

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

April, 1911.

The Month.

**Evangelical
Unity.** WE had not intended to make any further reference to the correspondence on the attitude of Evangelicals towards the "Higher Criticism" of the Old Testament which still proceeds in the columns of the *Record*. Two points, however, have emerged—one in the course of the correspondence, the other apart from it—which we cannot allow to pass without remark. One of the correspondents, writing on March 3, asks :

"Would one of your correspondents who has found refuge in the Higher Critical views tell us why he wishes to be called an 'Evangelical' and not a 'Broad Churchman'?"

The hint conveyed by this question is that Evangelicals who hold "Higher Critical" views have really no right to the name, and should, in common honesty, cease to bear it. The only possible answer to any such suggestion is a most emphatic and decided refusal. The men who, while holding to the traditions of the Evangelical school of thought, not only on the pre-eminent place of the doctrine of the Atonement in Christian theology, but also on the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments, have still "found refuge in Higher Critical views," will neither depart nor will they submit to expulsion. They claim to be loyal and faithful representatives of the name they have inherited, and to which they still maintain the fullest claim.

Dr. Eugene Stock's Contribution. The other matter connected with this topic to which we gladly invite attention is the appearance of an article by Dr. Eugene Stock in two successive numbers of the *Record* (March 3 and March 10) entitled "A Plain Man's Thoughts on Biblical Criticism." It is difficult to say which is the most attractive of the many admirable features in this paper. No more excellent example could be adduced of the tone and temper in which the discussion of the subject should be approached. It is quite clear on the one hand that Dr. Stock's own attitude is of careful and cautious conservatism. On the other hand, it is obvious, on his own admission, that his earlier views on the Old Testament have been modified by further reading and reflection. On many points he is content to suspend his judgment till the production of further and more conclusive evidence. He suspends judgment, for example, as to the literary analysis of Genesis. "That, however," he adds, "is no reason why I should condemn my brother who thinks Dr. Driver has proved his case." This frank and brotherly spirit towards those who may hold an opposite view pervades the whole article. He adds, too, the significant words: "I deprecate the grievous unfairness with which the 'Higher Critics' are too often treated." It would be a pleasure to give many longer quotations, but as the essay is easily accessible to our readers, we must content ourselves with a warm expression of gratitude for its appearance, and of hearty accordance with its sentiments.

A Retiring Age for Clergy. At the recent session of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, an interesting discussion took place on the compulsory retirement of the clergy at the age of seventy. As a result of the debate, reference to the particular age of seventy was dropped, and a modified resolution, declaring that "A clergyman should retire from any benefice without delay, when from age or other cause, it may appear, after due inquiry, that he has become incapable of discharging to the full its obligations," was carried. A

further clause of the resolution declared "that the whole question of pensions, by which alone, in the case of the parochial clergy, such retirement can be secured, should be pressed forward in every way." It is clear that the problem of the retiring age needs most careful handling. Some men who have toiled laboriously in adverse circumstances may well be worn out at sixty. Others, at seventy, are in robust health, capable of rendering most efficient service. But the question of pensions is all-important, and it ought not to be beyond the wit of our ecclesiastical leaders to formulate a scheme that shall be universally applicable. For the crux of the present situation is that there are so many men who *cannot* retire; they have been able to make no provision for old age, and retirement would mean abject penury, if not absolute starvation. Hence they are compelled by sheer necessity to cling for livelihood to posts involving duties they are quite unable to perform. This state of things is a scandal to the Church, and a cruel hardship to many of her most faithful ministers.

The Method
of the
Wesleyan
Church.

It may be of interest in this connection to refer to the way in which this problem of "superannuation" is solved by our brethren of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. When a minister, through either ill-health or advancing age, becomes incapable of full ministerial work, he, by consent of the Conference, becomes "supernumerary," and begins to draw the allotted amount per annum from the superannuation fund to which he has been contributing during his active ministerial life. But to be "supernumerary," or, as the colloquial expression is, "to sit down," does not mean absolute retirement from ministerial work. The minister in question is attached to the "circuit" of the particular district in which he settles down. To the work of this circuit he gives such assistance as he can—more or less, as health and age permit. In other words, he has the joy of continued work, coupled with freedom from responsibility. He is not expected to do more than he can; what he does do is

welcomed and appreciated. It seems to us that this is the position at which many of our parochial clergy would like to arrive—the opportunity of rendering further service without the heavy pressure of parochial responsibility. What one Christian communion has effected in the matter is sufficient to show that for ourselves the problem is not past solving.

As these notes are going to press we shall be
 The
 “Authorized
 Version.” occupied throughout England in celebrating the Tercentenary of the “Authorized Version” of our English Bible. The occasion is charged to the full with possibilities of suggestive thought. On the one hand are matters of historical and antiquarian interest; the revival of interest in those gallant pioneers in the task of translation—above all Tindale, on whose good work the translators of 1611 simply tried to improve. On the other hand there is the literary question; the place which “this incomparable possession, with its vast simplicity and moving eloquence,” holds in the formation of English thought and of English speech.

“It is marvellous,” says the *Spectator*, “to think with how few words it accomplishes its effect. Professor Cook points out that the ‘New English Dictionary’ reckons the words of the English language from A to L as 160,803. Shakespeare uses about 21,000 words; Milton 13,000; but the whole Authorized Version uses only about 6,000. Truly eloquence, as Goldsmith says, is not in the words but in the subject.”

The Tercentenary has also brought before us
 A New
 Revision. the question of the respective merits—especially in the New Testament, where the contrast between the two is greatest—of the Authorized and Revised Versions. Without attempting either to minimize or to underrate the work done by the revisers, we agree with those who hold that the changes they introduced were in certain respects too sweeping, and we heartily sympathize with the view that this is the appropriate time to attempt a revision of the Authorized Version in which any serious mistranslations—those mistranslations which actually change the meaning of the original—should be altered,

while the general style and language should remain as far as possible unaltered. It is, however, the matter of the Bible rather than its literary form that is the point of primary importance. The significance of this has been well expressed by the *Times'* leading article of March 9 :

“ Thus the present effort to organize the observance of this Tercentenary is due to a number of earnest men who desire to assert for the Holy Scriptures their ancient and rightful place in national and individual life. They are not concerned with the progress of a particular society or with the fortunes of any one branch of the Christian Church. They are not antiquaries, with a passion for what is old, but men of their time, who wish the best for their time. They believe that they can find that best in the message which it is the function of the Bible to convey, in whatever institutional modes that message may find expression. They recognize the growing interest that is felt about the Bible, but they want also a corresponding growth of interest in the revelation which it unfolds.”

Those who are hoping and praying for the
Reunion, reunion of Christendom may well be thankful for the sentiments voiced at the Free Church Council held at Portsmouth during March. “ Religious reunion ” was the subject of a special debate, to which Canon Hensley Henson contributed an interesting speech. Dr. Scott Lidgett, we think, was on sure ground when he said that every denomination should hold its denominationalism in trust, to be surrendered or held fast, as the interests of the whole Church demanded. We agree, too, with the Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, that little communities, engrossed in their local and denominational affairs, have to be convinced that there is a Holy Catholic Church, and that the Free Churches cannot very well speak with the Anglican Communion till they have ended their own divisions. Canon Hensley Henson’s significant points were: (1) That if the Church of England is “ sacerdotal,” then there is no prospect of reunion; (2) that mutual recognition of Churches should precede exchange of pulpits; (3) that the Christian Church, while obsessed by these unhappy rivalries, is quite unable to perform the great task that lies to her hand—of standing between the modern world and the encroaching tide of materialism. The

fact that Christians are speaking so earnestly of the need of unity augurs well for possible progress in that direction.

A new volume of essays has just been issued by The Date of the Gospels. the Oxford University Press, under the editorship of Professor Sanday, dealing in the most careful, scholarly, and yet most modest manner, with some of the vexed questions of New Testament Criticism concerning the Synoptic problem. For some years a few friends have been meeting at Professor Sanday's house and studying these problems together. The result is a book which we shall hope in due course to notice more fully in our pages. Suffice it to say now that the Oxford essayists accept the two-document theory (St. Mark and Q.) of the origin of our three Gospels. The essayists do not entirely agree with each other, but this is the general conclusion of the book. Almost contemporary with its publication we get an article in a German magazine by Professor Harnack, in which he reviews some of his own past work in the same field, and he reaches the conclusion that there is no real ground for believing that any one of our three Synoptic Gospels was written later than *circa* A.D. 68. He believes that St. Luke—which he is inclined to regard as the latest of the three—must be dated by the concluding verses of the Acts. He believes that the abrupt termination of the Acts is due to the fact that there was nothing more to record, because nothing more had happened.

The Oxford Essays and Professor Harnack's article are the last words, for the moment, of the Higher Criticism of the New Testament. The greatest scholars in England and in Germany have subjected the Synoptic problem to the most searching examination; they have used methods which were entirely unknown a generation or two ago—methods which would have shocked the Christian conscience of past generations. Now the greatest scholars of them all, travelling by this new and strange road, have practically reached the old conclusion. We venture to think that the conclusion is all the

surer for the investigation. We realize that there are still many differences of view, but we cannot help but express our gratitude to painstaking and careful scholarship for its honest and reverent conduct to the investigation; and we trust that Professor Harnack's conclusion will reassure many concerning similar investigations which at present have not arrived at a final conclusion, and which, so far as they have gone, seem to some minds subversive of truth.

Keswick. The greatest need of our religious life to-day—
as, indeed, of every day—is that it should be spiritual. Amongst the many things that help to the attainment of that end Keswick deserves honourable mention. In the early days of the Convention mistakes were made; but what great movement has ever sprung to vigorous life without mistakes? Mistakes are still sometimes made, but more often by camp-followers than by Keswick itself; and, indeed, Keswick makes no claim to infallibility. Keswick has stood and stands for the fundamental truth which ought to be the common heritage of all Christianity—that spiritual life and spiritual work must be maintained by spiritual means. We have just received the “Key to Keswick” for this year, and we venture to refer to it at once, because we feel that Evangelical Churchmanship can make a contribution to Keswick, and receive a contribution from it. In these days of difficulty and controversy, and yet days of splendid opportunity, this annual Convention may well become a means under God by which we may rid ourselves of the defilements of earth, and bring ourselves into closer communion with our Master.

Social Questions. The Church of Christ has always believed and taught that something more than mere environment is needed for the formation or reclamation of character. The Evangelical school of thought in the Church of England has from the very beginning insisted upon this fact; but equally from the very beginning Evangelicals have

borne their part in the solution of the social problems of the day. Wilberforce and the Clapham sect were responsible for the abolition of the slave trade, and Lord Shaftesbury for the first Factory Acts. We remind our readers of these facts because it seems especially incumbent upon the Christian Church to take the lead in similar directions to-day. The political parties of the country are engaged in high constitutional problems, the solution of which may be fraught with serious consequences to the Church. We may be compelled to defend ourselves, but we cannot be content with self-defence alone. The best Church defence is the doing of our daily work with real effectiveness, and the teaching of the lessons of our Master to the Church and the nation alike. Lazarus is lying at the door ; it is the business of the Church to see that he is cared for. The State for the moment is too busy to do much, but the time for new legislation must come, and it is the Church's business to see that it comes soon. It will come the sooner if she makes her voice heard. The Report of the Poor Law Commission must not be forgotten, and for the moment it seems that the Church has the best opportunity of keeping its memory green, until its claim to attention shall become so insistent that it may eventuate in wise and reasonable legislation.



Easter Eve.

NO! not the body that shall be,
 But this that suffered on the tree
 Lay we within the tyrant grave,
 Dead Saviour, strong to save !

Life's sorrows and familiar grief,
 The Garden's agony in chief,
 The demon battlings of Life's storm
 Have rent Thy sacred form.

With blows and shameful insult marred,
With scourging and the spear-thrust scarred,
Among ten thousand fair alone !

Where has Thy beauty flown ?

The budding flowers beside Thy tomb
Droop blighted by the sudden gloom,
By shaken earth, by twilight tread
Of mourners for the dead.

But they shall open fresh and fair
With Easter sunshine, April air ;
Blood-red anemone from the grass
So green when night shall pass.

Thus rising with the Easter breeze,
Thy glorious body through the trees
Moves to th' eternal sunlight clear,
Thy Church, Thy world to cheer !

Fanned for a while by mortal air,
Unfolding like Thy lilies fair,
Till flowers and fragrance pass above
And lift us by that Love

Mortal to immortality ;
Then weakness strength divine shall be,
Dishonour glory there shall bring,
And death eternal spring !

A. E. MOULE.



The Ministry of the Word and Sacraments.

BY THE RIGHT REV. J. W. DIGGLE, D.D.,

Lord Bishop of Carlisle.

(Continued from p. 193.)

THUS the position of the Church of England is altogether unmistakable in respect both to Sacraments and discipline. The doctrine of Christ is her rule in all things. She allows neither Sacraments nor discipline to be ministered except as the Lord hath commanded. And this is the Lord's commandment concerning absolution: that if men forgive, they are forgiven; if they forgive not, neither can they be forgiven. This commandment, together with other commandments concerning forgiveness taken out of Holy Scripture, the priest is to declare. Such declaration is one of the main purposes of his ordination. Publicly he is to preach it with all the authority that his commission, his knowledge, his experience can combine to confer. Privately he is to tell it, without scruple or doubtfulness, to disquieted penitents. At the dying bed he is to proclaim with no uncertain sound, but with all the power derived to the Church from Jesus Christ her Lord—a great and living power so long as the Church abides in Christ, but apart from Him a withered, lifeless impotence—that to the truly believing, the truly penitent, the truly charitable, those who make amends to them they have injured, and from the bottom of their hearts forgive those who have offended them, there is certain forgiveness, unquestionable absolution—the Father's kiss, the best robe, the Father's ring.

We see, then, that neither the discipline nor the Sacraments of the Gospel may be ministered in the Church of England otherwise than God's Word doth allow. The dispensing of the Word, as in Holy Scripture, takes precedence of the Sacraments. In the formularies of the Church of England the second never usurps the place of the first, nor is the first relegated to the position of the second. In the Ordering of Priests the

Bishop delivers a Bible into the hand of the ordinee, but neither paten nor chalice, as in some communions, and as in the Church of England in her mediæval, sacerdotal age. At the Reformation the Church of England broke away from this, as from some other similar ecclesiastical erroneous customs. And why did she thus break herself free from them? Not through any disparagement of the Sacraments of the Gospel. No one who knows the Church of England—her historic sense; her Apostolic continuity; her devotion to whatsoever things are beautiful, just, reverent, and true—can hurl at her any such false accusation as this. No, the Church of England is a sacramental Church—not primarily, because the Sacraments are not the prime things in Scripture, but deeply, truthfully, reverentially, and according to Divine proportion. It is because of her reverence for the Sacraments and the Divine Author and Giver of the Sacraments that she keeps them in their proper place—the place which the Lord and His Apostles assigned to them.

The New Testament is perfectly explicit as to the due and rightful position of the Sacraments in the economy of the Gospel. The ministry of the Lord is characteristically a ministry of the Word. The Lord Himself was baptized, but Himself never baptized. He did not even institute the Christian Sacrament of Baptism (a sign of new birth, an instrument for grafting into the Church, a pledge and witness of initiation into Christian discipleship) until after his Resurrection. The Sacrament of His Holy Supper He did not ordain till the eve of His great Passion and redeeming death. All the remainder of His ministry on earth was devoted to the Word—*i.e.*, the declaration and unfolding of the power and justice, the righteousness and love, the goodness and severity, the will and purpose, the sovereign mercy and infinite care, the essential mind and fatherly heart, of God. By example, by action, in conversation and conduct, in private talk with His disciples, in public preaching in the synagogue, by the seaside, and on mountain-tops—anywhere, everywhere, and always—this was His grand mission, the burden of His ministry: to teach men the things concerning

the kingdom of God, to show men the Father. His characteristic title among His contemporaries was "Teacher." By no other term is He so frequently designated in the narratives of the Evangelists as this. He Himself gloried in the designation. "Ye call Me Teacher and Lord," He said, "and so I am." Teaching, like redeeming, was of the quintessence of His ministry.

When we pass to the Apostolic age, the same proportion between the Word and Sacraments of the Gospel is maintained. "Christ sent me not," says St. Paul, "to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." So tremendous was his inspired dread of the oversacramentalizing tendencies of his age, that he once actually cried out in thanksgiving to God for the fewness of the baptisms he had administered. Of all his converts, he seems to have baptized only Crispus and Gaius and the household of Stephanas. In his Epistles the Holy Communion is only mentioned twice: once for the double purpose of emphasizing the unity of the faithful (all being partakers of the one bread),¹ and of warning Christian communicants against the perils of idolatry. The cup of the Lord, he says, is not to be confounded with the cup which Gentiles drink to demons. The Lord's table is not to be confounded with the table of demons. In the Christian Communion all fellowship with either the spirit or practices of idolatry must be avoided, there being no congruity, but a complete antagonism, between the sacrifices offered to idols and the Communion of the body and blood of Christ. To emphasize this antagonism the Holy Ghost guided him against the use of any terms which might tend to abate it, and so he uses neither the term "sacrifice" nor "altar" in connection with the Lord's Supper. Accustomed as he was from his earliest childhood to the use of these terms, both by the heathen around him and by the great Jewish Church of which he once had been so prominent and enthusiastic a member, he will adapt no such terms to the Christian feast. Israel after the flesh had sacrifices; Israel after the flesh had also a priestly altar; but Israel after the

¹ 1 Cor. x. 16 *et seq.*

Spirit has, according to St. Paul's inspired choice of terms, neither priestly sacrifice nor priestly altar. How altogether different, how much more grand and holy, would have been the history of the Christian Church if she had been loyal to this inspired choice of terms, and had not reverted to the use of pagan and Jewish nomenclature—a nomenclature which has drawn a whole host of pagan notions and Jewish traditions in its train!

The second occasion on which St. Paul adverts to the Holy Communion occurs in the same Epistle as the first.¹ Here the purpose of the mention is principally to inculcate the solemnity of the Supper—the exceeding need of self-control, self-examination, and the utmost reverence in eating the bread and drinking the cup, lest, in coming together to eat, men should be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. The Communion, according to St. Paul, is intended for a remembrance of Christ, and as a visible witness through all the ages of His death till the very end of time—“till He come.” Such an intention is sublime. Such a witness demands all the sanctity with which reverence can surround it, all the quietness and orderliness and seemliness which devotion can bestow. The necessity of this solemn and solemnizing spirit is the theme of St. Paul's second allusion to the Supper of the Lord. Nowhere else does he even refer to that Holy Supper. Neither is it referred to in any other part of the New Testament after the Gospels, except it be in the custom of the early Christians, who broke bread from house to house.

