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

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

The Churchman Advertiser.

JANUARY, 1933.

CONTENTS.

THE CHURCHMAN

January, 1933.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

"The Churchman."

FOR many years THE CHURCHMAN has played an important part by representing Evangelical opinions in a Magazine that takes its place among the similar publications issued monthly or quarterly by the various Churches or the sectional interests in them. It has a past record of useful work, and we believe will continue in the future as in the past to aid in the maintenance and furtherance of Evangelicalism in the Church of England. There is considerable evidence that the Evangelical interpretation of Christianity is gaining a firmer hold upon the Anglican communion, in spite of the violent efforts made to discredit Protestantism and to substitute for it a pseudo-Catholicism which in many points is an imitation of Romanism. The progress of Evangelicalism must be associated with an adequate presentation of the grounds upon which it is based. This intellectual side of the Evangelical position it has been the aim of THE CHURCHMAN to set out, while not neglecting the spiritual interests which must naturally have the paramount place. We thank our readers for their support in the past, and we would remind them that these are difficult days for every form of publication beyond the ordinary newspaper. We therefore appeal to Evangelical Churchmen who wish to help the cause of Evangelicalism to help us by securing fresh subscribers and thus widening the circle of our usefulness, and aiding us in making an adequate contribution, with the help of a body of able writers, to the well-being of the Anglican communion throughout the world.

The Centenary Celebration of the Oxford Movement.

In July next the Centenary of the Oxford Movement will be celebrated. The celebration has been taken up by the Archbishops, and the centenary is to be observed in official fashion throughout the Church. A strong endeavour has been made to secure the co-operation of Evangelical Churchpeople in the celebration. With this aim the celebration has been represented as a means of expressing and advancing the unity of the Church. No doubt there are

some Evangelicals who for the sake of peace, and with a desire to show goodwill towards their fellow-Churchmen of the Anglo-Catholic school, will consent to take part in some at least of the centenary gatherings. It can only be by a strong suppression of their scruples that they can approve of all that the Movement stands for or take part in some of the services which will be held in connection with the celebration. It has been arranged to hold a Pontifical High Mass in the open air at the Stadium, probably in imitation of the Mass arranged by the Roman Catholics at the Eucharistic Congress in Dublin. The Bishop of Gloucester is even compelled to protest against this, although he would dissociate himself from the Evangelical objections to it as disloyal. He thinks the name Pontifical High Mass is provocative, and that "such religious ostentation is entirely alien to the whole spirit of the Oxford Movement." For those who regard the true teaching of our Church on Holy Communion such a service without communicants is, with all due respect to the Bishop, a symptom of a spirit of utter disloyalty.

Evangelical Co-operation in the Celebration.

To those Evangelical churchmen who feel disposed to take part in the celebration we commend the article in this number of THE CHURCHMAN by "Academicus" on "The Attitude of Evangelicals to the Celebration of the Centenary of the Oxford Movement." As will be seen by the reading of the article, the author is an historical scholar acquainted with all the details of the period and the literature of the Movement. He is therefore able to show its true significance, and the ultimate and logical issues that are the fruit of the seeds sown by the Tractarians. When excessive claims are made for the benefits conferred on the Church by the Oxford Movement, as is being done in the cheap and inaccurate pamphlets being issued in connection with the Centenary, it is well to have the truth pointed out by a competent scholar. The extravagant teaching as to the nature of Apostolic Succession and all that must of necessity follow from it has been condemned even by High Churchmen, but it is necessary at this time, when everything is being done to create an artificial enthusiasm for the Movement, to show that there is much misrepresentation as to the history of the first half of the nineteenth century, and as to the purpose and result of the efforts of the Tractarians and their successors. A perusal of the valuable article by "Academicus" will give a clear insight into the real import of Tractarianism, and make obvious the difficulty of any clear-thinking Evangelical taking part in the celebration.

The Anglo-Catholic Manifesto.

The recently issued Manifesto of a body of extreme Anglo-Catholics shows the ultimate issues of the Oxford Movement, and the logical outcome of accepting its main principles—including its theory of Apostolical Succession. It has been pointed out recently that Ward in his *Ideal* maintained that all Roman doctrine could be held within the English Church, and Newman wrote Tract XC

to justify this "Catholic" interpretation of the Articles. This Manifesto sets out to show that the only true Anglo-Catholicism must maintain that attitude to-day. It condemns those Anglo-Catholics who accept the results of modern research, and endeavour to harmonise them with the teaching of Catholicism as understood in the Roman Church. The utterances of Anglican bishops are to be disregarded unless they can be shown to be faithful to "Catholic Faith and Practice." There is no specific Anglican religion in their view. They require the faith of the whole Catholic Church, and their meaning is clear from the statement that "This one Catholic Church was constituted with St. Peter as its Foundation and Head and for ever has as its Centre and Guide on earth the successor of St. Peter." Their "real and essential goal is Reunion with the Apostolic See of Rome." The obvious disloyalty displayed by this band of English clergy requires no comment. Other sections of Anglo-Catholics have endeavoured to repudiate these extremists, but it is obvious that the authors of the Manifesto represent the logical outcome of the acceptance of the Tractarian teaching.

Reunion at Home.

Progress towards reunion between the Church of England and the Free Churches at home is not advancing as rapidly as the friends of the reunion movement desire. After the recent conversations between a number of representatives of the Federal Council of the Free Churches and a similar number of Bishops at Lambeth, a resolution was carried at the Free Church Council expressing disappointment that the prolonged conversations which were begun more than ten years ago have not led to more practical recognition and co-operation between the Church of England and the Free Churches. While recognising the friendly spirit existing in the conference, they could not but feel that it will hardly be possible to continue these conversations indefinitely with hopefulness or even reality, if practicable proposals for action cannot be agreed upon. The opposition to reunion comes mainly from the Anglo-Catholics. They are quite willing to work for unity with the Orthodox Churches of the East, and the Old Catholics. These Churches are regarded as having the form of episcopacy considered by the Anglo-Catholics to be essential, but they refuse to recognise the Free Church ministries because of the want of an episcopal succession. They treat the Free Church ministers as they are themselves treated by the authorities of the Roman Church. They fail to realise the weakness of their position when tested by history or spiritual experience.

Reunion Overseas.

A determined effort has been made by the Anglo-Catholic section of the Church to wreck the South Indian Scheme of Reunion. They are wedded to their theory of Apostolical Succession and are determined to nullify if possible any scheme that is not based upon

it. The latest suggestion is that the South Indian Scheme should not come into operation for another five years. This proposal of postponement can only be regarded as a device to frustrate the scheme. As Mr. Wilson Cash has pointed out, if such a thing were done and reunion shelved in this way, it would be a disaster to the whole cause of unity. The Christians in the Mission Fields will not be bound by the theories of Western Churchmen which have helped to divide Western Christendom. Provision has been made for episcopacy to have its proper place in the union scheme in India. Churchmen must support the Indian Christians who believe that they are being led and guided by the Holy Spirit. It is interesting to note that an important movement has been set on foot for reunion in East Africa—the original centre of the Kikuyu movement. Representatives of the various Churches, Anglican, Presbyterian and Methodist, together with representatives of other Missions, have met at Nairobi. The Diocese of Mombasa is leading in this effort to weld together the Christian communities into one organised Church. The progress of the movement will be followed with interest.

Patronage Trusts.

The prejudice against Trustee Patronage reached a culmination in the last session of the Church Assembly when a Measure was passed permitting the purchase by the Parochial Church Council of any advowson acquired by Trustees since the year 1923. The Measure has been described as a vindictive one, aimed solely at lay and trustee patronage—episcopal patronage being exempted. This retrospective legislation has done immense injury to the prestige of the Assembly. Its reputation as a competent legislative instrument has received a blow from which it will not soon recover. Only a few parishes will be affected by the Measure, but some of them are parishes where an old Evangelical tradition had been extinguished by the appointment of a High Church incumbent.

ATTITUDE OF EVANGELICALS TO THE CELEBRATION OF THE CENTENARY OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

By Academicus.

IT has seemed good to the Archbishops and Bishops to express approval of a public religious celebration of the Centenary of the Oxford Movement. The date selected removes all ambiguity as to the object proposed. July 14, 1833, was the date of the Assize Sermon preached by John Keble before the University of Oxford. John Henry Newman regarded that sermon as the beginning of the Oxford or Tractarian Movement. The selection of July 14, 1933, as the great day of the Centenary celebration concentrates attention on that particular event, and on the current of English Church life derived from that source, as the occasion of a Thanksgiving to God by the whole Church of England.

It is important to envisage clearly both the object and the character of the proposed celebration. Already it is clear that the object is likely to be confused. Reference is frequently made by supporters of the celebration to a general advance in the religious life of the Church, to the expansion of the Church abroad, to the multiplication of Church services at home, to more frequent communions, to development of reverence in public worship, to the enlistment of art, of music, of architectural adornment, to aid devotion, and especially to the growth of a sense of the corporate life and responsibility of the Church. On such grounds as these it is urged that even those who object to the prominent doctrines of the Tractarians can find abundant cause for thanksgiving, and join their praises with those whose primary cause of thanksgiving is the doctrinal development to which the Movement gave birth or resuscitation. Some advocates of the Celebration even hint that it may be made an occasion of thanksgiving for the Evangelical revival, others, with yet greater boldness, for the birth of Methodism. Now it is true that we are taught " in everything to give thanks," and " to count it all joy when we fall into manifold temptations." But to select a particular day in a particular year when a particular event happened, a day which has a special meaning for a particular group of Churchmen, and to call on *all* Churchmen to use it as an occasion for giving thanks either for anything and everything, or for the over-ruling Providence which has brought good out of evil, goes very near to the margin of religious dishonesty. To those who believe the Tractarian Movement to have been, on account of its doctrine, a blessing to the Church, July 14, 1933, is the centenary of a great birthday, the centenary of a Pentecost. No one can blame them for celebrating that day. No one will wish to interfere with their celebration. But to call on Evangelicals

to celebrate the day is like asking Roman Catholics to light fireworks on the Fifth of November. The day fixes the object of thanksgiving, turns it to a definite purpose, and in fact confines its proper observance to those who look upon that day as a day of special blessing.

When the Archbishops and Bishops determined to approve the appointment of a Committee "so to guide the celebration" of that day that "the celebration may make for the unity of the Church," they seem to have confused promotion of Church unity with the celebration of a movement which rent asunder the unity of the Church. There are some even to-day who prefer the English Church of the eighteenth to the English Church of the nineteenth century, who look back to the eighteenth century as a time when Reason held its fitting place in the religious life of England. It is conceivable that the pendulum of religious thought may swing back in this direction. Without at all concurring in this view, Churchmen may look back to the pre-Tractarian days as days in which Church divisions were on the whole negligible, days in which no such gulf separated the public worship of the Church into distinct camps, as that which to-day divides an Anglo-Catholic Mass from an Evangelical Evening Communion. Nor can anyone who has even a glimmering inkling of Church History doubt that the present wide cleavage in the Church is the direct outcome of the Oxford Movement. When, therefore, we are told that the celebration is to be so guided as to make for the *unity* of the Church, we are compelled to ask whether the Bishops intend that the Anglo-Catholics should give up all those practices and observances which are outgrowths of the 14th of July, 1833, or that Evangelicals should conform their worship to the Anglo-Catholic for the sake of unity? Possibly a glorious optimism laid hold of their Council, and suggested a vision of the 14th of July, 1933, becoming under guidance of its Committee a day when Anglo-Catholics would tone down their doctrine and worship and Evangelicals tone up theirs, but any such conception is a pure day-dream, at all events so far as Anglo-Catholics are concerned. Their ultimate goal must be the reunion of Western Christendom, and there is not the remotest possibility of such reunion being effected if the Church of England maintains Protestant services. If Anglo-Catholics are true to their necessary spiritual goal they must persevere unflinchingly in the work of a Counter-Reformation in England. Their aim is settled and no Committee can deflect them from it. As for Evangelicals, one object of this paper is to show why they cannot join in any de-Protestantizing of the Church.

It may be replied that the object of the Committee is to promote unity without any interference with faith and worship on either side, each retaining its own position, but cultivating a greater spirit of unity in spite of external divergences. It is hard, however, to see the connection of July 14 with any such object. Fraternisation of Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals already exists in Ruridecanal Conferences, Clerical Meetings, Diocesan Missionary

Days and like occasions. But such fraternisation depends on the ignoring for the time being of the distinctive tenets and practices of two parties. Assuredly, the birthday of one of the two parties is the last day in all the year to select for the inculcation and promotion of a charitable spirit between the two. To one of the two parties it is a day of rejoicing and thanksgiving, to the other of sorrow and humiliation. The measure of the success of Tractarianism is the degree of the expulsion of Protestantism from the Church of England. To say this is not to suggest that all Tractarians would approve of a harsh, wholesale banishment of Protestants from the Church, or even grudge them the maintenance for the present of their churches and societies. Many Tractarians are willing to tolerate Evangelicals, and even, if they officiate in Protestant churches, to conform to Protestant uses. But toleration is not approval. To the Tractarian the goal of his labours, the full answer to his prayers, would be the day in which all Englishmen, or at all events all English Churchmen, were in heart and soul Tractarians. The Tractarian is bound to regard Protestantism as a defective and imperfect form of religion. Some (W. G. Ward, for instance) unhesitatingly condemned it as worse than atheism. The suggestion that Evangelicals should unite with Tractarians in praising God for the birthday of Tractarianism, has only one logical sequence, the abandonment of Evangelicalism. If Tractarianism as an interpretation of the Christian faith, as a system, is of God, Evangelicalism is not of God. It is what St. Paul would have called "another Gospel." Evangelicals, if they praise God for Tractarianism, should go on to repent of their Evangelicalism.

The most probable explanation of the action of the Archbishops and Bishops is this. They have, as a body, abandoned the Episcopal opposition which characterised them in the early days of Tractarianism. In the Revised Prayer Book they made room for greater concessions to Romanism in our Church than Newman or Pusey had ever dared to suggest. In so doing they obtained support from a considerable section of Evangelicals, whom they naturally regard as the only Evangelicals worth consideration. To invite these to join the July 14 celebrations is perfectly natural. Why should *they* not thank God for the beginnings of that Movement for which they have shown themselves prepared to find hospitality in the Church of England? By so doing they will confirm what they did in 1927 and 1928. They will endorse the belief then expressed that the Church of England has not repudiated the ritual or worship of pre-Reformation days, and that the main feature of her Protestantism is repudiation of Papal authority. That this was the true meaning of the Revised Prayer Book is indubitable. It restored the Mass, and continuance of the Real Presence in the Elements after the conclusion of the Communion Service. It confirmed all that Newman had contended for in Tract XC, and even more than he had desired. Considering the treatment then meted out by the Bishops to Newman and his friends, we are inclined to suggest that the right attitude of the

Episcopal Bench to the July celebrations to-day is that of reparation for the treatment which the Episcopate of 1842–5 awarded to Newman. Something in the shape of "a journey to Canossa," or "Henry II's flagellation" at the tomb of Thomas à Becket, is required by the fitness of things: something much more penitential than this invitation to Evangelicals, if the Bishops wish to make reparation for the past. "Ye build the tombs of the prophets, and your fathers killed them," are words exactly fitted to the Bishops and their Evangelical supporters to-day.

But there are Evangelicals who are both strong Protestants and loyal Churchmen. They are not, as some Bishops have suggested, bigoted party-men and sectarians. They look upon the Book of Common Prayer and the XXXIX Articles as the witness of the Church of England against the Roman corruption of the Gospel, and their opposition to Tractarianism is dictated by their loyalty to the Church. In the Tractarian demand for a revision of the Prayer Book and XXXIX Articles they read dissatisfaction with the doctrine of the Church of England as contained in those formularies. They place loyalty to the Church before loyalty to the Bishops, because they are well aware of the processes by which the present Bishops have been "squeezed" out of their former championship of the Church of England position into their present deference to the Romanizing tendencies of Tractarianism, nor are they in the least convinced by the subtleties by which the Bench has tried to persuade itself and the world that it has found an impregnable position at once anti-Roman and anti-Protestant. At the same time out of the deference due to the Episcopal Office those Protestants put their reply to the charge of disloyalty into the form of a concise review of the Oxford Movement as they have found it narrated in contemporary documents. From this summary it will be evident that those who so read the narrative cannot praise God for Tractarianism without manifest hypocrisy, and that their abstention from the celebration of the 14th of July is dictated not by partisanship but by loyalty to the Church of England.

First let it be observed that the Oxford Movement is never rightly appreciated when it is regarded as a local, or even as a national, manifestation of religious vitality. The second quarter of the nineteenth century was an era of spiritual revival throughout the whole of Western Christendom. The Napoleonic wars were over. Energies long repressed for fear of imperilling national safety were free to find a vent, and they found it, some in political, some in religious activity. Especially there arose in most nations a passionate demand for a Church which was something more than a department of Government. Disestablishment was the simplest answer, but Disestablishment, pure and simple, might have been no more than the outcome of irreligious forces. From such quarters, in fact, cries for Disestablishment were raised. But these cries hindered the spiritual movements towards Revival. There was not a country in Western Europe where the call was not heard among Roman Catholics as well as among Protestants. In the Pietistic

awakening in the German Universities, in the missionary earnestness of the Moravians, in the Roman Catholic movement in Bavaria associated with the names of Görres and Möhler, in the Swiss Protestant Churches under the leadership of Vinet, in the French Church voiced by La Mennais, Lacordaire and Montalembert, among French Protestants caught up by Adolphe Monod, in Scotland associated with the great names of Chalmers and McCheyne, in Ireland ,even in Rome itself, this surging demand for more spiritual religion swept like a volcanic wave from shore to shore. The Oxford Revival was one form of it, and must be judged as a special form there taken by a force which was working through the whole of Western Christendom.

In England this Revival for many years had found expression in the Evangelical Movement. That Movement began indeed in the eighteenth century, but its great advance came not till the early days of the nineteenth. Its full tide ran with force during the second quarter of the nineteenth century. So far was it from being spent, as Dean Church, among others, asserts, that it was then taking rapid possession of London, and of many of the large towns of England. Simeon's followers were rousing town after town from spiritual deadness to new life. By 1840 the newly founded Church Pastoral-Aid Society numbered nearly 2,000 clerical subscribers. Three Evangelicals, Dudley Ryder and the two Sumners, were on the Episcopal Bench. But the most remarkable of all its activities was the social work which it was doing in the final abolition of Slavery, the humanising of the terribly drastic Penal Code of the country, in the demand for limitations on the capitalistic exploitation of labour, and on the commercial greed displayed in the Opium Trade. The Evangelicals were in the front rank of social reformers. They took the same position in ecclesiastical reform. They refused to be terrified by the Reform Act, and were confident that in spite of all the agitation of Dissenters and Roman Catholics the Church had nothing to fear and everything to gain from the new electorate which the Reform Act had called into existence.

Oxford, on the other hand, shared in the general panic, which assailed even such Churchmen as Arnold, the fear that the days of the Church were numbered. To this fear Keble gave expression in his sermon on National Apostasy preached before the University at the Assizes on July 14, 1833. In that sermon Keble finds omens of National Apostasy in " the desire of the Nation to disavow the principle that being a Christian Nation, she is also part of the Christian Church, and bound in her legislation and policy by the fundamental laws of the Church," and in " the restless demand for a change of constitution." He goes on to ask : " Are not offices conferred, partnerships formed, intimacies courted—nay (what is almost painful to think of), do not parents commit their children to be educated, do they not encourage them to intermarry in houses, on which Apostolical authority would rather teach them to set a mark as unfit to be entered by a faithful servant of Christ ? " (i.e. presumably Dissenting schools and chapels). After condemning the spirit which leads men to exult in the decay of what they call an

exclusive system, Keble goes on to ask, "whether, according to the coolest estimate, the fashionable liberality of this generation be not ascribable in a great measure to the same temper which led the Jews voluntarily to set about degrading themselves to a level with the idolatrous Gentiles? And, if it be true anywhere, that such enactments are forced on the Legislature by public opinion, is APOSTASY too hard a word to describe the temper of that nation?" Farther on he speaks of "disrespect to the Successors of the Apostles, as such, as an unquestionable symptom of enmity to Christ," and adds that if this "disrespect be general, and grounded . . . on mere human reasons of popularity and expediency," the nation guilty of such disrespect "stands convicted in His sight of a direct disavowal of His Sovereignty." He defines the Church as "the laity as well as the clergy in their three orders, the whole body of Christians united, according to the will of Jesus Christ under the Successors of the Apostles."

The distinctive feature of the sermon of July 14, 1833, was the emphasis laid on disrespect to the Bishops, the successors of the Apostles by our Lord's ordinance, as symptomatic of National Apostasy. Now that disrespect was largely due to the Episcopal opposition to the Reform Bill. The immediate manifestation of it, uppermost in Keble's mind, was the suppression of ten Irish Bishoprics and two Archbishoprics by the Reformed Parliament, there being at the time twenty-four Archbishops and Bishops for a Protestant population equal to the Diocese of Lincoln. On the nation which dared to do these things Keble, from the University pulpit, issued what was equivalent to a sentence of excommunication. He pronounced it guilty of Apostasy. This is the sermon for which, and for its outcome, we are called to offer thanksgiving to God.

For the development of Keble's principle let us turn to the Tracts for the Times, issued under Newman's auspices, the manifesto from which the party derived its name. We read, for instance, in

Tract I. We must necessarily consider none to be really ordained who have not been thus [i.e. episcopally by Bishops as transmitters of the Holy Spirit] ordained . . . "Exalt our Holy Fathers, the Bishops, the Representatives of the Apostles, and the Angels of the Churches, and magnify your office, as being ordained by them to take part in the ministry."

Tract IV. Why should we not seriously endeavour to impress our people with this plain truth: that by separating themselves from our communion, they separate themselves not only from a devout, orderly, useful society, but from THE ONLY CHURCH IN THIS REALM WHICH HAS A RIGHT TO BE QUITE SURE THAT SHE HAS THE LORD'S BODY TO GIVE TO THE PEOPLE.

