

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.

MARCH, 1908.

The Month.

The Vestments. THE Report of the Sub-Committee of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, which was presented to Convocation last month, is a document of the very gravest importance. It represents the opinion of the five Bishops who composed it: the Bishops of Salisbury, Bristol, Exeter, Gloucester, and Ely. Their conclusion, broadly stated, is that "Vestments cannot rightly be regarded as expressive of doctrine," and that therefore "all questions of legislation in regard to them are questions of expediency rather than of principle." While the Bishops are careful to say that their Report binds no one, and is only to be regarded as an expression of their own opinions, they state very clearly their judgment that the Ornaments Rubric refers to and legalizes the Ornaments of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. If this is true, then the Vestments are now, and have been since the sixteenth century, compulsory on all clergymen, all who wear them are keeping the law, and the great mass of clergy who do not wear them are breaking the law. Not only so, but it also naturally follows that any legislation that may be contemplated under the Letters of Business can only be to make the use of the Vestments permissive! The Report admits that until within fifty years or so ago "there is no evidence whatever of the wearing of the chasuble," and also that "no attempt whatever was made to enforce the use of any other vesture in the Service." So that we have the curious anomaly of a law absolutely ignored from the very outset, and never enforced to this day. Let

those believe it who can. When we think of the way in which Elizabeth, James I., Charles I., and Charles II. enforced obedience to the Law, it will require a great deal of proof that the finding of the Report represents the true view of the Church of England in regard to the Vestments. It is well known that such a position has not commended itself to the highest legal minds of our country, and Lord Selborne's judgment, in spite of all that has been said from time to time, still stands unaffected by any supposed "new light." The Report brings more prominently than ever into consideration the one question whether the Vestments are authorized by the Church of England. If they are, their use should be enforced, and all Evangelical and Moderate Churchmen made to obey the Law or accept the alternative. We do not suppose for an instant that the theory of a minimum use, regarded as contemplated by our present Rubric, is likely to survive in the face of the very insignificant and inconclusive proofs adduced in support of it in this Report. The question is narrowed down to the interpretation of the Rubric as authorizing or not authorizing the Vestments. If the Law is as the five Bishops say, then Evangelicals who have been so loud in their charges against Ritualists for breaking it must themselves be brought to book and compelled to observe it. To mention this is to show the impossibility of the situation created by the Report. Evangelical Churchmen are not prepared to pay any regard to a merely permissive use of the surplice. The surplice is either right or it is wrong. If it is wrong, we ought to know it on irrefragable evidence that admits of no question.

It may be questioned whether the framers of the

The Present Situation. Report have fully realized the consequences of the conclusions to which they have come. Meanwhile, let us see how it is regarded in various quarters. The *Guardian* expresses its great satisfaction with the findings of the Sub-Committee, and considers that the opportunity for toleration is a golden one, and that "the present opportunity for peace

cannot be neglected without grave peril to the Church." Its conclusion is that the surplice and the chasuble should be equally permitted according to the desires of individual parishes. The *Church Times* quotes from the Report the opinion of the Bishops that the Ornaments Rubric is to be prized because it exhibits "our continuity with the past life of the Church," and it pleads for the Rubric to remain unaltered or "elucidated" by any addition, while freedom is allowed to those who are not prepared to obey the order of the Rubric. The *Record* points out that the wearers of Vestments will claim the Report as fully vindicating their position, and "will quote the language of the Report as making the present Rubric mandatory, and so stamping as disloyal all clergy who do not wear the Vestments." It will be seen from these three references how varied and different are the attitudes of Churchmen to this momentous Report. It behoves all Churchmen to read and study it with the greatest care. We have to be cautious about speaking of any document as "epoch-making," but it is hardly too much to say that the present Report is likely to partake of this character. According to the five Bishops, "Vestments are visible symbols of the antiquity and the unity of the Church," and everything will depend upon our view of unity, whether we are prepared to accept or oppose the Vestments. It seems somewhat unreal to say that "if all English clergy wore the chasuble there would be no feeling about any special type of doctrine attached to it." This entirely begs the question at issue. It is because the chasuble has never been worn by the great body of English clergy that such a view is quite untenable. We are thus in the presence of two incompatible positions, and it is essential that the issues shall be squarely faced and settled along the line of principle, not expediency; for, whatever the Report may say, the question does involve principle. This is evident from the article in the *Church Times*, and it is far better to know the truth from those who insist upon the Vestments than from those who do not wear them, whether they be High Churchmen or Evangelicals.

It is probably true to say that in connexion with the Vestments controversy everything, or almost everything, will depend upon Evangelicals. It is truly astonishing that anyone can fail to see that the question, as the Dean of Canterbury truly says, is not what the Vestments were originally or in themselves, but what is their *present use*; and who can doubt that

The
Next Step.

“their present use in the Church of England is avowedly expressive of doctrine, and that their explicit authorization or permission by Convocation would be still more expressive of doctrine, and that that doctrine is neither more nor less than the Roman doctrine of the Mass?”

If, according to the Report of the five Bishops, the Vestments stand for the antiquity and unity of the Church, then they must necessarily have a definite doctrinal meaning, for unity involves a very real doctrine; and thus the question at once becomes one of principle, and not merely one of expediency. If the Vestments are, to use the technical term, the “Mass Vestments” of the Roman Church, they must in some way or other be expressive of the Roman doctrine of the Mass; and since the Anglican doctrine of the Holy Communion is on this side of a “line of deep cleavage” between the Churches of England and Rome, how is it possible to use Vestments without to some degree appearing to approximate in doctrine to the Roman Church? How can the clergy of both Churches wear the same Vestments, and yet hold doctrines flatly opposed to each other? We can, of course, understand the wearing of Vestments in our Church by those who hold a doctrine of the Holy Communion almost identical with that of Rome; but this is not the view of the Prayer Book, or of the Articles, or of our English Church history since the sixteenth century. Why may we not look at facts as they are, and not endeavour to live in cloud-land? We wish to call very special attention to the able and convincing paper by the Dean of Canterbury in the *Record* of February 14. It is a trenchant and conclusive criticism of the main points of the Sub-Committee’s Report. One point more may be noted. The Report says that it is not unreasonable that the dress of

the clergy should differ somewhat in their ministration of the Sacrament from their dress in reading the common prayers. It is somewhat curious that they have entirely omitted a reference to the position of the minister as described in the Prayer Book as "the minister of the Word and Sacraments." If, therefore, it is reasonable to have a distinctive dress in the ministration of the Sacraments, why should there not also be a distinctive dress when they are ministering the Word? Yet, so far as we can see, the Report makes no recommendation for the reintroduction of the black gown or any other distinctive preaching Vestment. As the Dean of Canterbury very rightly says, a distinction between the dress of the clergy when administering the Sacraments and when reading ordinary prayers was not found in the Church for nine or ten centuries at least; and even now, though the Report uses the plural number, we have not yet heard of any serious proposal for a distinctive dress for the Sacrament of Baptism. Again we plead for a consideration of this subject along the line of practical politics, and not of mere theory.

This Bill stood condemned before it was debated in the House of Commons. Its very drastic character was utterly alien from the spirit of the House of Commons, and, indeed, from the spirit of our time; and it was in reality no service to the cause of true Churchmanship to introduce such a Bill into the Commons, for it was foredoomed to failure. At the same time, the amendment in favour of Disestablishment was not a fair or straightforward way of meeting the Bill, but raised an entirely false issue, which enabled a combination of High Churchmen, Non-conformists, and Labour Members to triumph, and score a great victory, through the utter want of tactics on the part of the promoters of the Bill. No doubt there is an increasing number of Churchmen who with no desire whatever for Disestablishment are coming, almost against their will, to the conclusion that only through Disestablishment will the Church be enabled to legislate for herself, and settle these Ritual questions. But

The
Ecclesiastical
Discipline
Bill.

those who advocated Disestablishment on February 14 could hardly have believed that the question was a practical one, or, indeed, would be for a long time to come. Their immediate object was to get rid of an awkward subject, and this they did by putting the Protestants in a dilemma. Meanwhile, the disorders in our Church, which were admitted by speakers on both sides, go on unchecked, and apparently there is no immediate redress. It remains to be seen whether anything will be done in connexion with the proposals which are being drawn up in reply to the Letters of Business. The *Times* considers that the upshot of the debate is "that the Church of England can look forward to a breathing space," and it quotes a Labour Member, who said that Disestablishment was not within practical politics by half a century. We are not at all so sure that the breathing space will last anything like this time. Events have a curious way of hastening towards a conclusion which not even the wisest politician or editor can readily foresee; and it does not require any great degree of foresight and prophecy to predict that the present state of disorder in our Church cannot go on for an indefinite time. We shall see before very long what action is taken on the Letters of Business; and, unless we are greatly mistaken, this action is more likely to precipitate a crisis than anything else.

The deputation to the Prime Minister and the
Simple Bible
Teaching. Minister for Education elicited a noteworthy response on the subject of religious education. The deputation was representative of all parties in the Church and of both great political parties in the State, and the words of the Prime Minister and of Mr. McKenna in response to the deputation were full of hope and encouragement to all those who are striving to prevent the catastrophe of secularism in national education. As the Prime Minister very truly remarked, "When one hears the Bible spoken of as 'corrosive' and 'poisonous' one rubs one's eyes, and wonders whether the type is being read correctly." He may well say that "it goes to one's heart to hear such language." Mr. McKenna was equally plain in

expressing the opinion that "there is no alternative to secular instruction except simple Bible teaching." The deputation was followed by a noteworthy letter in the *Times* from the Bishop of Carlisle. We wish that the entire letter could be circulated throughout the country, for it is one of the most faithful and truly Christian and statesmanlike utterances that we have seen for many a day. We are unable to quote it in full, and must content ourselves with the following extract, which speaks for itself, and needs no comment :

"The English nation is a Christian nation ; and surely the time has now come for it to declare definitely, and with resistless resolution, that in its system of education simple Bible teaching shall be incorporated as an indispensable permanent factor. The experience of thirty years has demonstrated the facility and effectiveness with which this can be done. We hear too much about tests for teachers, too little about trust in teachers. In our teachers of every grade we have a vast host of earnest Christian men and women devoted to the training of children, and loving them with deep, tender, Christian love. No other country in the world can show such a host as ours. Let us cease to suspect our teachers, and learn to confide and glory in them. Throughout the length and breadth of the land we have County Councils and local Education Authorities moved with a consecrated purpose, as their syllabuses prove, to do all in their power to bring Christian inspiration to the help and uplifting of children. Why should we throw this grand educational asset to the winds ? No sound of religious difficulty worth mentioning is heard in the schools themselves. It comes neither from teachers, parents, nor education authorities. We all know where it comes from ; and when we think of Christ and the children the knowledge of its source is a poignant sorrow. Can we not, for the sake of the children and Him who died for them, lay aside our differences and unite together around the footstool of the Divine Fatherhood, whose all-pitying love sent His Son to seek and to save the lost ? If this plain issue of simple Bible teaching can be placed before the nation, who can doubt on which side the verdict would be given ?"

Parents' Rights. It has been very interesting to observe the public attitude on the new question of parental rights. The correspondence in the papers during the past month has proved conclusively that its advocates have not yet progressed very far beyond the formulation of the principle. Its specific applications are still far to seek. The Bishop of Manchester's plan is not regarded as entirely satisfactory by the *Guardian*, which speaks of it as "a little difficult to understand." The *Church Times* will not allow a majority

of parents to settle the question of the religious teaching to be given. Canon Cleworth has his own view of the subject, while other well-known Manchester clergymen like Canon Scott and Canon Nunn have shown with remarkable clearness the difficulties, if not the impossibilities, of the situation. It is perfectly evident that the Bishop of Manchester is not carrying with him some of the leaders of education in his own diocese. All this goes to prove the truth of our quotation in January from the *Westminster Gazette* that "This is a case in which the formula must fit the facts, instead of the facts being evaded by the use of the formula." It is impossible for those who are hostile to the Church to overlook the frankness and significance of the Bishop of St. Asaph's letter to the *Times*, in which he said that the insistence upon parental rights would "take the sting" out of the demand for popular control. No one can have read Canon Nunn's forcible letter in the *Guardian* without being conscious of the striking force of his objections to the principle of parental rights, so far as that principle has been up to the present explained by its supporters. As another correspondent of the *Times* very truly said, it will be necessary for the Church to decide between the maintenance of the Trust Deeds and the insistence upon parental rights, for it is plainly impossible to champion both policies. Once again, then, we ask Churchmen to think out their position a little more clearly, in order that we may know what is involved in this advocacy of parental rights.

Everything that comes from the Bishop of Southwark demands and receives the careful consideration of Churchmen, and it goes almost without saying that his recent Charge is full of good and wise things, to which all Churchmen can give hearty assent and consent. But this makes it the more incumbent upon us to indicate what we are unable to accept. We find a difficulty in the following words of the Bishop as to the Holy Communion :

"I believe that He does there give to us with truest, because ineffable, truth His Body and Blood for food ; and that we rightly think and speak of the bread and wine which are given to us as being that Body and Blood."

We venture to ask, with great respect, whether these words are expressive of anything found in the Church of England formularies, or in representative utterances of English Churchmen prior to the Tractarian Movement. If the words mean what they say, they identify the sign with the thing signified, which our Prayer Book never does. We receive "these Thy creatures of bread and wine," and in the Words of Administration the sign and the thing signified are kept apart even while they are associated. The Body of our Lord "*was given for*" us, the bread and wine *are given to us*. This distinction is surely vital to a true understanding of the sacred ordinance, and we believe it can be proved that in none of the great writers on this subject, from Cranmer, Ridley, and Hooker, to Waterland, Vogan, and Meyrick, will the virtual identification of the outward and inward be found. It is no part of the teaching of the English Church. The gift of the Body and Blood runs parallel with, and is bestowed at the same time as, the bread and wine, but they are never identical. In the Lord's Supper there are two givers, the Lord and the minister. The Lord has never delegated the gift of His Body and Blood to any minister, and when the minister gives the bread and wine, the Lord Himself gives His Body and Blood to the faithful recipient who "does this in remembrance" of his Master. It is imperative that we should have clearness of thought and statement on this important subject, and that we should keep strictly and closely to the language and teaching of Scripture and the Prayer Book.

A Step in Social Reform. In a recent article the Bishop of Birmingham makes the following suggestion :

"We must make our voices as loud and as united as possible in claiming Wages Boards, established with statutable powers, to fix a minimum wage. In my judgment this step is actually the most important step at present in social reform. I would give it the very first place."

It is often asked what can be done to give practical effect to the desire for social reform which is becoming more general almost every month. Here is one answer, and a very definite

one. We entirely agree with the Bishop that the appointment of Wages Boards, with powers to fix a minimum wage, would go very far towards the solution of the great problem of sweating. The demonstration held in London at the end of January, organized by the National Anti-Sweating League, at which the Bishop spoke, was a striking testimony to the imperative need of reform. We must take steps to prevent the middleman from continuing to grind down the poor while reaping splendid profits from their labours. It is of no use whatever complaining of the prices charged by tradespeople, for the secret of the trouble lies, not with the tradesman who sells the goods, but with the middleman, who is the medium between the worker and the tradesman. We hope that Parliament will soon give facilities for the discussion and enactment of the Sweated Industries Bill. When we have obtained Wages Boards, it will soon be seen what a magnificent step forward we have taken in the pathway of true social reform.

