

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN.

SEPTEMBER, 1908.

The Month.

The
Lambeth
Encyclical. WE are afraid it must be confessed that the Lambeth Conference has not aroused any very strong interest or made any deep impression. Perhaps our expectations had been set too high, for many Churchmen had been hoping that on several of the more important and critical questions now before us we should have some light and leading from the Conference. But while the Letter says much that is valuable on the fundamental questions of the Deity of our Lord and the Holy Trinity, as well as on the practical questions of Social and Missionary Service, we seek in vain for guidance on the problems connected with Marriage and Divorce, on Christian Reunion, and on the Use of the Athanasian Creed. The way in which some of these subjects have been relegated to the decision of local branches of the Anglican Communion serves to show that any clear and undoubted pronouncement which would have represented the consensus of Anglican opinion is regarded as impossible. On the whole, perhaps, it is not to be regretted that this recognition of the rights of national Churches has been expressed once again. It may save us from difficulties in the future, if certain tendencies to centralization in the Anglican Communion should become too greatly accentuated. It always makes for liberty to have these problems faced and decided by particular branches of the Church, and in an ever-growing liberty will be found one of the greatest safeguards of ecclesiastical purity and progress. It is, of course, impossible for us this month to touch upon more than one or two topics comprised in the Lambeth Letter. They

will necessarily provide food for thought and discussion among Churchmen for some time to come, and in this discussion will probably be found the most fruitful results of the Conference.

**Marriage
Problems.**

The vote of eighty-seven to eighty-four in favour of regarding it as "undesirable" that the marriage of an innocent party should be solemnized in church is a very significant result. It means, first of all, that out of 243 Bishops, only 171 were present or else voted on this important issue. The majority in favour of the resolution represented not more than one-third of the Prelates of the Anglican Communion, while the size of the minority shows how strong and almost equally divided was the feeling. In face of these facts it is, of course, impossible to contend that the Anglican Communion has any distinct voice on this subject, and the matter will necessarily still remain open. We venture to predict that our Communion will never get men to see and accept the position that the innocent party is to be placed upon the same level as the guilty one, and is therefore to be compelled to bear a life-long stigma without redress so far as the Church is concerned. Such a position is not according to the mind of Christ as revealed in His Word, but is only the expression of a peculiar ecclesiastical view of matrimony, which is as far removed from Scripture truth as it is from ordinary principles of righteousness and justice. We have no wish whatever to suit our acts to please people or to gain popularity, and we are quite ready to run counter to popular feeling if we are warranted in doing so by the Word of God. But when, as in this case, we adopt a view that stands self-condemned by all ideas of elementary right and truth, we are doing an injury not only to the Church, but to the cause of the Church's Master.

**The
Deceased
Wife's Sister
Question.**

It was not at all to be expected that the Lambeth Conference would pronounce upon this subject in view of the fact that in several branches of the Anglican Communion marriage with a deceased wife's sister is perfectly legal. The Eaton case, decided by the

Dean of Arches last month, has, however, raised the whole question afresh for us at home, and it is difficult at this moment to see how it is going to be settled. The *Record* very truly described the decision as "a righteous judgment," and the *Guardian* regrets that the case was ever allowed to go forward. When the two leading representative organs of our Church thus substantially agree on the present situation, the matter cannot possibly be regarded as in any sense a party question. The *Guardian* has also rendered invaluable service to the cause of truth and peace by providing, in its issue of August 5, extracts from the advice given to clergy by various Bishops shortly after the passing of the Act last year. No less than eleven representative Bishops deprecate any refusal of Holy Communion to those who have contracted these marriages. One thing, at least, is perfectly clear : as Canon Thompson was ready to acknowledge the Court of Arches in permitting the trial to go forward, he ought now to accept its decision. If the Court had decided in his favour, he would probably have been quite ready to use it on his own behalf. It is impossible to sympathize with one who first accepts the jurisdiction of the Court, and then refuses submission because its decisions happen to be against him. If he cannot honestly and loyally carry out the legal requirements of his position, he should, of course, resign. But apart from this case the entire question must soon be faced. To call these marriages "incestuous," even in a technical sense, is quite impossible, for if they are in any sense "incestuous" they are wrong, and there is an end of it. No one can be dispensed for the purpose of "incest," yet Rome grants dispensations for the solemnization of these marriages from time to time. It has been pertinently inquired, What would be the attitude of those who object to these marriages towards such dispensed people if they wished to join our Church and attend Holy Communion? The one thing that dominates the situation is the question whether these marriages are contrary to the Word of God. If they are, they are wrong, and nothing can set them right. If they are not contrary to Holy Scripture, they

cannot possibly be inherently wrong in the sight of God. And the significant thing is that in all the recent debates and discussions no reference has been made to the argument from Scripture. So far as we have been able to discover, the passage in Leviticus which was formerly thought to be the stronghold of this position has not been mentioned. Why is this? If, then, the phrase in the Table of Kindred and Affinity stating that these marriages are "forbidden in Scripture" is no longer warranted, the best way will be to take steps to have it removed. It is no mere question of the law of the land, but of the relation of the law of the Church to the Word of God. Meanwhile, for a practical common-sense point of view, as expressed in one of our ablest secular journals, the following words of the *Westminster Gazette* are worthy of attention :

"We confess it amazes us that serious Churchmen can be willing to stake the credit of the Church as a moral guide on its adhesion to an ecclesiastical opinion which is so completely out of touch with ordinary sentiment. To brand innocent people, or people whom the vast majority of their neighbours consider innocent, as 'open and notorious evil-livers' is not to raise, but to lower, the standard of morals. You can say nothing worse about the real and flagrant offenders; and if it is to be said about the innocent, it will not affect them, but it *will* induce the belief that, according to the Church's code, the really vicious are no worse than their law-abiding neighbours. Nothing can be more mischievous than for the guardians of morality to confuse the boundaries in this way."

It is, indeed, astonishing to confuse matters in this way, and it is even more surprising that those who oppose marriage with a deceased wife's sister on the ground of affinity as equivalent to consanguinity have apparently not a word to say against the serious fact that first cousins are allowed to marry without any question. Surely, then, there is a call for some clear and balanced thinking on the entire subject, lest we should be unconsciously led away by distinctions which have no warrant whatever in the Word of God.

The question of Christian Reunion has received fresh attention during the month in various quarters. The Dean of Westminster's valuable sermon, together with the pronouncement of the Lambeth Conference, has kept the subject well to the front. In particular, we have read with

The
Vision of
Unity.

deep interest the views of leading Presbyterians as elicited by the *Church Family Newspaper*. Their statements of their own position should be carefully read by those Churchmen who think that Reunion by absorption, however long the process, is the most excellent, and indeed the only possible way. This is what Principal Lindsay of Glasgow says :

“We Presbyterians are quite assured of the validity and regularity of our Orders. We go further: we believe them to be of more ancient standing than the Anglican. We recognize the validity of Anglican ordination (as we do of Wesleyan, Congregational, and Baptist), but we think it irregular. . . . The historic Episcopate is seen by us in the pastorate of our congregations, which represents the Congregational Bishops of the early centuries. We believe that our ordination comes down to us by successive generations from the times of the Apostles.”

Other Presbyterians have written in equally clear and frank terms, and it is essential that Churchmen should take every opportunity, as recommended by the Lambeth Conference, of trying to understand the position of those who belong to other Communion. It is abundantly evident, and has been so all along, that Presbyterians will neither do anything which will imply any slight on their own Orders and ministry, nor take any step towards absorption into Anglicanism which will tend to remove them farther away from non-Presbyterian Communion, with which they are in close doctrinal and spiritual sympathy. All this tends to show the seriousness and complexity of the situation, and the utter impossibility of settling the matter by any such one-sided plan as even a very gradual absorption of the Presbyterian ideal into the historic Episcopate. We must face the problem afresh, and on very different lines. As Canon Henson very rightly said, expressing the feelings of many Churchmen for years past, the famous quadrilateral of the Lambeth Conference of 1888, which placed on a level of equality the Scripture, the Sacraments, the Creeds, and the historic Episcopate, is a barrier, not a help, to Reunion.

Can
Nothing
be Done?

In view of the strong recommendations of the Lambeth Encyclical that Anglican Churchmen should take every opportunity of meeting for private discussion with those of other Communion, in order

to learn more clearly each other's point of view, it is earnestly to be hoped that something definite and tangible will be done in this direction. Our New York contemporary, the *Churchman*, in commenting on the Dean of Westminster's sermon, uses the following pointed language :

"As is usual when reunion is spoken of in such positive terms that its realization is forced upon everyone's attention as a pressing and immediate necessity, the common admonitions follow both in the *Church Times* and in the *Guardian* to discourage haste, or what is called rashness. Nothing, to our mind, is more purposeless than such comments. They remind one only of the pious protests and fraternal greetings which passed between the rival Popes during the time of the schism in the Western Church, each desiring his rival to take the first step, and both afraid to put themselves in a place where their words might be taken seriously. There can be no such thing as rashness in getting out of a position that is uncatholic and unchristian. Admonitions to be patient in disobedience to Christ's command are worse than an absurdity. They are not only contrary to His own words, but irreconcilable with the spirit of His whole life."

We heartily re-echo this opinion, and we hope that those in authority, as well as many Churchmen in their private capacity, will face this problem in the light of what has happened during the last few weeks, and see whether there is not some way out of the present *impasse*. It cannot be right to go on in our present state of "unhappy divisions," and we will not believe it is beyond the power of Christian sanctified wisdom, enlightened and guided by the Holy Spirit, to make at least a commencement towards the realization of our Lord's prayer that His people "may be one."

A useful and noteworthy contribution to the subject of Christian Unity is found in the current number of the *Church Quarterly Review*, in an article on "The Lambeth Conference and the Union of the Churches." While the spirit of the entire article is admirable, we call especial attention to the following point, which goes to the very heart of the problem :

"Let us get rid of the expression 'validity' of Orders and Sacraments. Whether or no Orders and Sacraments are valid is, after all, something which we cannot settle. What we should ask is whether they are 'regular'—that is to say, whether a particular body of Christians correctly interprets the mind of Christ declared to us by His Church in the fulfilment of His

command to celebrate the Sacraments and to send out messengers of His Gospel. . . . We have then to be sure, not that the Sacraments of the Presbyterian bodies are valid, but that they are regular."

It would be a great point gained if we could follow the writer's advice, and at once and for ever cease from discussing validity and concentrating attention on regularity of ministry. What do we mean by "valid" in reference to ministry? Does it mean a validity which guarantees spiritual blessing in the ordinances administered? Then, if people are showing in their lives and communities the undoubted fruit of the Spirit, is not the validity of their ministry clearly proved? History shows beyond question that a ministry may be spiritually valid even while it is historically irregular. Irregularity is not invalidity. We are grateful for the admission from so well-known a High-Church organ as the *Church Quarterly Review* of a point which Evangelical Churchmen have always uniformly held, and if we see unmistakable tokens of spiritual blessing in any ministry or Church, we may be perfectly certain, as the Dean of Westminster so truly said, that our differences are not those of faith, but of discipline, and as such it ought to be possible to resolve them.

What is Schism? In the same article the connected question of Schism is also dealt with in the following words :

"What is the meaning of schism? The ordinary point of view of one body of Christians when speaking of schismatics is to suggest that they are themselves the Church, and all the others are schismatics—that is, persons who have separated themselves from it. . . . Now, historically that point of view cannot be held in any case. To an impartial observer it is quite impossible to say that the Eastern Church separated from the West, or the West from the East. They divided. A division was caused and a schism was created—that is to say, a division in a body; so at the time of the Reformation a schism was created, or, rather, many schisms were created. But it is not that this or that Church separated from the great body of the Church: a division was created in the body, sometimes large, sometimes small; and so in relation to ourselves and a body like the Wesleyans. And if this be the proper point of view, it is equally important to recognize that the sin of schism does not probably in any case lie wholly on one side or the other. Neither Leo X. nor Henry VIII. can be considered entirely free from either moral or intellectual blame. Even the strongest admirers of Luther cannot acquit him of blame. We are not prepared to defend either the spiritual life of the Church of England in the eighteenth century, or the spiritual self-assertion of the Wesleyan movement. Schism means sin in the past, and needs penitence and reparation in the future."

Nothing could be truer than these words, and nothing more welcome than the admissions they involve. If all Churchmen adopted this position, we should be quickly brought much nearer the goal of unity. The idea that Dissent as a whole is schismatic is impossible and preposterous. In view of the attitude of the Church of England, with its encroachments on individual conscience, in Elizabeth's reign, as Bishop Creighton points out; in view of its tyranny in 1662, in requiring subscription to a Prayer-Book which had not been published; and in view of its deplorable attitude in the eighteenth century to the Methodist and Evangelical movements, we ought to be ready to face facts and admit them, however unwelcome they may be. As the writer in the *Church Quarterly Review* truly says, the first step towards Reunion will be a great service of penitence and reconciliation. If we approach the subject in this spirit, we are certain to carry with us the right-minded men of other Churches, and to pave the way for that unity which is now only a vision, but which must, and will one day, be realized.

**Candidates
for Holy
Orders.** We desire to call earnest attention to a very valuable and important document—the Report of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Committee on “The Special Training of Candidates for Holy Orders.” It can be obtained from Canon Bullock-Webster, Parkstone, Dorset (1s. 6d.), and should be in the hands of those who are concerned, as we all ought to be, with the present dearth of curates and the general condition of clerical life in the Church. The Report is full of most varied information drawn from all quarters, and, if carefully studied, it should prove very fruitful of results. The Committee recommends that a course of education and training, such as is outlined, should be placed within the reach of all who may be selected as suitable candidates, and that this should be done by treating the education of the Church's ministers as a fundamental department of Church finance. This is a bold, statesman-like, and welcome pronouncement, which we cannot but believe will make its

impression in the right quarters. It is common knowledge that the students of Presbyterian Churches, to say nothing of Congregational and Methodist, are far more thoroughly trained than our own. While they require the students to spend three, and sometimes four, years at a theological college after obtaining a degree, we on our part cannot always be sure that our graduates will remain even a year at a theological college. When we think of what it means to obtain ordination on the strength of an ordinary Arts Degree, together with the provision of certain University Divinity certificates, we may well stand amazed that such an arrangement was ever permitted. And yet this is all that is required from a good proportion of candidates to-day. No wonder that the laity cherish a contempt for the average sermon heard in our churches. The worst of it is that not a few of our young men do not realize the need of fuller training, but seem content to enter the ministry with almost a minimum of knowledge and experience. Alas for them (and their congregations)! they are not long in finding out their intellectual and spiritual barrenness, for they have no reserve of knowledge or experience, and are in danger of ministerial failure for lack of resources. We hope and believe this Report will do much to end the present unfortunate and deplorable state of affairs, and bring about a great improvement in the quality and character of our ministerial work. One step could and should be taken at once. Our Bishops, who in some respects hold the key of the position, should make it compulsory on all graduates to attend a theological college for at least one year. If, as we hope, the Bishops are led to adopt this definite plan as the result of this Report, we feel sure that the laity will respond with the necessary funds in order to make it possible for our students to obtain the high qualification for Holy Orders that the requirements of the position imperatively demand.



Professor G. A. Smith's "Jerusalem."¹

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR SAYCE, D.D., LL.D.

