that what is common to the race is shared by all.

Having referred anonymously to so many books that ought not to be read, we may be permitted to mention a few works that will please. We have no desire to emulate the foreign publishers who

asterisk works " not fitted for family reading." And we think it unwise to contrast books with one another. Many will recognize the books that form the groundwork of this article, and we have no desire to advertise them to those who do not know them. Stanley Weyman, in *Ovington's Bank*, has given a splendid picture of the railway-speculating era and the financial convulsions that followed. He holds the reader's attention from beginning to end, and his love tale is as natural as it is pleasing. Two new novelists have rightly won attention. *Experience*, by Miss Cotton, is a story that avoids the sensational, deals frankly with many matters of importance and gives us insight into the influence of Christianity on life. Dr. MacKenna, in *Flower o' the Heather*, proves himself to be as clever a novelist as he is brilliant as an essayist and his book is as charming in its portrayal of pure womanhood as it is stirring as a picture of the persecution of the Covenanters in Scotland. These books that have recently appeared prove that English fiction can be pure, wholesome and attractive. But there is room for a writer who can, without pedantry or shibboleth, do for Evangelical Churchmanship what Charlotte Yonge has done for Tractarianism. We can never forget that Fiction has come to stay and cannot be excluded from our homes. It has far more to do with the making of character than most Churchmen believe.

ADDISON AS A STUDENT OF NATURE.

[*The following paper was written for a Literary Society by the late Rev. G. S. Streatfeild, who kindly sent it to us for publication. We greatly regret that before it was possible for it to appear in these pages he passed away.*]

WE associate the name of Joseph Addison with the study of human nature rather than of nature in the larger sense of the word ; yet there are many indications in his writings that, had he lived at the end, instead of at the beginning, of the eighteenth century, and when the love of the beautiful in nature had taken possession of the educated mind, his name might have been associated with the romantic revival that characterized the age of Wordsworth and Coleridge. He may not have possessed that " personal sympathy with nature " that is observed in the writings of Andrew Marvell, the last of the earlier romantic school : the classical reaction, in which Davenant and Waller led the way, and

which found its perfect expression in the work of Pope, had firmly established itself before the day of Addison. The age in which his lot was cast was destitute of the sentiment and spirit of mysticism that distinguish the modern outlook on the world of nature. There are, however, many passages in the *Spectator* from Addison's pen which prove that the works of creation, whether above or around him, kindled his sympathetic, not to say his enthusiastic, interest.

Indeed, to us it must seem strange that, although he was well acquainted with the unrivalled charms of Swiss scenery, they should find no place in the pages of the *Spectator*. If we wish to know what he thought of Switzerland, we must refer to his "Remarks on Italy." In December, 1701, he left Italy for Switzerland, travelling by the Mont Cenis route for Geneva. There he made a considerable stay, and became acquainted with the country by a voyage round the Lake. In his "Remarks on Italy" he describes, but without enthusiasm, some of the features of the country in the neighbourhood of Geneva; the same may be said of his visit to the Tyrol. The only occasion on which his language rises to enthusiasm is on the sight of the Bernese Oberland from the city of Berne, which is "the noblest view in the world"; but there is no attempt at description. Perhaps the best *description* of Alpine scenery is to be found in No. 161 of the *Tatler*, but it is fanciful and imaginative in the extreme. In his "Letter to Lord Halifax," one of Addison's best attempts at poetry, written during his journey from Italy to Switzerland, there is little to suggest that the scenery through which he is passing made any deep impression, but it must be remembered that the journey was undertaken in mid-winter. Little, however, as he has to say about Switzerland, no one can read his Essays without learning that he was keenly sensitive to the charms of nature. Nor can any one be acquainted with his hymns without realising how his soul kindles with spiritual fire in contemplation of nature's works. It has been said that "to read or sing a hymn by Addison is to be in contact with a spirit that in God's works sees God. To him the world is beautiful because God made it and dwells in it." As he looks forth upon the world of nature, he seems to anticipate the thought of Cowper, who bids his readers

> "Lift to heaven an unpresumptuous eye,
> And smiling say, My Father made them all."

The following selection of passages will illustrate Addison's attitude towards nature :—

No. 565. " I was yesterday about sunset walking in the open fields until the night insensibly fell upon me. I at first amused myself with all the richness and variety of colours which appeared in the western parts of heaven ; in proportion as they faded and went out several stars and planets appeared one after another, until the whole firmament was in a glow. The blueness of the ether was exceedingly heightened and enlivened by the season of the year (he was writing in July) and by the rays of all those luminaries that passed through it. The galaxy (i.e. the ' milky way ') appeared in its most beautiful white. To complete the scene, the full moon rose at length in that clouded majesty which Milton takes notice of, and opened to the eye a new picture of nature, which was more finely shaded and disposed among softer lights than that which the sun had before discovered to us. . . . As I was surveying the moon walking in her brightness, and taking her progress among the constellations, a thought rose in me which I believe very often perplexes and disturbs men of serious and contemplative natures. David himself fell into it in that reflection, ' When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars which Thou hast ordained ; what is man that Thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that Thou regardest him ? ' "

We note that Addison was before his time in preferring nature to art. Pope had declared himself on the same side, but, though theoretically agreeing with Addison, his practice was very inconsistent with his theory. While lavishing his satire on the formal and artificial fashion of gardening that had so long prevailed, he made his five acres at Twickenham a conspicuous example of formality. Addison really lived at the turn of the tide ; England's slavish copying of the Dutch school of gardening came to an end at the death of William the Third in 1702. The reaction therefore in favour of nature, as opposed to art, may be said to have begun with the eighteenth century, and Addison may be regarded as the champion, or one of the champions, of the change. He had the ear of educated England, and such was the respect in which the *Spectator* was held that the opinions expressed in its pages were not likely to be lost on the reader. In No. 414 Addison declares plainly against art and in favour of nature.

" If we consider the works of nature and art as they are qualified to entertain the imagination, we shall find the last very defective in comparison of the former ; for though they may sometimes appear as beautiful or strange, they can have nothing in them of

that vastness and immensity which afford so great an entertainment to the mind of the beholder . . . there is something more bold and masterly in the rough, careless strokes of nature, than in the nice touches and embellishments of art. The beauties of the most stately garden or palace lie in a narrow compass, the imagination immediately runs them over, and requires something else to gratify her; but in the wide fields of nature, the sight wanders up and down without confinement, and is fed with an infinite variety of images without any certain stint or number. For this reason we always find the poet in love with the country life, where nature appears in the greatest perfection, and furnishes out all those scenes that are most apt to delight the imagination:

"Scriptorum chorus omnis amat nemus, et fugit urbes."

. . . . . .

Our British gardeners, instead of humouring nature, love to deviate from it as much as possible. Our trees rise in cones, globes, and pyramids. We see the marks of the scissors upon every plant and bush. I do not know whether I am singular in my opinion, but, for my own part, I would rather look upon a tree in all its luxuriancy and diffusion of boughs and branches, than when it is cut and trimmed into a mathematical figure, and cannot but fancy that an orchard in flower looks infinitely more delightful than all the little labyrinths of the most finished parterre."

We shall hardly agree with our author when he goes on to say, "but though there are several of these wild scenes that are more delightful than any artificial shows; yet we find the works of nature still more pleasant the more they resemble art." What Addison meant to say was surely that, as has been well observed, "the secret of making a garden beautiful is to let art unobtrusively assist nature."

Ten years before writing for the *Spectator*, Addison had, in a letter to the poet Congreve, confessed his preference for natural beauty by contrasting the pleasure-grounds of Fontainebleau with those of Versailles. In an essay contributed to the *Guardian* he returns to the subject:—

"I am, however, so singular as to prefer Fontainebleau to all the rest. It is situated among rocks and woods that give you a fine variety of savage prospects. The King has humoured the genius of the place, and only made use of so much art as is necessary to help and regulate nature, without reforming her too much. . . . For my part I think there is something more charming in these rude heaps of stone than in so many statues; and would as soon see a river winding through woods and meadows, as when it is tossed up in so many whimsical figures as at Versailles."

No. 477, published September, 1712, possesses a peculiar interest because it appears to describe what we may call Addison's ideal garden; and we should like to indulge the thought that we have here a description of his own garden at Bilton, near Rugby, where he bought an estate in 1711, and where his only child, Charlotte, lived until her death in 1797. In such a conjecture we should be hardly justified in view of the fact that the grounds still retain indications of a formality which do not harmonize with the features depicted in this number of the *Spectator*. "Addison," says Alicia Amherst in her *History of Gardening in England*, "lived at one time at Bilton, in Warwickshire, and his garden is not in a natural style. Part of the garden dates from 1623; some of it was altered in the nineteenth century, but the arbour used by Addison is still there. It is of classical 'Queen Anne' style of architecture, with a straight bench, facing a view of the garden, with nothing rustic about it. There are still, however, in the garden, two old cut yew arbours, also good yew and holly hedges."

No. 477 is in the form of a letter, but the internal evidence is strong that it came from Addison's pen. In any case we may regard the letter as expressing his own views on the subject; nor could he have indicated more clearly than he did in this letter how completely, at least in theory, he had broken with the past in respect of horticulture. I wish time permitted the reading of the letter, but it is very long, and it would be difficult to make selections; but we may notice in passing that the essay contains an expression of his love for birds. "There is another circumstance in which I am very particular, or as my neighbours call me, very whimsical: as my garden invites into it all the birds of the country, by offering them the conveniency of springs and shades, solitudes and shelter, I do not suffer any one to destroy their nests in the spring, or drive them from their usual haunts in fruit time. I value my garden more for being full of black-birds than cherries, and very frankly give them their fruit for their songs."

Nor was it only songsters that possessed a charm for the ears of Addison. He loved to hear the rooks cawing in the tree-tops. One of the delights of Sir Roger de Coverley's country home was its rookery.

No. 110. "At a little distance from Sir Roger's house, among the ruins of an old abbey, there is a long walk of aged elms; which

are shot up so very high, that when one passes under them, the rooks and crows that rest upon the tops of them seem to be cawing in another region. I am very much delighted with this sort of noise, which I consider as a kind of natural prayer to that Being who supplies the wants of his whole creation, and who, in the beautiful language of the Psalms, feedeth the young ravens that call upon him."

Addison was a great tree-lover, and he has no words too strong for the reckless felling of timber. The heading of No. 589 is an apposite quotation from his favourite Ovid:

> "Persequitur scelus ille suum: labefactaque tandem
> Ictibus innumeris, adductaque funibus, arbor
> Corruit.

"He follows up his own wickedness; and the tree ready to fall at length by innumerable blows, and pulled by ropes attached to it, falls."

"I am so great an admirer of trees that the spot of ground I have chosen to build a small seat upon, in the country, is almost in the middle of a large wood. I was obliged, much against my will, to cut down several trees, that I might have any such thing as a walk in my gardens; but then I have taken care to leave the space, between every walk, as much a wood as I found it. The moment you turn either to the right or left you are in a forest, where nature presents you with a much more beautiful scene than could have been raised by art. Instead of tulips or carnations, I can show you oaks in my gardens of four hundred years standing, and a knot of elms that might shelter a troop of horse from the rain.

"It is not without the utmost indignation that I observe several prodigal young heirs in the neighbourhood felling down the most glorious monuments of their ancestors' industry, and ruining, in a day, the product of ages."

Although himself a townsman, Addison goes to the country to find his type of the happy man.

No. 610. "The story of Gyges, the rich Lydian monarch, is a memorable instance to our present purpose. The oracle being asked by Gyges who was the happiest man, replied, Aglaüs. Gyges, who had expected to have heard himself named on this occasion, was much surprised, and very curious to know who this Aglaüs should be. After much inquiry he was found to be an obscure countryman, who employed all his time in cultivating a garden, and a few acres of land about his house."