Tract X. "We (i.e. the Clergy) who are intrusted with the keys of Heaven and Hell, as the heralds of mercy, as the denouncers of woe to wicked men, as intrusted with the aweful and mysterious gift of making the bread and wine Christ's body and blood, as far greater than the most powerful and the wealthiest of men in our unseen strength and our heavenly rights." (1st Edition.)

The foregoing are not an exhaustive list of passages insisting on the Apostolical Succession as confined to the ministry of the Church of England. They are but illustrative, and could easily be multiplied. To evacuate the Tractarian movement of insistence on the monopoly of the Church of England to convey the grace of the Sacraments in England, and on that monopoly being a Divine ordinance, is to evacuate it of its most cherished teaching. The Tractarians were, in fact, engaged in a desperate conflict with Dissenters. Alarmed by Radical and Dissenting threats of Disestablishment, they retaliated by denying all validity, any kind of efficacy, to Nonconformist ministry. Among the Tracts are some written by Tom Keble in the form of dialogues, condemning participation even by attendance at marriages of Dissenters. A rustic is praised for refusing to give away his relative, the bride, at one of these weddings. If a more liberal tone prevails in the Church of England to-day, Tractarianism is not to be praised for it. It forms no part at all of the heritage which we are bidden to extol. No persons could be more out of place at a celebration of the inception of Tractarianism than those who are to-day advocating intercommunion with Nonconformists. Keble and Newman would have regarded them with nothing short of holy horror, and might even have refused to communicate with them.

While Apostolic Succession was a good weapon for chastising Dissenters, it was not long before it was found to be inconvenient in relation to Roman Catholics. The English Roman Catholics in 1832 were still an obscure and negligible body. Their desire for Roman Catholic Emancipation had associated them with the Whigs, and this association led them to take up with the Dissenters' demand for Disestablishment. In the early Tracts they are denounced, and, by distortions of history of which Tract XV is a most flagrant example, a defence of sorts is set up against them. They are consistently called Papists, and are represented as having adopted their most distinctive errors in the Council of Trent, for which we have to thank Luther! But with Wiseman's lectures in London in 1836, and the concurrent establishment by him of the *Dublin Review*, the scene changes. Wiseman, who had been specially urged by La Mennais to undertake the conversion of England, was consulted by Newman and Froude in 1830 as to the possibility of special terms being granted to England by the Papacy by way of reconciliation. Wiseman was, of course, unbending, but his interest in his special charge was sharpened. The rise of Tractarianism and Newman's growing reputation attracted the attention not only of Wiseman but also of the French Roman Catholics. The consequence was an assault on Newman's theory that the Church of England had by a special providence of God continued to be Catholic, while repudiating Tridentine additions to the Catholic Faith. It began to dawn upon the Tractarians that they had raised the flag of Apostolical Succession without considering its Romeward implication.

So it came to pass that three and a half years after the memorable 14th of July Newman wrote to his sister, in January, 1837:

"The controversy with the Romanists has overtaken us like a summer cloud," and in Tract LXXI of the same date he writes: "All that we know is that we are from long security ignorant why we are not Roman Catholics. . . . We find ourselves under the Anglican régime. Let every one of us, cleric and layman, remain in it till we have reason to suspect we are wrong. Let us put practical grounds in the forefront. Our Church, like her Latin sister, is in captivity, and we must pray with Bishop Andrewes for her deliverance."

In this last utterance are distinct notes of distress. There is a call *not* to secede; there is a possibility, a suspicion that Church of England doctrine may be unsound. There is an avoidance of some main issues of the controversy between the two Churches. We are to put *practical* grounds in the forefront, and doctrinal in the rear. There is an alarm, the fruit not of Dissenting malevolence, but of Roman Catholic superiority in controversy. Newman followed up the Tract by a fierce attack on the *Christian Observer*, which had told Dr. Pusey that his proper place as a Professor was not Oxford but Maynooth. From this onslaught Newman proceeded to his Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church, in which he tried to assert for the Church of England a theological position equally distinct from ultra-Protestantism and from the unhappy demon-possessed Church of Rome. These Lectures were succeeded by a course on Justification by Faith, which he found exceedingly difficult, a *terra incognita* in English Theology. The work of publishing a Library of the Fathers was pushed on, for it had become manifest that some such supplement was needed to secure for the Church of England its impregnable fortress of the Via Media between Rome and Geneva; Scripture and the XXXIX Articles were not enough. Indeed, in Tract LXXXV Newman makes answer to a supposed inquirer, who asks: "All this you say about the Church is very specious, and very attractive, but where is it to be found in Scripture?" Whereto Newman replies: "This difficulty is one which before now (I do not scruple to say so) I have much felt myself, and that without being able to answer satisfactorily."

The force of this admission, of course, lies in the fact that the words, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," are an Article of the Creed, binding on every Churchman and in some shape generally necessary to salvation. But in the VIth Article of the Church, "whatsoever is not read in the Scriptures nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or to be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." Newman's admission that his teaching concerning the Church was not to be found in Scripture, was a plain confession that his doctrine was not in harmony with that of the Church of England. This is precisely what Protestant Evangelicals maintain, and a cardinal difficulty in the way of their joining in thanksgiving for Tractarianism.

The difficulties raised by Apostolical Succession were not nearly

at an end. As Newman applied himself to study of the Fathers, he found that the position of the Church of England was perilously like that of heretics, such as the Monophysites, and he began to say to himself that he would rather be found in the company of Leo and Athanasius than in that of Cranmer and Ridley. While he was thus meditating appeared Wiseman's article on the Donatists in the *Dublin Review*. Wiseman, laying aside all other controversies, set out to show that the position of the Church of England exactly corresponded to that of the heretical Donatists. Like the Church of England, the Donatists had an undoubted Apostolical Succession, they maintained no heresies, they sought only to separate themselves from corruptions of the Church, but heretics they were, because they separated themselves from the Chair of St. Peter. Their mere separation was their condemnation. The whole of the Catholic world was against them. Thus the very ground on which Newman specially relied, the Divine Providence vouchsafed to our Island Church, her position as another Zoar in the days of Divine visitation, was cut away from under his feet. The insularity of the Church of England, her Via Media fortress, became the very ground of her condemnation, the supreme proof of her want of Catholicity. Insularity was incompatible with Catholicity. So Newman, unable to establish his doctrines on Scripture, found himself equally at a loss to establish it from the Fathers. He "had seen a ghost." He had felt "a pain in the pit of his stomach." He began to ask whether the Church of England, if not the spouse of Christ, might not rank as a handmaid. If she could not be a Sarah, might she not be a Hagar? Most Reverend and Right Reverend Lords, is a Churchman disloyal who cannot see his way to Thanksgiving for a day which led, in the person of the most brilliant of her sons, to this humiliating conclusion?

The immediate consequence of Newman's defeat by Wiseman was restlessness on the part of his followers, and growing desire for secession to Rome. Correspondence began to pass between the Tractarians and Ambrose Phillips de Lisle, a Leicestershire squire who had joined the Church of Rome and founded a monastery. De Lisle's most cherished longing was to bring about a reunion of the two Churches, and it was represented to him that nothing could be more fatal to his object than individual and disconnected secessions. The Roman authorities must discountenance such secessions. Meanwhile, steps could be taken to bridge the gulf between the two by an interpretation of the XXXIX Articles which should show that they were not so Protestant as were commonly supposed, but Articles of Peace, so worded as to give an impression of Protestantism, while stopping short of condemning authorised Roman teaching. If this interpretation could be accepted by the Anglican authorities, the ground would be prepared for that conciliation for which Newman and Froude had pleaded in Rome before the preaching of Keble's Assize Sermon. It must be clearly understood that there is no definite statement in the existing correspondence of the formulation of this design. What we do find

historically is Newman's retractation of the hard things that he had said against Rome. This retractation was published by Dr. Bloxam, of Magdalen College, and was a complete surprise to Pusey and Keble. Bloxam might be called the agent of the De Lisle party in Oxford. The retractation published by him could not fail to soothe the Roman authorities, and to induce them to listen to the suggestion of discouraging individual secessions. Another effect of the publication of Tract XC was to divert public attention from Roman propaganda by the agitation aroused within the Church of England. On the other hand, to quiet Roman Catholic activity, a précis of Tract XC appeared in the *Univers* of Paris, a principal organ of the Ultramontanists. This précis was the joint work of W. G. Ward and Dalgairns, intimate friends and followers of Newman. By Tract XC Newman was able to appear in England as making a supreme effort to keep his impatient followers in the Anglican fold, and on the Continent to pose as destroying the principal Formulary which stood between Romanism and Anglicanism. It was left to the crude, downright honesty of Father Dominic, an Italian Passionist, to reject the subtleties of Tract XC, and to insist that the Formularies of a Church ought to be plain and not ambiguous. Father Dominic four years after reaped his reward by receiving Newman into the Church of Rome.

With reference to Tract XC it has not seemed necessary to state even in a summarised form all the points to which Evangelical Churchmen take objection. Our object here is to present reasons why we cannot join in Thanksgiving for the Tractarian Movement. Tract XC was the culminating instance of that sophistry which characterised the whole movement, and constitutes our gravest objection to regarding it as a movement for which we ought to praise God. Confusion arises in some minds from forgetting the historical setting of that Tract. Because the Church to-day regards subscription to the XXXIX Articles with laxity, and because they are presented by Bishops to many ordinands as having very little fixed meaning, therefore subscription to them is treated as a pure formality. When they are so presented, it is not surprising that men perfectly honest should accept them with the indifference with which they are presented for signature. Is this lax subscription a sign of spiritual vitality? It appears to mean that the Anglican Church has become an almost creedless Church. Lax subscription of the Articles is naturally extended to the Creeds as well as to the Articles. Is it a good thing for the Church to have thus scrapped her Creeds? We do not believe that it is. Though the Church to-day is creedless, it was not so a century ago. The celebration of July 14 takes us to the Church of that date, and forces us to form our opinion on Tract XC in the light of those days. For this purpose out of a multitude of witnesses we will select one who for his intellectual ability, his experience of University life, his natural desire to regard the Oxford Movement in its most favourable light, stood head and shoulders above all his contemporaries—we mean Bishop Copleston. Copleston had been the

Provost under whose administration Oriel won the first place among all the colleges of the Oxford of that day. He was still in close touch with his old College. He knew the esteem in which Newman was held, to say nothing of Keble and the other Tractarian leaders. He did not stint the praise which was their due. But on the question of subscription to the Articles, and of the sense in which signature should be made, he spoke as follows: "To speak of the language of the Articles as being capable of two or more senses, and to teach that the subscriber may therefore take them in his own sense, knowing at the same time that the authority which requires his assent understands them in another, is merely a dishonest course—tending to corrupt the conscience and to destroy all confidence between man and man. . . . If, for instance, in subscribing to the Article which condemns the Romish doctrine of Purgatory, he mentally reserves the right of holding that doctrine, provided it differ *in some respects* from the *Romish*, he betrays, according to my judgment, a want of principle, which ought to exclude him not only from sacred functions, but from every office of important trust." Opinions to the same effect could easily be multiplied, but none could be adduced which would carry greater weight with those who knew Oxford a hundred years ago. Tract XC was not, and did not profess to be, an exposition of the XXXIX Articles. Its aim was not intellectual but moral. It aimed at reconciling subscription to the XXXIX Articles with retaining the doctrines which they seemed to condemn. It was condemned for its dishonesty.

On W. G. Ward's characterisation of Protestantism as worse than atheism it is not necessary here to dwell, as it can hardly be imagined that the most optimistic of Bishops would expect Evangelicals to give thanks for what Ward said about them. On the other hand, it is an entire error to imagine that if the Oxford Movement had achieved its object, a single Evangelical would have been left in the Church to-day. It is due, as W. G. Ward admitted, to the *failure* of the Oxford Movement that there are Evangelicals left to be invited to take part in the celebration. "Newman's hope was to restore the Catholic ideal by degrees, to expel heresy, to reinstate once more the spiritual brotherhood of Anglicans by uniform doctrine. The attempt was made and it signally failed" (W. Ward's *Oxford Movement*, p. 378). There might be a call to Evangelicals to give thanks for the failure of the Oxford Movement, but July 14 is not the day for the thanksgiving, nor could Anglo-Catholics take part in it.

To sum up. The Oxford Movement inaugurated by Keble's Assize Sermon was the reaction of Oxford to a great spiritual revival. The opportunity presented to men distinguished for religious earnestness and great intellectual gifts was thrown away. They had such an opportunity as has seldom occurred in ecclesiastical history of kindling the flame of faith and life among the leaders of thought, culture, refinement and political eminence in a great nation about to enter on a career of predominance throughout the

world. They had gifts for this work such as have rarely been entrusted to men. The poetry of Keble, the spiritual genius of Newman, the profound humility and impressive character of Pusey, formed a conjunction of spiritual forces not to be found in any of the surrounding European countries. In an evil hour, panic-stricken by fears of the new electorate, themselves swayed more than they realised by political and social prejudices, they made a desperate effort to put the clock back, or to use Keble's simile, "to force backward the waves of Time." Referring to the staying of the sun in the Book of Joshua, Keble says:

> "We too, O Lord, would fain command
> As then, Thy wonder-working Hand,
> And backward force the waves of Time
> That now so swift and silent bear
> Our restless bark from year to year:
> Help us to pause, and mourn to Thee our tale of crime."

This consideration leads us to the strongest plea that is advanced on behalf of the Oxford Movement—that it revived the idea of THE CHURCH and of its corporate life: that it found the Church almost smothered to death under the patronage of the State, reduced to the position of an ecclesiastical department of Government, its Bishoprics the reward of political service, its Church building hampered, its freedom to conduct its own worship regulated by State orders, its Convocations silenced, and its whole framework so encumbered with sinecures, pluralities and other abuses that it was ripe for destruction at the hands of dissenting and infidel Reformers. Then, we are told, came the Oxford Movement and revealed once more to men the Divine origin of the Church and insisted on her right to administer her own affairs. If all this were true, a strong case would be made for Evangelical thanksgiving, and we should be among the foremost to advocate it. Unfortunately, while it is generally true as to the condition of the Church a hundred years ago, it is not true as to the part that the Tractarians played, but the reverse of the truth.

As has been already pointed out, England with other countries shared in the passionate desire for release from the stranglehold of the State upon the Church. Having regard to the character and faith of the Tractarians, we should have expected them to be foremost in the agitation for Church Reform, which coincides with the political reforms of the thirties. We should have expected to find them calling on the Bishops to stand up in the House of Lords for the liberties of the Church, petitioning for the revival of Convocation and the increase of its powers, or at least assuring the Government of cordial support in remedial measures. But these things we do not find. Out of the Hadleigh Conference following on Keble's sermon came an Address to the Archbishop of Canterbury guardedly assuring him of support in reforms if he thought that any were needed. It was well known that his Grace was not an advocate of reform. But even in this address Newman and Keble took no part. Instead of so doing, they formed the Tractarian

party, and initiated the Oxford Movement. Pusey, it is true, made a real contribution to Cathedral Reform, and Newman later on advocated the revival of Bishops Suffragan. But the Oxford party detested the Whigs, denounced the formation of the Ecclesiastical Commission, and took no part in suggesting or advocating reforms. In a sense they almost courted Disestablishment, but they had not the courage to ask for it. Their position is indicated in Newman's lines:

> "Dear brother—hence, while ye for ill prepare
> Triumph is still your own;
> Blest is a pilgrim Church!—yet shrink to share
> The curse of throwing down:
> So will we toil in our own place to stand,
> Watching, not dreading the despoiler's hand."

Tory prejudice was sanctified in its opposition to Whig reforms of the Church. Pusey's Whig connections—he was a cousin of Lord Ashley—help to explain his somewhat more liberal attitude.

The one reform which the Tractarians desired was the revival of Church discipline. Keble called it the only reform worth having. Newman wrote a series of letters to the *Record* advocating it. It figures largely in the early Tracts. Unfortunately Church discipline meant to its advocates practically excommunication of dissenters. The Nelson Tracts, by Thomas Keble, show plainly enough what village life would have become if the Tractarians had had their way. Now it is notorious that laxity of Church discipline has been one of the most prominent results of the Tractarian Movement. Never was there less discipline of the clergy either in ritual or in teaching than there is to-day, and this laxity is directly due to the Oxford Movement. The supporters of the Oxford Movement began by putting their own interpretations on the Rubrics and the XXXIX Articles. Not only did they break away from old customs such as the use of the black gown in the pulpit, but they maintained that the revival of the whole ritual of the Pre-Reformation Church, except where it was expressly forbidden, was the *duty* of all priests. In discharge of this supposed duty they defied the Bishops, set at naught decisions of ecclesiastical courts, as well as of the Privy Council, became, each incumbent of them, a Pope in his own parish, trampled on the remonstrances of godly parishioners, and made the Church of England a byword of clerical indiscipline throughout all Western Christendom. Nowhere has any party in Church failed so signally in its *principal* aim as the Tractarian party in its plea for the revival of discipline.

The reason of this failure lay in the Tractarian misconception of the very doctrine for which they are most often praised, their doctrine of the Holy Catholic Church. They started from the position that the Holy Catholic Church was "the laity, as well as the clergy in their three orders—the whole body of Christians united, according to the will of Jesus Christ, under the successors of the Apostles." This is Keble's definition of the Church in his Assize Sermon, and that he is referring to the Holy Catholic Church is

clear from the words "according to the will of Jesus Christ." Episcopalians are members of the Holy Catholic Church as defined by Keble. non-episcopalians are not. Further, there is a reason for the use of the word "*under*" rather than, for instance, "in communion with." To Keble the Bishops as successors of the Apostles were the rulers of the Church. They might depute some part of their power to Presbyters, but the right of government remained theirs. According to Newman, his own diocesan was his Pope. Out of this definition inevitably rose the question: "What right had the Bishops of the Anglican Communion to separate themselves from the rest of the Episcopalians in Western Europe?" The Pre-Reformation Church was a corporate body—an order wholly international, with a central government at Rome, a common language—Latin—and in spite of variations known as uses (the use of Sarum for instance, or of Hereford, etc.) a common attitude towards the Sacraments, and exercising through the Confessional and Purgatorial fires a fairly strong discipline over the laity. It was true, no doubt, that the Pope had to reckon with the Holy Roman Emperor and with the sovereigns of each of the lay governments of Europe, who strove to restrict his powers. With some he dealt more successfully, with others less. But when it came to a question of breaking away from the faith and order of the Church, the Pope dealt with the innovators as heretics, and called on the secular arm, if necessary, to assist in suppressing them. So he treated the Albigenses in Languedoc and the Hussites in Bohemia. So too had he dealt with Queen Elizabeth, excommunicating her, and calling on Philip of Spain to crush her with his Armada. What the Tractarian party had to show was this: "What title had the English Church to reckon herself Catholic, when she separated herself from the rest of the Catholic communion?" The Tractarians strove to answer this question by minimising the extent of the separation. They tried to show that England had not committed herself to heresy: that she still held fast the Catholic faith: that her Liturgy was but an expurgated translation of the old Catholic liturgies and breviaries. But the more successful she was in repudiating the charge of heresy, the more unjustifiable became her schism. If she held with the Church of Rome in faith and doctrine, what right had she to break away from the Chair of St. Peter?

The only answer was to point to the tyranny of secular rulers, to denounce Henry VIII, Edward VI and Elizabeth, to blacken the fame of Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer, to undo their work as far as it could be undone. But there was, and there still is, in the English Church and nation a great multitude of loyal sons of England who entirely refuse to accept this counter-Reformation movement, who prize dearly as life itself the open Bible, the pure worship, the freedom of thought and conscience won for them at the Reformation. They see plainly that the doctrines of the Holy Catholic Church advocated by the Tractarians have driven a deep cleavage into the Church of England. They know what multitudes of godly men and women have been driven out of churches dear to them by time-

honoured association through the introduction of Romanising practices. They know that the sophistries of the early Tractarians have deeply discredited the clergy of the Church with multitudes of loyal Churchmen. To call upon these loyal Church people, faithful adherents of the Church of England, to praise God for the Tractarian Movement, and especially for its doctrine of the Church, is to ask them to play the hypocrite in the sight of God, and to join in a movement which has no meaning at all, if it does not unchurch all Episcopalians. They cannot help hoping that this statement of their case will absolve them from the rash charges of partisanship and sectarianism already levelled in some quarters against them. Their whole attitude may be summed up thus. Our Blessed Lord has said: "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life: no man cometh unto the Father but by Me." To these words the Church of Rome and its admirers add: "through the Church," and the proposed July celebration is, in fact, a thanksgiving for the revival of this addition. Evangelical Churchmen through loyalty to Christ and His Church refuse to make this addition. They hold fast to their belief that no man can be a member of the Church except through Christ. This difference is vital.

What, then, is the relation between the Holy Catholic Church and the Church of England? The English nation, being ideally a body of members of the Holy Catholic Church, organises its religious life in the form and under the laws constituting the Church of England, finding as it does in Scripture the doctrine of *national* responsibility to God.

It does not follow that membership of the Church of England is co-extensive with the Holy Catholic Church. There are members of the Holy Catholic Church, both in other nations and in England, who are not members of the Church of England. The Holy Catholic Church is the Body of Christ throughout the world, of which Christ is the Head. Of that Church He is not only the Head, but also the indefeasible Ruler and King. Against that Church the gates of Hell cannot prevail. The national or local churches are "congregations in which the pure Word of God is preached and the Sacraments are ministered according to Christ's ordinance," human efforts to realise and respond to the Divine ideal. These human efforts are liable to error, and have in fact erred (see Article XIX). There is not one of them that can claim to be the Holy Catholic Church, the pure and spotless Bride of Christ. The confusion between the two was at the root of Tractarian error, and a dishonour, however well-meant and unintentional, yet a grave dishonour to the Church of God. That dishonour Evangelicals cannot make a cause of thanksgiving.

THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL.

By A. Lukyn Williams, D.D., Hon. Canon of Ely Cathedral.