THIS is what our grandfathers would have described as a monumental work, and will remain the standard authority on the subject of which it treats for a long while to come. Professor George Adam Smith's gifts as the interpreter of ancient Israelitish geography have never been shown to greater advantage, and it is difficult which to admire most, the vast amount of learning and research to which the book bears witness, or the charm of style and lucidity of arrangement which are conspicuous in it. Scarcely anything relating to Jerusalem seems to have escaped his notice; foreign as well as British periodicals have been laid under contribution, and references are made to obscure articles in obscure publications. The chapters in the second "book" of the first volume on the "Economics" of ancient Jerusalem are at once original and important; for the first time attention has been drawn to the question of the natural resources and revenues of Jerusalem and the sources of its food-supply. Jerusalem did not lie upon the line of the high road which ran along the coast from Egypt to Phœnicia; it was situated among barren hills, and there was no navigable river near it. Whence, then, did it derive its wealth, and how came it to attain the position of a capital and a centre of power?

To these questions Professor Smith endeavours to find an answer. To the oil supplied by the olive-trees of the neighbourhood he would ascribe the beginnings of its commercial prosperity. It was the oil which first enabled its citizens to obtain in exchange the imports which they needed. Then with the establishment of David's empire came the carrying-trade, between Edom and Arabia on the one side, and Phœnicia and Europe on the other. This carrying-trade was never wholly lost, and after the disastrous age of the Exile was revived under a newer form.

¹ "Jerusalem: the Topography, Economics, and History. From the Earliest Times to A.D. 70." By George Adam Smith. 2 vols. Hodder and Stoughton. London, 1907. Price 24s.

Professor Smith is doubtless right in thus assigning to the trade in oil an important part in the early development of Jerusalem. But I think he has forgotten another and perhaps even more important factor in the early commercial history of the city. For several centuries Canaan was a province of Babylonia, and the name of Jerusalem itself, originally Uru-Salim, "the city of Salim," testifies—*pace* the Professor—to its Babylonian origin. Wherever Babylonian culture went it carried with it the brick architecture of Babylonia. In this architecture bitumen was used in place of mortar, and bitumen accordingly was from the outset one of the chief articles of Babylonian trade. Hence the serious character, from a Babylonian point of view, of the rebellion of the Canaanite kings, whose territory contained the bitumen springs of the Dead Sea region, and the dispatch of a large army to suppress it. Jerusalem lay on the route of the bitumen-trade; it was the first easily-defensible fortress west of the Dead Sea and the Jordan to which the naphtha could be brought, and here, consequently, Melchizedek came out to welcome Abram when the defeat of the Babylonian forces had transferred the command of the naphtha route from the Babylonians to Abram and his allies. The naphtha-trade, once started, would have been supplemented by the salt-trade, salt being a prime article of commerce in the East, and the Dead Sea furnishing an inexhaustible supply of it. Instead, therefore, of tracing the carrying-trade of Jerusalem to its trade in oil, as Professor Smith seems to do, I should be inclined to trace its trade in oil to its primitive carrying-trade in the products of the Vale of Siddim and "the Salt Sea."

The topography of Jerusalem is admirably handled by Professor Smith, and his scientific spirit of fairness is exemplified in the letters he prints from geological and topographical experts against his own theory of the effect of earthquakes on the water-supply of the ancient city. In the same spirit of scientific honesty he confesses that the materials do not allow us to determine whether "the Second Wall" ran inside or outside the site of

the Church of the Holy Sepulchre—a point upon which the dispute as to whether or not the latter represents Calvary largely turns; and like most modern scholars, he concludes that "Sion, or David's-Burgh, and the earliest city lay upon the East Hill." He believes, however, that under the Jewish kings the city extended also over the South-west Hill—the modern Mount Zion—a belief, however, which personally I am unable to share. The excavations of Dr. Bliss have shown that a wall once ran northward immediately to the west of the Birket-el-Hamra and the Pool of Siloam, and there is no reason for thinking that the remains of the wall running westward to the south of it across the mouth of the Tyropœon belong to the period before the Exile. As the Pool of Siloam, into which the famous water-tunnel opens, was protected by the wall west of the Birket-el-Hamra, I do not understand the force of Professor Smith's argument that, "under the conditions of ancient warfare," the South-west Hill would have commanded "the pool at the mouth of the Tunnel," and consequently must have already been enclosed within the city walls. It might command the mouth of the Tunnel under the conditions of modern warfare, but certainly not under those of ancient warfare.

The second volume of Professor Smith's work is devoted to the history of the Biblical Jerusalem, but I confess that I cannot extend the same unreserved welcome to the earlier part of it as to other portions of his work. When he forsakes geography and literature for the chair of the archæologist, his work betrays merely a second-hand acquaintance with the subject. He is dominated by prevalent literary theories about the age and composition of the Pentateuch, and the archæology is nothing but a *pis aller* thrown in, as it were, to fill up gaps. It makes one despair of literary criticism when a writer, so learned and exact, so sane, and in topographical matters so alive to the meaning of scientific evidence, should thus forget both scientific method and the nature of scientific proof as soon as he comes to deal with Old Testament history. At once the usual apparatus of the modern *littérateur* appears upon the scene; subjective

fantasies instead of facts, conclusions drawn from literary hypotheses, history based on literary philology, and dogmatic expressions of scepticism without a full knowledge of the facts. Take, for example, the name of Ebed-Kheba, the King of Jerusalem, in the age of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, which Professor Smith, though he is not an Assyriologist, pronounces the Assyriologists to be "probably" wrong in making Hittite. Had he been an Assyriologist himself he would have known that the question is settled. The name of Kheba is found on more than one Hittite cuneiform tablet from Boghaz Keui as that of a native Hittite deity, and from the Hittites it was borrowed by the people of Mitanni. It was this fact which made me give up my old attempt to explain the name—which should be read *Ui-Kheba*, *Kheba-memis*, or something similar—as Semitic. Literary criticism, however, has decided that there were no Hittites at Jerusalem, since the Old Testament says that there were, and literary criticism accordingly treats the Assyriologist or the archæologist as it treats the writers of the Hebrew Bible, denying their statements without knowing all the facts.

Or take, again, the Book of Deuteronomy, which Professor Smith assumes to have been forged, when it is said to have been "found" in the temple in the age of Josiah. Literary philology has averred that such was the case, and history consequently has to suffer. The book is invoked in evidence of the ideas and practices of the age shortly before the Exile; its historical value for an earlier epoch is denied and ignored. But here, once more, archæology has something to say on the matter. As Maspero, and, more recently, Naville, have pointed out, the discovery of an old book in a temple at a time when the latter was being repaired was nothing new or extraordinary. We hear of its happening several times in Egypt, and in Egypt we have archæological proof that when an old papyrus or parchment is said to have been found in the wall or other part of a temple the statement described a fact. The custom of burying a newspaper under the foundations of a building is not a modern

one, and in Babylonia, where clay took the place of paper, written documents were buried in the walls of a temple as far back as the fourth millennium B.C. In placing a copy of the Law in the walls of the Temple of Jerusalem, Solomon was only following the precedent of Babylonian and Egyptian custom. And, as Professor Naville has shown, the class of book that was committed to the safe keeping of the temple-walls was just such as that to which the Book of Deuteronomy belongs. Speaking as an archæologist, I find it difficult to believe that the main part of this book can be later than the Solomonic age, and to make it probable we must have, not the theorising of a subjective philology and a still more subjective hypothesis of philosophical development, but scientific facts and the application of a scientific method such as will alone satisfy a student of the inductive sciences.



The Lessons of the Pan-Anglican Congress.

BY MRS. ASHLEY CARUS-WILSON, B.A.

IT is generally agreed that the Pan-Anglican Congress raised great expectations and more than fulfilled the expectations that it had raised. The Bishop of St. Albans put into words what all were feeling when, meeting the General Committee as its chairman the day after the Thanksgiving Service, he said: "Every night I thanked God for the meetings that had taken place that day, for the wonderful spirit of goodwill, harmony, and kindly Christian feeling that characterized all sections. I have seldom been at gatherings at which so little was said that was unworthy of the occasion. Our imperfect faith has been indeed rebuked by the way in which our prayers for the Congress have been answered."

The sweetness and light of the sunniest June on record seem to have touched it throughout, and "inspiring" and "uplifting" are the words by which one oftenest heard it charac-

terized. But it did far more than stir emotion within our Church, and impress upon those without its importance as an institution. It may not have solved the complex questions that it raised ; it may inaugurate no far-reaching changes. But that it has taught many lessons of permanent value is indubitable—at any rate, to one who not only attended it throughout, but spoke on its behalf over seventy times in sixteen different dioceses, and, as a member of its General Committee, followed its organizing during a twelvemonth.

First, it taught a lesson of union and concord ; and a lesson of looking not on our own things, but on those of others, that must shame us out of our narrow parochialism, our paltry selfishness, our party bitterness, our criminal apathy ; and a lesson that, though we are heirs of all the ages, our outlook is not backward but forward.

Unity, freedom, and progress are indeed the distinctive marks of the Anglican Communion, and as we better understand its character and its mission to the world, and our own privileges and obligations as members of it, we learn a fourth lesson of deeper loyalty to it. Again, we learn that being members means not getting, but giving—not What is the Church going to do for me ? but What does the Church call upon me to do ?

And, lastly, we learn that the Church will be strong to serve, as it is spiritual ; not through academic correctness of doctrine, or impressiveness of ceremonial, or even through activity in good works, but through sustained communion with God Himself.

The organizers of the Congress did not begin by arguing that Churchmen should be united and work towards hearty co-operation in the future ; they began by making them co-operate as if they were already united. Men who had hitherto consorted almost entirely with those of their own way of thinking found themselves side by side with those of another way of thinking, working in absolute unanimity towards great objects that commanded the full sympathy of both. It revealed (as the Archdeacon of Ballarat puts it) “ a unity within the Church never dreamed of, and proved that party divisions are greatly exag-

gerated." Of course there were zealots on both sides who for this very reason disapproved of the whole enterprise; "Protestants" who said that the Congress was a scheme to capture the Church for the High Church party; who repudiated the idea that it would advance the cause of Christ's spiritual kingdom, and did not look forward to it with thankfulness (we quote one uncompromising journal). And there were also "Catholics," one associated with a famous Privy Council judgment, who "saw nothing in the Congress to be interested in"; another who protested that all this talk about "Anglican" tended to ignore the Catholic Church; several who seem to have apprehended that it may eventuate in establishing a central authority which will deal more promptly and effectively with innovations unsanctioned by the Prayer-Book than any existing authority. Nevertheless, the union of heart among High and Low and Broad, as they laboured together to rouse that vast central body of normal Anglicans, whose bane is not party spirit, but calm indifference, reminded one often of the phrase, "Except in opinion, not disagreeing."

For the true union and concord will come not through understandings convinced that *you* are right and *we* are wrong, but through enlarged minds, and warmed hearts, and fired imaginations, as we learn to look beyond our own four walls. When the Archbishop of Canterbury sent his mission to the ancient and isolated Assyrian Church, its members discovered with astonishment that they were not as they had hitherto believed themselves to be, the only Christians in the world. But we can find Christians not so remote as those in the fastnesses of Asiatic Turkey, whose absorption in petty local disputes argues a similar delusion. One hears of a prominent parishioner in a small rural parish forsaking church for chapel, because a new vicar of a domineering spirit asked him what he was in the habit of putting into the bag, and brought ornaments and ceremonies into the church unknown to his predecessor. From another small rural parish one hears of a prominent church-goer absenting himself from public worship altogether because the rector refused to expel summarily from his little

choir its best voice, whose parents, being Baptists, had never brought him to the font, though they were most willing that he should be under the rector's influence. Now, apart from any question of criticizing the clergyman in either of these cases, they point surely to a most defective conception of the obligations of Churchmanship on the laity, for which the only true remedy is that Englishmen become less insular. Our Church must be one—holding unflinchingly to the great essentials of the faith as the only genuine bond of unity; it must be Catholic, free to admit that the coexistence within its borders of schools of thought which differ with regard to non-essentials is a source of strength, not of weakness; it must also be Apostolic, recognizing a mission beyond its own borders. For that open mind towards new ideas, which is the sign of a progressive Church, will be sane and useful only as it is manifested by a self-extending missionary Church—a Church which recognizes growth as the token and condition of life.

Two most hopeful characteristics of the Congress were its determination to apply Christian principles more practically than ever before, and its readiness to rehabilitate half-forgotten truths, or to accept new expressions of old truths. Fearlessly it grappled with such debatable questions as Christian Science and non-Christian Religions, Biblical Criticism and Socialism, in a progressive spirit, but it was not carried away by rather cheap criticism of long-established principles on the part of advocates of untried theories. The element of truth in "Christian Science," which accounts for its popularity, may be latent, though not patent, in the Church's teaching, but no precipitate action should be taken to restore primitive unction. All now agree that the study of non-Christian faiths should start from what is good and true in them; but reaction from wholesale condemnation to indiscriminate admiration should be checked by realizing that those who best understand them, as they are to-day, are giving their lives as missionaries to the endeavour to supersede them. We ought to comprehend the Bible better than our forefathers did—in this connection the unvarying use of the Revised Version

at the Congress was significant — but modern scholarship promises in the end to confirm rather than to overthrow some of the traditional views that have been questioned lately, and we must beware of wholesale acceptance of unproved theories. While many social conditions call for reform, in which the Church should co-operate vigorously, the things that have actually been done hitherto for the betterment of society have certainly not been done by the Socialists, though they talk as if they were the first people to recognize that any evils exist.

As we learn that we should draw near to each other, that we should not be self-absorbed, that we should march with the times, we also learn what the Church's claim on our personal allegiance is, not as a mere ecclesiastical machine, or human institution, but as our own particular part of that Divine society to which Christ committed the doing of His own work in the world. Whim, prejudice, party feeling, sheer ignorance, lead some truly religious Anglicans to forsake their parish churches for Nonconformist chapels from time to time ; or to assist religious work done by some other body of Christians, no better than, though possibly as well as, our own Church is doing it. There are good Christians who are not good Churchmen. And some thoughtless people in their controversial ardour are strengthening tendencies to segregation which might eventually make Disestablishment not only, what it must in any case be, a disaster to the nation, but also, to an extent that it might not otherwise be, a disaster to the Church. Our prayer that it may not come ought not to prevent our foreseeing that if it comes on a distracted Church, the party that yearns to "purge" the Prayer-Book and the party that yearns to "enrich" it may each go in opposite directions with the largest following that each can muster, while political Nonconformity openly triumphs over a disrupted Church, and Roman Catholicism stealthily and effectually reaps the main advantage of its disruption. One widely read Nonconformist organ, while friendly, not to say patronizing, to the Congress generally, ingeniously asserts that as the Anglican Communion "does very well indeed without

Establishment " beyond Great Britain, the Congress in showing this " is really a most powerful argument against Establishment." We should, of course, question the premisses as well as the conclusion drawn from them. But we must remember that the Church which will be strong to resist or even strong to survive Disestablishment will be the Church that commands whole-hearted, self-sacrificing loyalty, in which men of different schools are at such close quarters over matters which are their common concern that they know and understand and respect each other, even where they do not wholly agree—a Church whose members are most of them *convinced* Anglicans.