Before passing from Addison as a horticulturist I draw attention to what has always seemed to me one of the most charming specimens of Addison's style and wit. It is called "A Visit to a Garden," and will be found as No. 218 of the *Tatler*; from first to last it is a plea for nature as opposed to art. Addison lived in the age of

tulippomania, when, as it has been said, " the gamble in tulips was as wild and ruinous as that of the South Sea stock, or shares in the Mississippi Bubble." To Addison's common sense and good taste this fashion was nothing short of ridiculous, and in his characteristic way he attacks it with the weapon of ridicule. Our time-limit forbids my reading the whole of it, but I will endeavour to put before you the gist of the paper, quoting some of the most amusing parts of it :

" I chanced to rise very early one particular morning, and took a walk into the country to divert myself among the fields and meadows, while the green was new, and the flowers in their bloom. As at this season of the year every lane is a beautiful walk, and every hedge full of nosegays, I lost myself with a great deal of pleasure among several thickets and bushes that were filled with a great variety of birds, and an agreeable confusion of notes, which formed the pleasantest scene in the world to one who had passed a whole winter in noise and smoke. The freshness of the dews that lay upon every thing about me, with the cool breath of the morning which inspired the birds with so many delightful instincts, created in me the same kind of animal pleasure, and made my heart overflow with such secret emotions of joy and satisfaction as are not to be described or accounted for."

In a heavy shower of rain the writer takes refuge in the porch of a house, and whilst sitting there overhears a very earnest conversation, which at first causes him great surprise.

" My curiosity was raised when I heard the names of Alexander the Great and Artaxerxes ; and as their talk seemed to run on ancient heroes, I concluded there could not be any secret in it ; for which reason I thought I might fairly listen to what they said. After several parallels between great men, which appeared to me altogether groundless and chimerical, I was surprised to hear one say that he valued the Black Prince more than the Duke of Vendosme. How the Duke of Vendosme should become a rival of the Black Prince, I could not conceive ; and was more startled when I heard a second affirm, with great vehemence, that if the Emperor of Germany was not going off, he should like him better than either of them. He added, that though the season was so changeable, the Duke of Marlborough was in blooming beauty. I was wondering to myself from whence they had received this odd intelligence ; especially when I heard them mention the names of several other great generals, as the Prince of Hesse and the King of Sweden, who, they said, were both running away. To which they added what I entirely agreed with them in, that the crown of France was very weak, but that the Marshal Villars still kept his colours."

The gentleman of the house at this juncture invites the writer to walk in his garden, promising that he will show him "such a blow of tulips as was not to be matched in the whole country."

". . . I was awakened out of these my speculations by observing the company often seemed to laugh at me. I accidentally praised a tulip as one of the finest I ever saw; upon which they told me it was a common Fool's Coat. Upon that I praised a second which it seems was but another kind of Fool's Coat. I had the same fate with two or three more, for which reason I desired the owner of the garden to let me know which were the finest of the flowers; for that I was so unskilful in the art that I thought the most beautiful were the most valuable, and that which had the gayest colours the most beautiful. The gentleman smiled at my ignorance. He seemed a very plain honest man, and a person of good sense, had not his head been touched with that distemper which Hippocrates calls the *Τυλιππομανία*, insomuch that he would talk very rationally on any subject in the world but a tulip.

"He told me that he valued the bed of flowers, which lay before us, and was not above twenty yards in length and two in breadth, more than he would the best hundred acres in England, and added, that it would have been worth twice the money it is, if a foolish cook-maid of his had not almost ruined him the last winter by mistaking a hand-ful of tulip-roots for a heap of onions, and by that means, says he, made me a dish of pottage that cost me above a thousand pounds sterling. He then showed me what he thought the finest of his tulips, which I found received all their value from their rarity and oddness, and put me in mind of your great fortunes, which are not always the greatest beauties.

"I have often looked upon it as a piece of happiness, that I have never fallen into any of these fantastical tastes, nor esteemed any thing the more for its being uncommon and hard to be met with. For this reason I look upon the whole country in spring time as a spacious garden and make as many visits to a spot of daisies, or a bank of violets as a florist does to his borders or parterres. There is not a bush in blossom within a mile of me which I am not acquainted with, nor scarce a daffodil or cowslip that withers away in my neighbourhood without my missing it. I walked home in this temper of mind through several fields and meadows with an unspeakable pleasure, not without reflecting on the bounty of Providence which has made the most pleasing and most beautiful objects the most ordinary and common."

(*To be concluded.*)

MEGILLATH TAANITH.

"SCROLL OF FASTING."

ENGLISHED, FOR THE FIRST TIME, FROM THE ARAMAIC AND THE HEBREW.

By the Rev. A. W. Greenup, D.D.

[*Concluded from the* Churchman *of July last.*]

XII (Adar).

1. **ON the eighth and ninth of Adar is the day of the blowing of the trumpet for rain.**[1]

But if they blow the trumpet on the eighth day why was it necessary to do so on the ninth? The eighth is to be understood of one year, the ninth of another. In this scroll the terms first, second, and third do not refer to the order of events, but the events are put under the headings of the various months and assigned to the days of the month to which they belong.

2. **The twelfth is the day of Trajan.**

[a] The day when Lulianus and Pappus his brother were seized in Laodicæa. Trajan said to them, Are you of the people of Ananias, Misael and Azariah? Let your God come and deliver you from my hand, as He delivered them from Nebuchadnezzar. They answered, Ananias, Misael and Azariah were worthy men; so, too, was King Nebuchadnezzar, and it was fitting that a miracle should be wrought for him: but thou art a wicked king, and it is not fitting that a miracle should be wrought for thee. We are worthy of death, and if thou slay us not God has many who can do so; many bears, many lions, many serpents who can attack us: but if thou slay us God will require our blood at thy hand. It is said that Trajan did not move from where he was till a despatch arrived against him from Rome. So they split his head with clubs and with logs of wood.[2]

[a] Taan. 18 b; Sem. viii.

[1] The mention of "second Adar," the intercalary month, is first met with in Meg. i. 4. It is the thirteenth month of an embolistic year, and has twenty-nine days.

[2] Zeitlin says that the glossator cannot refer to Trajan, who died in A.D. 117, since he died a natural death, and not on the 12th of Adar. He thinks the day originated in the war against Rome in honour of the young Jews who volunteered for military service, *tiron* in Aramaic meaning "a military recruit."

3. The thirteenth is the day of Nicanor.[a]

It is said that Nicanor was one of the prefects of the kings of Greece. He was journeying to Alexandria, and daily shaking his hand against Jerusalem, and reviling, and saying, When shall they fall into my hands, that I may destroy yonder tower? But when the Asmonæan house prevailed and conquered his armies, they kept on slaying them till they reached Nicanor's carriage. They cut off his head, the thumbs of his hands, his great toes, and hanged him before Jerusalem, and under the gallows wrote, The mouth which spake haughtily and the hands which shook against Judæa and Jerusalem and the Temple, this vengeance be done to them! The day when this was done to him they made a festival.

4. The fourteenth and fifteenth are the days of Purim,[b] **when one must not mourn.**

On those days miracles were wrought for Israel by Mordecai and Esther, and they were made festivals. R. Joshua b. Korḥah said, From the time when Moses died there rose no prophet who instituted any new commandment for Israel, with the exception of the commandment relating to Purim.[c] The deliverance from Egypt was celebrated for seven days, that wrought by Mordecai and Esther only for one day. Another matter in this connection, —[d] Since in the deliverance from Egypt the decree was against the males only, as it is written, Every son that is born ye shall cast into the river, and every daughter ye shall save alive[e]; and in the deliverance by Mordecai and Esther the decree was against the males and the females, as it is written, Both young and old, little children and women in one day[f]: how much the more are we bound to observe these days as festivals each year.

5. On the sixteenth they began to build the wall of Jerusalem,[1] **on which day one must not mourn;**[g]

Because the enemy had destroyed it, and the day on which Israel began to rebuild it they made a festival; for it was a joy to God that Jerusalem should be rebuilt, as it is said, Thus saith

[a] Taan. 18 b; Jer. Taan. ii. 14. 1 Macc. vii. 49; 2 Macc. xv. 36.
[b] Meg. 5 b; Taan. 18 b; Shek. i. 1; Esth. ix. 17 ff.
[c] Meg. 14 a. [d] Ibid. [e] Exod. i. 22. [f] Esth. iii. 13.
[g] Jer. Taan. ii. 12, and parallels.

[1] Grätz (*Hist.* III, p. 575) sees here a reference to the work of Agrippa I in 43–2 B.C. Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 11, 6.

Jehovah, I am returned unto Zion, and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem: and Jerusalem shall be called, The city of truth; and the mountain of Jehovah of hosts, The holy mountain:[a] and again, I am returned to Jerusalem with mercies; my house shall be built in it, etc.[b]: and again, He shall build my city, and he shall let my exiles go free, not for price nor reward, saith Jehovah of hosts.[c]

6. On the seventeenth the Gentiles rose against the remnant of the scribes in Chalcis and Beth-Zabdin,[1] and there came release to the house of Israel;[d]

Because when King Janneus came down to slay the sages, they fled before him and betook themselves to Syria, and dwelt in Chalcis. There the enemy gathered against them, laying siege against them to slay them; they greatly perturbed them, and smote them with great slaughter. The remnant betook themselves to Beth-Zabdin, stopping there till it was dark, when they fled. R. Jehudah says, Each had a horse bound for him at the gate of his house, so that everyone who saw the horse thought that there was no Jew in that house.[2] They stopped there till it was dark, and then fled; and the day on which they fled was made a festival. R. Ḥidka says, The day on which the enemy sought to destroy the wise men of Israel the sea rose and destroyed a third part of the inhabited world.

7. On the twentieth the people fasted to obtain rain, and it came down for them;[3][e]

Because there was a famine and dearth in the land of Israel, for the rain had not fallen for three consecutive years. [f]When they saw that the greater part of Adar had gone by without rain they

[a] Zech. viii. 3. [b] Ibid. i. 16. [c] Isa. xlv. 13.
[d] Ibid.; Meg. i. 4. [e] Taan. 23 a; Jer. Taan. iii. 9. [f] Taan. 23 b.

[1] Grätz (op. cit. III, p. 570 f.) thinks this is the incident referred to in Josephus, *Antiq.* xiii. 14, 2; but against this is the fact that the persecution mentioned in the Megillath Taanith was by Gentiles. Zeitlin takes ספריא not as "scribes," but as the name of the city Sepphoris, translating "the refugees of Sepphoris," and sees here a reference to the persecution of the Jews by the Gentiles in consequence of the victory over Cestius: cf. Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 4, 1.

[2] Either it was the Sabbath, or there was a decree in existence that no Jew should ride a horse.

