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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

February, 1912.

The Month.

The Royal Visit to India.

THE visit of the King and Queen to India has a message for us, both as citizens of the Empire and as Christian believers. In the former capacity it brings home to us afresh the sense of the grave responsibility which the trusteeship for that great country involves. It is inhabited by many nations, of different faith, of different temperament and different speech. If the strong hand of England were removed, there is little doubt that a scene of wildest anarchy and bloodshed would ensue, in which the strong Mohammedan tribes from the North-West would probably emerge as triumphant conquerors. It is in the interest of peace and justice that England must continue to maintain her sway. And when we think of the matter as Christian men, the conviction impresses itself with renewed force, that the only thing which can act as an ultimate bond of union in all this great diversity is the Christian faith. The task of implanting it may be long and very difficult. Mohammedanism and Hinduism are firmly entrenched. It may be that the administrator for many days to come will be called on to rule the peoples of these faiths. But the missionary in the field and his supporters at home must both feel that England's truest and highest work will not be fulfilled till India is won for Jesus Christ.

Islington, 1912.

It was an inspiration to be there: to see the serried ranks of clergy, old and young, and as many young as old, which filled the great hall, produced of

itself a sense of strength, of unity, and of purpose. To hear the old truths stated and applied in positive and practical form gave a sense of security and of responsibility. There was little of controversy at this year's Islington; perhaps here and there one or another of the hearers would have put a thought a little differently, would have varied the emphasis in a particular phrase; but in the main the presentation of the two great subjects of Holiness and of Service was such that neither Evangelicalism nor the Church at large need wish to vary it or be afraid of it. The papers reached an exceptionally high standard, and each speaker was eminently successful in putting that aspect of the subject with which he was entrusted. The *Record* does excellent service each year in issuing a verbatim report of the addresses in pamphlet form, and we hope that our readers will make use of the pamphlets for themselves and for others. The pamphlet is a clarion note calling us to higher ideals and clearer duty. Evangelicalism is not decadent, it is not really divided. Islington is proof to the contrary, but it is for us to carry the spirit of Islington into every diocese and parish in the country.

Evening Communion.

Our readers will have noticed with interest that Canon Paige Cox and Rev. W. S. Hooton have discussed in our pages the question of Evening Communion. Canon Paige Cox is a moderate Churchman with a strong resentment against the Romanizing tendencies of a section of the Church; but he does not like Evening Communion. We do not intend to deal with his reasons, as they are dealt with elsewhere in this number, in which another article on the same subject also appears. But we do desire to say two things: We regret and deprecate the painful fact that Evening Communion has tended to become a dividing line and a test, with the result that a certain amount of bitterness has crept into the discussion, not, we are thankful to say, into the discussion in our pages. We must not allow it to be a badge of partisanship. Secondly, despite Canon Paige Cox's courteous

and careful article, we see no reason for departure from our own position. Christ instituted the Holy Communion in the evening. Men need it and flock to it in the evening still. These two statements form an argument which to us seems irrefragable. Evening Communion is in no need of apology. The *onus probandi* is not with us, but with others. The example of Christ is the warrant for the practice. In view of that, to restrict a means of grace to a particular hour of the day is surely uncatholic, unapostolic, unprimitive, we had almost said, were it not for the obvious sincerity of such writers as Canon Paige Cox, immoral.

The Papal Decree.

It is not our custom to discuss in these Monthly Notes questions that are at issue only in the field of party politics. Sometimes, however, it happens that the points debated by the politicians have interest for a wider circle. The recently translated Papal decree, *Motu Proprio*, is a case in point. To the politicians who are fighting to win Home Rule in Ireland, it cannot be other than a staggering blow. However profusely the explanations may be poured forth that this is nothing but a piece of internal legislation reaffirming an existing law, and only intended to prevent un-Christian litigation between members of the same Christian community, a grave suspicion has been aroused in the minds of the general public as to the fetters by which the future administration of justice in Ireland, under a Home Rule régime, may be hampered. To the detached observer the interesting question is suggested: "What is the policy of the Vatican towards Home Rule?" Is the promulgation of this decree an unfortunate accident, or is it the first step in a deeply laid and insidious scheme of opposition to the whole project? It needs a subtle mind to follow the workings of Papal diplomacy. The whole episode reveals something of the fixity of Papal policy. The shade of Becket might well exult to think that the cause for which he contended so fiercely with Henry II. is a living force in politics to-day.

Parents and the Bible.

In the months of December and January many groups of educationalists meet in annual conference. The records of their proceedings are too often regarded as being merely of interest to experts. As a matter of fact the debates are frequently concerned with questions of the deepest interest both to parents and to all who care for the training of the rising generation. For example, the Headmasters' Conference in December had an interesting discussion on Bible teaching in schools. The Headmaster of Harrow, in moving certain resolutions, spoke of it as a subject

"in which the efforts and the enthusiasm of individuals were largely hampered by congested time-tables and curricula tending to crowd Scripture out or give it an inferior position, and a subject to which, he feared, the British parent and British homes were lending a constantly decreasing support."

This is a grave indictment for the head of a great public school to bring against the general body of parents. While we are contending warmly with one another as to the precise method in which religious instruction is to be given in the elementary schools of the country, shall we not do well to set another department of the British house in order, and see to it, so far as parental influence and pressure can help, that Bible teaching be not "crowded out" of the preparatory and public schools of the land?

The Whole Bible.

In spite of this lack of parental interest, the Conference is making a strenuous attempt to secure a proper place for the study of the Bible in Preparatory Schools. On one point in the proposed methods there was a difference of opinion. This was the proposal to use a "Schools' Bible," to be issued by the Clarendon Press and consisting of certain selections from the Old and New Testaments. The principle of selection seems to be that the narrative portion of both Testaments, should, with certain excisions, be retained, but that such matter as the Prophetic writings in the Old and the Epistles in the New Testament should be excluded, as being

more suitable for a later age. Strong opinions were expressed in the debate against this "bowdlerizing" of the Bible. We sympathize warmly with these opinions, and are glad that the note recommending this treatment of the Bible was eventually dropped. There is the greatest need in these days of literary analysis and *Quellenkritik* to recall to the minds of all, both young and old, the idea of the Bible as a whole. We have heard much in late years of the "Divine Library"; it is time now to insist on the idea of a Divine Book. Nor can we think that to take the Bible as a whole, including all the passages only suited to more mature study and appreciation, has ever done appreciable harm to boy or girl. The teaching of the whole Bible, under the direction of believing and reverent instructors, is what the present rising generation needs.

An Unwise Sermon.

On the second Sunday after Epiphany a sermon was preached (we do not say where or by whom, for we want to deal with principles, not persons) on the Miracle at Cana. It was long, and the latter half was a good sermon on Christ and the family. That latter half could have stood alone, and we should have listened and been edified. But to it was prefixed a lengthy introduction, of which the main thesis was this: This incident is not to be regarded as historical fact. The proof ran somewhat thus: modern scholars agree that St. John's Gospel is a spiritual and symbolical Gospel. Therefore it is not historical. But, we venture to ask, are symbolical and historical mutually exclusive terms? Then we were told for our comfort—comfort forsooth!—that Origen and Clement of Alexandria said the same thing. What the majority of scholars, ancient and modern, do say is this: St. John, writing later than the other Evangelists, selected the incidents which he records for a spiritual purpose. It does not in the least follow that they were unhistorical. The sermon therefore tended to mislead the congregation. It tended also to shock; and shocks of this kind discredit true scholarship and criticism and can do no possible good. The spiritual lesson of the marriage at Cana gains

nothing—nay, loses much—if we discredit the historicity of the incident. We venture to assert that there is no evidence against the historicity. The details, the unnecessary details of the story, are strong corroboration of that historicity. Who, if he were writing a symbolic parable, would introduce his *dramatis personæ* thus: The mother of Jesus was there. Jesus also and His disciples were called. If it is historical, obviously we gather that the invitation came through Mary, and hence the order. If it is merely symbolical, it is extraordinarily bad art. We make our protest and remind ourselves of two phrases used at Islington: "the spirit of modernism which evaporates the historical Christ"; and again, "a non-miraculous Christianity is no Christianity at all."

Examinations.

The Consultative Committee on Examinations in Secondary Schools has recently issued a report which is of the greatest interest to parents as well as to professional teachers. One point emerges with the greatest clearness: The examination system in its present form is doomed. The variety of external examinations for which the pupils of an ordinary secondary school have to be prepared is so great and so manifold that the conditions both for teachers and pupils are rapidly becoming intolerable. "The number of these examinations," say the Commissioners, "should be reduced. Their pressure upon the early years of school life should be relieved." The report rightly suggests that examination should be accompanied, to a far greater extent than has hitherto been the case, with inspection. How far the teacher should have, not merely a share in the examining, but a determining voice in the success or failure of the pupil, is perhaps a more debatable point. It is the appearance of the report as a whole that is a most hopeful portent. Parents who have witnessed and deplored the strain to which their children have been subjected in their efforts to pass the various "locals" and "certificates" will welcome the possibility of change. Schoolmasters, distracted in the effort to prepare pupils for various external examinations, will gladly

welcome any scheme that tends to the unification and simplification of the present chaotic state of things.

"The Modern Churchman."

Our contemporary, the *Modern Churchman*, has in the December number an appreciative note on that section of Canon Denton Thompson's "Central Churchmanship" which deals with Biblical criticism. The words quoted go, we think, as far as any Liberal Churchman of reverent mind could wish. They claim the right to use for the understanding of Scripture "reliable evidence from whatever source it comes," unhindered by "theological prejudice" and "religious prepossession." To do this is one thing. It is quite another thing, in obedience to a passing phase of thought, or to principles imported from some entirely different branch of investigation, lightly to discard the views that have appeared to the Christian consciousness of many generations. It is one thing to give *due* weight to all available evidence. It is a totally different thing to give *undue* weight to the most recent thing that offers itself as evidence. In claiming the right to free inquiry, we are at one with our friends of the *Modern Churchman*. We venture to think, however, that in their brave and chivalrous defence of men and books which have gone beyond the limits which they themselves would probably lay down, they have laid themselves open to some misunderstanding, and they can hardly grumble if general public opinion tends to identify them with those on whose behalf they have spoken. Is there not room here for the Apostolic precept: "Let not then your good be evil spoken of"?

The E.C.U. and the "Spectator."

The Secretary of the English Church Union has recently issued his Annual Letter to the members of that body. Things are not going entirely as they wish. What, according to Mr. Hill, the ultra-High Churchmen lack, is leadership. To quote his own words:

"There are opportunities of knowing by intimate association with one's fellows in various branches of Church work how zeal and devotion to the

Church are growing among men. Nothing seems to damp their ardour, not even the aberrations of certain Bishops in the Northern Province. If our rulers only knew what an army they could command they would have few anxieties touching the present, or, indeed, respecting the future. There is no Government or political party in England which would dare to affront the Church in regard to her rights, her liberties, her orders, her discipline, and her ceremonial, if she were properly led."

It is a good thing that the firm stand which the Bishops of the Northern Province are making for Catholic Churchmanship is recognized as a real factor in the situation by those who take sectarian views. In speaking of the proposals for Prayer-Book revision, Mr. Hill falls foul of our excellent contemporary, the *Spectator*. His words, again, may best tell their own tale:

"One thing is becoming clearer every day, and that is that the vast majority of Church-people are sick of these proposals and will have none of them. The world will never cease in its opposition; but the distressing feature is the number of Church-people, and among them from time to time rulers in the Church, who do not seem to grasp this fact, and who appear to think that everything will go well if the *Spectator* type of layman is appeased. Laymen who spend their lives in the work of the Church are not often able to discover the *Spectator* type engaged in that ceaseless war against the world, the flesh, and the devil, in which the so-called 'ecclesiastically-minded' layman bears his daily part."

It is quite true that the *Spectator* does not approach the consideration of ecclesiastical topics from the point of view of the English Church Union. But the *Spectator* always takes a frank and bold stand for the supremacy of religion in our national life. The *Spectator* type of layman is one who is striving earnestly that the educational problem may be so solved that the influence of the Bible and of Christianity may be maintained intact. The last sentence in the passage quoted is very much beside the mark. Whatever the "*Spectator* type" may do, the *Spectator* itself has earned the undying gratitude of all Christians by the zeal and ability with which it has exposed and castigated the more unclean and demoralizing elements that have appeared of late years in modern fiction. The *Spectator* may be somewhat cool and judicious, but its existence is a great asset for Christianity and righteousness in our land.

The Relations of Liberal and Evangelical Churchmanship.[1]

By the Very Rev. the DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.

I SPEAK as one who wishes to see the Church of England representative of the Christianity of England. We owe our privileged position as the Established Church of the country to the national, comprehensive character which it was hoped, at the time of the Reformation Settlement, that we should always maintain. But more than this, our peculiar position in Christendom as a Church which claims to be Catholic and yet English can only be justified if we do actually represent English Christianity. If there is to continue to be a Church of England, established or disestablished, it must be the Church of the English people.

Well, what is the state of things now? A hundred years ago, as is proved by statistics, the Nonconformists were a very feeble folk, numerically insignificant, and socially and intellectually even more so. There has been an enormous growth of Dissent at the expense of the Church, not during the eighteenth century, upon which modern Churchmen are fond of pointing the finger of scorn as a period of lethargy and deadness in the Church, but during the "revivals" which have attracted so much attention during the nineteenth century. The defection of the Wesleyan Methodists, which a little patience and statesmanship might have averted, has not only depleted the ranks of the Church, but has to all appearance upset finally the balance of parties by withdrawing from the Church the majority of the Protestant element, so that the Church is now far more Catholic and less Protestant than the nation.

The growth of Nonconformity at our expense has now been

[1] A Paper read to the London Clergy Home Mission Union, on December 4, 1911.

checked for a time, not so much, I fear, because we are gaining as because political interests have been allowed to preponderate so much over religious in the Nonconformist bodies that disgust has at length been aroused, and many persons who take religion seriously are leaving them. But it is necessary to insist (since the contrary is so often asserted) that the last seventy years of Church life have been for the Church a period of decline. We are relatively far weaker, and our rivals far stronger, than when Queen Victoria ascended the throne and the Oxford Movement began.

And what is the state of things within the Church? The phenomenon that first meets our eyes is the apparently secure predominance of Anglo-Catholicism, and the relative weakness of both the Liberal and Evangelical parties. The victorious party has certainly passed through strange vicissitudes, and appears to be still in the course of rapid evolution. The Oxford Movement began as a rally of the Church against an attempt, headed more by rationalists than by political radicals, to attack her as an obsolete and useless institution. We owe a great debt to the Oxford Movement for repelling that assault. But Tractarianism (as I know, for I was brought up in a Tractarian home) was then closely connected with old High Church Toryism and even Jacobitism. It was learned, antiquarian, intensely haughty towards Dissent and Dissenters, quite indifferent to ritualism, and as hidebound in its theological conservatism as the old evangelicals themselves. The differences are great indeed between this school and the younger generation of Anglo-Catholics to-day — ritualistic and socialistic — willing within certain well-defined limits to accept the results of scholarship and science, and inspired by a free and lawless energy which is at least a sign of vigour and self-confidence. Those who are least in sympathy with the aims and methods of the party must at any rate admit that but for it the Church of England would cut a very poor figure in the nation at the present time. The influence and popularity of the other two parties are, in many parts of England, at a very low ebb.

There are some who predict that this ascendancy of the Anglo-Catholic party will grow until almost all traces of the Reformation are obliterated, except that no allegiance will be acknowledged to the Bishop of Rome, unless he offers honourable terms. The remnants of the Evangelicals will then, it is supposed, be merged in the Wesleyans, while the Liberals will take refuge with the Congregationalists, Unitarians, or with the Quakers, now becoming a highly intellectual sect.

I am far from sharing this view. I believe that the Anglo-Catholic movement has now about reached its height, and that it must soon begin to break up owing to certain internal contradictions which the enthusiasm of its adherents has hitherto masked or ignored. I say this in no spirit of hostility to a movement which all Churchmen must regard with admiration, even if that sentiment is tempered by misgiving. But I want to view the prospects for the future dispassionately; and this is how things appear to me.

Anglo-Catholicism has its theoretical basis in a definition of Catholicity which is absolutely peculiar to itself. All other Catholics couple with belief in Apostolical succession—the mechanical devolution of privilege—a doctrine of intention, which absolutely invalidates our Orders and our Sacraments. Our claims to be "Catholics" (using the word not as equivalent to "members of Christ's holy Catholic Church," which the Bidding Prayer defines as "the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the world," but as the antithesis of "Protestants") are, to put it brutally, denied by all other Catholics, by all Protestants, and by all who are neither Catholics nor Protestants. Now, it is easy for Protestants to be "in the right with two or three," but not for Catholics arguing about Catholicity. The repudiation of authority by those who rest their faith on authority is suicidal. It is difficult to believe that the agonizing doubt about the validity of our claim to be Catholics, which has already driven hundreds over to Rome, will not in the future press still more hardly when the Church of England is shorn of her prestige and endowments, and is

outwardly reduced to the position of one among many sects. Already, if we take the whole English-speaking world, the Episcopalians are in a very humiliating minority. An American Episcopalian, even if a High Churchman, does not dare to "unchurch" his Presbyterian or Methodist neighbours—the thing is too absurd. And yet, if these bodies are Churches like his own, what becomes of his definition of Catholicity?