We will now look at the matter of giving to the Church instead of merely receiving from it in its narrowest sense only. "To my mind at least," says the Bishop of Antigua, "the blot on the Congress has been the quite inadequate amount of the Thank-offering." Its actual amount was indeed considerably less than the ordinary annual income of one of our two great missionary societies. But, after all, as the Archbishop of the West Indies reminds us, it is large, having regard to the fact that this is the first effort of the kind to reach the whole community, an effort not made in the interests of any one society or type of work. Its distribution, as seen in the official returns from the various dioceses, is, however, more instructive than its amount. Wherever people were made to realize the importance of the appeal, their gifts were liberal. Elsewhere the conventional collection coin took the place of the substantial cheque they might have written. One-eighteenth of the whole gift from the Diocese of London came from a single West End parish—wealthy, but by no means the wealthiest. And this parish gave more than the diocese which contains the fifth biggest town in England. Winchester, the diocese which came next to London in the amount of its gift—by no means one of the wealthiest dioceses—gave nearly £7,000 more than any other diocese, and almost twice as much as the two dioceses which contain the two largest cities in England next to London put together. Salisbury, with its scattered agricultural population, gave over

£8,300—having aimed at £5,000—an amount only exceeded by eight English dioceses. Pretoria, Singapore, and Rupert's Land were far ahead of all other dioceses beyond the seas, giving among them nearly twice as much as Montreal, Toronto, Adelaide, Sydney, and Melbourne put together. That Anglicans can be taught to give, when trouble is taken to teach them, is clearly the lesson of the Congress; and the whole Church is spiritually richer for the multitudinous unrecorded efforts and self-denials from many humble Churchmen, who made their oblation, not saying "How little can I get off with giving?" but "How much more can I manage to give?" And the bare fact that the offering presented in the largest cathedral of Anglican Christendom to the jubilant strains of Mendelssohn's "Hymn of Praise" by over 200 Bishops was wholly devoted to the Church's work beyond the seas was in itself an impressive object-lesson. The Bishop of Rangoon hopes that the Congress will make it impossible that outlying dioceses should ever again be so forgotten and so bereft of support as they were a few years ago. Hitherto, as that heroic pioneer, Bishop Bompas, put it, their support at home has been in inverse proportion to the square of their distance; the amount given has depended, not on their need, but on the frequency of the Bishop's visits to England, on the size and influence of his own social circle, on the attractiveness of his own personality, on his skill in telling a striking story. And people at home have been niggardly, though they really had enough and more than enough to give, because they have not begun to understand what giving to God for the service of the Church means. "Oh, I just hand a cheque for £10 annually to my vicar, and he does what he thinks best with it," said one lady, with a vague sense of merit in giving to "charity" so large a sum, that is probably less than a tenth of what she spent on her clothes. She said this in answer to a question as to whether she subscribed to the Church Missionary Society, and it indicated a too common confusion of mind. When we contribute to the upkeep of the Church we attend, or enable our vicar to secure a second curate to take the daily service which we value, we are no

more giving to "charity" than when we pay our police rate. It is a payment for services which as Churchmen we reckon indispensable, and the fact that it is a voluntary payment does not alter its character. If the compulsory police rate were abolished, on condition that the municipality would provide no more police, citizens would start a voluntary fund for police forthwith, and would not dream of calling their subscriptions to it "charity." Yet we constantly hear congregations say that they can do nothing for either home or foreign missions because they are raising a fund for a new organ, or a new reredos, or a new scheme for lighting the church.

Giving to our fellows for God's sake only begins when we look beyond providing for our own spiritual needs, and only as it begins can we give tangible expression to our gratitude for spiritual blessings, which, while they have a financial side, have certainly no equivalent in money.

And if we are guided by the sound principle of giving where the need is greatest and the work most urgent, the claim of the heathen and Mohammedan world can no longer be ignored; the principle laid down so forcibly by the Lambeth Conference of 1897, that "Foreign missions stand in the first rank of all the tasks we have to fulfil," will not only be reaffirmed, but acted upon.

We come to the last point—that union, and wide sympathy, and progress, and effective service all depend upon spirituality. Allusion has been made to the good Christians who are not good Churchmen. There are also good Churchmen who are not good Christians—worldly men who uphold the Church because it is a force making for law, and order, and morality, or because its maintenance is part of a political programme; worldly women who are assiduous in church-going, but whose lives are not really yielded to God. And these are a source of even greater weakness to the Church than the good Christians whose attachment to it is wavering and unintelligent.

The Pan-Anglican Congress was more than an able and interesting discussion of Church affairs—more than a reconciler of differences; it was an outcome of prayer and a call to prayer,

and a summons into the Presence of God—a great “mission” for the deepening of spiritual life. Constant and fervent intercessions prepared for it, not only in great cathedrals and little village churches and other places where prayer is wont to be made, but in many unexpected places as well. On May 30, for instance, a Dominion liner sailed from Montreal, with over twenty clergy and nearly fifty members of the Canadian Women’s Auxiliary on board, other delegates to the Congress, and a large general company. There was a celebration of Holy Communion on board every morning at 7 a.m., a prayer-meeting daily at 10.30 a.m. in the saloon, followed by an animated discussion on one or other of the Congress subjects. The attendance at all was very large; for the rest of the passengers entered into the spirit of expectant devotion which animated the Congress party as they kept their Whitsuntide. The keynote of the whole Congress was struck by that most solemn service in the Abbey, “which,” said one of our Bishops, “impressed me more than any service I have ever attended there.” Opening with the chanting of the fifty-first Psalm, without instrumental accompaniment, it brought home to the kneeling throng the sins and negligences and ignorances of our Church, and as the sweet strains of Wesley’s anthem, “When Thou hearest, O Lord, forgive,” died away, the clauses of the Bidding Prayer, taking up all the Congress topics one by one, were followed by silent petition. And then thousands of voices raised the hymn,

“O Holy Ghost, Thy people bless,
Who long to feel Thy might,”

praying every word as they sang it,

“Give life and order, light and love.”

They had not come to listen to a fervent exhortation or to witness a great ceremonial; they had come to pray that new life might indeed be infused into the ancient order of our Anglican Church, that light without love, and love without light, may alike be no more. “I believe in the Holy Ghost” came with new power to many hearts as we dispersed, realizing that we might indeed expect great things from the Congress.

Anglicans, who are sometimes inclined to carry to an extreme the English instinct of expressing much less than is felt, were more than once swept off their feet, in spite of many a dignified tradition and convention. Who can forget how nearly ten thousand Church-people on a weekday evening in a concert-hall stood in earnest, silent prayer, at the bidding of the Archbishop of Canterbury, turning into immediate petition the searching personal appeal of the Bishop-Designate of Zanzibar, at the great meeting for the non-Christian world ?

Will it last ? Will it have any substantial result ? In answer, we should refer not to the debated point of a possible decennial Congress, not to any definite scheme for practical work that may be considered by a surviving Committee of the Congress, but rather to the duty laid on all that band of men whose hearts God has touched to permeate the whole Church with the spirit of the Congress. We have seen a vision of what the Church ought to be and to do ; we have also seen a vision of the Divine power that can enable it to carry out that Divine ideal. And if we can only go forward in the uplifting strength of that vision, the gain from the Pan-Anglican Congress of 1908 must be solid and permanent.



The Vatican and Reform.

BY THE REV. ARTHUR GALTON, M.A.

CERTAIN changes have been contemplated for several years in the administrative machinery of the Holy See. After mature consideration, a new scheme has been adopted. The details of it have now been published, though it will not come into operation until November. In some quarters these changes have been welcomed effusively as a reformation, which in one sense they are ; but, before we accept that definition unreservedly, it will be advisable to examine what we mean by it. If it be meant that the Court of Rome has moved towards

decentralization, then the term "reformation" is certainly misapplied to the present changes; or if it be meant that the administration of the Papal Church has become less autocratic and more liberalized or popular, then, again, those who desire or expect a reformation will be disappointed.

A reformation, however, there certainly is; but it is limited strictly to the internal working and the mutual relations of the present Congregations. The business of the several Congregations is more sharply and scientifically divided. Their various functions and jurisdictions will not clash or overlap, as they do at present. Their duties and powers are readjusted to existing circumstances. Judicial, disciplinary, and executive functions are clearly separated from one another; and, in judicial matters, the same judges will no longer sit in different and successive courts, often revising their own previous decisions, and going through the farce of hearing appeals against themselves. Moreover, in all judicial cases which come in future before the Pontifical courts, the reasons for the judgments given must be stated. Procedure is simplified. Litigation is made cheap and easy. The courts are accessible to the poorest suitors, and they are to be continuously in session. All these changes are a veritable and sweeping reformation, which certainly was required, which is most creditable to those who devised it, and to the supreme authority which approves it. Let us add that many of these changes, *mutatis mutandis*, might be imitated and adopted with advantage by other governments. They cheapen, they facilitate, and they expedite the whole course of ecclesiastical business, so far as it has to be carried on in Rome.

But there is another aspect of the question, and we must not overlook it if we would understand things as they really are. That justice should be just and business prompt is, of course, admirable; especially in that place where for so many ages it was a reproach that justice was uncertain or venal, and that business was most dilatory. And both these defects were profitable in those days to the Holy See. They were profitable, not only for the obvious reasons by which delays in justice can be

made to pay, but because delays in procedure, with the then slow methods of communication, multiplied precedents and built up the authority of the Roman courts. In these days, however, of incessant and instantaneous communication with the centre, the simplest procedure, the most effective machinery, and the quickest decisions, are the most advantageous to the central authority. These three advantages are certainly aimed at, and probably will be secured, by the new arrangement of the Papal Congregations.

The chief of these Congregations go back, in their present form, to the sixteenth century ; to an age of theological controversy and ecclesiastical warfare in Europe, when all the Churches were assailed and many were overthrown by the struggles of the Reformation. It was an age, also, of adventure, of discovery, of conquests, and of colonization, leading on to missionary enterprises, to new ecclesiastical problems and acquisitions. These great affairs brought into being the existing Papal Congregations, and have left their mark on them ever since.

To deal with the Protestant revolution, the great Congregation of the Roman Inquisition was organized, of which the Pope himself is President ; and subsidiary to it was the Congregation of the Index. These two committees dealt, and still deal, respectively with men and books. They give practical expression to the Papal claim of infallibility in faith and morals, of supreme authority in the spheres of intellect and knowledge. They represent the most serious aspect of these Papal claims. Now, the Inquisition, it is true, has been modified by the recent changes. It is no longer a judicial court in matters of ordinary civil or criminal disputation ; but it still deals with questions of dogma, and of faith and morals. And we do not find, so far as our present information goes, that this mysterious, autocratic, and sinister tribunal has been reformed, either in its procedure or in its composition. In these matters a drastic reform is absolutely necessary if its decisions are to be accepted with respect and confidence.

Next to the Inquisition in rank, and of even more importance practically, was the *Congregatio de Propagandâ Fide*, the Propaganda. Under it are all missionary countries, and all countries in which the old and regular Church order was destroyed by the Reformation. Its interests and its influence extended into all the world. Those who realize the extent of Roman Catholicism cannot think of Propaganda without a thrill of emotion at the variety and size of the Empire governed by its Cardinal Prefect, the Red Pope.

Under Propaganda was that colonial world which grew up in the sixteenth century, and which has passed so largely into the hands of the Anglo-Celtic or English-speaking communities. Churches ruled by Propaganda had not the advantages of a regular ecclesiastical administration. The decrees of Trent were not technically current in them. The Canon Law was not in force. Their bishops are more truly apostolic delegates than bishops in the older and fuller meaning of the term. The priests, who usually take the missionary oath, are chattels of their bishops; and we use this term in its medieval sense, and not with any opprobrious application. Such priests have no security of tenure, no certainty of maintenance or employment, no canonical position. This was the state of English Romanism under the old Vicars-Apostolic. It was not altered, as it should have been logically, when the hierarchy was established in 1850. The so-called hierarchy was more a name than a reality. It is not an advantage, as the *Times* imagines, but a very great disadvantage, for the clergy, except in a genuine missionary country, to be under Propaganda. Discontent with this insecure and unsatisfactory position has been growing among the English secular clergy for the last fifty years, and sometimes it has become clamorous.

Great Britain, Ireland, and the United States are now to be removed from the jurisdiction of Propaganda. As Canada is included in the change, we cannot but wonder why Australasia is not.

We are not informed, either, what the new system of govern-

ment is to be ; and, until we know, it is not possible to decide whether the change is a reformation. If we may judge by recent, by contemporary, and by maturing facts, our judgment may find some guidance. In France, under the Concordat, the old Church order was not restored ; and it is undeniable that Ultramontane principles increased there steadily throughout the nineteenth century, in spite of the connection between Church and State. It was hoped by many French Catholics that separation would increase the freedom and autonomy of their Church. They expected a national Church existing freely in a neutral State ; but these expectations have not been realized. The French Church has, indeed, been cut adrift from State control, except where the necessary regulations of police, of finance, and of association are concerned. But the French clergy and all their affairs are more closely supervised by Rome than ever. We say this in no controversial temper. We neither blame nor praise. We only register existing facts. And we find no reason for supposing that Roman Catholic affairs will be regulated differently in those Churches which are now removed from Propaganda, and which will probably be administered by the Consistorial Congregation in its revived and extended form. This body, we are told, is to appoint bishops, to supervise seminaries, and to deal with the higher administration of dioceses. In other words, the change from one Congregation to another is a change of names with very little change in reality or *status*. So far as there is any alteration, we venture to predict that it will take the course of an increased and more effective centralization. The natural tendency of Rome has always been to centralize. This tendency was favoured enormously by the opportunities created in the sixteenth century. The Church of Rome not only solidified and crystallized the fluid medieval dogmas at the Council of Trent, but it strengthened and centralized its organization. Under the influences which then became dominant throughout the Papal system, this process has been continued with a fearless logic and an ever-growing rapidity. The losses of the Reformation and

the apparent disaster of the Revolution were both utilized by Rome to extend the Papal autocracy over the weakened national Churches. Separation in France has now added farther possibilities of an advance in the same direction. Indeed, it has created a new position, for which the Papacy is reorganizing itself with its usual astuteness and foresight. France has so often been the leader of European progress that it is almost safe to prophesy that her example is likely to be followed in political, social, and intellectual affairs. If so, separation is within measurable distance, not only in the other Latin countries, but generally on the Continent. This, as we think, is the new position for which the Vatican is preparing; and, if we judge truly, it is what we might have expected logically as a result of separation in France. That this progress in centralization should be proclaimed to the world as a reform is also natural. It is also thoroughly in the Roman manner: *agnosco stilum Curie Romanæ*; especially as a proclamation of reform will help to disguise both the increase of Papal centralization and the persecuting rigour which was initiated last year by the encyclical *Pascendi*.

There are two problems connected with the future of the Papacy which are worth noticing, as a great deal may turn upon their development. The United States, we are told, come under the new arrangement. That is, instead of being administered by Propaganda, as at present, they will be governed by the revived and renovated Consistorial Congregation. There has already been friction between American Catholicism and Rome. This uneasy movement is known as Americanism; and it is not confined to the United States. The term has been utilized and extended so as to mean that incompatibility between Papal methods and the modern spirit, between progress and reaction or passivity, between liberty and absolutism, which is certain to increase. In the solution of this problem lies the whole future of the Papacy.