[3] Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* xiv. 2, 1.

went to Ḥoni, the circle-drawer, and said to him, Pray for rain to come down. He replied, Go and collect the Passover ovens that they may not melt. He then prayed, but the rains came not down. What did he then do? He drew a circle and stood in the midst of it, just as Habakkuk the prophet did, as it is said, I will stand on my watch, and set me upon the fortress, and will look forth to see what He will speak by me, and what I shall answer concerning my complaint.[a] He said, O Lord of the world, Thy children have addressed themselves to me because I am like the son of the house before Thee[b]; I swear by Thy great Name that I will not move hence till Thou have compassion on Thy children. The rains then came down in drops. They said to him, We are persuaded that we shall die, for we are of opinion that these rains have only come down to loose thee from thy oath. He said to them, My children, you are not going to die. Then he prayed, O Lord of the world, it was not this I asked for, but for rain to fill the pits, the ditches, and the caves. The rains then began to descend in torrents, so that each drop was such as could fill the mouth of an earthen wine jug, and the sages estimated each drop at the measure of a log. They said to him, We are persuaded that we shall die, since we are of opinion that such rains have only come to destroy the whole world. He replied, My children, you are not going to die. Then he prayed, O Lord of the world, it was not this I asked for, but for a rain displaying Thy good will, bringing a blessing and abundance.[c] Then the rain came down in due measure, so that the Israelites went up from Jerusalem to the Temple mount because of the abundance of the rain. They said to him, As you did pray that the rains might descend, so now pray that they may cease, and that what has come may go. He replied, One should not pray against abundance of good; nevertheless go and bring me a bullock to offer thanksgiving over.[d] They brought it to him; and, laying both his hands on it, he prayed, saying, O Lord of the world, lo! Thy people Israel, whom Thou didst bring forth by Thy great power and with a stretched-out arm,[e] since they were unable to stand, neither before the greatness of Thine anger, nor before the greatness of Thy goodness (for when Thou wast angry with them they could not stand, nor could they when Thou didst pour out Thy goodness upon them), let it be Thy

[a] Hab. ii. 1. [b] Cf. Ber. 34 b. [c] Cf. Ps. lxviii. 10.
[d] Cf. Lev. xvi. 21. [e] Deut. ix.

pleasure that they have relief. Immediately the wind blew, the clouds were scattered, the sun shone, and the ground was dried up. Then they all went forth into the fields, and saw that they were full of morils and fungus. Simeon b. Shetaḥ sent to Ḥoni, saying, If thou wert not Ḥoni, the circle-drawer, I would excommunicate thee, for if these years had not been like those in the time of Elijah, would not the Name of God have been profaned by thee? But what can I do to thee, for thou sinnest against God like a child who lords it over his father, who nevertheless does what he asks him? When he says, Bring me something hot, it is brought to him; when he says, Bring me something cold, it is brought to him; when he says, Give me nuts, they are given to him; when he says, Give me pomegranates, they are given to him; when he says, Give me peaches, they are given to him. Of thee the Scripture says, Let thy father and mother be glad, and let her that bare thee rejoice.[a] So of this day when the rains descended they made a festival; since rains do not come down but for the merit of Israel,[1] as it is said, Jehovah will open unto thee his good treasury of the heavens to give the rain of thy land, etc.[b] "To thee," that is, on account of thy merit, for on thee the matter depends. And again it says, And in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed.[c] "In thee," that is, for thy merit do both the rains and the dew come down. And again it says, And I will give you your rains in their season.[d] [e] There is a story that in the days of Samuel the Little [2] they fasted, and the rains came down before the first sparklings of the rising sun; and when they thought that this was in their honour he said to them, I will make a comparison; it is like a servant seeking his fare from his master, who said to those by him, Give it to him, and let me no longer hear his voice.[f] Samuel the Little decreed another fast, and the rains came down after sunset. When the people thought that it was in honour of the congregation, he said to them, You are like a king who was angry with his son, and said to his steward, Do not give

[a] Prov. xxiii. 25. [b] Deut. xxviii. 12. [c] Gen. xxviii. 14.
[d] Lev. xxvi. 4. [e] Taan. 25 b. [f] Cf. Succ. 29 a.

[1] See Marmorstein, *Doctrine of Merits in Old Rabbinical Literature*, pp. 84, 90, 130, *al.*

[2] A tanna who arranged the benediction concerning the Minim (Ber. 28 b). Called "The Little," either to distinguish him from Samuel the prophet, or because of his humility (Jer. Sota. ix. 24 b).

him his food till he weeps and makes supplication before me.

8. **On the twenty-eighth the good tidings came to the Jews that they would not any longer be embarrassed by following the decrees of the Law[1]; and on that day one must not mourn;**

Because the Kings of Greece had decreed that the Israelites should not busy themselves with the study of the Law, should not circumcise their children, should not observe the Sabbath, but should serve false gods.[a] But the covenant made with Israel was that the Book of the Law should not be moved from their mouths, as it is said, For it shall not be forgotten out of the mouths of their seed[b]; and again, If these ordinances depart from before me, etc.[c]; and again, This is my covenant with them, etc.[d] What did Jehudah b. Shammua and his associates do? They rose up and went to a certain matron to whom all the great Romans were accustomed to come, and asked counsel of her.[e] She said to them, Come and cry out at night. So they stood and cried at night, saying, O heavens! are not we thy brethren? are not we all of one father and of one mother?[f] why then are we distinguished from every other nation and tongue by thy hard decrees against us? They did not move thence till they received permission to practise the three commandments, to circumcise their children, to observe the Sabbath, to study the Law, and that they should be exempted from idolatry. And that day on which they were permitted to keep the three commandments they made a festival.

9. **But every one who ere this has made a vow to fast will bind himself by his vow.**[g]

How is this to be understood? If an individual take upon himself to fast on the second and fifth days of the week, he must fast the whole day. But if either or both these days happen to be festivals named in the Megillath Taanith, then he should not fast. This is the general rule: every one who has made a vow before our decree, our decree is abrogated because of his vow; but if our

[a] Taan. 18 a; Rosh. H. 19 a. [b] Deut. xxxi. 21. [c] Jer. xxxi. 36.
[d] Isa. lix. 21. [e] Cf. Sabb. 127 b. [f] Cf. Mal. ii. 10.
[g] Taan. 12 a.

[1] Grätz (*op. cit.* iv. p. 185) accepts the glossator's view, and dates the event A.D. 139. Derenbourg (*op. cit.* p. 59) is inclined to see an allusion to the letter of Antiochus V (2 Macc. xi. 22–32) giving the Jews permission to follow the commands of the Law.

decree was made before his vow, his vow is abrogated because of our decree.

[a] There is no distinction between the first Adar and the second Adar, save in the reading of Esther and the distribution of gifts to the poor. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says,[b] Every commandment which has reference to first Adar has not reference to second Adar, except those of mourning and fasting, which are common to both. [c] In legal documents they write "first Adar," and in case of second Adar they only write "second." R. Jehudah, however, says "second Adar" is written.

[d] Who wrote the Megillath Taanith? The followers of R. Eliezer b. Ḥananiah b. Ḥezekiah b. Garon. Why? Because the Israelites hitherto had not been accustomed to persecutions, and frequent persecutions had not come upon them; but at this time, when they were accustomed to persecutions which frequently came upon them,[e] if all seas and rivers were ink, and all reeds and forests and trees were pens, and all men were scribes, and the heavens and the earth were parchments, they would not be sufficient to write of all the persecutions which came on them every year, and of all the deliverances and victories which were wrought for them.

Another matter:—One ladened with sorrows becomes indifferent to new afflictions; and a dead man's flesh does not quiver under the surgeon's knife.[f]

XIII

These are the days on which they fast as if it were commanded by the Law, and every one fasting thereon neither eats nor drinks till the evening:—

1. NISAN. The first, when the sons of Aaron died.[1g] The tenth, when Miriam the prophetess died, and the well was sealed up.[h] The twenty-sixth, when Joshua b. Nun died.

2. IYYAR. The tenth, when Eli the priest and his two sons died, and the ark was taken into captivity. The nineteenth, when Samuel the prophet died, and all Israel mourned for him.

3. SIVAN. The twenty-third, when the firstfruits ceased to be

[a] Cf. xii. 1. [b] Meg. 6 b; Shek. i. 1. [c] Ned. 63 a. [d] Sabb. 13 b.
[e] *Ibid.* 11 a. [f] Sabb. 13 b; Jer. Taan. iii. 8.
[g] Tanchuma, Achare, 6; Lev. x. 1. [h] Taan. 9 a; Tos. Sota xi, cf. Sabb. 35.

[1] Some MSS. read "eighth."

carried up to Jerusalem in the days of Jeroboam b. Nebat.[1] The twenty-fifth, when Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel, R. Ishmael b. Elisha, and R. Ḥanina, the adjutant high priest, were slain.[a] The twenty-seventh, when R. Ḥanina b. Teradyon was burnt, and the scroll of the Law with him.[b]

4. TAMMUZ. The seventeenth, when the tables of the Law were broken, the daily offering ceased, and Apostomos burnt the Law, and set up an image in the Temple.[c]

5. AB. The first, when Aaron the high priest died.[d] The ninth, when it was decreed that our fathers should not enter Canaan,[e] when the first and the second Temples were devastated, when Bethar was captured and the City ploughed up.[f] The eighteenth, when the western lamp was extinguished in the days of Ahaz.[g]

6. ELUL. The seventh, when those who brought an evil report of the land died by the plague.[h]

7. TISRI. The third, when Gedaliah b. Aḥikam and the Jews who were with him were slain.[i] The fifth, when twenty men of Israel died, and R. Akiba b. Joseph was bound in prison and died.[j] The seventh, when it was decreed against our fathers that they should die by the sword and by famine and pestilence. The tenth, when they that made the golden calf died.[k]

8. MARḤESHVAN. The sixth, when they put out the eyes of Zedekiah, and slew his sons before his eyes.[l]

9. KISLEV. The eighth, when Jehoiakim burnt the roll which Baruch had written at the mouth of Jeremiah the prophet.[m]

10. TEBETH. The eighth, when the Law was written in Greek in the days of Ptolemy the King,[n] and darkness came over the world for three days. The ninth, for what reason our fathers have not written. The tenth, when the King of Babylon drew close to Jerusalem to devastate it.[o]

11. SHEBAT. The fifth, when the righteous in the days of Joshua the son of Nun died.[p] The twenty-third, when all Israel was

[a] Echah Rab. ii. 2; Mid. Till. ix. [b] A.Z. 17 b.
[c] Taan. 26 a; Jer. Taan. iv. 6. [d] Taan. 9 a.
[e] *Ibid.* 26 b, Seder Olam R., 8. [f] Rosh. H. 18 b.
[g] Cf. 2 Chron. xxix. 19 (?). [h] Numb. xiv. [i] Jer. xli. 2. [j] San. 12 a.
[k] Cf. Seder Olam R., 6.
[l] Jer. lii. 10, 11. [m] *Ibid.* xxxvi. [n] Meg. 9 a; Sof. i. 8.
[o] Rosh. H. 18 b; Ezek. xxiv. 1, 2. [p] Cf. Judg. ii. 7.

[1] We do not find any place where this is ascribed to Jeroboam. We should probably read "in the days of the Greeks": cf. v. 1.

gathered together against the tribe of Benjamin on account of the concubine in Gibeah,[a] and on account of the image of Micah.[1 b]

12. ADAR. The seventh, when Moses our master died.[2 c] The ninth, when a fast was decreed because of the divisions between the house of Shammai and the house of Hillel.[d] The twenty-fourth (Second Adar), when the Alexandrians put the great Name on a precious stone idolatrously, and the Israelites fasted.[3]

These are the days of fasting which the Israelites received as if from the Law. And, moreover, our fathers decreed[e] that there should be fasts on the second and fifth days of the week for the sake of three things, the destruction of the Temple, the burning of the Law, and the blasphemy of the Name. But in the days to come the Holy One (blessed be He!) will change them into days of joy and gladness, as it is said, I will turn their mourning into joy, and make them rejoice from their sorrow.[f]

R. Eliezer said,[g] R. Ḥaninah said that the disciples of the sages multiply peace in the world, as it is written, And all thy children shall be disciples of Jehovah, and great shall be the peace of thy children[h]; and,

Peace be within thy walls,
And prosperity within thy palaces.
For my brethren and companions' sakes,
I will now say, Peace be within thee.
For the sake of the house of Jehovah our God
I will seek thy good;[i]

and,

Thou shalt see thy children's children
And peace upon Israel;[j]

and,

Great peace have they that love Thy law,
And have no occasion of stumbling;[k]

and,

Jehovah will give strength unto His people,
Jehovah will bless His people with peace.[l]

[a] *Ibid.* xix. 1 ff. [b] *Ibid.* xvii. 4.
[c] Meg. 13 b; Taan. 9 a; Kid. 38 a; Sota 12 b; Sed. Olam x.; Deut. xxxiv. 5 ff.
[d] Cf. Sabb. Jer. i. 4; Yeb. 86 b. [e] Sof. xxi. [f] Jer. xxxi. 13.
[g] Bar. 64 a. [h] Isaiah. liv. 13. [i] Ps. cxxii. 7–9.
[j] *Ibid.* cxxviii. 6. [k] *Ibid.* cxix. 165. [l] *Ibid.* xxix. 11.

[1] Two distinct events are apparently alluded to here.
[2] In Josephus, *Antiq.* iv. 8, 49, it is stated he died on the first.
[3] The last sentence is missing in many MSS.

CHELTENHAM CONFERENCE PAPERS.

THE EVANGELICAL MESSAGE: ITS CENTRAL MESSAGE—THE ATONEMENT.

