

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

December, 1910.

The Month.

Unity. THE sister Church in America has been holding its General Convention in Cincinnati, and, with the influence of the Edinburgh Conference strong upon them, both the House of Deputies and the House of Bishops, without a single dissentient in either House, passed a resolution, calling on the Church to initiate a movement for a world Conference for the consideration of questions touching faith and order. They resolved, further, that all Christian communions throughout the world which confess our Lord Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour should be asked to unite with them in arranging for and conducting such a Conference. The step is a momentous one, and the prayers of English Churchmen will go with the committee that has been formed to take the necessary steps. Once again, outside the homeland, a daughter Church is showing us the way along a path which, if God's will is to be done on earth, we must ultimately tread.

Our distinguished namesake, the *Churchman* of New York, in its issue of October 29, contains an editorial article in which it comments on the resolution in favourable terms. The final paragraph of the article realizes the difficulties of the position, and faces them in words so noble that we are glad to reprint them.

“ Obvious perils lie in the path of so stupendous a task, but it is better to be in peril than in safety when the best things lie a hair's-breadth beyond

the risk. It is better, as the Bishop of the Philippines said, to risk this Church's distinctive character than to sit still in idle contemplation of a shattered Christendom. The day will come when every society which now calls itself a Church, ourselves included, will lose its distinctive character in the Church, the Holy City. Each will bring its own special honour and glory to contribute to the completeness of the whole, by the methods and in the ways by which God will lead them into that unity which is organic. The fragments of our broken Christendom will gain their life by losing it."

We would warmly commend these words to the many English Churchmen who look askance at the late Lambeth resolutions and all other efforts in the direction of unity, because they are afraid that we of the Church of England are jeopardizing our Catholicity thereby.

Revision of
the
Prayer-Book.

We cannot conceal our satisfaction that the great debate in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury ended in a decisive victory for Prayer-Book reform. Canon Drummond's amendment deprecated revision at the present time, and mildly suggested the consideration of the advisability of drawing up a supplement. The matter was considered in no party spirit, and, indeed, it was better so. A supplement or appendix could be as little acceptable to particular schools of thought as a thoroughly revised Prayer-Book. Indeed, the merely supplementary nature of an appendix might easily lead to high-handed action on the part of a majority, and consequent irritation on the part of the minority. The persistent plea for delay has reminded someone of the story of the hole in the Irishman's roof, which he could not repair when it rained, and which there was no need to repair when the weather was dry. From the Church point of view the weather is as dry now as it will ever be. So, evidently, Convocation thinks, and it proceeds with its work of revision.

Two points of importance immediately arise. It may reassure some whose sympathies lie with Canon Drummond's amendment to read Canon Sutton's speech. There is need for revision, not so much in the interests of loyal Church-people, as of the many thousands who stand apart from all religion. We must win them, and to do so we need an instrument better

fitted for the present needs than a book compiled for other days can possibly be. No argument which ignores the man in the street must be urged, whether for revision or against it. That is the first point, and the second is this: there must be no revision in the interests of party. It was stated by one of the speakers at the Church Congress that Evangelicals who favoured revision did so in order to get rid of the indicative form of absolution in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick, and for kindred reasons. The statement is untrue. The Evangelical school is concerned for the fulfilment of the Church's mission, and for our part we believe revision is needed to that end. Of course there will be difficulties over detail, and of course we must reserve to ourselves the right to vote and work against specific proposals with which we cannot agree. For the ultimate issue we have faith enough to be free from fear.

In the discussions to which the Royal Commission on Divorce has given rise one point of importance seems to have been somewhat lightly treated—viz., the value of St. Matthew's Gospel as an independent record of our Lord's life and teaching. St. Matthew records an exception to the indissolubility of marriage in the teaching of our Lord which both St. Mark and St. Luke ignore. The higher critics of the New Testament would have us believe that St. Matthew added the excepting clause as a concession to Jewish feeling, and Churchmen to-day are blindly following critical lead. We are not here concerned with the general question of divorce, but we venture to ask how much of the Sermon on the Mount—nay, how much of St. Matthew's Gospel—we are similarly to yield on the ground that it has no counterpart in St. Luke or St. Mark. We recognize the primary position of St. Mark as the Gospel behind the Synoptists; we gladly welcome Harnack's testimony to the value of St. Luke; but we are not inclined to yield to the critics the large amount of original matter which St. Matthew contains.

We are interested to find the Bishop of Birmingham, unless

he has changed his mind, takes the same view on the critical question. In his "Sermon on the Mount" (1899 edition) he writes :

"Various attempts have been made to obviate the force of this exception. But to the present writer they do not commend themselves as at all satisfactory. Chiefly it is pleaded that the exception does not appear in St. Luke's Gospel or in St. Paul's Epistles, where marriage is dealt with. But it is a law of interpretation that a command with a specific qualification is more precise than a general command without any specific qualification ; and that the one where the qualification occurs must interpret the other where this specific qualification does not occur" (p. 71).

And again, in an appendix, the Bishop writes :

"Christ, by a distinct act of legislation, prohibited divorce among His disciples in such sense as allows of remarriage, except in the case of the adultery of one of the parties, in which case He did not prohibit it. . . . I do not think, then, that the obvious force of the passages in St. Matthew can be dissolved."

Bishop Gore believes that the Church is free to ignore our Lord's exception ; and he evidently regrets that the Lambeth Conference of 1888 gave a modified recognition to that exception. We do not propose to deal with that side of the matter here. We are only concerned at the moment in making a protest against the treatment to which the Gospel according to St. Matthew is being subjected—a treatment which in our judgment is fraught with larger issues than many suspect.

It is always well to pay some attention to the
Bishops on the
 Episcopate. impressions that may be made on the mind of the
 "general reader," sometimes spoken of as "the
 man in the street." He would naturally form his opinions of
 the recent Church Congress at Cambridge from the accounts
 given in the public press, and when he read that, in a large and
 crowded meeting, the Bishop of Birmingham was cheered for
 saying that the Anglican Communion would certainly be rent
 in twain on the day on which any non-episcopally ordained
 minister was formally allowed within their communion to cele-
 brate the Eucharist, he would not unnaturally conclude that

such an utterance, coming from so representative a man as the Bishop of Birmingham, was a fair index of the mind of the Church of England on the point, or, at any rate, of the sentiments of the Episcopal Bench. It is as well, therefore, while the topic is still before us, to point out that so far is this proposition from carrying universal support that two Bishops—one in the Northern and the other in the Southern Province—have taken the earliest opportunity to repudiate it with emphasis. The repudiation in each case is couched in such weighty terms, and uttered with such an obvious sense of responsibility, that it should certainly be placed on record.

The Bishop of Durham, writing in the *Inter-
preter* for October on the Edinburgh Conference,
says :

“One reflection was forced upon me. It was that at present, certainly, the most formidable obstacle to large and wholesome movements of co-operation and ultimate union is a theory of Episcopal succession and ministration which puts it in the very front rank of the Christian verities, instead of setting it in a great, a sacred, but secondary place. The theory which makes the Episcopal succession, determined on a certain definite plan of consecrations, the repository of Divine grace upon earth, so that outside it the ministration of grace is at best irregular, out of covenant certainly, void of the fulness of Divine validity, is by its nature antagonistic to modifications of itself in favour of a larger truth. For it can scarcely admit any truth as to the Divine methods of distribution to be larger. And what I gravely feel, not the less as time goes on, is that the theory, however imposing, commended by whatever greatness of tradition and sanctity of names, is not a revelation, but an inference from inferences, based at the last resort on presuppositions.”

The other pronouncement is by the Bishop of Hereford. In his address to the Hereford Diocesan Conference, the Bishop, speaking also of the Edinburgh Conference and its drawing together of various religious bodies, said :

“I venture to say to our clergy that I hope it will not be hindered by the separatist episcopal utterances heard at our recent Church Congress. . . . And, for my own part, I feel it a plain duty to say that such episcopal utterances as those to which I refer should be estimated simply as survivals from darker days, and should no longer influence the Christian mind. When

a highly esteemed Bishop tells us that acceptance of episcopacy is an absolutely necessary condition and requirement before we can hold communion and fellowship with Christians of any other denomination, he is surely forgetting that our Lord left no such rule for His Church, and laid no such restriction upon His followers; he is refusing to admit, what scholars and historians have made clear, that whilst the monarchical episcopate soon became general in the Church, it was not from the first a universal or necessary requirement."

A correspondent, writing to the *Spectator* on this matter of episcopacy, recalls one or two passages from older divines, showing their Catholic breadth of view as opposed to the novel and rigid exclusiveness of present-day High Anglican sectarianism. His first quotation is from Hooker ("Eccl. Pol.," III. xi. 16):

Hooker and
Andrewes,

"Although I see that certain reformed Churches, the Scottish especially and French, have not that which best agreeth with the Sacred Scripture, I mean the Government that is by Bishops . . . this their defect and imperfection I had rather lament in such case than exagitate [*i.e.*, inveigh against], considering that men oftentimes, without any fault of their own, may be driven to want that kind of polity or regiment which is best, and to content themselves with that which either the irremediable error of former times or the necessity of the present hath cast upon them."

The other quotation is from Bishop Andrewes' answer to the French *pasteur* Du Moulin ("Opuscula," 191):

"Nec tamen si nostra Divini juris sit, inde sequitur, vel quod sine ea salus non sit, vel quod stare non possit Ecclesia. Ferreus sit qui salutem eis neget. Nos non sumus illi ferrei."

These quotations are followed by a reference to the well-known fact of Bishop Cosin's intercourse when in exile with the Reformed Churches on the Continent. They all go to show that for these masters of Anglican theology it was possible to hold a most lofty estimate of episcopacy without any of the more exclusive inferences of modern days.

An unauthorized, but evidently correct, account of the long-expected Report of the Royal Commission on the Church in Wales has been issued. It bristles with elaborate and carefully compiled statistics.

The Church
in Wales.

From these some fairly obvious conclusions may be deduced. There can be no doubt that in recent years there has been great progress in the life and work of the Anglican Church in Wales, so that it now outnumbers any other religious body in the Principality. With regard to the Nonconformist bodies, a striking picture is given of the way in which the zeal for chapel-building has quite outrun the actual needs. To quote the *Guardian's* summary of this point: "Whereas the Church of England provides one church for every 1,080 of the population, the Nonconformist provides one church for every 450. So great is the accommodation provided by all the denominations beyond the actual requirements of the population, that if all the people over three years of age were to go to church at the same time on any particular Sunday, there would still be more than 100,000 unoccupied sittings." It should be noted that the Report gives full and ungrudging recognition to the splendid work done by the Nonconformists in their Sunday-schools.

An interesting additional Report has been issued
 A **Minority**
 Report. by Lord Hugh Cecil and the Archdeacon of
 Carmarthen. One of the striking features in this
 is the information afforded as to the miserable underpayment
 of ministers in the Principality. In the Congregational churches
 one-third of the ministers receive less than £80 a year, and
 more than one-tenth of them receive less than £60. One
 cannot help wondering how much of this pitiable poverty might
 be prevented if only there were less overlapping of competing
 agencies, and more combined concentration in religious work.
 The sheer waste of it all is seen most vividly from the fact that
 in some small villages two or three chapels belong to different
 denominations, each of which provides more sittings than would
 suffice for the entire population of the village. The impression
 we gather from the Reports as a whole is that they afford no
 reasonable basis for any measure of Disestablishment or
 Disendowment of the Anglican Church in Wales.