Now, what does this great reserve of the New Testament concerning the Sacraments mean? Does it mean that the writers of the New Testament were indifferent to the Sacraments—that they ignored and passed them by as unnecessary parts of the economy of the Gospel? Who that enters into their spirit and character, that appreciates their adoring love and loyalty to their Lord, can venture upon such a supposition? The words that Christ spake concerning the kingdom of God

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 20 *et seq.*

during the wondrous forty days of blessed converse between His Resurrection and Ascension must have sunk very deeply into their sensitive and devoted hearts. We have been permitted to know only a few of those sacred words, those Divine injunctions, but one of those injunctions has been left on record, either as an undisputed tradition or part of the Canonical Scripture—the injunction which commands the disciples to go to all the nations, discipleing them by Baptism into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. How strongly and firmly this injunction had seized upon the minds of the Apostles is evident from St. Peter's mandate to the 3,000 converts on the Day of Pentecost. "Repent," he said, 'and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.' Their Teacher's great saying to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," was no secret to the Apostles. They knew it well. Their practice proves how deeply they cherished its significance. Christianity was for them a new creation for man, a new birth—a birth from above. The Christian is a twice-born man. Naturally he is born of the flesh, and is flesh; spiritually he is born of the Spirit, and is spirit. And Baptism signified to them the instrument and seal of this new birth—this spiritual creation. Sometimes the Baptism followed the reception of the Holy Ghost, as in the instance of Cornelius and his company;¹ then it was a seal. Sometimes it preceded that reception, as with the converts at Ephesus; then it was an instrument. But in both instances the reception of Baptism and the gift of the Holy Ghost are connected together: the heart was sprinkled from an evil conscience and the body washed with pure water. Baptism was no uncertain element in the teaching of St. Paul. "Know ye not," he asks, "that so many of us as are baptized into Jesus Christ are baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised

¹ Cf. Acts x. 47, xix. 5, 6; Titus iii. 5; Heb. x. 22; Rom. vi. 3.

up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Even the custom of Baptism for the dead¹ he did not condemn, but wove it into the great argument set forth in his First Epistle to the Corinthians for the truth of the Resurrection. For St. Paul Baptism meant the putting on of Christ.² Thus, although there is great reserve displayed about Baptism in the writings of the New Testament, and few allusions are made to it, yet those allusions are clear, definite, unmistakable, strong. The Apostles clearly recognized and firmly taught the ministry of Baptism, but they made that ministry secondary to—yea, dependent upon—the ministry of the Word. The Church, so they taught, can only be sanctified and cleansed with the washing of water by the Word.³ Apart from the Word the washing was nothing. No Church can be a glorious Church, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, unless the Word vitalizes the washing and the washing is in harmony with the Word. This Apostolic teaching is the true echo of their Master's doctrine and their Master's prayer: "Ye are clean through the Word which I have spoken to you." "Sanctify them through Thy truth. Thy Word is truth."⁴

And as with the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, so also with the twin Sacrament of the Holy Communion. Here again there is great and striking reserve manifested in the Apostolic teachings—a reserve greater far than in reference to Baptism, a reserve amounting almost to silence. This most wonderful reserve is an astonishing note of the New Testament teachings. It cannot be unintentional, for it pervades the entire Canon. Outside the narratives of the three Synoptic Evangelists—and each of their accounts is singularly brief—there are not half a dozen references to the Holy Communion in all the New Testament Scriptures. St. John, the fourth Evangelist, the disciple whom Jesus loved, the disciple whose unique and blessed privilege it was to lean on the Lord's breast at the institution of the Supper, never mentions the details of that

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 29.

³ Eph. v. 26, 27.

² Col. iii. 27.

⁴ St. John xv. 3, xvii. 17.

institution. Some New Testament scholars are, indeed, of opinion that in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel there is a kind of treatise on the Holy Communion. It is just possible, but scarcely probable, that this is so. And why? The word 'flesh' is consistently used throughout that discourse, "body" never; whereas in each of the records of the institution of the Supper the word "body" is always used, not the word "flesh." Moreover, the conversation recorded in the sixth chapter of St. John took place some time previous to the institution, and it would be at least strange—something, indeed, like a reversal of things—to expound and dilate upon an institution which as yet, in the course of the narrative, had not even been alluded to. Such an exegesis is anachronistic. Besides, if in his sixth chapter St. John had been conscious of any reference to the Supper, it is almost past believing that he would have omitted, somewhere in his Gospel, to record the circumstances of the institution itself. Like the other Evangelists, he records in detail the circumstances of the betrayal, the trial, the death, the resurrection of the Lord; but the Supper he barely and briefly mentions, and then only in connection with the betrayal by Judas Iscariot and the very significant action of the Lord in washing the disciples' feet. This wondrous washing of the disciples' feet St. John relates in minute and copious detail, but not the institution of the Supper. The washing, together with the great saying, "Ye should do to others as I have done to you," seems to have made a singularly profound impression on St. John's mind, as if the unspeakable humility of the Son of God had been for him a grander legacy to the Church than the Sacrament of the Supper.

Again, in the sixth chapter of St. John neither of the fundamental words "remembrance" or "testament" occurs; whereas in all the four accounts given of the institution one or another of these words is used with striking emphasis. And in the accounts given by St. Luke and St. Paul, not one alone, but both these terms are used with stress. Their omission by St. John is at least noteworthy, and deserving of serious con-

sideration in the interpretation of the sixth chapter of his Gospel. Indeed, the best guide to the interpretation of the sixth chapter is the fourth chapter of the same Gospel. Both chapters are cast in the same mould. The conversations in both arise out of incidents related as immediately preceding and causing them. The crucial point in both chapters is the Messiahship of Jesus. It was a common tradition among the Jews that when Messiah should come He would give them His flesh to eat. The phrase was familiar, and signified to their minds, accustomed, as all Orientals are, to the free and frequent use of imagery for the conveyance of great thoughts and spiritual truths, that the Messiah would impart at His coming His own great strength, His own great vigour, His own robustness to conquer, to the chosen race. The Jews had no difficulty whatever in understanding such expressions as "bread from heaven," "living water," "wells of water springing up into everlasting life"—bread whose nourishment should abolish hunger, and water whose refreshment should abolish thirst—"flesh to eat and blood to drink." All these expressions were intelligible enough to them. They were commonplaces in reference to the Messiah. Their difficulty—the insuperable difficulty to many of them—was the appropriation of these expressions by Jesus to Himself. In the question, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" the stress of all the emphasis lies on the words "this man." No emphasis attaches to the words "his flesh." The stumbling-block, the rock of offence, the insurmountable incredibility, was that "THIS man"—this Jesus of Nazareth, this carpenter's son, this man whose mother was a peasant woman, this obscure native of a mountain village from which no good thing had been known to come, this man whose brothers and sisters were quite ordinary people, this man despised by the religious aristocracy and rejected by the learned rabbis—that "THIS man," of all men, should declare that he would give his flesh as bread for the life of the world, and his blood that men might live for ever: this indeed was a stone of stumbling, crushing Messianic hopes to powder. The appropriation of these expres-

sions by Jesus to Himself meant nothing less than the claim to Messiahship. And so it came to pass that the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well acknowledged Him as Messiah immediately after His promise to her of the living water which for ever quenches the thirst of men; and that Peter proclaimed Him as the Messiah, the Divine Messiah, the Son of God, immediately after His promise to give His flesh to eat and His blood to drink. In making these promises Jesus had Himself implicitly announced that He was Messiah, and it was the splendour of the Samaritan woman's believing privilege to be the first of the human race to accept and proclaim this announcement. As the Messiah was born of a woman, so by a woman was He first proclaimed. St. Peter was the second to proclaim Jesus as the Christ, and his proclamation went far beyond the first proclamation of the Samaritan woman, for he it was who, before all others, declared the Divinity of the Nazarene Messiah, the Christ of God. For this grand confession of the primal Christian faith—this heralding of the carpenter's son as the Son of God—Simon Bar-jonas was rewarded with the glorious title of Peter, the rock-man, the man who had revealed to the world the Messianic rock on which the Christian Church is built.

That rock is the Divinity of Jesus the Christ. The gates of hell can never prevail to break that rock. It is the rock of an eternal truth—the eternal truth which is the real key to the kingdom of heaven. No man can truly understand the glorious Gospel of the blessed God apart from the Divinity of Jesus Christ. He may understand parts of it, such as the beauty of its teachings, the perfection of its morals, the loveliness and heroism of its Central Figure; but its whole is unintelligible if Jesus Christ be not first acknowledged as God. Apart from the Divinity of Jesus Christ, Gethsemane is a red injustice, the Cross a cruel infamy, the Resurrection no better than a legend, the visible Ascension a myth, and, as St. Paul practically put it, the Apostles are false witnesses and the Christian faith a vain bubble, blown into existence by the breath of deceit. It is with the Divinity of the Messiah, and not with the Sacrament of the

Supper, that the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel is, as I believe, concerned. This interpretation falls in with the paramount purpose of the whole Gospel, which is the unfolding of the Divinity of the Lord. It liberates the discourse from anachronism. It takes away the incongruity which otherwise confronts the omission of any record by St. John of the institution of the Supper. It makes natural the proclamation by Simon Peter of His Master's Messiahship, directly after the Master had appropriated to Himself the great expectation that the Messiah would give to men His flesh to eat. It makes intelligible the difficulty of the multitude in continuing to follow Jesus. It explains why they went away. They had been eagerly expecting the Messiah to appear, but they had thought He would appear, not as a Nazarene artisan or a peasant teacher from Galilee, but with power and great glory. And when this rankless, simple Teacher, with little following and no force behind Him, appropriated to Himself Messianic attributes, thus claiming to be the Messiah, they found His sayings "hard"—hard, not in their significance, but in their application to Himself. It was because the meaning of His words was so clear that their application to Himself was so hard to receive. They would readily and with patriotic applause have understood and accepted the promise of flesh to eat and blood to drink if made by some conquering hero, some resistless warrior. Such a one they would have tumultuously hailed as Messiah. But "THIS man!" No! The saying was too hard; the claim a bitter and insupportable disappointment, a vain profanation. And therefore they went away. Just as in later days the same Apostle, who had first proclaimed the Divinity of the Messiah, denied that Messiah on his oath when the Messiah became the victim of the priests and Pharisees, so when the meek and gentle Jesus claimed by His language to be the Christ of God, the multitude forsook Him in faithless contempt and scorn.

Leaving, then, the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel out of account in reckoning the instances in which the Holy Communion is mentioned in the New Testament, we find those instances are

as rare and reserved as the exhortations to preach the Gospel are frequent and clear. Again, let me repeat, this comparative silence concerning the Sacraments is no disparagement of the Sacraments, but it is unquestionably an inspired measure of their true proportion and their ministerial proclamation and administration in the Christian religion. To put the ministry of the Sacraments before the ministry of the Word is to destroy the revealed proportion of that ministry. Our Lord Himself seems to have gone out of His way (if we may use the phrase with adoring reverence) to save His Church from this sacerdotal reversion. Although He is the Great High-Priest of the Christian profession, yet He nowhere calls Himself a priest; and this for a quite evident reason—His priesthood was of a wholly new type. As the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews puts it, the Messiah was designedly not born of the priestly tribe of Levi, but of the kingly tribe of Judah. Why? Clearly in order to get rid in the Christian Church of Jewish conceptions of priesthood. Christ was not a priest after the order of Aaron, but after that of Melchizedek. What are the generic differences between these two priesthoods? The Aaronic priesthood was an hereditary priesthood; that of Melchizedek stood by itself. It had no lineage either of ancestry or descent. It had neither parentage nor succession. The Aaronic priests were subject to death; the priesthood of Christ, after the order of Melchizedek, endureth for ever—death hath no dominion over it. The priesthood of Aaron was transferable: it passed from priest to priest. The priesthood of Christ is an eternal consecration—unchangeable and such as cannot pass to any other. The sacrifices of the Aaronic priesthood were daily repeated; that of Christ is incapable of repetition, though not of sacramental remembrance. The one priesthood was full of defects and after a carnal commandment; the other full, perfect, and sufficient, endued with the power of an endless life. The old Levitical priesthood was powerless, notwithstanding all its sacrificial shedding of blood, to take away sins; the new priesthood of Christ by its one oblation hath perfected for ever them

that are sanctified. The old priests were mortal servants and subjects; the great Christian High-Priest is the Son of God—our invisible and immortal King; eternally Divine as touching His Father, of the royal non-priestly line as touching His mother.

Nothing could be more clear and convincing than the whole trend of the Epistle to the Hebrews of the inspired purpose of the New Testament to pull up and root out from the Christian Church, not only the name “Jewish priesthood,” but the thing itself. The only priest the Epistle recognizes in the New Covenant is Jesus Christ our Lord—Himself both Victim and Priest, who has passed into the heavens, now to appear in the presence of God for us. All the Levitical terminology and practices as applied to the Christian ministry are shown both by their complete absence in other parts of the New Testament and by the express teachings of this Epistle to be inappropriate, obsolete, and misleading. In the fulness of time they had decayed and waxed old, and at the Advent of the Messiah were ready, and obviously intended, to vanish away. And in so far as any branch of the Christian Church reintroduces Levitical notions and Levitical names as embodying these notions, that branch of the Christian Church, as surely as the Jewish Church in the day of Christ, whatever be its pomp and ceremonial and outward show of vigour, is archaic, decadent, and on the brink of perishing.

My firm conviction is that the Church of England, especially if she boldly allies herself with other reformed Churches, may yet be the means, under God, of delivering Christianity from these perils of decadence and ruin. All that she has to do in order to accomplish this great and wonderful end is to be true to herself—true to her teachings and worship interpreted in the light of New Testament revelation. Firm as the rock of the Incarnate and the Inspired Word, nothing can prevail against her. I have already shown how loyal to the Word she is, and how jealously she maintains the Divine proportion between the Word and the Sacraments in the ordering of her deacons and

priests to their ministry. Nor is that proportion less clear in her appointed form for the Consecration of Bishops. The keystone in this form—that which gives fixity, strength, durability, supreme significance to episcopal consecration—is the ministry of the Word. The introductory Collect prays that Bishops may have grace diligently to preach God's Word. The emphatic note of both the Epistles and the first of the Gospels rings forth the duty of teaching and feeding the Church of God. The second Gospel lays stress on the awe-inspiring fact that as the Father sent the Son, so—*i.e.*, in so far as sons of men can take their share in the mission of God the Son—the Son sent forth His Apostles. I cannot in this paper enter into the much-vexed question of the relation of the Bishops of the Church to the Apostles of Christ. I assume that Bishops are in a very real sense successors of the Apostles, and that their commission is, as far as the possibilities allow, a commission from Christ through the Holy Ghost, as was that of the Apostles. But all the inspired biographies of the Lord Jesus agree in testifying that the supreme factor in His work, apart from His Atonement and Resurrection, and other elements of our salvation wholly Divine, and therefore incapable of human imitation, was His teaching. Following His example, the Apostles made the duty of teaching their first and paramount duty. Their Apostolate was a preaching Apostolate. St. Peter could never forget the thrice-repeated command of His risen Lord, "Feed My sheep"; and, as his after-history proves, his courage and diligence in preaching were the best test of his Apostolic commission. The Church of England clearly accepts this test, forasmuch as she makes this commission to teach her first Gospel in the Consecration Form, although it occurs in a later chapter of St. John's Evangel than the second of the appointed Gospels, thus re-emphasizing her conviction, made apparent in the Ordering of Priests, that the commission to teach takes precedence of the power to absolve, and that the effectiveness of the latter power is conditioned by aptitude and diligence in the former duty. A Bishop, therefore, unapt to teach and feed his flock is also

unapt to remit and retain its sins. As the original Apostolate was a preaching Apostolate, so the modern Episcopate, if true to its succession, will be a preaching Episcopate. This is the great truth unfolded in the introductory portion of the Anglican Form for the Consecration of Bishops—a truth particularly prominent in the third of the alternative Gospels selected for this service, a Gospel in which the Sacrament of Baptism is mentioned, and (as I believe) the Sacrament of the Holy Communion is also implied among the things commanded to be observed, but in which the duty of teaching is twice over expressly bidden.

The subsequent portions of the Consecration Service are equally distinct and definite as to the supreme obligation laid upon Anglican Bishops to be diligent in edifying Christ's Church. What could be more weighty and solemn than the interrogatories addressed to the Bishop-elect—interrogatories in this particular practically identical with those addressed to ordinand priests? "Are you determined out of the Holy Scripture to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach or maintain nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the same? Will you faithfully exercise yourself in the Holy Scriptures, and call upon God by prayer for the true understanding of the same; so as you may be able by them to teach and exhort with wholesome doctrine, and to withstand and convince the gainsayers? Are you ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word, and both privately and openly to call upon and encourage others to the same?" Again, in the prayer following the *Veni Creator Spiritus* occur the words: "Almighty God, who gave Thy Son Jesus Christ to be the Author of everlasting life, who after He had made perfect our redemption by His death, and was ascended into heaven, poured down His gifts abundantly upon men, making some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and doctors [here, as in the previous office, the title "priest" is significantly omitted], to the edifying and making perfect His Church; grant to this Thy servant such grace, that

he may evermore be ready to spread abroad Thy Gospel, the glad tidings of reconciliation with Thee.”

When the ministry of the Word has been thus clearly set forth as part of the fundamental—yea, the first essential—office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, there follows the imposition of hands and the grand petition for the gift of the Holy Ghost, without whom the episcopal office cannot be strongly discharged nor the work holily done. Then the Archbishop delivers to the consecrated Bishop, not chalice or paten, but the Bible, saying: “Give heed unto reading, exhortation, and doctrine. Think upon the things contained in this Book. Be diligent in them, that the increase coming thereby may be manifest unto all men. . . .” And finally, in the last Collect before the Benediction, we find the same note again, reverberating clear and full: “Most merciful Father, we beseech Thee, so endue Thy servant with Thy Holy Spirit, that he, preaching Thy Word, may be earnest to reprove . . . and such a wholesome example that, faithfully fulfilling his cause, at the latter day he may receive the crown of righteousness.”