By the Rev. G. Estwick Ford, B.A., Vicar of Bilston.

IT is to the teaching of Jesus Christ that we must naturally look for guidance concerning that Atonement between God and man which it was His mission on earth to accomplish; and we may do so with fullest confidence because He claimed for all His teaching that it was not His, but the Father's; and the Father has attested this claim by raising Him from the dead. I shall assume that the four Gospels present us with a substantially accurate account of His teaching on this subject. Let us, therefore, consider—

1. Christ's teaching concerning God's forgiveness in general.
2. His own forgiveness of sin in one particular case.
3. His teaching concerning His atoning death, and His association of His resurrection with that death.

For the first of these points it will suffice if we refer to the Lord's Prayer, the threefold Parable of Redemption in St. Luke xv., and the pardon of the penitent in Simon's house.

In the Lord's Prayer Christ teaches us to ask the Father for forgiveness just as we ask for daily bread; and only one condition is mentioned, viz. that we should ourselves forgive.

In the great Parable of Redemption, with its story of the lost sheep, the lost coin, the lost son, we learn of the shepherd's concern for the one individual, of the owner's sense of personal loss, of the father's complying with the desire of the wilful, selfish son; we see the helplessness, the uselessness, the degradation of the lost; and, dominating all, there is manifest the eagerness to recover the lost, the joy at recovery, the completeness of restoration. Nowhere is there any suggestion of difficulty to be removed on the part of the loser before the lost can be received back. It is the elder brother, not the father, who has to be appeased when the prodigal son comes home.

It is the same with the forgiveness of the penitent woman. In response to her penitence and faith she had already been forgiven

even though, in her deep distress, she was unconscious of the blessing. Only the abundance of her love testified to the fact of her pardon. It is as though the heavenly Father had been watching for an opening to forgive, even as the father in the parable watched for the first sign of the returning prodigal, and in response to her penitence had forgiven before even she had hoped or asked for pardon: "Because *she has been forgiven* much, therefore she loves much."

When we turn to the case in which our Lord Himself forgave, the same features appear. The palsied man was let down through the roof so as to reach the Saviour, and Jesus, seeing the faith of all concerned, said to him, Son, thy sins are forgiven; then wrought the physical miracle of healing in attestation of the spiritual miracle of pardon.

Is no more, then, required for the obtaining of forgiveness than penitence and faith and obedience? No more, indeed, on the sinner's part; but already in the Parable of Redemption we have, in the shepherd's search for the lost sheep, some suggestion of the labour and the sacrifice entailed, on God's part, in the saving of a sinner. What does Christ teach concerning this?

There is one saying of His which I take here out of its natural order so that, on the threshold of this the most important part of our inquiry, we may give it its full weight. He is reported by St. Matthew and St. Mark to have said to the disciples on the way to Gethsemane, "All ye shall be offended in me this night, for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered." The difference between our Lord's reported quotation—"I will smite"—and the actual words of Zechariah's prophecy—"*Smite* the shepherd"—is of no material significance, for the sole object of citing the prophecy was to show that Christ had good reason for expecting that desertion by His disciples which He now foretold. It was the scattering of the flock, not the smiting of the shepherd, about which He was here concerned. The question, therefore, of the agency at work in the putting to death of Christ does not here arise. This is made still more evident by St. John's reference to this incident. He reports the Lord as saying, "Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone; and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me." Incidentally—perhaps quite unconsciously—St. John corrects by anticipation any possible misunderstanding of the prophecy, as our Lord quoted it, by reporting His saying that when all His earthly friends had forsaken Him, still the Father would be with Him, and He would not be alone. Instead of being the one to smite Him, the Father would stand by Him to support Him when all others had gone. The prophecy, in truth, can fairly mean no more than this, that in the working out of Divine Providence the sword would awake against the Saviour, and that in that hour His followers would forsake Him. It is not, however, by an incidental allusion such as this that our Lord deals with the subject of His atoning death, but in plain,

explicit language that ought not easily to be misunderstood. His teaching may be studied under the following heads :—

(*a*) The occasion of His death.
(*b*) The significance of His death.
(*c*) The necessity for His death.
(*d*) The association of His resurrection with His death in His atoning sacrifice.

(*a*) It is in the contrast which our Lord draws between Himself, the good shepherd, and him that is a hireling that He speaks of the occasion of His death. The wolf is rushing upon the flock. The hireling sees the danger and runs for his life ; but the good shepherd stands his ground, faces the beast, and sacrifices his life in saving his sheep. Thus Christ teaches us that the occasion of His death is the conflict that He has to face in the salvation of mankind. However we describe the forces of evil in conflict with which He died, it is clear from this, His own account of the matter, that He fell fighting. It is true, indeed, that " we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted," that outwardly " he was numbered with the transgressors " ; true also that He " was made a curse " in the sense that the mode of His death classed Him in appearance with those whom the Law described as accursed ; but it is His own account of the matter that opens up to us the reality of the occasion of His death as distinct from outward appearances, and that account is that, knowing full well that the issue of the conflict must inevitably be His death, He nevertheless pressed steadily forward, and willingly sacrificed His life for the salvation of men. It was not His Heavenly Father that smote Him and slew Him, but the forces of evil, symbolized in His statement as " the wolf," the enemy of His flock and of Himself.

(*b*) What, then, is the significance of His death ? He Himself has been careful to guard us against misconception on this question. His teaching on this point is in continuation of what we have just been studying. Let us have His words before us :—

" The hireling fleeth because he is a hireling and careth not for the sheep. I am the good shepherd, and I know mine own and mine own know me, even as the Father knoweth me and I know the Father ; and I lay down my life for the sheep. . . . Therefore doth the Father love me, because I lay down my life that I may take it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received from my Father."

No one can fail to notice in these words of our Lord the strong emphasis which He lays upon the fact that the laying down of His life is not something forced upon Him from without, but that it is a purely voluntary act on His part : " No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself." The malice of the Jews, the cowardice of Pilate, the act of the Roman soldiers might be the immediate causes of His death ; but these could affect Him only in so far as He voluntarily gave Himself up. And with equal

definiteness must we draw from these words of His the inference that His suffering and death were in no sense whatever a punishment inflicted upon Him by God the Father. There is a well-known hymn in which the following verses occur :—

"Jehovah lifted up His rod—
O Christ, it fell on Thee!
Thou wast sore smitten of Thy God;
There's not one stroke for me.
Thy tears, Thy blood beneath it flowed,
Thy bruising healeth me.

"Jehovah bade His sword awake—
O Christ, it woke 'gainst Thee!
Thy blood the flaming blade must slake;
Thy heart its sheath must be—
All for my sake, my peace to make;
Now sleeps that sword for me."

Consider the picture painted by these words—The Heavenly Father flogging the Lord Jesus until His blood runs down with His tears; then driving His sword up to the hilt into His heart. The doctrine of which this is an expression is that Jesus Christ was the Substitute for men, and bore the punishment due to them for their sin; the object, in their stead, of the Father's wrath. As an earnest preacher, in the writer's hearing, once put the matter in a Good Friday sermon, "The arrows of Divine vengeance quivered in the heart of the Crucified."

In strong contrast with this whole class of teaching, consider the words of Jesus: "Therefore doth the Father love me, because I lay down my life that I may take it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself." We feel here that we are in a wholly different region of idea; we breathe another atmosphere. The conception of Christ's death conveyed by these words is that of voluntary martyrdom, certainly not of punishment at the Father's hands. And this is not all. When Peter attacked the High Priest's servant in Gethsemane Jesus said, "Thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father, and he shall even now send me more than twelve legions of angels?" But against whom were these legions to fight? Against the Father? Surely it is obvious to everyone that He could not have said these words if it had been the Father Who was punishing Him then.

True, indeed, it is that He was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities; that His was the chastisement from which comes peace for us; but all this is a very different thing indeed from saying that the punishment of our sin was inflicted by God upon Him. Our iniquity, as Isaiah says, was laid upon Him, as on the Day of Atonement the sins of Israel were symbolically laid upon the scapegoat, in the sense that He bears it away; but the punishment of that iniquity, from the very nature of the case, it was literally impossible for Him to bear; for the essential elements of the punishment of unrepented sin are the moral corruption, the alienation from God and goodness, the hopeless ruin, which are the

fruit *in the sinner himself* of his death-earning sin, and which none but himself can bear. However terrible was the suffering which Christ endured, His Cross and Passion are obviously in a different category altogether from the final doom of a lost soul. And, so far from the one being the equivalent of the other, the two things cannot be compared together; there is no standard by which the one can be estimated in terms of the other. He suffered that we might be saved; He died that we might live; He redeemed us at a cost to Himself which we can never know; but He could not and He did not bear the punishment of our sin. That was morally and literally impossible.

Moreover, according to His teaching, His death, instead of being in any sense a manifestation of Divine wrath, was in truth the cause of a fresh access of the Father's love: "*Therefore* doth the Father love me, because I lay down my life." It is exceedingly interesting and instructive to observe how the declaration of the Father's love for the incarnate Son accompanies, at His baptism, the opening of the brief ministry which was to culminate in His death, and also the announcement to Him, on the Mount of Transfiguration, of the near approach of that death. These Divine utterances, recorded by the Synoptists, illustrate and also reinforce the assertion of our Lord, recorded by St. John, that His death, so far from manifesting God's wrath or being God's punishment, unsealed, in truth, a fresh fountain of Divine love. Jesus Christ never associates any idea of Divine wrath or punishment with His own death, but only and always Divine love.

How, then, are we to understand His despairing cry upon the Cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Very simply and very naturally. He was utterly exhausted through the awful sufferings He had endured, and for a little while He touched the lowest depths of human distress in losing the sense of God's care, and feeling Himself God-forsaken. The present writer has, in the course of his ministry, met with precisely the same experience in two cases—a man and a woman. In each case there was utter physical prostration accompanied by profound mental distress, and culminating in that very experience of feeling forsaken by God to which our Lord gave expression. And the interesting fact is this, that the only thing which helped the sufferer in each case was being made to realize that Jesus Christ had passed through just the same awful experience of *feeling* God-forsaken, whilst all the time He was not alone because the Father was with Him, and that after only a little while He was able with the confidence of a child to say, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit."

May we not reverently say that it was but fitting that He Who was in all points tempted like as we are should go down to these lowest depths, in order that He might ever become a guide upward into the light again of those who should find themselves, from whatever cause, in the deep places of that utter darkness and desolation of spirit?

There is just one other expression used by our Lord with reference

to His death which needs explanation in order to avoid misconception. It is the word "ransom" in the statement, "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." The context gives no suggestion of anyone to whom the ransom-price is to be paid, and indeed precludes the idea of any such transaction. The word simply indicates the fact that it was at immense cost to Himself that our Lord accomplished His work of saving mankind; that His death was the culmination of a life of self-sacrificing ministry.

From the safeguards in Christ's teaching against possible misconceptions of His atoning sacrifice we now turn to consider its positive significance as He reveals it.

Shining bright and clear through all His teaching, both in word and work, is the light of Divine love. The key-note of His ministry is "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son"; and it is to be noted that these words occur as the explanation of the announcement immediately preceding them: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life." There can be little doubt that it was from such words as these that St. Paul got the truth that "God commendeth his own love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." But there is no need to enlarge upon this. All will agree that the death of Christ, whatever else it may be, is certainly the supreme manifestation of God's love for man.