**The Education
Question.**

We do not yet seem to have advanced very far towards a settlement of the religious difficulty. Although the proposals of the Settlement Committee have had a strong backing, recent events show that any attempt to make them the basis for legislation would meet with strong opposition. Mr. Lathbury published in the *Times* for October 10 an earnest appeal on behalf of what is practically secularism. This was promptly followed by an eloquent letter from the Bishop of Carlisle, repudiating any such suggestion and defending what is, in effect, the position of the Settlement Committee. Since then Lord Salisbury has put out a plea for what may be called the advanced "denominational" position, with strong emphasis on the parental right of choice in the matter. The tragedy of the situation is that while Churchmen disagree the Church of England is losing her schools. The Bishop of St. Asaph reminds us that, between August 1, 1903, and August 1, 1909, 372 Church of England schools were closed, owing to inability to comply with the demands of the Education Department, and that in the same period 298 of the same schools were transferred. In other words, we have lost 670 of our schools. And, as the Bishop points out, if we had only accepted the right of entry that was once offered, we might have assured the giving of genuine religious instruction in all the Elementary Schools of the land.

**Candidates for
Ordination.**

No more difficult problem is at present before the mind of the Church than that which concerns the training of candidates for Holy Orders. The Bishops of the Southern Province have passed a resolution, demanding that after 1917 every candidate (there are to be some exceptions) should possess a University degree. Probably a degree examination does provide the best rough test of general education. But there is considerable doubt whether the resolution of the Southern Upper House is not too sweeping, and that doubt has evidently weighed with the Northern House of Bishops to the extent that they are asking for a general meeting

of Bishops before they follow in the wake of the South. In the pages of the *Church Quarterly Review* there have been, first, a symposium in which several writers have taken part, and, second, a long article by the editor, who also presides over a training institution—King's College, London. Those pages are worthy of careful study; so also is the speech of Dr. Figgis of Mirfield, made at the annual meeting of the institution at Kelham. Two points of importance emerge. First, it is clear that the course of training must be made wider and more comprehensive, and, consequently, longer and more expensive. Secondly, to quote the *Church Times* summary of Dr. Figgis' speech, "The present system supplies a variety of training which is of the utmost value. To destroy it would be to exclude from the ranks of the priesthood some of the best and most promising men."

Bearing these two points in mind, it is necessary to insist that all institutions which are effectively and thoroughly training candidates for the ministry must be treated with even-handed justice. We doubt not that, whatever decisions are ultimately arrived at, this will be carefully done. And, furthermore, every school of thought in the Church, which believes that it has a contribution to make to the life and doctrine of the whole, will have to see to it that the means are provided for the maintenance of the necessary institutions, and the proper training of those who are admitted to them. A matter of money must not be allowed to interfere with the efficiency of our future clergy, or we shall never be able to fulfil the mission to which the Lord of the Church has called us.



The Rise of the Anglican Laity to Place and Power.

BY THE REV. CANON HENRY LEWIS, M.A.

(*Concluded.*)

III.

IT was not till 1857 that the English Church took any step to articulate herself formally and authoritatively on the subject of what her lay members can do for her in these modern times. In that year a Committee of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury presented an elaborate Report on the subject of "Lay Co-operation," and expressed the unanimous opinion that the well-being of the Church depends, under Almighty God, on the mutual good-will and cordial co-operation of its members—clergy and laity. It was late in the day for the Church to say all this; yet it must be remembered that Convocation had only resumed its active functions in 1852—five years before the pronouncement. Nevertheless, it is a reproach on the Church that she should have been so long in making an official utterance on the subject.

In 1861, the birth of the Church Congress as an annual function was a fresh impulse in the now fast-growing institution of the Anglican laity as a serving and even teaching body. Its declared purpose was "to bring together members of the Church of England, and of Churches in communion with her, for free deliberation, and for the exchange of opinion and experience on subjects which affect the practical efficiency of the Church, and the means of defence and extension; also for the encouragement of a general interest in these and kindred subjects among the Clergy and Laity in different parts of the kingdom."

The success of the yearly Church Congress has been continuous. Its usefulness as a means for calling out lay-interest and instructing lay-feeling on behalf of the National Church has been great. As a form of "Church Defence" it has accomplished much, and is capable of doing more.

Following upon the birth of the Church Congress there

came Diocesan Conferences, the purpose of which was mainly to call out and organize lay-help for Church ends. The first Diocesan Conference was held in the Diocese of Ely in 1864. Its example was soon followed by other dioceses. To coordinate these, and to secure some unity of action among these, the "Central Council of Diocesan Conferences" was instituted in 1881. Representatives from each Diocesan Conference form this Council.

It cannot be said that Diocesan Conferences have been a success from the lay point of view. They are far less democratic than the Church Congress. The laity have not learned to breathe freely in them. Very little spontaneous lay-speaking is heard in them. The result is, that Diocesan Conferences do not count for much with the outside world in their utterances. They are but little less academic than the ancient, but now feeble, Rural Deanery Chapters.

In 1886 the English Church took another step forward in the work of creating a really free and acting laity. It was the inauguration by both Houses of Convocation for Canterbury on February 16, 1886, of a House of Laymen. No legal status could be given to it. Nevertheless, what the Church could do, she did do. She arranged through the Convocation of Canterbury for the lay-members of Diocesan Conferences to elect from themselves representatives of each diocese throughout the land. Ten members were to be appointed for the Diocese of London, six for each of the Dioceses of Winchester, Rochester, Lichfield, and Worcester, and four for each of the dioceses which remained. Additional members, not exceeding ten, were to be nominated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, as president, by whom the House was in all cases to be convened and opened. It was also arranged that the House might be requested to confer with Convocation on such occasions and at such a place as the Archbishop might decide.

When the new House of Laymen came together for its first session on February 16, 1886, Archbishop Benson described

the event as "some initiation of a central organization of lay-power."¹ To him the creation of the new Lay House as an adjunct of Convocation was chiefly due. With true insight into the nature of the times, he had persistently emphasized that what the English Church needed pre-eminently was an awakened, instructed, and enfranchised laity. In his address to the new House he said: "The consultative bodies of laymen, which are now found in all branches of the Anglican Communion, carry us back long ages to the times when, before the Italian Church overrode all such promises, St. Cyprian promised the faithful laity that he would without their assent do nothing. . . . A Church which refers all to primitive standards is well able in the conduct of affairs to pursue primitive principles in forms which our own century can understand and use."

Lord Selborne was elected chairman, and Mr. G. A. Spottiswoode vice-chairman.

From the outset the new House of Laymen, like Convocation itself, has been pronouncedly High Church in its composition and doings. It has, however, done some good work, especially in matters affecting Church Patronage and Clergy Discipline Bills, the collecting of Church statistics, and the like.

The House of Laymen for the Province of York did not come into existence until 1892. Viscount Cross was elected chairman; Lord Halifax, the president of the English Church Union, was made vice-chairman.

Both the Northern and Southern Houses of Laymen have moved hesitatingly since their inauguration. The stiffness of Convocation, which begot them, is upon them, and there seems no likelihood of a more natural spontaneousness ever coming to them until Convocation itself is reformed.

IV.

While all this formal recognition of the rights of the laity to a share in the legislature and administration of the Anglican Church was thus being made, the laity themselves were pressing forward into other departments of the Church's work.

¹ "Life," vol. ii., p. 73.

In 1866, under the sagacious rule of Archbishop Tait—the first Primate of modern times to grasp the importance of an enfranchised laity as a chief factor of progress—the Order of Lay-Readers came into diocesan existence. Rules were drawn up by a meeting of Bishops at Lambeth, and what was already an irregular institution was thus taken under Episcopal direction, and, as far as individual Bishops could do so, was duly authorized.

In 1897-98 the Convocation of Canterbury decided that a new kind of lay-agent, who was described as a trained lay-evangelist, was necessary for the Church's needs. Three years later, in 1891, Bishop Temple called this new lay-agent into being. He described the class as Diocesan Readers, to distinguish them from Parochial Readers. Their area of service is the diocese. They are licensed to preach in churches at services other than Morning and Evening Prayer; they wear a surplice and a badge.

The present Bishop of Worcester, Dr. Yeatman Biggs, in his book, "Lay Work and the Office of Reader," chap. v., points out that notwithstanding all the movement and actual provision for using lay-help in the public ministrations of the Church, the Order of Lay-Readers has still to be authoritatively taken into the constitution of the Church as a defined and regulated office. This feeling found expression in 1903, when the Lower House of Canterbury requested the Archbishop to appoint a committee to consider and report on the question of restoring an Order of Readers, or Sub-deacons, in the Church. We have already referred to the report presented by this committee. The committee were unable to recommend the restoration of any of the Church's ancient minor orders. They saw serious legal and administrative difficulties in the way. They were "strongly in favour of extending and regulating the office of reader, including under that title the offices of evangelist and catechist, as more primitive, general, and permanent than those offices which are connected with the particular period of Church life in which the minor orders were created."¹

¹ P. 51 of the Committee's Report.

The Lower House of Canterbury agreed on July 5, 1904, to accept the main idea of the Report, and passed resolutions in which its recommendations for the admission and regulation of lay-readers were set forth.

Thus far has the Church of England reached in the matter of lay-agency in her public ministrations. No less than 3,365 lay-readers¹ are already at work in her parishes and dioceses. Convocation has taken official cognizance of them. The Bishops, as individuals, are welcoming them and gladly using them ; and yet the Church has still to take these 3,365 lay-readers into full legal connection with her constitution, and to acknowledge to the world that she holds them as one of her "Orders."

It is an unsatisfactory condition of things. The Bishop of Worcester, Dr. Yeatman Biggs, cools his impatience by suggesting that the delay will bring maturer wisdom and safer methods. And yet he thinks that the time has come "for some provincial measure, which will help men to understand what a reader is ; preventing the assumption of the title by those who are not qualified, and presently enabling the readers themselves to get into touch with one another, and to gain dignity and self-respect as they appreciate more and more a corporate relationship."²

To all this it may be added that among the 3,365 lay-readers there is no uniformity of system or even of management. In the London diocese the management is in the hands of a "Readers' Board," presided over by a Suffragan Bishop. In other dioceses the Bishop deals with his lay-readers directly. Uncertainty, too, exists even among the clergy as to what a reader may do or may not do. Finally, in no diocese can a lay-reader or trained evangelist feel that he is commissioned by the English Church. His authority at most amounts only to what an individual Bishop can give him. Still, although the 3,365 lay-

¹ "Official Year-Book of the Church of England for 1909."

² "Lay Work and the Office of Reader," p. 50.

readers in the Anglican Church are as yet but an irregular force in the army of the Church's public ministers, it is a force which is doing a big work now, and one which is likely to affect the fortunes of the National Church in the near future. For Church defence against Disestablishment the force of 3,365 lay-readers in these days of democracy is more qualified than the clergy. They could certainly be made powerful advocates for dealing with the Church's lay (political) masters; and in the event of Disestablishment ever taking place, the service which these lay-preachers could render in evacuated country cures would be enormous. Certainly "the factor of progress" is to a large extent with the Church's lay-readers. The true policy, therefore, seems to be to increase such agents, and to make them a constitutional and more and more used part of her system.

V.

A further movement for rallying and organizing the forces of lay life in England's national Church calls for notice.

We have seen how laymen have come into their own as fellow-counsellors, and legislators, and even teachers, with Bishops and clergy. We have now to see how these same enfranchised laymen are being taught to pray and to work for the Church as a living and serving whole.

A vast number of the laity do pray and do work; but it is as members of their local congregations. A considerable proportion of these pray and work as members of some missionary society whose operations, it may be, are world-wide. For these the Church of England may well be thankful.