It is to me at least impossible to conceive how the Church of England could possibly have laid greater stress upon the ministry of the Word and its precedence before that of the Sacraments than in the construction of these Forms for the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. In these forms there is, I again repeat, no depreciation of the Sacraments. In each of them the administration of the Holy Communion is an integral part. Every deacon and priest at his ordination, and every Bishop at his consecration, is required to receive that Holy Sacrament. It sets the seal upon his sacred ministry. It is the channel through which he receives that strengthening and refreshing of his soul which are needful for effective work in his ministry. But the reception of the Holy Communion is, by its place in the Ordinal, clearly regarded by the Church of England as a means to an end, and not the end itself. The ministry of the Word is the end; the ministry of the Sacraments a Divinely-appointed means in the attainment of that end.

(To be concluded.)

Fresh Light on the Date of the Crucifixion.

BY THE REV. D. R. FOTHERINGHAM, M.A., F.R.A.S.,
Queens' College, Cambridge.

IT has long been recognized that the direct references in the Gospels are too slight and too scanty to afford a substantial foundation for an exact chronology of the life of Christ. Students have been obliged, therefore, to fall back on indirect methods; and a favourite plan in all ages has been to search for astronomical evidence with regard to the appearance of the Star of the Nativity, or the darkness that enshrouded the scene of Crucifixion. But the methods of modern astronomy differ widely from those pursued by the ancients, and there is reason to fear that in both these cases chronologers have sometimes been seriously misguided. To attribute the darkness to an eclipse of the sun would be an elementary error in astronomy. The moon was full at the Passover, and it is only at new moon that solar eclipses can occur. But, though not so unscientific, it is probably no less incorrect to look for planetary conjunctions (as many have done, from Kepler to Alford), in hope of finding an explanation of the Star of Bethlehem. The ancients directed their attention to the "Heliacal rising" of the planets—that is, their first appearance in the twilight of the dawn, after being lost for some weeks in the radiance of the sun—rather than to the aspects generally considered by modern astronomers. And certainly the words of the Wise Men, "We have seen His star *in the East*,"¹ are strongly suggestive of some such Heliacal rising of the star that led them first to Jerusalem, and thence to Bethlehem.² Here lies a new and untraversed ocean before us, inviting the adventurous critic to embark. But so far as the Crucifixion is concerned, we seem at last to be approaching as near to finality as astronomy is likely to lead us.

All idea of an eclipse having been discarded, it will be vain to look for any striking astronomical phenomena as a means of

¹ St. Matt. ii. 2.

² *Journal of Theological Studies*, x. 116.

fixing the date of the Crucifixion by reference to the darkness at midday. So we fall back on the ordinary rules for determining the lunar month and its adjustment to the day of the week and solar calendar. The Jews of the present day make use of an artificial calendar, like the Christian rule for finding Easter, that may be calculated many centuries in advance. Such calendars were not unknown in the time of Christ, but they were then disregarded by the Jews. The commencement of the month and year were settled by direct observation. Each month began when the thin crescent of the new moon could first be seen in the evening sky: each year, when the ripening barley gave notice of approaching spring. As a result, the Jewish month might contain either twenty-nine or thirty days, and the year either twelve or thirteen months. Precise determination was clearly impossible beforehand: but as soon as the moon, eagerly looked for, had been seen at Jerusalem, beacons blazed on the hills as darkness succeeded twilight, and messengers were despatched in all directions, with so much urgency that they were allowed sometimes even to profane the Sabbath, in order that all might know the new month had begun.

So the reconstruction of the Jewish calendar is simply a calculation of successive new moons, and the dates of their first appearance in the evening sky. When we have this, we shall have all that is needed. For it is certain that Christ suffered either on the fourteenth or on the fifteenth of Nisan (as to *which* of these we shall see later), and that this day was "Paraskeve," or Friday.¹ Any year, therefore, in which the fourteenth or fifteenth of Nisan fell otherwise than on Friday is clearly excluded from further consideration. It is a happy circumstance that astronomy not only narrows the uncertainty of the year, but also definitely decides once and for ever the still more engrossing question as to the exact day of the Crucifixion.

The times of the astronomical new moons may be calculated

¹ Matt. xxvii. 62; Mark xv. 42; Luke xxiii. 54; John xix. 14, 31, 42.

with certainty, but an element of uncertainty has been introduced into all previous chronologies by lack of precise information as to the interval to be allowed between the actual conjunction of the sun and moon and the first appearance of the crescent in the sky. The late Professor Salmon¹ allowed thirty hours as a rough estimate of the minimum age of the moon at its first appearance, while Wurm, as long ago as 1817, had estimated thirty-six. But both rules are really very rough indeed. The new moon has actually been seen, though not often, on the very day of its conjunction with the sun ; while on other occasions her appearance has been delayed for a longer period than even Wurm's law would suggest. It is necessary to measure the space between the luminaries in distance and direction, as well as in time, or the rough rules based on time alone may lead us far astray.

Mr. C. H. Turner, in his article in Hastings' "Bible Dictionary," was content to follow Salmon's approximation, and other chronologers seem to have adopted similar rules for themselves. But apparently all have overlooked a series of actual observations on the subject, carried out by Julius Schmidt (famous for his measurements of the lunar mountains), principally at Athens, during the years 1859-1879. These observations raise the matter at once from the level of conjecture to that of accurate knowledge ; while at the same time they illustrate the irony of the fate that has left Biblical critics searching blindly for information, which an astronomer already possessed without being aware of its full value. However, after lying neglected for so long, Schmidt's observations have at length been republished and discussed by Dr. J. K. Fotheringham,² and such definite rules deduced and expressed as will serve to reconstruct for modern use the lunar calendars of the ancient world. Some of my brother's results, with calculations applicable to Jerusalem in the time of Pontius Pilate, are thus

¹ "Introduction to the New Testament," p. 255.

² *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, May, 1910, vol. lxx., p. 527.

expressed in the *Journal of Theological Studies*,¹ from which this table is extracted :

A.D.	First of Nisan (Evening).			Fourteenth of Nisan (Morning and Afternoon).		
27	March 28	April 11, FRIDAY.
28	„ 16	March 30, Tuesday.
29	„ 5	March 19, Saturday.
30	„ 24	April 7, FRIDAY.
31	„ 13	March 27, Tuesday.
32	„ 31	April 14, Monday.
33	„ 20	April 3, FRIDAY.
34	„ 10	March 24, Wednesday.
35	„ 29	April 12, Tuesday.

The question between the fourteenth and fifteenth of Nisan has been long debated. It has more than a chronological significance. Was the Last Supper, at which Christ sat with His disciples, so touchingly described by the four Evangelists, the great Paschal Supper of the Jews? So many have believed. Or can it be that Christ consumed no Paschal Supper at all that year, after all preparation made, because He was Himself the Paschal Lamb, Whose blood was to be shed for the sins of the world? Many have accepted this interpretation rather than the other. It seems to have been the general view of the ancient Church, of which the quartodeciman controversy is a reminder; and those who accept this view have reverently seen in the date of Christ's Passion, no mere accident of coincidence with the Temple Feast, but direct evidence of the predeterminate counsel of God. The Passover was more than a remembrance of deliverance from Egypt: it was the Feast of First-fruits.² On the sixteenth day of Nisan the first-fruits of the field were brought to the sanctuary, and there waved by the priest before the Lord, to consecrate the harvest. Not till this had been done could scythe or sickle be laid upon the standing corn. Now, if Christ suffered on the fourteenth of Nisan, He rose again on the sixteenth; and once more we may reverently see how, as the First-fruits of the Resurrection, He fulfilled the hidden symbolism of Mosaic Law.

¹ October, 1910, vol. xii., p. 120.

² Lev. xxiii. 10-12.

Still there are scholars, whose very names would entitle their opinion to respect, that have taken another view of the story of the Passion. But long as the controversy has been, it must be settled now. There was not a single year during the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate in which the fifteenth of Nisan fell on a Friday! Whatever doubt may linger as to the actual year of our Lord's Crucifixion and Resurrection, it is all to the good that the question of the days on which these events occurred can be decided by the irrefutable evidence of astronomy. In the very dates of His death and Resurrection prophetic symbolism is doubly justified.

But if the theologian is content to rest here, the chronologer will wish to investigate further as to which of the three years (27, 30, or 33) in which Nisan 14 fell on a Friday was the actual year of the Crucifixion. By common consent the first of these may be dismissed as manifestly too early for the purpose. The choice is therefore narrowed down to one of two years only, either of which is astronomically possible, and it is in defence of the latter that the remaining paragraphs are written.

In the whole course of Christ's life there is only one positive date given by any of the Evangelists, and that date has been the subject of remarkable controversy. The commencement of St. John the Baptist's ministry is dated by St. Luke as the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar.¹ It is curious to notice how the writer's evident desire to record the exact year has been misunderstood, the very simplicity of the phrase tempting us to a lawyerlike misinterpretation. The consequence is that the obvious meaning, which could hardly ever have been out of St. Luke's mind or the minds of his original readers, has been largely abandoned in favour of one less natural in itself, and essentially ambiguous in any case.

Tiberius succeeded Augustus on August 19, A.D. 14. According to different usages, there are three possible meanings that might be attached to St. Luke's phrase, "the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar":

¹ St. Luke iii. 1: Ἐν ἔτει δὲ πεντεκαδεκάτῃ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου Καίσαρος.

- i. The period of 365 days from August 19, A.D. 28, to August 18, A.D. 29.
- ii. The year 28 (A.U.C. 781).
- iii. The year 29 (A.U.C. 782).

I have discussed these three methods of counting somewhat fully elsewhere.¹ It must suffice to remark here that the first is purely academic, and may certainly be rejected. The use of the second is comparatively rare; for the short remainder of the year in which a King ascended the throne was not called the "first year," but the "beginning" of his reign.² The third is the meaning to be accepted. So we may say with confidence that all for whom St. Luke wrote would certainly understand him to mean that St. John the Baptist's ministry began at some time or other during the course of the year 29.³ And that this was the Evangelist's own meaning I see no reason to doubt.

We have no statement as to the length of the period between the Baptist's appearance and our Lord's own Baptism. Apparently it was not very long; yet it was long enough for the Baptist's mission to attain considerable dimensions, and for his fame to spread through the whole land. Apparently, therefore, any part of the year 29 itself must be regarded as too early for Christ's Baptism. Remembering the tradition that connects the Baptism with the festival of Epiphany, we might possibly fix its date at the beginning of the next year (A.D. 30). It would be just as reasonable, however, to allow a longer time for the work of the Forerunner, and so postpone the opening of Christ's personal ministry—including His Baptism, Fasting, and Temptation, the call of the first disciples, and the first Passover—to the opening months of the following year, or A.D. 31.

The length of our Lord's ministry has not been definitely decided. A few critics limit it to a single year, but the majority extend it to three or four. In St. John's Gospel it may

¹ "Chronology of the Old Testament," p. 11.

² *E.g.*, Jeremiah xxvi. 1.

³ According to customary Syriac use, the year might be reckoned from October.

apparently be measured, as a road is by milestones, by Christ's visits to the festivals at Jerusalem. These are six in number :

1. St. John ii. 13, 23	Passover, A.D. 30 or 31.
2. St. John v. 1	An unspecified feast.
3. St. John vi. 4	Passover, A.D. 32.
4. St. John vii. 2	Tabernacles, A.D. 32.
5. St. John x. 22.	Dedication, A.D. 32.
6. The Last Passover	A.D. 33 (April 3).

The sequence of events is quite clear, and the chronology would be equally clear if we could identify the unspecified feast with certainty. If it be Passover, then it must be that of A.D. 31, and our Lord's Baptism is thrown back to A.D. 30. But if it be a minor festival, then the commencement of our Lord's ministry can only be carried back to the beginning of A.D. 31. The question is complicated by an exceedingly minute point of textual criticism (*ἐορτή* or *ἡ ἐορτή*), with an interestingly even balance of MS. authority on either side. Into that attractive field we dare not wander now, but either reading or interpretation is quite consistent with the chronology proposed.

It only remains for us to consider briefly the alternative chronology that might be based on an earlier date for the Crucifixion, in the year A.D. 30 instead of A.D. 33. Those who wish to see the arguments ably and attractively marshalled may do so in Hastings' famous Dictionary of the Bible.¹ There Mr. Turner puts the case quite fairly between the two chronologies, and gives his adherence to the earlier. But the argument, learned and persuasive though it be, is vitiated by the fact that it leads him in the end to the choice of the year A.D. 29 for the Crucifixion, a date that is no longer astronomically tenable. When the choice is narrowed down to that between A.D. 30 and A.D. 33, it is by no means certain that he would reject the latter. It is necessary, however, that the claims of the earlier chronology should be considered.

If the Crucifixion occurred, as is astronomically possible, on April 7, A.D. 30, it is clear that even the hypothesis of a one year's ministry would hardly allow room for all that had

¹ I. 403. See also Dr. Wright's "New Testament Problems," p. 147.

occurred since the appearance of St. John the Baptist in A.D. 29. The mission of the Baptist must therefore be pushed further back, and in order to do this it becomes necessary to find a new (and, I think, unnatural) interpretation for St. Luke's phrase, "the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar." It must be granted that St. Luke's reckoning by the years of the Imperial reign is anomalous. Rome was constitutionally a republic still. Senators, consuls, prætors, tribunes, and other officers, existed as of old. The empire was a sort of accident, explicable only by the fact that the Emperor either summed up in his own person all the most important offices of state, or directed and controlled the policy of those who held them. He was a pluralist in a high degree, but not a king. Now the Greeks were not trained in the niceties of the Roman constitution. Tiberius was *consul* five times, *imperator* eight times, *tribunus* thirty-nine; and many other offices he held, either at frequent intervals or for long periods. So, indeed, a Roman constitutionalist would speak. But a Greek or an Oriental would be satisfied with saying (contrary to all Latin usage) that Tiberius "reigned twenty-three years" (A.D. 14-37). Of course, this is the simplest expression, and in reality it comes nearest to the mark. And for my own part I feel no doubt that St. Luke was counting the reign thus, when he dated the appearance of St. John the Baptist in the fifteenth year of Tiberius.

But those chronologers who favour the earlier Crucifixion-date are driven by hard necessity either to impugn St. Luke's chronology or else to find a new interpretation for his words; and when a man holds so many offices as Tiberius held, it should not be difficult, for those who look, to find some office at all events that will meet their desire. Indeed, the wonder rather is that the office they have found should be one so obscure and uncertain. Many honours had been heaped on Tiberius during Augustus's lifetime, some of a complimentary nature, others involving the exercise of real power. Among these, but of the former class rather than the latter, were

certain imperial titles with regard to the provinces of Rome. The date is uncertain; indeed, the whole business is extremely vague. But on the supposition that the titles were conferred about the time of his return to Rome after the German and Dalmatian campaigns (A.D. 12), when he was accorded the honour of a triumph, the reign of Tiberius has been pushed two years further back. But surely, even at the moment, it would be impossible for anyone to regard such titular honours as the equivalent of imperial rule; and when St. Luke came to write his Gospel fifty years later the matter may have been forgotten altogether. No Welshman ever reckons the reign of a king from his proclamation as Prince of Wales, and no provincial of Rome could fail to distinguish between the standings of Augustus and Tiberius while the former yet lived.

The wish has been father to the thought. In some cases the desire to bring our Lord's age as near the exact "thirty"¹ as possible at His baptism, or in other cases to allow as much time as possible for the development of the Christian Church before the conversion (perhaps ante-dated) of St. Paul, has prevailed over the natural judgment of the critic. But in the end, both historical evidence and astronomical research seem to concur in warranting the full acceptance of that chronology which assigns the commencement of the Baptist's mission to the year A.D. 29, and definitely dates the Crucifixion of our Lord on Friday, April 3, A.D. 33.

¹ St. Luke iii. 23.



The English and Scottish Non-Jurors.

BY THE REV. CANON COWLEY-BROWN, M.A.

THE case of the Non-jurors, who both in England and in Scotland refused to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary after the abdication of James II., because they had taken already the same oath to this latter monarch, presents us with a curious and interesting case of conscience or casuistry.

The Revolution of 1688 had placed the clergy and devout laity of the Church in a serious predicament. They had sworn to serve one monarch, and now they were required, at the risk of losing their posts and means of livelihood, to forswear themselves by taking the same oath to another. It was true that the throne had been declared vacant, that the King had exiled himself, and that the daughter of the self-exiled king, together with her husband, had been invited by the vast majority of the nation to take the place which he had so unworthily occupied and had now deserted. These and other considerations, which will be mentioned later on, were not allowed to weigh with these conscientious or scrupulous men, who feared they might be taking the name of the Lord their God in vain.

The Prince of Orange had been invited in the first instance simply to act as Regent. Even Sancroft, the Zadok of Dryden's "Absalom and Achitophel," smarting under the intolerable conduct of James, had joined in the requisition to the Prince "to adopt measures for the safety of the kingdom." Even Ken "went so far as to say that his scruples would be completely removed if he could be convinced that James had entered into engagements for ceding Ireland to the French King." He "actually began to prepare a pastoral letter explaining his reasons for taking the oath. . . . It is a curious fact," says Macaulay ("History," iii. 453), "that of the seven non-juring prelates, the only one whose name carries with it much weight was on the point of swearing, and was prevented from doing so, as he himself acknowledged, not by force of reason, but by a morbid scrupulosity which he did not advise others to imitate."

It is not possible in this short paper to trace the subsequent history of the movement. It is only the chief points that can be noted. It has been thought by some that those who scrupled to take the oaths, but were willing to lead a quiet and peaceable life under the new Sovereigns, might have been left unmolested in their posts. And the oath, it must be admitted, was made needlessly stringent.¹ It is obvious, however, in the unsettled and uncertain state of things, with a formidable Jacobite party in the country only waiting for their opportunity, that it would have been scarcely possible to dispense with it altogether. Nor could any distinctions have been made. The Non-jurors, however, were treated with considerable forbearance. They were allowed to remain in possession of their palaces for a whole year after their deprivation. At last the vacancies were filled up. Tillotson was preferred, straight from the Deanery of St. Paul's, to the Archbishopial See of Canterbury; and Sancroft, who had at first refused to quit the palace, reluctantly retired from Lambeth. Beveridge had been selected to succeed Ken, but under pressure of his Jacobite friends withdrew his acceptance, and Kidder was appointed in his place. Turner of Ely, who had been suspected—it would seem unjustly—of corresponding with James, and had absconded through fear, was succeeded by Patrick. The other Sees were filled up in due course.

Now comes a less creditable episode in the story. Hickes, Dean of Worcester, one of the ablest of the non-juring party, who, indeed, may be regarded as their leader, a headstrong man, of whom it was said "nothing could teach him moderation," paid a visit to James at St. Germain's, and James, after consultation with two Roman Catholic Bishops and with the Pope himself, nominated Hickes and one Dr. Wagstaffe to be Bishops of what might now be called the Church of the Separation; a Church of which the first Bishops were nominees of the Church of Rome. Hickes and Wagstaffe were consecrated accordingly, in a private house, by Lloyd, the deprived Bishop of

¹ See the terms in Russell's "History of the Church in Scotland," ii. 343, 344.