Another purpose served by that sacrifice is involved in words of our Lord spoken on the eve of His passion; and that purpose is the manifestation of the holiness, the righteousness, the true glory of God. The words were spoken on the occasion of Philip bringing to Jesus certain Greeks who had come to worship at the Feast of the Passover. Their approach was in some way for Jesus an intimation that the hour of His death had come, and He said, "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour? But for this cause came I to this hour. Father, glorify thy name." Thus He surrendered Himself to the agony and the death. But why does He describe this as a glorifying of the Father's name? St. Paul, with his sure insight into the thought of Jesus, gives the answer. Speaking of the redemption that is in Christ he says, "Whom God set forth as a propitiation, through faith, by his blood, to show his righteousness, because of the sins done aforetime in the forbearance of God; for the showing of his righteousness at this present season; that he might himself be righteous, and that he might make righteous him that hath faith in Jesus." These words of St. Paul have been singularly misunderstood to mean that God's judicial righteousness, His justice in the legal sense, was exhibited in the fact of His punishing Jesus Christ for the sins of bygone ages, which, when they were committed, He Himself had passed over; but it must be confessed that it puts an immense strain upon the imagination to conceive how such a transaction could possibly be regarded as a manifestation of justice in any sense of the word, even though

the Victim, equally with the Judge, was Divine. No! The righteousness of God that is here in question is His perfect holiness of character. His long forbearance might easily be regarded as indifference on His part to sin, as though He had not been sufficiently holy, and sensitive to sin, to concern Himself about the wrong-doing of those days of old; but in the death, for sin, of the Eternal Son God shows His constant concern about sin, the sin of all the ages of mankind, and also provides the way of salvation from sin for every sinner of every age. Thus He vindicates His own character for holiness; He glorifies His name. It is this aspect of His sacrifice that Christ puts foremost when, in the conscious presence of the Father, He makes His act of self-surrender to the suffering of death. And the voice out of heaven responds, "I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again." In the incarnation of the Eternal Son, in His self-denying ministry of loving service, God had already glorified His name. In the Divine sacrifice that was now so soon to be accomplished He would again glorify it, and that perfectly.

There is yet another element in the significance of the death of Christ; and this He shows us by His words indeed, but most effectively by the object-lesson which His death affords. The Sufferer is God the Son; He dies to save men from their sin. How fearful a thing, then, sin must be! How much to be dreaded its consequences!

"My God, my God, and can it be
That I should sin so lightly now,
And think no more of evil thoughts
Than of the wind that waves the bough!

"O, by the pains of Thy pure love,
Grant me the gift of holy fear. . . ."

Who is there that can contemplate the agony and death of Christ, realizing Who He is, without being afraid of sin and its inevitable wages?

Here, then, in the teaching of our Lord, we find the significance of His death. It is the supreme manifestation of the holiness of God, showing His infinite concern about sin, and the lengths to which He goes in order to root it out and to bring men to repentance. It is also the fullest demonstration of God's love for man; and it is calculated, beyond everything else, to arouse in all who will but consider it a deep and salutary dread of sin, and make them feel their need of salvation.

Here, too, is the secret of its efficacy. For consider the purpose of the atoning work of Christ. It was to save men from *their sin.* But salvation from sin implies the enlisting of the sinner's will on the side of God. The necessity for this is continually indicated in the teaching of Jesus. Before the prodigal can be restored he must resolve: I will arise and go to my father. "How often would I have gathered thy children together," is the lament of Christ over Jerusalem, "and ye would not." And again we hear Him complaining: "Ye will not come to me that ye may have life." Nowhere

in the Gospels is there any suggestion that anything needs to be done in order to produce in God the willingness to forgive the penitent. Everywhere the emphasis is laid on the need, and on the difficulty, of inducing sinners to be willing to turn from their evil ways and be saved. If, therefore, the sacrifice of Christ is to effect its purpose it must constitute a powerful appeal to the mind and heart, it must be calculated to exercise a potent influence upon the imagination and the will. In the significance which we have seen that Christ attaches to it we have just this appeal, just this effective influence. It moves to holy fear ; it stirs us up to wondering admiration and gratitude ; it awakens love in response to the love of God. It operates through the most powerful and constant motives that influence conduct.

In all our consideration of this subject we need to keep constantly before us this governing fact, so evident in Christ's teaching, that it is not at all the inflicting of so much punishment for so much sin that God is concerned about, but it is the saving of sinners from their sin, the transforming of them into holy men.

(*c*) We have now to learn from our Lord the necessity for His death ; why nothing less than this was sufficient. That He recognized this necessity is clear from more than one statement that He made. Speaking to Nicodemus He said, " As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up " ; and when His ministry was all but ended He said to the disciples, " This which is written must be fulfilled in me, And he was numbered with transgressors." In the thrice repeated prayer of Gethsemane there is the echo of the same necessity.

The clue to the reason for this necessity may be found in the words spoken on the way to Gethsemane, " Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." To lay down His life was the utmost that could be done in order that the greatness of God's love might be manifested : He must therefore die, because God must do His utmost. Being God He could do no less. God *so* loved the world that He gave His Son. The same truth appears in the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen : because there was nothing more that he could do, the lord of the vineyard sent his son. God could not leave the work unaccomplished so long as anything was left which it was possible for Him to do, any sacrifice for Him to make. The driving force of this necessity lay in Himself. To take man's nature, and to suffer death as the crown and consequence of a ministry of perfectly unselfish love, was the utmost that God could do, and therefore He *must* do it. It is just here that we find the real significance and value of the Divinity of Christ in the matter of His atoning death. Through all this supreme manifestation of love " God was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself." God was doing His best : doing what He must.

(*d*) There remains last to be considered the association by our Lord of His resurrection with His death as an essential part of His atoning sacrifice. It is not only when He foretells His resurrection as the sign from heaven by which the Father would attest His

ministry that He thus links together the resurrection with the death, but in all His teaching concerning His death. All the Synoptists unite in recording the fact that after St. Peter's great confession Jesus " from that time began to show unto his disciples how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up." He apparently then entered upon a systematic course of teaching concerning His atoning sacrifice, in which He invariably associated His resurrection with His death as the two essential elements of that sacrifice. In the tenth chapter of St. John's Gospel this teaching culminates in the sentences, " Therefore doth the Father love me because I lay down my life that I may take it again. . . . I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment received I from the Father." Not to press unduly the words, " I lay down my life *in order that* I may take it again," the least we can infer from so remarkable an assertion is, that for the purpose of man's salvation, for the perfection of the atoning sacrifice, the resurrection was at least as essential as the death. It is, perhaps, because this truth has so much been overlooked, that the balance of doctrine has been disturbed and such strange theories of atonement have arisen.

In St. Paul's epistles we find the strongest emphasis laid upon this part of Christ's teaching. " If Christ hath not been raised," he declares, " then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain . . . ye are yet in your sins." This last phrase is especially striking. Again he speaks of Christ as " delivered up for our trespasses, and raised for our justification."

On this part of our subject the ritual of the sin-offering for Israel on the Day of Atonement is peculiarly remarkable and suggestive. And here, with all due deference to the higher critical theory of the composition of the Pentateuch, I feel bound to say that I cannot regard the law of this sacrifice, as recorded in the Book of Leviticus, to be of other than Divine origin. Apart from other considerations, the ritual is altogether too unique, too entirely out of harmony with current ideas of sacrifice, too fully in accord with that element of Christ's teaching concerning His sacrifice which has least commended itself to men's minds, to have been the work of priests of the Exile. And, moreover, the deliberate violation of the prescribed ritual, in the worship of the restored Temple, in that which was its most unique and essential feature, viz. the killing of the scapegoat which, according to the ritual, was appointed to live, seems to show plainly that this ritual, so far from being then of recent origin, was already so old that, through ignorance of its significance, it had in course of time been radically altered in practice so as wholly to obliterate that significance. Space is not available for the setting out of the ritual in detail, but it is essential that attention should be given to two points in particular :—

1. The High Priest takes of the children of Israel *two* he-goats for *one and the same* sin-offering to the Lord (Lev. xvi. 5)—not one goat for a sacrifice to the Lord, and the other for a present to

be sent, laden with Israel's sin, to some wilderness demon named Azazel; as many have most foolishly imagined. The sacrifice was to symbolize living after death, as well as dying. Therefore, as no one animal could die and also live, two goats were appointed for the one sacrifice to Jehovah; they were regarded as one, and until the lot fell no one could say which was to die and which to live. Both were alike presented to Jehovah; both were His.

2. It was upon the head of *the goat that was to live* that the sins of the nation were symbolically laid; not upon the goat that died. It is not in the death alone of the atoning sacrifice that sin is taken away, but *in its life*. As St. Paul puts it, "If Christ is not raised, ye are yet in your sins"; although He has died. The death without the resurrection is not the complete sacrifice.

All this is specially worthy of attention because it is so wholly contrary to the general conviction among primitive races, among non-Christian people, and even among Christians, that it is death, and the suffering entailed thereby, that suffices for the removal of evil and the making expiation for sin.

The question remains to be asked, What is the meaning of these statements and foreshadowings? In what sense is it that our sins are taken away by the life of the risen Christ? Here, again, the teaching of Jesus gives us light. With regard to the putting away of sin there are two things that we need: one is the assurance that the sins of the past are forgiven; the other is grace and strength to keep clear of sin in the present. Now, the resurrection of Jesus Christ is, according to His own teaching, the Father's attestation of His ministry, sealing as true the words He said, owning as of God the works He did. We may, therefore, know assuredly that all that He has told us about God's free and full forgiveness of His penitent children is absolutely true. We do not underestimate the seriousness of our sin, nor do we fail to realize the miracle that is involved in forgiveness such as God bestows; but in the faith of Christ we bring all the sin to our Heavenly Father, in genuine repentance, and we leave it there with Him. In Christ's name, on His assurance which God has endorsed by raising Him from the dead, we ask for the forgiveness which is pledged to all who ask. In the full confidence of this assurance we can say with St. John, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins."

So much for the sins of the past. But what about the daily deliverance from sin? The teaching of Jesus on this point is one of the most precious lessons of the Master which St. John has preserved for us. With His disciples He had left the upper room and was on His way to Gethsemane. It was the last night of His earthly life; it was His last opportunity of speaking to the disciples before He should die. He began His address with the words, "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman," and went on to plead with them to abide in Him, holding out to them the assurance of unfailing help and of abundant fruit-bearing if only they would abide in Him. The abiding in Him to which He so

tenderly invited them could not have been meant to refer to the few remaining hours of His earthly life. Obviously, He was looking onward to the life beyond. It was to vital union with Him in His resurrection life that He was calling them. It would be given to them, if they would take the gift, to abide in Him, their Risen Lord, as the branch in the vine; to draw from Him, as the branch from the vine, everything that they needed for abundant life and for fruit-bearing to the glory of God. It is almost too much for faith to grasp—that each one of us should be in real, living, personal touch with the Risen Christ, so that He responds to every genuine need of our soul, as the vine to each branch's every requirement. But we have it from His own lips. This, then, is how He saves us day by day from sin. He keeps us spiritually healthy by union with Him. And to all who abide in Him He throws out the royal challenge, "Ask whatsoever ye will, and it shall be done unto you." It is so that He saves us by His life. It is so that His words are fulfilled, "Because I live, ye shall live also."

EVANGELIZATION.

By the Rev. Canon Lillingston, M.A.

I ALMOST blush to find myself at this time of day called on to read a paper on "Evangelization." It ought surely to be the most familiar topic, discussed all round and everywhere in Christian circles, whereas we rarely hear it mentioned—and when it is, the interest is not really marked. I say this without any hesitation, because Evangelism is of the very essence of our life and work. We may have much to do, but there is nothing which has such a claim upon our thoughts, our prayers, our strength. Admit, if you will, that our first duty is to worship God, but you must go on to allow that our second duty is to evangelize our fellow-men. "The Gospel is by its very nature designed for proclamation; it has not begun to be what it aims at being till it is proclaimed"—and, as the author of *Ecce Homo* puts it, "The article of conversion is the article of a standing or falling Church."

This being so, there is something wrong, very wrong, if every Christian has not an Evangelistic spirit and fervour; not that all have Evangelistic gifts, but all can have and ought to have Evangelistic power which can be exercised by intercession, faithful testimony and worthy living. The greatest trial of an earnest pastor is the sense that he is doing his work alone. He is surrounded by a body of kind and regular communicants, but few,

if any, of them share with him any passion for souls, and are working at the winning of souls.

An earnest Layman thus describes the position: "I have visited many churches in different parts of the country. I find nothing wrong or wanting when dealing with the material side of Church work. If money is needed, however much, it is forthcoming when the need is made known. But more than one has spoken to me of the absence of keen interest in the spiritual things of the Church."