But in the times that now are, and for those that are coming, something more is needed. The Church of England requires, and is already asking for the enthusiasm of men who bind themselves to pray for her every day, as the Jew prayed for his Jerusalem, and to work for her, as men must work for one whom they love with supreme affection.

The special means by which the Church is making this appeal is a Society—the Church of England Men's Society.

It was set going in 1890 by that strong leader of men, Bishop Temple. It has since been developed and made attractive by that other men's man, the present Archbishop of York, Dr. Lang. The latter has defined the object of the Society as being "to create in parish, town, district, and diocese strong centres of men, pledged to active service in and through the Church, and to bind them together in one comradeship." Its members, who must be communicants, and also its associates, who do not fulfil this condition, all bind themselves to accept and hold a simple rule of life, which is "to pray daily, and to do something to help forward the work of the Church." "No special prayers are enjoined, but all are to be men who pray. No special kind of service is defined; but all are to be men who work."

The constitution of the Society is equally simple. "The normal unit is the parochial branch, under the leadership of the incumbent." Parochial branches combine to form a district or diocesan division. Delegates are sent once a year to a Conference, which is "the supreme body as regards all questions concerning the movement as a whole, and which is becoming a real Parliament of the 'working men' of the Church of England." The number of branches is now 3,087. The membership has reached the large figure of 90,000 men. Truly we can say that the Anglican Church has at last adapted herself to the democratic feeling and movement of the age. And she has done it without sacrifice of principle or the employment of unworthy methods. While Nonconformity, in its eagerness to win the manhood of the nation, has not hesitated to use the free and easy method of the "Pleasant Sunday Afternoon" type of worship—a method which necessarily surrendered much of the dignity and spirituality of the old normal Church ways of the Wesleyans and other religious bodies—the Church of England has found a means by which to rouse labouring men to come and be sharers in her problems and advocates of her cause. And this, too, without the humiliation of giving prizes for attendance and the pain of having to provide entertainments in order to advertise and to draw.

VI.

We now come to the most recent effort of the English Church to secure for her laity a full partnership with Bishops and clergy in all that concerns her life, and teaching, and work. We refer to the establishment of the Representative Church Council.

The idea and its embodiment are the outcome of the Church's troubles in the present Education controversy.

On November 5 and 6, 1901, all the four Houses of the two Convocations and the two Houses of Laymen held a joint meeting at the Church House, Westminster, to discuss the situation, and to arrive at some common policy for the defence of the Church's day-schools. The experiment was repeated in July, 1902, and again in July, 1903. Its success was such that on the latter occasion it was resolved that the joint meeting of the two Convocations should be made a permanent institution, under the name of the Representative Church Council. The scheme was sanctioned by each House of each Convocation, sitting apart and acting independently. In November, 1905, the new Council formally adopted a Constitution—a set of Standing Orders for the conduct of its business—and also a scheme for the representation of the laity. Under its Constitution the Council consists of all the Houses of the two Convocations. It therefore represents Convocation in General Assembly, and provides a ready means for united counsel and action. Great care has been taken to safeguard the unity of the whole in the proceedings of the component parts of the Council. Equal precautions have been made for preventing any invasion by the Council upon the office and work of the Episcopate. The duties and privileges of Convocation have also been kept apart. Except in matters of procedure, a decision of the Council, before it can become authoritative, is to be made up of the assent of each of its three Houses, sitting separately. No statement purporting to declare the doctrine of the Church on any question of theology is to be

issued by the Council. And yet, as Mr. Chancellor P. V. Smith points out: "The Council may freely discuss and pass resolutions upon questions of doctrine and discipline, with this important proviso, viz., that any projected legislative measure touching doctrinal formulæ, or the service or the ceremonies of the Church, or the administration of the Church, shall be initiated in the House of Bishops, and shall be discussed by each House sitting separately; and the Council shall either accept or reject the measure in the terms in which it is finally proposed by the House of Bishops, after that House has received and considered the report of each separate discussion."¹ Thus, from first to last the Bishops have chief, though not all, control over the pronouncements of the Council. They initiate the discussions. They determine in what final shape the Council shall pronounce its collective "Yes" or "No" upon any point of doctrine, or discipline, or ceremonies, or administration of the Church.

The arrangement is a wise one. It is also a liberal one as far as the laity are concerned. If the Bishops are still to be regarded as judges and administrators in the Church's affairs, the laity, no less than the clergy, are now to be in a very real sense assessors.

At the first meeting of the new Representative Church Council in 1903 the momentous question of obtaining legal status and force for its constitution was discussed. It was resolved that no action be taken until the Council had shaped and consolidated itself on a voluntary basis into working order. The question is still waiting for that settlement which Parliament alone can give. When it comes before the House of Commons the real difficulties will begin. They will arise, not so much in what the Council asks to be enabled to legally do, as in the methods which are to be employed to shut out all non-confirmed members of Church of England congregations from even the right to vote at elections to the Representative Church Council. That only the confirmed should be allowed

¹ "The Church Handbook," p. 100.

to serve on the Council is reasonable enough. But that the baptized and habitual worshippers in our churches, who are not confirmed, should be refused the right to vote at elections to the Council, this seems to us unreasonable. It is inconsistent also, for unconfirmed members of Anglican congregations are often appointed to do the important work of churchwardens and sidesmen. We may be sure that Parliament will have something to say on this point when its sanction to the new scheme is sought.

VII.

Our task is finished. The story we have told began at a time in the eighteenth century, when the Anglican Church had no laity as a conscious and acting body of Christian life and thought. It ends in this twentieth century, at a moment when the Anglican Church has committed herself, for better or for worse, to a laity so conscious of itself, so organized in its powers, so instructed in its duties, and so enfranchised in its rights, that its equal in these particulars is not to be found in the whole range of past history. Compared with the position of the laity in the Roman and Greek Churches, the present position of the laity in the Anglican Church may seem hazardous to that Church. When, however, examination is made of the things contemplated, or at least suggested, by the New Testament conception of the Christian Church, then what we see to-day of the status and serving of the Anglican laity makes us feel that they are natural, and therefore hopeful.



The Authority of our Lord in the Synoptic Gospels.¹

BY THE REV. H. E. H. PROBYN,
Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Hereford.

THE personality of our Lord, and the effect of His personality on those who stood nearest to Him, gave rise to the greatest movement in history. If the Synoptic Gospels are wholly or in part the work of those who consorted with our Lord—if they are records of the preaching of those who knew Him in the flesh, some traces of this mighty personal factor must be discernible in them. The following article is the outcome of an attempt to study them from this point of view. It takes them as they stand—that is, as three historical documents of the origin of which history tells us that “St. Mark” is a report of the preaching of St. Peter, and that “St. Matthew” wrote the “Logia” in Hebrew; but whether or no the “Logia” and the “Gospel” are identical is uncertain. The writer of the Third Gospel says that he went over the whole ground again for the benefit of a friend.

Careful comparison of these documents shows that with their help we may approach the study of the personality of our Lord from three different points of view. Each of the three yields a somewhat different impression, because the personality of our Lord impressed different men in different ways. What kind of impression of authority and power did He make upon these three writers?

ST. MARK.

St. Mark's account, studied from Papias' point of view, as the report of St. Peter's preaching, seems to fall naturally into clearly marked divisions, each with its subject or *motif*.

After a short introduction (i. 1-13), in which the preparation of the people and the Lord's own preparation for His work are

¹ A paper read before the Hereford Ruri-Decanal Society.

outlined, St. Peter used to relate how our Lord began His work with a clear, simple message : “ The kingdom of God is near ” —“ God reigns.” And this was accompanied by an exhibition of the reign of God—an exhibition of power or authority. (1) In preaching : “ They were astonished at His teaching : for He taught them as having authority, and not as the Scribes.” (2) In driving out evil spirits : “ What is this ? A new teaching ! With authority He commandeth even the unclean spirits, and they obey Him.” (3) Over diseases, and this throughout Galilee. (4) Over sin : “ That they might know that the Son of man had authority on earth to forgive sins.” (5) Over the traditions and customs which, *e.g.*, in such matters as fasting and Sabbath observance, were crushing the spiritual power out of the religious life of the day.

This is the distinctive note of St. Peter’s preaching. This complex, impressive exhibition of power and authority was our Lord’s way of showing that in all departments of life God is King. The power was real and practical, and appealed with immense force to Simon the fisherman (i. 14–iii. 6).

In the next section our Lord is teaching the disciples how to lay hold of this power by faith. “ He that hath ears to ear, let him hear.” I am like a sower : the result of my teaching is often disappointing. Take pains to understand about the kingdom of God. It will grow as the seed grows to a great tree ; but the teacher’s fate is like the sower’s—half his words take no effect. “ Take pains to hear.”

Not long afterwards they were crossing the lake. The fury of the storm that night was terrifying, the danger pressing. When at a word from Him the danger passed, He asked why they were afraid. “ Have ye not yet faith ? ” Do you not yet understand that God reigns ? When a woman with an issue was cured, He said : “ It was your faith.” When Jairus hears that his little girl was dead, “ Do not be afraid,” He says, “ only believe ” ; and as He restored the child, the parents and Peter and his two friends were amazed to see yet another province over which God was King.

He was displaying His power, and watching and fostering the disciples' slowly growing apprehension of His lesson (iii. 7-vi. 6).

He was not satisfied with a theoretical hold on the truth. And presently He equips the disciples with His own power, "giving them authority over the unclean spirits," and sends them out to preach and heal. After the excitement of that first mission He would have them rest. But by this time the crowds had become so insistent that He could not shake them off so long as He was in Galilee. That evening He fed 5,000 men with a few loaves and fishes. But the disciples failed to grasp the significance of the sign, they had not yet learned their lesson. When, about 3 a.m., He came walking over the lake to join them, they thought it was a ghost — "they had not understood about the loaves." He repeated the sign; and afterwards in the boat He was cautioning them, and, as they thought, hinting at their forgetfulness in letting their provisions run as low as one loaf. "Oh no," He said; "do you not perceive nor understand? Where are your eyes and ears? Five loaves enough for 5,000, seven for 4,000! Do you not yet understand?"

St. Peter at least was on the verge of the great discovery. This last exhibition of power, this last lesson on the reign of God, linking it with the message of creation itself, completed one part of the Lord's task (vi. 7-viii. 26).

And when, by the streams and glades of Cæsarea Philippi, He asked, "Who say ye that I am?" Peter was ready with his answer, "The Christ." At once the lesson is carried to its conclusion. "The Christ must suffer, die, and rise again." The reign of God extends beyond this life. This life is not everything. "Believe it, and you will discover life. Cling to this life, and you will never find life at all." All the rest of St. Peter's preaching is occupied with the reiteration of this final lesson: until the Lord, who had taught the great truth that God reigns, holding men spellbound by His teaching, mastering devils and disease, lifting the burden of sin, shouldering His way through

the customs and traditions of men, by the end of three years had made His power so strongly felt that He was put to death because it seemed likely to endanger that of the authorities. But death could not subdue him. There was no limit to His power.

Thus the authority of our Lord laid hold of St. Peter. In after years, when his eyes had long been opened to its full meaning, he described its effect in these striking words: "God *begat us again* to a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead" (1 Peter i. 3). It had changed the whole face of life.

ST. MATTHEW.

The account traditionally ascribed to St. Matthew has for its subject the Messiah. The formal proof ("thus it is written") that Jesus was Messiah runs like a thread through the narrative, and round it the story is woven.

In the introductory chapters (i.-iv. 16) our Lord is set before us as the descendant of David and Abraham. He was born in an atmosphere deeper and purer than that of the formal righteousness of the day.