The question of Ireland is less important, but more curious. In the sixteenth century Ireland was not placed under Propa-

ganda. The old Canon Law was held to be still current there. It was not administered as a missionary country, but as a settled Church. The Stuart Kings nominated bishops. After the Revolution of 1688 and the Protestant Succession, the claims of the exiled Stuarts were still recognized at Rome. It was only when all hope of a restoration was abandoned, and Cardinal York was dead, and the French Revolution had happened, that this state of things was changed. Ireland was still, however, treated as having a canonical Church. It was only when Catholic Emancipation was passed, in 1829, that Irish affairs were transferred to Propaganda. In other words, it was just when Catholic affairs might be thought to have revived that the old Catholic organization was superseded. This is really what the Irish Catholics might not have expected. Certainly it is not what they deserved, after three centuries of heroism and suffering. We believe that this curious proceeding was the result of a deal between Leo XII. and the British Government, in which Irish interests were sacrificed to gain emancipation in Great Britain and the Colonies.

The "reform" in Canon Law, which was announced prematurely has not yet been accomplished. The present changes are only the prelude to a simplification and codification of the present ecclesiastical law. What is called Canon Law is an amalgam of Roman Civil Law and medieval precedents. It is not now recognized by any country, and is not applicable as it stands to modern conditions. But any changes in this mass of confused and obsolete legislation will, we feel confident, be all in the direction of perfecting, facilitating, and strengthening the Papal autocracy, of which we have so plain an object-lesson in the existing French Church.

Finally, we are astonished, not that these Papal changes should have been announced to the world as a radical reform, but that the *Times* should have succumbed so easily and completely to such an obvious manoeuvre. The Papacy may, indeed, be reformed gradually from below, by the local hierarchies or by the laity, though we think it more likely to end

by a slow and ignominious extinction. But to think that the Papacy will reform itself voluntarily, from above, shows very little intelligence in the present direction of the *Times*, and a singular incapacity in some of those who provide its news and articles.



"Lord of Hosts."

BY THE REV. ANDREW CRAIG ROBINSON, M.A.

IN the *CHURCHMAN* for September, 1900, an article appeared by the present writer on "The Divine Title 'Lord of Hosts' in its Bearing on the Theories of the Higher Criticism." Attention had never before been called to the point which was raised in that article—namely, that the total absence of this title from the Pentateuch would seem to be irreconcilable with the Graf-Wellhausen theory. Articles on the subject have since been contributed by the present writer to various periodicals, and to some of these articles replies have been made on the critical side. Such objections and criticisms have been met in a booklet, "A Problem for the Critics: the Divine Title 'Lord of Hosts'" (Marshall Brothers).

More recently, in the January number of the *Expository Times* of this year, there appeared a short contribution on the subject by the present writer, which in the issue for the following month was adversely criticized by an anonymous contributor signing himself "X." A rejoinder to this was sent to the *Expository Times* early in February, but was not admitted, although the editor's attention was more than once called to the matter. By not publishing that rejoinder, the editor left it open to his readers to conclude that there was no answer to "X's" criticism. The present article is written to set that matter right. The following is the original contribution :

As long ago as the year 1900, in an article contributed to the *CHURCHMAN* (September, 1900), I called attention to the significance of the fact that the Divine title "Lord of Hosts" never occurs in the Pentateuch, and I pointed

out the bearing of that fact on modern theories of the composition of the Pentateuch and Joshua.

The title "Lord of Hosts" occurs for the first time in the Bible in 1 Sam. i. 3: "And this man went up out of his city yearly to worship and to sacrifice unto the Lord of Hosts in Shiloh."

The following table shows the number of times it occurs afterwards in books of the Bible, and shows also the relative positions according to the critical theories of the supposed writers of the Hexateuch:

OCURRENCES OF THE TITLE "LORD OF HOSTS" IN THE BIBLE, AND RELATIVE POSITIONS OF THE ASSUMED WRITERS OF THE HEXATEUCH.

1 Samuel	5 times	
2 "	6 "	
1 Kings	2 "	
2 "	2 "	
1 Chronicles	3 "	
Psalms	14 "	
<i>Jehovist</i>	0 "	Early centuries of the monarchy (Driver)
<i>Elohist</i>	0 "	Same period (Driver).
<i>Jehovist</i>	0 "	850-800 (Kuenen).
Amos	9 "	760-746.
<i>Elohist</i>	0 "	c. 750 (Kuenen).
Hosea	1 "	746-734.
Isaiah	62 "	740-700.
Micah	1 "	727-697.
<i>Deuteronomist</i>	0 "	Not later than reign of Manasseh (Driver).
		640-621, reign of Josiah (Kuenen).
Jeremiah	81 "	626-582.
Zephaniah	2 "	626.
<i>JE United</i>	0 "	621-588 (Kuenen).
Nahum	2 "	610-607.
Habbakuk	1 "	608-597.
"P"	0 "	Age subsequent to Ezekiel (Driver).
Haggai	14 "	520.
Zechariah	52 "	520-518.
<i>P²</i>	0 "	500-475 (Kuenen).
<i>P² + P¹</i>	0 "	475-458 or 458-444 (Kuenen).
Malachi	24 "	450.
	<hr/>	
	281 times	
<i>P² + P¹</i> Promulgated		444 (Kuenen) <i>Rp.</i> From 406.
<i>Hexateuch United</i> .		444-400 (Kuenen) into third century.

Here it can be seen at a glance that at no matter what particular point of time any of these supposed writers may have been assumed by the theories of modern critics to have lived, each one of them would have been in contact with writers who frequently—in the case of some, it may be said, constantly

—used this title for God, "Lord of Hosts." How did it happen that in respect to this particular point they one and all, with a curious unanimity, resisted the influence of their own contemporaries, and ignored the religious phraseology of their own day?

According to the critics, the Hexateuch was manipulated, not to say tampered with, during a period of more than 400 years by a motley group, or rather series, of writers. One writer composed one part and one composed another; these parts were united by a different hand, and then another writer still composed a further part, and this by yet another was united to the two that went before; and after this another portion was composed by yet another scribe, and afterwards was joined on to the three. Matter was absorbed, interpolated, harmonized, smoothed over, coloured, redacted, from various points of view and with different, not to say opposing and interested, motives. And yet when the completed product—the Hexateuch—coming out of this curious literary seething-pot is examined, it is found to have this remarkable characteristic, that not one of these manifold manipulators—neither J, nor E, nor JE, nor D, nor Rd, nor P¹, nor P², nor P³, nor P⁴, nor Rp—would appear to have allowed himself to be betrayed, even by accident, into using this title "Lord of Hosts," so much in vogue in the days in which he is supposed to have written, *even once*. And the Pentateuch, devoid as it is of this expression, agrees with the traditional view of its antiquity, and seems to show that the critical theory of its composition in the later times is utterly untenable; because such a number of writers of various character, extending over such a lengthened period, would almost inevitably—some of them, if it were only by an accident, even once—have slipped into the mention of a title for God which was so much in vogue through all the period.

The present writer claims that the point here raised—if it cannot be overthrown—is absolutely subversive of the modern theories of the composition of the Pentateuch.

To this "X" replied in the February number as follows:

There are some questions—perhaps, indeed, many questions—on which a satisfactory judgment cannot be formed unless all the relevant facts are placed before those who have to form it. It is remarkable that Mr. Robinson, who specifies so precisely the number of occurrences of "Lord of Hosts" in many books of the Old Testament, does not specify with equal explicitness the books in which it does not occur. I venture, with your permission, to supply his omission, by setting out the books in a tabular form, similar to the one which he has adopted himself.

"Lord of Hosts," then, occurs in—

Judges	o times.
2 Chronicles	o "
Ezra	o "
Nehemiah	o "
Job	o "
Proverbs	o "
Ecclesiastes	o "
Canticle	o "

Daniel	o times
Joel	o "
Obadiah	o "
Jonah	o "

Two of Mr. Robinson's statements would also be put more exactly thus :

Chronicler	o times.
142 Psalms	o "

For the three occurrences in 1 Chronicles (xi., xvii. 7, 24) are simply transcribed from 2 Sam. v. 10, vii. 8, 26 : the author of Chronicles, when writing independently, never uses the expression. The Psalms in which the title occurs are xxiv., xlvi., xlviii., lix., lxix., lxxx. (four times), lxxxiv. (four times), lxxxix. Ps. xc. will probably be attributed by Mr. Robinson to Moses. Excluding this, therefore, as a Psalm written *ex hypothesi* before the time when the title is known to have come into use, there remain 141 Psalms, representing in any case a good many separate writers—we cannot, of course, say how many—who, unless, indeed, he regards any of them as living before 1 Sam. i. was written, Mr. Robinson must admit *might* have used it. I, naturally, do not attach any importance to the fact that the title does not occur in such books as Obadiah and Jonah ; but the fact that so many different writers, notwithstanding that the great majority of them, upon any view of their dates, lived in periods when the title was current, and by some writers was being copiously used, nevertheless did not use it, seems to me to neutralize altogether the force of the argument which Mr. Robinson bases upon its non-occurrence in the Hexateuch.

Why the title does not occur in the Hexateuch (upon the critical view of its origin) it does not seem to me that critics are called upon to explain, any more than either they or Mr. Robinson are called on to explain why the many other writers who, as we have seen, might have used it, do not use it. It may, however, be worth remarking that, whatever may have been Ezekiel's reasons for not using the term, it is pre-eminently a title used by the prophets ; and so the four occurrences in Kings are all in the mouths of prophets (Elijah, 1 Kings xviii. 15, xix. 10, 14 ; and Elisha, 2 Kings iii. 14). This fact, if it is a reason for our not expecting the title in such books as Job and Proverbs, is also a reason why we should not expect to find it in those parts of the Hexateuch which are ascribed by critics to a priestly hand. Prophets, however, are not prominent even in JE ; and in Deuteronomy, which, it might be objected, is regarded by the critical school as the work of a prophet, the favourite Divine title, in accordance with the leading parenetic motive of the book, is " Jehovah, thy (*or* your) God."

A rejoinder in something like the following terms was sent on February 9, 1908, to the editor of the *Expository Times* for insertion :

Your contributor " X "—who in concealing his identity does what I think is rather unusual in the *Expository Times*—observes that, while I specify so precisely the number of occurrences of " Lord of Hosts " in many books of

the Old Testament, I do not specify with equal explicitness the books in which it does not occur. When treating the subject more fully in a booklet published in 1906 I gave a full list of the books in which the title does not occur; but in my contribution to your periodical I had to study brevity. However, as the question has been raised, it is best to set out these books, and note what sort they are.

It is important to observe that three of the books which are without this title intervene between the Pentateuch and its first occurrence, making a chasm between. These books are Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. The following are the remaining books:

- 2 CHRONICLES.—Forms one book with 1 Chronicles, in which the title does occur, whether "simply transcribed" or otherwise.
- SONG OF SOLOMON, ESTHER.—In neither of these books does *any* Divine name occur.
- ECCLESIASTES.—A book of very marked individuality, which strikes out a line for itself. Does not contain the title "Lord"; "God" is always used.
- JOB.—Another book of very marked individuality. Uses the apparently archaic Divine title *Shaddai*="Almighty," 31 times (only 16 times elsewhere in the Old Testament). Has the title "God" 114 times, "Lord" 31.
- JONAH.—Another very peculiar book, which does not treat of Jehovah's dealings with His own people, but with Nineveh, an alien city.
- DANIEL.—Another peculiar book, which also is concerned in great part with peoples alien to Israel—in this case the Babylonians and Persians. It is only in one chapter—the ninth—that the prophet uses the Divine title "Jehovah," which occurs there six times in the expressions "Lord my God" or "Lord our God" (*Jehovah Elohi*).
- PROVERBS.—Another peculiar book.
- OBADIAH.—Very short, consisting of only one chapter. Threatenings against Edom. Concerned only indirectly with Israel. "Lord" occurs only five times.
- EZEKIEL.—Dominated apparently by the influence of the Pentateuch. Has a particular name for God, "The Lord God"—*Adoni Jehovah*—and a peculiar phrase, "Ye shall know that I am the Lord," which occurs over fifty times, and seems to be an expansion of a similar expression in Leviticus, occurring also nearly fifty times, "I am the Lord."
- LAMENTATIONS, JOEL.—Might be expected to have the title; but it is absent from these two books.
- EZRA, NEHEMIAH.—Practically one book.

Thus it will be seen that in the case of the great majority of these books from which the title is absent the peculiar character of each of the books is sufficient to account for its not falling in with the prevailing fashion.

"X" observes that the title is "pre-eminently a title used by the prophets"; but this would not be any reason for its non-occurrence in the Pentateuch, because the critics hold that in a considerable portion of the Pentateuch the "standpoint" is "the prophetic." Dr. Driver writes:

"The standpoint of E is the prophetic, though it is not so prominently brought forward as in J. . . . Abraham is styled by him 'a prophet,' possessing the power of effectual intercession (Gen. xx. 7). Moses, though not expressly so termed as by Hosea (xii. 13), is represented by him essentially as a prophet, entrusted by God with a prophet's mission (Exod. iii.) and holding exceptionally intimate communion with Him (Exod. xxxiii. 11; Num. xii. 6-8; cf. Deut. xxxiv. 10)."—*Introduction*, p. 118.

And of J he writes:

"The character of Moses is portrayed by him with singular attractiveness and force. In J, further, the prophetic element is conspicuously prominent. . . . And in order to illustrate the Divine purposes of grace as manifested in history, he introduces—at points fixed by tradition—prophetic glances into the future."—*Introduction*, pp. 119, 120.

In point of fact, a considerable portion of the Pentateuch is named "The Prophetic Narrative of the Pentateuch"; and to the writers of that portion no prophetic phrase ought surely to appear unsuited to the narrative. The reason, then, suggested by "X" for the non-appearance of the title in the Pentateuch is really a reason why it might have been expected to occur.

"X" refers to the Psalter; and the Psalter is an apt illustration of the argument in regard to the Pentateuch which I press. The Psalter, understood according to the "traditional" view, as extending from David down to the time after the Exile—say 500 years and more—corresponds in general conditions to the Pentateuch according to the critical theory, extending from the early times of the monarchy down to beyond the days of the Prophet Malachi. Both have *ex hypothesi* run the gauntlet of the same 500 years at least of the prevalence of the use of the title "Lord of Hosts." One—the Psalter—bears the natural mark of having passed through this period by having this Divine title; the other—the Pentateuch—bears no mark whatever of having run the gauntlet of those centuries, for in it the name is never found. In the Psalter the title is not apparently a very favourite one, but *it is there*; in the Pentateuch *it is not*. The Psalter is marked with the fire through which it passed; the Pentateuch would seem to have come out of the ordeal scatheless and unsinged. Why? Because it never passed through the fire at all.

It seems strange that publication should have been denied to this rejoinder. The usual principle, surely, which rules in such cases is that, if a criticism by one writer on an argument put forward by another is published, the original writer is entitled to a fair opportunity of reply. It might have been expected that, in the interests of fair play, free discussion, and the threshing out of a debatable point in Old Testament criticism, such a course would have been adopted in the present case. On the contrary, however, the closure was put in force, all further discussion stopped, and the question shelved.

Revival Memories.—D. L. Moody's First Visit to Liverpool, 1875.

By THE REV. CANON W. HAY M. H. AITKEN, M.A.

THE obvious point of contrast between the religious movement of 1859 and that in the early seventies, which will always be associated with the name of D. L. Moody, would probably be considered by most observers to lie in this, that the former was a revival and the latter a Mission. Such an antithetical statement, however, would be somewhat misleading, and would only represent a part of the truth. Undoubtedly that wonderful movement, by far the most remarkable this country has ever seen since the time of the Wesleys and of Whitfield, centred round the person of one rugged and forceful man, who seemed specially raised up of God to do the greatest spiritual work of the century ; but, on the other hand, there was all over the land at that time a certain spirit of responsiveness that made evangelizing work easy. The fields were ripe unto the harvest, and when the reaper came he found everything ready for the marvellous sweep of his scythe.