The reasons for this (which will not be much disputed) may be many, but the chief are not hard to seek. Firstly: We have not taught our people that they are equally responsible with us for the lost, that the whole Church was commissioned by the Risen Lord (S. John xx.) to go forth and continue His task. This is fatal, for Evangelism in the Church will never expand to its true greatness so long as it is regarded as an exclusively clerical interest. "The universal priesthood of believers is our flag," but rare is it to find that priesthood so put to work that outsiders are led to believe in God. Secondly: The imperious motive of personal affection for Christ Himself is lacking. If this fire burn low on the altar, how shall hearts be kindled into sacrificial flame? Roland Allen and others have shown us quite clearly that those who in the primitive Church and in any age have had power to save the lost, though they differed often in methods and even in some doctrines, have been alike in this; they were all baptized into the love of souls for Christ's sake. If we corrected this—and we can—we shall have great results; not the least shall we find that our appeal for young men for the ministry meets with a hearty response. Few gifted men are now offering for this, because there is nothing much doing, nothing much to do; and they will hold back so long as all that they are wanted for are hollow forms, empty sacraments, and lifeless prayers.

As for the need of this work, there can be no question. It is definitely recognized and ought to burden every member of Christ. It is said that when Dr. Thomas Chalmers found that in Glasgow 30,000 people had no connection with the churches, he was troubled and said that in God's Name this thing must come to an end. What would he say if he returned and found that in Glasgow to-day 400,000 people have no religious association? The Bishop of London has, I believe, expressed the opinion that only 3 per cent. of London's population are regular attenders at public worship.

When some lady pilgrims went forth in a campaign in 1920 to stir up missionary zeal in a certain diocese, they returned with sad hearts because their task was mainly fruitless, as the people needed evangelizing themselves!

How is Evangelization to be carried on? What is the plan and programme? This is a practical point and one on which we meet to help one another. Disturbed and unsettled as our times are, there is much divergence of opinion, men talking about a new

presentation of the old message, and not able to explain what they mean. Such divergences, however, need not divide us; rather let them bring us into closer touch with each other as we wait on the Holy Spirit for His guidance—and try to explore and understand the situation as we have it to-day. Probably I can best serve the Conference by offering for consideration my own opinions in a plain and frank manner. They are mainly concerned with three different parties which seem to require attention if Evangelization is to be a reality, and if the Spirit of God is to find conditions prevailing which are favourable to His operations. I would emphasize this point because there is an apparent tendency to expect the work of the Holy Spirit to be carried on, apart from our care and prayer—and apart from the humble earnest preparations which we can make and are expected to make for His Presence and His activity in our midst.

(1) First let me say that the personal attitude of the heart and mind of us clergy must be watched as never before. That is to say, it is vital that we see to it that our own spiritual life and tone be well ordered and maintained if we are to make our message carry. There is need to say this because of the many evidences that men are not enjoying free and happy communion with God as our fathers did. I know a brother who has been in hospital on two different occasions. Four Bishops have visited him, but not one of them prayed with him in his weakness and need. They were as kind and as friendly as could be—but they had not the grace or courage to kneel down and commend their brother to the mercy and goodness of God. Is it uncharitable to advance that this is an indication of a serious flaw—that a pastoral spirit is lacking, that the spirit of peace and power is not in full possession? If men are not so living that they can and do pray naturally, are they likely in their public address to come up to Bunyan's man, thus described: "He stood as if he pleaded with men."

To put the matter in another way, I would venture the opinion that we clergy are not on fire for souls. We do a great deal of work; we are as busy as we can be, especially in town parishes, but can it honestly be claimed that we go forth day by day with our hearts eagerly set upon our chief business of making God known and of winning men unto Him? Have we any such strong passion? Does it determine and colour all our relations with others—and all our conversation, in public and in private? Is it not essential that it should do so, if Evangelization is to be a continual success?

Now, if it be true that we are largely lacking in the pastoral spirit, I cannot help feeling that it can be traced to a weakness in our faith. We have not the convictions, we have not the vision, which make for Evangelistic fervour and devotion. We have to remember that it is a day of great credal disturbance, and many of the clauses of the Creed which our predecessors regarded as fundamental, and on which they went to work, are held very slenderly by us if held at all. Hence the poverty of our Evangelistic ministry.

In describing Mr. Bramwell Booth, the author of *Painted Windows* says: "At the back of everything, I am convinced, is the cold and commanding intensity of a really great fanatic. He believes as no little child believes in God and Satan, Heaven and Hell, and the eternal conflict of God and evil. He believes, too, that a man must in very truth be born again before he can inherit the Kingdom of Heaven" (p. 134). This, surely, is the explanation of the Evangelistic spirit which animates the Salvation Army, the Spirit which we all admire and respect, however widely we differ from that great body in other points; and it may be that we have not their zeal because we do not believe as they do. Apart from Bramwell Booth's faith, how can any man be a keen Evangelist? Until we clergy find out where we are and what we believe, I fail to see how we can do the work for which we were ordained. But given a simple clear faith, fostered by close contact with the Master—we cannot but be fishers of men. Both our pastoral work and our pulpit utterances will have the same high aim, and will oft-times hit the mark.

Here let me say that—for effective Evangelization—there is much need for reformation and revision in the pulpit. It is a most uncommon thing to hear anything approaching an Evangelistic sermon in a Christian pulpit. Men preach anything and everything else but the Word. Here are some of the topics dealt with of late in the Church of England: On Christmas Day, "Home Rule for Ireland"; on Easter Day, "The Genoa Conference"; on Trinity Sunday, "Courtship." Could anything be more deplorable—especially in a day when men are listening eagerly for some voice that will lead them into Light?

Permit me to submit my own view of the message which is especially called for in this great day:

(*a*) Preach about GOD. Like the Prophets of old, make Him a reality to your people. Bring Him near to their thoughts. Give Him shape in their minds. Show Him to the waiting vision of mankind. The proclaimed Word must centre in God, and in God as He is beheld at Calvary. To preach about man instead of God is the most self-defeating of all plans. I think St. Paul possibly felt that, when he dropped the simple message and gave a philosophic discourse in the Areopagus. The result was not cheering. As Mr. Rackham says in his commentary on the Acts: "At Athens St. Paul tried the wisdom of the world and found it wanting; and when he went on to Corinth, he determined not to try excellency of speech or the persuasive words of wisdom, but to preach—what he had not proclaimed in the Areopagus—Christ crucified. His disappointment at the failure of the former method to touch the frivolous Athenians no doubt kindled the fire with which he denounces the wisdom of the world in his first epistle to the Corinthians." When I say "Preach about God," I mean what I say. Make Him and His ways and His Will the subject; and in doing it avoid as much as possible any low motives for your appeal to the conscience and the heart. I am aware that social injustice

is perpetually blanketing the truth of Fatherhood revealed by the Cross. None the less, if we offer the Gospel to the world primarily as the cure for industrial wrongs, men will turn away, and they will indubitably be right. Nay, let preachers betray genuine and constant sympathy with our social and industrial difficulties, but have done with mercenary arguments for belief in God; let them trust the instinct that God is precious for His own sake. Let the appeal be "Get right with God." Kindle that fire, and it will burn to ashes the social apathies by which the Church has too often been disgraced. It is all very well to talk extravagantly about bringing in the Kingdom of God, but the only sure way to do it is to bring in the King Himself, and let Him reign. We are having too much talk about the Kingdom without any reference to the King.

(*b*) Preach about Jesus Christ. "Lift Him up," and in terms which mean something, which mean the right thing. It is extraordinary how necessary it is to say this, but you will find too often that Jesus Christ is referred to as a sort of kind Brother, acting a brother's part, whereas the real message is that He is to take my place—self's place—"Not I, but Christ liveth in me." Moreover, men have to be convinced that Jesus Christ is necessary for them, because, many as are the wonders of psycho-analysis and mental therapeutics, He alone can deal with buried guilt, for only He can reach to the innermost places and break the deadliest bondage that may be hiding in the secret chambers of the soul. He, and none but He, ventures into the haunted underworld, taking with Him authority, light, joy, peace. He, and none but He, can straighten out a man's relationship with God.

(*c*) Preach the Cross, not only as the atoning sacrifice, but also as the only way of freedom from the past, and of union with the Redeemer Himself. It is a fatal mistake to allow men to think that they can reign with Christ without suffering with Him, and is responsible for much failure. It has been well said that "there is a wide diffusion in the Church of a sort of Christian secularism, and an indifference to the heart of religion which clothes itself in the garb of religious toleration. Such a Laodicean temper should have no quarter in the Church, and preaching must be directed against it with a view to impress upon the minds of men that the difference between the Christian and the non-Christian attitude to Jesus is not a difference of more or less, or better or worse, but a difference of life and death." To put it otherwise, Evangelization can only tell when it rests on a pure unmingled element of loyalty to the Lord Jesus Christ, *and* demands pure unmingled loyalty to Him as the actual foundation of the Christian life. Such loyalty must needs express itself in renunciation for the sake of Jesus Christ. Loyalty has to pay its price, and if the price be death, loyalty asks no discount. The fact is, revival is the most expensive thing, and we have no business to disguise it. If anyone thinks that revival means emotion and no sacrifice, then they will get one of the biggest surprises of their life, when their eyes are opened to the Truth. This is not teaching which any man welcomes

naturally, but there is nothing gained by withholding it, and by ignoring the sterner side of the Master's message. The Woman of Samaria heard no palliating words, and the words of grace which Mary heard as she mourned on the Resurrection morning were accompanied by words of warning; "Touch Me not," for, as a preacher recently pointed out, Our Lord did not indulge in any "cheap Bernard Shaw-like talk," but called men to die unto sin in order that they might rise again unto life, and life for evermore.

(2) Secondly. We must needs pay much attention to the large body of lapsed communicants if Evangelization is to be carried on well. For the most part they are in agreement with us, but they are not living the life nor doing the work to which they have been called, and yet they are necessary. They can reach the unevangelized as, and when, we ordained men cannot. They can exercise an influence in many ways and in many directions and quarters from which we are precluded. It would be unfortunate to try and proceed without them. It is worth a great deal to recover them—and to bring them into the fighting line. A wise man, I think, will set about this by a great deal of prayer, and a great deal of careful teaching, more particularly by helping them understand the Bible and its message. It would be an enormous gain if men would devote themselves to such an exposition of the Bible that their hearers would almost feel themselves forced to read it themselves. There is little doubt that the Church is more or less impotent to-day because faith is weak, and convictions are not deep, and this can largely be traced to an ignorance of what God thinks and wants as revealed to us in Holy Writ. If, under the direction of the Holy Spirit, preachers and teachers would open men's understanding that they shall understand the Scriptures, we should certainly have a revived and revivified Church which is surely the obvious precursor to a revived world. I do not suggest, far from it, that we should trouble people with the various theories of inspiration, but, taking Scripture as the plain word of God, that its meaning should be so studied and brought out that men and women find themselves unable to resist its appeal, and humbly surrender themselves to the service of Him Whose Voice in Holy Writ is unmistakable. Another practical method of influencing this class seems to be by means of a parochial convention for about a week, having as its object the rousing of the ordinary congregation: (*a*) To the sense of a need of a mission. (*b*) To recognize their responsibility in the matter.

(3) Thirdly: There can be no satisfactory Evangelization unless we attend to the atmosphere and the soil. The Parable of the Sower is very explicit on this point, which is, alas! a too timely one.

(*a*) With regard to the atmosphere, I have in mind the difficulties of secularism, the parochial dance, the whist drive, which at their best may raise much money, but which cannot be called spiritually elevating, and are not wholly congenial to the operation

of the Holy Ghost on Whom we depend for results. It will be enough for me to quote from a letter of a dear brother written last January: "Parochial work just now is extraordinarily interesting but very difficult. Last week we had our Girls' Club Social, and actually I find some of the girls playing a game of kissing the young men—and this in a parish which has had generations of spiritual teaching." Comment is needless; for few, if any, would claim that such a condition of things makes for fruitful Evangelization.