1. *The Religion of the Semites*, by W. Robertson Smith. Third Edition, with Introduction and Notes by Stanley A. Cook. A. & C. Black, London, 1927.
2. *The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archæology*, by Stanley A. Cook. The Schweich Lectures for 1925. Oxford University Press, 1930.
3. *The Psalmists.* Essays on their religious experience and teaching, their social background, and their place in the development of Hebrew Psalmody. Edited by D. C. Simpson. Oxford University Press, 1926.
4. *A History of Israel.* In two volumes, by Theodore H. Robinson and W. O. E. Oesterley. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1932.

UNTIL a little more than a hundred years ago the question, What are the sources of information about the History of Israel? could receive a very simple and short answer. For, although certain mysterious remarks in Josephus, and even in more secular writers, were well known, yet they were single sayings, whose relevance was hardly appreciated, much less understood. The one and only source was the Bible. But about that time strange discoveries began to be made. The Egyptian hieroglyphs were beginning to deliver up their secrets. Even the worm-like markings on the Rock of Behistun, and on the monuments and tablets which were found in abundance beneath the earth of the Euphrates and Tigris valleys, were being guessed at, and at long last becoming read with certainty. And other discoveries were being made in quite other directions, bearing vitally upon the subject. So that to-day there is a mass of information about the History of Israel of which our elder forefathers of, say, a hundred and fifty years since never even dreamed.

And if they ever did dream of such trover of the past hidden away in the hands of Time, they would never have imagined its importance. For they would certainly have said that the statements of Holy Scripture were sufficient, because it was inspired by God, meaning by this that it did not contain anything that was imperfect, much less anything that was erroneous. How strange this seems to us! Had they forgotten Copernicus and Galileo, and the quotations from the Bible that were hurled at their heads? Alas, that Christians should have been so slow in learning God's methods! How painful too it is to read the controversy in the fifties between Bishops and Geologists, when the latter had dug into the earth and interpreted the meaning of the fossil plants and fish and birds and animals, hardly men so soon, that lay in the various strata, waiting to be brought to light, and so to sing in their turn of the Glory of the Lord. We confess with sorrow the errors of our very conservative ancestors, and grieve that believers could ever have shut their eyes so tightly against the Divine Light, because it did not shine solely through the

spectacles they wore, however heavily tinted these might be. We cannot help wondering that earnest Christians have dared, and the more readily the more earnest they have been, to assert that God can only have communicated His will in one way, and not have understood from the first that it was their duty humbly and patiently to investigate His methods before forming their own theory and judging all else by it. After all, the only religious way of dealing with the things of God is to learn the facts, and then form the theory that fits them. And if fresh facts are revealed, naturally the theory has to be modified. Herein lies the glory of true religion. It is never fixed, but grows and grows with each further knowledge of the facts of Life. Induction spells humility; deduction only presumption. For example: we say, and say rightly, that God made the world, and it might be deduced from that fact that every tree in it is perfect. Yet no one has yet seen a perfect tree; nay, no one has ever found one perfect leaf. It has not been God's method of work, that is to say, to make anything perfect. If the Bible is perfect, it is something absolutely abnormal in God's world. They who hold the perfection of the Bible—if there are any such—come perilously near to denying the uniqueness of the One and Only manifestation of God on earth—" God only begotten. . . . He revealed Him."

What, then, are the sources from which we can learn the facts about the History of Israel, and in what ways do they assist us?

Besides the Bible, which, after all, must, on strictly scientific reasons, be pronounced to be by far the best and fullest source we possess, we can obtain from elsewhere information on language, dates and data of history, customs and laws, doctrines, and even to a slight extent spiritual perceptions, related to the History of Israel. It is worth while to consider these briefly.

First, as to Language. Time was when a teacher would in all good faith point out to his pupil the curious relation between the two Hebrew words for Truth and for Falsehood. The former is *'Emeth*, and is made up of the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet and the last (its Alpha and Omega), the centre being one of the middle letters, every letter being of a solid and steady character, resting on two feet. For, in fact, Truth is the very Seal of God. But what of the Hebrew word for Falsehood? The three letters of this are *Sheqer*, and they are not even in the right order of the alphabet, and each of them has either only one leg to stand on, or a semicircle! And then after telling the pupil this, the Teacher would turn round and say, Can any other language do that? Is it not plain proof that Hebrew is Divine, the very language used by God in His speech to the inhabitants of heaven?

To-day we smile at all this, and are fully aware that Hebrew is only a late form of a primitive tongue, from which it and the other members of the great Semitic family of languages have been derived, each preserving something of the old stock better than the others, and each contributing its own share towards our knowledge of the forms and meanings of the others. Aramaic, Arabic, and Accadian (the title now given to the matter common to Assyrian and Baby-

lonian) all help, to say nothing of the occasional assistance to be found even in Ethiopic.

Then there are the dates and the historical facts. There is at least one fixed date in the History of Israel. For the Annals of the ninth year of King Ashur-dan III tell us that a total eclipse of the sun took place in that year, and, astronomers now assure us, on June 15, 763 B.C. By that fixed date we are able to trace dates in Assyrian chronology as far back as the end of the twelfth century with almost complete accuracy, for we find each year designated by the name of an official called *limmu*, and the lists are practically complete from the fall of Assyria until then. Thus we now know with certainty the dates of the following events: 853, the battle of Karkar, when Ahab King of Israel was present; 841, Jehu pays tribute to Shalmaneser; 738, Menahem pays tribute to Tiglath-Pileser III; 721, the capture of Samaria by Sargon.[1]

Again, there are the statements, often indeed hard to place, from which we learn the history of the Egyptian dynasties, and their peculiarities. From these we may see, for example, that the only period to which Joseph's history can belong is that of the Hyksos, the Semitic intruders who ruled over Egypt from about 1700 to 1580 B.C. And again, closely in connection with this, it is increasingly probable that the Exodus took place, not in 1215 B.C., as our older text-books tell us, but in 1447 or thereabouts, with the Fall of Jericho in 1400, as Garstang has almost proved. This recalls the letters found at Tell-el-Amarna in 1887, written by kinglets of Jerusalem and of other Palestinian towns to their suzerain the Pharaoh. They lament the onset of the Ḥabiri, and call upon him for protection from them. And who were the Ḥabiri? Has the word any connection with the word Hebrew? Further, whether it has or not, do they represent the Hebrew tribes who now here, now there, attacked the cities of Palestine about that time? These questions have to be answered, and after much discussion the probability is that scholars will soon agree that the Ḥabiri are the Israelites, even though the Letters about them must somewhat modify our idea of the History of Israel drawn from the Old Testament alone.

Nor can one leave Egypt without thinking of the much later documents, the Aramaic Papyri found at Elephantiné in 1904. These describe the experience of a little colony of Israelites at the beginning and near the end of the fifth century B.C., far away from Palestine in Upper Egypt, yet continuing to maintain the worship of Jāhôh, though in somewhat corrupt form, and in touch with persons of importance who are mentioned in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. These documents cannot but affect our own interpretation of the canonical books which deal with that time.

There is yet another source of information, not so concise, nor so easy to consult, but of wide extent and singularly convincing. This is the customs, and what we may conveniently call the folklore, of the nations in and around the Holy Land, or even of those

[1] See further *O. and R.*, i, 455 *sq.*

which are far distant geographically yet are still in conditions of life not unlike some portrayed in the Old Testament.

Such, for example, are the endless details about sacred stones and trees and springs of water; the manner of offering sacrifices, the customs of the Avenger of Blood, etc., etc.

And, further, there is the vast territory of the various laws promulgated partly in the Assyrian, partly even in the Hittite, inscriptions, all raising questions about their relation to the Laws found in the Pentateuch. How was it that the great Lawgiver was guided by the hand of God to select and improve the legal and ritual customs of his day?

Yet there is one question to which very little attention has been given, apparently from despair at finding an answer. In what relation do the Sacred Songs of Israel stand to those of other nations? Is there, or is there not, any connection between them? If there is not, *cadit questio.* But if there is, when was it made? That Israel's Psalms are superior to those of other religions of the time in everything that really matters, no one will deny. But how came they into Israel's life at all, if, as some writers seem to say, the religion of Israel itself stood for so long at a dismally low level of spiritual attainment? Did the Israelites learn their sacred hymnody from their heathen contemporaries during the Exile in Babylon, and from Egypt in even later years? Or was there, perhaps, nothing of the sort in ancient Israel, nothing, that is to say, of the more spiritual kind, until, as some scholars seem to think, the blessed time of the Maccabæan Revolt? Is this probable? Is it even possible? Will a nation which confessedly produced such high spiritual conceptions as Israel possessed in the days of Amos and Hosea, have had nothing corresponding to these in their public worship? It was a noisy religion, no doubt. Worshippers shouted out Jāhôh, prolonging the last syllable of the sacred Name, but is that all there was to it? Can the worship have been only as senseless as the cry of the Baal worshippers at whom Elijah jeered? Or as the delirious "Ram, Ram" of the Indian devotees to-day?

Will there have been no poet in early times, or at least as early as the eighth century, who was moved by the Divine Spirit as we know the great prophets were from the days of Amos downwards? And indeed, what were the songs which the old seers uttered as they discoursed on their instruments in such a way that their hearers were moved to the very depths? Or, at most, are we justified in asserting that it was only the terrible experience of the stay in Babylonia that humbled Israel's pride so low that at last people were able to learn their own unworthiness before God, and so come to place their confidence in Him in a deeper, and therefore more spiritual, way than in the former days of independence? And, briefly, is it true that we have any substantial reason for believing that the time of the Maccabees was especially conducive to the formation of the Psalter? The Maccabees were, it is true, the very embodiment of Patriotism, but there is very little evidence that they were spiritually-minded people, at all able to compose the majority

of the contents of the Psalter. Besides, were no individuals—and Psalms were made by individuals, not by companies or committees—fitted to learn humility before God in years previous to the Exile? Had they had no sorrows to move their hearts, none to cause introspection, none to lead them to search out the character of Jāhôh, and to learn more of His ideal Holiness and the perfection of His Love?

The third volume of the list at the head of this article is a courageous attempt to probe the subject. It is a collection of Essays with writers holding very different opinions. Yet each writes with great learning. Professor Gressmann tries to trace the beginning of Biblical Psalmody from the earliest days of the Judges—suggestively indeed but not too convincingly. Others describe the doctrines and the characters and the surroundings of the Psalmists themselves. Mr. G. R. Driver, above all, fascinates us with his description of the hymns of Babylon. And his essay shows, on the one hand conclusively that the Israelites could not have learned their Psalmody in the Captivity, and, on the other hand at least with great probability, that the Babylonian culture in Palestine from 2000 B.C. onwards contained plenty of hymns, which may well have served as a basis for the Hebrew Psalms. If this theory stands further examination it will throw not a little light on the origin and the development of spiritual song in Israel.

But putting the problem of the five books of Psalms on one side, how are we to deal with all the other material before us? For deal with it we must. We dare not shut our eyes, and read our Bibles as though the outside testimony to the History of Israel did not exist. God, as St. John insists in his Prologue, has been the God of the whole world, not of Israel alone, and He has not left Himself without witness. And now in the last days of the nineteenth, and the first days of this twentieth century, He has brought us this fresh evidence of His activity, and of His ceaseless preparation in other than Israelitish hearts for the full revelation of Himself in Christ. We dare not turn our eyes away; much less dare we say, It is not God's doing at all; it is but the imitative craft of the Evil One trying to appear like an angel of light.

In any case, serious attempts have been made, and, unless sanctified human nature changes its interests, attempts will continue to be made, to understand the information supplied by sources outside the Bible, and to see the relation in which the two classes of the sources of our information stand.

The books selected above represent such attempts. Only the last indeed tries to cover the whole ground of the History proper. But the first two deal very fully with the portions selected.

The first is in one sense an old book. For it was published originally by Robertson Smith as long ago as 1889. And a very charming book it was; more attractive to the general reader than its present form, though naturally not so complete. It covers the wide range of all religious institutions (not of doctrines, so far as these can be separated) current in Semitic lands. Naturally it is concerned

primarily with the Bible, and the other sources are used to throw light on that. Robertson Smith, it must never be forgotten, though his opponents seem hardly to have remembered it in his lifetime, was a man of very deep personal religion, and exceedingly orthodox in all the essential truths of our holy Faith. But when he found that outside the Bible there were established practices and institutions similar to those within it, he asked himself, How is it that this or that practice or institution is commanded or forbidden in the Bible? and, How came such orders into existence? For it is evident that most of them were not given to Moses for the first time at Mount Sinai, seeing that in one form or another they existed long before the Exodus. No student of the Bible can afford to neglect Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites* if he wishes to understand the spiritual meaning of many parts of the Pentateuch.

Evidence of the same kind brought up to date has been collected by Professor S. A. Cook, and handed on to us partly in the third edition of Robertson Smith, and more systematically and in greater detail in the Schweich Lectures. In this second volume on our list the reader will find also many pictorial illustrations of objects described in the text. One of these can hardly be omitted even in so cursory a survey as the present article. It is an enlarged copy of a South Palestinian coin (? of Gaza) belonging, it would seem, to about 400 B.C., on which is a representation of the God of Israel Himself. He is pictured somewhat like Zeus, but above His head is His Name JĀHÔH, doubtless the true pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton, and almost sufficient in itself to demonstrate the falsity of the nineteenth-century blunder in supposing it was Yahweh.

The third volume in the list has been mentioned already in what has been said about the Psalter.

But the last book is of most interest and importance to-day. For it is the first serious attempt made in England to provide a large and scholary résumé of the present state of the critical use of all the sources now at our disposal for knowledge of the History of Israel. Although the authors tell us that they have continually consulted each other in details, yet Professor Theodore Robinson is really responsible for the first and Dr. Oesterley for the second volume. But the two writers run very well together, and even though where their subjects overlap they do not always see eye to eye, this is all to the reader's advantage, both for information and for suggestion. No doubt Professor Theodore Robinson has had the easier task. That is not his fault; a division had to be made somewhere. For his period, nominally from the Exodus (but in fact from much earlier times) until the Fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., has been investigated again and again. He has therefore had chiefly to make up his mind on evidence which has been thoroughly sifted as to the verdict he must give. But he is to be sincerely congratulated on the result. He writes clearly, with full consciousness of the difficulties in explanation, and he shows us quite definitely what his decision is. He has accomplished his task well and attractively.

Naturally he adopts the Higher Critical position. Rightly or

wrongly—and, on the whole, we believe rightly—this has become the tradition of theological professors and lecturers. Wellhausen's school is still supreme, though there is sparse agreement among scholars about many details of his exposition. And in consequence there is now the tendency in all examinations, from those for Holy Orders downwards, to require more knowledge of those inspiring designations, J, E, D, H, P, than of the actual text and statements of the Authorized and Revised Versions. One can hardly be surprised. For to-day it is not exactness of Bible knowledge that is demanded of our clergy—at least by those in high office—but a general attitude towards fundamental questions. Probably this is the basic reason why the Bishops have now given up requiring Candidates for Deacon's Orders to be examined in Greek. In any case, it is the sad fact that whereas Hebrew has never been necessary for our clergy (unlike the clergy of Hungary and of Scotland), and Latin has been discarded for some twenty years, now many candidates are allowed—and even encouraged—to be ordained without any knowledge whatever of Greek, the tongue of the great document of our faith, the New Testament itself. What with the unwillingness of some scientific men to become properly educated, on the one hand, and, on the other, the desire of not a few influential ecclesiastics to stifle study of the Bible itself, conscientious students are having a thin time. Soon, it may be feared, our Church of England will indeed become *stupor mundi, not* in the sense in which the phrase was first used!

This is by the way, but it is plain that those who do not know a language must be content to accept the statements of those who do. And so very few of our clergy and laity know Hebrew that they will be compelled to trust experts. Dr. Theodore Robinson and Dr. Oesterley are fully qualified to guide them.

For the second volume of this great work is by Dr. Oesterley, and deals professedly with the History of Israel from the Fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. (but really from some forty years earlier) to its final Fall in A.D. 70, and even to the hopeless Revolt under Bar Kokhba in A.D. 135. Dr. Oesterley has had a very difficult task. For he had to correlate the non-Biblical, or perhaps we should say the non-canonical, literature with that of our English Bible. And to do this, as has been said, is extremely difficult. For the evidence of the Apocrypha and the Elephantiné documents, besides the information drawn from the Babylonian and Persian inscriptions, raises many new questions which have at present been very inadequately discussed. But here Professor Oesterley has shown extraordinary diligence and insight, and, for the first time in English histories of Israel of a full and connected kind, he has drawn up what may well be the true answers to the questions involved. Thus, for example, he believes that the Temple was not wholly destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar; that the country of Judæa was not actually depopulated; that the Samaritans were not unfriendly at first, or indeed until about 445 B.C.; that Ezra lived some fifty years after Nehemiah; that it was not the Pentateuch as such but only portions of it

(especially those added during the Exile) which Ezra read out. He also makes the interesting suggestion that the Jews who wrote the Elephantiné documents were really Northern Israelites who had been transported from Babylonia to Egypt. This would make the imperfection of their doctrinal statements easier to understand.

Dr. Oesterley had also a somewhat wearisome task before him in tracing the history of the interrelation of the Seleucid and Ptolemaic kings, and, after the Maccabæan revolt, the disputes of the Hasmonæans. His chapter on the Jewish Parties in Palestine—Pharisees, Apocalyptists, Sadducees, Essenes, and also the Therapeutæ—is especially interesting. We could wish, however, that he had written in more detail the history of the nation during the first century and a half of our era.

The net result of this our short study of the History of Israel may be set out quite briefly. In spite of the mass of information pouring in from all sides, with new contributions supplied almost every week, serious attempts are being made to cope with it all, and estimate the brightness of the light that it casts upon the Scriptures. For these still reign supreme. But, little by little, we are learning to put them in their true setting, and to understand them not merely according to our preconceived and usually Western notions, but as the result of the Spirit of God working by and through Oriental minds. Whom else could He employ so well? To whom else could He reveal His will so plainly? They were, no doubt, only imperfect instruments, men sometimes prejudiced, sometimes steeped in traditionalism, sometimes men of free and almost radical outlook, but all sincerely desirous of learning His will, according to their several capacities. So He could use them.

And the consequence is that we see in our Bible, as nowhere else, the gradual disclosure of the Truth of God, veil after veil of human prejudice and ignorance being torn away, until at last all is seen in our Lord Jesus Christ, the final revelation of the Father. "All is seen?" Thank God, all is not seen. For this will never be. Throughout eternity there will be to believers the ever fresh unfolding of His glory and majesty and forethought and love, the very Temple of the Knowledge of God, of which the foundations were laid slowly but surely in the History of Israel.

Two Irish Bishops have brought out a most interesting book on *The Cathedrals of the Church of Ireland* (S.P.C.K., 6s. net). Dr. Godfrey Day, Bishop of Ossory, and Dr. Henry Patton, Bishop of Killaloe, inspired by a real love of the ancient ecclesiastical edifices of the country, have told their story and illustrated it with a series of excellent photographs. The Churches have suffered much in the distressful changes through which in the course of the centuries the country has passed, but they yet possess features of great interest, and many who have never visited Ireland will find this book a fascinating study.

THE VALUE OF THE SEPTUAGINT.[1]

By E. H. Blakeney, M.A.

IT has been said, with a great deal of truth, that the work of the Bible Society had its first beginnings in Alexandria under the Ptolemies; for it was there that the earliest translation of the Bible —that is of the O.T. so far as it then existed—was made. It was fitting that Alexandria should have been the birthplace of the LXX. If, naturally and by right, Jerusalem was the peculiar home of those writings we know as the O.T., inasmuch as it was, above all other places, the Holy City, round which clustered the most sacred traditions of the Jews, and within which were to be found Jewry's most eminent teachers and eloquent doctors of the Law; we must not overlook the fact that, next to Jerusalem itself, Alexandria was the most Jewish centre. It was a comparatively new city, founded about the year 330 B.C. by Alexander the Great; but it was destined to become the capital of an Hellenic kingdom established in immemorial Egypt, and to be a mighty centre of trade, literature, and science. Among its famous buildings was the great Museum, with its endowments, its fellowships, its lecture-rooms, and its students. The presidency of that Museum—or University, as we might call it—was in the gift of the King, with all the prestige that belongs to such an office; and when Egypt became part of the Roman Empire, the President was appointed by the Emperor himself. There was a library there, which was reckoned the chief glory of the Museum; more than a million volumes (or rolls) were housed in it, and scholars flocked to examine its all but inexhaustible treasures; and few severer calamities have ever befallen any supreme place of learning than the destruction of a large part of this great collection of manuscripts by fire (so we are told) during the civil war between Cæsa and Pompey. By that disaster nearly half a million rolls were lost.

Now one of the most remarkable features about Alexandria was its vast Ghetto. In this quarter of the city was housed a large colony of Jews; some had been brought there, originally, as captives, but, as time went on, many emigrated voluntarily, attracted by the growing wealth and amenities of the place. A return to Egypt, indeed, to what had once been the House of Bondage, but had now become a centre of life and movement. It was inevitable, perhaps, that these Alexandrian Jews should gradually lose touch with the intellectual life of Jerusalem; they soon forgot their own sacred tongue, Hebrew, and adopted Greek—which, by the time their settlement had become consolidated, was everywhere regarded as the "lingua franca" of the Near East. But if they forgot their own language, they had not forgotten their religion; and it presently became a matter of importance that they should possess their sacred scriptures (which they could no longer read in the original) in the current vernacular.

[1] The substance of a lecture given at Cambridge in August, 1932.

Therefore a movement gradually arose to have a translation of those scriptures in Greek. How, precisely, this translation was shaped, it is not easy to say; there are no records of the Alexandrian Synagogue remaining now, to tell us the real story. Nevertheless a story there is, which purports to state the facts, in the shape of a long letter written by a certain Aristeas to his brother. This celebrated letter professes to give a contemporary account of the translation of the "Pentateuch" into Greek, in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus (that is, during the first half of the third century B.C.). And here, in briefest form, is the story that Aristeas has left us.