I disentombed the other day from amongst my old letters a note from Moody to myself, the circumstances of which have entirely passed from my memory. It runs thus :

“ YORK, ENGLAND,

“ July 1, 1873.

“ DEAR BROTHER AITKEN,

“ Yours received. Thanks for your kindness. Go on with Brothers Robinson and Nash, and get all things ready, so that when we throw the Gospel net, should the Lord fill it, we may have plenty of help to draw the fish ashore. Will see you in October.

“ Yours truly,

“ D. L. MOODY.”

To me this seems a particularly interesting and characteristic letter. It was written at a time when the fortunes of the great spiritual campaign to which he had committed himself had reached their low-water mark, and all seemed to suggest failure.

He had arrived in England a few weeks before to find that the two prominent men who had invited him to this country had both passed away, and he began his work at York, without any proper support either from Church-people or Nonconformists, in an almost empty chapel, which I believe he never succeeded in filling. Yet his faith was strong that the net would be so filled that plenty of help would be required to drag it ashore. Curiously enough, I have no recollection of what it was that led to this correspondence; with respect to which, however, it is interesting to notice, in passing, that the "Brother Robinson" referred to was the father of the present Dean of Westminster. But I very vividly recall his visit to Liverpool about a year later, when it was determined to erect the "Victoria Hall" for his gatherings.

We—that is to say, most of the leading men in Liverpool who were in favour of the movement—met Moody in the little hall at Hackins Hey to discuss the principal details of his proposed visit. After a few preliminary utterances he was asked what sort of a building he would require. "Well," he replied, "I guess you'd better erect a hall that will accommodate from 10,000 to 12,000 people." We looked aghast at each other, and someone ventured upon a more or less feeble expostulation. "Well," he replied, "we have had 14,000 to 15,000 at the Exhibition Hall, Dublin, and Dublin is a Roman Catholic city. I guess I'm not asking too much when I name 10,000 for a great Protestant town like Liverpool." "I'm afraid, Mr. Moody, you weren't heard in the Exhibition building in Dublin," said someone almost timidly. "Well," he replied, "that depends very much upon who it was that heard me. A gentleman came up to me the other night and remarked: 'I'm sorry to have to tell you, Mr. Moody, that you're not heard in this hall.' 'Is that so?' I said, 'Where did you sit?' 'I beg your pardon?' (Then raising his voice considerably), 'Where did you sit?' 'What did you say?' (Then with a tremendous shout), 'WHERE DID YOU SIT?'" Of course we were all convulsed with laughter, and incontinently voted him his 12,000,

which was what Victoria Hall would hold when it was well crowded.

It was in the month of February, 1895, that the great effort commenced with an early morning gathering attended by several thousands of Christian workers, and we had a most inspiring time. Before the Mission was ended the great hall was crammed even at that early hour. The evening meeting was announced for 8 p.m., so as not to interfere with the regular services of the various places of worship. It happened that Mr. Eugene Stock was staying with me at the time, and, after a very short evening service at our church, I strode off with him for the hall at a pace that he had some difficulty in keeping up with, and reached it before the clock had struck eight. We entered from behind through the anteroom, and found ourselves standing in a crowded gangway just by the platform. All was stillness and silence, and I whispered to my companion, "Just in time!" supposing that this was the moment of silent prayer before the opening of the service. Imagine our feelings, however, when the silence was broken by the voice of a minister pronouncing the benediction. The hall had been crowded by half-past six, and Moody, finding that no more could be got in, very sensibly proceeded with the service and preached his opening sermon.

The Mission lasted for four full weeks—indeed, it included five Sundays. I remember Moody's saying that it would have been a comparative failure had it only lasted for a fortnight. It was evident that the work deepened, and became more and more satisfactory as the time passed on. In a week the interest had so greatly increased that it became necessary on Sundays to have the women in the afternoon and only men in the evening. It was one of the sights of a lifetime to see that huge hall crammed with some 14,000 men the next Sunday evening. I see it noted in my diary that 350 men crowded into the room set apart for anxious inquirers after the sermon on that second Sunday night. Even so, overflow meetings had to be arranged, and St. James's Hall was filled with a gathering which I addressed. The following night thousands could not get in, and overflow meetings became necessary on week-days as well as Sundays.

It may be as well to say a word about the method adopted by Moody in dealing with the multitudes that were reached by the preaching. There was a large lean-to room at the back of the hall which might hold, perhaps, when packed, about 400 persons. Into this "the anxious" were invited immediately after Moody had asked them to rise for a moment to their feet, in token of their determination to yield to the claims of Christ. Each minister joining was requested to furnish such helpers as he could rely upon for the responsible work of directing these "inquirers," and there would usually be from 100 to 200 of these, either waiting in the room or scattered through the hall. This arrangement was at once the strength and the weakness of the movement—its strength, because provision was thus made for the giving of individual help to each seeking soul; its weakness, because necessarily some of those thus selected were not properly trained for this difficult and delicate work.

Still, I am persuaded that, with all its drawbacks, this was the best and wisest method of dealing with this problem; and on the whole it worked well. Where an awakened soul fell into the hands of an unskilful worker, he might not receive at once the help that he needed; but, as the evening passed on, other more experienced helpers would become free, and probably the incompetent worker, feeling that he was not succeeding in his well-intentioned efforts, would call in the assistance of someone better qualified than himself, and thus the needed help would at length be obtained. No doubt, too, many who began by being very inefficient, because inexperienced, workers, acquired a new efficiency ere those memorable weeks had passed away. On the whole, I am bound to say that I think that Moody's method was, probably, the best that he could have employed, and I regard it as much more satisfactory than some of the more wholesale ways of dealing with the awakened that have been adopted by certain more recent evangelists.

Towards the end of his visit the interest became really quite wonderful. Moody himself was greatly touched at the eagerness of the people. I see the following entry in my diary for

March 5—a Friday, too, which is usually a *dies non* for religious meetings all through the North of England: “In the evening an immense multitude was gathered outside and in the hall. Moody was much affected, and there was a general softening. The inquiry-room was crammed with the anxious, while Moody gathered 200 or 300 more around him in the gallery of the hall.” The following Sunday I see this entry: “This has been a most wonderful day. Moody thought it the greatest day of his life. The hall was crammed, of course, all through the day. A blessed meeting in the early morning; but the ‘inquirers’ meeting’ was the most touching. I should hope that thousands have been seeking and finding during this Mission. The number of men at the evening meeting was immense. The inquiry-room was crammed in a few minutes, and upwards of 400 men rose to their feet almost at once in response to Moody’s final appeal.”

So the great movement came to an end, and the next morning some 400 or 500 people assembled in the station to see the dear evangelist off, and give him a parting cheer; but the work did not stop with his departure. I was the unfortunate person to whose lot it fell to resume the work on that Monday night after his departure, and never did sermon of mine seem to fall more flat, and never was I conscious of a more trying reactionary influence. But before two or three days had passed these experiences gave place to fresh manifestations of spiritual power, and during the weeks that followed, in which the work was continued by one preacher after another, numbers of souls came under the power of the word, until the grape-gleanings of Ephraim must have nearly equalled the vintage of Abiezer.

I left Liverpool in the course of that year, and so am not able to speak from my own personal observation of the lasting character of the effects of the movement; but I have no hesitation in saying that the permanence of a very large proportion of these results was beyond question, and I believe that this would have been the testimony of most of the ministers who participated in the work. In some cases there was hardly any

perceptible backsliding. For example, I well remember a conversation that I had several years after with a former curate of mine, who had become the vicar of an important Liverpool church. He told me that about forty names had been sent to him of persons who had been conversed with in the after-meetings and who either belonged to or wished to join his congregation. He thought that he might have lost sight of perhaps half a dozen of them owing to change of residence, but with the exception of these he stated that he could give a good and satisfactory account of all who had thus professed to benefit by the services.

As I have already said, this was something more than a Mission, it was doubtless a time of revival all over the land. In looking through the notes that I made in my diary, I see that during that month I was pressed to go and hold special meetings in large halls in several big towns of the North, and in each case the crowds that thronged to hear me were so great that the buildings were unable to accommodate them. And also in each case there were not only crowds, but excellent spiritual results from a single meeting. Undoubtedly the Spirit of God was moving all the land as it has never been moved since, certainly not in either of Moody's subsequent visits.

No sketch of that wonderful season of blessing would be at all complete, even as a sketch, that made no reference to Moody's companions in travel and labour. The Mission of those two years was the introduction of the ministry of song into evangelizing work, and Mr. Sankey, I have no doubt, reached many whom Moody's strenuous appeals had failed to touch. I shall never forget a scene at the Free Trade Hall, Manchester, which occurred some little time before the Liverpool Mission. Moody had preached upon "the Excuses," which he described in the vernacular as "a pack of lies." The last of them was, "It's no use my coming, I'm too bad; I don't believe He will receive me." In answering this, he gave us a most touching story of his own early domestic life, of an elder brother who had run away from home, and of a mother's patient love that never would give up the hope of his return. He went on to describe that return,

how a tall, dark, sun-bronzed man stood before the window where the mother sat working, and how she knew him by his tears. "Mother," exclaimed the penitent prodigal, as he gently held the arms that were stretched out to embrace him, "I've vowed to God Almighty that I'll never cross your threshold till you forgive me!" "Do you think," exclaimed Moody, with a sort of ring of triumph in his voice—"do you think that she was long in forgiving him?" As he sat down Mr. Sankey's voice was heard in the first notes of that thrilling hymn, "Come home, come home, you are weary at heart!" The emotional effect was simply overwhelming, and strong men wept like children, myself amongst the number; but the emotion was but the vehicle to carry the great love-lesson home to the heart, and I cannot doubt that the Spirit of God spoke through the song as well as through the touching story.

His other companion-in-arms was Henry Drummond. "Drummond is as pure a soul as I have ever met with in all my life"—that was Moody's testimony to Drummond. "Moody is the biggest human that I have ever known"—that was Drummond's testimony to Moody. Those were the days in which Drummond used to deliver a simple Gospel message and gave no presage of his later developments. His influence with the young men was extraordinary, and after his work it was not to be wondered at that Moody's last act, ere he took his leave of Liverpool, was to secure the erection of new buildings for the local branch of the Y.M.C.A. In the next issue I hope to give some account of what I saw of Moody's work in London.



The Biblical Doctrine of the Atonement.

BY THE REV. MARCUS JOHNSON, A.K.C.

II.

SUCH would appear to be the Scriptural Doctrine of the Atonement. But we are now told that a transactional, and even an expiatory, view of the Atonement should be abandoned. Such a conception as is involved by those views is, it is said, revolting to the reason ; is a crude idea, worthy, no doubt, of the days of the early Fathers, but one which in the nineteenth and twentieth Christian centuries will not bear examination, and prevents many good men and women from becoming Christians. The supposition of "an angry or averted God" is intolerable. Anything like a change in the attitude of the Divine Being is resented as unworthy of Him, and implying that God the Father has a different mind from God the Son.¹ "Christ," says Archdeacon Wilson in his "Hulsean Lectures," "has plainly superseded high priest, mediator, sacrifice, veil and altar," although Christ's own words are : "I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil." Propitiation is weakened down by the same author to meaning "no more than the assurance of God's love towards us and His union with us" (p. 64). The sacrifice of Christ's death is, in his view, merely an example of self-sacrifice, "a suffering for others, which from its sublimity is as a magnet to draw all men upward and call out their own nobleness . . . but in it there is *no thought of substitution or expiation which have so closely attached themselves to the word sacrifice*" (pp. 64, 65).² What the Archdeacon styles the "ransom theory" of the Atonement he condemns under the astonishing phrase of "Christian mythology" (p. 67). Finally, evolution should teach us that, as there has been alteration in men's ideas of the creation of the world, the antiquity of man, the nature of the punishment of the lost, and the inspiration of the Bible, so, it is argued—not alone by Archdeacon Wilson, but also by the late

¹ See Archdeacon Wilson's "Hulsean Lectures for 1888-89," p. 82.

² The italics are the present writer's.

Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology at Oxford, Dr. Moberly, in his "Atonement and Personality," we must expect there will be alteration in our ideas of such a fundamental gospel truth as the nature of the Atonement; that, whereas it has been considered hitherto to consist in the death of Christ upon the cross—that death being, of course, in close connection with the Agony in Gethsemane and the whole great Life of obedience and sacrifice—the Atonement should now be considered as the indwelling of God in man, first and most perfectly in Christ, but subsequently, to some extent, in every Christian.

Let us examine these statements in order :

1. *The expiatory view of the Atonement is untenable, being a crude conception, evoking not faith, but repulsion and unbelief.* But this view, it must be remembered, has not been taught merely by ordinary theologians, of whatever school or age, but by inspired Apostles. While, as to its repelling rather than attractive power, is it not the case that every Christian doctrine possesses this double or alternative power, and is a "savour from death unto death" or "a savour from life unto life"? (2 Cor. ii. 16). The Cross always has produced and always will evoke resentment as well as devotion. If intelligence and conscience are to be respected, is not God's word also to be considered? If some persons of culture and refinement are deterred by what appears to be the Biblical doctrine of the Atonement from accepting the Christian creed, St. Paul's experience also was that "not many wise after the flesh are called" (1 Cor. i. 26).

2. *Change in the Divine Being is not to be thought of.* But why not, if that change has been always foreseen and fore-ordained? Or, rather, by what right is change spoken of at all in this connection? The Apostle Peter declares our Lord to have been "foreknown" as a sacrifice "before the foundation of the world" (1 Pet. i. 20), and St. John, using still more striking language, speaks of Christ as "the Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. xiii. 8). Nor has the Divine Son any different mind from the Father, for if the latter "spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up

for us all" (Rom. viii. 32), the Son also "emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant . . . humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death" (Phil. ii. 7, 8). But even as to a so-called change in God being brought about by Christ's expiatory sacrifice, why should this be unthinkable? If there has not been a change in the relations between God and man since Calvary, how is it that the light which rose in the East has travelled steadily westward everywhere, producing change and blessing, though the unchanged East itself still remains to be enlightened? It is not inevitably a "shock," as Archdeacon Wilson declares (p. 74), to have it suggested that a reconciliation with God is necessary, as attributing to Him something less than perfect fatherly love. His absolute justice and perfect holiness demand what His marvellous love and mercy were able to supply. Even an earthly father—and the more the better father he is—may require reparation before reconciliation with a son. The Archdeacon makes much of the Parable of the Prodigal Son, having in it no hint of any traditional view of the Atonement. That parable illustrates, indeed, the conversion of a sinner from both the Divine and human sides, but was possible only because of the offering which He who spoke it was about to make. He it was who was to procure the "new robe" with which the Father would cover the rags of all prodigals returned.

3. *Propitiation means "no more than the assurance of God's love towards us and of His union with us."* But if this were truly the case, surely that assurance could have been given us without the death of Christ.

4. *The sacrifice of Christ's death was merely an example of self-sacrifice, exercising, on account of its sublimity, a magnetic attraction for men, but having in it "no thought of substitution or expiation."* The foregoing part of this paper, it is to be hoped, meets this view. If anything in Scripture seems to be plain to a mind unbiassed, it is surely the need for the great Expiatory Offering of Calvary—"apart from shedding of blood there is no remission."