Norwich (to whom Sancroft had delegated his powers) ; White, late of Peterborough ; and Turner, formerly Bishop of Ely. Thus was begun a formal schism, which lasted on till 1805, when Boothe, "the last Bishop of that society which had proudly claimed to be the only true Church of England, dropped unnoticed into the grave."¹

This proceeding, however, was not approved of among the more sober-minded of their brethren. Frampton, the ex-Bishop of Gloucester, though he could not take the oath of allegiance, continued to attend the services of his parish church. Dodwell disavowed the consecrations. Ken persuaded Hooper, after the death of his immediate successor Kidder, to accept the See from which he had been ejected. The party therefore presented the appearance of "a house divided against itself."

The tendency of a spirit of separation is to reproduce itself. Schism begets schism. The new non-juring communion was soon split in two. Each section of the "Catholic remnant," as they called themselves, consecrated rival Bishops. The party led by Spinkes seems to have kept nearest to the Church from which it had separated. The other, under the influence of Brett and Collier, introduced what were called the "usages" into their ritual. This latter adopted a new Communion book ; the former adhered to the Book of Common Prayer. Both parties, however, sought to strengthen themselves by alliance with the Episcopal Church in Scotland. Bishops Campbell and Gadderar seem willingly to have lent their aid. There would have been no divisions among them if all had followed the example of Ken.

Of the original non-juring Bishops, by far the most interesting is Ken, brother-in-law, it may be noted, of Izaak Walton. If we cannot share his scruple, we cannot but admire his disinterestedness. But Ken was made, if not of sterner, yet of saner stuff than most of his fellow-sufferers for conscience' sake. His conduct contrasts favourably with that of Sancroft and the rest. There was no peevishness or querulousness about him—

¹ Macaulay, iv. 43.

nothing but what breathed the calm spirit which pervades his immortal "Morning and Evening and Midnight Hymns for Winchester Scholars." He was not one to censure, and even to excommunicate, those who took a different view from his own. He was content to worship in the Church to which he still belonged. He encouraged no schism. His was far from the spirit which, if caricatured in Cibber's play, "The Non-juror," yet seems to have recalled the old repulse, "Stand by thyself; I am holier than thou."

Of the other more prominent Non-jurors, Hickes, the deposed Dean of Worcester, seems to have been the coryphæus. All the characteristics of his party were conspicuous in this learned and headstrong man. Though brother of that John Hickes whom James had so cruelly put to death, he allowed political prejudice and religious fanaticism to prevail over personal resentment. But John was a non-conformist, and so doubly guilty in his orthodox brother's eyes.

Jeremy Collier, justly renowned for his efforts to purify the stage from the corruption which followed the period of Puritan intolerance—efforts which even Dryden owned to be just—became, after the death of Hickes, the leader of the party which upheld the "divine right of Kings to govern wrong."

Dodwell, the most learned of all the Non-jurors, was also their most curious specimen. Though Macaulay's description of him must be considerably discounted, he presented a strange combination of qualities—erudition which a wise man might envy, and a want of sense of which even a fool would be ashamed; conscientiousness coupled with superstition; the heroism of a martyr and the petulance of a child; greatness and littleness; as if in the same eye long-sight and short-sight might co-exist. It must be said of him, however, that at the last he had the sense to refuse to perpetuate the schism.

Spinkes is chiefly to be noted as having translated into Greek the proposals made by the Scottish Bishops, Campbell and Gadderar, with others, for the union of the non-juring with the Eastern Church (of which more later on), though he sub-

sequently declined to proceed any further in the matter, as he saw no necessity for the "usages" (*i.e.*, the mixed chalice, public prayers for the faithful departed, the invocation, and the oblation), and was content with the Communion Office of the Church of England; the question, it may be observed, not being whether the usages were primitive, but whether they were essential. Spinkes was described as "low of stature . . . and exalted in character." In the inscription on his tomb it is recorded: "Crederes antiquorum patrum et mores et doctrinam in nostrum theologum nupero quasi miraculo transfusos."

Leslie, whom Dr. Johnson regarded as the one exception from his indictment of the reasoning powers of the Non-jurors, was a controversialist of the highest order. Johnson said of him: "Leslie was a reasoner, and a reasoner who was not to be reasoned against."¹ He was also one of the "non-usagers," and, like Law and Collier, did not disdain to worship in the National Church.

Law, of whom Macaulay says "in mere dialectical skill he had very few superiors," has received the praise of Gibbon, in whose father's house he had been "the much-honoured friend," and had the still higher distinction of having been the means, by his "serious call," of turning Johnson's mind to the serious study of religion.

Kettlewell was one of the most attractive of the Non-jurors. Ken said of him: "He was certainly as saint-like a man as ever I knew."

The other more notable lay Non-jurors were the well-known Robert Nelson, who returned to the communion of the Established Church; John Byrom, a remarkable man, less known than he deserves to be, one greater than his fame; and Elijah Fenton, who has a place among Johnson's "Lives of the Poets." Johnson says of him: "With many other wise and virtuous men who at that time of discord and debate consulted conscience, whether well or ill informed, more than interest, he doubted the legality of the government, and, refusing to qualify

¹ Boswell, iv. 196.

himself for public employment by the oaths required, left the University without a degree; but I never heard that the enthusiasm of opposition impelled him to separation from the Church. By this perverseness of integrity he was driven out, a commoner of nature, excluded from the regular modes of profit and prosperity, and reduced to pick up a livelihood uncertain and fortuitous. But it must be remembered that he kept his name unsullied, and never suffered himself to be reduced, like too many of the same sect, to mean arts and dishonourable shifts." Pope assigned him four books of the translation of the "Odyssey," which Johnson says cannot be distinguished from those of Pope.

It may be as well to note here an obstacle in the way of those who were not altogether disaffected and continued to worship in their parish churches—that is, the "characteristics," as they were called, or the "immoral prayers," the prayers for the new Sovereigns by name. Canon Overton mentions "the various devices which they adopted to show they were not joining in them, such as standing and facing the congregation, sliding off their knees and sitting on a hassock, turning over the leaves of their Prayer-Books so as to avoid hearing the obnoxious words, and even pretending to take snuff—rather embarrassing proceedings, and not very edifying to the general congregation."

The correspondence with the Bishops of the Eastern Church, to which reference has been made above, into which some of the Non-jurors entered later on, originated with Bishop Campbell, little more than titular Bishop of Aberdeen—at least, an absentee Bishop. He took occasion of the visit of the Archbishop of Thebais, who had come to England with a view to obtaining help for his people suffering from Turkish tyranny, to suggest a union with the Greek Church. It led to a voluminous correspondence, which was carried on for nine years, with no result. The Greek Bishops, who seemed puzzled by the title "The Orthodox and Catholic Remnant of the British Churches," required complete submission as the only terms on which they

would consent to union. "The whole British Church," says Canon Overton, "would not appear to be a large one to representatives of the great Church of the East. What must a 'remnant' of it be?" The present writer has had the advantage of access to the originals, which are preserved among the manuscripts of Bishop Jolly in the Library of the Theological College of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. They are curiously interesting. The sand still remains as originally shaken over the signatures, after the lapse of nearly 200 years. The signature of the Archbishop, whether by accident or design, is large beyond the rest; the other signatures are "fine by degrees, and beautifully less." One signs himself "Archbishop of Constantinople, the new Rome"; another, "Patriarch of the great city of God, Antioch"; a third, "Patriarch of the Holy City Jerusalem." They append a paper, signed, amongst others, by "Samuel, by the mercy of God, Pope and Patriarch of the great city of Alexandria, and Judge of the Universe," containing these anathemas against heretics: "Let their portion be . . . cursed and deprived of pardon and remission after death. . . . Let their portion be with the traitor Judas . . . and with the crucifiers of our Lord. Let them be liable to hell fire, exposed to the curses of Fathers and Synods, and subject to an eternal anathema." The force of the *odium theologicum* could no further go. The "Judge of the Universe" seems to have forgotten that our Lord prayed that His crucifiers might be forgiven.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Wake, as soon as the project came to his ears, wrote to the Patriarch of Jerusalem a dignified letter exposing the schism. We cannot wonder that Spinkes "refused to be any further concerned in the affair"; nor can we regret that it fell through, as well as the subsequent negotiations with the Church in Russia, when we call to mind the Form of Reconciliation of the Princess Dagmar of Denmark, "which," as Williams says, "required of her, as a condition simply of Christian communion, such a series of anathemas against all that she had before most fondly cherished, involving all her ancestors and all her relatives in perdition."

The whole story may be read in Lathbury's "History of the Non-jurors," or George Williams's "Orthodox Church of the East," or in the more recent work of Canon Overton. The Bishop of Edinburgh has an illuminative note on the whole subject in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for July, 1900.

What moved some indignation at the time was the fact that Collier, one of the schismatically consecrated Bishops, signed himself "Primus Anglo-Britanniæ Episcopus." It was also signed by Campbell "Scoto-Britanniæ Episcopus," and by Gadderar, who, with other of the Scottish Bishops, assisted in several schismatic consecrations, consecrating for England, on one occasion at least, without the aid of any of their English brethren.

The notes as to "the points on which the Conference with the Greeks is to be held" are in Bishop Jolly's handwriting. The N.B. at the end of the document has never yet been published. The present writer, therefore, transcribes it *verbatim et literatim* from the original: "Arsenius, Abp. of Thebais, was sent in 1712 by Samuel Patriarch of Alexandria, from Grand Cairo in Ægypt, to represent to the Protestant Princes and States in Europe the truly deplorable Circumstances of the Greek Church under the Severe Tyranny and oppression of the Turks, and to solicit a sum of money, particularly for the Patriarchal See of Alexandria, brought under a Load of Debt of 30000 Dollars by one Cosmo, formerly Abp. of Mount Sinai, his pretending to deprive s^d Samuel of his Right to the Patriarchate of Alexandria, and to take Possession for himself, having by y^e force of Money procured himself to be invested by the Grand Visir in s^d patriarchal Throne, whose Clergy made a noble Stand for their Patriarch Samuel, and would not suffer him to be deprived by his Adversary. For w^{ch} Cause, to raise Money, Samuel was forced to sell, and lay in pawn, many of the sacred Vessels, patriarchal Habits, and other Utensils of the Church. Cosmo at length renounced all Title to Alexandria, and was then duly elected Patriarch of Constantinople, upon w^{ch} a firm Peace and Friendship commenced between Samuel and him. At what particular

Time Arsenius arrived in England, I have not yet discovered, but that he was in London in 1714 and 1716 is very certain. He received from Anne 300£ Sterl. and from George 1st 100£ Sterl. for the Church at Alexandria.—ah! poor! poor! poor!— But Arsenius by his long Stay in London, being nine in Family, had contracted Debts for necessary Substance on the most ordinary Food; for the Payment of w^{ch} he was obliged to apply, in the way of humble Petition, to all Charitable and tender-hearted Christians. He was attended by Father Gennadius (whom I take to be the òne called the Archimandrite in the foregoing Correspondence, Abbot of the Monks of the See of Alexandria), and by the Deacons, and other Domestics. See all this set forth at large in a 4^{to} Pamphlet of 20 pages, including Title-page and Preface entitled ‘Lachrima et suspiria Ecclesiæ Græcæ: Or The Distressed State of the Greek Church, humbly represented in a Letter to her late M. Q. Anne, &c. Printed in London 1715.’ As to those to have been sent to the Czar of Muscovy to hold Conference w^t the Greeks as to Points in Debate, &c., see the preceding Letters from Bp. Brett to Bp. Campbell, page 172, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 189. Not only the Death of the Czar put a Stop to the much-desired Union between the Greek Church and British Non-jurors, but likewise the Indiscretion of the Patriarch of Jerusalem in writing to Wake, then Abp. of Canterbury, and sending Copies of Proposals to him has quite knocked y^t Schemes in the Head; for w^{ch} see foresaid Letter, p. 164 [197], where it is well worth the remarking, that Wake behaved w^t great Prudence and Discretion in the Case, not exposing the Papers, or suffering them to be ridiculed. I have frequently heard, that the late R. Rev^d D^r Thomas Rattray of Craighall, having been in London in 1716, assisted M^r Spinckes in the translating into Greek the Proposals from the Non-Jurors to the Oriental Church.—A. JOLLY.”

With regard to the Scottish Non-jurors, their intrusion in schismatic consecrations has been already noted. The action of Rose, Bishop of Edinburgh, on their behalf, which led to the disestablishment of the Episcopal Church in Scotland and

the re-establishment of Presbyterianism by the disappointed Prince of Orange, is well known. The story has been graphically told by Macaulay and others. There is little doubt that if they had acquiesced, as the majority in England acquiesced, in the new régime, they would have been left unmolested, and Scotland would have been episcopal at the present day. Their blind romantic devotion to the other claimant to the crown, whom they still regarded as their lawful King, brought upon them those troubles which reduced their Church to "the shadow of a shade."

It only remains, in summing up the whole subject, to consider what, after the years, must be the verdict of posterity upon it all. To judge fairly the whole case, we must by the exercise of the historical imagination place ourselves, as it were, in their time.

There was nothing at that time, it must in fairness be remembered, to prevent a member of the Church of Rome from occupying the throne of these realms. It is one of the gains of the Revolution of 1688 that this is no longer possible. But what might justly have weighed with the Roman Catholic followers of James and his heirs, the old and young Pretender (as those claimants to the Crown were popularly called), need not have weighed with those who were so sincerely attached to the Church as were Ken and Kettlewell. What weighed with these sensitively conscientious men was the consideration that they had "opened their mouth to the Lord, and could not go back." What was it to them that their King, as they still regarded him even after his abdication, was as cruel, as cowardly, as immoral, as contemptible, as almost any monarch who had ever disgraced the throne? Was he not "the anointed of the Lord"? And it was with them an article of faith that

"Not all the water in the rough rude sea
Can wash the balm from an anointed King."

It did not occur to them that, after all, a constitutional monarchy implies a contract between King and people, and that the King had broken the contract by a virtual abdication; that he had fled

the kingdom, and taken refuge with the avowed enemy of their country. The loyalist reaction after the interval of Puritan intolerance had been carried to an extravagant pitch. The people seemed returning almost to the servility of Tudor times. Passive obedience, non-resistance, had been proclaimed from every pulpit; had been taught even by Tillotson, and was cast afterwards in the teeth of Burnet. The nation was saturated with a spirit of subjection which not even the shameless profligacy of the Second Charles could quench. Such was "the blind and passionate loyalty of the time."¹ No wonder that these good men thought it their duty to keep, "in scorn of consequence," the oath from which the King's breach of covenant had virtually absolved them. We cannot help admiring their spirit while we cannot share their scruple. The same spirit which had led the seven Bishops on a former occasion to *resist* the King seems here to have misled some of them to *support* him—

"Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum."

Macaulay puts the case of the "swearers" succinctly enough. After adducing a series of arguments for taking the oaths, he adds: "On these grounds a large body of divines, still asserting the doctrine that to resist the Sovereign must always be sinful, conceived that William was now the Sovereign whom it would be sinful to resist."²

It was the conviction of many of the Presbyterians also, lay as well as clerical, that James was still their lawful Sovereign. Their subsequent support of his son and grandson had a touch of romance about it which appealed to the perfervid imagination of the Scottish people. Other considerations, however, seem also to have entered in. Temper no less than temperament seems to have had something to do with it. A parallel, perhaps, might be drawn between the case of the Non-jurors and "the disruption." They were good men who in 1843 went out of the Establishment, and they were good men who

¹ Lecky, i. 9.

² "History," iii. 441, 445.

remained in it. They were good men who in 1688 took the oath to the new Sovereign, and they were good men who adhered to their allegiance to the old one. This, however, can only be said of those who originally refused the oaths. The conduct of the later Non-jurors seems indefensible, especially when we consider the action of those who, notwithstanding the remonstrances of the best men among them, consecrated Bishop after Bishop, consecrated Bishop against Bishop, and perpetuated the schism. Macaulay's portrait of them may be overdrawn, but a more impartial historian is not far wrong when he says they "strained all their energies to aggrandize their priestly powers, and to envenom the difference between themselves and the non-conformists. The Non-juror theology represented this tendency in its extreme form. . . . The writers of this school taught that Episcopalian clergymen were as literally priests as were the Jewish priests . . . that the Communion was literally and not metaphorically a sacrifice; that properly constituted clergymen had the power of uttering words over the sacred elements which produced the most wonderful, though unfortunately the most imperceptible, of miracles . . . that the sentence of excommunication involved an exclusion from heaven.

. . . Some of them contended that all baptisms except those by Episcopalian clergymen were not only irregular but invalid, and that therefore Dissenters had no kind of title to be regarded as Christians."¹ The "Catholic remainder," as they proudly called themselves, proved themselves precursors of that party in the Church which now monopolizes the name.

Of the earlier Non-jurors, the leaders were no doubt actuated by the highest principle. The rank and file, however, seem to have acted rather from what appeared to be probably, under the circumstances, the best policy. The chances were that James might yet return. They spent their time, says Macaulay, "in hearing and spreading reports that within a month His Majesty would certainly be on English ground, and wondering who would have Salisbury when Burnet was hanged." The con-

¹ Lecky, "History," i. 86.

clusion of the whole seems to be that there were two types of Non-jurors: one which commands our respect and pity, another which calls for pity without corresponding respect.



The Third Day: an Expository Study for Eastertide.

BY REV. HARRINGTON C. LEES, M.A.,
Vicar of Christ Church, Beckenham.

“He hath been raised on the third day, according to the Scriptures.”—
I COR. XV. 4, R.V.

SO writes St. Paul; so we repeat in all our creeds. Have we ever paused to ask ourselves why? “*Raised*”—yes, this is the citadel of our faith, the confidence of our hope; but why “*the third day*”? St. Paul sums up here the cardinal points of his Gospel in brief, but he finds room for this triviality. St. Peter preaches the fundamentals for the first time to a Gentile audience, yet he does not forget to mention it (Acts x. 40). It is only a slight numerical detail, yet somehow it has contrived to impress itself on the mind of the Church. The Athanasian Creed, in the midst of an elaborate and lengthy manifesto of Trinitarian doctrine, has a place for it; the Nicene Creed, battling keenly for the Deity of the Son, cannot apparently afford to omit it; while even the Apostles’ Creed—primitive, terse, and exclusive of so much that is weighty—still finds room for this tiny historic item.