Such is the title of an article in the *Church*
 "Fencing the Font." *Times* discussing the question raised by the resignation of the Rev. Roland Allen, to which reference was made in our January number. The article rightly says that "those who advocate the indiscriminate baptism of all children who can be gathered to the administration of the Sacrament have lost touch with the most essential feature of the Church's discipline." Then come these significant words:

"If they are to grow up in ignorance of Christianity, they had far better grow up unbaptized. Conversion will then be for them a more definite thing; how much fuller and richer than if they had a forgotten baptism in their past is known to those who have dealt with souls so placed."

This is admirably said, and should carry all the greater weight because of the quarter from which it comes. The indiscriminate baptism of children is causing serious misgivings and grave concern to not a few earnest clergymen, and is probably the cause of accessions to the ranks of the Baptists, which are utterly unwarranted on the true idea of infant baptism as taught in Scripture and the Prayer Book.

The Cradle of the Anglican Communion.

By A MISSIONARY BISHOP.

THE year upon which we have entered is bound to be full of interest and importance. It may well be epoch-making, both in the history of the Church of England, and her larger relations with other parts of her Communion, and also of her missionary work.

It is the year of the Pan-Anglican Congress, the first of its kind ever held. It is the year of the Lambeth Conference of Bishops. It will also be a year of anxious domestic questions that will touch the religious education of our children, the worship in our churches, and it may be, the continued establishment of a part of our National Church. Many papers are in circulation for the purpose of preparing the public for the really important debates of the coming Congress. There seems to be little doubt that it will attract a great deal of attention, and also influence events.

But, surely, there is a preliminary thought that must be at the back of a good many minds! That thought is concerned, not with other parts of our Communion, nor with the mission-field, but with ourselves. When guests have actually been invited on the largest scale to come and sit down with us in our Home Church life, it is natural to look round and consider whom they will meet, what they will see there, and what sort of home circle we have to show them. The Congress will flood us with problems about new churches in new lands, and some of those problems will be grave indeed. But have we studied our own problems adequately, and have we learnt the lessons that our history should have been able to teach us? The questions which agitate us in the homeland have been necessarily coloured by the controversies that have been acute amongst us from time to time. The missionary point of view and colonial point of view, have been too seldom brought to bear as a searchlight on our home difficulties. Before our friends arrive, let us see what that point of view is likely to be.

How many of those who quarrel about ecclesiastical courts, and magnify ceremonies and usages, and are agitated about dresses, can have breathed the atmosphere, we will say, of an old British Colony! From those parts, many an eye is turned on England now; and those who were born and bred there are heard to say that the England that suddenly in the sixteenth century began to grow into a Greater Britain, was an England that then passed through a Revolution of Church life, which it seems now by many—for it has not been disavowed—is to be “repented of in tears and ashes!”

People out there are quite sure that God would never have trusted a Roman England with the expansion that began at the time of the Reformation. These colonists overflowed, many of them, from the England of Stuart and Commonwealth times. Good Church societies sent them Bibles and Prayer Books, and bade them frame their lives thereby. They were brought up on this good plain food. They have built churches for Christian ministries. And many of them are wondering sorely what has occurred, what new light has come, to make things so uncomfortable and so critical in the old cradle of their faith! They wonder sometimes whether the folks in the old country realize what it really is that has created the intense loyalty they feel for the Sovereign, that makes them, one and all, call England “Home”; and that of late, when England was needing aid in the South African War, made their sons and brothers fall in and rally round the banner. They want to say it was the old Bible and the old Prayer Book that fostered these instincts of loyalty and fellow-citizenship, and they wonder what has happened to discredit the authority of either the one or the other!

Then, again, how many of these stout champions of “Catholic usage” seem ever to have studied either the word or the thing called Catholic? The missionary—whom one or two excellent societies (not the whole Church of England! it does not really care yet) have sent with our Church’s Catholic message, with its Catholic scope for the whole world—he also turns his eye on England from his lonely outpost. In front of him and around

him are huge, agelong hoary systems, that are literally embedded in the beliefs and customs of hundreds of millions of peoples. He believes in the power of God the Holy Ghost to enable him to interpret His message to all these peoples. But it is lonely isolated work. One or two fellow-missionaries now and then cheer him on. But he wants to be quite sure (and especially when he sees how uncertain life is in a difficult and strange climate) about supplies. Is the base all right? Are they still convinced at home that the Cause is a good one? And is there a strong public opinion for the war well maintained? His newspapers arrive, or some of the latest books and reviews, secular and religious. Alas! he finds that, while the world in England can talk of little but races, and amusements, and money-getting, Churchpeople (at least those who talk loudest) are saying that unless their own view of the Holy Communion, of clergy dress, or of what constitutes true Catholicism can obtain, they will divide the Church, and break the old cradle in two. Oh! how he wishes some of these loud talkers and editors could be sent to the frontiers of Christendom for a while, in order that they may correct their sense of perspective, and see things in their true proportion!

These are some of the things that are at the back of many of the minds of those who either will come to see us this year, or who will be represented by others. And it is the knowledge that this is so that makes us long for a few strong words from our present leaders, such as Archbishop Benson gave us at an S.P.G. meeting not very long before his death. He deplored the fashion in some quarters of speaking slightly of the Reformation, and he added that, in his opinion, it was the greatest event in all Church history since the Day of Pentecost. Some of us who have looked on at the steady trend of the Oxford Movement from a colonial and missionary atmosphere, are perfectly sure of this. There are many danger-signals on our home horizon. The last thing that certain leaders desire is to have public attention focused on those signals. But as there must be many who are open to conviction, we venture to voice

once again the ancient prophet's appeal: "Consider your ways."

How the Church of England became the cradle of the nation, Englishmen cannot be too often told. How it united hostile tribes and made them into one people, how it built up family life, philanthropies and our free institutions, may no Englishman ever be suffered to forget! And no history of England is fair or honest that omits to show these facts. All this must be postulated in the inquiry before us here and now, which is this: "How was the Cradle of the Anglican Communion formed?"

What exactly is meant by the Anglican Communion will be more fully shown presently. For the present let it stand for something outside Britain, a growth that began to happen at a certain time, after long centuries of isolation, and that, in our opinion, is traceable to certain causes now to be briefly indicated.

A short time ago we stood by that pillar of the old Abbey of Bury St. Edmunds, that records in brass the names of the Barons of England who swore on that spot that King John should be made to sign the Magna Charta. That document said: "The Church of England shall be free." But it was a long time before that freedom actually came to pass! And it was at a very terrible price that it was bought. Next in the chain of events after that document must be mentioned Wycliffe's English Bible. To a missionary who is accustomed in these days to learn the language of the tribe to whom he is sent, and to make it his first duty to translate into that language the Holy Scriptures, it is amazing that a Native Church was built up here in England, and that many centuries were allowed to roll by before it was thought necessary to translate the Bible into the language spoken by the rank and file of the people. And, even then, it was left to private initiative to do this thing that was destined so profoundly to influence the Church and nation in days to come. Here, surely, is the *fons et origo* of that movement which we have described as the formation of the Cradle of the Anglican Communion. It was more. Here began to be fixed for us our English language; and in God's Providence

the discovery of the art of printing furnished the means of diffusing these Scriptures more widely than had otherwise been possible. The century or so that elapsed between Wycliffe's Bible and the breach with Rome was a time when a public opinion on Church matters was being slowly but steadily formed. It is easy for us to see now, as we look back from the twentieth century, that a collision with Rome was bound to come. It becomes obvious that it would be impossible for men to read the New Testament for long without calling in question many of the developments in Church doctrine and practice that had hitherto been accepted without protest. And it stands to reason that a Church and Nation cannot be arrested, awakened, made repentant, and willing to "do the first works" again, without a great many things taking place that many now, in their greater wisdom and experience, might regret. But who was to blame? The verdict of history will be the Church herself. She had left undone what she ought to have done. She had done what she ought not to have done. It is the veriest attempt to throw dust in the eyes for writers to claim for Henry VIII., Edward VI., or Elizabeth, that they brought about the English Reformation, and that unworthy actions and aims and ends influenced it, and that unworthy men were instruments of it. It was not possible for even Tudor Kings to legislate ahead of public opinion. Not Henry VIII.'s wives, but the Holy Scriptures in the vernacular, affected the freedom of the Church of England, and framed the Cradle of the Anglican Communion for her future world-wide influence; and it is impossible to read the history of those times (with which every one should be familiar) without finding in the very characters of the chief actors, in their rapacity, or their despotism, in their self-seeking, in their intolerance, evidence—all the stronger for these very reasons—that God was working His purpose out, and was using them, as He has used many others, for His great ends. And, so far from blaming and criticizing the good men and true that dared to stand up for the new light and the new learning about the old theology, and take the consequences, let us honestly admit that they were great men, had great minds

and noble souls, and that they never did a greater service to true religion in England than when they helped to fashion our Book of Common Prayer very much as we have it now, and were content, many of them, to seal their testimony with their blood.

The story has just been told over in the United States of America, by the Bishop of London, of the grain of mustard-seed "blown ashore," as he put it, at Jamestown, Virginia, exactly three hundred years ago. That was some four years after James I. had come to the throne. The era of the expansion of England had begun. To watch this overflow movement, and guide and influence it in the best way, was, before long, seen by a few devoted sons of the Church of England to be a plain duty. And towards the close of that same century (the seventeenth) the S.P.C.K. and the S.P.G. were founded by private enterprise for this very purpose. If any man doubts as to the beneficence of these movements, let him move about the United States of America, or Canada, or the West Indies; let him go to South Africa or Australia to-day, and he will find Churchmen who will tell him that their Church followed them, through these Societies, with Bibles and Prayer Books and churches and ministries, to these new lands, and helped them to become what they are to-day. If a tree may be judged by its fruits, this, surely, is no unworthy outcome of a Reformed Church movement that had scarcely settled down in the homeland to its new conditions!

But more was to follow. In this very same Reformed Church, in the midst of a period of reaction, when confidence in the future of the Church was so slender that Bishop Butler refused the Primacy, because he thought he saw Ichabod written over the Establishment—at that moment the power of the Word of God—so honoured, at least in the services of the Church, and so free, through the Reformation struggle, to be read by anybody—asserted itself in an unmistakable way. A great spiritual revival set in. The Church of England did not, alas! know how to guide and use it. Much of it took the form of modern Methodism. Under its influence, however, a movement

was inaugurated within the Church at the close of the eighteenth century (again by private enterprise) to deal, not this time with the Empire, but with "the uttermost part of the earth." And the C.M.S. stands to-day, after 108 years, for the greatest missionary movement that has yet been seen, gathering round itself loyal members of this now awakening Church of England, who believe intensely in the old Gospel, who believe in the Holy Ghost, and who find in the call to preach the Gospel to every creature the true mission of the Holy Catholic Church. We look in vain back to medieval times for any work in the Empire and beyond the Empire, such as these herein recorded; and we do not hesitate to assert that, in these daughter and sister Churches, whose Bishops and clergy and lay members are coming, representatively, to be our guests in this year of our Lord, 1908, we receive those whose genesis and nurture and growth can directly, and indirectly, be surely traced to this historic cradle of what we can now intelligently call the Anglican Communion. What all this means of opportunity and responsibility for us we must consider in another paper.



Messages from the Epistle to the Hebrews.

BY THE BISHOP OF DURHAM.

IX.—HEBREWS XI. (b).

WE considered last month the account of faith with which the apostolic writer opens this great recital of faith's "life, work, and triumph" in holy human lives. His words, as we found, lend themselves to some variety of explanation in detail: *ὑπόστασις* alone may be interpreted in at least three ways. But I do not think that this need disturb us as to the essential meaning of the description. Each and all the renderings leave us with the thought that faith has a power in it to make the hoped-for act upon us as if it were attained, and the invisible as if it were before our eyes.

We may pause so far further over this description here as to point out that it is precisely this—a description, not a definition. To quote Heb. xi. 1 as a good definition of faith is to mistake its import altogether. I have often recalled, in speech or writing, a story told me forty years ago by an Oxford friend when we were masters together at a public school. He had attended a Greek Testament lecture at college a few years before, and the lecturer one day asked the class for a definition of faith. Some one quoted Heb. xi. 1, and the lecturer's answer was, "You could not have given a worse definition." My old friend, a Broad Churchman, but a most reverent one withal, referred to this as an instance of painful flippancy. It may have been so. But I am prepared to think that the lecturer may not have meant it so at all: He may only have expressed rather crudely his view (the right view, to my mind) that we have here not a definition of faith at all, but a description of faith as an operative force, a statement of what faith looks like when it is at work, which is a very different matter.

What is a definition? A precise and exclusive account of the essentials of a thing, such that it will fit no other thing. A description may be something altogether different from this. It may so handle the object that the terms are not exclusive at all, but are equally applicable to something else; as here, for example, where the phraseology would equally well describe imagination in its more vivid forms—a thing as different as possible from faith. To be quite practical, we have here, if we read this first verse in the light of the whole subsequent development of the chapter, a description of faith at work, of the potency and victories of faith, rather than a definition of faith in its distinctive essence. A true parallel to this passage is the familiar sentence, "Knowledge is power." Those words do not define knowledge, obviously; to do that would demand a totally different phrase, such as "sure apprehension of fact," or the like. What the words do is to give us one great resultant of knowledge; to tell us that the possession and use of it endows the man who knows with a force and efficiency which he would

lack without it. Few words are more elastic and adaptable than the verb substantive. “*Is*” can denote a wide variety of ideas, from that of personal identity, as when I see that yonder distant figure *is* my brother ; to that of equivalence, as when a stamped and signed piece of thin paper called a bank-note *is* five pounds of gold ; or to that of mere representation, as when another piece of paper, or a sheet of canvas, duly lined and coloured by the artist to show the semblance of a human face, *is* the King, or *is* the Prime Minister, or *is* my father ; or to that of result and effect, as when we say that knowledge *is* power, or that seeing *is* believing.¹

Here we have precisely that last application of the verb-substantive, only in an exact and most noble antithesis. “Seeing is believing,” says the familiar proverb. “Believing is seeing,” says the Divine word here. That is to say, when the human soul so relies upon God that His word is absolute and sufficient for its certainties, its faith has in it the potency of sight. It is as sure of the promised blessing as if it were a present possession. It is as ready to act upon “the things not seen as yet,” the laws and powers and hopes beyond the veil, as if all was in open view to the eyes of the body.