5. As to the "*ransom theory*" of the Atonement and

"*Christian mythology*," one ventures to question by what authority the word "theory" is joined to ransom at all in this connection. The Bible, whether New Testament or Old Testament, does not theorize. It states *facts* and inculcates *doctrines*, whether explicitly or implicitly, but it does not *theorize*. Our Lord's own words state no theory, but a profound, though no doubt mysterious, truth, when He says, "The Son of man came . . . to give His life a ransom for many" (Matt. xx. 28). The expression "Christian mythology" can have no real meaning unless the story of the Cross is to be regarded not as an historical fact, but as a fabulous myth. The language of the Book of Common Prayer and of the Articles of the Church is unmistakably in accordance with the substitutionary or expiatory doctrine of the Atonement. Especially is this evident in the Holy Communion Service and in Articles XI., XII., XV., and XXXI.

6. Lastly, we have the contention that *the Atonement is but the Incarnation, or an extension of the Incarnation in the persons of all Christians*. Here, chiefly, I come in contact with Dr. Moberly. There is undoubtedly much in his book, "Atonement and Personality," which one can readily accept as beautiful and true. But there is, I think, at the same time much that is nebulous, conjectural, and undefined. The Professor starts with the assertion that punishment is always (except in hell) to some extent disciplinary, and that the more the discipline is accepted and welcomed, the more the retributive aspect and sense of punishment disappears (see chapter i.). This, no doubt, is true, but it suggests the caution and query, May not the idea of the welcoming of punishment for the sake of its purificatory power develop the thought of *merit* in self-inflicted pain? Forgiveness the Professor defines as an attitude of love to be consummated in the perfect holiness of the recipient (see chapter iii.). This, no doubt, is again true; but is it not both more comforting to the sinner, and more in accordance with the teaching of Scripture, to say that forgiveness is a present possession by faith? Neither the Jew before

Calvary, nor the Christian since, has been taught by the Word of God to believe that he must wait to receive forgiveness until he achieves a state of sinless perfection. Again, Dr. Moberly says the Atonement made by Christ was that of a "perfect penitence." This could be experienced only by One who was personally sinless, and who had perfect consciousness of the true nature and measure of sin, and whose love was quite literally infinite. This penitence was consummated at the cost of a voluntary dissolution (see chapter vi.). Who can doubt that this was so? What sense of the sinfulness of sin must not He have had who, though He "knew no sin," was "made sin"? And who shall plumb the depths of either the great Agony or the awful cry of desolation on the Cross? Yet the emphasis of the satisfaction is laid by Scripture *not* upon the *penitence*, but upon the *death*. The sacrifice of Christ's death, says the Professor, is potentially and objectively the "sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world," but to be an effectual personal atonement it must be objectively realized by faith, contemplation, love; and this can only take place by the action of the Holy Spirit on the subjective personality (see chapter vii.). From this, though it might be differently expressed, most Christians probably would not dissent. But when Dr. Moberly reaches his conclusion, we find it is this—that "the Atonement is Christ in us: ourselves realized in Christ," "a real achievement of perfect sinlessness in the perfectly sinful, a real transformation of the conditions and possibilities of humanity" (p. 275). Whatever this is, it is not, I venture to assert, the teaching of Holy Scripture.

There appears to be in the above view a confusion between the Incarnation and the Atonement, between the Atonement and the subsequent effects of believing on that Atonement, between justification and sanctification, between Christ's work for us and the Holy Spirit's work in us, between our gradual growth in holiness here and our complete attainment of sinless perfection hereafter. The Atonement is not, in the view of Holy Scripture, the Incarnation; far less is the Atonement an

extension of the Incarnation—the indwelling of Christ in all professing Christians. The *order of importance* in Scripture is not (1) the Incarnation and (2) the Atonement, but (1) the Atonement and (2) the Incarnation. The Son of God took the nature of man with the ultimate design and express object of dying for man. The teaching of Scripture is that the love of God was the primary cause of the Atonement which Christ offered, and that upon faith in that Atonement or death of Christ forgiveness of sins and a title to everlasting life is accorded. “God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son,” etc. (John iii. 16); “being now justified by His blood” (Rom. v. 9); “being therefore justified by faith” (Rom. v. 1)—these are the words of Inspiration.

The mention of the word “justify” will arrest attention. With regard to its true meaning being to “*account* righteous,” it may be pointed out that in the whole range of classical literature there is no known instance in which the word means to “*make* righteous.” In the LXX. it is used forty-five times (Old Testament and Apocrypha), and always, or very nearly always, in the forensic sense. The nearest approach to an exception is in Ps. lxxiii. 13, where the word seems to mean “pronounced righteous,” “I called my conscience clear.” Again, as touching this question of an imputed righteousness, it is important to notice a distinction between the rendering of the Authorized Version and the Revised Version in Rom. i. 17. The latter translates, “For therein” (*i.e.*, in the Gospel) “is revealed not ‘the,’ but ‘a’ righteousness of God by faith unto faith.” Now “*a* righteousness of God is not *the* righteousness which God Himself possesses; *a* righteousness of God is not *the* righteousness of Christ: this would be to mistake the cause for the result; *a* righteousness of God is not the right relationship into which God puts the believer with respect to the law and God Himself: this is to put the consequence for the cause; *a* righteousness of God is not the *method* by which God pardons and accounts righteous and entitled to glory, for this is to substitute an idea for the reality, a theory for an act; but ‘*a* righteousness of God’ is a righteousness founded on the entire work of Christ in

the flesh, which He bestows on the believer. Man possessed of this gift of righteousness is pronounced righteous, and is in a state and standing in which he has acquittal of sin and acceptance with God."¹ Dr. Moberly asks (footnote, pp. 335-336): "Is it possible that when anyone is pronounced, or regarded, or treated as righteous *by the very truth* of God, his being so pronounced can be in its full and proper meaning dissevered from his so being?" In answer to this it may be said that no doubt, when God declares or accounts anyone righteous He *does so with the design of gradually making* that person righteous, until, when the process is at last complete, he is "set before the presence of His glory without blemish in exceeding joy" (Jude 24). Truth of fact and ideal truth are not opposed to one another. The raw recruit is called a soldier as soon as he is enlisted, because the intention is that he shall be properly trained until he is what his name implies. But this is not to say that he must realize that he is a thoroughly trained soldier before he can so style himself or believe that he is one. Here seems to me to lie the fallacy of Dr. Moberly's view of Atonement. There is in that view, as no clear definition, so no finality, and so no certain ground of comfort. If I cannot believe that a definite and sufficient sacrifice has been offered in substitution for myself, and *needs no addition on my part*, when shall I be certain that I have added sufficient, or sufficiently realized the presence of Christ in myself? Nay, how be sure that I am not self-deceived? How shall I feel secure, or, indeed, at all sensible of any peace? I fear if I were to go to a dying man with a page of Dr. Moberly in my hand, it would be but cold comfort; but if I go with the announcement that "while we were yet sinners Christ died for us" (Rom. v. 8), "the righteous for the unrighteous that he might bring us to God" (1 Pet. iii. 1-8), there is a solidity, a definiteness, a finality which has power to soothe the soul of one who must die, or to furnish a stimulus to quicken to holy living one who may live. The doctrine of the

¹ See article on "Righteousness of God," p. 614, in "A Protestant Dictionary." The italics are the present writer's.

Atonement is one of those doctrines which the ordinary mind must be able to grasp. The doctrine as stated—or in so far as it is stated—by the late Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology at Oxford, and can be mentally grasped by anyone, is one which it needs a trained mind to follow and a subtle intellect to apprehend at all. It is a doctrine highly esoteric. Not such a gospel as this is it which is “in all the world bearing fruit and increasing” (Col. i. 6).

The nineteenth and twentieth centuries after Christ have been anxious to apply hard-and-fast logic, metaphysical and philosophical speculations, and science to the plain statements of the “word of the truth of the Gospel” (Col. i. 5), and to the “simplicity which is toward Christ” (2 Cor. xi. 3), by and in which our forefathers believed and passed to their rest. We may well doubt if the world will be the better or the happier for these ambitious strivings. The early Church Fathers, and the doctrinal writers who followed them, are scorned to-day for what is termed “their crude theory of the Atonement.” But, at any rate, by keeping close to Scripture they preserved intact the central truth of the Christian faith, and did not fritter that truth away. Even to-day, in the full light of modern theories of the Atonement, one cannot but believe that so early a writing as the Epistle to Diognetus comprised the truth on this subject, rather than present-day subtleties and mysticisms—though Dr. Moberly’s rendering and what he sees in the passage form a fine example of what one may read into an author if one is determined to find it there. “God gave up His own Son,” says the writer of that letter, “a ransom for us, the holy for the unholy, the innocent for the wicked, the righteous for the unrighteous, the incorruptible for the corruptible, the immortal for the mortal. For what else could cover our sins but his righteousness? In whom was it possible for us, the unholy and ungodly, to be justified, but in the Son of God alone? Oh, unlooked-for blessings! that the transgression of many should be hidden in a righteous One, and that the righteousness of One should justify many transgressors” (“Ep. ad Diog.,” ix.).

Literary Notes.

THE fourth series of Dr. Alexander Maclaren's "Expositions of Holy Scripture" is to be completed this autumn. Already in this section two volumes devoted to "The Psalms" have been published. Vols. III. to VI. will cover "Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Minor Prophets," "St. Luke" in two volumes, and "The Epistle to the Romans." The whole undertaking is a fine piece of work, and richly merits, as I understand it has already attained, a large measure of success. Dr. Maclaren brings to bear in his homiletic criticism an originality of thought, a felicity of expression, and a spirituality of mind, which make all the volumes very attractive and inspiring reading. He is pre-eminently the preacher for preachers, and no clergyman, young or old, should be without these books, which, when completed, will make a splendid library of Biblical commentary. Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton are the publishers.



Dr. Ralph Dunstan, who has had much to do with the musical training of the male and female students of the various Wesleyan training-colleges for teachers, has just completed "A Cyclopædic Dictionary; or, Hand-Lexicon of Music." There is hardly another work of its kind in the English language. Of course, there is the valuable Grove's Dictionary, but this is so very expensive. Dr. Dunstan has been at work upon his dictionary some four years, and it embodies the results of over thirty years' study and experience. Moreover, the price is, I understand, to be very low. There is "something about everything" concerning music in this work. There are about 14,000 musical terms and phrases expounded in the volume, while 6,000 biographical notices, the numerous short articles, the charts and tables, and the miscellaneous items of musical interest, cover an unusually wide field, and embrace every variety of musical topic. The short articles in themselves reach the respectable total of 500. The curious reader or musical antiquarian will also find the results of explorations into various "nooks and corners" under such headings as Bird Music, Colour and Music, Imitative Music, Music of Insects, Key Colour, Melody in Speech, Miraculous Effects of Music, Nature's Music, etc.



In Mr. Murray's "Wisdom of the East Series" there are to be added shortly three new numbers. They are published at 2s. net per volume, and are entitled, "The Heart of India," by L. D. Barnett, LL.D.; "The Book of Filial Duty," with twenty-four examples, by Iwan Chen; and "Sa'Di's Scroll of Wisdom," with the text in English and Persian, and with an introduction by Sir Arthur N. Wollaston, K.C.I.E.



There is at present no work by a modern English writer dealing with the certainly fascinating subject of Bees, from the literary and antiquarian, as well as the scientific point of view. But Mr. Tickner Edwardes has written one entitled "The Lore of the Honey Bee," which covers the whole field of ascertained facts in the natural history of the honey bee, as well as the

romance of beemanship, past and present. There are some excellent illustrations from photographs in the volume, which is published by Messrs. Methuen.



What should prove a very readable biography is Dr. Robertson Nicoll's life of Dr. John Watson. Of course, the literary atmosphere will probably predominate; but for all that, Dr. Nicoll will deal proportionately with "Ian Maclaren's" sphere of religious activity. It was, it may not be known to everyone, at the suggestion of the editor of the *Expositor*, and the more popular *British Weekly*, that Dr. Watson commenced writing his delightful and inimitable stories, so beautifully phrased and so pleasingly arranged. We may, therefore, reasonably expect a more than intimate account of his life and a very personal understanding of his literary temperament. The work is expected next month.



One is always on the look-out for new books by our great writers. And, I take it, none of my readers will gainsay the contention when it refers to Mr. Swinburne. In some sense it is a regret that those writers whose works one places upon the shelf devoted to modern standard authors—writers of repute whose views and reviews one may trust and treat with more than the usual cursory respect—do not make their appearance more often. Yet, on the other hand, it is well. For, as a rule, the author who turns his books out as a man rolls off the cinematographic films is, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, a person of ephemeral conditions, and a meteorite across the cloudy sky of literary intent. But in the case of Mr. Swinburne we are indeed most fortunate. It was only the other day we had the good fortune of looking at his "Duke of Gandia," probably one of the best, in recent times at least, of his poetic efforts. At the end of this month we are again to have, all being well, another work from his matured mind. Naturally there is much expectation regarding the event, and there is no doubt that the great expectations will be duly fulfilled. It is more than fifty years since Mr. Swinburne wrote the first word in a literary career which has brought him the plaudits of the highest intellects and the appreciation of the true lover of poetry from all quarters of the world. The new book is to be called "The Age of Shakespeare." The title is poignantly suggestive, and should be a very valuable piece of criticism.



Dr. Joseph B. Mayor, who is Emeritus Professor at King's College, Cambridge, has almost ready for publication, through Mr. Murray, his work on "Select Readings from the Psalms." The author's desire in preparing this volume has been to omit from the Psalms whatever might tend to interfere with their use as a handbook for Christian worship—that is, whatever is not up to the standard of the teaching of Christ and His Apostles. Working from this basis, the scope of study requires the omission of all expressions implying such conceptions of a future life, or of the nature and character of God, as are not fully in harmony with the more perfect revelation made in Jesus Christ. The Prayer Book and Revised Versions are given on opposite pages.

The S.P.C.K. have just issued the 1908 edition of their "Dictionary of the Church of England." It is the third edition and has many appendices, bringing the work up to the end of June last. This Society also has in the press the "Official Report of the Pan-Anglican Congress." It will be published shortly, and will contain the official report of the speeches and discussions at all the meetings and the various groups of papers. Altogether it is expected the work will make seven volumes, including an introductory volume, and will be published at 30s. net the set.



Dr. Peake, who is Dean of the Faculty of Theology in the Victoria University, Manchester, has a volume coming out in the early autumn dealing with popular objections and difficulties to revealed religion.



"A Century of Archæological Discoveries" is to come this autumn from the house of Murray. The author of this very important book is Professor A. Michaelis, of Strasburg, and it has been translated into English by Miss Bettina Kahnweiler, while Professor Gardner has written a preface, and, in the course of the same, says: "It is a work showing intimate knowledge, but it is no dry summary; rather a record of that writer, watching all with the greatest interest, learned as the scroll of excavation and research was gradually unrolled. This infusing of a personal element has made the book more interesting to the reader."



What should prove a readable volume is one which is appearing from the pen of Dr. C. H. H. Wright, through Messrs. Williams and Norgate, on "Light from Egyptian Papyri on Jewish History before Christ."