There is another fact which militates against the Anglo-Catholic theory in its present form. In each generation the divergence between the avowed principles of every denomination and the real opinions held by its members necessarily increases. At the time of the Reformation a man was a Catholic or a Protestant because he was naturally attracted by Catholicism or Protestantism. He chose his party, or Church, or sect because he agreed with it *ex animo*. But now, when conversions are few, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred a man remains in the denomination in which he was born and bred. Religious opinions, however, are not inherited. Consequently, in every large religious body we find people who ought to be Catholics and who ought to be Protestants; we find High, Low, and Broad Churchmen everywhere. A man is no more a real Catholic because his family have brought him up as an Episcopalian than a duckling which has been hatched by a hen is a chicken. Conversely, there are men with Catholic sympathies among the Presbyterians. The late Dr. Marshall Lang is an example. There are limits beyond which it is impossible to believe in the validity of external classifications. When the labels become obviously grotesque, one ceases to trust them. There is no longer any *raison d'être* for most of our schisms, or rather, the real lines of cleavage run across and across all the denominational partitions. This is so obvious that people cannot shut their eyes to it much longer. And the most important thing of all—the fruit of the Spirit—is quite clearly interdenominational. In Christ there is neither Jew nor Samaritan — in modern language, neither Churchman nor Dissenter—if we judge the tree by its fruits.

If I am right in thinking that the party at present dominant must soon find itself in some perplexity in consequence of the manifest breakdown of its fundamental hypothesis, it is most important that the Evangelicals and Liberals should prepare to step into the breach, to take their proper share once more in the defence of the citadel, and claim their due place in the counsels of the Church. It is useless to pretend that they have this position at present; it is the Catholic party which is bearing the brunt of the battle, and which directs the tactics of the campaign. What is the cause of the comparative weakness and failure of these two parties?

Let me deal first with my own friends the Liberals. The Liberal Churchman at his best is a devout Christian of a mystical turn, whose moral and spiritual convictions are so strong that he cannot see the use of the ramshackle scaffolding and clumsy buttresses which most people have to erect round their faith. At his worst, he is a cultivated gentleman who happens to have taken up the history and philosophy of religion as a hobby, or a clergyman who has mistaken his vocation. In either case, if he is a controversialist against traditionalism, he takes the historical part of religion as if it were a mere narrative of events, and discusses coolly whether those events took place or not. The simple, orthodox Churchman, who does not in the least understand the grounds of his own belief, is generally eager to meet the Liberal on his own ground, and brings down the ark of God into the camp, where it is invariably captured by the Philistines.

Now, if there is one truth which the philosophy of the last twenty years may claim to have established, it is that every fact which is more than a mere phenomenon becomes false when you tear it out of its context. A fact is an idea—a thought of God—which works itself out in time. Its reality, its truth, is the meaning and purpose which become apparent when it has done its work. There may be mere phenomena which are complete in themselves. If so, they are negligible quantities—they are over and done with, and it does not matter to us whether they

ever happened or not. Such a phenomenon would be the transit of a comet across the sky, the course of which is carrying it for ever away from the earth's orbit. But a religious *fact* is a chapter in religious history; its meaning and reality are bound up with the meaning and reality of the religion. Its whole context is *religious*, and if we take it out of the religious sphere, and investigate it as a mere occurrence in history, we are ripping it out of its context, and the thing which we have in our hands for dissection is not the religious fact which we want to investigate. The dogmas of the Church's Creeds (to come to close grips with the burning question) are not believed in by Christians as brute facts, but as something rather different. This is a matter which touches Conservative and Liberal alike, and it is a most difficult and delicate problem; but let me ask you to put what I have just said to a personal test. Suppose that you were offered a ride on H. G. Wells's "Time-Machine," would you at once go and prove by ocular demonstration the two dogmas which are now so much controverted? Would you go to Bethlehem and witness the accouchement of the Virgin Mary, and satisfy yourselves that her physical condition was not that of other married women? Then, would you go to Joseph's garden very early in the morning, and watch the angels rolling away the heavy stone, helping the risen Lord out of His grave-clothes, folding up the grave-clothes and laying them in a corner, handing Him the new clothes which they had brought with them (for we cannot suppose that He appeared to Mary Magdalene without them), and then watch Him issuing from the vault? Having seen all this, would you say, "Thank God, my faith is now established on an absolutely sure basis: Christ was certainly God?" Or would you feel that somehow those precious doctrines had lost some of their value for you by being reduced to *banal* brute fact? If you will face this question fairly, I think it will take you to the heart of the problem about miracles, though not, alas! to the solution of it. Both sides are wrong in the controversy. Mr. Thompson is wrong if he plucks out of the Christian scheme a doctrine which

is part of the texture of it; his orthodox judges are wrong in insisting, on pain of excommunication, that these two dogmas are phenomena just like other phenomena. And, lastly, the Modernists are wrong in saying that though the historical Jesus was the son of Joseph, and though His body rotted in the ditch into which it was probably thrown, yet still the contrary assertions are true for faith, so that we may recite the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds with enthusiasm.

That is the open sore, the unsolved, and as yet insoluble, problem, which at present reduces Liberal Christianity to a perplexed and troubled silence. I have no answer to give. All I have to say is that this problem of the relation of faith to fact—this apparently necessary existence of a symbolic or sacramental element in belief, mediating somehow between the world of science and the world of faith, is far too complex to be solved by purely critical methods. The old expedient of simply cutting out all the supernatural part, and dressing up Christ in modern clothes as the pattern of all the civic virtues, will not serve. It is absurd to talk (as some who should know better have lately done) of the failure of Liberal Christianity. Liberal theology has done a great work—work of great permanent value—but it has not solved the central problem of religion.

Now for the Evangelicals. I have already said that this party has been the chief sufferer by the defection of the Wesleyans, who ought to be in the Church, the backbone of Evangelical Churchmanship. In a recent number of the *Modern Churchman* (an excellent little Quarterly which I commend to your support) an Evangelical clergyman complains of the patronizing tone which, he says, Liberals take in speaking of Evangelicals. I should be sorry to think that I had ever fallen into this fault; I have the highest respect for Evangelicalism; but surely the party must feel that it has fallen on rather evil days, and especially that it somehow fails to attract any large number of intelligent young men. Again and again at Oxford and Cambridge, the sons of Evangelical clergymen

are captured by the other side, and become aggressive Ritualists. And when a Prime Minister is reminded that it is high time for an Evangelical to be made a Bishop, he says "Very true; but where are your promotable Evangelicals?" Therefore it is not impertinent to inquire into the causes why a party with such noble traditions now seems to count for so little in the life of the Church.

To the outsider who, though in thorough sympathy with what (as he believes) Evangelical Churchmanship stands for, has not been brought up in those traditions, there seem to be two causes of weakness: (1) the adherence to verbal inspiration, or at any rate to a theory of inspiration which is incompatible with the results and methods of critical scholarship, even where those results seem assured; (2) the use of a peculiar phraseology which is simply unintelligible except to those who have been educated in the Evangelical tradition. These two legacies from the past seem to put the Evangelical at a disadvantage in dealing both with the educated portion of the younger generation and with the masses who have no religious traditions at all. The younger generation simply won't swallow Jonah, with or without his whale, and when they hear sermons about resting on the finished work of the Saviour, and being washed in the blood of the Lamb, they recognize the note of personal conviction, and wish to understand what the preacher means, but the words convey little or no meaning to them.

Well, I want to suggest that these two depressed and unsuccessful parties, the Liberals and Evangelicals, may profitably consider whether they have not certain things to learn from each other, and whether they may not gain new strength by falling back on their own first principles, in which they have much in common.

That they have much in common *negatively* goes without saying. The Liberals and Evangelicals both believe that what is called sacerdotalism is as near to being purely false as any theory held by good and intelligent men can be. That God should have delegated His Divine prerogative of forgiveness to

fallible human beings, that He should have placed His gifts of grace on a tariff, that He should have sanctioned privileged monopolies, to be exercised by certain persons and institutions—all this is to us incredible, for the simple reason that we cannot believe in a God who would be morally inferior to ourselves. We could not worship such a Being if we believed in Him, and we see no reason whatever to believe that such a Being exists.

But I should be very sorry to suggest that the principal bond between Liberals and Evangelicals is constituted by their common antipathy to certain other views. It seems to me that they have a much closer bond of sympathy, in that both, when they understand themselves, are based on trust in *personal experience*, and on the conviction that the essentials of religion are *moral and spiritual*, not political (in a wide sense), nor æsthetic. By trust in personal experience, I mean the conviction that what is variously called the God-consciousness, the inner light, the mystical sense, or (may we not say in one word) private *prayer*, is the foundation of religious faith. This is what the Evangelical means when he speaks of immediate access to God; this is what the Liberal means when he says that in the study of religious psychology we find the best apologetics for religious belief, and in religious experience its best proof. I think the time has come when we may relegate into the background vexed questions about inspiration—important and interesting as they are—and concentrate our attention on the growth and increase of the spiritual life, and the causes of its decay. The study of human character is the most fascinating of all studies. It is now by degrees being brought under scientific treatment. Books on religious psychology are pouring from the press—perhaps more in America than in England. Take such books as James's "Varieties of Religious Experience"; Stanley Hall's "Adolescence"; and the whole literature of mysticism, so rich in revelations of the human heart. Cannot those of us who are engaged in parochial work combine in a most interesting and useful way theoretical knowledge and practical experience of human character? May not we hope

that if we are properly equipped with such knowledge, and inspired with the sympathy and keenness of true physicians of the soul, we may induce large numbers of our people to come to us as consulting physicians, instead of resorting to the confessional, with its element of what seems to us unwarrantable assumption? I am sure that we shall remain at a disadvantage until we can get people to open their griefs to us as to experts in soul-healing.

Of course, the scientific study of human character, the interaction of mind and body, the special problems of childhood, youth, maturity and senescence, the influence of heredity and environment—all such topics, closely connected as they are with pastoral work, are not always conducted in a religious spirit, or with religious presuppositions. But for us they would be based on our fundamental belief that man was made for God, and that his true happiness and perfection consist in the attainment of an independent spiritual life. All leads up to that—the new birth into a higher, self-contained life, in contact with the realities of which the contents of the world are but shadows. I feel sure that the cause of all the unrest and evil passions which threaten to break up our civilization is that the vast majority of our population have lost all sense of the eternal background before which the things of time come and change and pass. We shall do no good by accepting their view of life and showing sympathy with their materialistic ideas. We must lift them up to the Christian point of view by showing them that *we* ourselves can live and breathe and work in that spiritual atmosphere which to them is so unreal. It is for us to hold fast to the moral and spiritual truth of Christianity, and to present that as our message. We shall find texts enough in St. Paul and St. John, and illustrations enough in that "Bible of the race" which is being compiled century by century in the writings of saints, prophets, poets, and philosophers. In that pure air, party differences simply cease to exist—Catholic, Protestant, and Liberal are one man in Christ Jesus.

What is wanted in our generation, I am convinced, is to go

back to spiritual religion in its simplest and purest form, and work outwards from that. It is not a forward movement that we want, but an inward movement. It is an age for laying good foundations, on which some master-builder of the future may build something worthy to be the temple of God. The old parties can get no further without much reconstruction. We can see how and why they fail. We don't want any more "revivals." We have had enough attempts to galvanize the dead past into life. By far the greater part of the history of the Church—that part, too, which will reveal the meaning and determine the character of the whole organic life of the Church—is in the unknown future, which our efforts may help to shape. We (I mean the Liberals and Evangelicals) do not wish to be fettered by old traditions. We had rather be ancestors ourselves, as Napoleon said. It is in the future, and the far future, that we look for the realization of our hopes for the Church and the world. God is in no hurry, having all future time to work in. Moral and spiritual purposes develop themselves far more slowly than secular and political ones. If we are on the right lines, we need not be troubled at being apparently in a back-water just now. Only if our enemies are rude enough to suggest that the Evangelical party is depressed by its want of education, and the Liberal party by its want of piety, let us lay these criticisms to heart, and try to make them even more unjust than they are. I believe that we shall soon see brighter times, especially for the Evangelical party. For the younger men are full of zeal, and many of them see clearly on what lines "the new Evangelicalism" must work.

Some Considerations on the Rev. J. M. Thompson's Book, "Miracles in the New Testament."

(Concluded.)

By the Rev. J. A. HARRISS, M.A.,
Vicar of St Andrew's, Oxford.

LET us turn now to the second and third sections of this chapter, which deal with the evidence furnished by St. Paul's letters on the supernatural powers exercised in the early Church and by the Apostle himself.

It is a little difficult to follow Mr. Thompson's treatment here. I am anxious not to misunderstand or to misrepresent his meaning, but the difficulty is to get at his exact meaning. A certain assumption meets us here again and again: it is that whatever words St. Paul may use of these wonderful events, they are to be understood in every instance as referring exclusively to works of healing or exorcism. No matter how full and comprehensive the phrase may be, and no matter how the words themselves may differ by which the Apostle endeavours to express his conviction of God's presence and power in the Church, yet the solution is always ready at hand and always the same. The words only mean faith-healing in some form, and that is an example of natural law and not of miracle. Mr. Thompson seems at times to admit that such events were due to the workings of God's Spirit, and that St. Paul himself was convinced that they were so. I suppose he might say that they were Divine acts, and yet, at the same time, were due to natural causes. If he mean that God was manifesting Himself in a special and unique manner, and yet was doing so by natural agencies that seemed then and now to be abnormal because not in accordance with ordinary experience, but none the less really according to law, then many would be disposed to agree with his explanation as being possible, if not certain. But if he mean by using the expression

"natural law" to exclude the Divine action, and to say that the Apostle was mistaken in attributing the events to God, then he can hardly wonder if Christian opinion condemns him. Certainly his language is ambiguous, and the general impression conveyed by his treatment of the subject is to the effect that he wishes to reduce the phenomena as a whole to the level of ordinary occurrences.

But, however that may be, the method by which he arrives at his conclusions in these two sections is open to criticism.

The interest turns mainly upon the meaning of the words in 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29, "workings of miracles" (*ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων*), and "miracles" (*δυνάμεις*), following on the phrase "gifts of healings" (*χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων*), by which St. Paul describes two of the forms among the many diversities of the Spirit's workings in the Church. The sense of the latter phrase is obvious. In order to ascertain the exact meaning of the other, "workings of miracles," Mr. Thompson suggests a study of the use of the word *δυνάμεις* in the New Testament, and directs attention especially to its use in Acts xix. 11. The conclusion at which he arrives is that "where *δυνάμεις* is explicitly shown," it means the healing of disease or the exorcism of evil spirits; and it is, he argues, therefore natural to suppose that St. Paul only means different degrees of the same kind when he calls them by different names; and so, as the final result—unless faith-cures are miracles, a possibility that has been already excluded—St. Paul never claims miraculous powers for the Church. Similarly, after discussing the passages (2 Cor. xii. 12, Rom. xv. 18, 19, etc.) that bear upon the Apostle's claim to supernatural powers, the conclusion is reached that the language only covers faith-healing and exorcism, which are instances of natural law, not miracles; and upon all this the hypothesis is reared that the nearer we get to first-hand witness, the weaker becomes the evidence for miracles.

If the leading commentaries be consulted as to the precise meaning of the two phrases in 1 Cor. xii. 9, 10, and the exact difference implied by them, it will be at once seen how great

a variety of opinions exists among scholars upon the matter. But it will also be found that there is a substantial agreement among them that the two clauses do mean different things; and naturally so, if the general sense of the whole passage be taken into account. For St. Paul is there enumerating the gifts exercised by the members of the Church, and he is emphasizing especially two things—the real unity lying behind all these various gifts, because they all flow from the one Holy Spirit, and their no less real difference as seen in the varied character of the gifts and of the men who exercise them. If that is so, the presumption surely is that when the Apostle says "to another gifts of healing," "to another workings of miracles," he has in his mind a real difference of kind between the two things, and not "different degrees of the same kind."

But let us examine afresh the New Testament use of *δυνάμεις* in relation to supernatural powers. We find that in three instances (Heb. ii. 4; 2 Cor. xii. 12; Acts ii. 22) it occurs in conjunction with the words *σημεῖα* and *τέρατα*. In each case the three terms are intended to express, in one comprehensive phrase, the whole range of supernatural manifestations. In the first, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of God bearing witness with the first generation of Christian preachers to our Lord's message by signs and wonders and by manifold powers. In the second, St. Paul tells the Corinthians that his Apostleship was proved to them by signs and wonders and mighty works. In the third, St. Peter, addressing the men of Israel, says that Jesus of Nazareth was approved by God unto them by mighty works and wonders and signs. Clearly in these three instances *δυνάμεις* are not defined or described as being any one particular form of miracle. The term, together with the other two, points to a broad and general conception of the miraculous.

In one case (Acts viii. 13) *δυνάμεις* occurs with *σημεῖα* only, without *τέρατα*; and again, as in the above instances, the phrase is quite general. It points to the supernatural accompaniments

of Philip's work in Samaria. There is nothing in the passage to show what is explicitly meant by the word.