The whole course of the chapter, when it comes down to particulars and persons, bears this out. From first to last the message carried to us by the lives and actions of the faithful is this, that they took their Lord at His word, simply as His word, and in the power of that reliance found themselves able to act as if the unseen were seen and the hoped-for were present. “*The elders*” (ver. 1) are in view from the first—that is to say, the pre-Christian saints, who were in *that* sense distinctively men who proved the power of faith, that they all lived and died before the visible fulfilment of the great promise of salvation. To them, to be sure, or rather to many of them, not to all, merciful helps were granted. The unseen and the hoped-for

¹ It is obvious that these elementary reflections have everything to do with the need of caution in explaining the sacred words, “This *is* My body which is given for you.”

was sometimes, not always, made more tangible to them by the grant of some sign and token, some portent or miracle, by the way. But the careful Bible-reader knows how very little such things are represented in the holy histories as being the "daily bread" of the life of the old believers. Even in the lives where they occur most often they come at long and difficult intervals, and in some lives not at all, or hardly at all. And assuredly we gather here that, to the mind of the apostolic writer, no experience of miracles, no permission even to hold direct colloquy with the Eternal, ever made up for that immeasurable "aid to faith" which we enjoy who know the Incarnation as fact, and walk on an earth which has seen the God-man traverse it, and die upon it, and rise again.

These "elders" were men called to live, in an eminent and most trying degree, not by sight, but by faith, by sheer reliance upon a Promiser. And therefore their living witness to the capacity of faith to make the unseen seen and the hoped-for present is the more precious to us. We, with the Christ of God manifested to us, displayed in history, experienced in the heart—what are not we to find the power of faith to be in our lives, having this supreme seal upon faith, the promise fulfilled, the Image of the Invisible God made one with our nature and dwelling in our hearts?

One partial exception, and only one, to this great ruling lesson of the chapter is to be noted; it occurs in the second verse. There "by faith we perceive that the worlds," the æons, the dispensations and evolutions of created being, "have been framed," perfected, adjusted to one another, "by the Word of God, so that not from things which appear has that which is seen originated." These words appear to be inserted where they stand in order, so to speak, to carry the sequence of the references to the Old Testament down from its very first page. The work of faith has exercise in face of the mysterious narrative of Creation, and in this one instance the exercise is quoted as for us now quite as much as for "the elders." They like us, we like them, get our guarantee as to the facts of the

primal past, not by sight, but by faith, by taking God at His word. He, in His revelation, tells us that "in the beginning"—the beginning of whatever existence is other than eternal—"God created": things finite, things visible, came into original being not as evolved from previous similar material, but as of His will.

But when that noble and pregnant side-word has been said, the argument settles itself at once upon the recorded examples of the potency of faith as "the elders" exercised it. We see man after man enabled to treat the invisible as visible, the promised as present, by reliant rest upon the Word of God, however conveyed. Somehow, to Abel it was divinely said that the sacrificed "firstling" was the acceptable offering, and, antecedent to any possible experience, he offered it. Somehow, to Enoch it was made known that the Eternal, as invisible to him as to us, cared for man's worshipping company, and he addressed himself through his age-long life to "walk with God." Noah was apprised, for the first time in man's known history, of an approaching cataclysm and of the way of escape; the promise, which came to him wrapped in the cloud of an awful warning, was long delayed, but he acted upon it in the steady energy of faith. Abraham was "called," we know not precisely how, but in some way which tested his reliance on things "not seen as yet," and he set out on that wonderful life of a hundred years of faith. He renounced the settled habits and old civilization of Chaldea for the new life of a Syrian nomad, "settling permanently in a tent" (*ἐν σκηναῖς κατοικήσας*), he and his son and his grandson after him, all in view of an invisible future made visible by the trusted promise, a future culminating at last to his "eye of faith," so here we are solemnly assured, in the city of the saints, in the Canaan of the heavens. The same reliance on the sheer word of promise nerved him to the awful ordeal of the all-but immolation of his son. And that son in his turn, against all appearances, and rather bowing to the Word than embracing it, blessed *his* least-loved son above his dearest; and that son in his turn, and his son in his turn, carried the process on, treating

the greatness of Ephraim and the deliverance from Egypt as things seen and present, because God had so spoken. The parents of Moses, and then Moses himself in his strange life of disappointments and wonders, deal likewise with the future, the unseen, the seemingly impossible, on the warrant of a promise. Figures as little heroic in natural character as Sarah, as little noble in life as Rahab, take place in the long procession, as those who treat the invisible as visible by faith. And so do the thronging "elders" of ver. 32—a group singularly diverse in everything but this victory over the seen and present by faith in a promise. And so do the unnamed confessors and martyrs of the closing paragraph, the heartbroken, the tortured, the wanderers of the dens and caves, who all alike, amidst ten thousand differences of condition and of character, "obtained a good report through faith"; and all won through faith that victory, so great when we reflect upon it, that they died "not having received the promise." They trusted *to the very end*. When they fell in their shadowy path of pilgrimage, "the promise," the promised Christ, had not yet come. Nevertheless, they treated the hope of Him as fact, and they won their victory by faith.

And now they are parts and members of the "great cloud" who watch us in our turn—us, with things unseen and hoped-for still in front, but with JESUS at our side.



A Layman's Thoughts on Old Testament Criticism.

By P. J. HEAWOOD, M.A.

I.

SOME time ago a friend lent me Professor G. A. Smith's "Lectures on Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament." As a layman interested in Theology, whose University work lies in other directions, I wanted a general reasoned statement of the "critical" position which did not

(like so much that is written in this wide field) beg the fundamental questions at issue. A few casual notes made at first led, as I had time, to a fuller examination, and the results were both interesting and surprising. The book is not now new, but it is still recommended by critical authorities, and may at least serve as a text for the general consideration of what is commonly said and thought on the subject. Space will here allow of only a brief résumé, leaving out of account the excellent practical advice on the value of the Old Testament to the preacher.

In Professor Smith's book we notice the familiar tendency to begin with an assumption. Long before any reasoned view has been put forward, we find the question-begging statement with respect to the Jewish Canon—that "virtually it began in the reign of King Josiah." But we soon reach the first point which deserves examination—that of the attitude towards the Old Testament shown by New Testament writers and by Christ Himself.

It is claimed that they enforce "the duty of Old Testament criticism," which is exemplified in the first instance by our Lord's treatment of the provisions of the Law of Moses in the Sermon on the Mount. Beginning with statements all might admit, the language used gathers force as it proceeds, until we are told that He "rejected some parts of the Law itself," and, later, that "He came . . . to judge the Law"; and that, "while there are parts of it which He renounced by simply leaving them silently behind Him, there are other parts upon which He turned with spoken condemnation." Before examining this we must see where the issue really lies. All agree that the old code of civil and criminal administration was not intended to continue such for the Jews, still less for Gentile Christians. That the Gospel was an "advance" upon the Law, doing what it could not do, is reiterated by St. Paul. Christ "brought life and incorruption to light through the Gospel" (2 Tim. i. 10). The question is whether, in turning men's eyes from the bondage of the letter to the freedom of the spirit, He enlarged the scope

of the old Commandments, or (as our author would have it) contradicted them; and, further, whether He treated them as having a true Divine sanction, as being (for their intended purpose) a true expression of the will of God, and, as such, of permanent significance for us; or whether, though based on right principles, their details are to be approved or condemned on their merits, according to the judgment of an enlightened conscience. Now, in the striking contrasts which Christ makes between the sayings of old and His own precepts, many of the latter are plainly extensions rather than contradictions of the Law of Moses, as where He puts lust and anger on the same footing with adultery and murder. The command which said, "Love thy neighbour," did not add, "Hate thine enemy," but, indeed, implied the contrary in personal differences (Lev. xix. 16-18); so *it* again does not stand condemned. Nor, indeed, can this be fairly said even of the law of divorce. As far as it went it put a check on the Eastern tendency to treat divorce as quite an easy matter, by the formality which it prescribed *if* a wife was to be put away (Deut. xxiv. 1). The ordinance, "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" (Exod. xxi. 24; Lev. xxiv. 20; Deut. xix. 21), is the one instance where contradiction may be plausibly represented. Yet even here the legal enactment is not exactly in the same plane with that which Christ is urging. It is the *sufferer* to whom He points a more excellent way than that of seeking legal redress at all. It does not follow that the law is condemned as a principle of strict justice, or in its application to some conditions of society. Compare the parable of the Unforgiving Servant and Christ's comment upon it (Matt. xviii. 23-35).

Now, turning to His statements about the Law generally, we find a sanctity attached to its commandments quite inconsistent with criticism of the kind supposed: "Think not that I came to destroy the Law or the Prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the Law till all things be accomplished." These words form the

preface to those very comments we have been considering, as though to guard against a misapprehension of their tendency. They are very hard to explain away. It is supposed indeed that they only refer to "the ideal or essential part of the Law." This, it is said, Christ on more than one occasion "extracted . . . and defined it as the whole." In support of this the words are quoted, "Whatsoever ye wish that men should do to you, so also do ye to them, for this is the Law and the Prophets" (Matt. vii. 12); and "On these two commandments hangeth all the Law" (Matt. xxii. 40). But it can hardly be said that in these two passages the Law is *set aside* in favour of its essential principles; and the metaphor of the jot and the tittle is quite unmeaning as applied to such an ideal substratum, referring naturally to the smaller details. This appears plainly from what follows: "Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. v. 19). So, later on, Christ opposes the traditions of men to the "commandment of God," as embodied in specific provisions of the Law—one an instance of its severity towards heinous offenders: "He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death" (Matt. xv. 3, 4; Mark vii. 9, 10). To the Law He directs inquirers (Luke x. 26; Matt. xix. 17, etc.). And the words (Matt. xi. 13; Luke xvi. 16), "the Law and the Prophets were until John; from that time the kingdom of God is preached," hastily taken as ascribing "the character of transitoriness to the whole of the Old Testament," are followed in St. Luke by the statement that "it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one tittle of the Law to fall."

In view of such words it is astonishing to hear (as quoted from Professor Denney) that Christ's ideas are "indifferent" to the Law, "either as a historic document or as a national institution"; and when we come to points in which He is said to have neglected the Law in practice, we find only what is doubtful or irrelevant. It is not at all clear that "He broke away from the literal observance of the Sabbath Law," or that *in practice* "He reckoned all foods as lawful." When He pointed out that

taking food has not in itself power to defile a man, the immediate reference was not to forbidden meats, but to eating with unwashed hands (Matt. xv. 2, 20, etc.). To say that "He touched the leper and did not feel Himself unclean" (when the leper was healed with the touch!) is a piece of perversity showing the hollowness of the case. It seems almost superfluous to quote any of the familiar passages in which He speaks as if His own work and destiny were rigidly determined by the language of the Law and the Prophets (*e.g.*, Matt. xxvi. 54; Mark xiv. 49; Luke xxiv. 44; John xiii. 18).

The attitude of the Apostles must be referred to very briefly. Their view of the abiding value of the Old Testament is so fully recognized that here all might seem to be conceded; but much is made of difficulties raised by some looseness of quotation, the use of the LXX as well as the Hebrew, and by some Apocryphal references (though the extreme rarity of these in the case of books included in the LXX—which are not cited as Scripture—is a striking testimony to the distinctness of the Jewish Canon). Two instances are given which deserve examination. It is said that in 1 Cor. xv. 55 "the Greek enables" St. Paul "to quote some words of Hosea" (xiii. 14) "in an opposite sense from that in which the prophet employed them." To begin with, the words are not strictly "quoted." If, after quoting Isa. xxv. 8 (Hebrew), the Apostle goes on to adopt Hosea's words as his own, it is not to make any use of the fact that they had been written by the prophet. Then, it seems that both the LXX and St. Paul do (probably) correctly represent the actual Hebrew. If so, Hosea's¹ words would naturally mean what St. Paul seems to mean. The rhetorical question, "Where are thy plagues?" should, by all analogy, be intended to minimize their power. (Compare Hos. xiii. 10; Isa. xxxvi. 19; Jer. xxxvii. 19; Mic. vii. 10.) It is only because of the sudden transition in what follows (almost paralleled in other parts of the book) that some great authorities

¹ If we render, with R.V. margin, "I will be," the turn of expression is different, but the words still express triumph over death.

suppose that death is thus summoned to destroy. But, further, it is only the inherent force of the words which settles *St. Paul's* meaning. If they could be understood to magnify the power of death, that would suit *his* purpose equally well. The words which follow "The sting of death is sin . . ." would then be an explanation of this admitted power, answered by the final words of triumph. In any case the dogmatic assertion of opposition depends upon a mere assumption. Perhaps *St. Paul* knew as well as we do what *Hosea* meant.

The next instance is even more astonishing. It is argued that when *St. Paul* says (1 Cor. ix. 9), "Doth God take care for oxen? or doth He say it altogether for our sakes?"—hardly an adequate translation—"he calls the literal meaning of the passage impossible, and substitutes for it a metaphorical application of his own." Can it be thought that his statement of the *purpose* of the command denies its literal *application*? As well might he be taken to deny the events in the history of *Israel*, of which he says that they "happened unto them τυπικῶς," for examples to us. These attempts to make capital out of *St. Paul's* Old Testament quotations do not seem very happy ones.

We must hardly follow our author in detail when he proceeds on his own account to criticize what he calls the "cruel tempers of the old dispensation" in language which demands a strong word of protest. To his argument, that much of the harsh and intolerant spirit of Christian times is due to a misuse of the Old Testament, it might suffice to say that the principle is entirely false which would condemn what has been abused. That would often condemn what is best; in fact, the words of our Lord Himself have been perverted. But there has been no excuse, with the New Testament before us, for such misapplications of the Jewish Law. Further, if it had been really followed, there would have been little to complain of. How can the assignment of the death penalty to those worst foes of society, who terrorized over their neighbours by pretended dealings with the unseen, be made an excuse for the barbarous treatment of persons who claimed no such powers, merely because cruelty, bigotry, and superstition dared to shelter themselves under such a plea?