Before His work began, the Baptist had confronted the people with a demand for the radical reformation of each individual. They were Abraham's children, but they must prove their descent by morality, goodness, character. When Jesus presented Himself for baptism, John hesitated; but Jesus persists: "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." He has an ideal to fulfil, and He will carry it out in detail, as in the great principles which are to govern His work. They are described in the story of the Temptation. The Word of God is His food; trust in God His support; the method of God His method. A unique character is stepping out into the field. It was like the dawn after a dreary night. "Zebulon, Naphthali, Galilee of the Gentiles, the people that sat in darkness, saw a great light."

He begins to preach the Kingdom of Heaven (iv. 17-vii. 29). A brief account of the call of the Twelve, and the teaching,

preaching, and healing throughout the length and breadth of Galilee, precedes the discourse which has given this Gospel the premier place in the world's spiritual development. In the Sermon on the Mount our Lord sketches "the blessed in the Kingdom." It was no new teaching. The blessed in the Kingdom are the blessed in the Book. The jewels which Christ set in this character of brilliants had long lain under men's hands, but until now none had cut and set them. It is the character after God's own heart: these men are the salt of the earth, the light of the world. And as He proceeds with His picture of the Heavenly Father and His beloved children, men felt that they were lifted into the very atmosphere of Heaven.

The whole discourse may be described as an impressionist study of our Lord's earliest teaching. It is characteristic of the writer to disregard chronology in order to give his readers a vivid impression. (A careful comparison of almost any of the discourses in this Gospel with parallels in St. Luke will make this plain.) St. Mark draws strongly in black and white; St. Matthew gives us atmosphere, colour. St. Mark shows us the reign of God, a reign of power; St. Matthew, the atmosphere in which God reigns, the Kingdom of Heaven. Righteousness, character, are its keynotes.

The preaching of the Kingdom is followed by the translation of the lesson into deeds (viii. 1-ix. 34). It is characteristic of the writer to keep all this side of the ministry in lower relief. St. Mark gives it with a vividness which impresses every reader; St. Matthew sets it back. He wants the teaching to stand out in high relief against a background of deeds of mercy.

Another tour of teaching impresses our Lord with the unshepherded, uncared-for state of the people (ix. 35-x. 42). He calls the Twelve, and gives them a definite charge to these sheep of the house of Israel who had lost their way for want of shepherds. This discourse, too, is clearly a grouping of our Lord's teaching on the subject in hand. Two features stand out prominently—His feeling for the spiritual destitution of the

people, and His sense of the danger that awaited the disciples. It is a perfect impression of the atmosphere in which service in the Kingdom of Heaven must be fulfilled.

In chapter xii. opposition to Messiah's work is strongly developed. Clouds are gathering. The teaching of the period is summarized in the chapter of parables (xiii.). The Kingdom of Heaven is not all sunshine. Our Lord speaks of the mysteries, the lights and shadows, of the Kingdom. There is the mystery of failure (the sower), the mystery of evil (tares), the mystery of progress (leaven and mustard-seed), the mystery of fascination (treasure and pearl), and, again, the mystery of iniquity (drag-net). And the truth and beauty and sadness of that picture have haunted men ever since.

And so throughout the Gospel; the writer uses Mark's vigorous story of deeds in low relief to bring Messiah's teaching into prominence, and groups the teaching according to its subject-matter so as to bring home to his readers the new ideal of righteousness. The Old Book spoke of it. Messiah fulfilled it. His power as a religious teacher was that He made men feel the true ideal of Judaism. Teaching it positively as an atmosphere of lofty character and motive, the atmosphere of the Kingdom of God—a life whose dominant notes are righteousness and mercy—"Come unto Me," He said; "I will give you rest." I will show you how to be men of God. Religion is not a heavy burden. It has become such. It is easily carried. Teaching it negatively, as a protest against the dead formalism of the religion of the day, a protest which grew more and more emphatic, and culminated in the tremendous philippic of chapter xxiii.

Both aspects of the teaching appealed to the writer. The reality of the true ideal touched his conscience. The unanswerable attack on the false broke his bonds. This is the note of authority and power which laid hold on the author of the Gospel, whoever he was. And if, as tradition says, he was one who till Christ came was outcast, and then was welcomed, we can the more readily understand his eager response to that

welcome, and the gladness with which he travelled far to tell others of the power which had set him free and brought him peace.

ST. LUKE.

St. Luke's Gospel is an account of our Lord's life and work written for a God-fearing friend. The writer collected trustworthy information, tested his facts, arranged them in chronological sequence, going carefully over all the ground again so that his friend might have a reliable history of all that he had been taught about the Lord by word of mouth.

This makes our inquiry a little more difficult. The Gospels of St. Mark and St. Matthew are homiletic in method. They are the work of preachers accustomed by long practice to bring out the salient features of their message with lucidity and force. St. Luke's method is more strictly historical—he binds himself to chronology. Yet, for all this difference, the study of the third Gospel, with its careful touches in detail, its additions, its rearrangements here and there, reveals a conception of our Lord's personality which is distinct from that of the other two, and not less impressive. It must suffice to indicate this in one or two particulars only.

St. Luke stands back from his subject and draws in his picture on the broadest possible lines. Jesus is the Son of Adam, the Son of God (iii. 38). His growth from childhood to boyhood is an all-round development, physical, mental, spiritual.

His first visit to the Temple was memorable. He was fascinated by the teachers there. They had that to impart which He was already longing to receive. There was growing towards maturity in Him an understanding which, even at that age, astonished all. The boy was something more than a genius. He had a genuine passion for truth. He flings Himself with ardour into His Father's business, whether in the enchanted air of the divine learning of the Temple, or in the quiet round of obedience in the home life at Nazareth.

Here is a nature full of passion for what is highest and deepest, developing, in an ideal environment, the spiritual atmosphere of a pure home. "He grew in wisdom," St. Luke wrote, "and grew to be beloved by all" (ii. 52).

John the Baptist described Him before His ministry began as one Who would bring into the world a spirit of holiness and flame. There would be a distinctiveness about all that He said and did which would be a purifying and uplifting force among men.

Much of the Sermon on the Mount is to be found in the teaching on the level place (vi. 17); but with a difference. "Blessed are ye poor"—not "poor in spirit"; St. Matthew's "religious" point of view is different to this. The phrasing is crisp and bold. "Blessed ye poor, ye that hunger and weep and are hated. Woe to you rich and full and laughing ones whom men praise." What is this bold man saying? What does He mean? His words provoke thought, provoke certainly strong feeling. "The thoughts of many hearts are being revealed," as Simeon foretold.

And so throughout; the Lord's teaching in short memorable sayings and in longer discourses impressed St. Luke by its depth and wisdom. His deeds appealed to him as a doctor by their range of power and knowledge, and by their tenderness.

A single phrase, unique in the Gospels, exactly expresses the feeling which grew upon him as he studied all the facts of the Lord's life afresh. Thus saith the Wisdom of God (xi. 49).

He shows us in the course of his narrative how our Lord's early enthusiasm for the Temple and the religious life of the day received its first great shock at Nazareth, gradually cooled, then turned to strong antagonism. "They had taken away," he said, "the key of knowledge; they entered not in themselves, and those that were entering they hindered" (xi. 52).

We must not go further into detail. Nothing but careful study of the Gospel will reveal the strength of the impression

that the wisdom of the Master—its breadth, its calm, its power—made upon St. Luke. It was no frigid intellectualism. It was a passion revealing itself in deed and word. "I came to cast fire upon the earth, and what will I if it be already kindled? I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straightened till it be accomplished!" (xii. 49). A spirit ardent and sensitive. A spirit also which can inspire others. At the very end of his story St. Luke relates an incident which is significant (xxiv. 13-35). Two friends of the Lord's were on their way home from Jerusalem after His death, in utter desolation, when He met them. They did not recognize Him, but as He opened the real meaning of the Scriptures to them "their hearts burned within them." Here, again, the Master's hold upon the writer may be seen. His words and deeds were a revelation of the Wisdom of God; and as careful study brought this home with ever-growing conviction to the writer, his heart burned within him, and he felt and bowed before the Power the authority of Him whose life's story he wrote that his friend might be sure that what he had been taught about Him was indeed the truth.

CONCLUSION.

No account of the way in which the power and authority of our Lord impressed the Evangelists would be complete if it stopped here. He impressed Himself by His practical power on St. Peter, by His ideal of righteousness upon the writer we call St. Matthew, by the cumulative force of His whole life and work upon St. Luke. The three narratives with their strongly-marked differences converge as they reach the closing scenes. Each by a different path leads us first to Gethsemane to witness a strong Man's agony, to Calvary to see His triumph, to the Sepulchre to hear Him proclaimed the Son of God with power.

If the impression of power made by the personality of our Lord during His ministry was striking, His death and triumph over death made it indelible.

When a friend is removed by death, blemishes are forgotten :

he seems dearer than ever before. When a great human figure vanishes from the scene, he seems immeasurably greater than in life. Death enhances men's regard for those they love and reverence. We have seen something of the strength and depth of the love and reverence which bound the disciples to the Lord while He was upon earth; death intensified both. Again, there come to us all moments in our lives when the question confronts us, "Is all that I believe, all that I cling to, this faith in God, in Christ, upon which I have staked my life, true or false?" We seem to stand on the brink of an abyss which appals us. The Lord's disciples faced that compared with which such gloomy moments are but the memory of a fantastic dream. They saw their Master quail. They fled in terror from a power He could not resist. They saw Him done to death. Not a hideous possibility, but despair blacker than any we need ever know overwhelmed them. We can but faintly gauge the revulsion when the full truth about His power swept over them. Recall one of its effects. All thoughts of revenge for their Master's sufferings and death were swept away. It was as if they had never been. Those of them whose writings we have been studying struggle to find words to express the sense of His power and authority which now possesses them. "In none other," says St. Peter, "is security absolute and unbounded to be found, in none other in Heaven or on earth" (Acts iv. 12). "All authority in Heaven and earth are His," are the closing words of St. Matthew's Gospel. "All that I told you was but the beginning" (Acts i. 1), says St. Luke, writing again to his friend. And at the moment that he wrote Imperial Rome herself, the mistress of the world, had felt the touch of Him before whose power she was to bow.

Before the volume whose opening chapters we have been studying closes, it seemed to one who had ears to hear that already in the stillness voices could be heard singing in the Presence chamber of the King, "Unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, be the blessing, and the honour, and the glory, *and the dominion* for ever and ever" (Rev. v. 13).

Some Chapters in the History of the Early English Church.

BY THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

VI.—MONASTICISM.

THE life of Bede leads naturally enough to a consideration of two tendencies which mark the history of the Western Church during the time that the English nation was being converted and the English Church was being organized; for to both of these tendencies Bede's life contributed a good deal. From the fifth to the seventh or eighth century Western Christendom had been moving in two directions, which were not altogether unconnected, or, perhaps we should say, towards two points which to a large extent might be reached by travelling along one and the same road: it had been becoming more distinctly monastic in spirit and organization, and it had been steadily developing into a vast monarchy. The influence of Bede told quite decidedly in furthering both these movements. By precept and example he showed how salutary and how happy the monastic life could be; and by precept and example he taught that the one safe centre of Church order and discipline was Rome. And the two movements aided one another. The Popes supported monasteries, even when they came into conflict with regular ecclesiastical organizations, and the monasteries naturally enough supported the claims of the Popes who favoured them.