In other instances of its use—1 Cor. xii. 10, 28; Gal. iii. 5; Acts xix. 11; St. Matt. vii. 22, xi. 20 (=St. Luke x. 13), xiii. 54, 58 (=St. Mark vi. 2, 5), xiv. 2 (=St. Mark vi. 14); and St. Luke xix. 37 —the word δυνάμεις occurs alone. In regard to five of these eight examples it will be found to stand for exactly what the combination of the two or three terms in the former instances expressed—viz., supernatural works generally, without specifying their nature. In the remaining three (Acts xix. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28; St. Matt. vii. 22) the context certainly suggests something as to what the word may possibly refer. But it only suggests: it does not define specifically what. In Acts xix. 11 the word is used of specially remarkable works wrought by God through St. Paul's agency at Ephesus, and the narrative goes on to say that, as a result, sick men were healed and evil spirits cast out. It may fairly be argued that δυνάμεις here points to and includes these two forms of supernatural energy—healing and exorcism. In St. Matt. vii. 22 our Lord speaks of certain people coming to Him "in that day," and saying that they have prophesied by His Name, and by His Name cast out devils, and by His Name done many mighty works—δυνάμεις. What meaning is to be attached to the word here? All that we can with certainty say is that it appears to express something other than prophesying and casting out devils. In 1 Cor. xii. 10 the meaning of δυνάμεις is, as we have seen, in itself vague and uncertain, and the context enables us to say nothing more than that it must mean something different from "gifts of healing."

That is practically all the available evidence. We have taken the twelve instances of the use of the word in the New Testament, and we have found that in nine of them δυνάμεις is used in a broad, undefined sense of miracles in general. In one of them (Acts xix. 11) it may mean works of healing and exorcism. In one of them (St. Matt. vii. 22) the sense is uncertain as to what the δυνάμεις are, and the context only helps us to form the negative conclusion that it does not appear to mean

exorcism. And then, when we come to the one remaining instance of the use of δυνάμεις (1 Cor. xii. 10), where the precise meaning is just as doubtful in reality as in practically all the others, Mr. Thompson tells us that if we consider the use of the word in the New Testament we shall come to the conclusion that where δυνάμεις is explicitly shown it means the healing of disease or exorcism, although it is altogether doubtful whether it is so explicitly shown; and even if we make an exception in the case of Acts xix. 11, which, he says, is significant in its bearing upon the interpretation of 1 Cor. xii. 10, it is the one and only example of the supposed explicit demonstration, and it gives a meaning which is, after all, a wider one than the word in this passage from the Corinthian letter is able to bear. It is by such methods that he finds what he wants to find in St. Paul's words, and then proceeds straightway, on the strength of that quite unwarranted inference, to dismiss the whole strange and perplexing phenomena of the supernatural in the life of the early Church and in St. Paul's own experience as non-miraculous. As a further illustration of method we may consider briefly one special point in Mr. Thompson's treatment of Q.

Q is the symbol "which has established itself," to quote Sir John Hawkins' words, "as a convenient designation of the second documentary source (our Gospel of St. Mark being substantially the first) which Mt. and Lk. are now generally thought to have had before them, and from which they both drew materials for their respective compilations" ("Studies in the Synoptic Problem," p. 97). It consists mainly of the sayings of our Lord, in contrast to the Gospel of St. Mark, in which events are specially emphasized; but it is supposed to comprise also some connecting incidents to serve as a setting for the sayings. Among those incidents are the narratives of two of our Lord's miracles, the healing of the centurion's servant and the casting out of the dumb demoniac, and also the narrative of the Temptation.

In discussing the two miracles, Mr. Thompson dismisses the first as being probably a mere coincidence, and the second as

one only of a large class of exorcisms, and therefore not, in his view, a miracle at all.

The Temptation he treats simply as a vision, and therefore not miraculous. It is this last point that calls for a word of comment. Our Lord's Temptation may, perhaps, have assumed the form of a series of visions, but even so, that does not touch its real significance. Whatever its form, it must be regarded as corresponding to and recording a true experience through which our Lord passed, and from its very nature it is difficult to conceive that it could have come originally from any other source than our Lord Himself. A vision in itself may not be miraculous, but if in an account of a vision the chief actor concerned is shown to possess miraculous powers, then we have to consider, not whether the vision itself may or may not be a miracle, but whether the claim of the person to work miracles is justified or not. That is the point which Mr. Thompson omits to discuss. And clearly the Temptation of our Lord turns upon that. The problem presented by the narrative is whether our Lord will or will not use a certain unique power, which He is assumed to possess—*e.g.*, of turning stones into bread—on His own behalf. The claim here suggested is not, be it noticed, a claim to do acts of healing or to exorcise spirits, which, on Mr. Thompson's assumption, are not really miracles, but rather to work a marvel of a kind that would definitely come under the category of Nature-miracles—the class, *i.e.*, which distinctly involves a breach of the ordinary laws of Nature, and is, in the true sense of the word, miraculous. Now, this narrative of the Temptation forms part of Q, and we have, therefore, in this the earliest, or one of the earliest possible sources of the Gospel, a fragment of evidence for our Lord's claim to miraculous powers of peculiar and special importance. For it not only presupposes that the Evangelists believed our Lord to be capable of working miracles, and that the narrative, to quote Sir John Hawkins' words, "would be unmeaning to those who did not regard Jesus as possessing miraculous powers" ("Studies in the Synoptic Problem," p. 129), but it carries us to a stage farther back. It

presupposes that the disciples believed this because our Lord had taught them to believe it of Him, and that He also claimed that power for Himself. And yet, in spite of the manifest importance of the evidence here, Mr. Thompson dismisses it with the slight notice that it "cannot be regarded as miraculous," and arrives at the conclusion that Q "contains no evidence for miracles."

The truth is that the miraculous element is so integral a part of the original conception of our Lord's Person, and so closely interwoven into the whole texture of the Gospel sources, that it is an impossible task to construct a consistent picture of His life and ministry if that element be eliminated; and it is not unjust to Mr. Thompson's book to say that one can only eliminate that element by either neglecting or doing violence to the evidence. It is the presence in his mind of a marked adverse preconception that has led him to do less than justice to himself, to his own abilities, and to his subject. Further examples of his method might be given from other parts of his book with like results. Again and again it will be observed that where the evidence fairly weighed leaves the matter open so that no one absolute and certain decision either for or against is justified, there the preconception is seen at work, disturbing the state of poise and casting its deciding vote, so to speak, in favour of the negative conclusion. It is this radical fault that spoils the book all through, and makes it an untrustworthy guide. It presents a great array of facts and figures. It marshals and analyzes them with an impressive show of critical skill and method. It appears to the unsuspecting reader to be conducting the inquiry with all the knowledge and care of a trained, discriminating mind. It claims to base its conclusions upon a fair, unprejudiced review of all the available evidence; but all the while, behind this impressive array, there is nevertheless that subtle bias already anticipating and influencing the conclusions in one particular direction. The book is the work rather of an advocate than of a judge.

Doubtless, in due course, it will be estimated by competent

students at its right and proper value, and we can safely leave it to them to judge how far it has made any permanent contribution to our store of knowledge; but in the meantime it cannot but be regretted that by its hasty judgments the book should needlessly prejudice the cause of New Testament criticism in the eyes of many devout but uncritical Church-people. A comparison naturally suggests itself between Mr. Thompson's work and the recently published volume of essays, "Studies in the Synoptic Problem," both in regard to the method and temper of mind in which each has been written, and in regard to the results arrived at by each. No one will venture to say that the latter is one whit less exact in its application of the critical spirit or less fearless in its readiness to abide by the results than the former. But the results of the one are largely negative and destructive, while those of the "Studies" tend to strengthen conviction in the reality of the great historic facts that underlie the Gospels. It would be difficult to say of Mr. Thompson's book what was said in a recent review of the other: "If all New Testament studies were prosecuted with the same cautious methods, the same fearless and open-minded, yet reverent, spirit, as those in this volume, Christianity would have nothing to fear and everything to gain from the advance of criticism."

The Continental Reformation.

By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

V.—The Reformation in Germany: Luther.

IF Erasmus is the great representative figure of the Renaissance, unquestionably the hero of the Reformation is Luther. Although it is quite true to say that the great reforming convulsion would have taken place if Luther had never lived, yet it is also true to say that it is impossible to understand the Reformation as it actually took place without understanding the life and character of Luther. The man and the work are so indissolubly united that we cannot have right judgments about either without considering the other.

This is not the case with all men who have attempted great things and achieved great results. We can sometimes judge, and judge rightly, of the work without knowing anything of the man who produced it, as in the case of many of the great poems and great pictures. And we can sometimes judge quite rightly about the man without taking into account his greatest achievements, as in the case of many of the great discoverers and inventors. Even with regard to those who took a leading part in the crisis of the Reformation, we can think of them as living at a different period, in quite different surroundings, and yet our estimate of them and of their influence on society would not be very different from what it is now. We can easily think of the gentle, peace-loving Melanchthon living as the friend and helper of Basil or Anselm, of George Herbert or Fénelon, aiding them, in their troubled times, to live in piety and usefulness, as scholars and divines, in all sobriety and honesty. With any of these he would have been much the same man, and would have produced much the same kind of work, as he was and did in his position as the friend and helper of Luther. We feel that we should think of him then, as we think of him now, working earnestly for the well-being and peace of Christendom, sometimes willing

to make too great sacrifices for peace, but always yearning to be freed from "the wrath of the theologians."

Again, we can imagine Leo X. as living a century earlier or a century later, and being very much what he was in the sixteenth century: evading difficulties with his placable smile, as if nothing in this world were worth worrying about, so long as life (by any means whatever) could be made artistically enjoyable, and the Papacy be maintained without serious diminution of power. His "intellectual sensuality" would have been the same in any age, and Sarpi's sarcastic (is it sarcastic?) estimate of him would in any environment hold good. He was a Pope "absolutely complete, if with these sympathies he had joined some knowledge in things that concern religion, and some more propension unto piety, of both of which he seemed careless." Moreover, we can understand the sixteenth century without Leo X.

But we cannot do the same with Luther. Place Luther in any other age, and he is Luther no longer. Think of the sixteenth century without Luther, and the history of it becomes confusion. The man and his work come before us, not as more or less harmonious elements, but as a unity, and we cannot analyze either without constant reference to the other. And if this is true of the Reformation movement as a whole, it is specially true of the Reformation in Germany. Here Luther is the one great man of his age, and there is no second.

But let us remind ourselves what we mean by this. We have agreed to regard the Reformation as a *religious* movement, although it was several other things—some of them of the highest importance—as well. It is only with this limitation that Luther is the one great man. He is great only in the sphere of religion. He was no great scholar; he never learnt Hebrew, he never quite mastered Greek, and he was himself aware that his Latin was somewhat rough. It is impossible in this respect to place him on a level with Erasmus, or Reuchlin, or his own disciple and younger colleague, Melanchthon. Luther often admitted that he was not equal to Melanchthon in learning—

"If the Lord will, Philip will beat many Martins"—but in influence Luther was immeasurably superior.

Although the University of Erfurt, at which Luther took his degree in 1502, had been one of the earliest to welcome the New Learning, and although, when he entered the convent of the Augustinian Hermits, he took Plautus and Virgil with him, Luther was no Humanist. During his University career he avoided the Humanist lectures, and in the monastery he had very different subjects to occupy his thoughts. He had no sympathy with the culture and art of his age; and during his stay in Rome in 1511, it was not its buildings or its artistic treasures which greatly impressed him. He used often to speak of his humble birth; he said that he was a peasant and the son of peasants. Such origin, followed by the education of a monk, was not likely to result in any great enthusiasm for the Renaissance—at any rate on its non-religious side.

But in the history of the religious life of the Continent in the first half of the sixteenth century Luther has the first place. And he never sank to the second place. The closing years of his life were comparatively tranquil, there being no great controversy for which a leader was required. But Luther never became a subordinate in the movement which he had himself started. He was influenced by others, and he was influenced still more by the results of his own actions; and in the end these results carried him much farther than he had originally intended to go. But so long as a controlling mind was needed, he retained the control; and, in spite of his own doctrine, he retained his freewill. He never became a mere swimmer, carried along by the flood which he himself let loose.

And we must remember that, in considering the religious movement of which Luther was the leader and the life, we have decided to adopt the religious point of view. In the marvellous success which he won we recognize results which are not adequately explained either by his force and ability or by his opportunities. They are results "which historians, the least prone to credulity, ascribe to Divine Providence. Though none

of the Reformers possessed, or professed to possess, supernatural gifts, yet that wonderful preparation of circumstances which disposed the minds of men for receiving their doctrines, that singular combination of causes which enabled men destitute of power and policy to triumph over those who employed against them extraordinary efforts of both, may be considered as no slight proof that the same Hand which planted the Christian religion protected the reformed faith, and reared it to an amazing degree of vigour and maturity."[1]

Probably there is no class of writers that deals more habitually in misrepresentation than religious controversialists; and among religious controversialists there is perhaps no one more easy to misrepresent, or more frequently misrepresented by his opponents, than Luther.[2] He was a man of intense convictions, and his convictions were always in a state of development. He went on from strength to strength; but his way of stating one strong position was not always in harmony with his way of stating the other strong positions which had preceded it. His heart burned within him, and he could not keep silence, and when he did speak with tongue or pen he did not stop to weigh his words. What he had got to say in attacking what he believed to be false and mischievous, or in teaching what he believed to be Scriptural truth, was blurted out, sometimes in exaggerated or paradoxical statements, from which an adroit opponent can easily extract absurdities and contradictions. And yet there are cases in which a teacher may find paradoxes and inconsistencies to be useful and even necessary. Some of us have heard Ruskin declare that in lecturing on Art he was never satisfied until he had contradicted himself several times; there were so many sides to be considered. In this respect, Luther is as simple, both in mind and method, as the writers of Scripture; and it is not difficult to find inconsistencies in some of them. In both cases we may quote the very words used, and draw a perfectly logical conclusion from them; and yet the conclusion is not what

[1] Robertson, "Life of Charles V.," ii., pp. 104 *et seq.*
[2] J. B. Mozley, "Essays," i., pp. 321 *et seq.*, 375 *et seq.*

the writer taught, and perhaps our interpretation of the words is not what he meant. No doubt Luther was incautious and vehement, and sometimes flung about strong words very wildly: but an enthusiast is not to be judged by his extreme utterances, any more than the character of a nation is to be inferred from the frenzy of its mobs.

Romanists and others who abominate the substance of Luther's teaching sometimes dwell upon the violence and coarseness of his language, and it is easy to cite examples. It was a violent and coarse age, and in this matter Luther is not so great a transgressor, according to our standards, as some of his contemporaries. Moreover, he was not the first to use such weapons. As Erasmus points out in a letter to the Elector of Mainz (November 1, 1519), "Luther has ventured to raise doubts about indulgences, but other people had previously made shameless assertions about them; he has ventured to speak rather strongly about the power of the Pope, but those others had written a great deal too strongly in support of it;" and so forth. His enemies flung fierce words at him, and he flung fierce words back. He could not, he said, go softly, as Melanchthon did. "That I am vehement is not to be wondered at. If you were in my place, you too would be vehement." He was dealing with evils which did not admit of either gentle remedies or compromise—*Mein handel ist nicht ein Mittel handel*—and concessions only encouraged the enemy. Christ and His Apostles had used strong language in dealing with similar evils, and their condemnations are remembered. If one wants to make an impression one must call things by their right names. As Heine said, "The polish of Erasmus, the benignity of Melanchthon, would never have brought us so far as the divine brutality of Brother Martin." There is no reason to believe that the men of his own generation were often shocked by either his vehemence or his scurrility. Some of the Humanists became disgusted, but most people liked invective, and they felt that in this case it had been provoked and was often just. Twenty or more years after he had written it, Luther says of one of his fiercest attacks: "I

have read my book over again, and I wonder how it was that I was so moderate."[1]

The greatness of Luther is more clearly seen when one compares him with other leaders in the same field on one side or the other. We must defer till another paper any comparison between him and Zwingli, or between him and Calvin. Let us look at him once more side by side with Erasmus. Both of them had begun their career with an experience of monastic life, but in very different ways. Erasmus had tried the life because he could not help himself. Those who had charge of him had made him enter a monastery, and he escaped from it as soon as he could conveniently do so. Luther had adopted the monastic life of his own freewill, very deliberately, and against the wishes of his father, who for years could not get over this act of his very promising son.[2] He adopted it in a spirit of earnest self-consecration, believing that it was for him the best means, if not the only means, of saving his soul. And no one reading his account of his experiences in the convent can doubt that he gave the system a full trial. If anyone could have been saved by such a system, he would have been, he says. The other friars thought him a saint, on account of his rigorous asceticism in fastings, watchings, and frequent devotions, both public and private. That he submitted to the strictest rules is less than the truth : he welcomed and augmented any strictness that his Superiors suggested to him ; indeed, his scrupulosity was more exacting than their rigour. And he found it all utterly unsatisfying : he could not by any such methods quiet his conscience and attain peace of mind. This is how he writes about it to George Spanheim, another Augustinian, April 7, 1516, about eighteen months before he nailed up his ninety-five Theses at Wittenberg : " The temptation to rest in one's own works is very strong, especially with those who wish to be good and pious. They are ignorant of God's righteousness, which has been so richly bestowed on us in Christ without money and

[1] McGiffert, " Martin Luther, the Man and his Work," p. 154.