But we must pass on from what is thus generally put forward as justifying a free treatment of the Old Testament to the beginnings of criticism itself, based, as we are reminded, on indications of composite structure in the narrative. This in some shape no one is concerned to deny. It is only so far as real discrepancies and incongruities are brought to light that other questions arise, though even these carry us a very little way in the direction which we are finally asked to take. We must briefly examine some actual instances, beginning with cases of "doublets"—a term which, by the way, seems to be applied to very different things: (1) Double accounts of the same event; (2) accounts of two similar events, which may or may not be identical; (3) a single account, supposed to be a combination of two different accounts on the ground of some apparent inconsistencies. First comes the so-called "double account of creation" in Gen. i., ii., which involves many questions too difficult to deal with incidentally, though we may notice that it is hardly accurate to speak of this as of alternative accounts of the same thing, whereas the second is mainly confined to the immediate surroundings of man. What we are asked to notice is differences of phraseology pointing to difference of origin. Besides the striking difference in the Divine names, there is the use of "create" in chaps. i.-ii. 4, and of "make" or "form" in chap. ii. 4, etc.; while "beasts of the earth" in the former is replaced by "beasts of the field" in the latter. If we trace the usage of these phrases, we find them sometimes quite near together (*e.g.*, in Ezekiel), while in Job they occur in adjoining verses. And their use suggests a certain difference of idea: "beasts of the earth" (which is less frequent) seems to be the wider term, while "beasts of the field" are usually wild beasts viewed in connexion with man or living in his neighbourhood. Thus, in Job v. 22, 23, "Neither shalt thou be afraid of the beasts of the earth," gives the general negation; "The beasts of the field shall be at peace with thee"—*i.e.*, wild animals within range, to which alone could the statement apply. So far as it goes, this exactly corresponds to

the distinction between the generality of Gen. i. and the limitation of Gen. ii. to the domain of man. So between the words for "form" and "create," which stand side by side in Amos iv. 13 ("He that formeth the mountains and createth the wind . . ."), a certain distinction appears, the latter being more distinctly appropriate to Divine origination, while the former (used specifically of the potter) suggests the bringing of a thing to a definite material shape or condition. These chapters present a remarkable problem; but such instances at least suggest how easy it is to mistake for signs of different authorship differences due to a nice adjustment of words to the ideas to be expressed.

The difference in the Divine names here and elsewhere is certainly noteworthy. The idea that it might be made the basis for a division of the Pentateuch into its component parts had at least the merit of simplicity; but we learn that this taken by itself "would have led to nothing but confusion." It has, in fact, been superseded by more intricate theories.

As to the "double account" of the naming of Bethel, we only stop to notice that Jacob's second visit is but the complement of the first, *fulfilling its conditions* (Gen. xxviii. 22). Then, of Israel, it is not at all clear that in Gen. xxxv. 9, 10, "the origin of the name Israel is dated at Bethel," since the resumptive clause referring to Padan Aram seems to dissociate these verses from the rest.

A doublet of the third kind is found in Josh. vi., where in the single account of the taking of Jericho it is said that "two stories have been interwoven, but are still distinguishable"! One, it is supposed, represented Israel as marching round six days in silence, while on the seventh day they shouted at the word of Joshua; in the other, a portion of the armed men marched round seven times in one day, and at the seventh the people shouted at the signal of the trumpets. But it is not shown that there is any inconsistency in the narrative as we have it, in which the city is compassed once a day for six days and seven times on the seventh. The *silence of voice* on the six days is not inconsistent with the *blowing of trumpets*; and the

distinction between shouting *at the word of Joshua* and *at a special signal of the trumpets* seems quite trivial, if we reflect that his word could hardly be conveyed to the whole host except by some such signal. It is gravely asserted that in ver. 20 "the people shout both before and after the trumpets," as though the order of verbs were necessarily that of actions! The exuberance of the repetitions is what seems to give force to the argument, but we find many examples of this characteristic of Hebrew style. Take, *e.g.*, a non-narrative chapter like Ezek. xviii., or the repetitions in Exod. xxv.-xxxi., xxxv.-xl.

We must just allude here to the case of Chronicles and Samuel-Kings, which form a veritable doublet on the largest scale, though very summarily treated by Professor Smith. A point he insists on is that, "when the parallel narratives . . . are compared, it is found that the chronicler has increased the numbers of the troops engaged in the campaigns described, of the men slain, and of the slaves, the cattle and the objects of value taken captive or brought as tribute to the victors." It would hardly be imagined from this how comparatively few the cases are where direct comparison is possible, *still less that the excess in numbers is by no means all on one side*. But want of space precludes a sufficiently detailed analysis to be useful. Some general considerations with respect to the character of the divergencies will be given in the sequel.



Fast^{ing}.¹

BY THE REV. T. S. TREANOR, M.A.

"WHY do we and the Pharisees fast oft, but Thy disciples fast not?" (Matt. ix. 14). This question was put to our Lord either at or in close connexion with the feast in "the house," probably that of Matthew the Publican.

¹ Suggested by an article on this subject by the Rev. C. Rumfitt, LL.D., CHURCHMAN, March, 1906.

The fasts of John's disciples were not the result of grief for the imprisonment of their Master, but were part and parcel of his ascetic conformity with the many fasts of the stricter traditional party among the Jews. "For John came neither eating nor drinking." Nor were the frequent fasts of the Pharisees of Divine appointment, for the only fast prescribed by the Law was the Day of Atonement; and the word used in the LXX is not "fast," but the more significant one, "to afflict the soul" (*ταπεινωὺν τὴν ψυχὴν*), which at once directs the mind to the inward and spiritual cause of the outward action of fasting. Our Lord's reply to the question was a justification of His disciples' non-fasting practice: "Can the children of the bride-chamber mourn?" and therefore, of course, equivalent to a direct statement that they did not fast. This was a distinct break with the existing religious usage of a merely traditional description. "They do not fast" (*οὐ νηστεύουσιν*) was true of the disciples and of their Master, and "Wisdom is justified of her children." "But," our Lord continues, "the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast"—a passage I reserve for consideration farther on; and He then immediately adds the parables of the new piece patched on the old garment and the danger of putting new wine into old bottles—parables which render it impossible to believe that there was any imposition of traditional Jewish rites, ordinances, and "elements of the world" in the following verse 15. For, as well expressed by Alford: "These words" (ver. 15) "are not a declaration of a duty or of an ordinance as binding on the Church in the days of the Lord's absence. The whole spirit of what follows is against such a supposition."

The parables of our Lord which follow are those already mentioned, "the new patch on the old garment," and "the new wine in old bottles"; and they undoubtedly teach that the old traditional system of prescribed fasts must not be patched with the Christian freedom of His own Evangel, and that the glorious liberty of the sons of God "must not be engrafted on the worn-out system of ceremonies," nor the new wine of

Christian principle that "there is nothing from without a man that entering into him can defile him," be poured into Judaic ceremonial observances of mere traditional authority.

Accordingly, in the Christian Church no such burden was laid on the Gentiles who were turned to God, as recorded in Acts xv. ; while the Jewish members of the early Church were, as we read, not compelled to abandon the vows—purifications and fastings—of the Jewish observance.

After Apostolic times the appointment of fasts was of human and ecclesiastical origin. The Lenten fast, whether of forty hours—the time that our Saviour lay in the grave—or of forty days, was probably the earliest, and varied greatly in point of time in many Churches.

But fasts and the habit of fasting increased immensely with the rise of monasticism. In Egypt, Syria, and elsewhere, anchorites, eremites, pillar saints, vied with each other in bodily mortifications, fastings, and austerities, which were supposed to be pleasing to God, and even meritorious in His sight, in direct proportion to their severity.

These were the days of Simon Stylites and Antony of Egypt and their innumerable followers, whose opinions on the meritorious efficacy of fastings and other austerities, and the deepening of spiritual life by these and similar "bodily exercises," may be summed up in the lines attributed to Andreas of Crete, about A.D. 635: "Smite them by the virtue of the Lenten fast"—a grievous error and popular delusion. For the best and holiest of our works, though they have "a dutiful necessity, have no meritorious dignity"; and the further question is whether fasting does belong to the category of such our best and holiest actions, and whether it does deepen the spiritual life at all in the light of the Saviour's words: "No man putteth a piece of new cloth unto an old garment."

Alas! the whole history of the Christian Church is a proof that man will put the new cloth to the old garment and patch Christian truths on to Judaic rites, making, indeed, the rent worse. The robe must be all new, for old things have in fulfil-

ment passed away ; and, to change the image, the robe we need is not the old one of burdens and prescriptions and austerities—hardly in themselves to be termed good works at all—but that robe the warp and weft of which are the blood and righteousness of Jesus—the wedding garment washed white in the blood of the Lamb.

The first of the passages of the New Testament which refer to fasting is Matt. vi. 16-18, "Moreover, when ye fast" (κ.τ.λ.), where Christ speaks of it in the same connexion as almsgiving and prayer. Our Lord was speaking of practices, some of the highest moral obligation, and others not at all on the same level ; and it is inconceivable that, because He speaks of these practices in the same passage, He thereby intended to place them all on the same platform as almsgiving and prayer, duties of natural and eternal obligation. What He did do was to warn against the ostentation of fasting, and to suggest the "when" of fasting. That fasting is legitimate is not disputed ; but when ? That kings and people fasted in Old Testament history is certain ; but "when" ? That the Apostles fasted is admitted, but they did not impose this on the Gentiles. That "fasting" took place among these same Apostles in the appointment of Saul and Barnabas as missionaries to the Gentiles is undoubted ; but it is not to be believed that it was practised on any of these occasions as a "godly exercise," or as "a means of deepening the religious life," but that it was in all these cases the result of either deep sorrow, or intense concentration in prayer, or the agony of heartfelt repentance towards God.

Only, therefore, as the result of these profound spiritual emotions is fasting legitimized in the Christian religion. It is not and cannot be the cause of these the holiest conditions of the human soul, and it ought not to be spoken of as "a great means of grace." As the natural and unforced outcome of sorrow and repentance, our Lord spoke of it when He said, "When ye fast." To regard it as "a great religious exercise," as "a means of grace," and tending to create repentance and a

“deepening of the spiritual life,” is simply to turn the truth upside-down, and to place the consequence first and the cause last. Our Lord never prescribed fasting. The passage in Matt. ix. 15, “The days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast,” is simply prophetic, and is not a declaration of a duty or ordinance, but a statement in the future tense, “they will fast,” and have real occasion of sorrow enough (*νηστεύουσιν*); and the words are followed by the weighty and far-reaching parable against patching the old system of Jewish prescription and ceremonies with the freedom of the Gospel of His glory.

As to the Days of Fasting or Abstinence in the Book of Common Prayer, it must be remembered that there is reason to suppose that this table had reference to a political rather than a religious purpose. As the Homily on Fasting, part ii., says: “Such abstinences as are appointed by . . . laws made by princes are upon policy not respecting any religion at all in the same.” And Act 5 Elizabeth, which imposes similar abstinence on the old Romish days, expressly enacts that whosoever shall publicly declare that “any eating of fish or forbearing of flesh mentioned therein is of any necessity for the saving of the soul of man, or that it is the service of God, any otherwise than as other politick laws are and be, that then such persons shall be punished as the spreaders of such news are and ought to be.”

This abstinence or fasting was enjoined in the fishing interest under severe penalties; and in the opinion of Archbishop Whately, in his “Cautions for the Times” (pp. 188, 189), a list of such days was appended to the calendar, and the minister was required to give public notice of them every Sunday. “The coincidence of these fasting days with days set apart for purely religious purposes,” the same authority says, “fostered a confusion between the religious and political observance of them.” But on any hypothesis as to the reason of inserting these “Tables of Days of Fasting or Abstinence,” it is clear that on any day or in any season, unless fasting be the natural result and outcome of bitter sorrow for sin and repentance, or deep

concentration of thought on holy things, it is of the same value as scourging oneself or similar physical mortifications. Given this preliminary condition of soul, the agony of remorse, the bitterness of repentance for irrevocable sins, fasting is a necessity, and the natural expression of the inner feelings. This condition of the spirit it is which alone makes fasting legitimate on any day or in any of the seasons of the Church.

Nor is fasting to be regarded as one of "the three great means of grace, without which a Christian cannot be made perfect." Neither ought it to be spoken of as "the greatest religious exercise." Nor has it anything to do with the words in the Communion Service: "It is much to be wished that the godly discipline of the primitive Church might be restored again." That "godly discipline" consisted in open penance for notorious sin, but it has no reference whatever to fasting. There is, indeed, a passage in the last prayer but one of the Communion Service: "Be favourable to Thy people who turn to Thee in weeping, fasting, and praying," where fasting is manifestly spoken of, "not as a positive duty in itself, but as, like weeping, a natural expression of deep sorrow; and the Church plainly no more enjoins fasting here than it enjoins weeping, nor prescribes a measure of abstinence than it prescribes a measure of tears."

It cannot, therefore, be allowed for a moment that fasting is "one of the means" of deepening the life of the Church. Nor does it tend to self-control or to the subjection of the flesh to the Spirit. Bishop Taylor says: "In actions which are less material, such as pride and envy, and blasphemy and impenitence, and all the kinds and degrees of malice, external mortifications do so little co-operate to their cure, that oftentimes they are their greatest incentives and inflamers. . . . And besides that great mortifiers have been soonest assaulted by the spirit of pride, we find that great fasters are naturally angry and choleric. St. Hierome found it in himself, and Ruffinus felt some of the effects of it" ("Life of Christ," Part I., S. viii., § 17).

The advocates of fasting "as the greatest religious exercise"

always put forward as its alternative what may be called the "full-meal" argument, and ring the changes on the "full-meal" practice of congregations. Nothing can be more unfair or more utterly opposed to the facts of the case. Moderate participation in simple food, "sanctified by the word of God and prayer," ought not to be described as the "full meal," after which "congregations in some services are so sleepy because they have come directly from the dinner-table." As a matter of fact, the people who do come to Church are of all people those least open to the "full-meal" accusation.

The passages of Scripture which bear on the question besides those already considered are John xvi. 20: "Verily, verily, I say unto you that ye shall weep and lament, but the world shall rejoice"; taken in connexion with Matt. ix. 15: "When the bridegroom shall be taken from them, then shall they fast." In both these passages "fasting" is no more prescribed than "weeping"; they are simply prophetic of what would happen "in those days."

In Matt. xvii. 21 and Mark ix. 29 we read: "This kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting." The whole verse in Matthew and the word "fasting" in Mark are omitted by both \aleph and B, so that the best and weightiest manuscripts are against the ascetic gloss.

NOTE ON MARK IX. 29.

It has been asserted recently by a high authority (Dr. Salmon) that the omission of the words *καὶ νηστεία* leads to an unnatural exegesis for the text, which would then read as in R.V.: "This kind can come out by nothing save by prayer," and would, it is said, seem to imply either that prayer was only necessary for the cure of this particular kind (*γένος*) of possession, or that the disciples, in their attempt to exorcise, had not given themselves to prayer at all.

To this it may rightly be answered that the Saviour's words emphasize, in this case, the special necessity of a believing appeal, in all-conquering faith, to the almighty power of God, without conveying the suggestion that prayer was unnecessary in other cases. And it is also apparent that our Lord discerned the absence of faith—faith such as to remove mountains, both in the father and in the disciples themselves, as neither he nor they were hopeful of a cure.

Hence the reply recorded in St. Matthew to the disciple's question:

“Why could not we cast it out?” was “Because of your little faith, for verily I say unto you, if ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence . . . and it shall remove” (R.V.).

It was the “prayer of faith” that was lacking, and therefore the reply of our Lord: “This kind can come out by nothing save by prayer,” preceded by His words as to their “little faith,” shows exactly what was wanting in their action on this occasion. Prayer may or may not have been wholly absent, but most certainly there was not in them the “effectual fervent prayer” of “unwavering” faith which “availeth much,” and which our Lord prescribes. The exegesis, therefore, of the verse without *καὶ νηστεία* is satisfactory.