It is not difficult to criticize monasticism. There is much in it which is not only contrary to modern ideas of what is good for the individual and for society, but which is at variance with human nature itself. It takes men away from those who have a claim upon their sympathy and services, and it prevents them from fulfilling the ordinary obligations of man to his fellow-men. It directly opposes some of the strongest among the original emotions of human nature—the affection between husband and wife and between parent and child. In the place of these

natural duties and relationships it substitutes a number of artificial duties and relationships, the transgression or neglect of which constitutes equally artificial offences. For the bracing atmosphere of the outside world it substitutes that of a hothouse, which may possibly be more pure, but is certainly more enervating.

All this, and a good deal more, is true. Nevertheless, monasticism must have substantial advantages to set against these real and manifest defects. It is not to be supposed that a system which is so ancient and which still survives, which has arisen in religions of such very different character, and has spread so widely in each of them, and which, in spite of monstrous and notorious failures, has been so persistently renewed, is unable to show that it answers to some elements in human nature, and can do some real good to mankind. A mode of life that has been tested by such very different kinds of men through so many centuries, and still survives and flourishes, cannot be merely a gigantic blunder. It must offer something that many human beings crave. We may go further than that, and say that, as a matter of fact, it offers to gratify at one and the same time two apparently opposed cravings, one of which is often very powerful, while the other always is so. These two are: aspirations for self-sacrifice and love of self. The monk and the nun were self-sacrificing, for they surrendered all those things which to most of us make life worth living—wealth, rank, fame, the joys of family life, and the inclinations of one's own will. But this manifest and far-reaching self-sacrifice, which often involved long and violent struggles for its accomplishment, was in reality self-seeking. It was often, if not commonly, thoroughly selfish in motive and in aim. The monk and the nun entered the monastery in order to escape distraction and temptation in this life, and in order to secure eternal happiness in the life to come. It is no sufficient answer to this to say that the selfishness that leads people to enter a monastery is not worse than the selfishness which prevails among those who remain outside: religious selfishness is cer-

tainly more subtle, and is probably harder to cure. Selfishness is bad wherever it is exhibited, and it is not easy to balance one kind against another. It is more easy to see that a monk is not necessarily a bad citizen because he retires from the discharge of ordinary social duties. That depends upon the condition of the society from which he retires. In an age in which the selfishness of ordinary men is exhibited in bestial sensualism, pitiless greed, and ruthless oppression of the weak, a striking example of vigorous self-control in all these things is an immense gain to society, and those who set such example may be rendering as great a service as the soldier who fights its battles or the trader who supplies its needs. Granted that the example would be all the more fruitful if it were exhibited in the world outside rather than in the seclusion of the convent, yet it is better that it should be manifested in the convent than not at all. Monks and nuns represent not the highest life that is attainable by human beings, but a life which, among other uses, may at least serve as an emphatic protest against some of the worst features that disfigure and defile the outside world.

But, however we may strike the balance between the merits and demerits of monasticism—whether we regard it as a good thing which human frailty has almost invariably depraved, or as a system which is radically wrong in principle, and only accidentally, under exceptional conditions, produces good results—it must always be reckoned as one of those influences which have taken a leading part in shaping the history of Christianity and of civilization. And it is not of Christian origin. Like Orientalism and Hellenism, it has come in from the outside, and, having been admitted into the Christian Church, and been greatly modified by it, has in turn had a great effect upon Christian thought and organization.

In considering monasticism as we find it in Britain after the conversion of the English, we may pass over the three stages through which it commonly passed elsewhere. These were: the *hermit* period, of solitaries living entirely apart in the desert; the *laura* period, of hermits' cells grouped round the cell of someone

who had a reputation for special sanctity and spiritual wisdom; and the *monastery* period, in which buildings, with a definite plan in accordance with definite regulations, are substituted for the unorganized group of separate dwellings.¹ The monastic system which existed in Britain before the coming of Augustine and the system which he brought with him from Rome had each of them already reached the third of these periods, and we need not ask when and where and to what extent it had passed through the other two. Our knowledge of both these types of monasticism is very incomplete. From the biographies of different saints we learn a good deal about the one,² and from scattered notices in Bede we learn something of both, and he tells us that in his time the period of decline and corruption had already begun. Augustine and his companions had come from a monastery founded by Gregory the Great in Rome, and it is likely enough that the Pope had drawn up the rule under which the monks lived. This is perhaps implied in the letter of his successor, Honorius, to Archbishop Honorius, June, 634 (Bede, *H. E.*, ii. 18), in which he speaks of the Archbishop's love in following *magistri et capituli sui sancti Gregorii regulam*. But we do not know any particulars of this rule, or whether it differed materially from other monastic rules, especially whether it was very different from the Benedictine rule which eventually succeeded it. The Benedictine rule in the end superseded, not only whatever rule Augustine may have brought with him to England, but also the Scottish rule of St. Columba, which was afterwards brought from Iona to various centres in Northumbria and elsewhere. We may believe that, as in the case of the struggle between the rule of Benedict and the rule of Columban on the Continent, the victory of the former was a survival of the fittest.

Authorities are not agreed as to who it was that introduced

¹ Kirsopp Lake, "The Early Days of Monasticism on Mount Athos," pp. 4 *et seq.*; Lingard, "The Anglo-Saxon Church," i., pp. 147 *et seq.*

² See, *e.g.*, "*Vitæ Sanctorum Hiberniæ*," edited by Charles Plummer, especially vol. i., pp. cxi-cxxix, and "*Adamnani Vita S. Columbæ*," edited by J. T. Fowler, pp. xxxvi-lvi.

the Benedictine system into England. Some say that this was due to Wilfrid, who had been brought up under the Scottish system at Lindisfarne, but had seen the superiority of the other rule in his travels on the Continent, and especially at Rome. Others attribute it to Benedict Biscop, who travelled to Lyons with Wilfrid in 653, and went on to Rome without him. In his five pilgrimages to the tombs of the Apostles he must often have stayed in Benedictine monasteries. Others, again, attribute the introduction to Augustine himself—an hypothesis which assumes that the monastery on the Cælian from which he came had a rule which was essentially that of Benedict. There is yet another view—that the true Benedictine rule never existed in England at all until the revival of monasticism under Dunstan. The only fact that is of much importance is that it was this rule which ultimately prevailed in England, as on the Continent.

The increase of monasteries had been enormous. It is said that the names of 1,481, founded before A.D. 814, are known. The number of those whose names are not known must be very large. We have some idea of the increase in England from a statement that is made by Bede in his famous letter to Bishop Egbert of York. Having pointed out (§ 7) that there are many villages in out-of-the-way places which for many years have never been visited by a Bishop, he suggested that the King of Northumbria, Ceolwulf, should be asked to co-operate in increasing the number of Bishops. There is, however, this difficulty (§ 9): that “by means of the foolish donations of former Kings, it is no easy matter to find a vacant place for the foundation of an episcopal see”; for all the suitable places are already in the possession of some monastery or other. Bede therefore advises that the Great Council, with the Archbishop and the King, should decree that one of the monasteries be made an episcopal see; and he thinks that the monks would consent to this if they were allowed to elect the Bishop either from their own body or from persons in the diocese.¹ If funds should be

¹ We have an instance of this policy being adopted in the case of the Abbey of St. Martin at Tours. Pope Hadrian I. in 786 granted permission

wanted for the maintenance of the bishopric, then he trusts that the revenues of some of the less satisfactory monasteries may be taken for this purpose.

In connection with this last suggestion, Bede makes known to us a monstrous abuse of the principle of monastic foundations. The abuse became possible through what may be regarded as an evasion of one of the chief rules in monastic discipline. The three primary duties of the monk were obedience, chastity, and poverty. In course of time it was argued that the poverty of the individual did not involve the poverty of the corporation. Although each member of the community was unable to call even a sandal his own, yet the community as a whole might be rich in buildings, lands, and any kind of endowment. Private property was forbidden, but corporate property might be acquired to any extent. This, of course, opened the door to indefinite relaxation of the rigours of monastic discipline, especially when study and teaching and the practice of various arts had taken the place of manual labour as the proper occupation of a monk. But the evils consequent upon the abandonment of the rule of poverty did not end there. A door was opened for the foundation of sham monasteries. Land granted for the foundation of a monastery was secured as the property of the monastery in perpetuity. Persons of influence obtained grants of land on the plea that they were about to found a monastery, bribed the King to grant them a charter (which was confirmed by ecclesiastical and civil authority), and then founded what they called a monastery, but what was really a home for dissolute persons. This abuse, Bede says, was very common; instances of it were frequent—so much so that it was difficult to find land for discharged soldiers and other deserving persons. And the abuse was not confined to one sex: there were convents of sham nuns as well as of sham monks. For this evil there is only one remedy—expulsion from the boundaries of the Church

to the Abbot and brethren to elect a Bishop of their own, who was to have jurisdiction over the territory held by the monastery, and was to be wholly independent of the Metropolitan of Tours. The latter was to have no authority over the priests of the monastery and no right to officiate in it.

by episcopal authority, which, however, is not easy to get, for there is a good deal of episcopal connivance in the matter.¹ Thus, while the property of some of the genuine monasteries in which discipline had become very lax was to be taken for the maintenance of additional bishoprics, the sham monasteries were to be simply abolished, and their lands set free for any good purpose, ecclesiastical or civil. In these suggestions of Bede we have a remarkable anticipation of the treatment of the monastic houses under Henry VIII., as it was planned by Wolsey, rather than as it was carried out by Cromwell.

Bede has been criticized for suggesting that the monastery that was chosen by the Council as an episcopal see should be allowed to elect one of their own monks, or someone in the diocese, to fill the see. Would it not have been better to allow them to elect the best man, wherever he was to be found? No doubt; but we must remember that Bede's object is to anticipate and overcome possible opposition. The monks would be less likely to oppose the erection of an episcopal see in their monastery if it was suggested to them that they themselves might fill it—and, indeed, were expected to fill it—with someone who was well known to them. They were not bound to look farther and elect an eminent stranger. Yet Bede may have been prejudiced in the matter. The founder of his own monastery, Benedict Biscop, was very much opposed to the policy of bringing an outsider from one monastic house to rule a house in which he was a stranger. Ceolfrid, before starting on the journey to Rome which he did not live to accomplish, charged the brethren to "choose one of the more efficient of their own number as their father." Such precedents (and they did not stand alone) would seem to Bede to be decisive. But the success of Theodore of Tarsus as Archbishop of Canterbury was a precedent for a more liberal policy. He, however, had the advantages of coming from the East, from the home of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, and of having been consecrated

¹ This seems to mean that the King was not the only person who took bribes in this nefarious business.

for his difficult post by the Bishop of Rome himself. Bede may have thought that so unique a combination of favourable conditions could not be a precedent for the appointment of an outsider.

These abuses were not the only thing which led to the temporary extinction of the Benedictines in England before the end of the ninth century. Monks were originally laymen who desired to fly from the temptations of the world. They required priests to minister to them. But becoming a monk was a different thing from taking Orders. When, however, monks worked as missionaries, as was the case in England, it was found very advantageous that they should be ordained. This innovation divided monks into two classes, clerics and laymen, and the clerics regarded themselves as superior to the laymen. The proportion of clerics gradually increased, and they became a college of canons separate from the true monks, though continuing to live side by side with them. They were intermediate between the monks and the secular clergy outside. They lived together under rule, and so far were like the monks; but, unlike the monks, and like the secular clergy, they mixed rather freely with the world. In some cases the monastic rule was formally abandoned, and the position of *canonici*¹ was adopted, with the consent of the whole body; and they called themselves monks or canons, just as they pleased. There is little doubt that this revolution took place in England as well as on the Continent, for somewhat later we find Alfred and Dunstan labouring to restore the monastic rule in its integrity.