1. *Now, when we come to examine the evidence more closely, we find that the weight laid upon the phrase comes from the Master Himself.* When challenged as to His authority after His drastic clearing of the Temple court, He names three days as the measure of His mystic “*Temple-raising*” (John ii. 19). When called upon to impress the nation with His *bona fides* as a religious teacher, He refers to Jonah and the three-day period

(Matt. xii. 40). When St. Peter's great confession has paved the way for a further self-revelation, Christ begins to tell of His coming Passion, and, linking with it, as always, the pledge of His Resurrection, He does not omit to name the space of time which shall elapse between the two events (Matt. xvi. 21, Mark viii. 31). So after the marvel of His Transfiguration: "they shall kill Him, and *the third day* He shall be raised up" (Matt. xvii. 23, Mark ix. 31, *cf.* Luke ix. 22); and in like manner He repeats the detail at the beginning of the final and fateful journey to Jerusalem (Matt. xx. 19, Mark x. 34, Luke xviii. 33). Thus on five critical and separate occasions the number three is conspicuous in Christ's Resurrection predictions. So Professor Findlay says: "Jesus appears to have seen a Scriptural necessity in the third day" ("Expositor's Greek Testament" on 1 Cor. xv. 4).

2. *But this is not all: the fact gripped the minds of His hearers.* The false witnesses at His trial alluded to it (Matt. xxvi. 61, Mark. xiv. 58); the mockers of Golgotha seized upon it and taunted Him with it (Matt. xxvii. 40, Mark xv. 29); the angels at the tomb reminded the women of it (Luke xxiv. 7); the despondent comrades, trudging heavily to Emmaus, pondered the significant figure (Luke xxiv. 21); and the Master Himself, later in the same evening, reminded the amazed assembly of His own oft-repeated words (Luke xxiv. 46). So we have no fewer than eighteen New Testament passages, and the invariable custom of our confessions of faith, to make us inquire whether there is any reason which makes the three-day period a significant one in the minds of men.

3. Now, there is a very considerable amount of evidence which goes to show that the third day after death was somewhat widely believed to be the time at which *every link between the body and the soul was finally dissolved*, when every spark of life was extinguished beyond hope of rekindling. "After death," writes a friend who knows Palestine well, "the body is buried at once, but the wailing is maintained for three days." This is

supplemented by striking evidence from John Lightfoot, who says: "All three days the mourner might do no servile work, no, not privately, and if anyone saluted him he was not to salute him again. . . . It is a tradition of Ben Kaphra's: the very height of mourning is not till the third day. For three days the spirit wanders about the sepulchre, expecting if it may return into the body; but when it sees that the form or aspect of the face is changed, then it hovers no more, but leaves the body to itself" (Lightfoot¹ on John xix. 39). Similarly, Herodotus tells us of bodies which were not embalmed till after three or four days had passed (Herod. ii. 89). So the Jews never accepted evidence of identification of a corpse after three days. ("Hastings' Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels," ii. 251). And, again, Latham, in "The Risen Master," dwells upon the significance of the three-day period, saying that what made the restoration of Lazarus seem so hopeless was that he had been four days in the tomb (p. 111).

4. Latham further proceeds to call attention to the fact that *so far back as the giving of the Law the same idea was in the air*. The man who contracted defilement through contact with a dead body was unclean for *three days*. The death-touch was accounted to last for that period, and then the cleansing began (Num. xix. 12). A slightly different idea, yet bearing the same general conception, is found in Lev. xix. 6. The flesh of the peace-offering was to be cooked and eaten, but was not to be kept beyond the third day. On that day death and corruption claimed it, and it was buried.

5. *Nor is the notion entirely a thing of the past*; and it may be of interest to give two modern illustrations, one from the East and the other from the West. The Rev. James Neil quotes an article in the *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly*, and states that when a blood-feud arises among the fellaheen of Palestine, the man-slayer may take refuge from his pursuers, even when no place of sanctuary is near, by simply calling on the name of some man of power and rank, although the person in question

¹ Vol. xii., pp. 351, 353, Pitman's edition.

be absent: "I am an indweller of the tent of So-and-so." If this invocation is disregarded and the man slain, then the influential protector has the duty of raiding the offending village for three and one-third days. After that period the death-claim is over, and the people may return to their village without further fear of molestation ("Palestine Explored," p. 109). Our second illustration comes from a curious and unexpected source—the spiritualist tenets in regard to psychic phenomena. Mr. Vance Thompson, writing in *Nash's Magazine*, in the October number of last year, says in three separate passages that Dr. Baraduc claims to have established by radio-photography that the "astral" inhabits a corpse for three days after death. "Under ordinary circumstances, three days are considered necessary for the body to release the fluids of carnal sensibility"!

I have quoted the last two illustrations, one barbaric and the other perhaps fantastic, simply to prove that for some reason or other men in the past and in the present have associated the notion of three days with the final severance between the soul and the body. The origin of the idea was probably framed from the normal period within which physical decay sets in, though men appear to have conceived of that as a consequence, rather than as a cause of, the partition. At any rate, the Resurrection of Jesus Christ bears a fresh aspect of triumphant conquest in face of the positive convictions of mankind on the subject. "In His case restoration to life ensued, instead of the corruption of the corpse that sets in otherwise after this interval" (von Hofmann, cited in "Expositor's Greek Testament" on 1 Cor. xv. 4). Man's limit is no barrier to Divine omnipotence.

There is above the Falls of Niagara a rock jutting out into the river, which bears the significant name of Past Redemption Point. At that place the current becomes so rapid and overpowering that all hope of swimming or rowing against it has to be abandoned. The man who drifts past it is lost. Now, three days would appear to be the Past Redemption Point of human conceptions in regard to the body and death. It is the period

after which hopelessness and despair reign. There is no possibility of undoing the dread fact. The one we love is gone for ever—so man appears to have reasoned. But the Resurrection on the third day is God's reply to it. He neither endorses nor refutes man's fancy in regard to it, but He overrides it, and undercuts it, and triumphantly brings back His Son in the face of hopeless human despondency and pessimism.

And as a fact it is clear that an enormous impression was made by the third-day victory over the grave. The three thousand converts of Acts ii. soon swell to the five thousand of the fourth chapter; and it is not long before we read of "the great company of the priests," whose adhesion to the faith has followed the miracle of the third day (Acts vi. 7). The cold form has become instinct with life. Revival has come where there seemed no possibility of it. All things have become possible to the believing Church.

"Never beyond God's reach"—that is the message of the third day. Hosea's inspiring prophecy to a people, whose backsliding looked irremediable, has found its triumphant fulfilment, not only in physical fact, but in spiritual renewal. Torn and smitten, there is yet healing and restoration for them. "After three days He will raise us up, and we shall live before Him" (Hos. vi. 2). So the Cape of Storms of the spiritual voyager has become the Cape of Good Hope through the Easter dawning, and henceforward, when the Apostle desires to find an apt illustration of God's ability to save to the uttermost those who are spiritually lost, he can only pray for the renewal of the third-day conquest, that, having eyes divinely opened, men may experience "that working of the strength of His might which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead" (Eph. i. 19, 20), and made the marred body of the Good Friday tragedy alive for evermore, to sit at His right hand in the Ascension glory.



Sir Matthew Hale.

By CANON VAUGHAN, M.A.,

Canon of Winchester.

THE tercentenary of the birth of so illustrious a personage as Sir Matthew Hale, Lord Chief Justice of England in the reign of Charles II. (which occurred in November, 1609), must not be allowed altogether to escape notice. As a lawyer and a judge he was renowned, not merely for his vast erudition and immense industry, but also for his stern integrity and delicate sense of honour, which caused him to be trusted by Royalist and Roundhead alike. During the fierce times of political strife he was employed by many of the King's party. He appeared as counsel for the Earl of Strafford, for Archbishop Laud, for the Duke of Hamilton and Lord Capel, and was appointed to defend the King himself. Under the Commonwealth he was prevailed upon to become a judge, while at the Restoration he was made Lord Chief Baron, and eleven years later Lord Chief Justice of England. His practical sagacity was no less conspicuous than his amazing knowledge. We are told in Burnet's "History of His own Time" that after the Great Fire in 1666 an Act was passed for rebuilding the City of London which gave Lord Chief Justice Hale a great reputation, for it was drawn up with so true a judgment and so great foresight that the whole city was raised out of its ashes, without any suits of law, which, adds the Bishop, "if that Bill had not prevented them, would have brought a second charge on the city, not much less than the fire itself had been."

It is not, however, in his legal capacity, as a lawyer and a judge, that we desire to commemorate Sir Matthew Hale; it is rather in his religious character, as a man of deep spirituality, as one who in that age of sectarian bitterness and controversy maintained a calm and constant sense of the eternal verities, a Christian whom no particular party could claim, who was on terms of intimacy with High Churchmen like Seth Ward

Bishop of Salisbury, with men of latitude like Tillotson and Bishop Wilkins, with Nonconformists like Richard Baxter.

As a young man at Oxford—so we learn from Bishop Burnet's charming little biography, "The Life and Death of Sir Matthew Hale, Kt., Chief Justice of England," Hale loved fine clothes and delighted much in company, and being of a strong robust body, he was a great master of all those exercises that required much strength. He was, however, shortly afterwards, when studying law at Lincoln's Inn, led to more serious thought by a circumstance which occurred at a convivial meeting, when one of his companions "fell down as dead before them." This, says Burnet, wrought an entire change on him; now he forsook all vain company, and divided himself between the duties of religion and the studies of his profession. For many years he worked at the rate of sixteen hours a day, rising always betimes in the morning, spending very little time in eating or drinking, and entering into no correspondence by letters except about necessary business or matters of learning. His strenuous life and keen ability soon attracted the attention of Noy, the Attorney-General, and of that great and learned antiquary, Mr. Selden, under the inspiration of whose friendship he extended his studies to matters beyond the range of his own profession. At this time he was much impressed by the life of Pomponius Atticus, written by Cornelius Nepos, whom he resolved to take as his model, whereby he was enabled to preserve his integrity and to live securely during the unhappy times of the Civil War.

Amid his intense application to business Judge Hale did not neglect his religious duties. Prayer "gave a tincture of devotion" to his secular concerns: it was, he says, "a Christian chemistry converting those acts which are materially natural and civil into acts truly and formally religious, whereby all life is rendered interpretatively a service to Almighty God." He was a strict observer of Sunday, on which day he never once failed for six-and-thirty years to attend Divine service. This observation, we learn, he once made when a fit of ague first

interrupted that constant course of duty. Besides this regularity of public worship, he was further accustomed to call all his family together, and repeat to them the heads of the sermons, with some suitable additions of his own ; after which he had a habit of shutting himself up for two or three hours, which he spent either in his own devotions, or in writing down such profitable meditations as occurred to him. In this way he produced a large number of manuscripts, which were found tied together "in bundles" at his death. One work on the "Defence of Christianity" he sent anonymously to Bishop Wilkins to desire his judgment on it ; but he that brought it would give no other account of the author but "that he was not a clergyman." The Bishop and Dr. Tillotson read the manuscript with delight, wondering who the writer could be. At last Dr. Tillotson guessed it must be the Lord Chief Baron, to which the other presently agreed. So they went to him immediately, and the Bishop thanking him for the pleasure his work had given them, Sir Matthew blushed extremely, not without some displeasure, thinking that the person he had trusted had discovered him. But the Bishop soon cleared his friend, and told him "he had discovered himself, for the learning of that book was so various that none but he could be the author of it."

Towards the end of his life, when living at Acton, Justice Hale formed a close intimacy with Richard Baxter, and the two men often held converse together, chiefly on philosophical matters, such as the nature of spirits and the immortality of the soul. Baxter himself seems to have regretted that his distinguished friend was not more communicative on matters of personal religion ; but, unlike the Puritans of his day, the Lord Chief Justice was reticent on such subjects. His discourse, Baxter tells us, was also sparing about religious controversies ; but that, while he did not believe in any Divinely appointed form of ecclesiastical government, he yet thought that Episcopacy was most fit and convenient. He greatly lamented that so many worthy ministers were silenced, and would fain

have drawn up a new Act of Uniformity, such as would embrace all reasonable men. In his discourse on the "Nature of True Religion," published after his death by Richard Baxter, Sir Matthew Hale gives clear and characteristic expression to what he conceived to be of the essence of Christianity. The whole passage is, indeed, a golden one, but we have only space for a single paragraph :

"He that fears the Lord of heaven and earth, walks humbly before Him, thankfully lays hold of the message of redemption by Christ Jesus, strives to express his thankfulness by the sincerity of his obedience, is sorry with all his soul when he comes short of his duty, walks watchfully in the denial of himself, and holds no confederacy with any lust or known sin ; . . . is true to his promise, just in his actions, charitable to the poor, sincere in his devotions ; . . . that dare not do an unjust act though never so much to his advantage, and all this because he sees Him that is invisible, and fears Him because he loves Him, fears Him as well for His goodness as His greatness. Such a man, whether he be an Episcopal or a Presbyterian or an Independent, whether he wears a surplice or wears none, whether he hears organs or hears none, whether he kneels at the Communion or for conscience' sake stands or sits, he hath the life of religion in him, and that life acts in him, and will conform his soul to the image of his Saviour, and walk along with him to eternity, notwithstanding his practice or non-practice of these indifferents."

To Richard Baxter, in his will, the Lord Chief Justice bequeathed a legacy of forty shillings, with which the good Presbyterian minister bought himself a great Bible, on the fly-leaf of which, beneath his friend's portrait, he wrote a long inscription, from which the following is taken :

"Sir Matthew Hale, that unwearied student, that prudent man, that solid philosopher, that famous lawyer, that pillar and basis of justice ; . . . that godly, serious, practical Christian, the tower of goodness and all good men ; . . . that pattern of honest plainness and humility, who, while he fled from the

honours that pursued him, was yet Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench. . . . This man, so wise, so good, so great, bequeathing me in his testament the legacy of forty shillings, merely as a testimony of his respect and love, I thought this book, the testament of Christianity, the meetest purchase by that price to remain in memorial of the faithful love which he bare and long expressed to his inferior and unworthy but honouring friend, who thought to have been with Christ before him, and waiteth for the day of his perfect conjunction with the spirits of the just made perfect."



Easter Morning.

"At early dawn they came unto the tomb, . . . and found not the body of the Lord Jesus."—LUKE XXIV. 1-3.

AT early dawn, the freshest hour of day,
When the resistless sun
Comes forth to run :

In early Spring, when in their bright array,
After long buried hours,
Spring up the flowers :

At early dawn they hasted to the tomb,
After the Sabbath's rest,
Seeking its Guest :

In early Spring to Calvary they clomb,
Where in that garden lone
The SEED was sown.

But from the tomb the everlasting SUN
Of Righteousness had ris'n
From out His pris'n ;

And the late buried SEED—new life begun—
From out the fecund earth
Had sprung to birth !

The Missionary World.

HOW many missionary sermons will be preached on Census Sunday upon the Census Psalm? The opportunity is a rare one, all men's minds being centred naturally upon a single thought.

"Psalm 87 is a prediction," says Dr. Kirkpatrick, "of the incorporation of all nations into the Church of Christ, and the establishment of a new universal nationality of the kingdom of God. . . . Jehovah holds His census of the nations, and writes their names down in His book. One after another of them He registers as 'born in Zion.' It is the official confirmation of their rights of citizenship."

The individual aspect of this Divine census can readily be illustrated from, to take one society only, the current Annual Report of the C.M.S. Its statistical table shows a total of over 23,000 baptisms (over 10,000 being those of adults) for the last completed year, and its index of special topics classifies a large number of striking individual cases. But the national aspect—the primary one in Psalm 87—is even more moving. Volume II. of the Report of the World Missionary Conference ("The Church in the Mission-Field") has a passage (pp. 6-10) full of force and beauty, surveying the many-nationed Church throughout the world, as it offers its Lord's Day sacrifice of praise "for more than thirty-six hours every week."

* * * * *

The *Church Missionary Review* for March contains a valuable summary, by Canon Ransford, of the Edinburgh Report on "The Preparation of Missionaries." The resolutions of the committee based upon it are a happy combination of the old and well-known C.M.S. principles (which are re-stated), with a recognition of the changed conditions of the Mission-field, and a consequent determination to work on fuller lines. The committee contemplate including more than hitherto in their scheme of training such subjects as the Science and History of Missions; the Religions of the World; Sociology; the Art of Teaching; the Science of Language, and the Languages required in the Mission-field; they instruct the secretaries to

make inquiries as to continuation study for young missionaries on first going out, and as to the value of training colleges in the field ; they set forward to consider the possibility of co-operating with other missionary bodies as to the preparation of missionaries ; they institute action to secure an earlier knowledge of actual needs abroad, and, as a result, an earlier location of candidates, in order to give opportunity for specialized training ; they express readiness to take " full advantage " of any help which the Board of Missionary Studies, when constituted, can give ; and they set before themselves a careful study of the whole operation of " recruiting for the Mission-field," whether in the home Church in general or at the Universities. In a word, the resolutions endorse all the main recommendations made in the report, and propose definite action upon them.

* * * * *

What does all this mean for the parochial clergyman with future candidates in his congregation, or for the future candidates themselves ? Does it set up an impossible standard, and brush aside as useless the " average man " ? Such a misconception is guarded against in the resolutions of the C.M.S. :

" In view of the Society's past experience of the use made by God the Holy Spirit of missionaries of very varying gifts, as shown by the effective and valuable work done by them, this committee will still be prepared to welcome candidates of all classes who have the essential spiritual and other qualifications, and show promise of ability to become missionaries."

A development of training such as the committee contemplate will rather give the " average man " a better chance of " becoming " than he has had before.

* * * * *

Here, as always, we balance ourselves by a study of the working of our Lord in the founding of His Church. The man divinely chosen to bear the knowledge of " Jesus Christ and Him crucified " to the Greek and Roman world was Saul of Tarsus, whose gifts of birth, education, training, and temperament fitted him to become the apostle to the Gentiles. But " average men " of Galilee, suited to be elsewhere " witnesses

of the resurrection," formed the rest of the apostolic band. The call took the conditions of the field into view. In each case there was fitness for the special work to be done, and the training given to the "average man" was superb in its depth and grasp. Walk, in thought, the villages and hillsides of Galilee with our Lord. Hear Him lead those humble men, not only into understanding of the written Word, but into the secrets of the spiritual kingdom, the ways and the purposes of God. Watch Him forming—by methods which have never been equalled—habits of thought, and calling out the diversities of each personality. See Him teach humility, strenuousness, independence, self-discipline, sympathy, faith; note how He tests each stage of growth by contact with life and its problems. The method of "average training" for the "average man" was never His. He welcomed—more, He called—the publican and the fisherman, but each He moulded into an "apostle according to the will of God" before He sent him forth.