It may be mentioned that although the original scribe of the Sinaitic MS. omits the words *καὶ νηστεία*, the third (N³), who lived some centuries afterwards, inserts them, pointing to the growth of asceticism in the Church. In 1 Cor. vii. 5 we find the same word *νηστεία* foisted into the text, which is thus in the A.V. made to read, “that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer,” while the true reading, “that ye may give yourselves unto prayer,” is supported by such overwhelming MSS. authority that the R.V. does not even give “fasting” a place in the margin.

Dean Alford, in his note on this text (1 Cor. vii. 5) says, “The addition of these words (‘and fasting’) shows how such passages as this have been tampered with by the ascetics. See also Mark ix. 29.”

In the bitterness of repentance, in the heights of faith and devotion and communion with God, food is intolerable, and fasting, or, rather, non-eating, a natural outcome and consequence; but separated from these indispensable antecedents, or used itself as an antecedent to bring about these or other spiritual results, it has no value, and is neither suggested nor prescribed in the sacred Scriptures.

With reference to Matt. iv. 2, “And when He had fasted forty days and forty nights He was afterward an hungered”; and Luke iv. 2, “And in those days He did eat nothing, and when they were ended He afterward hungered,” it should be said that the Lord felt no need of food, no hunger, during these forty days. It was only “when they were ended” that He was “an hungered.” It was no voluntary self-imposed fast—He felt no want of food in this miraculous suspension of physical needs; and that neither He nor His disciples ever fasted as a means of grace, the text at the head of this article makes plain. “Thy disciples fast not” is decisive. But the fact is also decisive for our own times. For if fasting was “the greatest religious exercise,” if fasting “deepens the spiritual life,” “tends to self-control,” is “an aid to worship,” and “stirs up the deepest depths of the heart,” how was it that the Pharisees as

well as John's disciples could accuse the Master and His followers of depriving themselves of this "great means of grace, without which a Christian cannot be perfect"?

And, above all, how was it that the Lord Jesus Himself defended and justified His disciples for not fasting? It is inconceivable that, if it were "a great means of grace" and "a deepener of the spiritual life" He would not have absolutely prescribed it to His disciples and practised it as their exemplar. This He never did.

The practice of the Apostles has already been alluded to; but it is surprising to see St. Paul's expression, "I keep under my body" (1 Cor. ix. 27), pressed into the service of fasting, as, indeed, it has been used to justify the practices of the Middle Age flagellants, with the latter of which St. Paul's metaphor (*ὑπωπιάζω*) has much more to do than with fasting. Paul's "bodily exercises" were not self-imposed fastings; like his thorn in the flesh, they were given him by God. His stripes, prisons, stonings, shipwrecks, his weariness, watchings, hungers, fastings, often were imposed on him in the course of his wondrous ministry by his Master. His cross was not self-selected, and his discipline was laid on him, not chosen by him, but accepted by him from the loving hand of Him, the splendour of whose face he first saw on the road to Damascus. His bodily discipline was his daily suffering; the great things he suffered "for His name's sake" were his glory and blessing, as all discipline sent by God is still to all His suffering people. This *ὑπωπιάζω* (*contundo, sugillare*) was no act of "voluntary humility."

Self-chosen mortifications, scourgings, and fastings do not "cultivate the habit of self-control." Such acts, "not in any honour," really are "to the satisfying of the flesh." They, therefore, do not deepen the spiritual life at all. They have "a show of wisdom" in "will-worship"—*i.e.*, in bodily exercises chosen by one's own will and "self-imposed."

This *ἑλεσθησκεία* is so much easier than the true mortification of one's "evil and corrupt affections" that it puffs up and

ministers to spiritual pride. Witness, "I fast twice in the week," while the mortifications prescribed by God humble one to the dust.

Immediately following the warning as to being led astray by anyone "voluntary in his humility" comes the awful list of Divinely prescribed mortifications, to be observed, not merely at stated seasons and then abandoned, but ever to be practised until "Christ, who is our life, shall appear."

"Mortify, therefore, your members which are upon the earth: fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry. . . . But now ye also put off all these—anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication—out of your mouth. Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds" (Col. iii.).

These are the mortifications that the Lord has commanded. The fast that He hath chosen, is it not to loose the bands of wickedness and "denying ungodliness and worldly lusts," thus truly to deepen the spiritual life, "looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ"?



The Transfiguration.

BY THE REV. F. W. M. WOODWARD, B.D.

THE Transfiguration is little dwelt upon in the New Testament or in ecclesiastical commemoration. There is truth in a remark made by J. H. Newman that "to many persons this portion of the sacred history may have appeared without object or meaning." Nevertheless, as he proceeds to maintain, it has a real and permanent significance. In discussing its significance it will be convenient—

- (1) To study the context ;
- (2) To treat the narrative as marking an epoch in the lives of the chosen witnesses and of Christ Himself ;

(3) To draw out its permanent message to the Church.

1. The Transfiguration is found in all the three Synoptic Gospels at the same point in the narrative. Despite all that has been urged against its historical character, it seems to be in its right place, and to be a narrative of an incident that actually happened. The account has internal marks of genuineness, and stands in an intelligible relation with what precedes, and also with what follows as Raffaello perceived when painting his picture of the Transfiguration.

Tracing the connexion with the preceding narrative, we notice that the incident is at the close of the Galilean ministry, termed by Professor Sanday "the period of culminations." The faith of the disciples, notwithstanding the lapse of the multitude and the opposition of the Pharisees, has become explicit and intelligent. "Thou art the Christ" (St. Luke adds "of God," and St. Matthew, "the Son of the living God"). "From that time," as St. Matthew significantly says, began a new teaching. Jesus ("the Christ," St. Matthew, κ and B) predicted that the Son of man (the title occurs in all the Synoptists) "must" suffer, and be raised again the third day. This teaching encountered the prejudices of the disciples, and the sternness of the rebuke administered to St. Peter shows how essentially it was bound up with the Messianic vocation. As the three Evangelists relate, the same law applies to the citizens of the kingdom. Taking up the Cross is the condition of discipleship and the gateway to life. All the Synoptists close the prelude with the saying, "Verily I say unto you, there be some of them that stand here which shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power" (St. Mark ix. 1; St. Luke omits "with power"; and St. Matthew says "till they see the Son of man coming in His kingdom"). The narrative of the Transfiguration is connected with this saying by a note of time—"after six days" (St. Luke, "about eight days"). Archbishop Trench says that nearly all the patristic expositors and medieval interpreters find in the Transfiguration the fulfilment of the prediction, though they regard it as a prelude and prophecy of the

coming in glory rather than the coming itself. It is difficult to deny all connexion. In any case the Transfiguration follows directly upon the doctrine of a Messiah suffering and victorious over death. This, as St. Luke's narrative says, was the theme of conversation in the Transfiguration itself.

Turning to the sequel, we observe that, whilst St. Luke relates they told none of the things they had seen, St. Mark and St. Matthew inform us that this silence was due to a charge to keep the matter secret "until the Son of man be risen again from the dead." St. Mark says they questioned amongst themselves what the rising from the dead should mean. He and St. Matthew report the conversation about Elijah and the prediction that, as the forerunner had suffered, so also should the Son of man. This looks like a point of contact with St. Luke's account of the conversation of Moses and Elijah. In all the Synoptists follows the healing of the possessed son. St. Mark notes that the multitude was amazed at the mighty power of God (*τῇ μεγαλειότητι*, the word used of the Transfiguration in 2 Pet. i. 16). Then follows another prophecy of the Passion and Resurrection. At this stage St. Matthew inserts the incident of the half-shekel. All three tell the story of the child placed in the midst, and the teaching about true greatness in the kingdom. St. Mark and St. Luke tell the story of the man "that followeth not us," and then St. Luke parts company with St. Matthew and St. Mark. The latter gives the promise of reward to those who give even a cup of cold water, "because ye are Christ's," and reports what measures are to be taken to avoid causes of offence. St. Matthew's narrative is parallel, but he adds the parable of the Lost Sheep, and a long passage on the duty and nature of forgiveness. At this stage there is a break in the narrative marked by a journey to Judæa.

In the sequel there is again the doctrine of a Messiah suffering and victorious, and again teaching that the kingdom has a standard and temper quite different from the world. Whether, therefore, we look at the prelude or the sequel, the chief thoughts are of self-sacrifice and victory through sacrifice in the case of

the Messiah and His followers alike. In the light of the contest the narrative should be interpreted as a representation of "the sufferings of Christ and the glories that should follow."

2. We next ask, What epoch does it mark—(a) in the teaching of the disciples, (b) in the life of Christ Himself?

We notice that the incident occurs precisely when it was needed—viz., at the beginning of teaching about the Messianic office and kingdom which ran contrary to all the inherited prejudices of the disciples. How obstinately they clung to their prepossessions, and how thoroughly their prejudices were undermined, can be seen in the subsequent portions of the Gospels and the earlier chapters in the Book of the Acts. The firm hold that the Apostles have in the opening part of the latter work on the indispensable nature and meaning of the death of Christ was not gained in a moment. It was the result of continuous teaching, giving them a new ideal of the Messiah's vocation and kingdom. After He was risen again, it would burst upon them in all its glory and power. This teaching our Lord began to give explicitly at the time of the Transfiguration. In connexion with it the Transfiguration served a twofold purpose—to confirm the faith, and to correct and spiritualize the beliefs of the disciples. (i.) The faith of the disciples had taken definite shape in the confession that He was the Christ. Meanwhile they were puzzled by the new teaching. The Transfiguration represents the Divine seal and sanction of their faith, given to the most receptive and most representative of the Apostles. They possessed henceforth "a reserve of certitude," which would have its effect on the remainder of the Twelve. This confirmation was given not to those who most needed faith, but to those who possessed it most, and assured them, however strange it might appear, that the Messiah had a real glory and a real kingdom. From this point of view the Transfiguration is a stage towards the teaching of the Fourth Gospel that Jesus of Nazareth, from first to last, in humiliation as well as in exaltation, had the glory of the Word Incarnate. (ii.) In the next place the Transfiguration was intended to correct the disciples'

beliefs and spiritualize them. The Messiah they had confessed was seen to transcend the chiefs of the older dispensation. He is represented as the Mediator of a perfect and final revelation, and declared to be the Son of the Psalmist (Ps. ii. 7), the Beloved of the prophets (Isa. xlii. 1), the Prophet of the Lawgiver (Deut. xviii. 15). As St. Jerome, quoted by Archbishop Trench, pertinently remarks: "Noli tria tabernacula quærere, cum unum sit tabernaculum Evangelii, in quo Lex et Prophetæ recapitulanda sunt." Further, the glory of Messiah is not adventitious. It is in accordance with spiritual laws. "As He prayed," says St. Luke, "the fashion of His countenance was changed." Last of all, there is a revelation that this true glory was His sacrifice of Himself in the conversation recorded by St. Luke with Moses and Elijah: "They spake of His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem." "Vocabulum valde grave," says Bengel, "quo continetur Passio, Crux, Mors, Resurrectio, Adscensio." Christ crucified might be a stumbling-block; nevertheless His "exodus" was a theme of absorbing interest to the transfigured Master and to the saints that appeared in glory. The day was to come when it would be seen to be not merely the condition of exaltation, but an exaltation in itself: "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me."

Thus, to the chosen witnesses the purpose of the Transfiguration was not only to confirm, but also to correct and spiritualize, their faith.

When we have to consider the place the Transfiguration holds in our Lord's life and ministry, we have to remember that we are treading on holy ground. We cannot analyze the movements of this inner consciousness, and can but follow such clues as are given us.

The voice of approval recalls the voice heard at the Baptism and the voice heard in Holy Week. It is from one point of view the Divine ratification of His ministry and life. As we know from other passages, the mission in Galilee, disappointing as it might appear, nevertheless represented a real victory. It has been well said that He could not be the Messiah

of popular expectation, because He would be the Messiah of the Divine vocation. At the close of the Galilean ministry He rejoiced in spirit (St. Luke x. 21), and poured out the words of thanksgiving contained in St. Luke x. 21, 22 (*cf.* St. Matt. xi. 25-28), following the thanksgiving, according to St. Luke, with an assurance of blessing to those who had been permitted to see these things, and, according to St. Matthew, with an invitation to the weary and heavy-laden. Of this prayer and the unique relation it implies with the Father, the Transfiguration and the voice from heaven are the counterpart. As He glorified the Father, so the Father glorified Him. His probation had been accomplished, and the Transfiguration is the sign of the Divine approval.

Further, the Transfiguration is a preparation for the Passion, when He was to offer Himself as the perfect Victim. On the eve of the Passion He prayed, "Father, the hour is come : glorify Thy Son"; so possibly on this occasion, when His thoughts were full of the Passion, He prayed the same prayer as He began to approach His priestly work. In that case the Transfiguration would be the answer in outward symbol that this prayer was heard. So Ruskin writes in a very beautiful passage quoted in Dr. Farrar's "Life of Christ" : "When, in the desert, He was girding Himself for the work of life, angels came and ministered unto Him ; now in the fair world, when He is girding Himself for the work of death, the ministrants came to Him from the grave—but from the grave conquered—one from that tomb under Abarim, which His own hand had sealed long ago ; the other from the veil into which he had entered without seeing corruption. There stood by Him Moses and Elias, and spake of His decease. And when the prayer is ended, the task accepted, then first since the star paused over Him at Bethlehem, the full glory falls upon Him from heaven, and the testimony is borne to His everlasting sonship and power : 'Hear ye Him.'"

It is fitting that the Transfiguration should have significance, not only for the chosen witnesses, but also for Christ Himself,

of Divine approval and preparation. He was no docetic or monophysitical Christ. His faith was real, His prayer was truly human, and the strength asked was genuinely vouchsafed. To quote the words of Archbishop Trench : "He did not merely manifest to others that glory that should one day be His, but became more fully conscious of it Himself, and that He already possessed it, however He might voluntarily defer its full manifestation."

3. It remains to draw out the permanent message of the Transfiguration. It may be briefly stated as the glorification of life. This glorification was consummated in Christ Jesus, and it was consummated in Him that through Him it may be fulfilled in us. He had indeed from the time of His coming into the world the glory of the Lord Incarnate. It was the glory of the only Begotten from the Father. He had, to quote the words of Bishop Westcott, "the glory of one who represents another, being derived from Him, and of the same essence with Him." This glory He specially manifested from time to time, and in the Synoptic narrative the Transfiguration is such a special manifestation. What light does it throw on the nature of His glory, and what may we deduce thence concerning our own glorification ?

In the narrative of the Transfiguration there are the three ideas of sonship, sacrifice, and spiritual power :

(1) "This is My beloved Son" are the emphatic words of the Divine approval. The unique glory of the new covenant is the revelation of the Father through the Son. Upon this the eyes of the Church must ever be directed. It is the foundation of the theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the Gospel of St. John. Whenever this is forgotten, what is characteristically Christian has vanished. If we ask why, the answer is that the sonship of the Incarnate Son, as depicted in the Gospels, expresses at once perfect apprehension of the will of the Father and perfect conformity with it. These guarantee the finality and truth of the revelation. Of this the Transfiguration is a symbolic representation. It is the outward expression of the inward reality of the glory of the Son.