¹ See Stubbs, "Constitutional History," i., pp. 222 *et seq.* He quotes from the Legatine Councils of A.D. 787: *Ut episcopi diligenti cura provideant quo omnes canonici sui canonice vivant et monachi seu monachæ regulariter conversentur*; and he remarks that this is the first time that the word *canon* occurs in an English document.



Verbal Revision of the Prayer-Book.

BY THE REV. E. J. WOLFE,

Vicar of St. Thomas', Telford Park, S.W.

AMONG the resolutions formally adopted by the recent Lambeth Conference is one in which the necessity is laid down for the "change of words obscure or commonly misunderstood" in any revision of the Prayer-Book which may be undertaken.

How has this necessity arisen? And what changes are necessary?

1. With the exception of some of the "occasional services," which have been added to or revised in comparatively modern times, the bulk of our English Prayer-Book assumed its present form at varying dates between 1544 (the translation of the Litany) and 1661 (the Savoy Conference revision).

The continuous portions of Scripture, such as the Epistles and Gospels, are from the Authorized Version of the Bible, 1611, but the Prayer-Book version of the Psalms is that of the "Great English Bible," 1539.

Our present service-book, therefore, is almost entirely in language in use from 250 to 360 years ago. It is easy to understand how, during such a length of time, many changes must have taken place in our language. Living languages reflect the vicissitudes of the peoples who use them. "In the course of a nation's progress new ideas are evermore mounting above the horizon, while others are lost sight of and sink below it; others, again, change their form and aspect; others which seem united split into parts. And as it is with ideas, so is it with their symbols, words. New ones are perpetually coined to meet the demand of an advanced understanding, of new feelings that have sprung out of the decay of old ones, of ideas that have shot forth from the summit of the tree of our knowledge. Old words meanwhile fall into disuse and become obsolete; others have their meaning narrowed and defined; synonyms diverge from each other and their property is parted

between them ; nay, whole classes of words will now and then be thrown overboard, as new feelings or perceptions of analogy gain ground" (Archdeacon Hare, quoted in Trench's "Past and Present"). Indeed, the wonder, in view of the circumstances, is, not that there should be "obscure and commonly misunderstood words" in the Prayer-Book, but that their number is not much greater than it is—nay, might it not well have happened, considering the influence our English Bible and Prayer-Book have had upon our common speech, that many words, familiarized and kept alive by them and so in current use to-day, would have died long ago, if the language of these books had been continuously and at short intervals revised and brought up to date.

2. An exhaustive list of desirable verbal alterations in the Book of Common Prayer is not attempted here. A few typical examples are given by way of illustration, and to exonerate, if need be, the Bishops' resolution from any possibility of being thought superfluous. But first we should like to point out wherein the danger of misconception lies. Not in the presence of archaic or obsolete words, the very unfamiliarity of which insures some inquiry as to their signification, but in that of words which are still in everyday use, with meanings more or less removed from those which they once possessed. "These are as hidden rocks, which are the more dangerous that their very existence is unsuspected. . . . Words that have changed their meanings have often a deceivableness about them ; a reader not once doubts but that he knows their intention ; he is visited with no misgivings that they possess for him another force than that which they possessed for the author in whose writings he finds them, and which they conveyed to *his* contemporaries (Trench's "Past and Present").

It may be objected, perhaps, that some of the under-mentioned examples are puerile in their simplicity, and so well recognized as unlikely to be misconceived by anybody ; but we can assure our readers that not one is cited but has in our experience proved a stumbling-block to inadequately instructed

users of our Prayer-Book. Indeed, it would be well if teachers—the clergy especially—were to assume a little less familiarity on the part of learners, with even foundation truths, than they are sometimes wont to do. It will not, then, perhaps be out of place to start with one instance where the clergy themselves often give the weight of their example to a misused word.

How common to see in Church papers advertisements for “curates wanted,” or by “curates wanting curacies!” How frequently is “my curate” spoken of when “my colleague” or “my assistant” would both sound more courteous and be more correct. “The Curate’s Lot” is the title of a correspondence which appeared lately in a London daily paper. In each of these instances the correct designation should be curate-assistant or stipendiary-curate. “Curate,” unmodified, is in Prayer-Book language one having a “cure,” or “care,” of souls—*e.g.*, the incumbent of a parish. It was, no doubt, acquaintance with the word only in its popular sense that led a by no means ill-educated or unintelligent member of a former congregation to ask the writer in all sincerity: “Why do you pray for “all Bishops and curates” while the rectors and vicars are left out in the cold?” It may be, perhaps, inadvisable, or even impossible, to alter now the popular use of “curate,” but if so, the Prayer-Book use should be made clear.

Several words which present no difficulty to a reader of even the slightest classical knowledge are veritable pitfalls to those who know them only in their English dress. Take as examples two words often associated, “Hell,” “Damnation.” The former is ambiguous, as the translation of two Greek words with widely differing significations—“Hades,” the abode of departed spirits, or sometimes simply “the grave” and “Gehenna,” the place of final punishment of the impenitent. It would be a great gain if the corresponding Greek words were substituted for “Hell” wherever it occurs, as has been done in the “Revised Version.”

“Damnation” is susceptible of a variety of meanings. Sometimes it stands merely for “judgment,” sometimes for

“condemnation,” sometimes for the “loss” or “punishment” that follows condemnation. In view of its universally forcible but objectionable meaning on the lips of “the man in the street,” it is surely advisable that its appearance in our formularies should be as restricted as possible.

The example that occurs most readily to our minds when the subject of “changed meanings” of words is mentioned is that of “prevent” (preventing). “*Prevent* us, O Lord, in all our doings” (Collect at the end of the Communion Office). “By Thy special Grace *preventing* us” (Collect for Easter Day). “We pray Thee that Thy Grace may always *prevent* and follow us” (Collect, Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity). Little as it may be thought, there are still members of our congregations who, puzzled by the use of the word in these places, think, when they try to solve the puzzle at all, that it in some way means *hinder* us from going astray, and who have therefore to be told that, whereas now “prevent” suggests going in front to stop the way, it originally conveyed, and in our Prayer-Book still conveys, the idea of the help and protection to be afforded by a friendly pioneer, courier, or advanced guard.

This particular example is especially worthy of attention, not merely because it shows the perfect *volte face* words may in process of time come to make (here from “help” to “hinder”), but because it illustrates a remarkable tendency which words often exhibit to deteriorate in meaning by use.

Side by side with “prevent,” we may well place “let”—a word which has gone through very similar changes, but in an exactly opposite direction, so that the two words have almost, as it were, changed places.

In our Prayer-Book—“Sore *let* and hindered” (Collect, Fourth Sunday in Advent) *cf.* also 2 Thess. ii. 7—“let” is the modern “prevent,” “hinder”; while in the speech of to-day, if not the active “help,” it is the neutral “permit,” “allow.”

Another word belonging to the same class of “degenerates” as “prevent” is “indifferent” (indifferently)—“rites and ceremonies . . . being things in their own nature *indifferent*”

(Preface to Prayer-Book). "That they may truly and *indifferently* minister justice" (Prayer for the Church Militant). Here the change is almost as great as in the case of "prevent." In current speech the force is "bad," "badly," "an *indifferent* sermon." "He reads *indifferently*." The original meaning was quite other—"inclining to neither side," "without respect of persons," "neutral," "impartial."

Tempt (temptation) also illustrates the same downward tendency in the development of some words, but, with this feature of added interest, that in our books the old meaning is not either everywhere retained or everywhere superseded. Both old and new meanings are found. The process of change is at work, but is not completed.

The original meaning, "to prove," "to try," "to make trial of," may be clearly seen in Gen. xxii. 1, "And it came to pass after these things that God did *tempt* Abraham," where we certainly cannot attach the modern signification of direct solicitation to wrong-doing to the act of the Almighty. In this same neutral sense of trial, without, necessarily, reference to any desired evil issue, it probably occurs in the Collect for the Fourth Sunday after the Epiphany, "Carry us through all *temptations*," and also, possibly, in the Lord's Prayer, "Lead us not into *temptation*"; but in the Collect for the Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity, "To withstand the *temptations* of the world, the flesh, and the devil," we can have no hesitation in giving it the full force of its modern bad significance. It is probably also used in the same sense in the Service for the Visitation of the Sick, "Give him strength against all his *temptations*."

Other examples of deterioration occurring in our services and liable to misconstruction are :

"Vulgar," now "common," in the sense of "low," "ill-bred," but originally "belonging to the people"; so "the vulgar tongue," the language of the country as opposed to a foreign tongue, and, considering one of the great principles of the Reformation, as especially opposed to Latin.

“Charity,” a much colder-sounding word to-day than its true equivalent “love.” “Charity children,” “charity sermon”—almost contemptuous! How it ever could have caught this tone for those familiar with St. Paul’s exquisite exposition of its essence and graces, or become narrowed down to mere *giving* with no thought of sympathy behind it, is strange indeed!

“Usury”: at first merely a return from money out at “use,” simply “interest,” and so used in St. Matt. xxv. 27, but now with a sense of exorbitance and illegality, and thus, not infrequently, in the Bible. See also Psalm xv. 6 (Prayer-Book Version).

The *Quincunque Vult*, better known as the “Athanasian Creed,” has long been the object of special attention from those who desire its revision, both from the point of view of doctrine and of language. So great has the force of the arguments in the latter case been felt to be that the Bishops in a special resolution have affirmed the need for a new translation, and asked the Archbishop of Canterbury to take the necessary steps to provide one.

A single instance of a probably almost universally misunderstood word from this formulary will suffice.

“Incomprehensible”—“The Father *incomprehensible*, the Son *incomprehensible*, and the Holy Ghost *incomprehensible*.” A gentleman, who paid more attention than most ordinary worshippers to the words and sentiments put into his mouth by our Church, once triumphantly concluded a fierce tirade against the Creed and the wickedness of demanding, on pain of “perishing everlastingly,” a profession of belief in “the person and nature of God as expressed in the most metaphysical terms. God, a Being the very same document declares to be in His threefold personality absolutely *incomprehensible!*” He was somewhat taken aback, but certainly not appeased, by the remark of the writer: “‘Incomprehensible’ is here used in its classical sense, ‘immense,’ ‘that cannot be contained or limited.’” There was justice in his retort: “Humph! Is it? Then why doesn’t it say so?”

We turn to the Litany for our next examples.

"Passion"—"By Thy Cross and Passion." Here, and in five other places in the Prayer-Book, this word is used in the passive sense of "suffering," and is by no means intended to suggest, as it undoubtedly does, to readers unacquainted with its derivation and history, an outburst of ungoverned temper. It is the more necessary to point this out as in two places—the Accession Service Prayer (but omitted from the service now authorized), "our sinful passions," and the First Article, "Without body parts or passions"—the plural is used with its familiar modern force.