Mr. Andrew Melrose, publisher at 16, Pilgrim Street, informs us that he is about to admit as partner Mr. Ronald Spicer, son of Mr. George Spicer, of Enfield, and that the new firm will, after September 1, publish from premises at 3, York Street, Covent Garden. The newly-constituted house will develop publishing along broad and general lines, but the name of the firm will for the present remain unchanged. Mr. Ronald Spicer, who took an honours degree in Natural Science at Cambridge last year, is at present learning his business with Messrs. Chapman and Hall.



Notices of Books.

ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS. By the Rev. George Milligan, D.D. London: *Macmillan and Co., Ltd.* Price 12s.

It is well known that Bishops Lightfoot and Westcott and Dr. Hort planned to write between them a Commentary on the New Testament. It is, alas! equally well known that the project was never completed. Bishop Lightfoot's priceless volumes on St. Paul show what we lost by his appointment to Durham. What would not the Church give for a Commentary by him on Romans? Bishop Westcott's share we all know. Of Dr. Hort's part only the merest fragments are available, precious though they are.

But other men are entering upon the task, and we value highly what Drs. Swete, Sanday, Plummer, and the Dean of Westminster have provided for us. The present volume is another contribution to the complete modern Commentary on the New Testament which we all need. Dr. Milligan comes to his task fully equipped by scholarship and spirituality, and, whether we judge by the outward appearance or, still more, by the substance, we almost fancy we are handling one of Westcott's great Commentaries. Higher praise we could not give. The work proceeds on "orthodox" lines, and consists of an Introduction, Text, Notes, and Additional Notes. A special feature is the extent to which the papyri have been utilized for the elucidation of the Greek text. Like the works of the great Cambridge scholars, it is a fine example of close, patient, scholarly exegesis, which will train the student while it provides him with the latest information. Among the special points to which we naturally turn in any Commentary on these Epistles is the *crux* in 2 Thess. ii. Dr. Milligan interprets it of the Roman power, and very summarily dismisses the view that there is any reference to the Holy Spirit in "that which letteth." He has presumably not thought it worth while to consider the futurist or predictive view of the passage, though there is probably more in that interpretation than the historical views of modern scholars would be prepared to admit. The book will at once take its place as our leading English Commentary on the Thessalonians, and students will really require nothing more for their work, though if they can also place beside it Findlay in the Cambridge Greek Testament and Denney in the Expositor's Bible, they will be trebly equipped for their task.

JEREMIAH: THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE. By J. R. Gillies. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 6s.

Another work on Jeremiah, coming closely after that by Dr. Driver which we reviewed in these columns not long ago. After a general introduction the book is taken section by section, a commentary and a new translation being provided, together with critical notes. The author acknowledges his debt to the German commentators, Duhm and Erbt, and their influence is seen in the freedom with which the text is treated. Four elements are recognized as making up the book, and the result is that the author regards it as "not so much a book, the product of a single mind, as a literature, the product of many minds and of many and divers ages." It will be seen that Mr. Gillies adopts a pretty pronounced critical position, and the freedom with which he criticizes and amends both text and author seems to us for the most part arbitrary and impossible. Thus, in dealing with the well-known passage of the Potter's wheel, he speaks of St. Paul in his speculative moods as "entangling himself in the meshes of a religious philosophy, of which one of his brother Apostles plaintively remarks that there are things in it hard to be understood." We question whether this is fair to either Apostle. The discussion of the New Covenant is better, because the doctrinal influence of the Westminster Confession is more in evidence. If used with care and constant reference to more conservative and safer authorities, students and clergymen will find it useful to consult this volume. Apart from the critical questions, there is much on the practical side that is well and aptly put.

LEADING IDEAS OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. By the Rev. George Bailey. London: *Simphin, Marshall and Co., Ltd.* Dublin: *Hodges, Figgis and Co., Ltd.*

Half of this book is taken up with the subject of the title, and will be welcomed by all students of Hebrews, whether they agree with the author's conclusions or not. He takes his own line, and has not a little to say for his interpretations. Certainly no one will consult it as he studies the Epistle without obtaining food for thought and suggestions for interpretation. Among the other essays is one which argues in favour of applying the word "saint" to Jewish Christians only. Here the author is not so easy to follow, and yet there is a great deal more in his contention than might have been supposed. The characteristics of the First Epistle of St. Peter is the subject of another essay. Bible students should make a note of this book, because it goes out of the beaten track and sets the reader thinking along new lines. We should much like to see some more fruits of the author's careful scholarship.

MISSIONS TO HINDUS. By the Rev. Bishop Mylne. London: *Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

The author describes this as "A Contribution to the Study of Missionary Methods." Part I. deals with caste, and discusses it in various aspects. Part II. is occupied with the methods required for meeting the problem. Bishop Mylne describes the two distinct types under which all missions fall—the "diffused" and the "concentrated" mission, or, in other words, the itinerating and the settled—and he expresses a strong partiality for the latter. He then illustrates these two types by the work of Xavier, Schwartz, Carey, and Duff, devoting one chapter to the last-named in connection with the work of educational missions. Part III. sums up the results, and describes what the author regards as the prospects of missionary work. The Bishop's ecclesiastical position is well known, and though it is not hidden in this book, it is not made unduly prominent. His treatment of Xavier is favourable to his personal character and unfavourable to the methods and results of his work. The treatment of Schwartz is generous and appreciative, though quite candid as to the weakness and lack of principles in his work. The account of Carey is entirely favourable, and it is particularly attractive to see the extreme Anglican praising the great Baptist. So also the reference to Duff is full of deep and yet discriminating appreciation. We are unable to follow the Bishop in his admiration for the Cowley-Wantage Mission work. The fruit of this work done by his permission and under his guidance has been only too plainly seen in the recent controversy of the Mission with Bishop Pym. In contrast with the S.P.G., the C.M.S. comes under the Bishop's disapproval for employing non-Christians in mission schools. His plain speaking is also seen in his treatment of educational missions, in which, however, we entirely agree with him. It will be seen from this how frank Dr. Mylne is. He knows his mind and speaks it, and this is always refreshing and useful, whether we agree or not. The book well deserves its sub-title, and should be used by all who are seriously interested in the study of missions.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT. By the Rev. J. R. Cohu. London: *Sheffington and Son*. Price 3s. 6d.

The author deals only with that part of the Sermon on the Mount which is contained in St. Matthew (chap. v.), so that a great deal more material is necessary before the book can be true to its title. In addition, however, there are chapters on such critical subjects as Inspiration, and also as to whether our Gospels faithfully report Christ's sermon. While dealing with practical exposition, the author has much to say that is admirable in point and force; but on critical questions he is obviously not so much at home, and has not taken into account some of the most recent work on the Gospels. The discussion on Inspiration is quite unnecessary to the purpose of the book, and several points of great importance are not included in his view. We could easily spare these slight and often unsatisfactory chapters for more of the practical work which Mr. Cohu knows so well how to give. We should much like to know his authority for saying that to the Jew of Christ's day eating the flesh of the Messiah was a current phrase indicative of the pleasure, delight, and welcome with which they would acclaim the Messiah when He came.

THE ANALYZED OLD TESTAMENT. Vol. I., Genesis to Esther; Vol. II., Job to Malachi; Vol. III., Matthew to Revelation. By the Rev. G. Campbell Morgan, D.D. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 3s. 6d. each.

This series of three volumes consists of an outline of each book in the form of a diagram, followed by a lecture elaborating the outline and indicating the general contents and teaching. They represent the substance of what Dr. Campbell Morgan has given at his now well-known and largely-attended Bible Class at Westminster Chapel. With great truth and force he urges the importance of the study of the Bible as it is, instead of books about it. He has himself read these books of the Bible over and over again until their general idea and drift have been seen and felt. He is right in not claiming finality for his analyses, for here and there they certainly do not seem in accord with the true structure of the book, and, in addition, they betray the author's too great partiality for "apt alliteration's artful aid." But it is the method of the work, and not the particular results that is important, and in this Dr. Campbell Morgan's books will be of the greatest possible value. They will afford just the help required by clergymen and teachers in their work, and we hope the publication will result in a great revival of Bible study in all the Churches. We question whether anything that Dr. Campbell Morgan has done will prove of such real value and far-reaching influence.

SERMONS IN SYNTAX. By the Rev. John Adams. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 4s. 6d. net.

We reviewed some time ago the author's former book on "Sermons in Accents," in which he endeavoured to show how valuable to preachers and students is a careful consideration of the study of Hebrew accentuation. In the present work he does the same with Hebrew syntax, and, as he very rightly says, if readers have profited in any way from the homiletical hints

provided in his former book, they may be assured that in the sphere of Hebrew grammar there is a far more fruitful and suggestive field. In the course of a careful account of Hebrew tenses and moods the writer provides some very interesting and suggestive expository outlines, and he expresses the opinion that "so rich and varied is this practical side of Hebrew syntax that they who deal with the minutæ of the text will never lack sermons." This is essentially a book for preachers and students, especially for those who may be tempted to give up their study of Hebrew. It will show them the wealth of fruitful suggestion found in a careful study of the Old Testament. We should like to see this book in the hands of all our clergy and theological students. It would soon have its effect on their sermons, and, indeed, on their entire study of the Bible.

THE WESTMINSTER NEW TESTAMENT. Edited by the Rev. A. E. Garvie, D.D. Vol. I., St. John's Gospel. By the Rev. H. W. Clark. Vol. II., The Acts of the Apostles. By Professor H. T. Andrews. Vol. III., The Gospel of St. Matthew. By the Rev. David Smith, D.D. London: *Andrew Melrose*. Price, cloth, 2s. net; leather, 3s. net per vol.

Another series of Handbooks to the New Testament. Coming so soon after the Century Bible, it would almost seem as though there were no room for it, but in the opinion of the promoters this series will make a place for itself. It is intended chiefly for teachers, lay-preachers, and others engaged in Christian work, and their needs are kept particularly in view. The editor, Dr. Garvie, says that, "while the standpoint adopted is that of modern critical scholarship, only the generally accepted results, and not the vagaries of individual critics, are being presented, and in such a fashion as to avoid unnecessarily giving offence or causing any difficulty to the reverent Bible student." How far this purpose is carried out will be seen from a careful examination of these first three volumes.

Dr. David Smith's general position is already known from his life of Christ, "In the Days of His Flesh." His main theory of the origin of the Gospels is that of Oral Tradition, and he concludes that the first Gospel is not by Matthew, but by a disciple of that Apostle, though he does not give any satisfactory reason for the persistent tradition which associates the first Gospel with the Apostle Matthew. His well-known view of demoniacal possession again comes out, in which he regards it as only an intensified form of lunacy. His interpretation of the coin in the fish's mouth as a playful suggestion of our Lord to Peter to go back to his fishing, seems to us almost ludicrous in its weakness and disregard of the facts of the situation.

The editor's selection of Mr. Clark for St. John's Gospel is a happy one. Few books have proved more suggestive in recent years than the two which are credited to him on the title-page. He argues effectively for the Johannine authorship, though we think he yields far too much in saying that it is possible "that he may have put in a given discourse thoughts and phrases which really belonged to another." We have a much higher opinion of the power of the author of the Gospel than this. Apart from the particular critical views, the comments strike us as terse and helpful.

The next volume on Acts is by one of the Professors in the Congregational New College at Hampstead. The Lukan authorship is, of course, accepted, and there is a good statement of the purpose and theology of the book. Here, again, we are sorry to see concessions to the modern spirit, as, for example, when we are told that "Luke gives himself completely away by his anachronism with regard to Theudas." This is a pure assumption, as is also the case with the alleged inaccuracy of Stephen. It is wholly gratuitous to assume without the clearest proof that Stephen did not know the history of his people as well as modern writers.

It will be seen that in our judgment the standpoint of this Commentary does not fulfil the claim of the editor, for it certainly presents its critical views in a way that cannot help causing difficulty to many in the particular classes of readers for whom the series is specially intended. In view of the critical standpoint adopted, and of the fact that the series is for teachers and lay-preachers, there might surely have been some reference to the main grounds of authority on which we accept these books. They form part of a volume which we dignify by the name of the Word of God, and Sunday-school teachers and other Christian workers will naturally want to know how to reconcile this position of Divine authority with the charges of historical inaccuracy which are so freely made in these volumes. The get-up of the books is particularly neat and attractive. They are delightful to handle, and the type is clear and good. The text provided is that of the Authorized Version, and this is certainly less confusing and much more convenient than the method of the Century Bible, which gives both Authorized Version and Revised Version. We should like something still better, in the form of the valuable Interlinear text of the two versions. We cannot help feeling sorry for the choice of the name of the "Westminster" New Testament, in view of the now well-known "Westminster Commentaries" which are being issued on the entire Bible. Some other name would have prevented confusion.

THE GRAMMAR OF PHILOSOPHY: A STUDY OF SCIENTIFIC METHOD. By David Graham. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 7s. 6d.

This curious and exasperating book is supposed to be a study of scientific method. In point of fact it is not very methodical, and not very scientific. Why the author should style his book a "Grammar of Philosophy," we do not gather; for, despite all his reading—and this has been really considerable—Mr. Graham does not appear to us to have a very clear or true idea of what Philosophy actually is. The book, written in a rather rollicking vein at times, may be described (briefly) as one long panegyric of "Common Sense." As a champion of common sense, Mr. Graham does battle with all sorts and conditions of men and thinkers; and at times he deals shrewd blows. There are many *obiter dicta* of the writer which we cordially endorse, and many of the criticisms we can heartily approve; they are often acute and sometimes wise. But the book, as a whole, is somewhat of a failure; its title is a misnomer, for one thing; and its general attitude inclined to be captious and perverse, for another. Its style and method occasionally remind us of a book published some sixteen years ago ("The Greenleeks Papers").

THE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF NATIONAL CHURCHES. By the Rev. J. H. B. Masterman, M.A. Cambridge: *University Press*, 1908. Price 2s. 6d.

This book contains the "Hulsean Lectures" for 1907-08. These lectures caused a good deal of attention when originally delivered. They are scholarly, clever, and thoughtful. They are not deep. One ought not to expect much depth in a book of this kind. Enough, if these pages recall men to consider afresh the verdict of history on certain prevalent ideas, both social and ecclesiastical. And this they assuredly do. The book, if read carefully alongside of Peile's "Bampton Lectures," should prove of real service to Churchmen.

THEOGNOSTUS, PIERIUS, AND PETER. By the Rev. L. B. Radford, M.A. Cambridge: *University Press*. 1908. Price 2s. 6d.

Brief as this book is, it represents an unusual amount of scholarly study in a field of criticism not much worked. The book is, to describe it briefly, a study in the early history of Origenism and Anti-Origenism. The three Alexandrian teachers whose influence on contemporary human thought is here set out will be *incogniti viri* to most of us; all the more reason, therefore, have we to thank Mr. Radford for his very able and conscientious monograph.

ISLAM: A CHALLENGE TO THE FAITH. By S. M. Zwemer, Ph.D. New York: *Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions*. Price 5s.