King Ptolemy, anxious to have a complete collection of the laws of all nations, for the purpose of including copies in the great library, was urged by his librarian to secure a Greek translation of the Jewish scriptures. Accordingly the king sent an Embassy to Jerusalem to ask for the help of the learned scribes in that city. By the good offices of Eleazar, the high priest, a band of learned men—seventy-two, that is six from each of the twelve Tribes—was dispatched to Egypt, where they were bidden to set about the task of translation. These met on an island, off the coast, for seventy-two days continuously, at the end of which period their task was accomplished. The story of Aristeas seems to recognise the translation of the Law only—viz. the Torah, or five books of Moses, always regarded by orthodox Jews as the most sacred part of their canon; but later writers rather imply that the translation included all the canonical books of the Jews. Obviously this story is thoroughly untrustworthy; but, like the stories of the early kings of Rome, it may contain certain elements of truth. The date of the letter of Aristeas remains unsettled.

The title "Septuagint" is a natural one, based as it is on the old tradition of the seventy-two elders. It may be as well to note here that the LXX as we have it to-day contains not only the O.T. as it is familiar to us in our Bibles, but also certain added books, some of which have no Hebrew original but were composed in Greek. At some date—no longer known—the Jews were careful to purge their canon, and works retained in the Greek Bible but not found in the Hebrew were called Apocrypha, a word originally without any sinister connotation. However, as they were not counted genuine by the Jews, these apocryphal books were excluded by the Protestant Reformers from our canon, though the Church of Rome declared them to be canonical at the Council of Trent, and they appear in the Vulgate.

There are four principal manuscripts of the Greek Bible, but for English people the most interesting is the Codex Alexandrinus (A), now kept at the British Museum, where it is reckoned one of its chief treasures. It was presented by the Patriarch of Constantinople to King Charles I, and the MS. remained in the royal library till it was presented to the nation by George II. The Patriarch had brought it from Alexandria, where it was probably transcribed some time during the fifth century. Like the majority of the greater MSS. of the Bible, it is written on vellum in uncial (or capital) letters. It is interesting to remember that it was the first of these greater MSS. to be made

accessible to scholars—and that, as far back as the early part of the eighteenth century, though it was not reproduced in photogravure till about fifty years ago. It may be as well to state that in our British Museum MS. the books of the O.T. do not appear quite as we are accustomed to see them in our own A.V., and the names are not always the same: thus what we know as the books of Chronicles are called Paralipomena—"things left out." Other points of interest are these: after the Psalms are written out certain poems like Miriam's Song, and some of the Canticles; and the Psalter contains 151 psalms—not 150 as we reckon them to-day. Again: the LXX sometimes contains less, sometimes more, than the Hebrew original. And as the manuscripts of the LXX are older than any existing Hebrew MSS., it has been conjectured that the Greek version bears witness to an older text than the Hebrew, as we know it. Observe, too, that the Pentateuch (the first portion of the O.T. to be translated) shows less difference between Hebrew and Greek than other portions of the O.T. The reason (as I have already remarked) is this: an extraordinary sanctity was attached to the Torah, or Law, and the care taken to preserve the text unimpaired was greater than that taken elsewhere. Yet even in the Torah we do find occasional divergences, e.g. in the famous "Shiloh" passage in Genesis xlix. This is how the verse runs in the A.V. "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver [R.V. the ruler's staff] from between his feet, until Shiloh come"—where Shiloh seems to be a personal name; but in the LXX we have this curious variant: "A ruler shall not fail from Judah, and a leader from his loins, until there come the things laid up in store for him." No mention here of Shiloh at all. The passage is one of extreme difficulty, and it has long puzzled scholars. For examples of verses added in the LXX we may examine Psalm xiv, which has three extra verses, as we know from Paul's Epistle to the Romans (for Paul habitually made use of the Septuagint, naturally enough, considering whom he was addressing). Some parts of the LXX are slavishly literal, so much so that it is no easy matter to understand precisely what the translators meant; other parts are, like the book of Job, little more than paraphrases of the original. N.T. quotations from the O.T. again and again follow the LXX version; and this is noticeable specially in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the authorship of which is unknown. And we may observe, in passing, that the Church Fathers are extremely fond of using the Septuagint, and that is simply because they knew no Hebrew. Jerome was, of course, a notable exception; he deliberately set himself to learn Hebrew, for he had no doubt that the Hebrew text was superior to the Greek version, and, where divergences occurred, he followed the Hebrew text, when he was busy with his translation of the Bible into Latin.

As I have already hinted, the LXX is written in Hellenistic Greek, the genus of which Alexandrian Greek is the species. It is a variety of the Greek spoken by the common people in Alexandria, and contains—naturally—a certain infusion of Semitic words and idioms, for it was intended to be a more or less literal version of the Hebrew

original. The translators felt bound to set down the Greek words which seemed the nearest equivalent of the Hebrew; hence, as we are informed, there is not infrequently a doubt whether the Greek *had* a meaning to those who wrote it down. Besides the peculiar difficulty of a word-for-word rendering of the Semitic original into a Greek version, there was this other difficulty: *ideas* which were familiar enough to a Hebrew were foreign to a Greek. The style is uneven; but this is due to the fact that different translators were at work, and the version was by no means done at the same epoch; and, apparently, there was no attempt made in after times to revise the translation as a whole, smooth away angularities, and secure uniformity.

The Septuagint managed to hold its own until after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70; but in the second century the Jews, dissatisfied with the rendering that so long had served its purpose, turned to a new version by one Aquila, who made of the Hebrew a word-for-word construe—for it is this, rather than a translation. After Aquila, there appeared various revised editions of the LXX, i.e. those of *Theodotion* and *Symmachus*, but the greatest of these was Origen's, one of the few Gentiles who had an intimate acquaintance with Hebrew. Even then work on the LXX was not quite ended; later on Eusebius and others were busy with revision; most of these revised versions belong to the fourth century, and that is the period when our oldest (and best) MSS. were produced. It may be said, in a general way, that a goodly number of ancient versions of the O.T. (the Slavonic, for example) have their source in the LXX.

I have implied that the production of the LXX took a long time—say from the third to the first century B.C. There are differences in our MSS. of the LXX, but they are not so marked as those between the Greek and its Hebrew original. It may well be that the LXX has preserved a better text; but it would be rash to trust it too completely in matters of word and phrase, as the translators often misread or misconstrued the Hebrew. None the less, even its mistakes are often of considerable interest.

The use of the O.T. by the writers of the N.T. suggests problems not readily admitting of a solution. What about quotations in the N.T. that do not follow the LXX? These need not always be derived from the Hebrew, but through the medium of Aramaic versions current in the synagogues. Aramaic was a Semitic language, akin to Hebrew in some degree; and, being the language of the people in Palestine in the generations immediately preceding our Lord's days, it was used in these synagogues for an obvious reason: the common people were no longer familiar with their ancient language, Hebrew, which was the literary language and familiar only to the learned. Consequently, after a passage had been read out from the Hebrew during divine service, it was customary for some expert to come forward and render it in the popular dialect—the Aramaic. These Aramaic renderings finally got fixed in writing; and these written versions may quite conceivably have been used by some, at least, of the N.T. writers when making excerpts and quota-

tions from the O.T. Jesus Christ himself habitually, we may believe, spoke in Aramaic; indeed, we have some actual phrases of His embedded in our New Testaments, like "Ephphatha," all in Aramaic, and not the ancient Hebrew. When Paul addressed the crowds at Jerusalem, he is said in the "Acts" to have spoken to them in the *Hebrew* tongue; but note that this means *Aramaic*.

The number of LXX manuscripts is really considerable; the text does not depend on two or three, still less on a single MS. like some pagan writers of note. It will be understood that editors when they wish to present us with a good and readable text are met with many difficulties: they are obliged to choose between conflicting readings, and to do this requires skilled judgment, They are obliged to estimate the varying values of the manuscripts they consult: such is the main task of textual criticism. [For ordinary students, not interested in minute points of criticism, a text which gives us a good resultant of all the best MSS. is sufficient.] But it must not be forgotten that editorial difficulties are not at an end when they have settled a word here and a word there; sometimes it is found that the MSS. present a passage in a different order from the Hebrew; sometimes we find a different version of a section of some narrative. Let me give a few examples, despite the fact that this matter has already been touched on:

(1) Take the order of some of the commandments. This varies from the normal, as we understand it.

(2) In the Book of Proverbs some verses are omitted, but others inserted—which find no place in the authorised Hebrew text.

(3) Perhaps the text of Daniel exhibits the strangest of all the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek. In this book there are additions in the LXX which are completely absent in the Hebrew. If you look for these additions in your ordinary English Bibles, you will look in vain; but, if you wish to examine them, they may be found in the Apocrypha; and, when you have found them and read them, you will doubtless be glad that the old Jewish revisers improved the book by omitting these "additions." At the same time do not let us forget that among these additions was the piece known as the Song of the Three Holy Children, which, though absent from our Bibles, is to be found in the Prayer Book, and is known as the Benedicite.

I wish to stress once more the fact that the LXX translation of the Hebrew O.T. was not done at one time; it was a process extending over generations. Yet, for all that, the LXX *as a whole* is fairly of a piece throughout, written in the language *of* the people and *for* the people. And it may usefully be noted here that not a few expressions, words, turns of idiom, which half a century ago were confidently dubbed Semitisms or Hebraisms, have recently been found in documents not Biblical at all; in documents and even potsherds unearthed from the sands of Egypt, and evidently in common use—whatever their precise origin may have been. A very probable explanation of these so-called Semitisms is this: the *κοινή*, that is the Greek universally spoken in Alexandria and in general through-

out the Near East, must in course of time have been contaminated by Semitic influences. How could it be otherwise, when we remember that about a third of the population of Alexandria was Jewish? Besides, the traders, merchants, wandering scholars, pilgrims, and the rest, coming from Palestine, would be sure to import some words and idioms which, constantly reiterated, would soon become fashionable. We see the same sort of process going on in our own language. But the very fact of these Semitic importations into the Greek of the LXX would—or at least might—actually enhance its value in the eyes of Jewish readers; and it is not at all surprising that the Apostles used this Greek version almost as naturally as we use the A.V. of the Bible. The reaction of *later* Jews against the LXX may well be accounted for on the ground that they found this version continually appealed to by their hated opponents, the Christians.

We have already noted that the N.T. writers habitually used the LXX. Indeed, I think I am correct in stating that out of over 300 quotations from the O.T. in the N.T. most are derived from the Greek version. Not more than fifty differ materially from that version. But besides these direct quotations, there are a very large number of indirect verbal allusions. More than that: with some truth the LXX has been called the mother of the N.T., for without this Alexandrian rendering in the *κοινή* the language of the N.T. would have been very different from what it is. Therefore, adequately to understand the language of the N.T. some acquaintance with the LXX is obviously needed. And mark, too, how wide was the influence of this great translation in the spread of the Gospel. Jews who would assemble at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, whatever their language might be in the places where they lived, could all understand the "lingua franca," the *κοινή*, just as all ecclesiastics and scholars in the Middle Ages habitually used Latin as a common medium in which to express their thoughts. You might almost call the *κοινή* the Esperanto of its period. As these Jews gathered together they would hear, for the first time, the story of Jesus of Nazareth; and the Jewish Christians, speaking and preaching of His life and death on the Cross, would call to witness the prophetic words of the O.T. scriptures, believing that those scriptures pointed to Him, as the long-expected Messiah, to be a light to lighten the Gentiles and the glory of the people of Israel. And those testimonies to Jesus from the Torah and the Prophets would come to them—through what medium? In Hebrew? no; not even in Aramaic, for the Jews of the Dispersion were hardly acquainted with that dialect. Rather it would reach them in the words of the Septuagint. Perhaps Stephen, the proto-martyr, used that self-same version in his famous address to the Jews; and, years later, Ignatius at Antioch, Clement at Rome, Justin in Palestine, Irenæus at Lyons taught in the words of the LXX, and drew their quotations from its pages. Subsequently a yet wider range was given to the Septuagint, thanks to the Latin version made from it, for the use of Latin congregations in Italy and Africa; and later still we find it becoming the parent of many other versions.

I have previously alluded to the imperfections of the LXX. Well, there they are, without doubt; but do they detract from its value substantially? Not more, surely, than the errors in our own A.V. detract from its substantial value and accuracy. Probably no student of Scripture can read a chapter without some benefit. A few examples of its usefulness to the student might not be out of place. Take a well-known passage in the fourth chapter of Genesis, which runs thus in our A.V.: "And Cain talked with Abel his brother; and it came to pass when they were in the field together that Cain rose up against his brother and slew him." That sounds all right, till we learn that the word rendered "talked" is in the Hebrew "*said*," and regularly is used to introduce what a speaker wants to tell us; so that really the words should run, "And Cain said unto Abel his brother . . . and it came to pass that, when they were in the field," etc. This no longer sounds correct; obviously something has fallen out of the Hebrew, a fact which the A.V. manages to gloss over by turning "said unto" into "talked with." Now the LXX fills up the gap, and the words it supplies are just what we need to make good the sense of the passage. The words will now run thus: "And Cain said unto Abel his brother, Let us go into the field; and it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain slew his brother."

This is a passage, it is true, of no great importance; but the next one I shall quote is of very considerable importance, for it touches on a point of controversy between Christians and Jews. The passage comes in that extremely interesting and important Psalm xxii. (= LXX xxi.). Now the Hebrew text, as pointed, reads thus: "Many wild-dogs (i.e. fierce persecutors) have come against me; as a lion my hands and my feet; I may count all my bones." This does not give any sense, as it stands; a verb is required to govern the words "my hands and my feet." The Septuagint supplies it with "they pierced," and it is followed by the Vulgate and the Syriac versions. This gives at least the sense required. Another most interesting passage may well be taken notice of—from Job xix. Handel's setting of it in the *Messiah* has made it known to everybody who loves music, and its use in the opening sentences of the service for the Burial of the Dead in our Prayer Books has given it a sacred and touching character. Here are the words as they are familiar to so many mourners: "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh I shall see God." The LXX version is quite different; it runs thus: "I know that he is everliving who is destined to deliver me, and to raise up on the earth my skin which endures these sufferings; for these things have been accomplished for me by the Lord. These things I am conscious of in myself; mine eyes have seen them, and not another, but all have been fulfilled in my bosom." The idea here seems to be that of an Avenger, or Vindicator, who in the end will manifest himself after Job's death, and clear him finally from the unjust imputations which his friends have cast upon his good name. The

notion of a divine Redeemer is absent from the passage as the LXX translators understood it. These two verses are of notorious difficulty ; I make reference to them merely to show that the Septuagint gives an entirely different complexion to them from that with which we are familiar. I suppose that the actual Hebrew original has been so completely altered, or corrupted, that no final solution is possible. Further, by way of emphasising afresh the importance and value of the LXX, we must bear in mind that its language is the mould in which many of the thoughts and even many of the expressions of the Evangelists and of the Apostles were cast. Notice how terms of the Mosaic ritual were taken over from their O.T. setting, and given a new life and a wider application in the N.T. One example will do —*ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας*, a sweet-smelling savour—which occurs almost forty times in the Pentateuch, but there of literal offerings ; Paul employs it metaphorically. Such phrases as " believe in God," " faith towards God " you would certainly not find in ancient Greek authors, who probably wouldn't have understood them in any case ; but we who read them in the N.T. have only to examine the LXX to see how such terms were understood by readers of the Greek Testament, simply because they had been taken over from the Old, with which they were already familiar. An interesting case of the transfer of meaning in some given word is furnished by the Greek *βαπτίζω*, which in the N.T. is used exclusively of the Christian rite of baptism. The history of the word itself is not without importance, for neither the verb *βαπτίζω* or the nouns *βάπτισμα* or *βάπτισμος* were used, previous to N.T. times, in connection with religious rites. The verb = dip, or sink. But the Christians took the word over, and gave it a new—and sacramental—meaning. This is another case, then, where the employment of a word in the LXX was destined to influence not only Christian vocabulary but Christian doctrine. I might note in passing that in the Book of Revelation the phraseology of the LXX is constant, and some of the speeches in the Acts are full of its echoes.

The frequent citations of the LXX by the Greek Fathers, and of the Latin version of the LXX by the Latin Fathers, are a fairly good reason for studying the Septuagint. One example, to show that it is so, may not be amiss, for it is curious. St. Ambrose somewhere applies to Christ the appellation *scarabæus bonus*, which literally means " a good beetle." If we hadn't the LXX to refer to, such a phrase would surprise us, certainly, but we should be completely at a loss to know what it meant. But a reference to a passage in the second chapter of Habakkuk will give us the clue. In our English versions (A.V. and R.V.) we read : " The stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it," which is interpreted to mean that when the proud and grasping foeman (i.e. the Chaldæan) employs ill-gotten spoil for building his house, the very materials used will testify to the evil gain by which they were built. The stones and beams will cry aloud for vengeance on the blood shed in order to win that spoil. But in the LXX we find something different : for the second part of the verse, literally trans-

lated, runs thus: "the beetle out of the timber shall speak." The Latin Father refers this to Christ, who, like a beetle, called from the Cross (the timber), "My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" And St. Jerome says this: "Some say that it was a worm (*vermis*) speaking in the wood of the cross, which uttered these words in the 21st Psalm, 'I am become a worm and no man.'" Again, in the third chapter of Habakkuk we find in our versions, "Thou shalt revive thy work in the midst of the years." But the LXX give us this: "Thou shalt be recognised in the midst of two animals." Various curious inferences were drawn from this blunder: in the "two animals" Origen discovers the Son and the Spirit; Tertullian sees there the two figures of Moses and Elijah; others the two thieves; others again the two Testaments. The very mistakes of the LXX were employed by these Fathers—who knew no Hebrew—on which to embroider grotesque interpretations. Even the great Augustine had an idea that errors found in the LXX were, somehow or other, of divine origin.

I have already alluded to the great importance of the LXX from the fact it contains much valuable material not to be found in the O.T. Canon. This material we group together under the single name "Apocrypha." Among the books of the Apocrypha may be named the two Wisdom Books, viz. The Book of Wisdom, and what is known as Ecclesiasticus; but the most important in some ways is the First Book of the Maccabees, which tells the story of the great revolt which took place in Palestine in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes (second century B.C.). This was really the heroic age of Jewish nationalism, and we cannot but feel moved as we read how the aged Mattathias and his sons fought for, and won, their independence when it was threatened by the cruelty and tyranny of Antiochus. One at least of the Psalms gives us a pathetic picture of the desolation of the Sanctuary in those days, before the great victory enabled Judas and his followers to repair the ravage and bring about an era of prosperity. There is little doubt that the Book of Daniel was written during that heroic epoch. But it may be as well to caution those who are not too familiar with these matters not to confuse the Apocrypha with the Apocalyptic literature that was destined to leave so deep a mark on many a passage in the N.T. Of all that apocalyptic literature, with its somewhat vague and grandiose pictures of the Last Things, the N.T. contains one complete specimen—the Apocalypse itself, in which earlier material is set in a Christian framework. The Apocalyptists, despite their vagueness, their inconsistency, and their frequent absurdities, cannot be overlooked; they profoundly influenced the thought of the age immediately preceding the days of Jesus. They laid stress on the transcendental character of the Messiah, for one thing; for another they asserted the immortality of the soul, and the doctrine of a bodily resurrection. The importance of the individual, too, was stressed; previously the nation had been the unit of interest; and they were eager to include the Gentiles in the divine plan of salvation, instead of limiting it to the Jews.

We have seen that the books of the O.T. as finally settled by the Jewish Canonists, are those that we find in our own English A.V. and in the R.V. To some books, Daniel and Esther, additions were made in the LXX, but were not accepted by the Palestinian Jews.

Besides these books—canonical, as we term them—others were brought into the Alexandrian Greek version: these form the Apocrypha, the surplusage from the Hebrew O.T. Outside the limits of Palestine, Christianity was spread by Greek-speaking Jews who had embraced the new Messianic faith; and their converts—Jews and Gentiles—speaking Greek, naturally took the Alexandrian version of the O.T. as their authority. The same sort of infallibility which was ascribed to the Hebrew Scriptures was held to attach to the version of the LXX. And, in their desire not to leave any possible divine utterance out of their collection, they gathered up many other books without inquiring too rigidly whether the orthodox canonists included them in their sacred Scriptures or not. Only when sharp controversies at a later period showed Christian apologists that the Jews refused to acknowledge the authority of these books from which (as from an arsenal) opponents drew weapons with which mightily to confute their Jewish opponents, did it become necessary to draw up a list of books universally accepted as of divine origin. The oldest of these lists was made toward the end of the second century A.D. It was natural that the Latin Church, receiving the Bible from the Greeks, included in its versions what the synagogue rejected. It was not till the fifth century that Jerome, the greatest scholar of his time, was persuaded by the Bishop of Rome to undertake a new Latin version to take the place of the older translations. This version, known as the Vulgate, was derived not from the LXX but direct from the Hebrew. As a critic, Jerome would relegate all the surplusage of the LXX to the Apocrypha; but he was unable or unwilling to display consistency. The result was that these Apocryphal books came to form part of the Vulgate itself, though he never regarded them as possessing the supreme authority of the books in the Hebrew canon. Inconsistent this, perhaps; but at least it was a triumph for the LXX. And so it came to pass that, in the middle of the sixteenth century, in opposition to the Protestant contention that the canon of the O.T. should be limited to the books contained in the Hebrew Bible, the Roman Church decided at the Council of Trent that the deutero-canonical books should form an integral part of the Bible to be accepted by all faithful members of the Roman Catholic communion. "If," said the Tridentine fathers, "any man does not accept as sacred and canonical these books as contained in the ancient Latin edition [i.e. the Vulgate], let him be anathema."

Of recent years there has been a remarkable revival of interest in LXX study. Indeed, the literature that has gathered round that version which, for half a millennium, was dominant in the Græco-Roman world, is enormous. What it shows is that the Septuagint is no dead record but a living testimony.

THE CONVERSION OF SIMON FISH.

By John Knipe.

3. SIMON WRITES HIS BOOK.

How an Orchard became an Eden.