"Wealth"—"In all time of our wealth" (see also the Prayer for the King in Morning and Evening Prayer, and the Second Prayer for the King in the Communion Office). An example of a class of words alluded to by Archdeacon Hare in the quotation given above, originally possessing an extended meaning, which has in process of time become narrowed and restricted in application. In the common speech of to-day *wealth* connotes only one form of "well-being"—namely, money, or its equivalent. It arouses sad reflections on human tendencies to be reminded that the idea of "well-being" should be made synonymous with "the abundance of things which we possess"; yet who shall say there are not many in our congregations to-day using *wealth* in this degenerate sense in their prayers! The positive harm which may thus result from a misconception of the words we employ will not, of course, in all instances, be of the same degree. There are many passages, "commonly misunderstood," where probably no great harm is done; but in all cases our intelligent use of the words must suffer. Take the phrase "the *kindly* fruits of the earth." We are confident that many users of the Litany pay no attention whatever to the qualifying word "kindly," and never, even in their own minds, give it any particular meaning. If asked to explain they will probably say, "Kindly, I suppose, in the sense of serviceable to us," or, "kindly, because evidences of God's *kindness* to us." How puzzled all such persons would be to read a passage quoted by Trench from More's "Life of Richard III.," where he

relates that Richard calculated by murdering his nephews to be accounted "a *kindly King*"!

Kindly fruits are "natural fruits"—fruits brought forth "after their kind," and a "kindly King," in More's language, was a King in the natural descent, which Richard hoped to be thought when he had removed the more direct heirs to the throne.

Another interesting word with "changed meaning" not much affecting the sense is *dearth*—to-day a synonym for scarceness. But it acquired this meaning because its original sense, *dearness*, was usually a result of scarcity. That the compilers of our Prayer-Book understood it in the old meaning is evident from the antitheses employed in the two prayers, "In the time of dearth and famine," and in the corresponding Thanksgiving, "Grant that the scarcity and *dearth* which we do now most justly suffer . . . be mercifully turned into *cheapness* and plenty." "O God . . . Who . . . didst . . . turn great scarcity and *dearth* into plenty and *cheapness*." "O most merciful Father Who . . . has turned our *dearth* and scarcity into *cheapness* and plenty."

We mentioned above some words on whose meaning the process of deterioration has been at work. There are others whose history happily shows the opposite tendency. *Let*, already noticed, is one. "Careful"—"Be careful for nothing" (Epistle, Fourth Sunday in Advent)—is another.

In the passage before us it is equivalent to "be not over-anxious." Exactly the advice our Lord gave when He said (Gospel, Fifteenth Sunday after Trinity): "Take no thought for the morrow"—advice which sounds strangely to those who see in "carefulness" and "taking thought" only that prudence and forethought commended in every age. It would be well again if, in the Gospel for the Ninth Sunday after Trinity, it could be made more clear that the unjust steward was commended by his lord, not for the highest and truest wisdom we think of when "wise" is used, but because he had been "sharp" or "cute."

Mystery, a word "fetched from the very dregs of paganism" (Sanderson), has, like *humility*, been elevated by Christianity;

but its meaning seems to have dropped a little since its elevation. Ordinarily it stands, we should say, for a profound secret, something wholly unknown. In the Collect for the Third Sunday in Advent, adopted from the Epistle for the same day, and elsewhere, the emphasis is on what is revealed rather than what is hidden. It is "employed for the setting forth, the revelation of the great truths of our redemption" (Trench, "Study of Words"). It suggests something "kept secret for a time to be afterwards revealed," "something only to be known by revelation."

Much is being said and written concerning the Marriage Service. Its wording might well, perhaps, in some respects be remodelled on the lines of the Irish Revision. One word in particular has needlessly been the cause of much perplexity and some offence. "With my body I thee worship" was never intended by the framers of the service to bear our modern sense of "worship." "Worship" or "worthship" in our Early English meant "honour," a meaning very harmlessly surviving in "worshipful," and in the title of "Your Worship" addressed to the magistrate on the bench. Its proper explication, however, in the Marriage Service would have spoiled the symmetry of form of the anathema launched against it by a fervent supporter of revision in the days when the Irish Prayer-Book was undergoing the process. "Not need revision," she is reported to have cried. "Listen—'With this ring I thee wed'—necromancy! 'With my body I thee worship'—idolatry! 'With all my worldly goods I thee endow'—a lie! And all this in a Christian Service-Book."

Enough surely has now been said to show that the sphere of operations for the verbal revisers of our Book of Common Prayer is a wide one, and contains many matters worthy their best attention and care.

When revision does come, as no doubt it will, many of us, however, will miss sorely the old words we have long used, and which, so far from obscuring the sense, have been to us full of significance and thought—inspiring, bringing as they do a

breath from the past, reminding us that ours is no mushroom "form of words," but that the forms we use to-day have proved their "soundness" by the services they have rendered to successive generations. Nevertheless, we cannot doubt that our Prayer-Book will gain in intelligibility, and so, let us hope, in attractiveness and usefulness for the many.



The Generations of Shem.

(GENESIS XI. 10-26.)

BY THE REV. W. T. PILTER.

NO one can honestly believe the New Testament and not believe also that Abraham was a strictly historical person ; nor can he fail to believe that the Deluge, in which Noah and his family were saved in the ark, really occurred ; and equally must he believe that the personal names preserved to us in Genesis xi. 10-26 are those of human beings who lived during the period and in the succession stated. But we dare not affirm—rather are we called upon to deny, for reasons here to be given—that that pedigree is, or is meant to be understood as, a complete one. For (1) overwhelming external evidence, and (2) the fullest agreement therewith of the analogy of Scripture (to which there is no clear counter-evidence), constrain us to believe that many links have been purposely omitted from the line of descent recorded in the passage before us for consideration.

It is conceded that, at first sight and before comparing other genealogical passages of the Bible with it, the second part of the eleventh chapter of Genesis does appear to give us a complete bridge over the period from the chosen son of Noah to Abraham, "the father of the faithful," although the whole sum of the enumerated years is less than 300. Thus it tells us that Arphaxad was born to Shem two years after the Flood,

then that Salah was born to Arphaxad thirty-five years later, and so on until Terah, at about the age of seventy, begat Abram; the total is 292 years.

THE EVIDENCE OF SECULAR RESEARCH.

Now, we venture to say that it is impossible for anyone acquainted with the broad facts of ancient history, of archæology, of the settlements of nations and the development of families of speech—such things as constitute the external evidence on the subject—to accept 300 years as at all adequate for the course of the world from the Deluge to Abraham, unless, indeed, he is prepared to invoke a series of miracles for the purpose. But that would be a procedure which, since the Bible itself makes no mention and gives no hint of such, were as unsound in theology as in criticism. The evidence for our conclusion, as we have intimated, is manifold and overwhelming, and it is unimpeachable. Two witnesses only will probably suffice to prove the point—the histories of ancient Egypt and of ancient Babylonia.

1. Egyptologists tell us that Abraham probably visited Egypt during the rule of Usertesens III. of that Dynasty XII. which has been termed “the real Golden Age of Egypt.” They also give us the length of time from Mena, the reputed founder of the first historic dynasty, to Dynasty XII. as 2,300 years. This may be much too long, because, for one thing, although we have considerable monumental evidence from Dynasties I., II., and III., it is quite inadequate to control the time of 700 years which Manetho assigns them, and which is at the basis of the estimate. Then there are other sections of the period for which the witnesses are insufficient and doubtful. Furthermore, Professor J. Garstang, in his recent work entitled the “Burial Customs of Ancient Egypt,” has made it tolerably clear that there is no gap in the continuity of local customs in Egypt between the close of Dynasty VI. and the period of Dynasties XI. and XII.; with these, therefore, Dynasties VII., VIII., IX., and X. may have been contemporary, and, if so, must be

omitted from the chronological sequence. For these reasons the 2,300 years, reckoned from the beginning of the historical dynasties to the time of Abraham, may have to be greatly reduced, but when full allowance is made therefor it is quite impossible to bring the period within the stated years of our genealogical list from the patriarch Abraham to the remoter days of the Deluge.

It is impossible, for these reasons among others: the four Kings who preceded Usertesens III. in his dynasty reigned—after allowing for the overlapping of co-regencies—quite 130 years, while Dynasties IV. (that of the builders of the great pyramids), V. and VI. together reigned apparently for wellnigh 700 years, a length of time in itself which is twice that of our whole genealogy. But besides the Dynastic Period there is to be reckoned the unknown but very long time which preceded it, for the history of the preceding populations of Egypt, for the progress of the Dynastic peoples from their original home, possibly in Babylonia, as well as of the other races then living on the earth, for the growth of their civilizations and development of their languages. No, the 300 years of our genealogy cannot represent the full time from the Noachian Deluge to the patriarch Abraham. It is very much too short.

2. The evidence of Assyriology fully justifies the same conclusion.

Ancient Babylonia possesses not merely a legendary antiquity, but it has of late years furnished our museums with contemporary monuments, inscribed with cuneiform characters, which were wrought long before the existence of the First Dynasty of united Babylonia. In those early times there were usually several governors ruling contemporaneously in different city states, of which now one and now another was paramount; it was a condition of affairs to some extent comparable to the different concurrent governments of England during the Heptarchy. In consequence of that, the very many Babylonian remains of the period referred to bear the inscriptions of a host of rulers, and until very recently (to be precise, till after the end of the spring

of 1907) no one could rightly have co-ordinated or have dated, even approximately, a large number of them. Since then the publication of important discoveries, decipherments, and the results of investigations in other directions, on the part especially of M. Thureau-Dangin, of the Louvre, Dr. H. V. Hilprecht, of the University of Pennsylvania, and Mr. L. W. King, of the British Museum, have made it possible to write the following lines.

It may be as well to premise that the very earliest civilization of Babylonia was that of Sumeria, which then lay specially in the southern part of the country; the Sumerian language was non-Semitic. Northern Babylonia, on the other hand, was known as Akkad (from the chief city Agade). Some of its earliest rulers were Semites; their native language was of course a variety of Semitic. They do not appear to have had any form of writing of their own, but they learnt and always employed the cuneiform script previously used and probably invented by the Sumerians.

The researches of Mr. King show that most, if not the whole, of the period of the Second Dynasty of Babylonia—368 years—is to be blotted out of the historical succession, because it synchronized with part of the First and part of the Third Dynasty. As the result of his researches on this point, Mr. King is thus able to write that “the earliest Sumerian remains that have been recovered may probably be assigned to the fourth millennium, B.C.” If by “fourth millennium” we may provisionally read 3,500 B.C., the date for the beginning of Babylonian written records is reduced by about 1,000 years from that previously accepted by the more moderate Assyriologists, and the present writer does not know of any Assyriologist of repute who would even now assign a lower date than that just suggested. What follows may seem to indicate that there is room for very considerable further reduction, but whether that is so or not does not now concern us; our present object is simply to show the *minimum* length of time which preceded the period of Abraham, as assuredly certified to us by Babylonian historical literature.

The King who ruled in "the land of Shinar" during the early years of Abram's sojourn in Canaan was, we learn from Genesis xiv., Amraphel, and Amraphel, it is now practically conceded by all experts, was identical with Hammurabi, the sixth ruler of the First Dynasty of united Babylonia. Abram cannot have lived a great while in Canaan before circumstances called him to hasten to the rescue of Lot from the hands of Chedorlaomer of Elam, with whom Amraphel and other Kings were associated; this we learn from the following Biblical *data*:¹ the patriarch, at the Divine call, had left Haran and come into Canaan in the seventy-fifth year of his age; he was eighty-six when Ishmael was born of Hagar; it was in the previous year, just ten years since their arrival in Canaan, that Sarai gave Hagar to Abram, and some time before that that Abram came into collision with Amraphel (Hammurabi), as narrated in Genesis xiv. How much before we are not told, but it can scarcely have been more than a year or two, because of the time required for Abram's sojournings in Canaan, his visit to Egypt, the growth of his flocks and herds, and Lot's departure from him and settlement in the vicinity of Sodom; all of which took place before the Chedorlaomer episode. It will be reasonable, therefore, to place the rescue from Amraphel, and those with whom he was associated, in the eighth year after Abram came to Canaan and in the eighty-third year of his age.