* * * * *

The man who can respond to training, who has capacity to *become* a missionary, has before him an open door. But the *becoming* should not begin only after an offer of service is made. The "average men" who have become great seldom waited for a society to start them. They worked onward, outward, upward, by the force of their inner life. If Missionary Societies are preparing to justify their raised standard by providing advanced training on specialized lines, the Home Church should see that "average" men and women come forward with a far higher qualification on general lines. It would be easily possible for our Christian homes and parishes to prepare men and women up to the point at which present missionary training too often stops, and leave the Missionary Societies to go forward from that point. This is urged strongly in the Edinburgh Report.

* * * * *

The financial year 1910-11 has closed. Within a few days the Missionary Societies will be face to face with a realization of

their hopes or their fears. The March periodicals indicate how severe the strain in some cases is ; we note with special sympathy the position of the C.E.Z.M.S., which, like its sister society, the Zenana Bible and Medical Mission, has large responsibilities amongst women in the East. Already two societies—the S.P.G. and the China Inland Mission—have passed over to the thanksgiving side. Others may yet follow, for all things are possible with God. Should, however, some societies find themselves faced with deficit or retrenchment, or both, thousands who have worked, and prayed, and given at home will ask with deep concern the question, *What remains?* Their question will be echoed ere the month is out by burdened missionaries and dependent Churches in the Mission-field.

* * * * *

Is **ADVANCE**, with all its light, and hope, and victory, withdrawn out of our reach? Are we at home, who are already sharers in, if not leaders of, foreign missionary work, and our missionaries abroad, driven to “mark time” until the Christian Church becomes conscious of that lack of consecration and self-sacrifice which is a menace to her very life? Are we to be checked in our spiritual outgoing because money is checked in its incoming? Is the spread of the kingdom in the world necessarily hindered because certain methods for its expansion are dependent on silver and gold? Must missionary bodies abroad abandon constructive policy, and the Christians in the Mission-field of necessity weaken, because the dark shadow of retrenchment has fallen upon the work for a time? If the progress of **GOD** is not arrested, our progress need not be. Only one thing has ever stayed His hand—our unbelief. Trusting Him, we may with strenuous faith **ADVANCE**.

* * * * *

But advance has many aspects, and certain forms of it—so urgent that delay seems a mystery—must rightly be postponed. The South American Missionary Society may go forward in its new mission to the Indians of the Argentine Chaco ; some working developments may be possible for the tribes in the

Lado Enclave; but other great doors to evangelistic work must stand open but unentered. Certain opportunities for educational work in the Far East may be availed of quickly; others equally urgent must wait for lack of funds. It may even prove needful, if the expenses of old work are unmet, to withhold for a time some missionaries ready to be sent out. But, if we cannot advance with these new things, *there remain the old things to be made new*. Time is a gift more precious than money. Reorganization and reconstruction, so vital for the welfare of our work abroad and at home, are apt to be crowded out in the onrush of missionary expansion. "New work" is apt to sap the life of the old, because interest, gifts, and prayer gravitate unduly towards it. If the old work emerges to sight in this time of arrestment, we shall truly have scope for **ADVANCE**.

* * * * *

Let us stir ourselves to hope and effort at the call of God, who governs at His will the opening and shutting of doors. We look at the work abroad. If new mission-stations cannot be opened, old ones may be flooded with newness of life. Money has here no place. If additional schools and colleges cannot be built, co-operation may be introduced into existing educational work to an extent that will double its efficiency. If reinforcements must be held back from the mission-field, there is time to train those detained more efficiently, and thus raise the standard of all after-training work, and time to prepare ourselves for wider, deeper service. If the avowed work-policy of a mission is hindered by lack of funds, a prayer-policy, equally thought out and agreed on, can transcend the barriers of money, and press on to conquest for Christ. Is not this **ADVANCE**?

* * * * *

We look at the Church on the Mission-field. Has our money always fostered her life? Is it not possible that, hidden in the pain of this withholding, is God's answer to our prayers on her behalf? A Christian man said recently, speaking of a trial which had fallen on him and on his house: "The cost has

been worth while because of what it has taught the children. Their mother and I laid all our burden before them, and let them share the family load. They rose to it bravely, and it has been ceaseless joy to watch them grow beneath its weight." There may, when the Societies' books are balanced, be need to withdraw the foreign missionary from certain mission-stations, and leave infant Christian communities humanly unled. But if the prayer of faith is called out on their behalf from fellow-Christians in their own land and at home, until their life grows strong and nourished, rooted in the resources of God—is not even this last dread form of retrenchment really veiled ADVANCE?

* * * * *

We look at the Church at home. Shortage of funds concentrates prayer, thought, and leadership upon the problems of the Home Base. To insure advance in income, we must address ourselves—centrally and locally—to advance in deep intensive work. It would cost no money to examine, simplify, and co-ordinate all our home organization for foreign missions, or to train our deputations in effective presentation of the message, or to develop good method in all our local missionary work. It would cost no money to gather a conference of missionary editors for a fearless review of their publications—pamphlets, periodicals, books—calling in as assessors Christian writers, editors, and publishers who have expert knowledge on general lines, to see how far correlated production could cover the whole field of missionary appeal without increased expenditure, and how missionary literature might become that great power which it is not, but ought to be. On these and many other lines the Home Base, on its present restricted income, can ADVANCE.

* * * * *

In a word, it is suggested that the present lack of money for missionary work is a sign-post which governs direction, not a barrier which closes the way. Deep in some hearts lies the

assurance that if by faith we tread bravely in the narrow path before us, we shall find ourselves ere long in the great highway of Advance-yet-to-be.

* * * * *

A paper on "The Indian Bar-Student," in the *Times* educational supplement for March 7, brings one aspect of the international student question before us. Oriental students are pouring into England; the field they offer for Christian influence and fellowship is a large one, and the workers in it are few. The Student Christian Movement of Great Britain has unusual facilities for helping Orientals; we shall do well to strengthen its hands for this work. We call our readers once more to prayer for the ninth Conference of the World Student Christian Federation, to be held at Constantinople (April 26-30). Previous Federation Conferences have been held in Sweden, America, Germany, France, Denmark, Holland, Japan, and England. Each one has left its mark. The twelve national movements comprising the Federation will be represented at Constantinople, a larger number of students being admitted from the Levant. Both the *Student World*, published in New York, and the *Student Movement*, published at 93, Chancery Lane, W.C., have papers of thrilling interest on life, thought, and education in the Turkish Empire. Few realize how much has been already effected there by what Mr. Noel Buxton calls (in his article on "Young Turkey after Two Years," in the *Nineteenth Century and After* for March) "the patient work of the American missionaries." Clergy who want to open a new world of thought and prayer for their people will do well to inform themselves about this Conference, and call out intercession for the Federation and its work.

G.



Discussions.

“THE PERMISSIVE USE OF THE VESTMENTS.”

(*The Churchman, March, 1911, p. 169.*)

I SHOULD not venture to intervene in this discussion but for the fact that, as it seems to me, one particular point is not brought to the front as it deserves to be. To my mind there is an even larger question involved than the prevention of moderate High Churchmen joining forces with the extremists. I freely admit the strength of Canon Beeching's argument on this head; I recognize the danger that he points out, and should be quite prepared to see a section of High Churchmen move in the direction of Ritualism, in the event of permissive use of Eucharistic Vestments being denied. Such a reinforcement of Ritualism were much to be regretted. But an object dearer to my heart than the restraint of Ritualism is the Reunion of Christendom. And this is the larger question to which I have already alluded.

A vast proportion of High Churchmen have been hitherto content to celebrate the Holy Communion without any distinctive Vestment. I have the greatest personal respect for the high character and self-devotion of the minority, as a body, by whom the agitation for change has been raised and carried on. But what will happen if the Ornaments Rubric is altered with the view of distinctly legalizing a Eucharistic dress? I cannot confine my thoughts to the Church of England. I am bound to ask myself what, outside my own Communion, would result from the general adoption of a distinctive Eucharistic dress? I believe it would mean a fresh and very serious barrier to reunion with those with whom reunion is most to be hoped for. It is, perhaps, rash, in view of the intellectual cleavage that has appeared in the Roman Church, to say what may or may not happen within the next two or three decades; but, judging from the past, it is not in that direction that Reunion is to be looked for. The Church of Rome knows nothing of Reunion from the true Anglican standpoint. The *Church Times* does not represent the *Anglican Church* when it says that “the Church of England is not at variance with Rome on the Sacrament of the Altar, but on the papal claims and all that they involve.” The Anglican Church, if represented by her formularies, is at issue with the Church of Rome on a great many fundamental questions; and on not one of those questions will the Church of Rome yield an inch. She will accept submission, and nothing short of submission; she will brook no interference, much less will she federate; we see no signs of return to primitive and Scriptural purity. Our real hope for any substantial measure of

Reunion lies in other directions—viz., with the Presbyterians and with those Nonconformist bodies which accept the Apostles' Creed as the basis of their teaching. The forces of infidelity are every year gathering strength, and it often seems to me that the one hope for the faith of our children is in the drawing together of all who love and believe in Jesus Christ as the Divine Saviour of the world. The Church's disunion, its lack of solidarity and concentration, is a terrible source of weakness. We want to sweep away barriers to union instead of erecting fresh ones. And, believing, as I do, that a Eucharistic Vestment, legalized to satisfy the Sacerdotal and Sacramentarian section of the Church of England, would be such a barrier, I sincerely trust that no such step will be taken. If I thought that one's sole object should be to make the Church of England as comprehensive as possible, I might hesitate, whatever my personal feeling and preference, to offer any resolute objection to the proposed alteration of the Rubric. But since my thoughts of comprehension are not confined to my own Church, I hope and trust that no fresh stumbling-block will be placed in the way of Reunion with those whose principles are not antagonistic to mutual concession and reasonable toleration.

I deprecate as warmly as Canon Beeching the unhappy divisions of the Church of which I am a member. But this concession in regard to a Eucharistic Vestment is surely an attempt to "heal lightly" the hurt which we deplore. I am prepared to wait, and to wait fifty years if need be, for Reunion with other bodies of Evangelical Christians; and for that very reason I am not prepared to play into the hands of those whose attitude to orthodox Nonconformists is as unyielding as that of Rome herself. Whatever Canon Beeching may say (and no one can say it more effectively), the legalization of Vestments will be regarded by the public as a triumph of Sacerdotalism, and as such will be celebrated by the *Church Times*.

G. S. STREATFEILD.

The "Vestment controversy" has demonstrated at least one point beyond reasonable dispute—viz., that the vast majority of those clergy who wear Eucharistic Vestments do so because, on their own confession, they regard them (as they are regarded in the Church of Rome) as "ecclesiastical Vestments indispensable to and characteristic of the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar." Canon Beeching, on the other hand, contends that their use should be permitted as the historic "vesture appointed for the ministration" of Holy Communion, and he urges that this was the view entertained by Cranmer. This, however, can hardly have been the case, as Canon Beeching has omitted to notice that the Rubric of 1549 allowed the use of the chasuble (Vestment) or *cope* for the Celebrant, and Cranmer could not have been unaware of the fact that historically the cope was a processional dress, and had never been regarded as a distinctively Eucharistic Vestment,

whereas the chasuble, since its recognition as a sacrificial Vestment, had been indispensable.

Mr. Guy Johnson has also well pointed out that at the utmost the historic continuity of the Eucharistic Vestments is confined to their use during 600 years of the most corrupt period of the Middle Ages, and it may be further added that for only about 300 years prior to the Reformation was the chasuble regarded as a distinctively and exclusively sacrificial garment—a period which significantly synchronizes with the official acceptance of the dogma of Transubstantiation.

Surely, then, if the Vestments are to be permitted on purely historical grounds, their use must not be confined to the single service of Holy Communion, but extended to *all other times of ministration*, as historically the chasuble was used as a general ministerial dress, and only for about 300 years as a specially sacrificial garment suitable only for the Eucharist?

But I hardly think that the Ritualist who values the chasuble only for its sacrificial signification would welcome its enforcement for preaching, burying, or marrying! Thus, to allow the chasuble for the Eucharist in contradistinction to “other times of ministration” would only serve to emphasize our historic continuity, more especially with the three centuries prior to the Reformation, when it was regarded as an expressly sacrificial Vestment, and would therefore vindicate the contention of the “Counter-Reformation” party within the Church.

It would, however, at the same time endorse a view which is absolutely contradictory to the whole Reformation position and to the teaching of the Prayer-Book, and one also which is consistent only with the Roman theory of the Sacrament, which requires the priest at his ordination to be given the chasuble as the “*vestem sacerdotalem*” symbolical of the power then bestowed on him “of offering sacrifices and masses for the living and the dead.”

With the revision of the Prayer-Book in prospect, the Vestment question certainly does become a matter of present-day expediency rather than an historical question as to the precise interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric; but if it is decided to legalize a distinctive and exclusive Eucharistic Vestment, which, as confined to the Eucharist, historically symbolizes sacrificial teaching, the only logical sequel is that the teaching of the Prayer-Book must also be altered to harmonize with this sacrificial view of the Eucharist and this sacerdotal view of the ministry. The Communion must once again be turned into the Mass, and the presbyter into the sacrificing priest.

If loyal High Churchmen are genuinely anxious for the permissive use of Vestments in order to emphasize the historic continuity of the Church, let them in all consistency, at least, advocate their general use for *all* times of ministration, and not simply as a distinctive Eucharistic dress which would inevitably be construed as symbolizing

our continuity with the medieval theories of Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Past experience also leads us to the conviction that "permissive" use, would, in the course of a generation or so, practically amount to a binding custom, as those who refused to adopt the practice would gradually come to be regarded just as antiquated, narrow, and puritanical, as those who cling to the use of the black preaching-gown to-day.

C. SYDNEY CARTER.

"HIGHER CRITICISM AND ORTHODOX BELIEF."

(*The Churchman*, March, 1911, p. 193.)

The article in the March number of the CHURCHMAN, which is written as an appeal to those who hesitate to accept the new criticism, contains certain assumptions which should be first eliminated.

At the outset we read "the main results of historical criticism are generally accepted as practically ascertained facts"; but none acquainted with both sides of the controversy, or who have read, say, such a book as "The Problem of the Old Testament," can admit this for a moment. Take, for example, one of these "most assured results," of which Wellhausen says: "About the origin of Deuteronomy, in all circles where appreciation of scientific results can be looked for at all it is recognized that it was composed in the same age as that in which it was discovered."

Yet this preposterous theory, which is inconsistent with all the records, Kings, Chronicles, or Jeremiah, and is encumbered with improbabilities that no critic has fairly considered, remains as incredible as when it was first propounded by De Wette.

In regard to these results generally, the *facts* that have been brought to light have only served to confirm the traditional view. One fact must be admitted, that multitudes of men, many of them of learning and sincerity, have accepted the new theories; but this should not carry conviction to any who are acquainted with the history of human thought; again and again a like deluge of mere opinion has submerged the world of orthodoxy.

All of us agree that "whatever the ultimate results may prove to be, so long as they have been arrived at by fair and scientific means, they will have to be accepted as just deduction of historical and literary investigation," but it is just because the means used are often unfair and unscientific we cannot consent to them.

The Article accepts the objection made to the traditional view that it represents the Divine revelation as given "wholesale and ready made," as though all the great expositors before Wellhausen had failed to show that the Scriptures as they stand record a progressive revelation.

The reference, of course, is to the Law of Moses, which the critics will not allow could have been given at one time.

And yet, what is this Law more than the circumstances of the time needed? It brought with it no sudden advance in the revelation of the Divine will.

The Decalogue contained no new laws for men. The civil "judgments" were such as were necessary to serve as the basis of jurisprudence in the new nation.

The code of ritual was but an elaboration of the sacrificial worship of the patriarchs, particularizing and emphasizing the ideas involved in primeval sacrifices, atonement, redemption, satisfaction, cleansing, fellowship, thanksgiving, and setting these ideas before the mind in all the personal, domestic, social, and national experiences of the Israelite.

The spiritual meaning of the law marked no great advance, if any, beyond the religion of Abraham. The Law was a revelation to the people of "the God of their fathers," whom they had forgotten in Egypt.

It is also singularly inconsistent to deny that the Law could have been given by Moses at the beginning of Israel's life with Divine attestations, and to insist that it was surreptitiously manufactured, ready-made, too, by some unknown scribes after the Exile.

Another assumption adopted in the Article is that man was led "from crude beginnings up to the loftiest conceptions."

That the spiritual condition of man at the first was *crude* is not only opposed to the records we have of early piety, but is opposed also to all that scientific historical investigation has proved concerning the earliest races.

Well it would be for all of us to be true children to the man who heard and obeyed the Divine voice—"Get thee out of thy country . . . go into the land that I will show thee. . . . I will bless thee and thou shalt be a blessing. Fear not, Abram, I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward. Walk before Me and be thou perfect"—the man who longed to see the day of Christ, and who saw it and rejoiced, when he saw, as it were, the promised seed dying as a sacrifice and rising from the dead.

When all unproved assumptions are removed from the discussion, we shall be able to come to a sound conclusion as to the value of this new spirit of criticism, and shall learn to profit by it in all that is fair and scientific and historical.

W. F. KIMM.

"SUGGESTIONS TOWARDS REUNION."

(*The Churchman*, February, 1911, p. 119.)

I have to thank Mr. Malaher for his interesting comment. He draws what is no doubt a true distinction between the two functions of Episcopacy. When, however, he proceeds to demand "proof" that

Presbyterian elders are priests to whom has been delegated the power of transmitting Orders, then I must protest that he asks for what it is impossible to give. "Proof" in such a matter there can be none. It would be interesting to know Mr. Malaher's idea of the proof which the Catholic Church can offer that her Bishops were given the power to transmit orders. At any rate, if with Lightfoot and Gwatkin we believe that Episcopacy is a very early development from Presbytery, then the question of the power to transmit Orders stands upon the same footing for the one as for the other. In such a matter we cannot well go behind the intention of the founders of Modern Presbyterianism. If the intention was, as we believe, to maintain the unbroken succession of Orders, though reverting to Presbyterian government, then those who desire Reunion will be satisfied.

But I cannot refrain from adding that the real intention of my original paper was to show, by reference to some of the representative Anglican divines, how very far from the true spirit of English Catholicism is the modern rigorist demand for proof in matters not susceptible of logical demonstration. I must therefore regard Mr. Malaher's comment as expressing a view which our great Anglican predecessors would have disowned, and which is necessarily fatal to hopes of Reunion.