THE Widow Necton folded her hands comfortably as she sat on the garden seat at the top of the orchard and watched her little Margery where she stood under an apple-tree with her cousin Robert who had just shown her his fine new stone house built on a gentle rise above the banks of the Stour. That house, its fair gardens and goodly orchards, with lands and farms both grazing and corn lands—all were being offered to her maid, reflected the widow, smiling, sighing and nodding her head, for Cousin Robert's grave face was very earnest as he pleaded under the tree while Margery listened earnestly, her eyes downcast, so still a form that she scarce seemed to breathe.

That comfortable woman on the bench waited only to see the smooth brown head lifted, the gentle response obediently given, and the happy Robert lead her blushing daughter to desire humbly her mother's consent and blessing. That was how it had been when Margery's father courted her. "Only my dear mother—Our Lady rest her soul!—told me she'd beat me black and blue if I gainsaid my own father's will"—meditated the widow—"which was right and proper after the dowry he had gotten together with a deal o' pains, the kind heart! And if my Thomas had lived we might have done more for the child—but there, Master Monmouth has nor chick nor child, and he promised to make up her portion—though Robert says he wants none save the maid's goodwill."

Time slipped by—minutes grew into the hour—while Cousin Robert pleaded and Margery listened unresponsive—very silent, very still under the gnarled bough of the apple-tree—laden with green leaves and hard small green apples.

A shadow fell on the grass and made the mother look up.

"How, cousin? 'Tis wellnigh the supper-hour," said a deep voice—and the Sheriff of Norwich came and joined her on the bench—"So! Rob is wooing our little Madge, ha? And is the maid willing?"

"The wench is no fool!" snapped the widow, whose anxious eyes betrayed her doubting fears. "Margery would hear how much he cares for her. She's but a tender lass and she's a head stuffed with these new notions. But a good child, obedient and humble, a biddable maid, cousin Stephen."

"Biddable?" repeated the Sheriff dryly. "I count men biddable if they submit themselves to the King's justice in my court. But a soft slip of a lass wooed by a true man in an orchard, nay, 'tis not bidding nor chiding should bring her to the answer. 'Twas not thus my Kate spoke with me. Nor will Robert take

an unwilling 'Yea.' He'd liefer hear a plain 'Nay' and so rest her good cousin. I doubt that my brother is too grave a man for Madge. She's young and likes a frolic, she wants . . ."

"Tillyvally!" exclaimed the widow. "The child has more sense. I'll tell thee what she wants—a good man and a good home."

The Sheriff smiled under his beard. "A trifle more, I do guess. Ha! Robert comes hither—alone."

"Alone!" echoed the dismayed mother. The sunlight seemed to fade from the leaves and the grass and the bright river turned grey.

The Sheriff got up and his six feet of grave dignity towered over her. "Take it wisely," he counselled her kindly enough. "Thou dost seek thy maid's happiness, my cousin."

"She's still dreaming of yon runagate! Yon idle mocker Simon!" muttered the widow. "I'd liefer see my child in her grave than wed to yon wicked rebel! He's turned heretic to boot!"

The Sheriff shook his head at her and Robert joined them.

"She says that she thanks me kindly, esteems me much, but she could never be my wife," he said quietly.

"Did Madge give thee no further reason, brother?" asked the Sheriff, for the widow was dumb with chagrin.

"She loves me not," answered Robert simply.

"Holy Mary!" burst out the mother. "'Tis not like she could! What modest wench dare love until her mother bid her! Hast been over-hasty, Robert. Give her time and she'll come to love thee right well, a good kind true man who would make the foolish chit the best of husbands."

Robert Necton shook his head and looked sorrowful. "No. I was earnest with the Lord to give me this dear maid—I desired her greatly and besought her love with tears in my prayers. But she is denied me."

Madam Necton stared. "Art gone mad? Why shouldst thou pray for her *love*, cousin?" she asked bewildered. "I promised her to thee for thy true wife. Ye can win her love as her husband —the maid is wife-old, cousin."

"We who are of the Brethren take none to wedded wife but such as are willing," replied Robert Necton gravely, "since in all things we are bound to seek the Lord's Will. I know not why He has refused me this priceless boon, but He has refused it."

Margery's suitor spoke with a strange dignity and, saluting his cousin, he walked away with bowed head and a slow resolute tread like a man who was defeated in an honest battle.

Widow Necton turned to the other brother. "Holy Saints! What does Robert mean?" she exclaimed. "How can he or other Christian man think so? We're all perforce made buxom to the Lord God! But to seek out a wife by praying! Nay! It smacks of presumption to my mind. It smells of heresy!" She started. "The Brethren!" she repeated. "Does he mean those

secret heretics the priest warned me of! They call themselves 'The Christian Brethren.' Nay! If Robert be one I do refuse him for my child! He need seek no praying answer for't!"

"Chut! Thou foolish woman!" rebuked the Sheriff. "Dost blow hot and cold in a breath! Robert is a good and sober man who is a devout churchgoer and much respected here in Norwich. He has his notions and he believes in prayer more than most men."

"Then he'd be better as priest or monk," observed the widow; "such fancies are unsettling to an honest simple woman."

"A while ago thou wert all agog to see him wedded," retorted the Sheriff, laughing. "Nay! Cousin, come your ways! Robert is a staid man of years and Margery is——"

"Less than nineteen and he better than thirty-five," replied the mother. "I did always fear he might be over-old for the child," she added, musing. And she beckoned to her daughter, who came meekly to her with grave face and downcast eyes.

Widow Necton surveyed her shrewdly. "So! Hast no will to wed thy cousin?" she demanded.

"No, good mother, so please you," murmured the girl.

"Wherefore?"

"He is—he is—no more young," stammered the daughter. She looked up timidly and perceiving her mother's smile Margery flung herself into the open arms and burst into tears.

"So! So! My dove!" murmured Madam Necton, patting her gently. "Shalt not wed where thou art unhappy. Nay, nay, 'tis a good buxom child and she shall be free to choose where she loves—so the man has means," she added prudently.

Margery raised her head and looked over her mother's shoulder. Her fair soft skin flushed bright red and, leaving the shelter of the maternal embrace, she ran fleetfooted towards that same rejected Cousin Robert who now appeared at the orchard wicket accompanied by a slim youth booted and spurred and dusty from hard riding.

"Saints! Will the foolish child run to take back her Nay?" gasped the perplexed mother.

Then Margery's voice rang out in such rapture and passion as her mother had never heard it in her whole life—"Simon!"

And the widow jumping up from her comfortable seat in the sun saw a pair of arms—belonging to a travel-stained and dust-whitened youth—seize her daughter as the meek girl fairly rushed into them, submitting to be honestly and heartily kissed without any visible pause in the proceeding for a considerable time.

The Sheriff held back the indignant mother.

"Nay," he bade her, "we've known the like in our time, cousin. Youth goes to youth. Margery has chosen her own man."

"But yon Simon! Rebel, penniless scamp, vagabond!" She wept for rage.

"He looks none," said the good-humoured Stephen, eyeing the lovers. "Come, Jenny, dry thy eyes and observe the young man. He has a brave appearance under his dusty cloak."

The widow could not resist the impulse to look. She saw a very different Simon to the former self-willed eager youth whom she had disliked for her darling. Simon Fish advanced with an assured air and kept his arm round Margery's waist, but the handsome flashing witty young lawyer was now sobered into a determined man, and purpose and consideration marked his broad white brow. His dress was rich but of a sober fashion.

"Thou hast much changed, Simon," she admitted, staring at him.

"For the better, I hope, good mother," he said, a firmer ring in his pleasant voice. "If I may?" he added tactfully.

He kissed her quickly on both cheeks.

Taken aback the widow returned it and Simon said—"Margery knows the reason for my flight. The Lord Cardinal was pleased to count me his enemy. But all is mended. I owe my return not to his will but to the good pleasure of the King's Grace who himself deigned to command my Lord of York that he should send word there would be no further prosecution of those concerned in the Christmas Game at Gray's Inn. Thus I am not returned as a penniless rogue and vagabond, my good dame. Means are sufficient and I have employment. So I pray you right humbly to give us your willing consent to a speedy marriage."

"Well spoken!" approved Stephen Necton, smiling at them.

Robert Necton had followed and he said slowly: "Cousin Jane, I have heard of this young man Simon Fish, and I believe that he is worthy of our sweet kinswoman. He has been tried and proved faithful by Mynheer van Endhoven and other good men. In token of which trust, Master Fish," he added, turning to Simon, "I ask to be counted of your good acquaintance."

"Acquaintance, Master Robert Necton! Nay, friends rather!" cried Simon heartily. "Shalt dance at my wedding, then!" He wrung the offered hand and turned to the Sheriff: "Sir, I think that ye are the maid's next of kin after her mother. I am ready to discuss matters, for I desire to make a proper settlement on my wife-to-be." Simon smiled at her. "My father has given me fair rentals."

"So! I think, Cousin Jenny, that thou wilt be satisfied with such provision," Stephen Necton said, turning to the widow.

Jane Necton nodded. "I have done my duty as Margery's mother," she replied. "I have striven to care for the interests of my best beloved child, since her father is in Paradise. If I opposed thee before, Simon, it was for her good. But in truth, my dear lad, I have ever wished thee well in my heart, for thou art one to win hearts, and wild as thou didst seem I did ever love thee"—she gulped—"if I treated thee harshly, sweet daughter, it was from fear—I did ever dread thou might leave me to seek thy Simon in a strange land, for I knew that thou wouldst sooner beg thy bread than lose his love. . . . Take her, dear Simon, and take my blessing and forgive me."

The widow could not continue, for tears choked her words. All

listened in amazement that the hard grasping Jane Necton spoke so humbly and pleaded for forgiveness with the scorned and slandered Simon Fish. Once a slight smile touched Simon's lips as she assured him of her past feelings, but he could be generous in the triumph of a return which the King himself had been pleased to allow.

" It needs no forgiveness of mine, dear mother," Simon answered.

SIMON AS THE LONDON AGENT FOR CHRISTOPHER VAN ENDHOVEN.

The young couple settled down in a house near Whitefriars which, being in the neighbourhood of the Temple, gave Simon the colour of undertaking some legal work as a law-scrivener which he could do without suspicion. But he was readmitted to study at Gray's Inn when it became known that the King had shown him such singular favour and after he had submitted a Treatise through his friend Mr. Edward Hall. Simon received his Coif in the Hall where his Play had been given and he took his Call to the Bar even though as a married man he was no longer resident for the few weeks which remained to complete his Term. It was held by the Master and the Benchers that a forced exile did not invalidate so brilliant a student.

Neither did the lawyers cavil at Simon's occupation as the agent and representative of the wealthy Flemish printer, Endhoven. He set up his modest business—more office than shop—for supplying books printed in the Low Countries. And as he was prudent and thrifty as well as trustworthy, Simon drove a good trade and had his own connection. Secretly he was also an agent for the Christian Brethren and he supplied their people with the Testaments of William Tyndale, which were first brought over, well-concealed in merchandise, in the summer of 1526.

For some time all remained quiet and unsuspected. Margery was a happy wife and Simon a steady and respected London citizen. Robert Necton bought Tyndale's Testaments from Simon's store.

" I fear Cousin Rob is over-ready with his tongue," Margery said anxiously one late autumn evening when she was helping Simon to unpack the hampers in which the precious Testaments had been brought over concealed under coverings of flax and consigned as " *Clean Paper.*"

Simon, who was kneeling on the garret floor, paused to look up and smile at his wife as she sat by the lamp, carefully shaded from the window over the street.

" How, sweetheart ? " he asked—half-absently counting the books.

" He is a good man, but he confides so readily," replied Margery, " and Rob is not brave like thou, dear Simon."

Her husband laughed. " I'm not brave, darling. But thou art and wise with it. So ! How many of the First Two Gospels are writ in the secret manifest ? "

" I will see. Hark ! Someone knocks and 'tis late. Dark night ! O Simon ! If they take thee from me again ! I should surely die ! "

"Foolish little wife! 'Tis some reveller. Quick! We must pack these books again and hide them close in the recess! Aye! There is someone without. I hear Tim stirring. Hold the lamp, lower. So!" Simon swung open the secret panel and disclosed a space under the roof-gable where he rapidly transferred the prohibited books from overseas. "Go down first," he whispered. "Lie down on the bed and I will bring the lamp and make some clatter on the stairs. Then open thy door and call out to me as if just awakened by the noise."

Margery obeyed, though she much disliked the deception. But as Simon shrewdly told her how else could the Word be distributed without using some of the wisdom of serpents?

He himself went boldly down and demanded who knocked so late in the Water Lane. A familiar voice answered. Tim was rubbing his eyes and shivering as he waited to know if his master willed for the servant to open at that hour.

"Unbar the door and let him in quickly," bade Simon—who ran back and told his wife to fear nothing, for the visitant was a tried friend.

"Who is it?" whispered Margery.

"Master Monmouth," replied Simon quietly, and he kissed her white face as she clung to him.

"Godfather! O Simon! There must be some new terrible danger!" she panted.

But she went down with him and greeted Monmouth calmly with her usual affectionate kiss.

Humphrey Monmouth looked keenly at Simon as he stood in the tiny parlour under the light of the lamp which was set on the table.

"Simon, lad, I'm grieved for thee and Margery both. But 'tis true kindness to warn ye. Someone is thy enemy. I fear me 'tis the ancient vengeance of my Lord Cardinal which strikes a deadlier blow. However that may be, thy business here is known. Thou art suspect of heresy." Monmouth sighed and added: "Thy name has been sent to my Lord of London."

"Tunstal!" muttered Simon.

"Aye. And he preached last September against Sir William Tyndale and called his Testament 'naughtily translated'—in his Sermon at Paul's Cross. The bishops are all resolved to burn the book wherever it may be found, and cast into prison those who sell and those who buy them. So unless thou wilt recant?"

"No," answered Simon quietly and without hesitation.

"Then thou must fly the country for thy life." Monmouth sighed.

"'Tis the first time that I ever suspected or knew any evil of Master Tyndale. I held him for a good priest and more—a saint."

"He is both," answered Simon. "Well, sweet wife? Thou hast heard."

"I will go with thee, my husband," Margery said.

But Monmouth shook his head. "She cannot go—at least yet.

It would cause suspicion to fall on all of us. But for thee to take ship at dawn when the tide serves in the Pool with thy business known as agent for Endhoven—why, it may pass, lad. And maybe a few months hence the heresy-hunt will be less hot, for 'tis said that the King wearies of the Cardinal Wolsey and my Lady Anne Boleyn hates him. The King is much under her spell and 'tis reported that she favours the Gospellers and has no love for bishops. So this may be a brief parting, please the saints."

"Simon! Take me! I cannot bear it a second time!" sobbed Margery piteously.

Her husband shook his head. "Sweetheart, thy godfather is right. We must not bring suspicion on our friends. Thou wilt say that I was suddenly called back to Antwerp on urgent business and thou dost expect me back in a little while." Simon took her weeping in his arms. "Be brave, dear heart!"

"Must thou go—at once?" she whispered. "Then I will prepare speedily some clothes—and make a provision—food—pack thy small leather mail, dear. Give me another lamp."

Humphrey Monmouth looked at them. "Ye poor children!" he said.

"Margery knew when she married me that I have put my hand to the plough and may not look back" Simon said. But he followed her upstairs and they knelt hand and hand as he prayed for leave to return quickly, and for comfort and help for his wife.

Margery did not go back to her mother. She remained quietly at home and managed the secular part of his business until near her time, when Madam Necton came and stayed when Simon's child—a girl—was born, to be the best comfort for Margery's loneliness. But Simon in his exile burned with zeal and scorn for the persecuting bishops and he began to write the boldest book or pamphlet of the day. With keen witty eloquence he attacked the monks and friars, bishops and clergy who hated the Word of God and would burn all who read and loved it. His bold fiery book, *A Supplication of the Beggars*, was printed secretly by Endhoven and it reached England in 1528–9, the year before Wolsey's Fall and disgrace. And it may have been Humphrey Monmouth who showed a copy to certain London merchants who contrived to pass it into the hands of the Lady Anne Boleyn, Marchioness of Pembroke.

In a short time Mrs. Simon Fish was honoured by a visit from one of the Lady Marchioness's gentlemen who privately assured her of their Lady's goodwill and offered counsel to draw up a suit for Simon's return to be presented to the King by the Lady Anne. Amazed, Margery sent a grateful answer but preferred to make the suit through one of Simon's friends of Gray's Inn. And this suit was set aside since Wolsey, though losing favour, had not yet been deprived. But in October, 1529, the great Cardinal was disgraced and in danger of his own life

Simon returned quickly and Margery had word as soon as Endhoven's ship was sighted from the Pool. She went to meet him boldly, her child in her arms, and Simon took the baby and went

home with her in great contentment. Only Monmouth sent his man to warn him to keep close, for Sir Thomas More was made Lord Chancellor in Wolsey's place and he much disliked the book called *A Supplication of the Beggars*.

Monmouth soon came to the little home in the Water Lane hard by Whitefriars and he told Simon a great thing. It seemed that the Lady Anne had spoken to the King of Simon's book and Henry had asked to see it, but my Lady of Pembroke said she had returned it since " she knew not," quoth she, cunningly, " whether his Grace would approve her act or no."

" Sly puss ! " said Henry, pinching her smooth cheek—and he bade her summon those who had shown it her and willed to see them privately. And those London merchants came boldly to the court and read the book to the King in his Privy Closet at his own royal command.

Henry nodded and smiled as he listened. Then he said slowly : " *If a man should pull down an old stone wall and begin at the lower part, the upper part thereof might chance to fall down on his own head.*" And he took the book from the merchants and bade them keep still tongues and none should hurt them.

" What meant he ? " asked Simon, playing with his baby's brown curls.

" I do think his Grace would say that the upper part of the wall was the Pope's Supremacy," replied Monmouth shrewdly : " The King had not then overthrown the Cardinal who was the Pope's Legate."

Simon meditated. " Where is his royal Grace ? "

" At Windsor." Monmouth took his leave.

" Margery," said Simon that night, " to-morrow I shall go to Windsor and seek a meeting with the King and ask his help and protection, for I will not willingly be driven overseas again and parted from wife and child more."

" Well, dear heart, as thou wilt," she answered, " but I must go with thee, for thou art grown so dear that I cannot bear to be left at home."

The King was hunting in his Royal Chace at Windsor and it chanced that he first observed Madam Fish in the forest. Having an eye for a sweet smiling countenance, King Hal paused, drew rein and beckoned so that Margery came and, kneeling, begged him to protect her husband whom the Lord Cardinal had ever persecuted, assuring her sovereign of the devoted loyalty of Simon to his King.

" Ha ! " said Henry, who was in high good humour after a successful chase, " Was not thy husband this same Simon Fish who acted in a merry Play against the traitor Wolsey ? Aye ! And he is the author of a certain book, sweet dame ? " Henry chuckled. " How long has he been kept from ye ? Ha ! More than two years ! By'r Lady ! They have done ye bitter wrong who kept a loving pair apart so long ! And where is he now, my fair dame ? "

" Please it your Grace, he is not far from hence," she stammered. Her fair face flushed under the King's bold eyes.

"So! Fetch him, sweeting!" laughed the King.

Margery made her reverence and sped to find her Simon watching jealously from an oak-tree.

And Simon hastened to meet the King and offer his humble homage.

"Art a bold man," said Henry, smiling, "but we think a true loyal fellow at heart. Here! Take this ring! Show it to any who may vex ye, man. Aye! Were it Master Thomas More our Chancellor, for he loves not thy brave sharp wit! But thou mayst tell him and all the realm that henceforth Simon Fish has the protection of Henry his King—the Father of all his true loving lieges."

"My Lord the King!" stammered Simon as he gazed incredulously at the royal signet-ring which glittered on his palm. "Ye shall never find a truer loving subject in your kingdom than the poor law-clerk who kneels at your stirrup."

"Well said," answered Henry. "Use that sharp pen in our service, man, and thy King will know how to reward such keen wit."

And the King set spurs to his horse and rode off to his hunt, but Simon went to Margery and told her and they went back home together and thanked God that such bitter trials were happily ended by Henry's kindness and royal favour.

Dr. C. H. Irwin has provided students with a useful companion to Bible Study in his book, *The Bible, the Scholar and the Spade*, in which he gives "A Summary of the Results of Modern Excavation and Discovery" (Religious Tract Society, 7*s*. 6*d*. net). Some of the results of the most wonderful recent excavations are recorded and explained with Dr. Irwin's clear and delightful touch which leaves a vivid impression on the reader.

Dr. H. E. Fosdick's *As I See Religion* (Student Christian Mission Movement, 5*s*. net) adds another to the many books which have proved useful to those faced with difficulties in their religious beliefs. In this he meets the challenge of Humanism which has gained a stronger hold in America than in this country. His approach to the meaning of Christianity through the channel of personality is full of stimulating thought.

The Rev. E. F. E. Wigram wrote the C.M.S. story of the year 1931 in his usual fascinating style under the title *Silver and Gold* (1*s*. net). Tastefully produced, the writer plays effectively for his purpose of describing the various phases of the Society's work on the many passages in the Bible where silver and gold are mentioned. It is an inspiring record of work.

THE TRANSFIGURATION OF OUR LORD.

By the Very Rev. LeB. E. ffrench, B.A., Provost of Kilmacduagh and Canon of Clonfert, Rector of Ballinasloe, Co. Galway.

THE interest of Irish Churchmen in the story of Our Lord's Transfiguration has been quickened since the last revision of the Prayer Book "according to the use of the Church of Ireland" was completed in 1926. Till then this great event was not even noted in the Calendar, but it is now commemorated on August 6, not as a "black-letter" day as in the English Book, but as a leading Festival, with special Collect, Epistle, and Gospel.