[2] See Luther's letter to his father, November 21, 1521. Stories about his having been frightened into taking this step, or having taken it impulsively in a fit of strong emotion, are not very credible.

price, and they try to do good of themselves, till they fancy that they can appear before God adorned with every grace; but they never get thus far. You yourself, when you were with us in Erfurt, suffered from this illusion, or rather delusion; and I also was a martyr to it, and even yet have not overcome it. Therefore, dear brother, learn Christ and Him crucified."[1]

There is no such training for the work of a strenuous reformer in the monastic experiences of Erasmus. His guardians forced him to "renounce the world," and he also entered an Augustinian house. A schoolfellow who was in it described it as an angelic home, with plenty of books and plenty of time for reading them. Erasmus comforted himself that it would be two years before he need take life vows, and he might escape in the meantime. But he failed, and the vows were taken. The home was anything but angelic. The books were there, but the study of them was discouraged. Erasmus says that he might get drunk openly, without fear of consequences, but he had to read at night in secret. He hints at grievous vices among the friars, and at his yielding to them himself. But instead of the terrible penances by which Luther attempted to conquer temptations and atone for transgressions, Erasmus took refuge in study. He excuses himself with the remark that "if there had been over him a Superior of a truly Christian character, and not one full of Jewish superstition, he might have been brought to yield excellent fruit." The amusing story of his robbing the Prior's pear-tree, and causing the blame to be laid on another friar, illustrates the monastic life of Erasmus. He was not being braced by it for higher things. It was some years before he escaped from the convent, and some years more before he was dispensed from his vows. All this is in complete contrast with the monastic experiences of Luther.

It was about five and a half years before the death of Luther that Paul III. at last recognized the possible value of the society founded by Ignatius Loyola, and the Company of the

[1] M. A. Currie, "Letters of Martin Luther," p. 5. This was written about two months after Erasmus published his Greek Testament.

Jesuits was formally established on September 27, 1540. Let us compare Luther with the great leader who from that day onwards devoted his immense energy and enthusiasm to the task of undoing the work of Luther. The conversion of Loyola, after being wounded at Pampluna in 1521, was very different from the conversion of Luther in his convent. In Luther's case a soul overwhelmed by the consciousness of a heavy burden of sin at last found peace in the conviction of having obtained mercy from God in Christ. In Loyola, it was the old craving for active service finding satisfaction in a new object. Loyola's chivalrous spirit and genius for organization were turned in a new direction. His capacity for seeing the key to a position, and for producing the machinery for defending it, was henceforth devoted to the defence of the Roman Church and of the Papacy, especially against Protestant assailants. If Luther's "Liberty of the Christian Man" contains the essence of the Reformation, the "Spiritual Exercises" of Loyola may be called the engine of the Counter-Reformation. Prompt military obedience was the keynote of Loyola's life and system. His "Exercises" were inspired with the idea of military drill. There was no need to examine Luther's teaching. Lutheranism was mutiny against constituted authority. What was to become of the army of the Church if the rank and file might rebel against their commanders? The three or four weeks of absolute solitude required for the use of the "Exercises" produced what we should now call a hypnotic condition of experiences, the influence of which was to last for life.[1]

Loyola is as clearly the hero of the Counter-Reformation as Luther is of the Reformation. Both desired to remedy the evils of the Church as each understood them, but each wished to retain just those features which were abhorrent to the other. The one was all for submission, as the other was for liberty. The thoroughly German Luther was an enigma and an abomination to so thorough a Spaniard as Loyola; and Loyola

[1] Schiele and Zscharnack, "Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart," Art. "Jesuiten."

remains an enigma to most German Protestants. As a mighty influence in his own and subsequent times, Loyola may be placed side by side with Luther; but as a creative force Luther is far the greater man of the two.[1]

Two things which greatly contributed to Luther's success may be regarded as in a special sense providential, for neither of them was in any way due to his own foresight or ability. One of these was his beginning with very moderate demands, and being gradually, and sometimes unwillingly, led on to demand much more. He himself said in later years that, if he had seen at the outset the position which he at last reached, wild horses would not have dragged him into action. The other thing which contributed to his success was the fatuous way in which the Pope dealt with him. As Döllinger has said, "Luther had one very powerful ally besides the national sympathy, and that was the Court of Rome itself. Had the Curia been advised by an astute disciple of the German Reformer, he could hardly have given counsel more efficient or more profitable to his master than what was actually followed."

At Leipzig, Eck had got Luther to admit that in some things he agreed with John Huss, and that the Council of Constance had done wrongly in condemning Huss. At Worms, Aleander extracted a similar admission. Luther said: "I believe neither the Pope nor the Council alone, since it is clear that they have often erred and contradicted one another." It was this which made Charles V. exclaim that he had heard enough. How could either the Church or the Empire be ruled if every individual might judge for himself? Luther, already excommunicated by Leo X., left Worms on April 26, and in May Aleander induced Charles V. to sign the document which placed Luther under the ban of the Empire—*i.e.*, made him an outlaw.

Thus Luther was smitten by both the spiritual and the temporal sword. What was the result? In July the Archbishop of Mainz wrote to the Pope: "Since the Bull of your Holiness and the Edict of the Emperor, the number of Lutherans has

[1] W. Walker, "The Reformation," pp. 368 *et seq.*

been daily increasing, and now very few laymen are found who honestly and simply favour the clergy. But a great part of the priests side with Luther, and very many are ashamed to stand by the Roman Church, so hateful is the name of the Curia and of the decrees of your Beatitude, which others also follow the Wittenbergers in treating with utter contempt."[1] The nuncio said that nine-tenths of Germany cried, "Long life to Luther!" and the other tenth shouted, "Death to the Church!" Napoleon said that, if Charles V. had sided with Luther, he could have conquered Europe with a united Germany. But Charles V. was far more of a Spaniard than a German. It surprises us at first that all this should have been the result, when both the sword of the Church and the sword of the Empire had aimed their deadliest blows at the head of a peasant-born friar. Leo X. can hardly have received the report of the Archbishop of Mainz with his habitual smile, but he was content to leave the matter as it was. Neither he nor any of his successors ever realized what the Latin races lost when the Germanic element was expelled from the Church by the condemnation of Luther.

[1] J. B. Kidd, "Documents illustrative of the Continental Reformation," pp. 87-89.

St. Paul's Conception of Christ.

By the Rev. H. T. DIXON, M.A., D.D.

II.

As St. Paul considers that Christ's work for fallen man is the creation of a new humanity which, as its life and Lord He sustains and controls, the question naturally arises, What position does he assign to Christ and God in their relation to men? He thinks of the Father as Supreme; He is the Father of all, whilst Christ is His Son. "God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." "The head of every man is Christ, and the head of Christ is God." Christ, however, is not son in the sense that we are. The phrases which are applied by St. Paul to Christ, such as *τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο*: *περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*: *τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱον* suggests that there was something unique in Christ's sonship: it is a Divine, eternal sonship. As Son, St. Paul does not regard Him to be unequal to God: in mind, in heart, and in will the Son is absolutely one with the Father. The very basis of His Lordship depends upon the fact that He is perfectly Son of God, and shares the very life of God. And so He is qualified to represent the Father and to be the instrument of the Father's will. He is one with God. What the Father is said to do, sometimes Christ is also said to do; but mostly it is through Christ that God works. He is the channel through whom God's gifts are bestowed: "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ;" in prayer and in thanksgiving we approach God through Christ; and in what Christ does for us and in us God is active.

It is not therefore surprising to find that as St. Paul calls Christ the Spirit, so when he thinks of Christ's relation to us he addresses Him as God. *καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κάτα σάρκα ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς*: as to this passage it is agreed by a larger number of commentators that it entirely refers to Christ. *ὁ ὤν* represents His superior nature as one that had no commencement of existence: *ἐπὶ πάντων* His supremacy over all things:

Θεὸς designates His all-controlling power as God; and in the verse τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ there are some who also apply Θεοῦ to Christ, because of the absence of the article, and also because the reference of the context seems to them to be to Christ; but on the other hand the article is not grammatically necessary, and there is a reference to the Father a few lines above. But even if θεοῦ is not applied to Christ, but to the Father, the rendering to them the same honour and praise establishes the supreme divinity of Christ and asserts his equality with the Father. It was evidently not St. Paul's custom to address Christ as Θεὸς. Having to combat polytheism on every side, he found it necessary to be guarded in his terms. There is, however, no room for an Arian Christ in his theology; if he is careful of his terms, his whole teaching clearly shows that to him Christ was really and truly God. The risen and exalted Christ stands to him as God. He is, as it were, God's vicegerent and representative, and is therefore God to him. To Him he prayed: upon His name Christians call—"those who call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ:" to Him he renders worship and adoration, and in His name he sends his blessing to the Churches"; in Him he saw God manifested in the human flesh, and in His influence upon himself he felt the influence of God's Holy Spirit, and in contact with Him he was in communion with God.

It was therefore because St. Paul found in Christ the supreme and ultimate authority over his moral and religious life; because he knew Him to be his Saviour through whom his sins were forgiven: because he found in Him the source of that Divine life whereby it was possible for Him to grow in righteousness and holiness, and because in Him he obtained the hope of immortality, that he found God in Him, and He was to him truly God.

In the later epistles St. Paul's Christology expands. Christ's reign in heaven, His pre-existence and His omnipotence, form the theme of the Apostle. He was compelled to confront the teaching of the gnostics, who disparaged the work and degraded

the person of Christ. According to them Christ was only one of a multitude of æons, through whose agency the world had been created and was sustained: but St. Paul was convinced that He who was to him Lord, Saviour, Giver of Life, and in whom he found God, and who was supreme in the spiritual world, could not hold any secondary place in the physical world. He declares that Christ is supreme in the universe. He is its Creator, its Sustainer and its Goal. He is the εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, and in Him alone dwells the fulness of God, and as such the sole Mediator between God and creation and between God and man. He was ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ, and counted it not robbery to be equal with God.

This is a great advance in St. Paul's previous teaching, but there is no inconsistency; there is progress with continuity. The conception of Christ as the ideal or celestial Man does not exhaust St. Paul's ideas of Christ. If Christ was supreme in the moral world, it must have led on to loftier conclusions. When St. Paul places Christ on the same level with God in his greeting to the Corinthians, and when he calls Him the Spirit, and when he applies to Him the name Θεὸς, and ascribes Lordship to Him, which was an essential prerogative of Jehovah, we have the germ of his teaching, which the gnostic heresy led him to develop and express.

It was because of this gnostic teaching that St. Paul was compelled to consider Christ's relation to the universe. The first cause and primal fountain of all creative existence he conceived to be God: "All things are from God, and from Him and through Him and unto Him are all things"; "It is God who quickeneth the dead and calleth the things that are not as though they are"; whilst Christ was the instrument of creation—"All things are (ἐκ) from God, through (διά) Jesus Christ"; "There is one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things." In Him all things were made. But Christ's work did not cease at Creation. The universe requires continual support, and this continuous preservation no less than creation St. Paul ascribes to Christ. He is its Sustainer: "All things

subsist in Him." "There is in Christ not merely the creative cause, but also the cause which brings about organic stability and continuance in unity for the whole of existing things." In Him the world finds its subsistence and its unity; and as all things find their life and support in Him, they also find in Him their perfection, for in living unto Him every creature finds at once the explanation and law of its being. And so He is Creation's goal as He was its starting-point. St. Paul teaches that the aim of God's work of redemption is to sum up all things in Him, and also through Him (and not through angels, as the gnostics asserted) "to reconcile all things in heaven and earth." He is the destined Heir, whose universal supremacy and whose claim upon their worship and obedience all things will at length acknowledge, for "all things were created unto Him."

It is to Christ, then, that St. Paul ascribes the work of creation, of preservation, and of reconciliation. It was, therefore, not the work of many, but of one, and that one was Christ. Between God, who was inaccessible, and man there was only one Mediator, who was Christ. And as the vastness of work ascribed to Christ is extended, we find a corresponding exaltation of His Person. He is the image of the invisible God, the organ whereby God, in His essence invisible, reveals Himself to creation. He is God's expression of Himself, who manifests and represents God to man. He is essentially the Mediator, the sole link between God and man, through whom alone God imparts Himself to the world, and through whom the world returns to Him. And because He is the image of God, He is the firstborn of all creation—that is, He is not the first of created beings, but one who stands apart from creation, before it and above it, its Sovereign and its Lord. And besides being the outward manifestation of the invisible God, and as such the organ of creation, since it is in creation that God is first revealed, He is "the fulness of the Godhead." Christ is the Person into whom the fulness of God is poured—"it pleased God that in Him should the fulness of God dwell"; and even when incarnate it found a place in Him, for St. Paul adds, "It

dwelt in Him bodily wise." Of the fulness Bengel says that it was "non modo divinæ virtutes sed ipsa divina natura." By virtue of this gift Christ, then, becomes more than the author of creation; He is the source of its life, the centre of all its developments, the mainspring of all its motives. God fills Christ, and Christ fills and sustains the universe.

And as St. Paul contemplated the sovereignty of Christ and the greatness of His work in the universe, his ideas of Christ's influence in the moral world were enlarged. He perceived that Christ is supreme in the universe of being. The angelic agencies, who interfered, as the gnostics maintained, with the course of nature, and who were sources of dread and annoyance, Christ robbed of their power; for by His death and resurrection He showed that He alone is Lord, and that their power was unreal—"Having spoiled principalities and powers, He made a show over them, openly triumphing over them in the Cross." His dominion was co-extensive with the world of nature and humanity, and all baneful influences which a belief in thrones, principalities, dominions, and powers inspired in men, gave way before Christ's triumphant love. As Head of all beings, He is clothed with ability to subdue all things for those who believe in Him.

He is also "Head of the Church." Previously St. Paul thought of Christ as the Life and the Lord over the new creation of which He was the founder and the representative man; now He declares Him to be the Head over the new creation, which is His body. The Headship implies not only the two former ideas of immanence and transcendence, but it also asserts His authority. As settled communities arose, it was necessary to insist upon the recognition by all the Churches of His all-controlling authority as well as the fact of their common life in Him. "God," he says, "hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." "He is the head of the body, the Church; who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things He might have

the pre-eminence." And from Him, the Head, the Church derives its life. He pours into it the fulness which is in Himself. Not only is the Christian in Christ, but now it can be said that Christ is in the Church. He has need of the Church in order to manifest the plenitude of life within Himself, and only a redeemed humanity is adequate to reveal the nature which is in Him; and as each individual and nation become part of His body, they will contribute and express something of what is latent in Him. Just as Christ is the plenitude and actual manifestation of God, so the Church is the body in which all the fulness of the life within Him is realized. In his Epistle to the Ephesians we have St. Paul's conception of the Church: it is a Divine universal society which draws its life from its Head, whose members are members one of another, and in whose hearts Christ dwells, and who are filled with the love, holiness, and power of their Divine Head, "in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit."

St. Paul rises to the understanding of what Christ is through the experience of what He proves Himself to be, and specially by reason of His influence upon his own inner life. Starting with Christ's life immanent in himself, he arrives at the magnificent conception of Christ as Sovereign and Lord of the Universe and Head of the Church. In both spheres he traces and perceives His work and influence. What Christ's eternal nature was before His incarnation he is not led so much to conjecture. But there are several passages here and there in his epistles which indirectly tell us what he conceived Christ's pre-incarnate condition to have been. He fully believed that Christ existed before His incarnation. His coming to earth was a mission: "God sent His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh": it was a change of condition; "before He was rich, then He became poor": it was also an act of humiliation, "being in the form of God He humbled Himself," as well as a manifestation, "the grace which was given unto us in Jesus Christ before

time eternal hath now been manifested by the appearing of our Saviour Christ."

Like the other Apostles, it is evident that St. Paul asserts Christ's pre-existence, and accepts the belief of Christ's pre-existent state which was prevalent in the Early Church. "What strikes us in these statements," says a writer about pre-existence, "is that the Apostle nowhere really establishes or teaches the pre-existence of Christ, but especially in his earlier epistles presupposes it as familiar to his readers and disputed by no one." He may take the belief for granted on many occasions, but it is not too much to say that St. Paul's epistles contain expressions which leave it quite clear that Christ possessed a real personal existence before His incarnation: the theories which were current about the Messiah and the speculations of the Greek school of philosophy do not sufficiently account for these definite remarks about Christ's pre-existence; and, further, only the representation of Christ as eternally pre-existent, descending into a connection with us from a higher state, satisfies the mind, and is most in keeping with the conviction of His superhuman greatness and with the supreme significance of His life and death for mankind.