W. ALDWORTH FERGUSON.



Reason and Belief.¹

BY SIR OLIVER LODGE, F.R.S.

THIS is a book to read, and at the same time a readable book, pleasantly written in a popular, lucid style, and enriched on almost every page with apt poetical quotations, of which, by the way, there is a complete index at the end.

The learned author has certainly an adventurous spirit. He makes incursions into many fields and invades many realms. He is interested in the subject of psychical research, has recently delivered himself on the phenomena of spiritualism, has compiled a Catechism, and in "Man and the Universe" has offered suggestions on such subjects as Christian Worship and the formation of a comprehensive National Church.

It is, of course, in the realm of science that he has won his laurels, and may claim to be an authority. In the realm of theology, however, he is more or less a mere layman, and while he may be listened to with respectful attention, it must yet be tempered with caution. This is quite fair. If a theologian ventured to write on scientific subjects, and if, moreover, he presumed to differ from recognized experts, he would be quickly pounced

¹ Methuen. Price 3s. 6d. net.

upon and severely handled. At the same time, since science and religion are not in themselves mutually antagonistic, the observations and pronouncements of the scientist command attention.

Divided into three parts, Sir Oliver in the first deals with the subject of Incarnation, in the second with the Old Testament in education, and in the third with the scope of science. The first part appears to be mainly the expansion of an address recently delivered in Birmingham; indeed, some portions are identical.

He affirms, in a chapter on "the adventure of existence," his belief in pre-existence, though the only proof he has to offer is "that children often appear to retain for a time some intuition, some shadowy recollection, as it were, of a former state of being," and that "even adults . . . are perplexed at times with a dim reminiscence as of previous experience." He is anxious that his theory should not be confounded with "the guesses of reincarnation and transmigration." "We may not," he says, "have been individuals before, but we are chips or fragments of a great mass of mind, of spirit, and of life—drops, as it were, taken out of a germinal reservoir of life, and incubated until incarnate in a material body. . . ." He thinks that at the time of birth personality begins, and he is convinced that it must continue. "Before that [birth] we cannot trace identity. Perhaps we had none. Either we had none or we have forgotten." He does not believe in annihilation, and declares his conviction that the death of the body conveys no assurance of the "soul's decease." Again he says: "All analogy is against the idea of disappearance being synonymous with destruction. Death is change . . . but it is not annihilation." From the subject of the permanence of personality he passes on to those of character and freedom. Under this heading he speaks of the Fall. He is an evolutionist, so we are hardly surprised to read: "Man tripped over the upward step"; but with much he says on this subject few will disagree.

Having considered human responsibility and freewill, he proceeds to speak of the Incarnation. It is the pronouncement and confession of faith in this chapter that is, above all else in the book, of profound interest. Only one or two quotations can be given. "We are all incarnations, all sons of God, in a sense; but at that epoch a Son of God, in a supremest sense, took pity on the race, laid aside His majesty, made Himself of no reputation, took upon Him the form of a Servant, a Minister, entered into our flesh, and lived on the planet as a Peasant, a Teacher, a Reformer, a Martyr. This is said to have literally happened: and, as a student of science, I am bound to say that, so far as we can understand such an assertion, there is nothing in it contrary to accepted knowledge. I am not testifying to it because it is a conventional belief, I am testifying because I have gradually become assured of the possibility of such an incarnation. The historic testimony in its favour is entirely credible." With the exception of this last sentence, I can discover nothing to show that the writer believes in an incarnation by miraculous birth. He does not mention the Virgin Mary, though, oddly enough, he refers to Joseph. On p. 75 we read: "At last He emerged from obscurity, and in His native place stood up in the church and announced that hereafter He was no longer a village carpenter, the mere Son of Joseph

. . . but a Prophet, a Messiah." We may, however, give Sir Oliver the benefit of the doubt, since he has gone so far as to say that the historical testimony is credible, and that testimony includes an account of the Virgin birth. We might have expected to find the scientist referring to parthenogenesis, an admitted fact, though usually confined to lower forms of life.

One other quotation on this point: "Christ did not spring into existence as the man Jesus of Nazareth. At birth He became incarnate. Then it was that He assumed His chosen title, 'Son of man.' Before that He is called the Companion, the Counsellor, the Word of God." For such words, coming as they do from one of the leading scientists of the day, we may well be thankful.

I pass over a delightful chapter on "progress and service" with one quotation: "Truly the peace of God passes all understanding. It is not a thing easily obtained; it is very different from mere rest; it is restfulness, but it is not rest. Nor can it ever be the folding of the hands in satisfaction with what has been accomplished. . . . The most ideal joy is found in service. It is the keynote of existence—service in the highest. This is what is meant by the 'joy of the Lord.'" The parable of the talents serves as an illustration of service for God beyond the confines of this present life. There is advancement from a trusteeship of ten pounds to a rulership over ten cities—an enlarged sphere, and not the rest of inactivity.

In the second part of the book Sir Oliver treats of the Old Testament in education. It is refreshing to read such words as these: "For teaching purposes the Bible itself is better than Commentaries, Creeds, and Catechisms." Nor does he desire an expurgated Bible. He would teach the whole Bible. Even unessential stories are part of a literature which should be known by educated persons. Of these Old Testament Scriptures we read: "They rise to a magnificence of utterance which no other nation can parallel."

In answer to those who would condemn the morality of the Old Testament, he observes that we can, of course, see much to blame in the actions of the chosen people. "Imagine," he continues, "posterity 3,000 years hence reading our history, our newspapers, our politics! What will they think of us? They will not place us very high; they may prefer, in some respects, the record of the early Hebrews."

In these pages there is much with which we find ourselves in agreement. The temper of the author is delightful. We find it impossible to be angry, even when we differ from him. Even when he assails the Christian Science citadel, though without mentioning that cult by name (p. 140), he does not even descend to sarcasm. Every line has been penned in a profoundly reverent spirit—there is not a flippant note anywhere. It is the work of an optimistic evolutionist who believes that the palmy days of the race are all in the future, and that the "long pathetic struggle of the human race . . . culminates in the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

S. R. CAMBIE.



Notices of Books.

RELIGION AND ENGLISH SOCIETY. By J. N. Figgis, Litt.D. *Longmans*.
Paper 1s.; cloth 2s.

Dr. Figgis has been persuaded to publish two lectures which he delivered to a Conference in London in November of last year. Here and there we find a sentence we would have expressed otherwise, but most of what the writer says is well and truly put. He sees the need for ceasing to pretend that Christians are in a majority. In face of the secularization and indifference of modern life, the Church must take up the old Evangelical motto of separation from the world. It must reject the seen for the unseen, and appeal to the still existent spirit of chivalry to suffer, if need be, for the cause of Christ.

EARLY LETTERS OF MARCUS DODS, D.D., 1850-1864. Selected and edited by his son, Marcus Dods, M.A. Pp. 390. *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 6s.

Admirers of Dr. Marcus Dods will be glad to have this volume of letters, although they cover a period when his name was still comparatively unknown. There is an interesting sketch of his early life by one of his sisters, and a number of letters written during his eight years at the University of Edinburgh and at New College. But the bulk of the somewhat voluminous correspondence dates from the six years 1858 to 1864, in which he served in various places as probationary minister. It is surprising to see that after five years' ministerial work he had already "preached" for twenty-one parishes, and failed in every case, and some of the letters reveal how heavily his disappointments weighed upon his mind. They reveal also that his mind was not only well stored with knowledge, but deeply spiritual in tone and broad in sympathy, and we rejoice that his Church at length recognized his merits.

THE ASSYRIAN CHURCH (A.D. 100-640). By the Rev. W. A. Wigram, D.D. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 5s.

Dr. Wigram is head of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to Assyrian Christians, and has, therefore, special opportunities for mastering the somewhat intricate details of the history of the early Assyrian Church. In this volume he gives us the results of some years of study, and affords students a clue to the proper understanding of a very little known period. That period, indeed, is so unfamiliar to most of us that the book makes considerable demands on our attention. But it is well worth perusal, for all that; and we are grateful to the author for the labour he has expended on his treatise. It is modestly styled an "Introduction" to the history of the Assyrian Church; but it is so full and careful that we do not imagine it will require to be supplanted, at any rate, for many a day.

THE CHURCH: HER BOOKS AND HER SACRAMENTS. By Canon E. E. Holmes. London: *Longmans*. 1910. Price 2s. 6d.

This book consists of a course of lectures delivered during last Lent at All Saints, Margaret Street. It is an attempt to instruct Churchmen in

"first principles." What those principles are, the reader will probably be able to surmise. The book is, in fact, a full-blooded plea for a purely Tractarian conception of the Church; no other idea seems to be regarded by the writer as even deserving of consideration. We cannot, we fear, commend this little work.

BLAKE'S VISION OF THE BOOK OF JOB. With Reproductions of the Illustrations. A Study by J. H. Wicksteed, M.A. London: *Dent*. 1910. Price 6s. net.

This very handsome quarto, with its excellent reproductions of Blake's very curious and interesting designs, merits a word of welcome at the hands not only of art students, but of all those who are interested in mysticism in general and of Blake in particular. That the book will be caviare to the multitude is perfectly obvious. Blake never can be popular; such art as his, whether as poet or craftsman, must necessarily appeal only to the "elect." Yet the twenty-one designs which he executed for the Book of Job rank among his most perfect work. They were the production of his old age (he was nearly seventy when the book was published in 1826), just as his finest poems were the work of his early years. In imaginary force and visionary power they stand unrivalled. Mr. Wicksteed, alike in his very helpful introductory "Study" as in his notes to the several designs, does his best to render intelligible to readers the inner significance of Blake's startlingly original work. "The world of imagination is the world of eternity"—thus Blake sums up his faith. Symbolism, or mysticism, was the very soul of Blake's life-work, whether as lyricist or artist-designer. He lives in too refined and abstract an atmosphere to be "understanded of the people"; but, if his work lies out of the common orbit, Mr. Wicksteed has done his best to make that work intelligible to the inner eye of faith.

A MESSAGE TO THE WELL; AND OTHER ESSAYS ON THE ART OF HEALTH. By Horatio W. Dresser, Ph.D. *Putnam's Sons*. 1910.

The so-called "Emmanuel movement" is one of the significant signs of the times. Many volumes have been written on the subject. They are mostly by Americans; and America, as we know, is the home of many novel experiments in religious life and emotion. Briefly, the organizers of this movement lay stress on the fact that, in dealing with morbid physical conditions, the mental (or inner) life has been neglected; the power of the Spirit to heal has been forgotten; and external methods of cure have been tried—ineffectively, it is believed—to the practical detriment of humanity. No doubt there is a profound truth lying somewhere at the back of the new movement. Mental conditions are largely responsible for physical states. This no sensible person denies, least of all in these days of overtaxed nerves, with the consequent loss of physical vitality that attends them. But there is a grave danger lest we magnify this truth out of all due proportion; and our examination of those "Emmanuel" books that the movement has engendered does not tend to lessen our anxiety on this point. Mr. Dresser writes with persuasiveness and skill; he makes the most of an attractive thesis; but he is not, in the end, wholly convincing. Still, his book is worth reading, even if it merely stimulates reflection on a very profound problem.

Mixed up with the underlying verity—the supremacy of spirit over matter—there is a good deal of unsatisfactory psychology. And this each reader should be prepared to weigh with caution, if he is to read this work to any sort of profit.

EVOLUTION AND THE FALL. By the Rev. Francis J. Hall, D.D. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Price 5s. net.

Dr. Hall believes that "the evolutionary theory affords the best available working hypothesis of the origin of species," though he would limit the hypothesis to the physical aspects of the problem. But he does not allow that the more specific explanations of the general theory of evolution have attained to the same scientific rank, and, of course, he denies that the naturalistic philosophy which is so often associated with the evolutionary hypothesis has any scientific validity. The book is an attempt to show that belief in the natural evolution of man's physical organism is not fatal to a belief in the Christian doctrine of the origin of sin. To maintain this position, Dr. Hall has to distinguish between what he calls "the truly ecumenical doctrine and certain speculative accretions," especially those associated with the names of Augustine and Calvin. What this Catholic doctrine is, it is frequently difficult to discover from Dr. Hall's pages, because he assumes throughout that it is a uniform doctrine, though he makes no reference to the specific Roman Catholic doctrine of the superadded gift of righteousness. Dr. Hall is frequently girding at Protestantism, and especially at those men of the sixteenth century who, as he terms it, "broke away" from the Catholic Church. But we observe the author's characteristic inability to state fairly and accurately the position of his opponents. When, for instance, he says that Protestants repudiate the view that man's primitive state was one of grace, and supernatural, we should like to know on what authority he bases this contention. Then, again, there is the fatal confusion between "total depravity" and "total corruption." It may fairly be said that few thoroughly representative Protestant theologians have ever maintained that man's nature means that there is no good in him, no real freedom, and that "the virtues of the unregenerate are splendid vices." Total depravity means that every part of man's nature has been affected by sin, but not that he is totally corrupt, without a spark of good. As against the views of Dr. Tennant, this book is able and forceful, but it is not by any means so convincing against the positions adopted by Dr. Orr in his "God's Image in Man." Nor can we think that the view here stated of Creationism and Original Sin is at all satisfactory. The early chapters are by far the best, in which the evolutionary theories are stated and discussed. Nothing could be clearer or more helpful than this part of the treatment, especially in its freedom from technical scientific terminology. All the later chapters are vitiated for Evangelicals by the identification of Catholic with Roman Catholic doctrine. This is a position which, as we have shown from his earlier works, Dr. Hall is altogether unable to substantiate. It is a well-known fact in Church History that Catholic doctrine, as it is usually called, on the subjects of human nature and sin, has always tended in a Pelagian direction. The official doctrine of the Roman Church is undoubtedly semi-Pelagian to-day, and Dr. Hall's view has not escaped this snare.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION IN CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY. By E. Boutroux.
Translated by Jonathan Nield. London: *Duckworth and Co.*

The purpose of this book, as suggested by the title, is to give a review of the Relations of Science and religion in contemporary philosophy. After a brief introduction, sketching in outline the story of religion and science from Greek antiquity to the present time, the substance of the book appears in two parts. Part I. is entitled "The Naturalistic Tendency," and deals in the course of four chapters with "Auguste Comte and the Religion of Humanity"; "Herbert Spencer and the Unknowable"; "Haeckel and Monism"; "Psychology and Sociology." Part II., "The Spiritualistic Tendency," is also divided into four chapters dealing with "Ritschl and Radical Dualism"; "Religion and the Limits of Science"; "The Philosophy of Action"; and "William James and Religious Experience." The conclusion is that the conflict is properly between the scientific spirit and the religious spirit. We are glad to notice that the author will not allow us to be content with the easy "separate compartment" system, so much in vogue last century. The struggle is between two mental dispositions, and it is impossible for a conscious being like man to allow two principles to remain without instituting some sort of comparison between them. Of course, the view here given of the content of religion will not be regarded as adequate to the Christian revelation in the New Testament; but the general statement of the case, so far as it goes, is perfectly satisfactory. In the closing words we are told that, "in spite of their relations, science and religion remain, and must remain, distinct, and the value and indestructibility of each becoming more and more evident, reason endeavours to unite them, and thereby to produce a richer and more harmonious union." The book is a decidedly valuable one, full of historical information and acute criticism. All who are interested in modern apologetics should make a note of this work, and give it their careful attention.

INDIAN UNREST. By Valentine Chirol. London: *Macmillan and Co.* Price 5s. net.

UNREST AND EDUCATION IN INDIA. By William Miller, D.D. Edinburgh: *Blackwood and Sons.* Price 1s. net.

Mr. Chirol's book issues from the press with its reputation already made. The series of papers which appeared in the *Times* during 1910 attracted wide notice, criticism and commendation alike attesting their significance. Now, revised and enlarged, with an introduction by Sir Alfred Lyall and some twenty pages of valuable notes, they claim a place on the bookshelves of all who study India either as a part of empire or as a Mission-field. The book, which still continues to evoke notice from weighty writers in the larger reviews, deals mainly with the problem of existing unrest, but to a man of Mr. Chirol's measure that involves covering wide ground. He analyzes the scum thrown to the surface of India by political ferment with a clear-eyed justice which shows the strictly scientific temper, and is never biassed or prejudiced. From his conclusions one may occasionally differ, but at no point can he be termed unfair. From the loyalist native princes to the "untouchables," cast out from Hindu society; from the great officials of the Indian Government down to the soldiers of the line; from the men who

carried the partition of Bengal to completion, down to the Indian civilian who only does his duty in the *mofussil*—all are dealt with alike. It is only when the political agitator is in question that mercy ceases to season justice, and that Mr. Chirol writes words which sting. Those who have only followed the intermittent record in the daily press will be startled at the evidence collected in the volume before us. The extracts from the native press are appalling. So are the reported utterances of leading men. Mr. Chirol recognizes that a measure of continuous unrest has always characterized Indian history, and he realizes the elements of true aspiration and laudable endeavour which are included in *swaraj* and *swadeshi*. But he would deal sternly with the rest. He traces the uprising and development of the agitation in Western India amongst the Mahratta Brahmans; he follows it closely in Bengal, showing with what disastrous result it is being fostered amongst students and even schoolboys; he deals in less detail with the problems of the north and the south. At every point there is frank discussion of past and present governmental methods. The responsibility of empire goes home.

Indian education—almost as urgent a problem as education at home—occupies an important section of the book. Here, again, past mistakes and present perils are temperately but incisively dealt with. The need for the religious element is powerfully urged. The veteran Dr. Miller, who has given nearly half a century of distinguished educational service to India, though he dissents at some points from statements of facts and expressions of opinion in "Indian Unrest," endorses Mr. Chirol's main educational contentions.

The references to missions or to missionary work are few, but invariably sympathetic. Dr. Garfield Williams is quoted as an authority on Indian students; attention is called to the value of vocation shown in educational missionaries; the remarkable influence of individual missionaries, even amongst high-class Indians, is recognized; the claims of the depressed masses outside Hinduism are strongly urged, even to the extent of a suggestion that here Government might depart from its principle of neutrality and subsidize missionary work.