Readers of The Churchman will recall an instructive article by Bishop Knox in October, 1928, on The Transfiguration, from which doubtless many as well as the present writer learned much, in which its significance to Our Lord Himself was reverently discussed "with the greatest learning and theological grace." In a most helpful manner the Bishop treats of "the spiritual reassurance which was ministered to" the Lord on the mountain ("probably Hermon"), and shows that the Transfiguration was "a succour given in answer to the prayers of a really tempted Jesus." It was "a sublime answer to intensely fervent prayer, which prayer was prompted by a real sense of need. The battle-ground of the Transfiguration was as desperate as that of the Temptation in the wilderness, and hardly, if at all, less desperate than that of Gethsemane." This is in harmony with Dr. Sanday's statement, "The narrative reminds us in more ways than one of those of the Baptism and Temptation."[1] Some popular writers adopt the same view. A well-known Irish clergyman says: "Meditate for a moment on that scene. Look at the Lord Himself, rapt in prayer, steadfastly setting Himself to go to Jerusalem to die. May we reverently say that He needed prayer for Himself, that in it His soul might be calm and still in the unruffled peace of the Father's presence? Was this the answer to His prayer, bringing the exile back for the moment to the precincts of His home, to hear the approval of the Father, to be glorified with 'the glory which He had before the world was'?"[2]

Another, a Scottish divine, writes: "His prayers received a splendid answer in the Transfiguration. That glorious scene . . . was chiefly intended for Himself. It was a great gift of His Father, an acknowledgment of His fidelity up to this point, and a preparation for what lay before Him."[3]

But not all will assent to Dr. Knox's assertion, "All explanations of the Transfiguration as meant to confirm the faith of the disciples are undoubtedly erroneous." That such interpretations are imperfect or defective may be admitted, but can we say more than this in the face of 2 Peter i. 16–19? Whatever view may be held as to the authorship of this Epistle, it will not be questioned that

it emanated from the Petrine school in the early Church, and is intended to represent the teaching of the great Apostle. The Bishop rightly emphasises the part played by the disciples as "witnesses attesting the reality of the experience," i.e. "as confirming its reality for Jesus"; but in the New Testament passage referred to is it not implied, not only that these disciples pointed to what they had seen and heard when they were "eye-witnesses of their Master's Majesty" as attesting the truth of their message concerning Him, but also that their own faith had been "confirmed" by their experiences on "the holy mount"? In St. John i. 14, there is perhaps another reference to those experiences: "We beheld His glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father."

When we remember that, as the late Mr. Latham and others have taught us, Our Lord was at this time throwing the best of His time and strength into the task of training the Apostles for the great work which lay before them when His bodily Presence was withdrawn, it is natural to believe that He had this strengthening of their faith in view when He took the three who had hitherto shown themselves most responsive to His teaching and most capable of grasping higher truths "*apart by themselves, and was transfigured before them.*"

The analogy of similar occurrences in Our Lord's life tends to establish this opinion. At His Baptism the descending spirit was not only a veritable "anointing" of Jesus "with the Holy Ghost and with power," probably conveying also a gift of Illumination—"He learned when His business was to commence and how it would be done" [4]; it was also the sign to the Baptist that "this was the Son of God." And when in the last week of His life "a voice from heaven" answered the prayer which, when His soul was troubled, Jesus offered, "Father, glorify Thy name," He testified, "This voice hath not come for My sake, but for your sakes."

Again, His words which followed His thanksgiving immediately before the raising of Lazarus convey an intimation that even in His closest intercourse with the Father the thought of helping the faith of others was present to Our Lord's mind. "Father, I thank Thee that Thou heardest me. And I knew that Thou hearest me always: but because of the multitude which standeth around I said it, that they may believe that Thou didst send me."

We must allow also full weight to the fact that the three Evangelists, whose testimony differs in this particular from what is stated in 2 Peter i. 17, all imply that the voice which "came out of the cloud" spoke not, as at the Jordan, to Our Lord,* but to the Apostles,—"This is My beloved Son; hear ye Him."

"The divine voice declares that all divine revelation is now included in the Lord Himself. Moses and Elijah, representing the Law and the Prophets, pass away, leaving "Jesus only." [5]

"The voice which addressed Jesus as God's Son at His Baptism now reveals Him as God's Son *to the three disciples.*" [6]

* In this St. Mark and St. Luke in their account of the Baptism agree as against St. Matthew.

Is it " to consider too curiously " to think that He who " knew what was in man " may have perceived that these disciples in particular needed to be emancipated from too strong an allegiance to what " Moses and Elijah " stood for at this date in the Jewish Church? St. Peter in the after years acknowledged that the " yoke " of the Mosaic Law had become an intolerable " burden," and how difficult it was for him to cast it off is shown by St. Luke's narrative of this Apostle's Vision at Joppa, and by St. Paul's reference to his " dissimulation " at Antioch. James and John merited a rebuke from their Master when they wished to " bid fire come down from heaven " and " consume " certain Samaritans. Even if the words " as Elijah did " are not part of the true text (and there is good authority for them), their request indicated that they were possessed by the " spirit " which they believed to have been his. This may appear fanciful, but the purport of the voice " from the excellent glory " is, as we have seen, in the main clear, even as " the appearance of Moses and Elijah by the side of, and as it were ministering to Jesus, symbolised *to the disciples* the Law and the Prophets as leading up to and receiving their fulfilment in the Gospel." [1] Peter, James, and John were on the mount not only as " Witnesses," but as Learners.

A closer examination of the words spoken to the three Apostles shows that a deeper meaning lay in them than we have yet noticed, and enhances our sense of the importance of the message given them, especially when we remember the point in Our Lord's life at which the Transfiguration occurred. He had now reached " the climax of His earthly manifestation." The three Evangelists carefully fix the date as about a week after St. Peter's great confession at Cæsarea Philippi, and they all make it plain that it was just after Our Lord had begun to prepare His immediate followers for His rejection by His countrymen and His death of shame. " And He began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again."

A well-known commentary has the following note on this verse in St. Mark: " Jesus devotes Himself to training the twelve *in the shadow of the Cross.* This concentration on His disciples becomes possible when they pierce His secret." [6] (It is implied that St. Peter's confession shows they have done so.) But how far is this true of the disciples? St. Peter's answer to the question, " Who say ye that I am? " rejoiced the Lord's heart because it afforded evidence that, at the time when His Mission in Galilee appeared to have failed, His intimate friends and scholars had grasped so much of the truth concerning Himself that He saw in them " the nucleus of the future Church," the foundation of which He could now with all the authority that centred in Him declare to be well and truly laid. A special blessing was pronounced upon Peter for his answer in the solemn and memorable words, obviously spoken with deep emotion, which, though found only in one Gospel, " seem unmistakably to be Our Lord's " [5]; but Peter had spoken, in St.

Chrysostom's phrase, as "the mouth of the Apostles," and so had given utterance to "the first real Confession of the Church."[4] This Confession is probably preserved for us in its original form in St. Mark's or in St. Luke's Gospel,—"Thou art the Christ"; "The Christ of God"; and appears to be interpreted in St. John vi. 69, —"We have believed and know that Thou art the Holy One of God." And yet, welcome as this evidence was to Our Lord that His careful education of the twelve had not been in vain, the Confession fell far short of that true faith concerning His Person to which the Apostolic band was guided by the Holy Spirit in the after days when Jesus was "declared to be the Son of God with power . . . by the resurrection of the dead."

It is a great point gained that Peter has now consciously reached the firm ground of Messianic acknowledgment,[4] . . . but, just as the words he spoke a little later on the Mount, "not knowing what he said," seem to indicate that he thought of Our Lord, with Moses and Elijah, as scarcely more than "primus inter pares," so now his reply to Christ's searching question appears to us more reminiscent of the Confession of Nathaniel in the Fourth Gospel than anticipatory of that of St. Thomas. "The secret of the Lord" is not yet fully "pierced." But at the Transfiguration a higher truth concerning Jesus than he had hitherto grasped was revealed to Peter and his companions, though, as has been suggested, it was only subsequently, in the light of the Resurrection, that they and the rest of the faithful Eleven came fully to perceive its significance. We are distinctly told that their Master's command to keep silence concerning "the Vision" "till the Son of Man be risen from the dead," was strictly observed. The inference may fairly be drawn that after the Lord's Resurrection the favoured three related in full to their colleagues all that they had seen and heard.

We may now consider a little more closely the Divine message. St. Mark and St. Matthew record the words as "This is My beloved Son; hear ye Him." St. Matthew adds after "Son," "in whom I am well pleased." St. Luke, according to the text adopted by the Revisers, has, "This is My Son, My chosen, hear ye Him"; but here also "many ancient authorities read 'My beloved Son.'"

Assuming for a moment that "My chosen" (Greek, *ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος*) is the correct version of the words, it is of interest to notice that *in this Gospel* the same epithet "Chosen" (Greek, *ὁ ἐκλεκτός*), is scornfully addressed to the crucified Saviour in the mocking taunt of "the rulers" (St. Luke xxiii. 35); "He saved others; let him save himself, if this is the Christ of God, His chosen." And if St. John, as he stood by the Cross, heard these words, would they not awaken in his mind an echo of the Voice which came "out of the cloud," and proclaimed "This is My Son, My chosen," when the conversation, mentioned only in this Gospel, was finished in which Jesus spake with Moses and Elijah "concerning His decease which He was about to accomplish at Jerusalem"? As he looked back, this would help him to perceive, not so much while he remained upon Golgotha as in his meditations afterwards, "the essential

connexion of the Transfiguration with the Passion," and he would be led to see that the brief though dazzling glimpse which had been granted to him and his brother and their friend of Christ in glory, and the words which they heard, were intended to prepare them for the coming woes. It is an old thought expressed by an illustrious teacher of the fifth century that such a purpose lay behind the Transfiguration in the counsels of God. " Before Jesus suffered, to prepare the innermost circle of disciples to bear it, they were given the vision of His glory and the assurance of the divine authority of the Christ, ' My son, My chosen One.' ' In transfiguratione,' says Leo the Great, ' illud principaliter agebatur ut de cordibus discipulorum scandalum crucis tolleretur.' " [5]

But there is greater weight of authority for the version of the words preserved by St. Mark in what we have come to regard as practically St. Peter's Gospel, and by St. Matthew, who incorporated St. Mark's account, and also in what is perhaps the true text of St. Luke, viz. " *My beloved Son.*" This (*ἀγαπητός*) was the adjective applied by the Father to His " Son " at Our Lord's Baptism, as the three Evangelists tell us,—" Thou art My beloved Son "—or, as St. Matthew has it, " This is My beloved Son,"—" in Whom I am well pleased." We may reverently say it appears antecedently probable that at the Transfiguration the identical word would again be used.

But now we shall do well to remember the appeal of Athanasius to " those skilled in Greek idioms and to Homer, when asserting against the Arians " that " *only Son* " is the true meaning of *ἀγαπητός*.[5] " The Voice from heaven repeats the witness of the Baptism ; Jesus is not only God's Anointed, but *God's only Son.*" We are again reminded of the testimony of St. John ; " We beheld His glory, glory *as of the only begotten from the Father.*" To grasp this truth concerning Jesus would mean for the disciples a considerable advance in " the knowledge of Christ," from that to which they had as yet attained, even if we accept as historical the full form of the Confession uttered at Cæsarea Philippi as it is given in St. Matthew's Gospel. Even more than the assurance that Jesus was the " Chosen " of God, the revelation concerning His person, " This is My only Son," would help the Apostles in their future ministry to meet the stumbling-block of the Cross. Of course they did not at the time understand the full implication of the heaven-sent message. We can, perhaps, as Dr. Edersheim thought, trace " a retrogression " from the faith to which they had attained before " Jesus began to show unto his disciples " His coming unimaginable sufferings and " the glories that should follow them." " Never afterwards, till His Resurrection, did their faith reach so high." [4] Even after the Resurrection, of the reality of which they had been convinced " by many proofs," and the Ascension of the Lord into heaven and the Pentecostal gift of the Holy Spirit, the Apostles do not appear for some time to have grasped the full truth of their Lord's true Divinity.

An examination of what St. Luke tells us of St. Peter's addresses

in " the Acts " leads us to think that in the earliest days of the Church there was " no thought-out doctrine of the person of Christ." Peter had not as yet risen above the conception of Jesus as " a man approved of God by mighty works and wonders and signs," Who after His violent death and Resurrection was exalted " at the right hand of God," and had " poured forth " the promised gift of the Spirit, the effect of which was manifest to all dwellers in Jerusalem, and who should come again at " the times of restoration of all things " " in His Kingdom," to which the penitent robber had had faith to look forward. Even the title " the Prince of Life," " belongs to the vocabulary of the Messianic hope." [5]

But a deeper doctrine concerning Our Lord's Person appears to underlie the references with which this Apostle's generally accepted Epistle abounds to Christ's " fore-known " sufferings for us, and the " precious blood " wherewith we have been " redeemed," and the belief in the Holy Trinity implied in its opening verses.

We are perhaps on firmer ground when we turn to that Ephesian Gospel which, if we cannot confidently claim that its author was " the beloved disciple," at all events emanated from the Johannine School, and which was written in order to lead its readers to believe that " Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God " ; and that not in the ordinary Messianic sense of these titles, but that they might " believe on His Name " as that of " the Only begotten Son " Who so perfectly " declared " God that " he that had seen Him had seen the Father " ; Who was indeed, according to what Bishop Westcott calls " the best attested reading " in St. John i. 18, " God only begotten " ; and to all who " believed " in Him, whether they had " seen " Him or not, their " Lord " and their " God." This conception of Christ underlies all the Johannine writings, which lay such stress upon the blood which " redeems " and " cleanses us from all sin," and present Jesus as " the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world," and as " He that came by water and blood."

The suggestion of this essay is that the recollection of their Vision of Christ in glory, and in particular of the Voice from what they had recognised as the Shekinah (for " they feared as they entered into the cloud "), greatly helped Peter and John and their colleagues, to whom they had now related their experiences on that awe-ful occasion, in their progress to this true faith which interpreted for them the Mystery of the Cross, and that this was intended by God Himself who spoke to them out of the " bright cloud." " We beheld His glory " (cf. " they saw His glory," St. Luke ix. 32) * ; " There came such a Voice from the excellent glory . . . and this Voice we heard."

This was ever the " apology " of Peter and John ; " We cannot but speak the things which we saw and heard " ; " That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you." This connexion

* Cf. also St. John xii. 41, " he saw His glory." Here indubitably the reference is to the " glory " of Deity. Isaiah asserts that he saw " the Lord," even " the King, the LORD of hosts."

of the Transfiguration with the Passion is worthy of note in the present day. There has been since the Great War a marked return to the Cross in Christian thought and preaching. Nevertheless we are still far from a final theory concerning the atoning sacrifice consummated upon the "green hill far away." Much that is written on this "κεφάλαιον" of our faith, as Athanasius called it, seems to us inadequate and unsatisfying. The more books we read on the subject the more, like Bishop Butler, we realise the difficulty of explaining "How, or in what particular way, Christ's death was efficacious." We endorse the opinion of one of the most distinguished of Irish Primates that "our wisest hymn before the Cross" is

> "I cannot understand the woe
> Which Thou wert pleased to bear,
> O dying Lamb! I only know,
> That all my hope is there"[7]

Perhaps "there will always be (as the late Canon Mozley thought) "a shadow round the Cross." But this at least may be said with some assurance; a proper estimate of the Person of the Sufferer is an indispensable requisite for a right understanding of the New Testament presentation of the doctrine of the Atonement. Here the Gospel story of the Transfiguration helps us.

> "Who hath dreamed that when the Cross in darkness rested,
> Upon the Victim's hidden face no love was manifested?"

Certainly, once the faith which they seem to have lost during the Passion, had been restored, no doubt on this point could have disturbed the minds of those who had seen their Master's face "shine as the sun,"* and heard the eternal Father's testimony to Him.

And still a glory from the "high mountain" illumines the Cross. The dew of Hermon falls on the hill of Zion; while, as we kneel in deepest penitence and faith at the feet of our Crucified Saviour, a Voice from the Throne sounds in our ears, "This is My Son, My Chosen"; nay more, "This is My Only Son."

* Cf. Rev. i. 16. The action and words of the glorified Christ of which the Seer of Patmos tells us here remind us forcibly of the narrative of the Transfiguration (*vid.* St. Matthew xvii. 6, 7). They would help St. John if, as Archbishop Bernard thought, he was the Seer, to realise that this was the same Jesus.

REFERENCES.

[1] H.D.B., article, "Jesus Christ."
[2] J. Paterson Smyth, D.D., *People's Life of Christ.*
[3] J. Stalker, D.D., *Life of Jesus Christ.*
[4] Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah.*
[5] Gore's Commentary.
[6] Peake's Commentary.
[7] Archbishop Alexander, *Verbum Crucis*, on Isaiah liii. 12.

CHRISTIANITY AND MODERN KNOWLEDGE, OR, RELIGION AT THE CROSS-ROADS.

By the Rev. Thomas Reeve, B.D., A.K.C., Vicar of Longnor, Buxton.

THE problem of relating Modern Knowledge to the Christian Faith is the most immediate and urgent of all the problems which face the Christian community to-day. The bases for the solution of many other problems depend upon it; since it concerns the ultimate foundations on which a constructive view of God, Man and the Universe (and therefore of Christianity in all its varied aspects) may be effected. The criticism of religious ideas is necessary so as to bring them into consistent relations with the larger whole of knowledge.

Among the clergy ignorance of Modern Knowledge abounds, while distrust, apathy and indecision are characteristic attitudes towards it. The drift of educated youth from organised Christianity will continue unless they can be shown that the Church is more concerned about ultimate truth than the mere continuance of an inherited Tradition.

Christianity is a life—a life of fellowship with God in Christ Jesus. All else that is Christian flows from that experience. Doctrines define and formulate that experience in intellectual terms. Institutions and Rites constitute its social embodiments. The Doctrines, Institutions and Rites, however, are important and almost indispensable in forming the environment in which the Christian experience may be generated.

Three stages in the development of Christian thought may be noted:

(1) *Theology and Christology.*

(2) *The psychological re-expression of Theology (i.e. its manward aspect) in the doctrines of sin and grace, freedom and grace, grace and the means of grace.*

(3) *Doctrines concerning the constitution of the Church.*

These Doctrines were hammered out amid the intellectual blows which mark the history of Doctrines.

They are the fruit of nearly 1,500 years' thought on the primary experience of the Christian life, and express that experience in the categories of the Culture during which they arose.

This Ancient-Medieval Culture included a definite logic, philosophy, psychology, and science, as well as a view of history of a very definite type. It was a unified system of knowledge—the conception of God, Man and the Universe attained by antiquity after centuries of labour. The Summa of S. Thomas Aquinas (for instance) attempted to cover the whole content of human knowledge

and to settle for ever changeless paths for the human mind to walk in.

Christianity, however (like all life), is essentially creative; it was not born of Ancient Culture, nor is it for ever to be chained to it. The Catholic Tradition has not yet transcended that Culture, though Science has raised itself above it.

Modern scientific discoveries, modern thought, and a new knowledge of history, have effected with increasing acceleration a profound revolution in our conceptions of God, Man and the Universe during the past 400 years. It is a revolution and not an orderly development, and it is still in progress.

Most of the old categories of thought have gone: a geocentric universe, solid indestructible atoms, creation by fiat a few thousand years ago, a dualistic psychology, changeless perfection. In their place we have the Universe of modern astronomy, dynamic (probably spontaneous) atoms, æons of creative evolution, the human soul rooted in inherited instinctive life, the relativity of time and space, change and movement the fundamental realities of the universe.

The "a priori" logic of the ancients has given way to the "a posteriori" logic of modern science.

Gone is the distinction of two incompatible worlds of "nature" and "grace," the "sacred" and the "secular," distinctions unknown to primitive man. The "higher" and the "lower" are but aspects of one life. The old conceptions resulted in a divided and incoherent personality, the separation of the higher sentiments from the biological functions, and the limitation of religion to a relatively narrow field of human experience. In the new conceptions, religion is concerned with the whole man, and with the whole of life.

To sum up the difference between the ancient and modern conceptions of God, Man and the Universe, we may say that a fundamentally transcendental static and catastrophic conception has been replaced by a fundamentally immanent dynamic and evolutionary conception.

In the realm of organised Christianity also there has been a profound revolution. Protestantism was the protestation (i.e. an earnest declaration) of the fundamental truth of religion—the *IMMEDIATE* apprehension of God in the human soul. Man meets the Divine in the depths of his being and by dependence on and union with God in Christ wins a new spiritual content which is rooted in an Eternal, Immanent, yet Transcendent Life.

All that Church Tradition conceived as *MEDIATED through its* elaborate system was held to be appropriated by subjective faith. Faith and Conscience (immanent and subjective) stood in antithetic relation to Sacraments and Authority (transcendent and objective).

The Theses of the Reformers involved, either explicitly or implicitly, a revision of Church Tradition, and therefore of Doctrine also. They were prepared to test all doctrines afresh by a true understanding of the Scriptures.

The Reformation led the Western Church to fix its faith on the basis of the theological work of the Middle Ages, and therein

the Roman Church Doctrine was stereotyped in the categories of an Ancient Culture from which there is no appeal. The Pseudo-Catholic Tradition was (and still is) regarded as not perfectible. (Shall man whose days are as grass, rise up and say that he has made a statement about God, Man and the Universe which shall not need revision?)

We owe a real debt to Protestant Theology, for in emphasising the immanence of God and the immediacy of the Christian experience, it anticipated in Theology the modern immanental conceptions of God, Man and the Universe, and thus prepared the way for reconciling Christianity with the scientific and philosophic thought of to-day. Christianity in Protestant lands is working itself out of the forms it was once compelled to assume, and a re-valuation of the whole content of human knowledge, and its co-ordination with Christian experience is an indispensable part of the process. As Dean Inge has said, " The work of the Reformation still awaits completion, and I believe that our Church and our Nation may complete it."