(2) The second idea is sacrifice. It suffuses the whole context and appears in the narrative itself. In all three Gospels it lurks in the epithet "beloved" or "elect," which points at once to the suffering servant of the Lord, and St. Luke specially mentions the deace that He was to accomplish at Jerusalem. His glory was the full apprehension of the Father's will. The specific object of that will was redemption by sacrifice. To work this redemption was His Messianic vocation. Thus, His death was the revelation, not only of His absolute self-sacrifice, but of the Father's love.

(3) The third idea is power. The word used of His death suggests triumph over death. This triumph is the outcome of the life in which prayer, as St. Luke suggests, was the transforming power, and death was but the condition of greater power. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." The final manifestation of power is the Advent, of which the Transfiguration was the prophecy and prelude (2 Pet. i. 16).

He was transfigured that we might be transfigured. In the high-priestly prayer He says of His disciples: "The glory which Thou has given Me I have given unto them." They in Him are transfigured, and find all things transfigured. As is the Master, so are His servants.

(1) The disciple is no longer a slave, but a son. The spring and the power of the Christian life is sonship. The servant knoweth not what his lord doeth, but the friend or son has the spirit of intelligent apprehension. The saying of St. Anselm is true: "*Testamentum vetus quod datum est per servum retinet in eo vilitatem servitutis, novum vero quod datum est per Filium possidet honorem filiationis.*"

(2) Sonship is realized in sacrifice. "He that loveth his life shall lose it." The Messiah who gave His life in sacrifice has suffering servants who give themselves in sacrifice. In this consists the significance of the narrative following the Transfiguration. Thus the kingdom has the notes of service, humility, and love. By these are lives transfigured and hallowed with a Divine glory.

(3) Sacrifice, again, is fruitful, and ensures power and victory. This victory begins on earth, and is consummated by the resurrection. In prayer the Master was transfigured; so also we, "with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image" (2 Cor. iii. 18). We are transfigured by the renewing of our mind (Rom. xii. 2). Of this the resurrection of the body is the complete expression. "He shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like (conformed) to His glorious body." With true insight the patristic writers saw in the Transfiguration a prophecy of the glory of the saints at the resurrection. Hence, St. Thomas Aquinas termed it the Sacrament of the Second Regeneration.

Sonship, sacrifice, and spiritual power form the glory of the Incarnate Son, and through Him our lives are glorified according to the same pattern. In them is the true glory of life to be found, and because of the unique debt we owe to Him for making this glorification possible, we can pray in the words of the collect for the Feast of the Transfiguration, in the American Prayer Book, "that we, being delivered from the disquietude of this world, may be permitted to behold the King in His beauty, where, with the Father and the Holy Ghost; He liveth and reigneth ever one God world without end. Amen."



The Inspiration of the Church.

BY THE REV. A. E. N. SIMMS, B.D.

IT has been generally believed that the first band of Christians, assembled in the upper room in Jerusalem, set to themselves consciously and deliberately the audacious plan of the evangelization of the whole world. The boldness of these inspired fishermen has been cited in reply to the objection that the idea of effecting a corporate reunion of modern Christendom, entertained by some enthusiasts, is confronted with insuperable difficulties. But this theory reposes upon the a priori belief that Christ

constituted an "Apostolic College," to which He confided His plan of a universal Church, and to which He imparted a knowledge of the methods by which such a plan should be realized. Even if the "forty days" during which He spake the things that pertained to the kingdom is not made responsible for so many later "developments," it is, nevertheless, held by many in reserve to account for the possession of such a scheme as that of the Catholic Church by men whose natural horizon had been so restricted. Besides, it is asserted that the disciples were in possession of "marching orders," which it was impossible for them not to understand, for Christ had said, "Go ye into all the world."

But this theory, which represents Christ enabling men once and for all to understand His scheme, is one which supposes that He guided His first disciples by other means than those by which He still guides His disciples to-day. It introduces the miraculous in such a manner as to render the history of those men's conduct in large part useless for those who have to follow. Indeed, it obscures the study of God's uniform methods, and renders inexplicable the account which we find in the Acts of the Apostles. That account will show which in the case of the early Apostles, as in the case of the Hebrew Prophets, the advance in the knowledge of God and Christ, and in appreciation of His plan and comprehension of His Commandments, was the outcome of fidelity to Christ in the midst of perfectly unforeseen circumstances. Faithfulness in a new and trying situation was rewarded then, as it is now, by an enlarged and fuller vision.

The forty days during which He has been telling the disciples of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God are over, and these exhibit the knowledge with which they start upon their career by asking, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" It is the old popular conception of the kingdom and the Christ in which they were brought up, although they must expect that its character will reflect the character of Jesus. As they learn more of the kingdom, they will learn more of the Christ, and *vice versa*. It was not for *them* to know

the times and the seasons that lay before them any more than it is for us to know the times and seasons that lie before *us*. But we have nearly nineteen centuries of times and seasons to ponder over which they had not. In that which is called the Table of Contents, Acts i. 8, the "uttermost parts of the earth" is out of proportion. Jerusalem and Judæa and Samaria loom far larger in the fishermen's view of the world. They will stay in Jerusalem and the neighbourhood until unforeseen events drive them further. In the meantime they receive, sacramentally, that Spirit—the Spirit of Jesus—which will *guide* them unto all truth, not suddenly impart to them the whole truth. It will guide them, in ways unforeseen, geographically to Rome as the centre of the world, and *parsi passu* spiritually to Christ as the "fullness of the Godhead."

In the meantime they are in Jerusalem. The burden of Peter's sermon is that Jesus had risen, that he and his companions had seen Him, that if the accomplished fact of the resurrection would be fairly faced it would be found that this Jesus was the Christ of the prophets. A morally purged Israel will be followed by the "restoration of all things." Jesus is the Christ. The term for the present is at its lowest power. If St. Peter (iii. 21) corrects the popular view that the Messiah is to remain on earth, and has so far advanced on the position of i. 6, yet he did not expect a long delay. He calls on them to repent of having crucified Jesus, that the Lord may "send forth the Christ." He seems to think that they will repent speedily when they see what a mistake they made. "And now, brethren, I wot that in ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers." Naturally, the Sadducees object to the contradiction of their special tenet, and the rulers refuse to be made responsible for such a crime as the murder of the Messiah. They do not face the fact—do not inquire into it—and so they violate the condition of progress. The guiding Spirit is not with *them*.

During this time there is nothing in the outward lives of the Apostles, nor in the subject of their preaching, nor in their

attitude to Jewish religion in general, which could shock popular prejudice. They were, on the contrary, popular. "And they [the rulers], when they had further threatened them, let them go, finding nothing how they might punish them *because of the people,*" etc. If the people had been hostile, or even indifferent, there would have been no such restraint upon the rulers. The Apostles are "good Jews," with Jewish Messianic ideas and orthodox exclusive Jewish conceptions of the privileges of Israel. The people are willing to listen to them when escaped from prison, are ready to stone the authorities for interfering. The Council, though "cut to the heart" and "minded to slay them," are impotent, and must submit to the prudent counsel of Gamaliel. The burden of the message, as well as the sphere of their operations, is seen in the passage, "And every day, in the Temple and at home, they ceased not to teach and to preach Jesus as the Christ." It was a "faith" to which "multitudes of priests" could subscribe. There was no talk of leaving Jerusalem, of "the uttermost parts of the earth," of a universal mission. They are all very happy and comfortable, have "all things in common," are content to be a sect of the Jews.

The first crisis occurs in vi. 1. There is a squabble over the distribution of alms among some women. It is not a glorious event. The Hellenistic Jewish widows have been slighted in a Church directed exclusively to Hebrew Jews. The Apostles, in settling a practical question in a practical way, have no farther purpose than that of securing a fair administration of the alms. Stephen, the Hellenist appointed to regulate the distribution of relief, discusses in the synagogues of the foreign Jews the religion which he has adopted. Immediately the condition of things changes. Popular prejudice is touched. The Temple and the Law are spoken of as Peter had not ventured to speak of them. "And they stirred up the people." Those who had been ready to stone the authorities for interfering with Peter, are joining the authorities in stoning Stephen. Jesus might be the Christ, if the Christ meant the perpetuation of the Jewish people, but if Jesus was "to destroy this place and change the customs which Moses

delivered unto us," that was quite another matter. Peter had never said this, for Peter had not believed this.

The persecution which followed the death of Stephen was the cause of the first step in a course which ultimately proved to be a carrying out of the Divine design. Judæa and Samaria received the Gospel, and, through Philip, Cæsarea was reached, and thus first the Church touched the great administrative framework of the Roman Empire. This was the work of the forward party, and the Apostles remained in Jerusalem. But more important even than this was the conversion of Saul. It has always been felt that, psychologically considered, this was ultimately due to the testimony and death of Stephen. The integrity of the man made him face a new fact when presented in such a forcible way, and the intellect of the native of Tarsus enabled him to appreciate the new setting of his country's history. His prejudice might have prevented both, but it was precisely this refusal to hold a principle as a prejudice, and this willingness to receive new impressions, even after a struggle, that mark the career of the Apostles, and even the conditions of their inspiration. 'There are some men for whom it is useless to "kick against the pricks," and these are the men whom the Lord has chosen to take His kingdom into all the world. Paul believed that Jesus was the Christ, but it was the Christ according to Stephen, not according to Peter.

The admission of the Gentiles was the great achievement of apostolic times, and it is interesting to observe how it came about. In the case of the first convert the invitation came from Cornelius, not from St. Peter. The Apostle has to be urged by a special visit, and he is disposed to argue the point. He comes, indeed, to Cornelius, but explains that he would not have come unless specially directed (x. 28). He is surprised to see even such a modified case of God's respect for outsiders, and limits it to the proselytes of the gate (x. 35). He tells Cornelius the main facts, stating that he was charged to proclaim them to the privileged people (x. 36, 42, τῶ λαῶ). The external signs of acceptance precede baptism: "They of the circumcision are

amazed, and as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit." Peter could not help himself, and asks: "Can any man forbid water?" He faces this new fact, and, when called on to explain before his brother Apostles the new and unexpected phenomenon, he exclaims: "Who was I that I could withstand God?" It is a surprise. "Then to the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life."

In the meantime the Hellenistic teachers have carried the message to Antioch, and have thus touched more definitely the highway to Rome. They have done this without the knowledge of the Apostles, who, when they hear of it as an accomplished fact, dispatch Barnabas to investigate the matter (xi. 22). Barnabas, on his own initiative, brings Saul from his retirement as being the man best qualified to deal with the new turn affairs have taken. The centre of gravity is moving when Antioch, the capital of Syria, is sending relief to Jerusalem.

The rest of the story in Acts tells how St. Paul transferred the Church from Jerusalem to Rome, and laid it upon the framework of the Empire which was to convey all the treasures of antiquity to modern times. There is not space to enter particularly into the development which even here took place. It is evident, as Sir William Ramsay has pointed out, that Saul started as the subordinate of Barnabas, and their first idea was probably to visit the country of the latter only, Cyprus. They then crossed over to Pamphylia, either to preach there because it was the next natural step after preaching in Cyprus and Cilicia—as Saul had been doubtless doing before Barnabas sought him—or because they meant to proceed direct to Cilicia. If the South Galatian theory is correct, the next actual step was determined by an unforeseen event—namely, Paul's illness (Gal. iv. 13). They proceeded to Antioch, the Roman centre of the province Galatia. Paul had now taken the lead, and he was catching the imperial idea, both as a Roman citizen himself, and from the atmosphere of such a Romanizing centre as Antioch was at that time. It was *here* that he broke away from

the Jews, apparently in a fit of wrath at their refusal to hear him. It was here that the great crisis took place—the result, it may be, not merely of the rejection, but of his relations with Sergius Paulus. At all events, Paul widened his conception of the Christ to meet the new circumstances. The centre of his next circle was Corinth, and that of his last was Rome. As we read the epistles written from that centre after all his experience, we see that “Jesus is Christ” has developed far beyond the meaning which Jews and Apostles had accepted long before in Jerusalem. But this denationalizing of the term had to be defended at the Council of Jerusalem, and again the older teachers, instead of drawing back, faced the new situation as well as their national tendency would admit. In 1 Peter the older Apostle has attained the Pauline plan.

These things are written for our learning. The conditions of inspiration, of farther insight into the Divine Plan, are the same to-day. Theological prejudice may produce zealots perishing with their Jerusalem, but the scientific temper which honestly faces facts is the only mark of an “infallible Church.” It is not of money only that it was written, “they forsook all and followed Him.” To those whose ideal is always in the past—in the stiffened Church of the Middle Ages—we should say that it was not thus, in the Acts, Christ was “lifted up” so that He drew all men unto Him.



Literary Notes.

IT is very interesting to learn that Messrs. Smith, Elder and Co. are going to reissue that very valuable work, the “Dictionary of National Biography.” Of double interest, at least to the intellectual man of the slender purse—and there are many of us who count ourselves as such—is the fact that it is to be brought out at a third of the original cost. Its compass will also be less, inasmuch as it will take up a third of the room of the first issue. All told, there will be twenty-two volumes, published at 21s. net per volume. The type and the size will be exactly the same as in the first issue, while many errors will be corrected which crept into the old volumes, and many of the bibliographies will be revised. Otherwise the text will be the same. Vol. I. of this new issue will appear on the 10th

of this (March) month, and will cover Abbadie—Beadon. It was as far away as the year 1881 that the late Mr. Smith conceived the scheme for a National Biography, and set his heart upon its production. A year later the late Sir Leslie Stephen commenced the task of editing it, which he did alone, saving, of course, the hearty support and help of Mr. Smith, until 1889, when Mr. Sidney Lee joined him in the work. Two years later Mr. Leslie Stephen, as he then was, resigned, and the entire responsibility—its importance increased as the years rolled on—devolved upon Mr. Lee. It may not be generally known, perhaps, that the longest article in the "Dictionary" comes from the pen of Mr. Lee—that on Shakespeare. It occupies nearly fifty pages of letterpress. The reissue will appear regularly with one volume per month.



Messrs. Longmans' theological books to come out include the following: In the "Oxford Library of Practical Theology" Canon Newbolt will have a volume on "The Sacrament of the Altar"; Vol. II. of Dr. Francis J. Hall's "Introduction to Dogmatic Theology: Authority, Ecclesiastical and Biblical"; four addresses delivered to candidates for ordination in the chapel of Fulham Palace, 1907, under the heading of "In Christ's Name," by Dr. F. Homes Dudden, with an introduction by the Bishop of London; "The Forgiveness of Sins," by the Bishop of Vermont; and "Common-Sense in Religion," by Martin R. Smith.