We can safely say, then, that St. Paul was firmly convinced of Christ's pre-existence, but of His eternal nature there is little said. We have seen that he calls Christ in a very special sense "God's own Son." And there are two expressions which, besides asserting His pre-existence, reveal to us something of His eternal nature. "Christ is the image of the invisible God," which, we saw, implied that He was the instrument whereby God in His essence invisible reveals Himself to His creatures, but which in His relation to God asserts that Christ is "the exact likeness of the Father in all things, except being the Father." And the still higher metaphysical definition, ὃς ἐν μορφῇ ὑπάρχων. Some maintain that in this expression St. Paul does not ascribe absolute divinity to Christ, but that there was a higher position for Him to attain, which He really did after His humiliation; before His incarna-

tion He was in the form of God, and after His self-sacrifice "God highly exalted Him and gave Him a name above every other name." But does St. Paul mean to teach here that there were stages of growth in Christ's personality? Is not the phrase itself "in the form of God" equivalent to a declaration that Christ was very God? How could there, then, be an increase of His glory? For μορφή implies not only the external accidents, but also the essential attributes. "The form of a thing is that external manifestation of its inward nature which declares it to be what it is": it therefore indicates objective reality, and therefore the μορφὴ Θεοῦ, with which is contrasted the μορφὴ δούλου, can have no other signification than that the divine status or condition of Christ was exactly the same as that of God. This equality with God Christ did not regard as robbery, because it was His own by natural right; not a thing to be eagerly prized or seized; on the contrary, He gave it up. If He were inferior, it was wrong to grasp after what did not, and could not, belong to Him. But He did not so regard it. It was His, and He was content to lay it aside and to become man, and thus to win the higher glory of being loved, honoured, and adored by all, on the ground of His service to mankind. And when He returned to heaven, we believe that He was not really more than He was before: the glory and majesty which He had laid aside were again assumed; but in one sense He was exalted, for did He not return with the possession of His human nature and with the experience of a human life, which not only added to the fulness of His own being, making Him more than He was before, but it also made Him known to and loved by men. And He sits, as before, at the right hand of God, sharing with the Absolute Deity in the majesty and glory of the Divine government. God "hath set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principalities, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come."

When St. Paul calls Christ the "image of the invisible God," the firstborn of all creation in whom the fulness of the Godhead

dwelt, and asserts that "He was in the form of God," his teaching rises to the same height as St. John's when he declares that "in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God, all things were made by Him." Both teach the same truths: that Christ existed prior to creation, that He was the agent in creation, that He was a divine person, that He was equal with God and shared His essential life, and that He was really none other but God. But it is Christ as the God-man which best expresses St. Paul's conception of Christ. The glory and the majesty of the eternal Son of God and the vastness of His work in the universe drew out his admiration and his love; but the aspect of Christ which is most dear to him is that of Christ as the Saviour and Restorer of men, who fills them with His own victorious life and conforms them into His own image, and who, as their Lord, guides, protects, and supports His people, and as their Mediator unites them to God.

Evening Communion.

By the Rev. M. LINTON SMITH, M.A.,
Vicar of Blundellsands, Liverpool.

THIS paper has no partisan motive; the practice with which it deals is one which has, to our shame be it spoken, become little more than a party badge in the eyes of many; and there are those who would judge of a man's loyalty to the school of thought to which they belong by the simple test as to whether or no he is willing to accept this use. Surely this is nothing less than desecration; this Sacrament of our Salvation is far too holy a thing to be degraded into a mere partisan test. But, on the other hand, can it be a true honouring of the rite and of the Lord who ordained it to hedge it about with such restrictions and regulations as, under the circumstances of modern life, practically put it out of the reach of many to whom it must be an inestimable boon? This paper attempts partly to meet certain objections to this practice which seem to be invalid, and partly to vindicate Christian freedom in the matter.

"We have, I hope, got beyond the notion that the early Church objected to afternoon and evening celebration. The early Church in no sort of way objected to evening celebration *per se*." With this explicit statement Father Puller brings to a head his investigations into the hour of celebrations in the pre-Reformation period. The most important evidence, much of which is owed to his paper,[1] must be briefly indicated. There is, of course, the fact that the institution of the rite took place in the evening; and it is not unworthy of notice that the most definite mention of the fact, "the Lord Jesus the same night in which He was betrayed" (1 Cor. xi. 23), occurs in the same epistle and the same chapter (xi. 34) as those words "the rest will I set in order when I come," from which it was deduced, as early as the time of St. Augustine ("Ep. ad Januarium I."), that St. Paul

[1] "On the Fast before Communion."

transferred the celebration in the Corinthian Church to the morning (in order that it might be received fasting).

It cannot, indeed, be argued from the fact of the institution that evening celebration should be obligatory; it cannot even be argued that the Church may not, for definite reasons, forbid evening celebration; but I think that it is not unfair to conclude that there is nothing wrong in "evening celebration *per se*." Moreover, as long as the Eucharist was associated with the Agape, it must have been in the evening; and Bishop Lightfoot argues from a passage in Ignatius ("Ep. ad. Smyrn.," c. viii.), in which *βαπτίζειν* and *ἀγάπην ποιεῖν* are placed side by side, as requiring the presence of the Bishop, that such association still persisted at Smyrna and Antioch down to A.D. 117. Pliny's letter (A.D. 112) shows that in Pontus the Eucharist and the Agape were already separate, the Eucharist apparently being celebrated in the morning, and the Agape being held at night, until the latter was discontinued at the Governor's own request.

But there is further clear evidence that under certain circumstances—*i.e.*, on fast days—the Eucharist was long celebrated in the afternoon or evening. The "Peregrinatio Silviæ" (A.D. 386) shows that at Jerusalem celebrations on Wednesdays and Fridays were always at 3 p.m. (except in Lent, during which season there were no weekday celebrations, and Eastertide—*i.e.* Easter to Whitsuntide—when there were no fasts). The Capitulare of Theodulf of Orleans (*c.* A.D. 800), dealing with the Lenten Fast runs: "Men ought to come to Mass, and when they have heard Mass and Evensong, and have given their alms, then they may sit down to their meal" (Cap. Article 39), which makes it clear that Mass was said just before Evensong—*i.e.*, before sundown. Peter of Blois, Archdeacon of Bath (*c.* 1200), says in one of his sermons: "At fasting times the Office of the Mass is put off until after midday, in order that the abstinence from food may not be protracted till a later hour than 3 p.m. But in Lent the Altar Office is put off until after 3 p.m., in order that the refection may be postponed until after Evensong"; while in the Eastern Church to the present day the great vigil service of Easter Eve

commences about 9 p.m., and the actual celebration takes place shortly after midnight, the Gospel being timed to be read just before twelve o'clock. "This varying of the hour of the celebration according to the character of the day," says Father Puller, "was undoubtedly the rule of the Church for at least twelve hundred years."

Enough has been said to show that, as far as the question of the time of the celebration is concerned, there can be no objection to afternoon or evening celebration on the score of Catholic use; for many opponents of the practice seem to take their stand upon the ground that evening celebrations *per se* are contrary to Catholic custom.

The real ground of objection, with which we must now deal, is the rule of the fast before Communion. With regard to its origin, St. Augustine claims the custom as universal and, apparently, apostolic. "For from that time (*ex hoc*) it has seemed good to the Holy Ghost that in honour of so great a Sacrament, the Body of the Lord should enter the mouth of a Christian before other food; and it is for this reason that the custom referred to is observed throughout the whole world" ("Epistle ad Januarium I."). As a witness for his own day, St. Augustine is unexceptionable, but traces of an earlier custom survived even to his day. Socrates ("Hist. Eccl.," v. 22), dealing with varieties of use, mentions that the Christians in the neighbourhood of Alexandria and in the Thebaid celebrated on Saturday evening (*μετὰ γὰρ τὸ ἐνωχηθῆναι καὶ παντοίων ἐδεσμάτων ἐμφορηθῆναι, περὶ ἑσπέραν προσφέροντες, τῶν μυστηρίων μεταλαμβάνουσιν*), and his only expression of disapprobation is the mild *οὐχ ὡς ἔθος Χριστιανοῖς*. This looks like a survival of the undoubtedly primitive practice of celebrating the Eucharist at the Agape, which clearly prevailed at Corinth in St. Paul's day (1 Cor. xi.), apparently at Antioch and Smyrna in the beginning of the second century, and in that Church (apparently Palestinian) to which we owe the Didache. Even granted that St. Augustine is right in his contention that St. Paul, among the things set in order at Corinth, did separate the Eucharist from the Agape, and

institute the fast, the rule cannot at first have been looked upon as of universal obligation, since half a century later Smyrna, which was in daily communication with Corinth, and Antioch, with little less frequent intercourse, had neither of them followed it. Stress must be laid on this point because, even if we grant what is only an inference of St. Augustine, that the fast before Communion was of apostolic initiation at Corinth, it is plain that in prominent centres of Church life, like Smyrna and Antioch, this rule only came to be looked upon as of binding validity at a considerably later date. Apostolic initiation of a custom in one Church passed not unnaturally into an apostolic injunction for the universal Church by a process common enough: reverence for such a figure as St. Paul would in the course of time elevate any advice or ruling of his in an individual case into a rule generally applicable; and this seems to be the utmost that can be safely asserted of the apostolic origin of the rule of fasting Communion. Moreover, it was always held possible to suspend the rule. Theophilus of Alexandria, when the Vigil of the Epiphany (a strict fast) coincided with Sunday, a festival, ordered that the Eucharist should be celebrated at 3 p.m., but that the faithful should partake of food in the morning in order to mark the day as a festival. Still more striking is the exception mentioned by St. Augustine himself; with a view to dramatizing the events of Holy Week, some of the Churches of North Africa celebrated the Eucharist on the evening of Maundy Thursday, and allowed Communion after receiving food.

What the primitive Church only gradually adopted, and what provincial Churches from time to time suspended, is a rule with which a national Church or province has power to dispense. "It seems to me," says Father Puller, "to be absolutely certain that our Bishops have full authority to dispense from the obligation of the rule of the Eucharistic fast. On the principles of the primitive Church, such an authority is inherent in the Episcopal office." And that which the individual Bishop may do for special cases in his diocese, the Bishops of a province may surely do for the general use of the province. As

far as the Province of Canterbury is concerned, this has been done. Eight resolutions dealing with the question were promulgated by the Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury at the Session of May 5, 1893. The first six deal with the history of the practice, recognizing (Resolution 4) "That from the close of the fourth century this regular and recognized usage was formulated in rules for the clergy and canons of local and provincial councils." Resolutions 7 and 8 are as follows: (7) "That at the Reformation the Church of England, in accordance with the principle of liberty laid down in Article XXXIV., ceased to require the Communion to be received fasting, though the practice was observed by many as a reverent and ancient custom, and as such is commended by several of her eminent writers and divines down to the present time." (8) "That, regard being had to the practice of the Apostolic Church in this matter, to teach that it is a sin to communicate otherwise than fasting is contrary to the teaching and spirit of the Church of England." These resolutions are sufficiently explicit; and they only proceed along the lines laid down by Roman casuists in dealing with one aspect of this very question—viz., the administration of the Easter Communion to non-fasting sick people who are not in danger of death. One such writer, in notes to Gury's "Compendium Theologiæ Moralis," published at Rome in 1877, writes, "Et quidem juxta doctissimos theologos Romæ interrogatos, *nullum dubium est*, quoad casum Communionis annuæ seu Paschalis, quæ non mero jure Ecclesiastico, sed etiam Divino præcipitur, *quia divinum mandatum humano præstantius est.*" Nothing further need be asked than the two frank admissions of the last clause—viz., that the rule of fasting Communion is a "mandatum humanum," and that as such it must give way before a "mandatum divinum."

Let us now return to the question of evening celebration. Nothing can be clearer that the hour of a celebration may be varied in strictest accord with Catholic custom, and that *per se* evening celebrations are in no way contrary to it; further, the position of the Church of England with regard to fasting Communion is clear—she does not exact it, but leaves the matter to the individual

conscience. On what ground, then, are those who under plea of urgency (and with that we will deal directly) celebrate in the evening to be condemned? It may be replied, on the ground of irregular introduction. But was the introduction so hopelessly irregular? In November, 1851, the Leeds Ruri-decanal Chapter, under the presidency of Dean Hook, adopted a report from which the following words may be quoted: "It has been deeply impressed upon us that the paucity of attenders at the Holy Communion is in a considerable degree due to its celebration at a time when it is most inconvenient to the humbler classes, and effectually prevents the attendance of the wives and mothers amongst our poorer brethren. Your committee do not believe that by such an arrangement (*i.e.*, evening celebration) any rule of the Church would be infringed, whilst it would allow many of the working classes who are now virtually debarred from that ordinance to approach the Table of the Lord."

It may be admitted that a Ruri-decanal Chapter is not the highest ecclesiastical authority. Strictly speaking, it would have been more orderly to wait for the action, shall we say, of Convocation in the matter; but is it quite beside the point to ask whether the reintroduction of customs, contrary to the existing use of the Church, and contrary to one interpretation of the law of the Church—as, for example, the use of the Eucharistic vestments—had the authority even of a Ruri-decanal Chapter? Or, further, to inquire in how many churches their use would now prevail if the sanction of Convocation to such an innovation upon the existing use of the Church had been awaited?

It is sometimes alleged that the practice is contrary to the intention of the Prayer-Book as expressed in its rubrics and arrangements; but such strictness of interpretation, applied in a slightly different direction, tells with equal force against early celebrations. What can be more obvious from the relation of the Second Lesson at Morning Prayer to the Gospels on Palm Sunday and Good Friday than that it is the intention of the Church that Morning Prayer shall precede the celebration, an arrangement which is dislocated by an early celebration. But

few would be found to press this clear argument against the practice of early celebration.

Let us now turn to the question of urgency, on which alone must rest the justification or the introduction of the practice. No reasonable man would willingly break with the past, save under the pressure of a real need; and while it has been shown that there are precedents for late celebration in pre-Reformation times, it must be frankly admitted that there are features about Evening Communion which constitute it, from some points of view, an innovation. But it may fairly be claimed that there is here real urgency. The Bishop of Oxford in a recent utterance exhorted Church-people to set their faces against late hours on Saturday night. That this is sound advice to people of leisure, and people who are more or less masters of their own time, we freely admit; but can the majority of those to whom most of us are called upon to minister be truly so described? We often fail to recognize the change which has come over the habits of the whole of Western Europe, as the result of the introduction of cheap and effective illuminants—a change, which, little less than a revolution, has proceeded so quietly and gradually that it is only perceived when a considerable period of years is passed under review. The change is reflected in matters ecclesiastical. Sixty years ago Evensong was almost invariably said on Sunday afternoon; to-day such a practice is confined to the remoter country districts, or to the dignified and conservative leisure of our great cathedrals; and these cathedrals, when their chapters desire to make them minister to the needs of the populations in which they stand, have been driven to supplement the choir service of the afternoon by an evening nave service. And this revolution must surely be taken into account by the Church in the provision which she makes for the wants of her members. The discipline and self-denial demanded in rising for an early celebration is a very excellent thing; but there are considerations of health, in the case of the shop-assistant who has been up till midnight and even later through no fault of her own; there are considerations (not to be put on one side without thought) of convenience, in the case of young communicants

drawn from homes in the ordering of which religion plays but a very small part; there are considerations as to what best conduces to the calm and devotional frame of mind in which the holy rite should be approached. To most of us the early morning seems obviously to present the required conditions, before the work of the day has brought distraction; but is this the case with the mother of a large family, on whom devolve all the cares and duties of a working-man's house. If the testimony of such, both explicitly given and implicitly shown by their habits, be admitted, the evening, when the day's work is done, and the little ones are in bed and asleep, is the time when the mind is freest from care and distraction. There are considerations due to the exhaustion produced by pressure of daily life and work. The head of a large firm (I speak of no imaginary case) who is working fifteen hours a day all through the week is not at his freshest at 8 a.m. on Sunday morning, nor is his plea of the need of bodily rest to be lightly set on one side. The plea of "beginning the day with God" is after all a purely sentimental one, and the idea which it presupposes that a man is at his freshest and best in the early hours of Sunday morning is one which is sadly out of accord with the hard facts of modern life. The beauty of the ideal may be admitted, the value of the principle of self-denial which underlies it must be recognized; but an ideal which is made binding by external authority, a principle which is imposed from without, loses its essential character and value, which consist in the call that it makes to the free choice of those before whom it is set; they cease to be ideals or principles, and become a law.

Those who minister in holy things have to be very watchful lest, by lack of sympathy and understanding of the very varied lives of those whom they serve, they incur the condemnation of binding upon men burdens hard to be borne; and lest, by their very anxiety to honour that which they hold sacred, they hedge it about with restrictions so exacting that by them they hinder men from obeying the Divine command, and keep those who most need its sustenance from partaking of the spiritual food of the Bread of Life.

On Teaching Children.

By J. W. Adamson, B.A.,
Professor of Education in the University of London.

II.—The Motive for Learning.

FAILURE to appreciate the child's standpoint not only causes him to misunderstand what he is taught; it is also a frequent cause of his failure to attend to the teaching. To be sure, an inattentive class is most often an unoccupied class; the teacher does not bring home to the mind of every pupil the thought that all must work, or be found out. Where every pupil has something to do, or at least expects to be called on at any moment to do or say something, where every wandering glance is challenged by a look or a question, the symptoms of inattention are not easy to detect. But even in these favourable circumstances, the attention of the class as a whole may be but half-hearted, and in consequence the effect of the instruction will be evanescent.