(*b*) With regard to the soil. Too often it is ignored—and the seed, good in itself and well sown, cannot strike a root. It is never wise to overlook the state of heart and mind of the hearers as if it were immaterial. No good husbandman does so. And that is surely the explanation of the words employed by Jeremiah in his call to repentance, when he exclaims, "Break up the fallow ground" —words which prove the conviction that beneath the shallow barren surface of the national life there was soil capable of receiving good seed and of bringing forth fruit meet for repentance. I would wish here to raise my voice in support of the plea for a restoration of religion to our English home life, for I cannot see much hope for any man's ministry unless the soil is prepared, and mainly prepared, at the home fireside. On the whole, the Church of Christ is more indebted for her successes to pious parents than to pious pastors. Let me support this statement by quoting the language employed recently by a leading journal about the late Sir Alfred Pearce Gould. "He was born and nurtured in a Christian home. He was a son of the manse, and the influence of that home moulded him and made him. To his last hour he held in lowly reverence the memory of that pious pair to whom he owed body and soul. At a time when the old-fashioned Christian household is passing away, being replaced by an establishment in which neither prayer nor praise resounds, it is pertinent to ask whether the youth, to-day soul-starved and pagan, will yield to-morrow a sterling manhood capable of meeting the stern demands of a rapidly changing world? I do not believe it is possible. Out of the rags and ribbons of a frivolous age we cannot weave the glories of a worthy humanity. Christian homes have begotten the great men of the past; to similar homes we must turn for the great men of the future." Few men can be great Evangelists only by faithful preaching; they must also be faithful pastors, consistent and earnest in their visiting, getting into the homes of the people, and making them more or less independent establishments for the cultivation of a divine harvest. A happy and simple way of beginning this is by personally starting family prayers in homes; and by showing some of the family how to carry them on regularly, recommending the Scripture Union or some such portion of Scripture, and the weekly collect or the excellent Mothers' Union prayer.

My closing word may be the most important and the most needed. It somewhat summarizes what I have been trying to say, and it is virtually an appeal.

(i.) To get our minds clearly fixed on this work; not to be over-occupied with other interests, such as Church politics and the doings of the National Assembly, and the wonderful potentialities of Reunion, topics which have a real claim to our limited attention, but we must see that it *is* limited, for, as I think the Archbishop of York said some time ago: "Nothing matters but Evangelization."

(ii.) To give our hearts to the work, and to let them be so engaged with it and in it that it is, as it were, "our meat and our drink" (St. John iv.) to do it and to have it done. Perhaps the saddest feature of the whole situation of to-day is that we can look upon our fellow-men and not really care whether they live or die. Until that is corrected, there will not be any Evangelization worthy of the name.

How mysterious it is that we can think of the Holy Spirit dwelling within us, and yet be conscious of having no fire! Verily we need to seek, in patience and faith, a fresh baptism of the Holy Spirit, whatever it means, whatever it costs. Otherwise, Christ cannot work through us nor we effectually for Him. But given a new heart and a fresh flame, we shall exclaim to ourselves in a new way, "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel, if I do not win souls"; and we shall think out and devise many means and methods of doing it; it will be the uppermost thought in our dreams day and night; we shall say, "I must work the work of Him Who has ordained me whilst it is called the day."

Many of you can match this example of what I mean. A young woman recently came forward for confirmation and is living a faithful Christian life. Not many months ago she was sitting in darkness, and simply did not care about, or seem to understand any of God's Truths. But a kind lady, who is always out for others, approached her, made friends with her, talked quietly to her, lent her books and discussed them with her, and then began to pray with her until her eyes were opened and she came to Jesus.

The personal touch is the touch of power. Thereby the Spirit is wont to work; for most souls are brought to Christ by some other soul that cares.

If we but cared more, and went to our work daily with a truly strong pastoral spirit, with a definite aim and desire, our labours and our prayers would not be in vain; God would turn to Himself such as should be saved.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

"ON WHAT AUTHORITY?"

ON WHAT AUTHORITY? By the Right Rev. E. A. Knox, D.D., formerly Bishop of Manchester. London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

There is a revolt against authority in theology. Men seem to have assured themselves that the will to believe followed by satisfaction in their belief supplies the final argument for Christianity. All objective grounds of belief are being abandoned, one by one, and no longer do we find Scripture or the Tradition of the Church or the voice of the living Church made a ground of religious conviction. Man is a religious animal—religion is as necessary to him as food—undogmatic Christianity satisfies his religious cravings—why then should we trouble about anything else? This attitude is much more general than is believed, and we think that a great many of those described by Dr. Knox as having taken over their theology with their conversion, as well as those satisfied by vagueness, are among the class who reject authority with their minds, no matter what they may say with their lips. Dr. Knox writes his book for those "who are conscious that they cannot really love God unless they know Him, and know Him as truly as He can be known by the best and most unsparing intellectual effort at their command." In *On What Authority?* he writes a sort of apologia for his own faith, and it is this mingling of personal outlook with apologetic method that gives his volume special interest.

He has re-written his final charge to his Diocese and we cordially welcome his defence of Evangelical Truth. He starts with the conviction that "the core of the New Testament is the identity of Jesus of Nazareth with the Risen Saviour and Lord, whom the Christians worshipped as God." Here he is on firm historical ground. Take the New Testament as a whole, put whatever date that may be assigned to its documents by responsible critics, and the conclusion cannot be evaded. Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was worshipped by the Primitive Church as God Who Lives. It has no room in its pages for the conception of an imperfect or a dead Christ. "Jesus Lives" is the keynote of the whole of its writings, and by His resurrection He gave His Church and mankind the proof of His Divinity. The miracle of the resurrection is a great deal more than a mere evidential event—it is as St. Paul saw with a clearness that he never allowed to grow dim, "the keystone of the power of the Gospel he proclaimed." It is not fashionable nowadays to be old-fashioned in the sense of believing what the Primitive Church and New Testament teach. We live in a creative age, and the many attempts to reconstruct Christianity in the past are for the most part interred in literary cemeteries. Dr. Knox has no difficulty in showing that a similar fate awaits the pictures of imagination drawn by clever contemporary artists. In going back to T. H.

Green some may think that he is resurrecting ancient history. No one familiar with the development of the New Theology can fail to see that most of the half-baked presentations of " reduced Christianity " have their origin in the teaching of Green, who is more often misunderstood than faithfully expounded.

Dr. Knox holds, and in our opinion rightly holds, traditional views concerning the date of the New Testament documents. Criticism (that word which covers the most absurd conjectures as well as the sanest inquiry) will prove him right, and he has no sympathy with the wild guesses that are so frequently put forward as proofs of learning. He has, however, been much impressed by the influence of apocalyptic teaching on the teaching of Christ. We are not impressed by his contention on the necessary influence of current and popular ideas on the Mind of the Master. He who discerned the real mind of God behind the Mosaic law and the traditions of the time, was not likely to be misled by the apocalyptic dreams of his age. Dean Inge, who is by no means a slave to traditional orthodoxy, is nearer to what we believe to be the truth when he says : " Personally I think that He used the traditional prophetic language about the Day of the Lord, but that like John Baptist, He revived the older prophetic tradition, and did not attach Himself to the recent apocalyptists. No doubt there are apocalyptic passages in the synoptics, and, what is more important, the first two generations of Christians believed that the ' Presence ' of the Messiah was evident. But the expectation of a sudden dramatic and, above all, violent upsetting of all human institutions by miracle seems quite contrary to the temper of His mind, and would hardly be compatible with sanity, much less with the positions which Christians are bound to give Him."

We are inclined to believe that the view Dr. Knox takes on the coming end of the age colours a good deal of his writing on that most mysterious question of the two Natures in the person of our Lord. To much of what he says no fair-minded student can take exception, and we are thankful that he abandons the Kenotic view which will never fit the facts of life as lived by our blessed Lord, The sinlessness of that life places Him from the human standpoint in a class by Himself. He claims that all things are delivered unto Him of His Father, and with our necessary ignorance of the capacity of sinless humanity receiving all things of His Father, it is rash to be over bold in speculating on the self-restraint imposed by the union. On the other hand, we can never forget that our Lord was man living among His contemporaries speaking to them in a way they as children of the Kingdom could understand. We have really too little revealed to us to enable a theory that can satisfy all minds to be evolved. We must avoid Eutychianism as well as the opposite heresy. A rash dogmatism has infected much contemporary thought on the subject. There is an acceptance of hypothesis as demonstrated fact which involves certain conclusions, and then a new hypothesis is erected to enable the first to be accepted. No one can read the shrewd criticisms of Dr. Knox on the Welhausen

hypothesis without feeling that we have by no means heard the last word on this subject.

We have left ourselves no space to comment on the thoughtful and helpful chapter on the Authority of the Holy Spirit. Church Authority is subjected to an analysis that is necessary in these days, and the exposition of the place of conscience in the world is admirable. All we need say in conclusion is that if the readers of this review learn as much from Dr. Knox as its writer has learned, they will be well advised to buy it, read and re-read it for their personal profit. What a pity that a book of this real value should have an index that is so incomplete and contains blunders which find no place in the text!

"OUTSPOKEN ESSAYS."

OUTSPOKEN ESSAYS: SECOND SERIES. By W. R. Inge, D.D. London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 6s.

We venture to say that no theological writer in England has anything like the number of readers attracted by the Dean of St. Paul's. This is a fact that cannot be overlooked, and whether we agree or disagree with the Dean, he is one of the forces that are moulding English opinion. We are the least speculative of nations. Discuss any question with a Frenchman or a German who has passed through a University and before half an hour you will be in the midst of a philosophical debate. In England we seem to make a point of avoiding fundamental theories and rest content with seeing how a thing works in practice. Dr. Inge is nothing if not a philosopher. He is not only a philosopher—he is attached to the school of Plotinus. We who have wrestled with Plotinus and failed to understand his theories are amazed by the skill shown by Dr. Inge in making plain to the average mind the impact of Platonism on current speculative and practical thinking. We hold no brief for Dr. Inge. Justice demands our saying that there are two Inges that must never be confounded. Inge speaking his own convictions is one man; Inge pleading for a view of Christianity comprehending other opinions than his own is another man, and much of the indignation poured forth on the opinions of the Dean arises from inability to grasp the distinction we have ventured to make.

Dean Inge warns us that we are not to expect anything very daring or unconventional in this volume. We differ from him, after having read every line of its contents. It is at once the most daring book he has published and the most helpful with the possible exception of his best work *Speculum Animæ*. Like *Speculum Animæ* the first long Essay, "Confessio Fidei," appeals to the soul. Few men would have dared to lay his soul so bare to the age as he has laid his bare in this beautiful and supremely honest paper. Is not the Dean one of the best living writers and exponents of Mysticism? "I am very far from claiming that I have had these rich experiences myself. It is only occasionally that I can pray with the spirit and with the understanding also, a very different thing from merely 'saying one's prayers.' Nor have I found in the contemplation of

nature anything like the inspiration which Wordsworth and others have described. At times 'the moving waters at their priest-like task' seem to have the power which Euripides ascribes to them of 'washing away all human ills,' at times the mountains speak plainly of the Ancient of Days who was before they began to be; but too often nature only echoes back my own moods, and seems dark or bright because I am sad or merry. The sweet sanctities of home life, and especially the innocence and affection of young children, more often bring me near to the felt presence of God. But for the testimony of the great cloud of witnesses, who have mounted higher and seen more, I should not have ventured to build so much on this immediate revelation of God to the human soul." This is characteristic of the man. Equally characteristic is his comment on the inefficiency of Platonism as compared with Christianity. "But the loss of the 'Divine Word' would be a very heavy deprivation; and if I felt that I had lost it, I should not think it honest to call myself any longer a Christian, or to remain in the Christian ministry. It seems to me that the Roman Church was quite right in condemning both Loisy and Tyrrell. The latter was less explicit, but his real opinions were probably not far different from those of the French critic." The man who writes thus is no apologist for Rome.