The task of giving intellectual expression to the fundamental truths of Christian experience in conformity with scientific and historic knowledge is immense. It must be undertaken by those within the Christian circle, for both knowledge and experience are necessary. It lies beyond the scope of the many, but there is a real work for the many to perform. They must learn to recognise the fact that there is a problem to solve and a work to complete. They must see that those who are capable have the opportunity of making the attempt, and that they neglect nothing of the material out of which a constructive formulation of the Faith should be made. It is almost inevitable that mistakes will be made. But the function of the mass of Christians should be that of intelligent interest and sympathetic criticism. The decisions of the Ancient Church Councils came to be regarded as authoritative only after they had been accepted by the Church as a whole. The general consensus of Christian opinion must operate in like manner to-day —not in a blind refusal to accept new light in order to conserve an old Tradition—but in an intelligent examination of the fruits of Christian scholarship and discussion, so that whatsoever is true and lovely, whatsoever makes the Faith more intelligent and edifying, may be incorporated into our expression of the Faith; and whatsoever may be found to be misleading or obsolete may be set on one side.

There appears to be a large amount of mistrust which really springs from anxiety concerning the Faith. The conflicts between Science and Religion, Philosophy and Faith, have been long and sustained; but they need not blind our eyes to the fact that every department of knowledge and investigation is contributing its quota to the richness of our conceptions of God, Man and the Universe. Faith must work for the reconciliation. The Theologian of to-day has the advantage of a larger and better sifted body of material than his predecessor in any former time. He may therefore be

spared the errors which befell former thinkers, and for which they could hardly be blamed. The abundance of the material has made the task harder by increasing the complexity of the problem. But we crave for more light, and if we are to gain it, we must not shut off any source from which it may stream.

The limitations of Science and Philosophy are becoming increasingly recognised. The supposed opposition of the scientific and the religious view of the universe is now seen to be an illusion. Both are necessary for a full knowledge of the universe and life. The philosophies have failed to discover a complete answer to our questions and problems; though they have shed much light upon them. The failure is due to the fact that they assumed that all our apprehensions of external reality can be expressed in terms of knowledge, doubt, and ignorance. They have really ignored the possibility of Faith in a Divine self-revelation as a vehicle of apprehension. Science has come to our aid by revealing to us an evolving Universe with movement and progressive change as its fundamental characteristics. The unity of Nature is abundantly testified. The eternal ground of all existence must be taken for granted. And the conclusion that this ground is the real source of all the progressive achievements of the human mind is wellnigh inevitable. The urge to completeness is found to be a fundamental instinct of all life. May we not claim that Religion is the highest expression of that instinct, through which man rises above mere sensuous existence to moral and rational life, and through Faith to fellowship with God and Eternal Life? The wonder of man's moral and spiritual evolution is disclosed, and bears witness to an Immanent yet Transcendent God ever seeking man and aiding man's highest endeavours.

Science really bears witness to the fact that the Universe and man within it has a future, a future of which as yet we can only dream, Faith stretching out into that future is still the assurance of things hoped for.

A passion for reality is the dominant note of the modern mind —a desire to face up squarely to the facts of experience in all their implications. The soul of the race will not rest until it has found a religious faith that can satisfy both its conscience and its intelligence; that is the reconciliation which we need to-day. Jesus still reigns supreme in the hearts of men, though they may not understand Him nor follow Him.

The new knowledge of man and the universe revealed by Science —the new view of History disclosed by Archæology, Anthropology and Literary Research—the new conceptions of the limitations of knowledge displayed in the criticisms of the various systems of Philosophy—have provided the material for a possible reconciliation between Faith and Knowledge which has been hitherto impossible.

The Reformation was incomplete because it lacked the material for a complete synthetic view of God, Man and the Universe. Its knowledge of origins was defective. Its dualistic psychology conceived the soul as a separately constituted and specially derived

element in human nature. It lacked the unifying and dynamic conception of Evolution. Progress in the modern sense of that term was inconceivable.

On the practical side of Christianity, however, it reached down to essentials. The essential nature of Christianity, it declared, is a personal fellowship with God in Christ Jesus. The principles of authority and freedom were rooted in this experience. The analogical interpretation of Sacraments and Orders, whereby Grace was conceived as a mysterious force transmitted through persons, things and acts (which could easily degenerate into superstition and magic) was set on one side. Grace was interpreted as the blessings which inhere in the personal contacts between God and man. Institutions and Rites which generate these personal contacts between God and man are therefore real expressions of essential Christianity. In the recognition of this principle lies the one hope of the reunion of Christendom, and therein is revealed the essential catholicity of the Churches.

The Movement which took us back to Jesus of the Gospels and to Jesus behind the Gospels has been a wholesome discipline. It has pricked the bubble of belief that the modern catholic conceptions of the Church, Orders, and Sacraments can be verified by an appeal to the Gospels. It shows that they can only be justified on the assumption that Jesus was not always conscious of His purposes and plans, and that the sub-apostolic minds saw clearly where His vision was dim, and that His followers could interpret Jesus better than He could interpret Himself in the days of His flesh. To call these conceptions and all that they involve the posthumous work of Jesus is not to mend matters. To read the Gospel aright we must read it in the light of all Christian experience and all knowledge. It is through such a renewed reading of the life and teaching of Jesus, that the experience of redemption is possible, for there we meet the fontal source of all spiritual life.

The new philosophical emphasis on religious experience, the new psychological studies of individual biography, the new emphasis on intuition as against intellect, all tend to reinforce the evangelical interpretation of Christianity, and are preparing the educated public mind for the acceptance of its central message—that ultimate Reality does not yield its secret to intellectual searching, because that Reality is personal, and can only be known through personal relations, and that within the race a Personality has appeared who, in perfect fellowship and correspondence with this personal Reality can equate the race and Him, through a supreme moral act (the Cross).

Love, Faith, Patience, Hope, and Courage are all necessary in this age of transition. The Incarnation alone gives coherence, sanity and encouragement to all our learning and efforts. Faith has no real ground for anxiety or uncertainty.

The Truth as it is in Jesus is the standard of our efforts. A true understanding of the Gospel, in the light of modern knowledge, will bring in a new era of dynamic religious life, and His promises

—" the Holy Spirit will guide you," " Seek and ye shall find "—are the pledge and assurance that the task is worthy of our efforts.

Two ways lie before us, the one through new knowledge, new hope, and new adventure to a deeper apprehension of Truth and newness of life in Christ; the other to maintain a static outlook on Christianity which would leave the Church a static and sterile institution in the midst of a changing progressive universe.

THE SPIRIT OF THE LIVING GOD. Addresses given at the Cromer Convention, 1932. *S.P.C.K.* 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

The addresses given at the Cromer Convention last year on " The Spirit of the Living God " form a much-needed exposition of the work of the Holy Spirit in relation to the special problems of the day. The Convention was fortunate in its speakers. They have combined the power of intellectual treatment with spiritual discernment, and have thus given the proceedings of the Convention a special and effective character. The opening addresses of the Archbishop of York on " The Spirit of God " and " The Holy Spirit and Human Personality " provide a peculiarly effective introduction to the whole subject. The power of the Holy Spirit came in a new way to the disciples through their companionship with Jesus Christ, and the same power will come upon us as we make more constant and deep our personal companionship with Jesus Christ. Human personality must have " a concentrated passivity over against the Holy Spirit " in order that the Holy Spirit may do His work in us and through us. Canon L. Mannering emphasised the vital need of a rediscovery of Pentecost to secure the transforming of personal life. The Rev. R. O. P. Taylor treated of " The Holy Spirit in the Universe " in a striking and original way. Two addresses by Canon C. E. Raven set out in fresh form " The Spirit creating the Fellowship " and " The Spirit Energising Fellowship." Canon A. W. Davies considered the work of the Church in his address on " The Holy Spirit and the Christian Task." The Bishop of Croydon, on " The Spirit inspiring Worship," laid down the principles of true worship. The Four Bible Readings by Archdeacon Storr are examples of the clear and inspiring exegesis which we have learned to expect from him. Their subjects were " The Spirit in the Earthly Life of Jesus," " The Spirit as the Interpreter of Christ," " One Body and One Spirit," and " The Spirit and the Divine Creativeness."

The Christian Church and the Christian State is a useful booklet by Mr. Robert Stokes, B.A. (Church Book Room, 6*d.* net), in which the case put forward by the Church Self-Government League for an establishment in England on the model of the Church of Scotland is critically examined and its weaknesses exposed.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

AGAPE AND EROS. A Study of the Christian Idea of Love. By Anders Nygren, Professor of Systematic Theology in the University of Lund, Sweden. Authorized Translation by A. G. Herbert, M.A. *S.P.C.K.* 6*s.* net.

Sweden has recently made some notable contributions to theological study. The present volume is an examination on quite original lines of a subject which, as the author points out, has hitherto been strangely neglected by theologians, although it lies at the very centre of Christian thought. The term Christian love is used frequently, but sufficient attention has not been paid to the various significations of the word. Professor Nygren examines these and suggests many sources of new light upon their use. He draws a sharp distinction between the two words Agape and Eros, which are both translated in English by the one word "Love." They indicate two antithetical conceptions, and in them "we have a pair of ideas which in their origins and early developments had nothing at all to do with one another, and are by nature completely antithetic, and yet in the course of subsequent history have become so thoroughly interwoven that it is now difficult for us to think of the one without thinking of the other." Agape is the love of God, and "it is not merely a fundamental idea of Christianity, but *the* fundamental idea *par excellence*. The idea of Agape is a new creation of Christianity. It sets its mark on the whole of Christianity. Without it nothing that is Christian would be Christian." Eros has been associated with many religions, and covers many ideas of love. It has no connection with sensual love, but is the heavenly Eros—"the Platonic love. Eros in its most refined and spiritual form; it is the desire of the soul of man to attain salvation by detachment from earthly objects of desire, and by seeking after heavenly things." The idea of Agape is examined as it appears in the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles and the Johannine writings. The idea of Eros is then examined as it is found in all essentials in the early Greek mystery religions. It received its classical form from Plato, but underwent a partial transformation from Aristotle and the Neoplatonists, and in this form had a strong influence upon Christianity. The *caritas* of the medieval age is neither Agape nor Eros," but a complex conception, containing elements of both." Professor Nygren promises a second volume in which he will show the conflict between Agape and Eros in Christian history.

Agape indicates the sovereignty of God's love. "The Christian way of fellowship with God depends wholly on the Divine Agape." Its characteristics are: It is spontaneous and "uncaused." It is indifferent to human merit. It is creative, so that "that which is without value acquires value by the fact that it is the object of God's love," and it opens up the way of fellowship with God.

Several of our Lord's parables are used to illustrate these characteristics. St. Paul carries the thought of this pure Agape further, and shows that " the love manifested on the Cross is God's own love," and " the description of Agape and the Cross in Romans v. may be called the supreme expression of the idea of God's Agape." When Agape is used for the love of the Christian for his neighbour, it means that in this case Agape denotes God's own love—God's love present in the human heart.

In the Johannine writings Professor Nygren sees the final formulation of the idea of Agape, " the coping-stone of the edifice of the New Testament doctrine of Agape," but he notes a tendency towards weakening the conception of the idea of Agape which marks the beginning of the transition to the stage in which the Christian idea of love is determined, not by pure Agape, but by Eros and Agape. The interesting chapter on Platonic Eros, deals with Eros in the mystery Religions and in Plato. Similar treatment is given to the idea in Aristotle and Plotinus, and the final chapter contains " the Essential Contrast of Agape and Eros." He deprecates " blunting the edge of all Christian terminology " and insists on the deepest meaning of the contrast between the terms as indicating two opposite interpretations of the meaning of Love. The opposition is fundamental, " Agape and Eros are the symbols of two completely opposite attitudes to life, two utterly different religious and ethical types. They represent two streams which run through the whole history of religion, the egocentric and the theocentric outlook." The two ideas have been blended again and again, but it has always been " an uneasy balance of contradictories." Eros arises from the sense of human need and seeks God in order to satisfy man's spiritual yearnings, while Agape freely pours itself out in the richness of Divine Grace.

The Translator in his Preface emphasises the contrast in the two ways of salvation indicated in the two words. The place of Divine Grace in the salvation of mankind and the part played by men has been the occasion of many reactions in religious thought. The sovereignty of God's grace has been insisted upon at one time. At another time man's seeking after God has been given the chief place in thought. The conflict of these in the history of Christian thought is indicated in this volume. We have no doubt that much will be heard in the near future of the distinctions so ably indicated by Professor Nygren, and this book will undoubtedly have a wide-reaching influence on theological thought. Whether there can be a final synthesis of the ideas of Agape and Eros in theological thought may be doubtful, but for the practical purposes of life, Christian experience will show the place of both in application to human needs which further study and examination of the two conceptions will make clearer in the course of time.

I.

THE MONASTIC CRAFTSMAN. By R. E. Swartout, M.Litt. Pp. 198. With illustrations. *W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd., Cambridge.* 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

For some years now the popular ideas prevalent about the Middle Ages have been undergoing a series of revisions. Nearly every phase of medieval life has been submitted to careful scrutiny by a succession of experts. The result has been to revise many of the current conceptions of the period and even to cause some ancient traditions to be discarded altogether. Such a process was inevitable. No period of history can expect to escape it even though it may be in the interest of some to delay it as long as possible. The present book is a good example of the process, for it is concerned with the shattering of just one more medieval myth. For long the tradition was handed down, based not on facts but on supposition, that the great medieval abbeys were largely built by the monks themselves. On the face of it the theory was improbable, but it has held sway for a long period. Its continuance has been largely due to the use of an English phrase which is distinctly ambiguous. When to-day we speak of a man building a house for himself we do not suppose that he actually designs and builds it himself. He may as a matter of interest assist in some minor way or other, but that is quite a different matter. Hence when we read in medieval chronicles of certain abbots or monks building a church or a refectory we ought not to have supposed that they actually did it with their own hands even though a particularly clever one amongst them may have helped in the task. Yet that is precisely what later writers anxious to magnify monasticism have persistently done. The result has led to much misunderstanding which has rendered a study like this necessary. Thus the writer has been able to show very clearly that when a chronicler uses the word *fecit* he really means us to understand *fieri fecit.*

One would hardly have thought, however, that it was necessary to produce evidence to support such a statement, for in any case it would appear to be highly improbable that a man devoted to the Religious life, probably from early youth, would possess either the inclination, knowledge or skill to carry on building work of any importance. For building then, as now, is a highly technical business, a statement which requires no support beyond a glance at some of our great cathedrals with their wonderful carving and tracery. That such magnificent edifices could have been reared by comparative amateurs in anything like their beauty and completeness was on the surface highly improbable. Yet surprising as it may seem, the tradition lingered and has persisted. The author refers to many examples, a good one being Montalembert's statement that the monks of Ramsey sang Psalms while building churches. But an examination of the records makes it abundantly clear that the masons at Ramsey were hired, though some young men, probably novices, helped the masons by carrying stones for them and singing Psalms as they went—a very different story. This and other examples

enable the writer to state emphatically that " The monastic builder is the exception and not the rule ; and in practically every instance in which monks have acted as builders on a scale at all large there has been some special reason, and the incident has been recorded by the chroniclers in tones of admiration as something quite out of the common." And the same can be said with regard to monastic architects, goldsmiths and metal workers.

A perusal of this book shows how carelessly many writers even of distinction have read, or not read, the records of the Middle Ages. Writers have assumed so often without any foundation that the workers referred to were monks. Yet there is a mass of evidence in the various extant Rolls and Cartularies of our abbeys and cathedrals " with their endless list of masons' and carpenters' wages, sums paid for painting and carving, and the like," to show how absurd is the contention and " to shatter finally the legend of the monastic builder." The main purpose of this book, then, is in the nature of an historical revision, and superficially may appear to be rather of a negative character. But the amount of evidence collected, particularly in the very full and valuable appendices, give it a distinct and positive value for the student. The illustrations add to its value and should help it to appeal to the ordinary reader. A few misprints should be eliminated in a future edition, e.g. on p. 94 *van* should be *vain* ; p. 106 *rebult, rebuilt* ; p. 118 *out, our,* etc. But these are merely minor blemishes which cannot detract from the value of a very interesting and useful work.

C. J. O.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Volume I. Standards. Edited by Oscar Hardman, D.D., Rector of Chislehurst. *S.P.C.K.* 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

The moral upheaval which has developed since the days of the Great War has led to a widespread disregard of the old standards of Christian morality. There was a time within the recollection of many when the teaching of Christ on moral questions was unhesitatingly accepted even if the claims made by Christians for the Founder of their Religion were either questioned or rejected. Those moral standards are now denounced in some quarters as inapplicable to our modern conditions of life, and new moral codes are the order of the day. These circumstances have led Christian thinkers to a fresh examination of the foundations of morality, and to a restatement of the Christian position in view of the changed conditions and modern requirements. In this volume Dr. Hardman has brought together a band of writers—experts in several departments of thought bearing directly on the subject—and they have presented in a series of well-planned essays their views of the Christian life and the standards which they believe it demands.

In his introduction Dr. Hardman explains the nature of " The Modern Challenge to Christian Standards and Discipline." He sees the whole world in a state of ferment and all forms of organised

religion suffering a grave and unaccustomed measure of contradiction. The causes of this challenge of the modern world to the authority of moral systems based on religion are examined. Amusement, Commerce, the Gambling Spirit, the Mentality produced by the War, the New Place of Woman, are among the contributory causes. The criticism of Christianity as inadequate is analysed. The claims made for the New Psychology are estimated and unmasked, and the position of the Church is set out. Christianity is the absolute religion, the final revelation of truth by the Spirit of God, the final stage in that creative redemption which is God's purpose for this world-order. The succeeding chapters state various aspects of this claim. Canon Goudge, Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford, describes " The Distinctive Character of the Christian Way of Life." The Rev. A. E. Baker gives an account of " The Formulation of the Christian Moral Ideal." He traces the various influences that have been at work throughout the ages, within and without the Church, and is specially interesting in dealing with the " Protestant Catholicism " of Anglicanism, although special prominence is given to the " kind of Christian Ethic which has resulted from the Oxford Movement." Mrs. A. D. Lindsay, in dealing with " Reverence," covers many of the problems which to-day are matters of controversy. " Reverence for life means reverence for its coming and going as well as for its intermediate process." With great delicacy she suggests lines of solution to such questions as the right and wrong use of pleasure, the right and wrong avoidance of pain and the right and wrong balance of individualism and altruism. " The Christian gospel is not to be regarded as containing model solutions of current problems. . . . It is, rather, the offer of spiritual light which can be received into the soul by all and each, in so far as the soul is humble, reverent and thankful."

Bishop Heywood writes on " Loyalty " and asserts the definite and emphatic prohibition of divorce by our Lord, and suggests that any Churchman is guilty of a signal failure in loyalty who acts as if the Church's law were otherwise. He speaks of " the unfortunate rejection of the Revised Prayer Book by the House of Commons," but thinks loyalty requires obedience to the Bishop's directions within its limitations. He thinks the daily celebration of the Holy Communion is indicated in the direction, " The same Collect, Epistle and Gospel shall serve for every day after until the Epiphany." It is possible that " shall serve " may imply on any day that there may be a Communion. Canon J. M. C. Crum writes on " Compassion." One of the most interesting chapters is by the well-known Congregationalist Minister, the Rev. A. T. Cadoux, D.D., whose appearance among High Anglicans is a little strange. His essay on " Overcoming Evil with Good " is full of interesting points and effective illustrations on such questions as punishment and the use of force and coercion. The Rev. Clement F. Rogers, on " Honest Dealing," lays down the rules for the conduct of business, and the principles which govern many of the ordinary relationships of life. The Editor closes the volume with a discussion of " The

Increase and Use of Wealth." He sets out the principles of Christian stewardship. Whether or not we accept the conclusions laid down in every case, the volume presents a useful conspectus of interesting views on the Christian attitude towards many of the most difficult problems of present-day life.

MODERNISM PAST AND PRESENT. By Herbert Leslie Stewart, M.A. (Oxon.), Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy, Dalhousie University. *London: John Murray.* 12s. net.

Whatever opinion may be formed concerning Modernism, it is essential in order to arrive at a just estimate of its purpose and value to study its origin and nature, and to learn from its representatives their aims and methods. Dr. H. L. Stewart, in *Modernism Past and Present*, sets himself the task of tracing the spirit of Modernism as it has manifested itself in the past, as it has developed in the face of the needs of each age, and as it stands to-day in regard to the complicated problems of our time. The Bishop of Ripon, who contributes an interesting Foreword, seems to imply that Dr. Stewart's definition of Modernism may be somewhat conservative. It runs: "Modernism is an effort to construe the Christian faith in conformity with scientific and historical knowledge while retaining its essential character." The vagueness of the last two words opens up a large subject of discussion, and the opposition to Modernism on the part of many is based on the opinion that it ignores some of the essential characteristics of the Christian Faith. The presentation of the spirit of Modernism given here provokes sympathetic interest with the development of thought and the growth of science, and we must all be prepared to accept what are usually described as the assured results of scientific investigation, but we have to be quite certain in the changing movements of Science that the results are assured and that they do in some way affect the teaching of the Christian faith. Apart from the actual thesis which he is maintaining, Dr. Stewart's account of the leaders of thought is intensely interesting. Passing over the earliest ages and the account of the origin of "heresy," we come to the age of the Renaissance and the Copernican Revolution with a statement of the position of Galileo. Erasmus is regarded as the typical modernist, but it is doubtful if there would ever have been a return to the Christianity of the New Testament if his methods of reform had been adopted. The account of the rise of rationalism in Germany leads on to the most interesting historical portion of the book—the account of the nineteenth-century movements of thought. The life and work of Ernest Renan, who abandoned the Roman Church in the same week in which Newman entered it, are sympathetically described. Then came the great break which resulted from Darwin's teaching on evolution, and the claims made for the theory, many of which have long since been abandoned. The real Modernism of the century

began in the Church of Rome with Loisy and the reaction against the Liberal Protestantism of Germany. Loisy's treatment of the historic Jesus as mainly mythical and his advocating at the same time the maintenance of the Roman forms of worship created obviously an impossible situation, and his excommunication was inevitable. The last chapter dealing with " The Present Outlook for Modernism " discusses a number of interesting problems. There has developed an idea that we can have " Religion without Revelation." The most striking examples of this development are the religion founded by Auguste Comte early in last century, and the " Humanism " which is now claiming attention in various parts of the United States. Some fear that Modernism will lead to the neglect of Christianity in favour of these modern efforts to provide for man's religious needs. But is there any real need for such fear ? Comtism is already dead. It is only to be found " by persistent search in a few centres such as London and New York from which no eccentric cult seems ever wholly to disappear." Whatever vogue the Humanism of Lippmann may have for a time, it will as certainly fail to secure any general support, just as Comtism has failed. In fact, every criticism of Christianity and the life of Christ that has failed fully to account for Him ultimately disappears, as Strauss' and Baur's interpretations have failed and faded away. Any excesses of which some modernists may be guilty will in the long run suffer the fate that the theories of Protestant Liberalism in Germany have suffered. The Barthian movement, to which Dr. Stewart gives high commendation, is a natural reaction against the reduced Christianity of the earlier movement. Christianity cannot expect to be exempt from criticism, friendly or hostile. Both help to the purifying of the Church's life, and we must not be afraid of them. Every attack leaves Christianity stronger and more firmly based. Its essential character asserts itself with the inherent power that truth has of maintaining itself in the face of error. Dr. Stewart's book is of great interest as an historical record of the progress of thought apart from any theories which he may wish to advocate. His view of Modernism has been questioned, and his claims for it criticised. It is very difficult to decide the limits of toleration within any organisation with definitely stated fundamental principles. Varieties of interpretation must be allowed, but it is obvious that there are limits that cannot be exceeded. Many are of opinion that those limits have already been passed, and that the doubts thrown on the supernatural character of Revelation is a definite challenge to orthodox Christianity. There will be little sympathy for a Modernism which destroys those elements which must be regarded as part of the " essential character " of the Christian faith.