The essential thing is that the pupil should have a motive for attending. The fear of detection, the discomfort of the teacher's disapproving glance, the stimulus of some form of reward, are better than nothing; but they are too external in origin, they rank low as motives, and their driving-power is but feeble. The spontaneous interests of children spring from the circumstances of their daily life, and though many a child transcends these limits by the exercise of a lively fancy, even those imaginative flights are conditioned by what the child knows of the persons, things and places of his actual surroundings. These are at the starting-point, however distant the region to which imagination transports him. But the purely intellectual, detached from persons and from particular things, has attraction for very few children; its aloofness from their experience, no less than the difficulty of understanding its speech, is a barrier which divides it from the appreciation of most children.

The textbook once more serves as an illustration. Dealing with chemistry, such a book will begin with topics like the following: the composition of matter, its physical properties, the nature of chemical reaction, and so on, each being presented in a purely formal way. Next, the different elements are in turn brought before the reader, often in some such stereotyped order as "i. Preparation"; "ii. Properties"; "iii. Uses"; each element being treated under these categories. This choice and sequence of topics are excellent in a work of reference, but stupefying when applied unchanged as canons of teaching. The child's natural use of his own powers, when these are aroused by interest, leads him to *discover* elements, to reach the idea of properties through an analysis of concrete things and processes, in which those properties inhere. But element and properties, as such, possess little, if any, attraction for him. His first question is always, What is the use of this? The teacher, therefore, should exhibit the use of a thing, and particularly its relevance to the boy's own experience, in order to furnish him with a sufficient motive for studying the thing itself; "properties" and "preparation" will then fall into their proper places and secure a measure of spontaneous attention. In short, while the textbook assumes the pupil's interest, the teacher takes measures to excite it.

This distinction in procedure has long been a ground of variance between rule-of-thumb instructors, who are apt to monopolize for themselves the title, "practical teachers," and their critics, whom they are wont to stigmatize as "mere theorizers." One of these critics has laid it down in reference to children that "their book, or anything we would have them learn, should not be enjoined them as *business*." "Children should not have anything like work, or serious, laid on them; neither their minds nor bodies will bear it." The schoolmaster's retort to John Locke is obvious: "These notions may work when confined to the affairs of a private tutor and one or two pupils; they are impossible as principles of school-keeping, when twenty, sixty, or three hundred pupils are in question." The school cannot remain at a standstill because some pupils are not

in the mood for lessons; more than that, it is not desirable that children should be trained to believe that business, work, and "the serious" generally, ought to be postponed in favour of inclination.

It may be easy on such grounds to dismiss Locke. But Froebel is less manageable, since it is an undoubted fact that he founded a system of education which is in actual and extensive practice at the present day. He is also author of this dictum: "Regarded in the light of their origin and first principles, education, instruction and doctrine must of necessity be passive, following—guarding, merely, and sheltering—not prescribing, determining, encroaching." Froebel is popularly regarded in this country as a homely, kindly-disposed German, who devised a number of more or less entertaining games, by means of which a judicious person could insinuate reading, writing, and summing into the unwilling minds of little children. Thus it came about that in the time-tables of infant schools, "Kindergarten" figured as one of several "subjects" thought to be appropriate to tender years. The schoolmistresses could excuse themselves by quoting the ill-informed judgment of the late Sir Joshua Fitch: "You will not, I think, come to the conclusion that he (Froebel) took a large or very sound view of the purpose of education as a whole." Froebel's conceptions may or may not be sound; some of them, at least, are disputable. But his largeness of view respecting "the purpose of education as a whole" would only be questioned by a person ignorant of his writings. Such ignorance is not incompatible with high official position; our national habit of identifying "an open mind" with a vacant mind always makes this association possible.

The opinion which represents Froebel as something of a mystic is much nearer the truth than that which dismisses him as a child-like, if not childish, thinker. But those who accept the more favourable view of the German educator sometimes forget that the mystic frequently exhibits a well-marked vein of practical sagacity, a quality in which Froebel was not altogether wanting. The trait appears in the dictum already quoted.

What is the practical import of the words? Do they not indicate that the child is not simply an intelligence to be informed and directed at the will of the instructor—that there are other avenues to his intelligence than those which the schools commonly use? In Froebel's view, the child was, above all else, an active creature endowed with instincts which impelled him to be constantly doing. But these instincts are not each and all effective from the beginning; they are bound up with bodily activities, and can only become operative as bodily growth and development make them possible. The educator, therefore, must be "passive, following," in the sense that he must watch the child's development as a whole, and find employment for instincts which are morally and socially desirable as they appear, diverting or "starving out," as best he can, such instincts as are undesirable. In other words, the mental and bodily development of the child, more especially as these are exhibited through instinct and innate tendency, are the determining factors of curriculum and method. The educator "prescribes" and "encroaches" (and does amiss) when he insists upon forcing adult ways of thinking and "grown-up" ideas upon the child, with scant attention to childish capacity, limitations, and desires.

The games of the Kindergarten were to be much more than kinds of amusement; with Montaigne, Froebel was of opinion that they were the "most serious" occupation of childhood. Both writers in effect anticipated one of the most recent and most widely-accepted explanations of the nature and function of play. According to this explanation, the play of all young animals is a preparation for the specific activities of adult life. Play furnishes opportunities for exercising many instincts, and for turning them into settled habits; it gives a wider field in which the young creature may get chances of displaying actions which are self-initiated, as well as those of a more imitative character.

The games of the Kindergarten were intended by Froebel to be the means by which the young child should give expression to the impulses and rudimentary thinking which stirred

within. Above all, games and "occupations" were to furnish occasion for bodily activity, so that children might learn by doing rather than by listening or reading. The ordinary school praises and seeks to cultivate but one type of human capacity—that which is represented by the "scholar"; Froebel realized that there were other types, and endeavoured to educate them during the early years at least. But his first object was to provide a stage whereon instinct might display itself and become habit, be diverted, or be weakened or suppressed, as morality dictated. And it was an essential part of his plan that these activities should be exercised in a society; while the child was building up his individuality through self-activity, it became clearer to him that this individuality must be dedicated to social service.

Thoughtful Germans who are dissatisfied with their nationa systems of education declare that the German school should but does not, cultivate personality; and Froebel is securing to-day such a hearing in his own country as was denied to him while he lived. On the other hand, modern psychology recognizes the great part played by instinct in the course of mental development, and the influence which instincts have upon character. Indeed, the balance of opinion appears to favour the belief that a young child is a *plexus* of instincts and innate tendencies, whose morally and intellectually wholesome evolution will determine the life of the man. The Kindergarten, ideally conceived, is the sphere within which this evolution is assured during the early years of life; and it ensures this evolution by suggesting to the child purposes and objects of a kind which appeal to him and rouse him to activity.

This brings us back after a long digression to John Locke and his critic, the practical teacher. The question between them is, What kind of motive should be relied on to get the child to learn? Locke and Froebel hold that motives externally imposed are either harmful or of very little value; learning, if it is to be real in the sense of forming the mental texture, must be the results of a process which originates within. The child

learns because he *wants* to learn, and wanting to learn depends in the first place upon kinship between things proposed to be learnt and the instincts and innate tendencies which the child brings to them. Of course, as the learning proceeds, the motives become more complicated; the only question here is the beginning. While the schoolmaster, naturally enough, is disposed to say that the child must learn because he ought, Froebel urges that we must enlist the child's instincts and innate tendencies, or at least such of them as are relevant and desirable.

Locke has finely said that "Knowledge is as grateful to the understanding as light is to the eyes." Children are as capable of this pleasure as their elders in so far as they understand. The late Professor Bain thought that the curiosity of children was "a spurious article." This, even if founded on a truth, would tend to quench the smoking flax. The teacher will be better advised if he acts on Locke's assumption that the instinct of curiosity is "the great instrument Nature has provided to remove that ignorance children were born with." Given an adequate reason for studying a topic which is within the range of their knowledge and capacity, most children will find an interest in that topic; and the more spontaneous the reason, and the more the teacher's method is based upon the child's knowledge and powers, the greater and more fruitful that interest will be.

To revert to a former illustration, the textbook in chemistry. The teacher who makes the order of topics in the book his own order of dealing with them will "prepare" oxygen, demonstrate its "properties," and thence deduce its "uses," without considering why the child should feel any interest in oxygen at all. To say that the child "ought" to feel this interest is to expect him to occupy a level of intelligence or of duty which is certainly a long way above most childish heads. But the teacher who attaches value to childish curiosity, and recalls the interest which children feel in the concrete *uses* of things, will attach these to "oxygen" by presenting his theme in the guise of a problem to be solved. How does it come about that this merely glowing,

and virtually extinguished match flashes into flame when plunged in this apparently empty glass jar? Why is it that a paper "blower," or a bellows, revives a smouldering fire?

Again, the instinct of construction, the impulse to use the hands in disturbing, making and remaking, is universally recognized as a characteristic of the young child. But schools for the most part ignore it, or so starve or over-specialize its employment that the pen or pencil is the only tool which the boy can handle with effect, and the human hand, one of the most wonderful instruments in the world, gets but little training in the school-room. The head-master of a great public school used to describe the drawing-class as the place where "fellows who could do nothing else could do something"; yet this gentleman could also insist on the fame of Pheidias and Praxiteles! The English school-boy would become as deft as French and German boys at using chalk on the classroom blackboard if he had their opportunities; and, generally, he would be a more efficient learner if he were made to do and to say more and to listen less. For some children the instinct of construction is satisfied by speech, if it be spontaneous and self-directed; "poet" is "maker."

It is well to recognize that there are boys and girls who find it an ungrateful task to "learn their catechism," or "collects," or "texts"; reasons have already been suggested why this might be expected, apart from mere laziness. Even the plain and concrete statements of the "Duty towards my neighbour" may fall on deaf ears, because the boy fails to realize at all vividly the connection between the words and his daily life. Nevertheless, the daily life of himself and his neighbours is a topic full of intrinsic interest for him. His innate tendency to sympathize, however dumbly, with those amidst whom he lives, and with human beings in general, always makes a story attractive. Acting on the knowledge of this fact, the teacher does not begin by plunging the pupil into the "Duty"; but, selecting one or more of its clauses for illustration, he tells a story which bears on its face the "moral" summed up in the words of the Catechism.

If the story be Biblical, the device has the advantage of associating Bible and Catechism in a more living way, as the child sees it, than is the case when the bond of connection is only a series of authoritative "texts." After the story, the words of the Catechism are presented, explained or illustrated still further, and then learned by heart.

The instinct of curiosity and the innate tendency of sympathy have been chosen as examples, because they are amongst the most widely distributed qualities which make up the child's mental outfit. But effective teaching is doubly individual, seeing that it expresses the personality of the teacher and is addressed to the personality of the taught. Half a dozen little boys or girls on the bench of a Sunday-school will include very different capacities, limitations and preferences amongst them; and therefore they may severally be swayed by different motives. He will be their most successful teacher who excites in them the greatest number of appropriate desires, using the word "appropriate" as equivalent to suitable to the individual child, as well as to the occasion, or general situation.

The Missionary World.

IT is curious and somewhat saddening to read the review of 1911 in the *Times*, from the standpoint of a man who believes that the purpose of the ages is the extension of the kingdom of God. One by one the leading events at home and abroad are recorded, and the forces lying directly behind them are discussed. The tone is grave and thoughtful, the emphasis is proportionate and just, the outlook is sane. But the great God of history, whose purpose lies at the base of all these movements, is not openly recognized. Yet His living and overruling Providence has been steadily at work, the greatest force and factor in all the complexities and combinations of life, the one enduring will which must ultimately be "done on earth." As we enter into 1912, there is no simplification in the conditions round us. India has, in answer to many prayers, been drawn closely to the King-Emperor. But China is still in revolution, Persia in protracted unrest. Between Germany and ourselves—two great Protestant nations whose interests are fundamentally at one and who should stand before the world not as rivals but as brothers—relations are unhappily strained. Industrial upheaval and political tension disturb our peace at home. Church questions of grave magnitude are clamant for an answer. A thousand currents swirl round us and threaten to sweep us from our feet. But there is still the secret place of the Most High where we may take refuge, not for selfish shelter, but in search of calm victorious strength. We can only serve our own generation faithfully through an influence at one with the purpose of God. It is the old deep lesson, "Abide in Me and I in you. . . . Apart from Me ye can do nothing."

* * * * *

In the *Missionary Review of the World*, Dr. James Dennis of New York (well known by his book "Christian Missions and Social Progress") sums up at length the "Missionary Assets and Liabilities of 1911." The contrast between his review of the year and that in the *Times* is striking. One deals with

great events, the other with small ones. Yet it may be that the true significance of the latter would turn the scale. It matters little to the world at large that 1911 saw the great celebration in America of the Women's National Foreign Mission Jubilee; that the Lucknow Conference on Missions to Moslems was held; that the Continuation Committee of the World Missionary Conference met at Auckland Castle; that both in America and in Great Britain there were conferences of the officials of the various missionary societies; that the World Student Christian Federation held its Conference at Constantinople; that the American Student Volunteer Movement celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary, having "enlisted nearly 5,000 young and strong recruits for foreign missionary service"; that the Tercentenary of the Authorized Version of the English Bible was widely observed; that the total number of missionaries sent out "apparently exceeds that of any reported year since Christ came to inaugurate the great mission of His Church"; that native leaders begin to multiply in the mission-field Churches; that the liberality of the native Christians is growing; that there has been a marked advance in facilities for training missionaries, in the number of Mission Study Circles, and in the production of missionary literature. But these facts, looked at in relation to the spread of the kingdom, are alive with import. Dr. Dennis well points out that the missionary assets of 1911 produce the missionary liabilities of 1912.

* * * * *

Notices both in the secular and religious press have shown already that the Students' Conference at Liverpool fulfilled the high hopes based upon it, and brought the answer to many prayers. "It was *Christianity*," said a delegate whose own life-sphere lay in foreign missionary work. From the first, human need, whether in the home or foreign field, was treated as one, and Christ was upheld as the only means to meet it. The plea for social reform and for missionary advance both sprang directly from the revelation of God in Christ. There was the wonderfully intent audience, the reverent spirit, the quiet and

gracious leadership which has long characterized Student Movement gatherings. The most impressive moment of the whole Conference was when, after a great address upon "The Death of Christ," the vast audience sang "Rock of Ages, cleft for me." The official Report of the Conference, containing all the most important addresses, has just been published, price 2s. It should be ordered without delay from the office of the Student Christian Movement, 93, Chancery Lane, London, E.C.

* * * * *

The Scriptural basis and devotional aspect of missions and missionary service are well to the front in the January magazines. In *The East and the West* the Rev. G. Currie Martin, Secretary of the L.M.S., writes on "The Theory and Practice of Missions in the New Testament." The *C.M. Review* has a stimulating message for the New Year by the Rev. Cyril C. B. Bardsley, and a thoughtful meditation on "Faith" by the Rev. G. B. Durrant. *The Bible in the World* opens with an impressive article called "The Time is Short." *India's Women*, the organ of the C.E.Z.M.S., has an able paper on "The World Crisis and the Missionary Message," by Mrs. Graham Wilmot Brooke, and in *China's Millions* Mr. D. E. Hoste, General Director of the C.I.M. writes on "Some Missionary Motives." It is also noteworthy that at the Islington Clerical Meeting—assembling just as these lines are written—the Hon. Secretary of the C.M.S. is to speak on "The Call to Evangelize the World." We need deep roots in these days of wide expansion.

* * * * *

The outlook upon the field of missionary literature grows brighter year by year. The larger reviews are now reinforced by the welcomed *International Review of Missions*. The lesser missionary magazines have in many cases improved in appearance, and offer better paper, better type, better illustrations than in the past. The old slipshod effect has vanished; the present struggle is between a desire to do what is popular on the one hand, and on the other to fulfil the educational and inspira-

tional functions which alone justify the heavy expenditure which missionary publications involve. In some cases the "snippet" still prevails. "Snippets are always read," said a missionary editor pathetically the other day. But there is a beginning of better things. Several magazines—notably the Wesleyan *Foreign Field*—have been backing up Mission Study text-books with diagrams and news from the field. The B.F.B.S. magazine is just beginning a record of "The Bible Society in Pagan Africa," by William Canton. Others are issuing serial matter of considerable value. The *Foreign Field*, for instance, is using the pen of the Rev. E. W. Thompson, a recognized authority on Hinduism, and the L.M.S. *Chronicle* is giving a serial autobiography of a Sakalava prince, translated by a Madagascar missionary, because of its "importance to ethnologists, comparative students of religion, and students of religious psychology." The inclusion of articles from periodicals in the bibliography in the *International Review of Missions* should develop this tendency. The day may not be far off when missionary editors will combine to procure and publish matter from their various fields and denominations to illustrate some great topic which is being investigated by the whole Church. Until some such step is taken the advance of the science of missions must be slow.