The same publishing house is issuing in the near future a cheap edition, at 4s. 6d. net, of the "History of St. Vincent de Paul, Founder of the Congregation of the Mission (Vincentians), and of the Sisters of Charity," by Mgr. Bougand, Bishop of Laval; and "Germany in the Dark and Middle Ages," by Dr. Stubbs, formerly Bishop of Oxford, and Regius Professor of Modern History at the University. Mr. Hassall has edited this volume.



There is in course of preparation a library of text-books—Messrs. Longmans are also to publish these—to be edited by the Principal of Ripon Theological College, the Rev. J. Battersby Harford. The first group of volumes will include "The Prayer Book," by the Bishop of Sodor and Man; "English Church History," by the Rev. M. W. Patterson; "The Articles," by Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas; and "Christian Doctrine," by Canon Storr. This is a series of volumes which should prove a valuable library to Evangelical clergy and laity. It is quite evident that no stone is to be left unturned by the leaders of Evangelical thought in their endeavours to provide teaching for the needs of Church-people. To that end efforts are being strenuously made to reach all classes of men and women. The series just referred to will appeal to the more educated, perhaps, but the man or woman who has not the time, or even, mayhap, the inclination to weigh all the points, are being also catered for by a little series of shilling volumes entitled "The Anglican Church Handbooks," which Dr. Griffith Thomas is editing. Then, again, the third class of church-goers is going to be helped and instructed by a penny series of booklets entitled "Church Manuals," to

be edited by Dr. Dawson Walker, of Durham University, Canon J. C. Wright, and the Rev. J. E. Watts-Ditchfield. I have often wondered why other Churches have had so much "ammunition" of the popular kind, in the shape of manuals, etc., compared with the literature of Evangelical Churchmen; but now it looks as if Evangelicals are going to catch them up. There should be a great sale for these various series.



The other day was published the first volume of the new translation of Aristotle, which is, as may be already known, intended to serve as a memorial of the labour of Dr. Jowett, which will eventually be followed by "Organon," "Physics," "De Cælo," "De Anima," "Historia Animalium," "De Animalium Generatione," "De Insecabilibus Lineis," "Metaphysics," "Eudemian Ethics," "Rhetoric," and "Poetics." Other translations will follow in course of time.



Mr. Murray has some very interesting items in his new list, of which only brief mention may be made at the moment. Probably one of the most attractive works will be "John Thadeus Delane, 1817-1879, Editor of the *Times*." This life, in two volumes, will include his correspondence, much of which has not hitherto been published. His nephew, Mr. Arthur Irwin Dasent, is to prepare the biography. Then another book, also in two volumes, will be the "Correspondence of George Canning and some Intimate Friends," edited by Josceline Bagot. Another book, "The Trial and Crucifixion of Jesus Christ of Nazareth," by M. Brodrick, who is also the editor of Mr. Murray's "Handbook of Egypt," endeavours to show, from the historical and legal aspects, how the Jewish law was evaded on all its most important points at the trial of Christ, and how Pilate failed in his duty as the Procurator Cæsaris. Mr. Brodrick has purposely taken a non-theological attitude, in the hope of making the book useful to teachers of all denominations. The site of Golgotha is discussed in the light of the latest archæological discoveries.



Three other works are to come from Albemarle Street. One is entitled "From Peking to Sikhim," by Count de Lesdain, being the experiences of the Count and Countess de Lesdain, who travelled from Peking through the little-known district of the Ordos Desert, which lies in a bend of the Hoangho, thence by the province of Kansu, across the high mountainous district into the valley of the Yangtse, and so to Tibet. Surely a remarkable journey for a wedding tour! Yet it was so.



The other two books are: "The Latins in the Levant: a History of Frankish Greece (1204-1566)," by William Miller; and "Greek Dress," by Miss E. B. Abrahams. The former book is the first attempt to write a complete history of the Latin States of medieval Greece that has been made for over thirty years; while Miss Abrahams' work is an exhaustive study of the costume worn by the ancient Greeks from pre-Hellenic or Minoan times down to the end of the Hellenistic age.

We are still having books about Socialism. I suppose that the number will increase, rather than diminish. But one has yet to discover the able, discriminating, and unbiased treatise about the subject. Some day a genius will rise up with such a work. Many have tried, but their views have been weighed and found wanting. Ever and anon there comes out a study of the question in its relation to Christianity. There can be no question of relationship whatsoever; for Christianity *is* Socialism. Leastwise, it is a burning topic of the day. A little while since—in fact, only a day or two back—there was issued a volume entitled “The Social Message of the Modern Pulpit,” by an American Congregationalist, in which the author goes over the whole field of “The Relation between Christianity and Socialism.” Perhaps, in this connexion, certain readers may recall a volume of sermons by the Rev. Prebendary Whitworth, entitled “Christian Thought on Present-Day Questions.” Well, the same author recently finished for press another volume called “The Sanctuary of God.” Of course the matters dealt with in this later book are of a different nature.



Abbot Gasquet, who is probably the most industrious literary worker of the Roman Catholic Church, has brought out a revised edition of his book “The Great Pestilence,” which has been out of print for some time. It is re-appearing, with a new introduction, under the title of “The Black Death in 1348-1349.” I fear this renaming of a book often leads to confusion. I do not recall that it occurs very frequently. The same author has also just published “The Last Abbot of Glastonbury,” and other essays.



A colonial writer, yet nevertheless a world-known author—namely, Dr. W. H. Fitchett—has a book on Messrs. Cassell’s list entitled “Beliefs and Unbeliefs: Studies in the Alternatives of Faith,” which treats of the many strange beliefs which exist under the mask of unbelief. Messrs. Cassell are also the publishers of the Bishop of Carlisle’s “Home Life” in their “Christian Life” series.



Twelve chapters comprise a volume entitled “The Christian Church since the Reformation,” by Archdeacon Cheetham. The work is founded upon many years’ study of the period over which it extends. The history is brought down, so far as the leading events are concerned, to our own time, but, with few exceptions, no reference is made to living persons.



Here is a little, but interesting, handbook. It is being edited by Mr. Percy Parker, editor of *Public Opinion*. It is to be called *The Daily Mail* “Year-Book of the Churches.” It will concern itself with all the religious problems and facts of the day for 1908. It will be published next month at 6d. net.



Lieutenant-Colonel Sedgwick, late R.E., has recently published through Mr. Laurie, “Man and his Future: a Glimpse from the Fields of Science.”

An endeavour is made to show the connexion between the new road of knowledge, which science is opening up, and the ancient road of faith, which religion maintains.



"The Great Salvation: a Gospel for the Day," is a book which has grown from a series of lectures which the author—Rev. Peter Wilson, M.A., of St. Andrew's Place United Free Church, Leith—delivered to students attending the Training Institute of the Edinburgh Presbytery of the United Free Church.



Archdeacon Chapman's long-expected edition of the "Sacrist Rolls of Ely" is at length published, or, rather, a limited number of copies are for sale—to be exact, about 50. These can be purchased from G. A. Tyndall, Minster Press, Ely. The work is in two volumes, and admirably printed and edited. The first volume contains Notes on the Sacrist Rolls, from 1291 to 1350, with four appendices. Volume II. contains the transcripts of the Rolls, with a careful glossary of Latin terms. The work is one which every ecclesiastical antiquary should, if possible, secure while he has a chance.

M.



Notices of Books.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY. By the Rev. J. R. Illingworth, M.A., D.D. London: *Macmillan and Co., Ltd.* Price 6s.

The announcement of a book by Mr. Illingworth is now received with keen interest by a large and appreciative constituency. We have learned to value his weighty contributions to Christian thought. No one would willingly be without the four great works by which he has already made us all his debtor, and when it was known that he was about to publish a work on the Trinity, we looked forward to it with eager hope. And yet now we have it we are bound to confess to a feeling of some disappointment. Perhaps we were expecting something different, something that covered more ground, something that discussed the great problems more fully, widely, and thoroughly. Perhaps we have not been sufficiently mindful of the sub-title, in which he describes the doctrine as "apologetically considered"; but whatever be the cause, we are somehow conscious that there is still a great deal about the Trinity that Mr. Illingworth has not given, and could give, as perhaps no one else could. The first two chapters deal respectively with "Evolution," and "the Subjective Element in Criticism," and they are truly able and illuminating discussions, for which we are profoundly grateful. Never have we seen the idea of evolution in relation to theism put with such convincing force, and never has the subjective element in criticism been more faithfully and conclusively shown. As we read Mr. Illingworth's forceful discussion, we find ourselves applying his language to the Old Testament, and drawing very obvious conclusions. Thus, he pours scorn upon the assumption that "we can best attain to a right understanding of the New Testament by separating

it from the society which existed before it and created it, and treating it like any literary relic which archæology may have unearthed" (p. 32). The bearing of this on the Old Testament is too obvious to need comment. We do not consider that Mr. Illingworth correctly states the relation of the New Testament to the Church. His ecclesiastical presuppositions are somewhat too clearly in evidence at this point. These two chapters, though very valuable and timely, are only very indirectly appropriate to the subject of the Trinity. The four next chapters take their subjects in a curious order. First the Trinity is discussed as it is found in the New Testament, and then as in patristic tradition. Then we have a discussion of the doctrinal development in the New Testament, and the same development in the Fathers. It would, perhaps, have been more helpful if the entire doctrinal view of the New Testament had been dealt with, before taking up the subject of the Fathers. A very characteristic chapter is headed "Omnia Exeunt in Mysterium," and then follows a valuable consideration of the practical power of the doctrine. In chapter ix. the Ritschlian view of worth as a presumption of truth is applied to the Trinity, and the treatment is marked by all Mr. Illingworth's power of penetration and illumination. The last chapters discuss the intellectual bearings of the doctrine, and deal with Revelation as the continuance of Creation. Then come "Recapitulation and Conclusion," and seven illustrative notes. As we close the book we are again conscious of the need of more. In spite of Mr. Illingworth's limitation of himself to the apologetic side, we could have wished that he had included the theological side as well, more especially as theological statement would prove in part the best apologetic. We must not, however, end with this note of regret, because we are deeply thankful for the book as it is. It is full of good and great things, well and ably said, and said as Mr. Illingworth only can say them. He is one of the most valuable exponents of present-day Christian thought. The proofs might well have been read a little more carefully here and there.

THE MAGI, HOW THEY RECOGNIZED CHRIST'S STAR. By Lieut.-Colonel G. Mackinlay. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 6s.

A book which is prefaced by Sir William Ramsay, and which has occasioned an article by that great scholar in the *Expositor*, rightly calls for special attention, for we may be sure that it contains work that is worthy of notice. The object of the book is to attest the truth of the Gospels, by calling attention to a number of hitherto unnoticed harmonies, especially definite dates, which are in full accord with history. In the first chapter the importance of the sun, and of its herald the morning star, is dwelt upon, and the Scriptural allusions of Christ to the former, and of His forerunner to the latter, are emphasized. The next step is a very interesting and fruitful one. It is a recognition of the fact that figurative allusions in the Bible are often made to things actually present. From this it is inferred that the morning star and the Sabbath year are referred to in figures in the Gospels. As these periods are now known from astronomical calculations and from history, the author reaches the conclusion that the Crucifixion took place A.D. 29. By means of similar calculations he argues for the date of the Nativity as 8 B.C., and it is particularly interesting to observe that he has almost won the assent

of Sir William Ramsay to this contention. The attempt is next made to fix the chronology of our Lord's life and ministry, and it is argued that from the Old Testament it was quite possible for the Magi to have news beforehand that Christ would be born in the autumn of 8 B.C. It will be seen that the book is a serious contribution to the study of Gospel chronology, and thereby to the proof of the truth of Scripture. It must not be thought that the ordinary reader will find the discussion abstruse. On the contrary, it is marked all through by very great simplicity and clearness of statement. So far as we are able to enter upon the calculations, the author seems to have proved his main contentions. We do not pretend to accept all his conclusions, but he has written a notable book, which deserves and demands the attention of all who are interested in the study of the Gospels and their authenticity.

IN THE SECRET PLACE. By Alexander Smellie, M.A. London: *Andrew Melrose*. Price 4s. 6d. net.

To those who already know Mr. Smellie's works, the appearance of another book by him will be very welcome, for he is one of the most valued devotional writers of to-day. With a genuine spirituality he combines a choice literary gift, a keen insight into Holy Scripture and the secrets of the spiritual life, a true suggestiveness of thought, and a fine homiletical power. We rarely find all these qualities in one writer. We only know of three in the present day of whom this is true. For each day of the year there is a suggestive subject-heading, followed by a text and exposition extending over a page. The prayerful use of this book will minister to the enjoyment and profit of the spiritual life of every earnest reader, while we should not be surprised if many a sermon and address were inspired by these thought-provoking pages. Our readers will do well to make a special note of this book.

LITERARY CRITICISM AND THE NEW TESTAMENT. By R. J. Knowling, D.D. London: *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*. Price 2s.

Dr. Knowling overwhelms us with his knowledge of German monographs and brochures. We wonder whether there are any that he has not seen. We are afraid that this quality will have its defects for ordinary readers, and even for not a few students who would prefer more of Dr. Knowling and less of Germany. But those who wish to be made aware of the latest that has been written against the New Testament in Germany will find it here in abundance. What a testimony to the vitality of the Bible are all these writings of rationalistic critics! If the Scriptures are such doubtful and untrustworthy books, it is surprising that scholarly men should continue to trouble themselves to write against them. It seems as though they cannot leave the Bible alone. Christ ever compels attention.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY. A Devotional Commentary. By the Rev. T. A. Gurney. London: *Religious Tract Society*. Price 2s.

A noteworthy addition to this series of Devotional Commentaries. Mr. Gurney blends thought and aspiration, scholarship and spirituality, in a truly helpful way. For all practical purposes of exposition and devotion an ordinary reader will require nothing more than this volume, while serious Bible students who know the original will find in it many a suggestive

discussion, with full references to the latest and best that has been written on the pastoral Epistles. Like all Mr. Gurney writes, the book has a distinct grace of style as well as of spirit. We do not remember another volume in the series that more aptly and worthily fulfils its specific purpose.

HOW TO ENJOY THE BIBLE. By E. W. Bullinger, D.D. London: *Eyre and Spottiswoode*. Price 5s.

The title of this book attracts and tempts us. No use of the Bible will be of much value if it does not produce "enjoyment." Dr. Bullinger first deals with the Word of God as a whole, and emphasizes the meaning of its Object and Subject. He also has much to say as to the need of "rightly dividing the word of truth," whether as to literary form, or subject matter, or times and dispensations. Then in a second part the words of Scripture are considered, and twelve great and important principles of study are enunciated. Thus, we are counselled as to the meaning of words, the scope of passages, the literary structure of passages, the Biblical usage of words, the importance of the context, the importance of accuracy in the study of the words of Scripture, the necessity of distinguishing between interpretation and application. These are some of the principles laid down, and there are others of equal importance. We do not pretend to accept all the author's interpretations—indeed, some of them we venture to think utterly wrong and impossible; but he has the great virtue of making his readers think and study for themselves, and if an author can do this in strict loyalty to the Word of God, it is a very secondary matter whether we accept his precise interpretation or not. In spite of difference about particular interpretations, we have thoroughly "enjoyed" this book, and we commend it to Bible students as worthy of their careful attention, even though they may reject all its particular interpretations. Of the general truth of the principles here laid down for the enjoyment of the Bible we have no manner of doubt.