PROVIDENCE AND WORLD-ORDER. By Charles Frederick D'Arcy, D.D., Archbishop of Armagh. *Hodder and Stoughton.* 6s. net.

This volume contains the Alexander Robertson Lectures delivered before the University of Glasgow 1932. It forms a suitable sequel to the volume written by Dr. D'Arcy some three years ago, *The Christian Outlook in the Modern World*, which was described as an account of " the amazing pageant of creation and history as understood by Faith and Science." It is an account of recent thought in the various departments of knowledge as it bears on the teaching of Christianity. It tells the story of the development of man's knowledge of the wonders of the universe as Science in these days is unfolding them, and relates the whole in a considered scheme to man's religious needs, and shows " their effect on those beliefs which have hitherto given strength and consolation to the human spirit."

The foundation is laid for the examination of the various departments of knowledge by a brief survey of the methods of thought. Like Dr. Oman in his great work, *The Natural and the Supernatural*, he shows that experience in its widest and most comprehensive sense must be regarded, and that there is danger of error in any attempts at abstraction which tend to ignore portions of the whole or to place them in a wrong relation to other parts equally necessary. He then proceeds to deal with the ascending scale of the creative process and shows that " there is emerging from the correspondence between the order of creation and the inevitable processes of the human mind a clear indication that the mind of man is indeed akin to the Power which works in the universe." A mass of interesting information is given in each section displaying the wide field of knowledge covered by the Archbishop in dealing with the range of modern thought. Students who are unable themselves to embrace in their study these numerous subjects will be grateful to him for the insight given into the results of recent research and its bearing on religious belief. The physical order comes first with man's place amid the vast universe and yet his superiority in spite of material insignificance. The biological order is the next step and here there is the same wealth of detailed information. The same may be said for the next steps—the psychical order and the historical order. Then we come to the higher ranges—the moral order, and the spiritual order. These are explained with the same clearness and accuracy. They show the position of man in the long range of creation and display those qualities which justify a firm belief in the providential order, which is the last step to be considered. In this is summed up the conclusions arrived at in dealing with the details set out in the other lectures. The final point reached is that the highest element in the universe is Love, and God is Love and the highest manifestation of His Love was in the Cross of Christ.

The Archbishop of Armagh is acknowledged to be one of the foremost thinkers of the day, and he excels equally in the power of clear expression. The usefulness of this treatment of a great subject

to all who have to deal with the intricacies of modern thought cannot be exaggerated.

THE NEW MORALITY. By G. E. Newsom, Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge. *Ivor Nicholson & Watson, Ltd.* 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Since the War " the New Morality " has been claiming to replace the old system based on Christian teaching and experience. Dr. Newsom sums up its two main points thus :— (1) " Nothing should be allowed to interfere with the freedom of sex-life. If the ideals of family life stand in the way of this freedom, the family must be mended or ended. (2) The ideal of sexual freedom is in harmony with the progress of modern science and civilisation." The object of this book is to show " that those who believe in the ethical value of the family need not fear that either modern science or modern social philosophy has made this value to be of less account than it was before."

The case for the New Morality is stated fairly and adequately. Its scientific and historical claims are examined with frankness and candour, and the conclusions are set out clearly that only by misrepresentation, or the suppression of vital elements, or the perversion of facts, can they be made to support a theory that would destroy marriage and family life and the civilisation of which they are essential characteristics. The evidence of Biology as to the elementary instincts of the race is shown to be against sexual freedom. The New Moralists therefore turn to Anthropology. A study of the customs of the inhabitants of the Trobriand Islands does not prove the system of matrilineal society necessary to the theory of the New Morality. There is no adequate evidence that sexual freedom was a condition of primitive man. An examination of the instincts of mankind, the parental impulse, the fraternal and filial impulses, shows that they are practically ignored in the New Morality which is egocentric. The herd instinct gives no clue to the character of family life. Social life of to-day affords no evidence that the New Morality will lead to a higher form of civilisation, but on the contrary it has many elements of degeneracy. " In the New Morality the State becomes the substitute, not only for fatherhood and motherhood, but also for conscience." Our social structure is raised on a great arch of trust and honour. The keystone is compacted of marital and parental honour. " It is the aim of the New Morality to dissolve the moral cement which binds these two elements together. If the effort were successful, the keystone would fall out and the arch would collapse."

This crushing answer to the wild theories put forward by such writers as Bertrand Russell and Aldous Huxley should be in the hands of all who have to deal with these problems.

LIGHTFOOT OF DURHAM. MEMORIES AND APPRECIATIONS. Collected and Edited by George E. Eden, D.D., formerly Bishop of Wakefield, and F. C. MacDonald, M.A., O.B.E., Hon. Canon of Durham. *Cambridge University Press*, 7*s*. 6*d*. net.

WINFRID BURROWS, 1858–1929. Bishop of Truro 1912–1919. Bishop of Chichester 1919–1929. By Mary Moore. *S.P.C.K.* 5*s*. net.

The lives of two bishops have recently been written, and they provide in some respect a contrast of two types of the episcopate. Bishop Lightfoot was one of the great scholars of the nineteenth century. His work on the early centuries of the Church is recognised as the beginning of a new era in the methods of historical study. As Bishop Headlam points out, he originated the scientific method which replaced the speculative. The picture of his life presented by some of those associated with him gives an impression of him as a devoted, earnest, loving, scholarly, simple-minded Christian for whom the dignity and prestige of the episcopal office meant little. He regarded it simply as an increased opportunity of doing God's work. He left his impress on the character of the men who had the privilege of being educated for the ministry as "Sons of the House" at Auckland Castle, and he left his impress on the thought of his age by the massive learning which resulted in his commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul and his edition of the Apostolic Fathers.

Bishop Burrows represents a later time and a different outlook. He was brought up in the Tractarian tradition, and although he gained four firsts at Oxford and was evidently qualified by his gifts for great intellectual achievements, he left no work of outstanding distinction. He did much practical work as Head of Leeds Clergy School and as Archdeacon of Birmingham before his appointment to the Bishopric of Truro in 1912. Although an advanced High Churchman, he felt compelled to take action in the Courts against one of the clergy of his diocese who persisted in spite of many admonitions in holding the service of Benediction. Bishop Burrows was one of the chief members of the Committee of Bishops who drew up the Revised Book of Common Prayer which was rejected by the House of Commons in 1927. His daughter says that although he loved the old Book he threw himself heartily into the revision because he wanted it to be better adapted for the service of God, and his comment on the rejection was, "They've turned down such nice things." The nice things would no doubt have been accepted, if they had not been associated with changes that materially altered the doctrinal balance of the old Book.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE RECEPTIONIST DOCTRINE OF THOMAS AQUINAS.

CANON QUICK'S CRITICISM.

1 AMEN COURT,
ST. PAUL'S, E.C.4.
7 Nov., 1932.

DEAR SIR,—

I have only just seen Mr. T. C. Hammond's article in the October CHURCHMAN on "The Receptionist Doctrine of Aquinas." May I say at once that in my criticism of his essay in *The Evangelical Doctrine of Holy Communion*, I had not the smallest intention of attributing to him any sinister motive in the omission of a reference to a passage quoted from Aquinas? I failed to supply the missing reference myself for the perhaps inadequate, but surely intelligible, reason that I had not time to search the works of Aquinas for the passage in question. Now that Mr. Hammond has kindly supplied both the reference and the context, I think it is quite clear that his original quotation would certainly be misleading to an unlearned reader. Such a reader, seeing it stated that "what is reality only (in the Sacrament), namely, the grace bestowed, is in the recipient," and the conclusion immediately drawn from this that "the appropriative element is all-important," would not immediately understand that "what is reality only" is contrasted, not with what is not reality, but with "what is reality-and-sacrament." Apparently what Aquinas means to denote by the *res et sacramentum* in the Eucharist is the Lord's body and blood—not something relatively unimportant.

Apart from technicalities, I find Mr. Hammond's general argument quite unconvincing. It is of course true that Aquinas always insists that a certain disposition (or "appropriative element") in the recipient is a necessary condition of his receiving the grace which is *res sacramenti*; and in that sense he affirms that the *res sacramenti* is in the recipient. But he equally affirms that the cause of the *res sacramenti* in the recipient is that which Christ or the Holy Spirit does *in and through the outward sign*. He quotes with apparent approval a saying of St. Chrysostom that "the water does not act simply as such upon the baptised, but when it receives the grace of the Holy Ghost, then it looses all sins." And he goes on to say that "the true body of Christ bears the same relation to the species of the bread and wine, as the power of the Holy Ghost does to the water of Baptism: hence the species of the bread and wine produce no effect except from the virtue of Christ's true body." This is something very different from Receptionism. (Summa III Q. 73, Art. 1, ad 2.)

It is of course perfectly true that I can receive no nutriment from the food I eat, if my digestion is in a wholly disordered condition. But it does not follow that, for the purpose of nutriment, the condition of my digestion is more important than food, which remains the *cause* of the nutriment. In the same way, according to Aquinas, faith in the recipient is a necessary condition of receiving grace for sanctification; but it is not therefore more important than what God does through the outward sacrament, this being the cause of the grace received.

When Mr. Hammond says in reference to the Eucharist that "sin

does not nullify the change of substance, according to Aquinas, but it does nullify the identification with the body of Christ which alone ministers blessing to the soul," I have no idea what he means. According to Aquinas, I suppose, either the guilt of mortal sin unrepented or the complete absence of faith would suffice to nullify the reception of grace, but not, surely, to nullify the identification of the duly consecrated elements with the body and blood of Christ. Most people will agree that Catholic orthodoxy is to be preferred as an interpretation of Aquinas, whatever they think of its relation to the truth.

Mr. Hammond's attempt to " equate in meaning " *res et sacramentum* with *res sacramenti*, in the same way as *sacramentum* is undoubtedly to be equated with *signum sacramenti* and *res tantum* with *gratia*, seems almost more unintelligible. The identification seems to me contrary, not only to the whole tenor of Aquinas's argument, but also to the rest of Mr. Hammond's interpretation of it.

I am afraid Mr. Hammond must give me up. His learned subtleties are too much for me.

I am,
Yours very truly,
OLIVER C. QUICK.

The Editor of THE CHURCHMAN.

REPLY OF THE REV. T. C. HAMMOND.

5A TOWNSEND ST.,
DUBLIN.

SIR,—

I gladly accept Canon Quick's assurance that he acquits me of sinister intention in omitting the reference to Aquinas in my article. I confess to a little surprise at the fact that he criticised my deduction without referring to the original passage. Few can claim such an intimate acquaintance with the whole of Aquinas as would justify them in disregarding this precaution.

Canon Quick charged me with ignoring " a technical distinction " and elects to discuss the ensuing problem " apart from technicalities." This seems strange.

Canon Quick offers an analogy from the eating of food. I suggest that if a physician said " The digestion is the all-important matter " even an unlearned hearer would not conclude that he was contrasting digestion with food. He would conclude that the physician meant " all-important for the purpose of receiving nutriment." The end of the sacrament for Aquinas is " to confer grace." In relation to that end the appropriative element is all-important. That is my argument. The alleged miracle of Transubstantiation does not achieve this end. Aquinas teaches quite definitely that " The Body and Blood " are in the recipient apart from grace.

Is there any theory of the sacraments, even the so-called Zwinglian, that denies that the cause of grace is " The Body and Blood " ? Why labour what is a commonplace of Christendom ? Canon Quick quotes : " The species of bread and wine produce no effect except from the virtue of Christ's true Body." He adds : " This is something very different from Receptionism." Substitute " bread and wine " for the subtler term " species of bread and wine " and the most ardent Receptionist would accept the dictum. Canon Quick seems to imagine that Receptionists make faith creative of grace. That is not so. A Receptionist

doctrine, further, is not the same thing as technical Receptionism. Canon Quick confuses identification of the soul with the Body and Blood of Christ and identification of the consecrated elements with the same Body and Blood. Once the distinction is made clear his argument disappears. The expression, by the way, is not mine but comes directly from Aquinas himself.

Canon Quick insists that "The Body and Blood" although "*res et sacramentum*," cannot be *res sacramenti*" and disputes the equation of these terms. Yet when speaking of "*res sacramenti*" which he defines as "the grace which is *res sacramenti*" he hesitates and adds "in that sense he affirms that the *res sacramenti* is in the recipient." So there is a sense in which *res sacramenti* is not in the recipient. A sense therefore in which it cannot be identified with *res tantum*. Could this be the equation? Like the nervous sleeper we wait for the second boot to drop. It does not drop. If Canon Quick had only let go that boot your readers would have been able to appraise the criticism that my equation was "almost more unintelligible." My equation at least explains how the "*res et sacramentum*" of the Eucharist, alone of all the sacraments, is in "the matter" and not in the recipient. It also explains the statement that "other sacraments are perfected in use but in this sacrament the Author of sanctity Himself is present before us." The subtleties that Canon Quick is good enough to call learned are really the peculiar property of Aquinas. Mine is the humbler rôle of interpreter. Your readers must judge of my success.

Yours very truly,
THOMAS C. HAMMOND.

The Goodly Fellowship, by Phyllis L. Garlick (The Highway Press, 2*s*. net), contains an account of great missionary efforts in different ages, and is an inspiring record of achievement. It is well to remember that although there was a great missionary awakening in the eighteenth century, there were great missionaries in earlier days by whom the Church was spread in many lands. This book is a useful reminder of these pioneers of all ages.

S.P.C.K. reprints a long essay on *Christian Mysticism* (3*s*. 6*d*. net), by Paul Elmer More. It contains a close analysis of the various forms which Mysticism and the kindred "Mystihood" has taken. He writes "in no spirit of sympathy with mysticism," so that some may find his criticism a corrective to exaggerated claims that are sometimes put forward for mystical experiences.

A Little Book on God's Acre, by Thomas Alfred Walker, LL.D. (S.P.C.K., 2*s*.), is a useful compendium of information concerning graveyards, their history, the responsibility for their care, and the laws controlling their use. The Bishop of St. Edmundsbury writes commending the book to the attention of parochial clergy, the churchwardens and the Parochial Church Councils, as the three authorities responsible for churchyards.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

WINE OFFICE COURT, FLEET STREET, E.C.4.

National Church Almanack.—We remind our readers of the announcement made in the October number of THE CHURCHMAN of the issue of the National Church Almanack for 1933 (2*d.*). Copies are still available, and we suggest it might well be used by Clergy for circulation in their Parishes at the New Year. Special terms can be arranged for quantities.

Dr. Griffith Thomas.—The demand for copies of *The Principles of Theology*, An Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles, by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. (12*s.* 6*d.*), continues. It will be remembered that the first edition was disposed of within two months of publication, and a larger edition with a more complete index was issued immediately. The returns for *The Catholic Faith*, a Manual of Instruction for Members of the Church of England (2*s.* 6*d.* and 1*s.* 6*d.*), are also exceedingly good. This book has reached its fiftieth thousand. *A Sacrament of our Redemption*, An inquiry into the meaning of the Lord's Supper in the New Testament and the Church of England (1*s.* 6*d.* and 1*s.*), which is in its second edition, is also in demand. Two reprints of two of Dr. Griffith Thomas's books have recently been issued, and we commend them to the notice of our readers. They are: *The Apostle John, his Life and Writings* (4*s.*); a volume which is intended to help those who are called upon to preach and teach, and on this account, the material is set out largely in outline form. This book also contains a very valuable bibliography of larger books, which the author says, although varying greatly in their attitude to Scripture and in their Spiritual teaching, have been consulted or otherwise used, in the preparation of his book. The second book, *Grace and Power—Some Aspects of the Spiritual Life* (2*s.* 6*d.*), is intended in its first part to call attention to some of the possibilities of Christian living, in the second to some of its provisions, and in the third to a few of its guarantees of protection.

Parochial Church Councils.—The following forms and books have been issued by the Church Book Room: *The Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure*, with complete Text, Introduction, and Notes, by Albert Mitchell (1*s.*); *The Enabling Act*, with complete Text and the Constitution of the National Assembly of the Church of England, with Notes, Introduction, and "Ladder of Lay Representation," and other Appendices, by Albert Mitchell (1*s.*). These are recommended, as are also the forms published by the League, a sample packet of which will be sent on receipt of 3*d.* The following is the list: No. 1A. *Application for Enrolment on Church Electoral Roll* (1*s.* per 100). No. 1B. Ditto, printed on card for Card Index System (1*s.* 6*d.* per 100). No. 2. *Notice of Enrolment of a Non-Resident* (10*d.* per 100). No. 3. *Notice to Cancel Entry in Another Parish* (10*d.* per 100). No. 4. *Notice of Removal to Another Parish* (10*d.* per 100). No. 5. *Notice of Revision of Church Electoral Roll* (1*d.* each; 9*d.* per dozen). No. 6. *Notice of Annual Parochial Church Meeting* (1*d.* each; 9*d.* per dozen). *No.* 7. *Notice of Joint Meeting for Electing Churchwardens* (1*d.* each; 9*d.* per dozen). No. 8. *Notice of Parochial Church Council Meeting* (for Church Door) (3*d.* per dozen). No. 9. *Notice of Parochial Church Council Meeting with Agenda* (1*s.* 6*d.* per 100). No. 10B. *Form of Parochial Voting Paper*, with space for forty names (2*s.* 6*d.* per 100). No. 11. *Electoral Roll Sheets* (2*s.* per 100). No. 12. *Nomination Forms to Diocesan Conference* (6*d.* per dozen). No. 13. *Nomination*

Forms to House of Laity (6*d.* per dozen). No. 14. *Nomination Forms to Parochial Church Council* (1*s.* per 100).

Sunday Schools.—As we understand from purchasers in the Book Room that a large number of Sunday Schools are taking the *Acts of the Apostles* as their subject for this year, we mention some publications of George Philips & Co., which are interesting and useful, namely: 1. Philips's *Handy Scripture Atlas* with index (price 1*s.* 3*d.*). This Atlas, in addition to the Bibliographical and Classical names of places, also gives their modern names. It contains 32 maps, and there are 11 pages of index. 2. *An Atlas illustrating the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles*, by the Rev. John F. Stirling (price 1*s.* 3*d.*). This Atlas contains 22 maps, and some very useful notes. It is designed to give at a glance a complete and graphic outline of Apostolic history. 3. *An Atlas of the Life of Christ*, by the Rev. John F. Stirling (price 1*s.* 3*d.*), the design of which is to give a simple, clear and connected outline of the Life of Christ. It contains 21 maps, upon which as far as possible His journeys are traced, and the different incidents of His history are marked at the places where they occur. Two Jig-Saw puzzles (price 1*s.* each), have also been issued, one illustrating the Missionary journeys and the last voyage of the Apostle Paul, and the other a Map of Palestine.

Church and State.—Mr. Robert Stokes, auther of *New Imperial Ideals* and *The Moral Issue in India*, has just published at 6*d.* a valuable booklet entitled *The Christian Church and the Christian State.* Mr. Stokes treats with the main features of the position of the Established Church in this country, and Sir Thomas Inskip contributes a foreword in which he bears his testimony to Mr. Stokes's treatment of the subject. He says: "I am very glad it has been decided to publish this most informative and wise examination of the relation of Church and State." In this study of the application of Christian ethics to the corporate conduct of the State the author criticises theories based on facile analogies between the Church of England, and argues that for England there can be no permanent half-way house between the present Establishment of the Church of England and the degradation of the Empire to the level of a secular State. All our readers who wish to understand the issues which will be raised in the controversy which must inevitably soon arise when the report of the Church Assembly Commission on the relation of Church and State is published, would do well to make a careful study of the case as presented by Mr. Stokes in his pamphlet, which has already reached a second edition.

Confirmation.—A new series of notes by the Rev. C. H. E. Freeman published in connection with his book, *The Christian Fellowship*, has just been issued, entitled *Outlines for Confirmation Candidates* (price 2*d.* or 14*s.* per 100). The Outlines are twelve in number, and there are also pages devoted to Confirmation questions, Confirmation and After, and some Methods of Work. Mr. Freeman's book (1*s.* and 1*s.* 6*d.*), has been very well received, and is commended by the Bishop of Worcester in the foreword, in which he states that it commends itself to him "because it contains *twelve* talks, and not the usual eight which are insufficient for any but exceptional boys and girls; and also because it lays stress on the outcome of Confirmation in a life of *service*, a point often forgotten in Confirmation preparation: and does not stop short of the world-wide mission of the Church which every member should be taught from the first is his concern. It is none the worse for being quite frankly written from the point of view of a loyal Evangelical Churchman."