* * * * *

The Baptist Missionary Society is trying an interesting experiment. Hitherto they have issued a general magazine—the *Herald*—to which we have often referred, and also separate magazines for their medical work, and their Baptist Zenana Mission. Now these three have been combined into one. The first number is naturally largely given to *personalia*. Unless these can be greatly lessened it is difficult to see how an adequate presentment of the cause can be made in the available space. The principle has much to commend it, but it will not be easy to work out. The B.M.S. has now a European staff of 440 missionaries, wives, and woman helpers, including twenty-seven doctors and twelve nurses. The Baptist Zenana Mission

has, besides, ninety-one missionaries on its staff. The three main fields of labour are China, India, and the Congo. These responsibilities need to be brought effectively before the whole Baptist body if they are to be met. We wish the remodelled *Herald* all success

* * * * *

Amongst other fruits of the Laymen's National Missionary Movement we shall soon hope to find an increase of missionary speeches and articles by laymen. They will be the most effective propagandists in their own ranks. This month the S.P.G. *Mission Field* reports a telling speech—a mingling of sane criticism with kindly counsel—by an M.P.; *The East and the West* has a vigorous article, "Where are the men?" by Major Storr, who is succeeding Captain Watson in the C.E.M.S.; and in the *C.M. Review*, one of the most consistent lay advocates of missions, Mr. Henry Morris, comments at length on the History of the Bible Society. But we still wait for young laymen of the same type as those who share in the leadership of the Student Christian Movement to ally themselves with the general work of missions, and let their enthusiasm find expression in the ordinary missionary magazines.

* * * * *

A new chapter is about to be begun in the wonderful story of the Uganda Mission. Bishop Tucker has seen marvellous developments. Many will unite in praying that Bishop Willis may see even greater things. His sympathy with "The Mind of an African" has been made manifest in more than one article he has written of late. He will receive a warm welcome in his new office from the people he loves.

G.

Discussions.

[*The contributions contained under this heading are comments on articles in the previous number of the* CHURCHMAN. *The writer of the article criticized may reply in the next issue of the magazine; then the discussion in each case terminates. Contributions to the "Discussions"* must *reach the Editors before the 12th of the month.*]

(*As the* CHURCHMAN *for January had to go to press at an exceptionally early date owing to the Christmas holidays, the two following articles, which, according to our rules, should have appeared in that number, are being printed in our present issue.*—EDITORS, *CHURCHMAN.*)

"REORDINATION AND REUNION."

(*See "Churchman," December* 1911, *p.* 910.)

MR. MALAHER'S article seems to me admirable in its spirit, and it offers a fair solution of a perplexing problem. Mr. Henderson's criticism of the term "extended ordination" does not affect the principle of the proposal, of which I understand him to approve. Even Mr. Carter, although he rejects Mr. Malaher's premises, accepts (*mirabile dictu*) his main contention. But when one asks if Mr. Malaher's proposal is likely to be approved by Nonconformists, I fear that the reply must be in the negative. Mr. Malaher thinks that if union were achieved in England it would only be reasonable to require Nonconformists to receive Episcopal ordination in order to exercise their ministry in the wide sphere of the historic Catholic Church, but that this "extended ordination" would not deny that such orders as they already possessed were valid in the narrow sphere of non-Catholic communities. Mr. Henderson prefers "conditional ordination," as not involving a denial of Orders, but merely throwing doubt on the validity of the form of ordination. Mr. Carter wishes to retain historic Episcopal ordination while not requiring the reordination of Nonconformist ministers; but as he gives no hint of how this can possibly be done, he may be left out of account. I am afraid that if either Mr. Malaher's or Mr. Henderson's proposals were brought before any company of Nonconformist ministers they would unanimously reject them both.

There is one fact which does not seem to be noticed by any of the three writers on this subject, although it is of the greatest importance. There are large numbers of Nonconformists who look upon ordination in any shape or form as savouring of superstition, or at least as being needless and valueless in these progressive days. Dr. Robert Horton is by no means the only Nonconformist minister who has refused to submit to any kind of ordination, and, as baptism is not always insisted on as a condition of membership in some Nonconformist bodies, it i

quite possible that some of their ministers are unbaptized as well as unordained. Men who refuse to be ordained according to the customary form of their own denomination are not at all likely to accept Episcopal ordination as a condition of union with the Church of England.

Mr. Henderson's article on "The Kirk of Scotland and the Experiment of 1610" brings into the field a community which lays the greatest stress on ordination, and rigorously confines the administration of the sacraments to those who have been "lawfully ordained." Of this a remarkable proof was given at the last General Assembly, which decided that a Wesleyan minister who had applied for admission into the Kirk could not be allowed to exercise his ministry therein, unless he was reordained according to the Presbyterian form. Here, surely, is common ground on which Presbyterians and ourselves may meet. Supposing that the Established Church of Scotland and the Church of England were to unite, would it be necessary for the ministers of the former to be reordained?

Mr. Malaher's answer is that it would, for, although Presbyterian Orders were valid in the Kirk before the Union, they would need to be superseded by Catholic Orders when the ministers became part of the Catholic Church. Mr. Henderson would also require reordination, but he would qualify it by the formula, "If thou art not already ordained." Permit me to say emphatically (and, as one reared in Presbyterianism and still in close touch with it, I speak of what I know) that reunion on such terms is impossible.

Both ministers and people amongst the Presbyterians are quite assured of the validity of Presbyterian Orders and the correctness of their form of ordination. The subject, indeed, gives them no concern, and they have considerable difficulty in understanding our position. The Presbyterian minister believes that he has been duly ordained "juxta laudabilem Ecclesiæ Scotiæ Reformatæ formam et ritum" (to quote the words of an Archbishop of Canterbury); he can trace his Orders through ordained presbyters to the times of the Reformation, when they merge into Episcopal Orders, and he is persuaded that the Episcopal power of ordination is inherent in the presbyterate. If, as the price of union with the Church of England, it is required that Presbyterian ministers must undergo "extended" or "conditional" ordination, we shall be told by them that our terms are too high.

There is an alternative, however, and one with which I expect Mr. Malaher and Mr. Henderson to agree. In the event of union, the Orders of Presbyterian ministers might be recognized as valid for all purposes in the sphere in which they had already been exercised, but as not valid for all purposes in the united Church. To take a particular case in order to make my meaning plain: If a union took place on the terms I suggest between the Church of England and the Kirk of Scotland, then Dr. Wallace Williamson, the minister of

St. Giles, Edinburgh, would not be required to undergo Episcopal ordination. He would continue as at present to exercise every function of his ministry, with this exception, that in any ordination at which he assisted a Bishop must preside. In addition, he would be allowed to preach in any English church when permitted by the Bishop. If he wished for the further privilege of celebrating the Holy Communion in an English church, he would then require to be Episcopally ordained.

This solution might be accepted by all the parties concerned, for none of them would be called on to recant their opinions or deny their convictions. The Presbyterian minister would not be required to admit that his ministry was invalid, and in being allowed to preach in our pulpits he would gain a recognition which he greatly desires. Our own people would, as now, be assured that no one would preach to them without Episcopal permission or administer the Holy Communion without Episcopal ordination. In the course of some years the ministers who had been ordained according to the Presbyterian Order would die out, and as, after the union, all ordinations would be conducted by a Bishop with his presbyters, the men thus Episcopally ordained would gradually take the place of the others.

A solution such as this has already been proposed both in Scotland and Australia, and, indeed, wherever union proposals have taken definite form. It has this great advantage, that Presbyterians consider it to be a fair proposal, and one which they might accept without any feeling of humiliation. As such, it deserves our serious consideration, and I venture to commend it to Mr. Malaher and to your readers.

J. T. LEVENS.

"THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT FOR THE TIME OF COMMUNION."

(*See "Churchman," December,* 1911, *p.* 903.)

CANON PAIGE COX'S article deals with my paper on "The Time of Communion at Troas" in the CHURCHMAN for last June. He has given us, with the greatest possible courtesy, the clearest statement of the view which it was one main object of that paper to examine.

He asks what are the other indications in Scripture which I claimed to be all on the side of the evening hour? He says there are none except the institution, which he explains in accordance with his theory. But it is surely impossible to exclude Corinth; and if surprise be expressed at the choice of such a precedent, it is important to point out that it provides one of the most striking of all instances, from the fact that St. Paul recommended no change of hour even for abuses which might be argued to arise then from the time of service, but apparently urged that any necessary personal meal should be taken at home *first* (see "Expos. G. T." on 1 Cor. xi. 34, and other authori-

ties). Moreover, I used the word "indications" to cover the case of Emmaus. It cannot be quoted as a direct instance, but the sacramental associations of the scene and the phrase "the breaking of bread" are sufficiently suggestive; and it is often rightly used as an "indication." And this, at any rate, was on the *Sunday* evening. Add the original institution and the service at Troas (which is certainly a case in point, though I cannot now repeat my reasons), and it becomes clear that, whatever day is signified, all available Scripture guidance points to the evening.

I may explain that it was the view that the Sunday began at sunset, after the Jewish fashion, which I granted to be reasonable in itself, if it contradicts no other *data*—not, as might appear from Canon Cox's reference, the view that the service at Troas was designed so that the actual Communion took place in the morning. His words do not really imply this, nor do I think he meant it; but I wish to make the point quite clear. However reasonable that other view may be, apart from other considerations, it would appear at least to be incapable of proof. Canon Cox replies to one of my suggestions against the view, but his reply does not seem altogether to cover the second appearance eight days after; nor is it appropriate to suggest a possible wish to commemorate *two* such remarkable appearances, both presumably on the *Sunday* evening. And he does not deal with the strongest point—the language of Acts xx.—which was examined in § 3 (ii.) of my paper. He lays great stress upon continuous Church practice. But Bishop Lightfoot said that there were evening Communions for 150 years (see Dr. Griffith Thomas's "Catholic Faith," p. 421). Even Cyprian refers to them without condemnation. And Canon Meyrick thought that the change to early morning was not due to ecclesiastical authority, but to an imperial rule against club meetings. The later strictness of rule had probably much more connection with fasting than Canon Cox admits. In purely or mainly Gentile Churches, before the change was universal, would a Jewish mode of reckoning time be enforced against all their former Roman usage? I have already shown that this Roman reckoning may have been operative even quite early at Troas. It is much more likely in later cases. Similarly, we ourselves have Jews in our midst; but we have our own reckoning. Under all these circumstances, no disrespect to Church practice is involved in a return to more primitive custom—rather the reverse. Is our Church, in purely administrative matters, ever to stand still—and to stand still, moreover, in ways which, if these things are true, are not strictly primitive? Doctrine and principle are unchanging; in administration we not only can, but ought to move.

I do not follow the argument about the preparatory aspect of the Passover. In what sense was it preparatory, except at its institution? Its later observance illustrates the memorial and other aspects of the Lord's Supper; but had the annual Passover any preparatory signifi-

cance for the day on which it was held? One could understand better if its institution in Exodus were taken as a type of the need for spiritual strength on life's journey; but that would be equally applicable to Holy Communion at any hour.

The theory as a whole seems to rest upon a series of increasingly doubtful assumptions—the Sunday beginning at sunset, the preparatory aspect of the service, the change to morning by Roman reckoning, the unbroken custom from early time till sixty years ago, and, finally, the presumed necessity of telling those who cannot come in the early part of the day that we will not let them come at all till we have effected an altogether Utopian change in modern social life. One is reminded rather of the list of unprovable assumptions in the plea for Papal supremacy. If the first two or three links be granted, a good deal will follow (though even then not all), but when the argument begins by begging several questions the conclusion is less convincing. Is it credible that if the matter were so vital we should be left to uncertain inferences, and that what inferences can be drawn from Scripture should, to the unsophisticated mind, favour the evening?

Canon Cox ignores one most serious difficulty, though I mentioned it in my paper, and his article now only emphasizes its importance. If he is right, our Church has not been true to Catholic usage, as he claims. Much of his argument will prove nothing unless it establishes that we must *begin* the day with this service. At the very utmost, "the earlier hours" cannot cover 12.30 or 1 p.m. Is he prepared to lead a campaign against *midday* Communions? Nay, further, has our Church, leaving the door open for these late services by the arrangement of her own Prayer-Book, committed a breach of Catholic usage of which she must repent? It is well known that early Communions were regarded as an innovation not so long ago, and that the Prayer-Book contemplates Morning Prayer first. And the significant excision of the words "afore noon" which stood in the First Prayer-Book (Communion of the Sick) seems to show the mind of the Reformers to assert Scriptural liberty. Late evening services of any kind were of course then not thought of. But they are now.

The spiritual profit of early Communion is mentioned. That appears to be a matter of temperament. Equally devout Christians say exactly the same of the evening. And physical freshness accounts for much. For example, stress is often laid upon early morning prayer and Bible study; but that does not mean that they are neither acceptable to God nor profitable to our souls at any other hour. And against any such advantage must be placed the tendency in some quarters to think that an "early celebration" sets the day free for golf or cycling.

Everyone will appreciate the earnestness of the plea to reconsider the whole subject, "argument by argument," for unity's sake. Canon Cox at the same time announces himself open to conviction. May we therefore, on our side, earnestly plead that he and others will them-

selves reconsider the arguments? The Upper House of Canterbury Convocation, in 1893 at any rate, did not feel able to condemn us. And may we also earnestly ask those with whom we plead to give due weight to the feelings of that large number who, for the sake of Christians practically excommunicated by the cutting off of evening Communion, seek to vindicate what they consider rightful and scriptural liberty against the bondage of a one-sided tradition?

W. S. HOOTON.

"REORDINATION AND REUNION."

(*See* "*Churchman*," *January*, 1912, *p.* 66.)

Mr. Henderson's kindly criticism evinces considerable agreement with the main lines of my paper, but he wishes to substitute the term "conditional ordination" for that of "extended ordination," on the ground that there can be no such thing as "restricted" ordination, and that, therefore, Nonconformist ministers are either "ordained" or "not ordained." But what are they ordained *to?* That is the question. They are not ordained to ministry in the Church of God as a whole, but avowedly to particular sects; their ordination is therefore "restricted," to use Mr. Henderson's term. And yet this is fully compatible with the validity of that ordination *so far as it goes.* Mr. Henderson would have Nonconformists reordained conditionally—conditionally, apparently, on the possible invalidity of the *form* of their ordination. Such a suggestion might be feasible, but is surely less satisfactory than mine, since it throws a greater amount of doubt on the validity of Nonconformist Orders, and would therefore be less acceptable; for my own proposal is not a negative one—of reordination in case of possible previous invalidity, but a positive one—of Apostolic order, practical expediency, and the definite need of "extending" the authority of the previous ordination, since it is now to be exercised in a wider sphere. And so one cannot but feel that "extended ordination," or "supplementary ordination," is a better term than "conditional ordination."

Turning to Mr. Sydney Carter's criticism, I find he has misunderstood me in more than one important point. In the first place, he misunderstands the sense in which the word "Catholic" was used. The article spoke of the "Historic, or Catholic Church," in distinction from the "Church of God" (or "Body of Christ"), which "Church of God" includes both the "Catholic Church" and certain "non-Catholic" elements as well. Mr. Carter takes exception to this nomenclature, and understands one to deny to Nonconformists all Catholicity in any sense whatever. But this I would not do. There is a sense in which even Nonconformists are Catholic, for they are a part of the Church of God; but this is the *evangelical* sense of the word—descriptive of the "evangel" of Christ, to which they bear witness, and which

is Catholic in the sense of being a revelation complete and sufficient for all people for all time.

But there is another sense of the word—the *ecclesiastical* sense—which is surely sufficiently established to require no apology for using. This sense of the word was in use for many centuries to distinguish the historic society (in all its local branches) from the various sects of heretics or schismatics who stood outside the original and orthodox society.

In England the National Church is the local representative of this Historic or Catholic Church, and may therefore well claim the title of Catholic in the ecclesiastical sense, to distinguish herself from Nonconformist bodies. This unique relationship of the National Church to the Historic Church being a matter of fact and of history, *some* word or other would have to be used as expressive thereof, even were the word "Catholic" confined solely to its evangelical sense. That the word was being used in its ecclesiastical, not its evangelical, sense, when one spoke of Nonconformists as being non-Catholics, ought to have been evident from the fact that I expressly included them in the Church of God, and also gave a definition of what I meant by the Catholic Church. This use is further justified by the fact that Nonconformists themselves generally fight shy of the word "Catholic," on the very account of the firm establishment of the term in its ecclesiastical sense, which sense is, therefore, one well known.

Incidentally it may be observed that this use of the word, in application to what is historic and approved, justifies the description of the heritage of our own Church as being both Catholic and Reformed, to which Mr. Carter objects as presenting a false antithesis of terms, for it points to the undoubted fact that our Reformation was conducted on the principle of reverence for and preservation of all that was good in the past—a principle largely disregarded by *other* Protestant bodies; so much so that, as a matter of fact, even in regard to the evangelical sense of Catholicity, though it is an undoubted part of a Nonconformist's heritage, it is doubtful if his Nonconformity always allows him so fully to enter into the *spirit* of this Catholicity as does the Churchman. For instance, in regard to the Catholicity of the Gospel message as they actually *preach* it, it is ofttimes mutilated by the omission of all sacramental teaching, or by a belief that definite official adhesion to the historic Creeds is optional. Again, the Catholicity of that Gospel's appeal is sometimes partially obscured by the belief that the Visible Church is to include only men whose true piety has officially run the gauntlet of some fallacious human test, or by the confining of Church membership to believers in certain theories—*e.g.*, baptism by immersion alone. Or, again, the Catholicity of the Gospel in respect of time is distinctly impoverished if the verdict of Mr. Clark, the latest historian of Nonconformity, be indeed true. He defines Nonconformity as the spirit which exalts Life above Organization to such a degree

that the duty of the religious man is not only to secure life for himself, but to let that life work itself out into an organization—all this regardless of such religious organization as he finds already existent. But if the Christian faith is never able to express itself in any but a highly transient form of organization, can it be indeed for all time? and will not religion tend rather to degenerate into a perpetual negation—a negation of all existent expressions of the truth? Thus, even in the evangelical sense, the Nonconformist might gain by Reunion and contact with the Historic Church a deepening and enrichment of his Catholicity, while in the ecclesiastical sense he will gain something he never had before.