THE RELIGION AND WORSHIP OF THE SYNAGOGUE. By Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box, M.A. London: *Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd.* Price 10s. 6d. net.

The sub-title more definitely explains the end and purpose of this book—"An Introduction to the Study of Judaism from the New Testament Period." The writers are two scholars who have made all things Judaic their special study. One of the chapters appeared in our columns last year. The work is divided into three parts. The first gives a historical sketch of modern Judaism from the Babylonian Exile to the present day. The second part treats of the doctrine of Judaism, its view of God, the Messiah, and other aspects of truth. The third gives a deeply interesting account of the practical side of Judaism, its religion, home-life, etc. There can be no question of the importance of the subject to all Christian people, and the authors have rendered valuable service by making available such a mass of interesting and important information. We are not prepared to accept their critical position, nor is their view of Sacraments quite our own. We feel, too, that Evangelical Churchmen will be prepared to give more importance to the Zionist movement; but these points, important in themselves, do not materially affect the book as a whole. The survey is singularly comprehensive, and, although written from the Christian standpoint, it seems to be

almost as accurate and well informed as though it were written from within the Jewish fold. The book will long remain a valuable work of reference for the great majority of English readers who have neither time nor ability to consult the original authorities. For those who are interested, as we all ought to be, in missions to the Jews, this book will be of special value.

MANKIND AND THE CHURCH: An Attempt to Estimate the Contribution of Great Races to the Fullness of the Church of God. By Seven Bishops. Edited by the Right Rev. H. H. Montgomery, D.D. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 7s. 6d.

This volume is one of the most remarkable in the history of missionary literature. It would be worth purchasing if only to read Bishop Montgomery's admirable introduction; but, in point of fact, every one of the essays contained in the volume has a value of its own, which even a careless reader could scarcely overlook. Not all the essays are of equal value, though their subject-matter is of equal consequence to the Church of Christ; but there is no essay that is not pregnant with suggestion. The most notable of the essays is, without doubt, Bishop Milne's, on the possible service of Hinduism to the collective thought of the Church. It is, in fact, an exhaustive essay, and deserves the most careful consideration. Another excellent essay is the late Bishop Hoare's, on the Church of China. In view of developments in the Celestial Empire, we commend this thoughtful piece of work to all students of missionary enterprise.

THE CHURCH AND THE CHANGING ORDER. By Shailer Mathews. New York: *The Macmillan Co.* Price 6s.

This book, though we should be sorry to commit ourselves to an acceptance of all its teaching, is a really noteworthy piece of work. It deals with the "Crisis of the Church," mainly in reference to (1) recent critical theories as to the nature of the sacred records, and (2) to those social movements which are so marked a feature of our day. It is written with real downright earnestness, both moral and spiritual; and the vigour of its thought is sustained by a no less vigour of expression. We cannot but be grateful to Professor Shailer Mathews for his very instructive and, in many respects, illuminative work.

NEW LIGHT ON THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Adolf Deissmann. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark.* Price 3s. net.

The substance of this book appeared a year ago in the *Expository Times*, and created much attention. The author is a pioneer in the work of showing the relation of the papyri to the interpretation of the New Testament. The last few years have indeed thrown "new light on the New Testament," and there is evidently very much more to come. After a statement of the problem, Professor Deissmann shows the importance of the papyri for the philological, literary, and religious interpretation of the New Testament. No serious student can well dispense with this little book, more particularly as it will set him in the way of making further inquiries and prosecuting fuller researches for himself. The book closes with a statement of "problems for future investigation." We must, of course, take care, amidst all this new material, that we do not make the mistake, so characteristic of modern scholarship, of

going to the other extreme, and deny all influence of the LXX on the New Testament. Professor Deissmann is not quite guiltless of this tendency himself, but with this caution we may freely hand ourselves over to his guidance and that of his British colleague, Professor Moulton, to whom this little volume is very appropriately inscribed.

BAPTISM: WHAT SAITH THE SCRIPTURE? By the Rev. D. H. D. Wilkinson, London: *Charles J. Thynne*. Price 1s. net.

We welcome a new and cheaper edition of this excellent little work. The treatment is clear and convincing, and the book is specially suitable for use among those who are troubled with difficulties on the subject.

GIFT-BOOKS.

ADVENTURES IN BIRD-LAND. By Oliver G. Pike. London: *Religious Tract Society*. Price 6s. net.

Another journey into bird-land, under the guidance of an old and valued friend. Mr. Pike is a delightful guide and an enthusiast, who conveys his intense love for birds to his readers, and makes them wish for equal knowledge, skill and patience in connexion with bird-life. There are sixteen chapters, full of chatty and deeply interesting material, and nearly one hundred photographs, taken direct from nature by the author, besides other pictures, and one hundred pen sketches on the borders of the pages, drawn by a youth in his teens. While the book is intended for boys it can, and doubtless will, be read by old boys as well, and also by those who are not and never will be boys. The last chapter very appropriately provides "a few hints for the bird-photographer."

BY MEADOW, GROVE, AND STREAM. By Henry Hilton Brown. London: *Religious Tract Society*. Price 3s. 6d.

How often people have wished for some book on Natural History which would help a beginner to study Nature, and would not assume any scientific knowledge, but only a desire to observe and learn! Well, here is the very thing. In his preface the author explains very clearly and helpfully why he has published his book. It is concerned with objects which first attract the notice of a rambler, including trees, flowers, birds' eggs, and insects of several kinds. Examples of each group have been carefully selected, and they are described briefly and in such a way as to help beginners. Black-and-white drawings are made, examples and sketches for measurement have been furnished in special cases. A list of books for further study is given at the end of each chapter, and practical instructions are given for collecting and preserving objects mentioned. To those who, like the writer of these lines, have no knowledge whatever of Nature, this book will be of special interest, for it will make its readers long to go forth and learn, under the author's guidance, all that can be known by minds that do not wish for the higher technicalities of Nature-study. Not the least valuable feature of the book is the way it leads up from Nature to Nature's God. It is attractive as a gift-book as well as valuable to the beginner. Parents and teachers should make a note of this admirable introduction to the science of observation by young people.

SENSE AND SENSIBILITY. By Jane Austen. Cloth, 1s. net.

LAST DAYS OF POMPEII. By Lord Lytton. Cloth, 1s. net.

VANITY FAIR. By W. M. Thackeray. Leather, 2s. net.

Illustrated Pocket Classics. London and Glasgow: *William Collins Sons and Co., Ltd.*

A WEAVER OF WEBS. By John Oxenham. Price 7d.

A DAUGHTER OF HETH. By William Black. Price 7d.

WRECK OF THE GROSVENOR. By W. Clark Russell. Price 7d.

COMIN' THRO' THE RYE. By Helen Mathers. Price 7d.

THE SECRET WOMAN. By Eden Phillpotts. Price 7d.

THE GREAT REFUSAL. By Maxwell Gray. Price 7d.

THE BROWN EYES OF MARY. By Madame Albanesi. Price 7d.

THE GOLDEN BUTTERFLY. By Besant and Rice. Price 7d.

Modern Fiction. London and Glasgow: *William Collins Sons and Co., Ltd.*

These reprints surely represent the high-water mark of attractiveness combined with cheapness. The mystery is how it is done, but that is the publishers' business. As the

novels are either classics of our language or else well-known works of fiction by modern writers, it is unnecessary to do more than call attention to them, and recommend these astonishingly cheap editions to our readers. Quite apart from the interest of the books themselves, their appearance is attractive enough for any bookshelf.

TWO OF THEM AND THE PRINCE. By Helen H. Watson. London: *Religious Tract Society*. Price 1s. 6d.

An interesting and attractive story for young children. "Two of Them" appear throughout the tale, while "the Prince" is only introduced in the last chapter. We heartily recommend this simple little story, which is well told, and is sure to please little girls in particular.

CLANRICKARD COURT. By E. Everett Green. London: *Religious Tract Society*. Price 3s. 6d.

Clanrickard Court is a stately English home into which a family of children are introduced on the death of their father. As they had led a wild life hitherto, we follow the various incidents and experiences of these impulsive children with much interest. The characters are well drawn, and there is the usual struggle between right and wrong, which happily ends in a victory for the good and true. There are two pretty love-stories, which add to the attraction of the book. We need hardly say that the tone and wholesomeness of this volume are all that can be desired, while the formation of character is evidently of great importance in the mind and aim of this well-known authoress.

THE SETTLERS OF KAROSSA CREEK, and other Stories of Australian Bush Life. By Louis Becke. London: *Religious Tract Society*. Price 2s. 6d.

The title alone is sufficient to attract a boy to this book. How can a genuine lover of adventure fail to have his attention arrested by stories of Australian bush life? The second tale is concerned with the exciting mysteries of smuggling, and shows the misery that is caused by methods of dishonesty. The third and last story gives us an account of a canoe fight.

PERIODICALS AND PAMPHLETS.

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW. January, 1908. London: *Spottiswoode and Co.* Price 3s.

The first article is by the Bishop of St. Albans, on the Lambeth Conference and the Pan-Anglican Congress, giving an account of what is to be considered at these important forthcoming gatherings. An unsigned article on "The Law of the Church and the Law of the State," discusses the subject with special reference to the Deceased Wife's Sister's Marriage Act, and takes the strong but impossible line that any such marriages celebrated in Church would be disloyal as a violation of the law of the Church. "Education and Crime" is another timely and useful article, at the conclusion of which the writer pleads for religious instruction to be continued as an integral part of school-training, on the ground that no Sunday-schools or supplementary classes will be adequate to the work. The principal of Leeds Clergy School has a particularly interesting and useful article on "Methodism and Reunion," written with all the balance and reasonableness which we have learned to associate with his utterances. Other articles are "Socialism and Reform," "The Papacy in the Nineteenth Century," and "Oxford University Reform," by the Warden of New College, in which he comes to the conclusion that a Royal Commission is not necessary. Not the least valuable item in this review is its list of articles from the various quarterly and monthly theological publications of this and other countries. The short notices are not made so prominent and definite a feature as in former days.

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA. January, 1908. Oberlin, Ohio, U.S.A. Sold by *Kegan Paul and Co.*, London. Price 75 cents.

The present number has four articles of very special theological interest. The first is on "Contributions from the History of Religions to the New Testament." The second is on "Science and Higher Criticism." The third is on "Some Perils of Current Views of Immanence." The fourth, by one who is well known to our readers, Mr. H. M. Wiener, is on "Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents." This article is a very searching and trenchant criticism of Dr. Kent's book of the same title. Mr. Wiener, with his legal knowledge, is easily able to show that writers on Old Testament Criticism are not always conversant with legal procedure and phraseology before they discuss the laws and legal institutions of Israel. The number contains other articles of a literary and Biblical nature, to which space prevents us from referring in detail. We are glad to call attention to this valued quarterly review on Biblical and religious topics.

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

The first article is on "The Theology of Dr. Du Bose," and is written very appropriately by Mr. W. H. Moberly. While the writer is hearty in his praise of the American theologian, who is now becoming so well known in our midst, he is also critical of some of Dr. Du Bose's distinctive points. His conclusion is that no recent theologian has carried us further forward towards the true ideal of philosophical theology, and for this reason "he has rightly been hailed not only a philosopher but a prophet." For our part we are not quite so sure of this, but we shall doubtless know better when Dr. Du Bose deals with the Person of Christ and the Objective Atonement, as he has promised to do. Meanwhile, no one should overlook this article as an introduction to Dr. Du Bose's writings. Sir Henry Howorth continues his discussion of the Canon of Scripture, by treating of the view held on the subject by the Continental Reformers, Luther, Zwingli, Lefèvre and Calvin. The rest of this number is taken up with subjects appealing almost entirely to professed students. Among them is a valuable contribution by Dr. Burn on "Some Spanish MSS. of the Constantinopolitan Creed," which deals usefully with the Filioque Clause.

THE IRISH CHURCH QUARTERLY. January, 1908. Dublin: *The Church of Ireland Printing and Publishing Co., Ltd.* Price 6d.

A new aspirant to public favour, and judging by this first number it will be heartily welcomed by all who are interested in the study of theological and ecclesiastical subjects. An article by the Bishop of Edinburgh, entitled "A Contribution towards the Study of the Prayer Book of Humble Access," is worth the entire cost, being marked by all Dr. Dowden's erudition and balance of judgment. Dr. Pooler writes on "Hincks, the Egyptologist and Assyriologist." Dean Bernard discusses "The Traditions as to the Death of John the Son of Zebedee," and the inevitable "Rome and Modernism" is the subject of another useful article. We shall look forward with the greatest interest to the next number, for we believe this Quarterly has a place of its own to fill.

LONDON DIOCESE BOOK FOR 1908. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s. 6d.

Indispensable to all who wish to know about things ecclesiastical in the London Diocese.

THE DAY OF DAYS ANNUAL. Vol. XXXVI. London: "*Home Words*" Publishing Office, Price 2s.

This admirable monthly magazine for Sunday reading is very welcome. It is the organ of a Union founded by the editor, called "Hold Fast by your Sunday Union." All who are interested in the observance of the Lord's Day should make a note of this magazine and of the Union it represents.

EPISCOPACY, and other Sermons. By George Salmon, D.D. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 6d.

No praise is required at this time of day for the sermons of the great Irish theologian. This cheap form will be very welcome.

THE LEAVES OF THE TREE. A Popular Illustrated Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society. London: *The Bible House*.

Full of good things of the deepest interest to all who love the Bible and the Bible Society.

EASTERTIDE WITH JESUS. By Anthony Bathe. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price, paper 6d., cloth 1s.

Some truly spiritual meditations, though we cannot accept all the teaching on the Church and Sacraments.

MATRICULATION DIRECTORY. January, 1908. Cambridge: *Burlington House*. Price 1s.

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF APOCRYPHA. January, 1908. London: *International Society of the Apocrypha*. Price 6d net.

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

THE SECOND COMING OF OUR LORD AS CONNECTED WITH THE JEWISH PEOPLE. A Paper read before the Reading Prophetic Society. By Captain Alex. W. Cobham. Reading: *William C. Long*. Price 1d.

MAN'S RELATION TO AND APPREHENSION OF THE UNIVERSE. By the Rev. R. W. Corbet. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 6d.

THE CALL OF THE CHURCH TO LAYMEN. Pan-Anglican Papers. Being Problems for Consideration at the Pan-Anglican Congress, 1908. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2d.

STEADFAST AND ALWAYS ABOUNDING. By the Rev. J. Stuart Holden. London: *Protestant Reformation Society*. C. J. Thynne. Price 1d.

UNITY! By the Rev. Herbert J. R. Marston. London: *Protestant Reformation Society*. Price 1d.