It is curious to reflect (and painful, as well as curious) that, despite the fact that more than 60,000,000 Moslems are subjects of the King of England—in *India alone*—there is no special "mission to Mohammedans," as there are Missions to the Jews. Yet Islam is the greatest of all anti-Christian religions, not by reason of its numbers, but by reason of its propagandist zeal. And we find to-day a world-wide movement at work, commonly called Pan-Islamism, which aims at consolidating Islamic missionary effort, and to make the religion of the Prophet once more a matter of universal importance. The importance of these and kindred questions is well shown in Dr. Zwemer's excellent handbook, which, in a brief space, marshals facts and discusses problems in a manner that leaves little to be desired. Its publication follows suitably close on the heels of the "Cairo Conference" of 1906, when missionaries from every Moslem land made such an appeal to the Churches of Christendom as should stir the hearts of every one to whom Jesus Christ himself is other than *magni nominis umbra*. The responsibility which rests on Great Britain in this matter is all but overwhelming. "The greatest Moslem power on earth:" these words very justly apply to our mighty Empire. Does that Empire, in its national character, really understand or vitally respond, to the vast charge God has seen fit to lay upon it? The reply must be—unhesitatingly—"No." Individual efforts there have been, and are; but, nationally, we have shirked the charge. Every serious student would do well to consider this book; every patriot-statesman would be the better for reflecting on the grave problems it suggests. Its attitude towards Islam is severe, but not (*ni fallimur*) unduly so. The whole religious problem of half Africa is involved in the attitude we, as Christians, take up as regards the swift and stealthy onslaught of Islam in the central Soudan.

The book is provided with some good bibliographies, showing the sources of its information ; and there are several illustrations, and a useful index.

IN DEFENCE: A PLEA FOR THE FAITH. By Sir Robert Anderson, K.C.B., LL.D. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 5s.

This vigorous polemic should be read by all those who have qualms as to the veracity of certain modern theories of science and religion. Sir Robert Anderson is apt, indeed, "to call a spade a spade," if not something still less polite ; but, after making due allowance for a certain amount of over-zealous language, we cannot but commend the writer's undoubted courage. He lays about him trenchantly ; and the men who accept rationalistic premisses while vainly endeavouring to avoid drawing rationalistic conclusions find short shrift at his hands. A frank unbeliever is more acceptable to him than the sitters on theological and doctrinal fences.

THE EARLY ENGLISH COLONIES. By the Rev. Sadler Phillips. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 6s. net.

This volume is a summary of a lecture given by the Bishop of London, about a year since, at Richmond, in Virginia, to a large audience of Americans. As the aim of the lecture was to explain the interesting historic ties which exist between the American Episcopal Church and the old See of London, so the aim of the editor of this book is to illustrate, by means of various historical documents, the intimate connection of the work of the Bishops of London in the past with the founding of the English Colonies. Two main principles were insisted on by Dr. Ingram: (1) The Virginia settlements were made on a *religious* basis, and that basis the religion of the Church of England ; (2) it was from that same Church that the American Church sprang. The book is well-edited, in the main ; but the lack of an index is a very serious blemish.

LETTERS FROM A MYSTIC OF THE PRESENT DAY. By the Rev. R. W. Corbet, M.A. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 2s. 6d.

A fourth "edition" (so called—but it appears to be merely a reprint of the second edition) of a charming and suggestive little book.

CONFESSIO MEDICI. London: *Macmillan and Co.* Price 2s. 6d.

This book—by a writer who does not give his name, save indirectly, as the author of "The Young People"—is written somewhat in the vein made familiar by Arthur Benson's books. "Somewhat"—but the differences are as numerous as the resemblances. We commend the book to our readers ; it has a flavour all its own, and the flavour is a good one. There is a kindliness of judgment and a keenness of insight displayed throughout the pages of this "Confession" which will endear the (unknown) writer to his readers.

THE UNFINISHED TASK OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By J. L. Barton. New York: *Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions*. 1908. Price 2s. 6d.

This book purports to be a series of studies in the problem of the world's Evangelisation ; and, as such, they have been issued by the New York Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions. As far as we are able to judge, the book seems to be well put together, and the statistics trust-

worthy. It is certainly admirably fitted for the use of mission-study classes, and will, we trust, lead many students to gird themselves for the "unfinished task."

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE: THE FAITH AND THE FOUNDER. By the Rev. L. P. Powell. New York: *Putnam*. Price 5s. net.

This book—written by the Rector of St. John's Church, Northampton, Massachusetts—is of singular value, alike as a criticism and an interpretation of one of the most curious "aberrations" of the human intellect ever witnessed in modern times. Mr. Powell writes with quite first-hand knowledge, and writes with force and earnestness. His pages read well, which is no small gain, as the book is meant not for the student of psychology, but the mass of average people. That Mr. Powell formulates a very heavy indictment against "Christian Science" is clear; and we hope that the book will be widely, and wisely, read. In point of fact, the term "Christian Science" contains, within itself, its own refutation: first, it is in no sense "science" (that is, exact knowledge); second, it is not Christian. But its dupes are many; and every sensible exposition of this silly "heresy"—which exposition must inevitably involve its *exposure*—will be welcomed by sane people all the world over.

BIBLE WORK AND WARFARE. By the Rev. Frank Swainson. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. net.

A cheap reissue of a valuable record of work among men. While it is called a Bible Class, Mr. Swainson's work really consists of a men's service fashioned on the model of Mr. Watts-Ditchfield's well-known service. Mr. Swainson has proved an apt pupil, and has added to his model his own personal gifts, with the result that at Sheffield he had the largest gathering for men in the world, while at Holloway he is equally successful, though necessarily with smaller scope the numbers are fewer. This is the very book for clergy and other workers among men. While the personal power of the author is a great asset, most of his suggestions can be adopted or adapted by other workers. What we specially like is the entire dependence upon the power of the Gospel, apart from extraneous helps, such as musical attractions, clubs, etc.

MEDITATIONS FOR THE CHURCH'S YEAR. By the Bishop of Durham. London: *H. R. Allenson*. Price 3s. 6d.

Dr. Moule puts the sons and daughters of the Church of England under a deep indebtedness. Most of the meditations have appeared before under the title "From Sunday to Sunday." The rearrangement to follow the order of the Church's year meets a definite need. So deep and spiritual a guide, such literary gifts as his, such insight born of prayer and meditation, bring the message of the Church with unsurpassed vividness and conviction.

WITH CHRIST IN PALESTINE. By A. T. Schofield, M.D. London: J. F. Shaw and Co. Price 1s.

These four addresses were given in 1905, and were suggested by a visit to the Holy Land. Many interesting things are told us about Bethlehem, Nazareth, Capernaum, and Jerusalem, and the practical and spiritual teaching is of the freshest and most helpful.

THE MATRON. London: *The Scientific Press, Ltd.* Price 2s. 6d.

The duties and responsibilities of the Matrons of Hospitals are here well set forth. The fruit of long experience is well gathered and presented, and principles of economy in institutions are added.

THOUGHTS ABOUT GOD, MAN, EVIL. By Rev. C. G. Ashwin, M.A. London: *Elliot Stock.* 2s. net.

The second edition of a work already noticed in these pages. These are distinctly suggestive, and likely to be a help to minds perplexed. There are six short essays, the last of which applies the argument on the atomic theory to Christianity. The writer does not seem clear on the substitutionary element of Christ's Atonement.

GOLDEN THOUGHTS FROM THOREAU. Edited by Dorothy Eastwood. London: *John Lane.* 1s.

Pupil of Emerson, Pantheist, pencil-maker, and founder of the cult of the simple life, there are many pearls in the philosophy of Thoreau. He is in many ways a great soul, and the selection made by an enthusiastic editor will give the proof. Though great, he is lonely, for he has little use for faith and prayer, though some for humility. The sovereignty of God and His Fatherhood have never gripped him, and he is strangely reticent about Christ.

LITTLE SCHOLARS IN THE SCHOOL OF PAIN. By Rose Bourdillon. London: *Elliot Stock.* 3s.

The Bishop of Bath and Wells writes a preface cordially recommending this book. It is intended for children in every class of life to whom has been given any pain or illness to bear. The book is simple, helpful, and Scriptural.

THE SUPERSENSUAL LIFE. By Jacob Boehme. London: *H. N. Allenson.* 1s. net.

These two dialogues between disciple and master are translated by William Law. Mystic heights and depths of the soul are here, and the translation of Law enhances their deep value. It is one of a series of the "Heart and Life" booklets.

A CALENDAR OF HOPE. By Claudine Currey. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* 1s.

The booklet is tasteful, and the thoughts full of good cheer. Each month has its tonic for mind and spirit.

ROCK OR SAND. By the Rev. J. Wakeford. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 6d.

Short lectures in answer to the question "Is Christianity true or false?" The subjects are six, and include "The Being of God," "The Nature of Man," "Christ, God, and Man," "The Purpose of Miracles," "Truth of the Resurrection," "The Christian Religion." They are reprinted from the *Liverpool Courier*. They are manly, straightforward, and convincing.

SOCIAL LIFE. By Bishop Ridgeway. London: *Cassell and Co.* Price 1s. 6d.

We heartily commend this little volume of the "Christian Life Series." Starting from the individual and his right relation, the Dean deals with the Christian as a social being in the home, in society, as associated with the nation and the race. His words on Christian unity and the Christian Sunday are well worth pondering. There is a simplicity and directness about the book as well as instructiveness. The subject is opportune.

THE NEW CENTURY SUNDAY SCHOOL. Edited by Frank Johnson. London: *The Sunday School Union*. Price 1s. net.

This contains the Report of the Conference of the British and American Members of the International Lessons Committee, which was held in London last summer. It includes the consideration of such important subjects as the relation of Biblical scholarship to Sunday-school teaching, a consecutive Bible study, and use of the poetical and prophetic books, temperance lessons, advanced and primary courses, Sunday-schools and missions, with other subsidiary topics. No student of Sunday-school problems should be without this volume. Its keynote is the blending of the educational with the Evangelical, and in the combination of these two lies the hope of the Sunday-school.

MYTHOLOGIES OF ANCIENT MEXICO AND PERU. By Lewis Spence. Religions Ancient and Modern. London: *Archibald Constable and Co., Ltd.* Price 1s. net.

Another volume of this useful series. The writer in the preface notes the neglect into which the study of Mexican and Peruvian mythologies has fallen. This handbook will help to correct this neglect, and provide the student of comparative religion with some valuable information on a subject that is far too little known.

THE WORLD AND ITS GOD. By Philip Mauro. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* Price 1s.

A new and enlarged edition of a little work already noticed. It is characterized by much strong thinking and forcible arguments. The main contention is that the world is now under Satan, not God; and while we believe this to be true in general, we cannot, however, accept all the deductions from it by the author. The new chapters, which deal mainly with evolution, are particularly interesting in view of the changes now taking place among scientists themselves as to the Darwinian hypothesis.

PAMPHLETS, PERIODICALS, AND REPRINTS.

THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW. July, 1908. London: *Spottiswoode and Co., Ltd.* Price 3s.

This is an excellent number—one of the best that we have had for some time. The first article, to which we make reference on another page, is on "The Lambeth Conference and the Union of the Churches." The Dean of Westminster writes in his own scholarly and interesting way on "Simon Langham, Abbot of Westminster." A charming article deals with "The Pleasant Land of France." The Rev. W. C. Bishop writes on "The Primitive Form of Consecration of the Holy Eucharist," and makes the important point that the words of our Lord in instituting the Lord's Supper are strictly words of administration, not consecration. The last article, "The Theology of the Keswick Convention," deals out both praise and blame, though the conclusion seems to be rather indefinite and inconsequent, making it difficult to know precisely how the writer regards the movement as a whole.

ADMINISTRATION OF CHARITY. By Arthur Paterson. London: *The City Council for Organization of Charity*. Price 1s.

Articles reprinted from the *Times*. The author shows how serious is the overlapping of charitable agencies and how deplorable are the results. He puts in an earnest and urgent plea for co-ordination and co-operation among charitable institutions. We hope much good will result from his appeal.

THE ART OF TEACHING. By the late Sir Joshua Fitch. London: *The Sunday School Union*. Price 6d. net, paper covers; 1s. net, cloth.

A new edition of lectures delivered forty years ago by one of the greatest educationists of modern times. We could wish that this admirable little manual were in the hands not only of all Sunday-school teachers, but also of all junior clergymen. It would vastly improve their work among children, and, indeed, all their teaching.

ST. FRANCIS AND HIS FRIENDS.—AGATHOS, AND OTHER SUNDAY STORIES. By Samuel Wilberforce.—THE IMITATION OF CHRIST. By Thomas à Kempis.—THE INTERLINEAR PSALMS. Price 1s. 6d. net each. London: *Cambridge University Press*.

Very charming and dainty editions of works that have become classics in their way. They are a delight to handle and a pleasure to read, and all who are on the look-out for gifts should bear these beautiful little volumes in mind. We are especially interested to see that the Psalms are now available in separate form from the Interlinear Bible. This is by far the easiest and most helpful version for obtaining an immediate acquaintance of the differences between the Authorised Version and the Revised Version.

THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES. July, 1908. London: *Henry Frowde*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

The first article is by the Rev. H. J. Lawlor, D.D., on "The Heresy of the Phrygians," and discusses afresh the important subject of Montanism. Dr. Lawlor argues very forcibly against the view that Montanism was homogeneous, and distinguishes with great probability of truth between Phrygian and African Montanism. There is less material in the present number for the general student and more of a technical character for the specialist, though there are, of course, some very useful reviews. Mr. Brooke of Cambridge deals severely with Gregory's "Canon of the New Testament." We are glad to notice some slight acknowledgment of error on the part of the reviewer of Gwatkin's "Gifford Lectures" in a former number which struck us as eminently unfair in certain essential particulars.

THE JOURNAL OF THE GYPSY LORE SOCIETY. July, 1908. Liverpool: *The Gypsy Lore Society*, 6, Hope Place.

The first number of a new volume containing a great variety of articles which may be commended to those who take an interest in gipsy life and ways.

THE HISTORICAL CHARACTER OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL. By J. Armitage Robinson, D.D. London: *Longmans, Green, and Co.* Price 6d. net, paper; 1s. net, cloth.

The substance of three lectures given in Westminster Abbey. Marked by all the eminent author's scholarship, ability, and forcefulness of expression. A small but valuable contribution to the historicity of the Fourth Gospel.

ST. PAUL'S ILLUSTRATIONS CLASSIFIED AND EXPLAINED. By the Rev. R. Resker. Bible Class Primers. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. London: *Simphin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent, and Co., Ltd.* Price 6d. paper; 8d. cloth.

The author, who is well known to our readers, is one of our most valued writers on all things connected with Sunday-schools and with teaching generally. He has here performed a useful service for clergy and teachers in arranging and explaining the illustrations of St. Paul. No one could have believed that there were so many illustrations in the Apostle's writings without seeing them as they are here set out before us in these well-written and interesting pages.

A FORM OF SERVICE FOR USE IN CHILDREN'S CHURCHES, MISSION SERVICES, AND AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE GENERALLY. Compiled from the Book of Common Prayer. Croydon: *Roffey and Clark*. Price 1d. paper; 3d. cloth.

This is drawn almost entirely from the Book of Common Prayer, and is authorized for use in quite a number of dioceses. It will be found useful in connection with children's work, though we think a further selection of Psalms would have been an improvement. The Form of Service issued by the Church of England Sunday-school Institute is an illustration of what we mean.

QUOSQUE? WHEREUNTO ARE WE DRIFTING? Edited by the Rev. A. M. W. Christopher and J. C. Sharpe. Oxford: *James Parker and Co.* London: *Simphin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent, and Co., Ltd.* Price 1s. net.

A remarkable collection of extracts from leading Bishops and clergy during the last fifty years, intended to prove the disloyalty of the extreme section of the Church of England, and to unite all those who are loyal to the Reformation. It is admirably adapted to fulfil its purpose, and should be circulated widely by all who love Reformation principles.