Two or three further points call for notice. There is no recognition of the native Christian community, its hopes and its ideals, its relation to the future of India, in the book. Your reviewer has noted no conversation with an Indian Christian, amongst the many recorded with other Indian friends—Mohammedan, Hindu, Parsi. We should have welcomed some words from so just an observer here. Again, Mr. Chirol's estimate of Indian character, valuable as it is, seems taken from a Western rather than from an Eastern standpoint. Loyalty to the British *raj* seems to be the first of Indian virtues in his eyes. On this side the book is not so interpretative as might be desired. Lastly, there is apparently no consciousness of that fascinating appeal to the imagination in which India is so rich, and which is one of her strong attractions to many. Mr. Chirol knows her and has served her; he is a fearless surgeon for her dread disease. But has he ever done any dreaming of the past or present or future of the great mother of religions? If so, we have missed the traces of his dreams.

THE STUDY OF THE MIRACLES. By Ada R. Habershon. London: *Morgan and Scott*. 1911.

Miss Habershon's book is neither a critical study nor a defence of the miraculous in Scripture. It is, as she says, an attempt to collect from a brief review of the miracles some knowledge of the power and the other attributes of God. It is pleasantly and simply written, and contains much that will be useful, especially to that large class of readers whose knowledge of the Bible is not profound.

The method adopted—that of arranging the various miracles under heads or subjects—and the earnest devotional spirit which breathes through the whole, rather than any great originality of thought, give the book its value.

The chapters on "God's Reason for Working Miracles" and "The Setting of the Miracles" will, perhaps, be read with the greatest interest, as they present very clearly some important principles of the study of miracles which not everyone would discover for themselves.

THE AIMS AND ORIGINS OF THE FOUR GOSPELS. By Canon J. M. Wilson. London: *Macmillan and Co., Ltd.*

Some sermons must be heard to be appreciated. Take away the preacher's personality, and only a mass of sentences is left. Others must be read and studied to be appreciated fully; and to that class belong the two courses of sermons, preached in Worcester Cathedral last year, and embodied in this volume.

The author lays stress on the fact that they are "not for scholars and specialists," but "for those who wish to learn something of what scholars are thinking and are not unwilling to think seriously themselves." Nevertheless, we are not quite sure that a congregation—even an educated congregation—could assimilate through the ear a third of the good things which Canon Wilson sets before them.

Their value does not lie on the surface. Half-an-hour's serious reading convinces one of the patient research of the preacher, his careful sifting of material, his skilful handling of his subject. And yet we are never allowed to forget that we are reading *sermons*, not *lectures*. There is always the personal message and the personal appeal to the heart.

The last two are the best of the series, treating of the message of St. John's Gospel to the Church of to-day and the Christian of to-day. In connection with the former the writer thinks that in the Fourth Gospel we shall find the truest conception of the catholicity of the Church.

"It is not the medieval conception into which we have been born." It is no unity of form conditioning spirit. The essential thing is invisible Spirit vitalizing framework and form.

And the life of Church and Christian depends upon the absorption of the Spirit of Christ, of which "the Lord's Supper is for ever an outward and visible sign." This gospel, he says, "guards us against a localization of His Presence in bread and wine, against the materialism—a recrudescence of the spirit of idolatry—to which men are so prone; while it emphasizes and explains the spiritual union that the act symbolizes—'the words I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life.' To St. John the thought of the Sacraments is wholly spiritual and symbolic." Surely remarkable words, weighty words, faithful words, from such a preacher!

PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION: PRACTICAL AND HISTORICAL. By the Very Rev. Henry Wace, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. London: *Nisbet and Co., Ltd.* Price 5s. net.

We are very grateful to the Dean of Canterbury for this book. It consists of three long essays on the teaching of Luther, and three shorter ones showing the bearing of Luther's teaching upon certain urgent points of modern controversy. Some of the essays have seen the light before, but it is good to have them brought together in a single volume. The book is marked by two characteristics—depth of knowledge and clearness of writing. The essays profess to be “the result of many years' study of the writings of Luther,” and that the study has not been fruitless is shown by the easy and familiar way in which the Dean can speak of the leaders of the Reformation movement, their mental and spiritual inheritance from the Middle Ages, their environment, and their own individual and characteristic genius. The Dean has united this full knowledge with a beautiful lucidity of style which makes it a real pleasure to read, and from time to time we are given apt quotations in which the Reformers speak for themselves. The first essay is on “The First Principles of Protestantism,” and we are clearly shown that a Protestant is not a man who takes up a negative attitude, but one whose position rests on the positive statement that “In matters of conscience there can be no question of majorities” (p. 16). This, however, does not mean an unrestricted right of private judgment; and later on (p. 244) the practical conclusion is drawn that an English Churchman is bound to render “a conditional assent and a cautionary obedience” to the formulæ of his own branch of the Catholic Church, reserving to himself the right to appeal to the New Testament Scriptures, which, as the Bishop of Birmingham admits, “represent the mind of the Church at its best and freshest; they represent the utterance of its highest inspirations.” The second essay sketches with remarkable freshness and insight the origin and development of the Reformers' teaching on justification by faith, the new life, the ministry, the Word and Sacraments, and shows the difference between the views of Luther and Calvin on the subject of Predestination. The third essay further illustrates these points by an examination of the ninety-five theses and the three primary works published in the critical year 1520. Most interesting, too, is the short chapter on “The Sacrificial Aspect of the Holy Communion,” which reads like a reminiscence of the Fulham Conference by its President, and deserves to be studied by Churchmen of all schools of thought, as showing what fundamental agreement there is between them. We hope the book will be widely read. Nothing could show better the immense spiritual debt we owe to Luther and Melancthon and their allies; nothing could prove more convincingly that in the Reformation we have something, not to repent of, but to rejoice over.

HOW TO SPEAK EFFECTIVELY. By Charles Seymour. Pp. 350. Third edition. *The Speaker's Library*, 358, Strand, W.C. Price 3s. net.

Mr. Seymour is a teacher of elocution with a good deal of practical experience, and the principles which he has tried to elucidate and illustrate in this book are the fruit of it. His suggestions are practical and appeal to common-sense. In these days, when the agnostic lecturer so often manages to speak much more effectively than the preacher of the Gospel, elocution is a subject which candidates for the ministry cannot afford to neglect.

THE SONG OF SONGS. With Notes and Comments by M. King. London and Edinburgh : *Marshall Bros., Ltd.*

The Song of Songs, which is Solomon's, has always been a difficult and attractive subject for the commentator. This little book, which the writer bases upon Professor Godet's work, gives a clear and interesting explanation of the poem for the ordinary reader. Its main thesis is that "the Beloved" mentioned in the Song and King Solomon are "not one and the same person, but rivals, the Beloved possessing, and King Solomon endeavouring to win, the affections" of the Shulamite. Where a book is as difficult of interpretation as the Song of Songs any fresh suggestions are welcome, but we are inclined to think that the introduction of a third person into the poem raises more difficulties than it solves.

KNOWING THE SCRIPTURES. Rules and Methods of Bible Study. By A. T. Pierson, D.D. London : *T. Nisbet and Co., Ltd.*

Dr. Pierson is a great student of the Bible. In this book he has "gathered up some results of fifty years of Bible study," and put into form for publication some of the principles which he has found of the greatest value in his own work. There are, as might be expected, many interesting chapters, such as those dealing with "Versions and Translations," "Refrain and Chorus in Scripture," "Dominant Words and Phrases," and the like. On these and many other subjects the writer has collected a very large amount of material, of which he makes good use. We are, however, somewhat disappointed with the book. Students of Scripture may always learn much from Dr. Pierson, but this book appears to lack the distinction of his earlier works. It may also, we think, be doubted whether any study of the Bible which treats it from the point of view of unity alone, and disregards the diversities of the various books—their dates, writers, and conditions—is likely to be of great or permanent value. On the other hand, there are very many who will welcome this book, and find in it a storehouse of Biblical knowledge.

KONT-HON-NOFER; THROUGH THE LAND OF ETHIOPIA. By H. K. W. Kumm. London : *Marshall Bros.* Price 6s.

Two things are undoubtedly clear—the earnestness of Dr. Karl Kumm, and the appealing need of the great Sudan; but, after a survey of the book before us, we are constrained to admit that the one throws very little light upon the other. We took up the book to seek an answer to many questions—amongst others one concerning the working policy, organization, administration, and general methods of the Sudan United Mission—but we lay it down without finding what we sought. Dr. Kumm is the most sunny-hearted of travellers, on the happiest terms with his "boys." He loves the Africans, and though we by no means concur in his view of racial psychology, his whole-hearted belief in their future is good. His missionary history is distinctly vague, and his geography and ethnology leave a sense of bewilderment, partly due to the erratic structure of the book. There is, especially on the travel side, a good deal of valuable matter, but it is not easy to estimate or to absorb it. The book is not so incomprehensible as its title, but it tends at way.

GLIMPSES OF FOUR CONTINENTS. By Mrs. R. C. Morgan. London : *Morgan and Scott.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

This book records the travels of the well-known editor of the *Christian*, for the most part in company with his wife. These simple records show a kindly man of sincere and wide-hearted Christianity and a certain native shrewdness, in touch with many aspects of life in divers lands. For personal friends the volume will have a deeper interest than for general readers. But Mr. Morgan's friends were so many that the issue of this book as a sequel to his *Life* is justified.

INDIAN IDYLLS. By Anstice Abbott. Introduction by George Smith, LL.D. *Elliot Stock.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

These five delicately drawn Indian sketches have great literary charm. They are missionary, but above all they are Indian. The reader is drawn into the very life of the people, simply and unconsciously, and lays down the book with a sense of newly-established fellowship which lasts. The Indian men, women, and children, whether Hindu or Christian, have become friends, and the simple naturalness of the pervasive missionary element is delightful. The book gives a foretaste of what indigenous Christianity will be. It is so transparently true that it convinces without argument. Those who eschew missionary literature of the ordinary type will be won by it, and it will be found invaluable for reading aloud.

MARTYN TRAFFORD. A Sketch of his Life and his Work for the Student Christian Movement. By Tissington Tallow. Price 1s. net. London: *Student Christian Movement*.

This book gives an outline, drawn with truth and tenderness, of the growth of a singularly attractive personality. Martyn Trafford, a young Baptist student volunteer, did remarkable work amongst his fellow-students, and died very suddenly last August, before he had fulfilled his call to the Mission-field. The inner life of the Student Movement is suggestively sketched. We see the growth of high ideals amongst the student workers for the theological colleges of the land, and the steps taken towards their attainment. But what remains with us most strongly is a sense of the reality and beauty of a young life spent out in a strenuous following of Christ. The book has distinct interest for all—and they are many—who follow the Student Christian Movement in its great work with sympathy. But it also appeals to all young men and women, and to those who desire to keep in touch with the thought and life of to-day.

HARRIET'S TREASURE. By Mrs. Mitchell. London: *S.P.C.K.*

This story is pleasantly told, but the plot is very slight, and the characters are by no means convincing. It may prove acceptable to children.

OCEAN CHUMS. By W. C. Metcalfe. London: *S.P.C.K.*

This is a capital story, full of thrilling adventures. It is written in a humorous and racy style, and is sure to be appreciated by all boys.

JENKYN CLYFFE, BEDESMAN. By Gertrude Hollis. London: *S.P.C.K.*

This story is largely concerned with the doings of Henry V., especially during his French campaign. The many exciting adventures which befell him and his followers there are well told, and the whole book gives a graphic picture of one of the most romantic periods of English history.

PILGRIM SONGS. By H. W. Frost. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.*

These "songs" are on the whole disappointing, though several of them display considerable merit. They are reverent in tone, and are evidently the product of a devotional mind.

VENERABILIS BRÆ: HISTORIÆ ECCLESIASTICÆ GENTIS ANGLORUM. Liber III. Analytically translated for Theological Students. By the Rev. T. J. Williams-Fisher. London: *Thornton and Sons*. Price 5s. net.

If the author's directions in the preface are followed, this book will be an acquisition to the struggling student. If they are ignored, it will be just a cram-book, swallowed undigested.

The short historical and grammatical notes and the translation are excellent. We cannot say the same of the long lists of words fully parsed at the end of each chapter. Such methods are not intelligent. Students, however weak, should be encouraged to find their way about a dictionary.

IDEALS FOR THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. By W. D. M. Sutherland. London: *Robert Scott*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

We like these crisp sermons. They grip. Originally contributed to the columns of a Scottish local newspaper, they are worthy of a wider circle of readers. Based upon the Bible and a rich personal experience, they have the ring of conviction and the power of appeal. The preacher will find them suggestive; the ordinary reader will find them inspiring.

SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHING. By F. G. Llewellyn. London: *Robert Scott*.

The problem of Sunday-school reform is in the air. One solution of the problem is—reform the teacher. This little book invites teachers to reform themselves and their methods, and it tells them how to set about the task. "Teach yourself before you teach others" is the motto which the writer expands with a simplicity and a directness which are themselves the essentials of all effective teaching.

PAPAL MERCHANDISE. By Ernest Phillippo. London: *Charles J. Thynne*.

Apart from the general scheme, the author's contribution is small. He has devoted himself to collecting evidence from all sorts of literature. And that evidence is a mass of hard facts and surprising figures, exposing all too clearly the deep-seated commercialism of the Church of Rome.

"THEOPNEUSTIA." By L. Gaussen, D.D. London: *Charles J. Thynne*.

A revised translation of a work first published over seventy years ago, designed to prove plenary inspiration of the Bible. The writer's treatment of the arguments against

plenary inspiration strike one as often fantastic, while in considering the question of the variant readings of the manuscript he admits that there must be choice between one word and another, and falls back on "primary inspiration." Is it really true that "those who have desired to study God's Word only by the light of God's Word have been unable to perceive any difficulties or to find any uncertainties"?

Received: "MORE BLESSED." By Rev. J. B. Ferry. London: S.P.C.K. Price 5s. per 100. THE RHYTHM OF BERNARD DE MORLAIR, MONK OF CLUNY, ON THE CELESTIAL COUNTRY. By Rev. J. Mason Neale, D.D. London: S.P.C.K. Price 6d. A GLORIOUS MINISTRY. Sermon. By the Right Rev. C. H. Brent. London: S.P.C.K. Price 1d. THE KNOWLEDGE OF CHRIST. London: *Simpkin, Marshall and Co., Ltd.* Price 1s. net. KELWAYS' MANUAL OF HORTICULTURE. Somerset: *Kelway and Son*. RECREATIONS OF A BOOK-LOVER. By Frederic W. Macdonald. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 2s. 6d. net. THE IRISH CHURCH QUARTERLY. Edited by Rev. H. J. Lawlor, D.D. Dublin: *Hodges, Figgis and Co.* LIFE OF DANTON. By Hilaire Belloc. London: *T. Nelson and Sons*. Price 1s. THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW. Edited by Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, D.D. London: *Spottiswoode and Co.* Dr. Headlam's article on the Odes of Solomon is the special feature of a good number. THE RELIEF OF CHITRAL. By Captain Younghusband. London: *Macmillan and Co.* Price 1s. net. An interesting account of an interesting campaign. A FATHER'S LETTERS TO HIS SON. London: *Marshall Brothers*. Price 2s. 6d. Valuable and well-put advice to young men. CHRISTIAN CHARACTER. By A. C. Dixon, D.D. London: *Marshall Brothers*. Price 1s. net. Another well-written volume of advice to young people. PARABLES FROM NATURE. By Mrs. Gatty. London: *T. Nelson and Sons*. Price 1s. A cheap and well-printed edition of Mrs. Gatty's well-known work. A BROKEN ALTAR. By Frederick Harper. London: *James Nisbet and Co.* Price 3s. net. A volume of excellent sermon outlines, full of point and illustration. THE MOABITE STONE. By W. H. Bennett, D.D. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 2s. 6d. net. An account and a translation of the well-known inscription, learned enough for students, and popular enough for all. THE AUSTRALIAN CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW. Edited by Rev. Lewis B. Radford, D.D. Sydney: *D. S. Ford*. Price 1s. 6d. A new venture from the Antipodes which bids fair to do well. HOW AND WHY KING GEORGE WILL BE CROWNED. By Joseph Hammond. HYMNS FOR THE CORONATION OF HIS MAJESTY KING GEORGE V. London: *Sheffington and Son*. Price 1s. net each. Two nicely got up little volumes which should have a large circulation just now. THE AUTHORIZED VERSION OF THE BIBLE AND ITS INFLUENCE. By A. S. Cook. London: *G. P. Putnam's Sons*. Price 3s. 6d. An excellent account, reprinted for the Tercentenary Celebration. THE FOUR GOSPELS UNIFIED. By Rev. H. J. Gossar. London: *J. Nisbet and Co.* Price 5s. Not a harmony, but an interwoven account of the Gospel story. THE BOY'S OWN PAPER, THE GIRLS' OWN PAPER, THE SUNDAY AT HOME, and FRIENDLY GREETINGS. London: R.T.S. The usual excellent monthly batch from the R.T.S. THE REUNION MAGAZINE. *Cope and Fenwick*. Price 9d. net. THE IRISH REVIEW. London: *Simpkin, Marshall and Co.* Price 6d. net. A new review dealing with Irish matters, well printed and attractive. JOTTINGS FROM AN INDIAN JOURNAL. By Sir John Field. London: *Jarrold and Sons*. Some of the experiences of the late Sir John Field. SERMONS. By Rev. R. Daly Cocking. Brighton: *Garnett, Mephram and Fisher*. Price 2s. net. THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA. Edited by G. Frederick Wright. Price 75 cents. SPECULUM ANIMÆ. By Professor Inge. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 6d. net. Four devotional addresses of a suggestive character. THE CLUB FEAST OF CHRIST'S APPOINTMENT. By Rev. Herbert Moore. Stoke-on-Trent: *The Booklet Press*. Price 8d. THE LOVE OF JESUS. By Sir Henry S. Lunn. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 1s. 6d. net. Two manuals for Holy Communion, the former by a clergyman, the latter by Sir Henry Lunn. A POCKETFUL OF SIXPENCES. By G. W. E. Russell. VIXEN. By Miss Braddon. London: *T. Nelson and Sons*. Price 1s. net. AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF EDWARD GIBBON, CHARLES ACHESTER, THE OLD YELLOW BOOK, THE RING AND THE BOOK, PLAYS OF BEAUMONT AND FLETCHER, ESSAYS ON EDUCATION. London: *J. M. Dent*. Price 1s. net each. New volumes of the Everyman's Series. THE HOLY BIBLE. London: *Oxford Printing Press*. A reprint of the Authorized Version. LEILA. By Antonio Fogazzaro. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 6s. A novel by the famous Italian novelist, published in England on the day of his death. THE REVELATION OF JOHN THE DIVINE. Edited by G. H. S. Walpole. *Cambridge University Press*. Price 1s. 6d. WESTMINSTER NEW TESTAMENT. By A. F. Mitchell. London: *Andrew Melrose*. Price 2s. net. New volumes of these two excellent series.