But, secondly, Mr. Carter has misunderstood not only what was meant by Catholic, but also what was predicated of that Catholic Church. He sums up, incorrectly, my conception of the Catholic Church, by stating that the organization of that Church in the New Testament "implies the possession of episcopal orders"; and he speaks of my whole conception of the Catholic Church as consisting in continuity with the original society "*solely by means of episcopal succession*" (his italics), which conception he proceeds to demolish. After all this, would it be believed that throughout the article neither the word "episcopal" nor "Bishop" was even so much as mentioned, while "Apostolical Succession" was defined simply as "the corporate preservation of historic and organic continuity with [the] original society." Provided this corporate preservation of historic and organic continuity has been maintained, and the ministry ordained regularly, my position remains unaffected by the controversy as to the exact origin of episcopacy. For supposing the forerunners of Bishops to have been not prophets or Apostolic delegates, but a body of presbyters, it must be remembered that these men acted collectively, and in a recognized and lawful way (as what might in fact be called "Bishop-priests"). They would have been the first utterly to have repudiated acts of schism or unlawful and unauthoritative ordinations.

In short, unity is one of the notes of the Church. According to the Creeds the notes are four—the Church is One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic. In its aspect as the Church of God, the Church is One by reason of being the Spirit-bearing Body; but in its aspect as the Catholic Church, it is One in a further sense also. The different branches are corporately and organically descended from a common source; we earnestly look for the day when this further unity shall mean something even more complete and valuable than it does already —something more of real fellowship. Mr. Carter refers to Ephesians iv. as showing things alone requisite to the note of unity; but why does he quote only one half of the sentence ("One Lord, one faith, one baptism"), leaving out the crucial words, "There is one body and one spirit"? Dr. Armitage Robinson remarks on this passage: "By a mischievous carelessness of expression, 'unity of spirit' is commonly

spoken of in contrast to 'corporate unity,' and as though it might be accepted as a substitute for it. Such language would have been unintelligible to St. Paul." Was it, then, wrong after all to declare that Apostolical Succession (defined as above) is an essential part of our heritage? Did not our Reformers, by striving earnestly after the ideal of verses 3, 4, show plainly that they held it to be so? and may we not find somewhere here the answer to the question as to where there is any Scriptural warrant for the "assumption" that Nonconformists are "self-deprived of the fulness of covenant blessings"? Those who have failed to keep the Apostolic injunction surely suffer, though it is not for us to pronounce in what way. And be it remembered that, in so far as we Church-people are responsible for their schism, we suffer too: "Whether one member [of the body] suffereth, all the members suffer with it."

We Church-people are surely right in insisting upon "regular" ordination, but we need to insist upon it very humbly.

H. T. MALAHER.

Notices of Books.

STUDIES IN THE PSALMS. By Joseph Bryant Rotherham. *Allenson.* Price 10s. 6d. net.

Mr. Rotherham is the translator of "The Emphasized Bible"—a translation "made from corrected Hebrew and Greek texts, distinguishing narrative, speech, parallelism, and logical analysis," and reproducing by certain simple signs the emphatic idioms of the original texts. It was at the Westminster Bible School, conducted by Dr. G. Campbell Morgan, that Mr. Rotherham received the impulse to "make an attempt on the Psalms." The present volume is the outcome.

In an interesting introduction the author discusses the Psalms as literature, as lyrics, as a summary of sacred learning, and as a stimulus to holy living. He cordially adopts Dr. Thirtle's theory about the titles of the Psalms. According to this theory, we ought to distinguish the strictly *literary* titles from the purely *musical* instructions. The headlines describing (1) the nature of the poem, such as psalm, song, or michtam; (2) the name of the author, as "David," "Asaph"; and (3) the occasion when the Psalm was written, are *literary* titles, and ought to stand at the *beginning* of the Psalm, as they do at present. On the other hand, all the *musical* or liturgical instructions, as "to the chief musician," "upon" such and such instrument, or "for" such and such choir, rightly belong to the *conclusion* of the immediately *preceding* Psalm. As a justification for this theory, we are referred to the prayer or Psalm in the third chapter of Habakkuk, where the *literary* inscription stands at the *beginning* and the *musical* assignment at the *end*. Let us apply this rule to Psalm lvi. The full title of this Psalm is: [*a*] "For the chief musician; set to the dove of the distant terebinth;

[*b*] By David—a Michtam—when the Philistines seized him in Gath." Remove the musical part [*a*] to the end of the *preceding* Psalm [lv.], and the effect will be very satisfactory. "Set to the *dove* of the distant terebinth" thus becomes the *sub*scription of Psalm lv., which contains the wish "would that I had pinions like a *dove*." This theory deserves more attention from scholars than it has actually received. In his arrangement of the text, Mr. Rotherham has consistently followed Dr. Thirtle's theory.

The translation is that of the author's "Emphasized Bible," "diligently revised." It closely follows the translations of Briggs and of Driver, and is printed in stanzas. Each Psalm has a descriptive title, and is followed by an exposition. We have compared Mr. Rotherham's translation with the Hebrew, and found it quite reliable. Eccentricities of rendering are few. He is too fond of small emendations of the Hebrew text. We are not opposed to *judicious* emendations when necessary, so long as a literal translation of the Massoretic text is given in the footnotes; this, however, is not always done. The emendation of Psalm cx. 7 is unnecessary, as the Hebrew is quite clear, and a literal translation gives good sense. "Quiet" for "prosper" in Psalm cx. 6 is tame. The alternative renderings, culled from the works of other scholars, are valuable.

The exposition, which follows each Psalm, is chiefly concerned with discussing the historical background. Mr. Rotherham believes that every Psalm bearing the name of David is either David's composition or an adaptation, or a fragment of a Psalm of which David was the author. He further believes that Hezekiah has "overhauled" several Davidic Psalms to adapt them to altered circumstances.

The book is not a commentary on the Psalms, and has no index. The aim is "to induce readers of the Psalms to become students." Lovers of the Psalms who cannot read Hebrew will derive much help from this volume, which is both reverent and successful in giving to the English reader some of the force and beauty of the Hebrew text.

K. E. KHODADAD.

THE EMPIRE OF THE OLD WORLD TO THE FALL OF ROME. By M. Bramston, S.Th. *Blackie and Son.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

A most ambitious book. The author has attempted in less than 300 pages to cover 4,700 years of history in Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Greece, Israel, and Rome. Of course, the treatment is necessarily scrappy; but where we have tested it by recognized authorities the details are accurate. The book is written in a bright and interesting way, and may well fulfil its author's purpose of serving as a reading-book for children of twelve and upwards. It certainly gives good "general knowledge," and has a plentiful supply of nice illustrations.

THE GROWING GENERATION. By Barclay Baron. *Student Christian Movement.* Price 1s.

Mr. Baron is acting warden of the Oxford and Bermondsey Medical Mission, and therefore writes with knowledge, and his work has been edited by the S.C.M. Social Service Committee. There are seven chapters, primarily intended for study circles, but they are interesting as general

reading. It is needless to add that they are instructive, and if Mr. Baron has not found the solution of social troubles, who can be surprised? The chapters are on Physique, Education, Finding Work, Play, Finding Interests, Social Relations, Religion. We hope many students and schoolboys will find time to read the book.

OUR LORD'S WORK IN HEAVEN. By the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. *Longmans, Green, and Co.* Price 1d.

The name of the author of the latest addition to the English Church manuals is a sufficient guarantee that its contents are scriptural, full and condensed. Recent literature on the subject is noticed, and the facts are presented in a clear, analytic way. We hope that a second edition will speedily be required. When the times come, may we suggest to the author that the two subjects with which he has attempted to deal are large enough to require separate treatment. He begins and ends with our Lord's High Priestly work, but he inserts between the two sections a long digression dealing with the Eucharistic Sacrifice and its related topics. This is not strictly relevant to the subject nominally in hand, though of course our view of the one is vitally affected by our view of the other. We cannot help feeling that it would have been better if the author had dealt only with "Our Lord's work in heaven." He could then have treated certain parts of it in the fuller and more positive way they deserve, and his book would be more helpful to the members of an average congregation, upon whom his condensed and occasionally allusive way of writing makes too great demands.

DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHY. Edited by Henry Wace, D.D., and W. C. Piercy, B.A. London: *John Murray*. Price 21s. net.

Most modern dictionaries tend to become so large that they are both difficult to use and expensive to buy. One always fears that if they are made smaller they will immediately lose their value. We have here a dictionary of four volumes reduced to one, and the edition before us will be a work, unless we are much mistaken, of much greater value for most people and of much wider use. The four-volume edition is a monument of learning, and, as a work of reference, indispensable. But for the ordinary clergyman's library we want something smaller; we can be satisfied with something less than the "596 Johns," of whom we are told in its pages. This book deals with the first 600 years, instead of the first 800, which of course saves space. Many of the less important names have been omitted, and some articles slightly condensed; but the great articles of the old book have been in the main retained, and a number of new ones have been added. The editorial work has been thoroughly and excellently done, and the volume before us ought to find a place in the reference libraries of most clergy. We are all too ignorant of the life and work of those who guided the Church of God in the critical stages of its early existence. The book is no mere shortened form of a larger work; it is a dictionary, comprehensive and complete enough for most students, dealing fully with the men of the period which it professes to cover.

NOTES ON THE FULHAM CONFERENCE. By the Rev. N. Dimock. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2s. net.

Another volume of the Memorial edition of Mr. Dimock's works. Mr. Dimock was a member of the Fulham Conference on the Doctrine of the

Holy Communion, and he took his membership seriously, as this volume abundantly proves. It contains a little of his own writing, and valuable indeed that little is. It contains much of quotations from others, and the quotations are pertinent and important. It is a real contribution to the study of the subject.

THE LIFE HEREAFTER. By Edward Hicks, D.D. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 2s. net.

Perhaps the main contribution that Dr. Hicks makes to the study of this difficult subject is the emphasis that he lays on Mellone's view that the notion of mere endlessness without growth is a poor and cramped conception. He believes that real life is always growing to fuller life, and that as our life depends upon union with Christ, so that fact will make it both fruitful and eternal. Dr. Hicks discusses the various difficulties in a simple and practical manner, and his little book, although it does not solve all the problems, will help at least some to a better understanding.

HERE AND HEREAFTER. By Rev. J. E. Watts-Ditchfield. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

We are always curious to know how a great writer lives and works. Here we are enabled to see how a man of vigorous life and inexhaustible work writes. If this book were not worth reading, we should be disposed to bid our readers forgive its imperfections, and work their way through it. Mr. Watts-Ditchfield has done so much for East London, for society, and for the Church that whatever he writes deserves to be read. But this book requires no apology of this kind; for itself it is abundantly worth reading. It is a series of sermons and addresses, the first five being addresses to the great midday congregation of St. Paul's at Lenten Services. Then there follow a number of sermons preached on special occasions: one preached before the University of Cambridge, two in Westminster Abbey, some in other cathedrals, and some in his own parish church at Bethnal Green. They are full of practical common sense, they are full of real thought, they are marked by wide experience of men and things, and, best of all, they are full of the simple Gospel. Mr. Watts-Ditchfield is an evangelical who is not ashamed of the fact, but he is blind neither to the faults of his own school nor to the virtues of other schools. Here is a passage in proof: "It is little use men calling themselves Protestants and living 'at ease in Sion,' with town and country houses, railing at the 'Mirfield monks,' who, at any rate, give of their own substance, and live a life of self-denial which puts many of us to shame." And to those who desire to gain faith and strength for the work of their lives this book will come as a real help. His sermons are well arrranged, excellently illustrated, forcefully put. One is tempted to ask how, in the midst of all his work, the author can have written them, but the real answer is ready to hand. They are the product of his life, the result of his work; and, after all, such are the only sermons worth the reading.

IDEALS FOR THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. By the Rev. W. D. M. Sutherland, with Introduction by the Rev. G. H. Morrison, M.A. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

A collection of the best of a series of articles in the *Ardrossan and Saltcoats Herald*, dealing with a variety of mainly ethical topics from a Christian point of view. There are many fine and shrewd sayings; one example must suffice. In the essay on Conscience the essential points are well put in a few lines. Conscience is an inborn faculty. It distinguishes right and wrong, and it is "moral knowledge together with another, and that other, God," who educates it.

SHALL I BELIEVE? By Rev. G. N. Oakley, B.D. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2s. 6d.

A book of Christian evidences on a small scale, written with real ability, and suitable for distribution among thoughtful young men.

Received: LATER LETTERS OF MARCUS DODS. Edited and selected by his son, Marcus Dods. London: *Hodder and Stoughton.* Price 6s. Readers of the earlier volume will be glad to have these additional letters, and those who did not read the earlier volume will find here the revelation of the personality of a remarkable man and some interesting religious discussions. GOLDEN SUNBEAM. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s. 4d. The Annual Volume of the Church Magazine for Children. THE GOLDEN KEY. By Lilian Street. London: *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.* Price 3s. 6d. A volume of daily thoughts, from prose and poetry, admirably chosen, carefully arranged, and beautifully got up. THE DAWN OF DAY. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s. The Annual Volume of the well-known Parish Magazine. THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE OF LIFE. London: *H. R. Allenson.* Price 1s. net. The words are used in their natural, not their sectarian, sense. A series of practical essays, in letter form, dealing with the ordinary problems of life. OUR ENGLISH BIBLE: HOW WE GOT IT. By Rev. R. B. Girdlestone, M.A. London: *S.P.C.K.* A second edition of a useful little book. THE HISTORY OF THE EVANGELICAL PARTY. By G. R. Balleine. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. net. A cheap edition of Mr. Balleine's most valuable book. SONGS OF THE TWILIGHT. By F. V. Harcourt. London: *Morton and Sons.* Price 6d. A small pamphlet of religious poems. PRAYER. By Rev. W. P. Warburton, M.A. London: *Putnam's Sons.* Price 1s. net. A devotional paper on prayer read to a clerical society. TOWARDS A PERFECT MAN. By H. W. Clark. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 2s. net. Some practical studies in character building, likely to be very useful, especially to young men and women. UGANDA; A CHOSEN VESSEL. By Rev. H. T. C. Weatherhead. London: *C.M.S.* Price 6d. net. The Missionary Study Book for 1912, of a simpler and more elementary kind than the larger books. Just the thing for a parochial study circle. MINISTERS DIARY, 1912. London: *Hodder and Stoughton.* Price 2s. and 3s. net. A usefully arranged and very complete pocket-book for a working clergyman. THE CHURCHMAN'S ALMANACK, 1912. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 6d. The usual but absolutely indispensable batch of Churchmen's Almanack. THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES. Published by Henry Frowde. London: *Clarendon Press.* Price 3s. 6d. WILD WALES. By George Borrow. London: *T. Nelson and Sons.* Price 6d. net. MR. HORROCKS PURSER. By C. J. Cutcliffe. London: *T. Nelson and Sons.* Price 7d. net. EMBLEMS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. By F. E. Marsh. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 3s. 6d. net. A series of devotional studies on the work of the Holy Spirit, written with simplicity, aptly illustrated, and sure to be helpful. THE SIX NECESSARY THINGS. By J. Hammond. London: *Duckworth and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net. The six things are: Knowledge of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, Repentance, Faith, and Obedience. Some unconventional theology for the man in the street. THE HEBREWS EPISTLE. By Sir Robert Anderson. London: *T. Nisbet and Co.* Price 3s. 6d. net. The writer discusses the types and similes of the Epistle in the light of the Old Testament and of the Gospel. A clearly-written and useful book. SCRIPTURE POST-CARDS. By Harold Copping. London: *R.T.S.* Price 6d. net each packet. A series of picture post-cards, depicting Scripture incidents, reproduced from Copping's Bible. These beautiful cards will give much greater pleasure than the very unsatisfactory and inartistic cards of which we have far too many. We recommend them to the buyers of picture post-cards. A DEFENCE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AGAINST DISESTABLISHMENT. By Roundell, Earl of Selborne. London: *Macmillan and Co.* Price 1s. net. A very opportune reprint of Lord Selborne's book, with an additional chapter on the Report of the Royal Commission. Full of facts for speakers in the present campaign. DR. ALEC'S SON. By Irene H. Barnes. London: *C.M.S.* Price 1s. 6d. Miss Barnes's name ought to be sufficient to circulate this book, which is an excellent missionary story, printed and illustrated even better than some of its predecessors. The children will thoroughly enjoy it, and it will help them. READING FROM THE BIBLE AND APOCRYPHA. By E. M. Ecroyd. London: *Henry Frowde.* Price 2s. net. A series of Bible readings arranged for every day in the year, and printed from the Revised Version. STUDIES IN THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST. By C. H. Robinson, D.D. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 6d. net. A reprint with an extra chapter of Canon Robinson's well-known book. The extra chapter deals with the presence of Christ in the Holy Communion, and although we cannot agree with all that it says, it combats one mischievous heresy—the heresy that suggests that, when what you see in the Sacrament passes away, the hidden blessing is also lost.