Again and again in his pages he condemns the influence of Roman Catholicism on life and religion. "A heavy price has to be paid by a civilization that calls in an ambitious priesthood to save it. I once said to a wise man, 'If I had to choose between the Red International and the Black, I think I should prefer the Black.' He replied, 'No. We should escape from the Red tyranny; but the Blacks do not let their victims go.'" "The miserable results of this policy which the Roman Catholic Church would establish everywhere, if it could, are apparent in Poland, in Canada and above all, in Ireland." But no one can understand the indictment the Dean draws against the Church of Rome without reading carefully all he says on the subject. Protestant pamphleteers are often accused of violent assertion. We know of no pamphleteer who has written with more incisive or pointed criticism than the author of these Essays.

The *Confessio Fidei* is the most important Essay in the volume, but the Hibbert Lectures on "The State Visible and Invisible," contain a gold mine of information and sound historical sense. They shed much light on problems that are under discussion, and will be read and re-read by all who can value the honest thinking of a competent mind on questions that are of present importance. We all need to have our ideas clarified, and Dr. Inge has the unique gift among his contemporaries of presenting a subject in a challenging manner. We are passing through a stage of political reconstruction, and it is essential that we should know why certain proposals have broken down in the past. We should like all Members of Parliament as well as Christian Ministers to make themselves familiar with his Lectures.

The remaining five Essays have appeared before in print, and are familiar to that large body of readers who make it their privilege to study everything from the pen of the Dean. "The Idea of Progress" will teach those who are ready to learn that in all that is great in intellectual equipment man has made little progress, and our civilization is but a thin veneer over our barbaric past. No abler description of the Victorian Age can be found than that contained in the Rede Lecture. "The White Man and His Rivals," "The Dilemma of Civilization" and "Eugenics" are all so outspoken that they will excite strong opposition in many quarters that will be more indignant because they cannot reply to them than comfortable in reading them. When all is said Dean Inge has one of the most acute minds of the day, and his book is worth far more than the six shillings asked by the publishers. Many would gladly pay the additional one and sixpence were it furnished with an index. It is a crime against a book of this class to deprive the reader of the opportunity of reviving his knowledge by easy reference to its contents. The *Outspoken Essays* have neither a summary preceding them nor an index following them. Both are needed for their full appreciation by a careful reader.

A STANDARD LATIN TEXT.

PSALTERIUM IUXTA HEBRAEOS HIERONYMI. Edited by J. M. Harden, B.D., LL.D. London: *S.P.C.K.*

We live in an age distinguished for its daring speculation and meticulous attention to small matters. In every department of human activity we have the men who frame hypotheses and those who work at the details that verify them or supply the matter for their formation. It is therefore not surprising to come across a book by a scholar that supplies us with a text that is badly needed by all students of the Latin Psalter. Such a text has been vainly sought for by scholars who are intent on discovering what Jerome wrote in his final translation of the Book of Psalms. He had twice translated it from the Greek of the Septuagint. One of these translations has been made familiar to students and others by its use in the Service Books of the Church of Rome. The earlier version was retained in the Churches, and in this respect we find Rome acting as she did in connection with the Mozarabic Liturgy which she commanded to be used in a certain number of Spanish Churches. But the revision of the translation made from collation of the Hebrew text is seldom met with, and it is hard to discover what the true readings are. Dr. Harden with infinite labour has produced a text which bears witness on every page to his critical insight and wide knowledge of the Latin of the Vulgate.

He has examined manuscripts in British and foreign museums. He has had access to the printed editions and has been in consultation with scholars on many points, and his book has been published with many proofs of skill and mechanical dexterity by the S.P.C.K. The Hebrew Psalter was specially popular in Spain—that happy

hunting-ground for scholars who have an eye to obtaining first-hand information from the little-studied manuscript treasures of its libraries. Dr. Harden had before him a complete photographic record of the Psalter in the famous Codex Toletanus, and we find in his critical notes many evidences of its usefulness. This leads us to say that the invention of the phototype process enables students to have before them at a moderate cost exact facsimiles of the most valued documents. It is no longer necessary for them to spend days and months in foreign libraries. They can have the text in their own studies and with a magnifying glass discover the minutiæ of its glosses and corrections. The Spanish Manuscripts collated by Dr. Harden for the most part agree with the Manuscripts in the British Museum, which he has been the first to use for a determination of the true text. He has discovered in the course of his investigation that the Roman Catholic editors unconsciously introduce readings which have no support from the Manuscripts. This is natural, for knowing by heart the Gallican Psalter, they unintentionally read into the text that which is most familiar to them.

In his introduction Dr. Harden gives a deeply interesting account of the Manuscripts and their inter-relation. He tell us: "The more I have studied the Psalter the more I have been convinced that the text translated by St. Jerome at the end of the fourth century was substantially the same as our present Masoretic text." This is a valuable testimony to the value of this text. All who are interested in the Latin text of Holy Scripture will do well to acquire this book, which is a proof that Evangelical scholarship is not so sterile as its critics suppose, but is ready to fill gaps found in the garnered harvest from the past. Jerome knew that his earlier translations were defective, and it is a great boon to know his final work in a form that is at once authoritative and easily read.

The *Church Quarterly Review* is becoming more and more associated with King's College, London. This is not an evil, for its contributors are well able to maintain its traditional high standard. In the October number the late Principal of King's, Dr. Headlam—now Bishop-designate of Gloucester—writes a striking review of Bishop Gore's book on God—which is praised with discrimination.

The *Journal of Theological Studies* makes an appeal to scholars, who discover it to be invaluable. Again and again back numbers are consulted, for they contain matter of first-rate importance that cannot be found elsewhere. Both these quarterlies prove that the Church of England contains research workers of the highest ability.

The death of Dr. James Hastings—the greatest Dictionary Maker of our day, came as a personal loss to those who value everything edited by him. His name on the cover of the book was a sort of hall-mark of excellence. We are glad to know that the *Expository Times*—his first venture—still continues to live up to its reputation, and we confess that our monthly magazine list would be much the poorer if it did not contain the journal, that is always fresh and can be trusted to contain matter of current interest.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1

Theological Books.—A general list of theological books has not been issued by the Church Book Room for some time owing to the difficulties of ascertaining what books were actually obtainable and their prices. A list has now been prepared and will be sent on application. Books are classified under the general headings of the subjects with which they deal, and care has been taken only to name those which are obtainable, cheap and worth reading.

Prayer Book Revision.—A four-page leaflet has been prepared by the National Church League, containing a summary of the proposed changes in the Prayer Book, which is issued at 3*s.* per 100 post free, and is intended to give Churchmen a brief statement of the contents of the Report. A lecture by Bishop Knox on the Report on Prayer Book Revision has also been published at 3*d.* It contains a review of the whole situation and deals especially with the position of the laity and their duty. Mr. W. Prescott Upton has written another pamphlet on this subject, price 3*d.* net. It deals especially with the changes in the Holy Communion Service, and in the Baptismal and Confirmation Services. It will be found of service in the consideration of the Report. Parochial Church Councillors and others would do well to purchase and to consider the following pamphlets in connexion with this matter as they will give them information and instruction in regard to our present Prayer Book which will be of service to them in any consideration of the Report:—*The Story of the Prayer Book*, by Bishop Moule; *Principles of the Book of Common Prayer*, by Bishop Drury; *The Place of the Elements; The Case against Reservation*, by G. A. King; and *The Power of the Presence and its Relation to the Holy Communion*, by Bishop Moule—all at 1*d.* each.

A New Manual for Communicants.—The Rev. T. W. Gilbert has written a little manual for Communicants entitled *Helps to the Christian Life* (cloth 1*s.* 3*d.*; cloth gilt, 1*s.* 6*d.*). This manual, as the title indicates, is rather more than a Manual for use at the service of Holy Communion, as it has a section on prayer, with prayers for special occasions, and one on Bible study with suggested readings, in addition to instruction and devotions before, at the time of, and after Communion. To the young and to the adult Communicant this will be a real help. As the author states in his Preface: "God has given to us PRAYER, by which we can have communion and fellowship with Him, a fellowship which raises us above the things of everyday life and enables us to view the things of this world from God's standpoint. He has given to us the BIBLE, in which we can hear God speaking to us, educating our minds, strengthening our souls, and imparting to us the knowledge which results in an active Christian life. And He has given to us the HOLY COMMUNION, to be a visible reminder of Christ's Death on the Cross for us, to be a pledge and assurance that that Death was indeed wrought for us and for our salvation, and to be a means of grace until He comes again to meet us in the fullness of His glory."

Ritualism.—In view of the large number of Anglo-Roman pamphlets which are being circulated through the country and the statements which appear in certain of the handbooks issued in connexion with the "Anglo-

Catholic" Congresses, we strongly recommend the perusal and circulation of Canon Meyrick's valuable books *Scriptural and Catholic Truth and Worship*, or the Faith and Worship of the Primitive, the Mediæval and the Reformed Anglican Churches (1*s.* 6*d.* net), and his *Old Anglicanism and Modern Ritualism* (1*s.* net). Canon Meyrick shows in the first book what was the faith and worship of the Early Church to the fifth century. He then traces the transition period to the end of the eighth century, the growth of the confessional, the doctrine of purgatory and the Papal power. The creed of Pius IV is taken as summing up the Mediæval faith, and the worship of the Church is shown to be altered in accordance with its changed creed. Then came the Reformation in the Anglican Church, with its return to the earlier faith and worship. In *Old Anglicanism and Modern Ritualism* he gives extracts from the writings of the Caroline Divines on particular subjects which are agitating our Church to-day.

Finally we mention a most useful pamphlet by Canon Meyrick entitled *Ritual and Ritualism* (price 1*d.*). The author asks 231 leading questions on matters such as The Objective Presence, Elevation, Adoration, Reservation, Vestments, the Ornaments Rubric, Confession, Mariolatry, etc., and answers each in a lucid helpful way.

Historical Novels.—Two most interesting historical novels have just been brought to our notice. *The Hour before the Dawn* (8*s.* 6*d.* net) is a story, as the title indicates, of the period of Henry VIII, but the action takes place in Scotland, and the reader is enabled to read the tale in modern English without being perplexed by the Scotch or English of the age. The book is a remarkable one, and the characters stand out with well-defined distinctiveness. The character study of James V of Scotland, and the description of the period are remarkably good, and we were particularly interested in the sketch of Cardinal Beaton and his persecutions of the Reformers. The hero will endear himself to the ordinary reader, and he and the heroine appear in a second book, *The Watch Dog of the Crown* (7*s.* net), which is a sequel. The author changes the scene of the story to England in the period of the reign of Edward VI. The three chief characters are Lord Seymour, Lady Frances Grey, and Sir Henry Talbot, the Lieutenant of the Tower, where quite a considerable portion of the action of the story takes place. Again we have a story of intrigue, duplicity, equivocation, persecution. Both novels are of absorbing interest, and although there are some points in the latter book to which some may take exception, particularly in the character study of Queen Elizabeth, we consider the history of both good and illuminating.

Parochial Missions.—In view of the various Missions now being arranged, the following leaflets will be found useful for general circulation: *Our Saviour and Redeemer*, by Canon Girdlestone; *The Holy Spirit*, by Rev. Dr. Flecker; *Sin*, by Canon Buchanan; *Judgment to Come*, by the Bishop of Truro; *Repentance*, by Canon Hay Aitken; *Salvation*, by Rev. The O'Shea; *Assurance*, by the Bishop of Chelmsford; *Christian Service*, by Rev. Dr. Mullins; *Consecration*, by Preb. F. S. Webster; *Baptism*, by Rev. D. H. D. Wilkinson; *The Holy Communion*, by Canon Barnes-Lawrence; *Bible Reading*, by W. Guy Johnson; *A Call to Prayer*, by Canon Morrow; *Purity of Life*, by Col. Seton Churchill; *Confession*, by Preb. Eardley-Wilmot, at 5*s.* per 100: *God*, by Bishop E. A. Knox; *Prayer*, by Albert Mitchell; *The Lord's Day*, by Preb. Fox; and *The Joy of Salvation*, by Canon Odom, at 3*s.* per 100; *The Road that Led me to Christ*, by Col. Seton Churchill, at 7*s.* per 100; and *Can you Read?* by Albert Mitchell, at 3*s.* per 100. A sample packet, together with specimen copies of decision cards, will be sent for 1*s.* post free.