Then, for reasons which I have set forth elsewhere,² it would be quite early in his reign that Hammurabi joined Chedorlaomer in his expedition to Canaan; for the sake of having a fixed point we may place it provisionally in Hammurabi's fifth year. Now, exactly eight years earlier—*i.e.*, in the self-same year that Abram left Haran—Hammurabi's father and predecessor, Sin-muballit by name, fought a very important battle with the King of the city state of Isin, which lay in the south-east of Babylonia, a long way indeed from Haran, though

¹ The references are: Gen. xii. 4; xiv.; xv. 1; xvi. 3, 16.

² In a little book entitled "The Laws of Hammurabi and Moses," by Professor H. Grimme and the Rev. W. T. Piltner (London, 1907, pp. 82-84). Cf. also my article in *The Churchman* for January, 1907.

comparatively near to Ur. By that battle, which was fought in the seventeenth year of Sin-muballit, Isin was defeated and, what is of consequence for our purpose, the dynasty of Isin was destroyed.

The dynasty thus destroyed, as we learn from a tablet recently discovered and published by Dr. Hilprecht, was made up of sixteen Kings, who ruled for 225 years. The dynasty of Isin was immediately preceded by that of Ur, which consisted of five Kings (the second being the famous Dungi) and lasted 117 years. But the first ruler of Ur was contemporary also with a certain ruler of Lagash (or Shirpurla, now Telloh), which was the most lasting and most renowned of all the dynasties of early Babylonia; one which has supplied us with almost the very oldest of the cuneiform monuments which we possess (some of those from Nippur and a few others are probably older than they). Lagash thus affords us, as M. Thureau-Dangin says, "a sort of frame" in which to set the general history of early Babylonia; but within that frame we fear the memories of our readers must be burdened with some details. The ruler of Lagash, when the kingdom of Ur was founded, was named Ur-ningirsu, who came late on in his dynasty; his father, Gudea, was a great builder, many of whose wonderful monuments of inscribed sculpture have been brought to light by the French excavators. The thirteenth (or fifteenth) in the line of the rulers of Lagash was Lugal-ushum-gal, who acknowledged as his suzerain the mighty Sargon I., the father of Naram Sin, who enlarged his kingdom of Agade (Akkad) till it reached from Elam to the Mediterranean. We notice a breach in the annals of Lagash before Lugal-ushum-gal, for in the time of his last recorded predecessor (named Urukagina) Lugal-zaggisi, the patesi of the neighbouring city-kingdom to Gishhu (the modern Jotha) had invaded and subdued Lagash. Yet again in the time of the first ruler of Lagash of whom we have record (Urukagina being either the eleventh or the thirteenth), Lugal-shag-engur by name, as during most of the intervening period, Lagash and Gishhu were at strife. But in this first period

Mesilim, King of Kish, intervened, caused the two belligerent cities to make a treaty of peace between themselves, and Mesilim erected a monumental column to commemorate the event—how wonderfully modern all this seems! It should be added that Mesilim is the second King of Kish of whom we possess records.

We do not know what length of time the dynasty of Lagash bore sway, but if we reckon that each of its rulers had on the average the same regnal period as that which each of the rulers of the combined dynasties of Ur and Isin had—*i.e.*, $16\frac{6}{21}$ years, then the eighteen rulers of Lagash¹ who preceded the founding of the dynasty of Ur will have reigned over 293 years.

We thus get for the whole period from the first recorded ruler of Lagash until the destruction of the dynasty of Isin by Sin-muballit in his seventeenth year, a total of 635 years; to make the period complete, there has to be added to this sum the unknown but short interval in the annals of Lagash between Urukagina and Lugal-ushum-gal; also the years during which eleven other Kings ruled, of whom we know little more than their names. But the seventeenth year of Sin-muballit, as we have already calculated, coincided approximately with Abram's departure from Haran to Canaan when he was seventy-five years old. It follows, therefore, that the dynasty of Lagash in South Babylonia came into existence 560 years (plus the years of the eleven omitted rulers) before Abraham was born, whereas his pedigree, so far as it is preserved to us in Genesis xi. 10-26, allows only 292 years from the flood until his birth.

But in the period thus apparently covered by that registered pedigree there is to be really reckoned, not only the 560 years certified to us by the documents of early Babylonian history, but also that period of unknown length (from which some inscribed and other monuments have come down to us) during which Babylonia was inhabited before the founding of the dynasty of

¹ The number was certainly more than eighteen, it was probably twenty-nine, but as eleven other rulers' names, which have come down to us for this period, cannot be placed with certainty, we, for the moment, disregard them.

Lagash, and also that other period referred to in Genesis xi. 2, 9, during which the descendants of Noah were multiplying and journeying from where the ark settled unto the land of Shinar, which must have occupied some, perhaps many, generations.

It is thus, by the evidence adduced (reinforced by the further evidence suggested, which might be largely added to), demonstrably an error to assume that the recorded "generations of Shem" from the Deluge to Abraham make a complete register. The assumption that it is complete is no doubt very ancient and still widespread, because it is naturally made on a cursory reading of the genealogy, but it can scarcely be held in the light of Scripture analogy and Scripture usage when dealing with genealogies.



Sentimentality.

BY THE REV. J. WARREN, B.D.,

Trinity College, Dublin.

"Of all broken reeds, sentimentality is the most broken reed on which righteousness can lean."—ROOSEVELT, *at the Guildhall.*

WHAT is sentimentality? It is the disposition to judge and act in obedience to feeling rather than reason. It has been defined briefly as "feeling for feeling's sake."

By feeling is to be understood the series of delicate thrills or resonances, along the finer nerve-fibres, which are known to be generated by every idea conceived and entertained in the mind. These thrills are probably of an electrical nature, leading from the brain-centres, and are of very considerably varying intensity, many of them being, from the character of the ideas that originate them, far too faint to be apprehended in consciousness. Such as are cognizable, according to psychologists, range themselves under two grades—sentiment and emotion, the latter being the more intense form, capable of passing onward even to hysteria.

The mind, when it becomes submerged beneath the swelling surf of an emotion, even though itself has first aroused it, for the time being has parted with its own self-control, to some extent at least, and often almost altogether. Under the soft spray of a sentiment it still retains, whether or no it adequately exercises, its ordinary inherent capabilities. Emotion commonly evinces itself in external bodily manifestations: sentiment hardly so at all. Emotion, too, in the nature of things (unless it deepens and solidifies into passion), does not admit of as persistent reiteration as does sentiment. Hence the sensibilities evoked by, *e.g.*, sublimity, pathos, love (in the intense and vehement sense), and fear, do not, as they properly come under the head of emotion, specifically call for review here. It is with sentiment only that we are concerning ourselves for the moment.

Now a series of physical thrills, mentally generated, will be, according to their nature and cause, either pleasurable or the reverse. In the case of such as do not prove agreeable, the normal outcome is an endeavour, not always by laudable means, to avert or to dislodge from the mind the thoughts and ideas, of whatever sort they may be, that from their nature occasion them. Where they are found entirely pleasant, on the other hand, and especially if they retain the gentle level of a simple sentiment, the natural inclination is to harbour (or to reproduce) in the mind the originating thoughts and ideas.

All would be well if the pleasure-giving ideas were always founded on a basis of reality or rationality. Too frequently, however, they can be shown to rest on spurious and untenable ground-work.

In the first place, luscious ideas are being constantly entertained and fostered which owe their birth to unveracious and misleading, or simply misinterpreted, representations of *art*. The all too ready receptivity for these furnishes the most easily recognizable variety of sentimentality. It has acquired a particularly dominant foothold in the religious domain. Now there can be no occasion for any vindication of true art, with

the noble and gracious purposes it is designed to serve. But we dare not conceive of it, with Schelling, Schlegel, and many other assertors of its "divinity," as though it were independent of all relation to reason. As with faith, its concepts may transcend reason, that which is cognizable—indeed, to be satisfying, they must needs at least suggest something higher than what is cognizable, something limitless—but they must not conflict with what we apprehend and know to be rational or actual. Indeed, true taste demands that finer feelings be attempered with judgment. Only thus can taste be at all ancillary to the moral sense, as philosophers like Dugald Stewart have attested. Then it may even be said to constitute a phase of the moral sense.

These representations, giving rise here mediately to sentimental conceptions, are external to the mind. There is another and a distinct type, however, of this mental-cum-physical phenomenon which calls for more careful notice still. It is an internal, a subjective, and consequently more subtle, variety of sentimentality. The mind, in default of an idea or ideas of the desired sort grounded on actuality or reason, suffers a certain faculty of its own—viz., *imagination*—to cater unguidedly for its need. An artist within sets to work at portrayal, inside the studio of the mind.

Let it now be allowed at once that imagination, properly conditioned, can and does have its uses. For instance, our progress in science has been indebted at almost every step to the help of hypothesis, which is simply a form of imagination. It was in regard to the scientific realm that Tyndall stated that "when nourished by knowledge patiently won, and bounded and conditioned by operant reason, imagination becomes the mightiest instrument of the physical discoverer." "Imagination," also Sully points out, "has its own legitimate function, when subsisting in a calm and orderly form, in building up the fabric of knowledge. When duly controlled, imaginative activity not only leads on to the grasp of new concrete fact, but even paves the way for the higher processes of thinking.

Mobility and flexibility in the images of memory conduces to activity of thought. By breaking up complex mental images into segments and by re-arranging the material in new forms, it facilitates abstraction and introduces fresh combinations of the thought-elements."

"Imagination must create nothing," Ruskin laid down; "its function is to penetrate truth, to associate truth." But, unhappily, his ruling suffers constant violation. The imagination is encouraged to create, to create recklessly. It is allowed, in fact, to sink itself to the level of what we more commonly call *fancy*, wherein the improbable and the impracticable, the superficial, the volatile and transient, are granted as ready admittance to its immaterial canvas as their better opposites. Then the mind, forgoing its discriminative faculty, discarding all keen regard for absolute truth, indulges itself in the choice semblances pictorially conjured up within and the delicious sensibility evoked by them, as though it were engaged in the contemplation of that which could fairly be claimed to be either veritable or rational. Not much wonder is it, therefore, that Bishop Butler is found characterizing imagination as "that forward delusive faculty, ever obtruding beyond its sphere: of some assistance indeed to apprehension, but the author of all error."

Little children are often found uttering grotesque and fantastic fibs, without the slightest desire or intention to deceive, from the simple cause that their imagination is, for the time, in a certain sense more developed than their moral and voluntary and, no doubt also, reasoning faculties. As they grow up to maturity, if their characters be healthy and well disciplined, the materially spectacular ideals of their imagination give place more and more to moral and ethical ones. And a happy provision of Providence it is that men should feel their whole organic frame responsively exhilarated and aglow, gently and therefore the less transiently, from the ideals, the morally beautiful contemplations, sanctioned by reason, which engage and enkindle their minds. It is indeed inspiring to all around even to know that there are men and women beside and

amongst them thus animated. To this state of righteously evoked, yet suitably controlled, mental stimulation it is that we apply the description "sentiment" when we intend the term in a higher and appreciative signification. On the contrary, where the moral ideals that propel the finer physical feelings are illusory, lacking a basis of actuality or rationality, we have to do with "sentimentality."

"They are dangerous guides, those feelings."

"Nothing," says Ruskin, "can atone for the want of truth; not the most brilliant imagination, the most playful fancy, the most pure feeling—supposing that feeling *could* be pure and false at the same time." The psychologists are unanimous in their warnings here. Stout, for example, in discussing imagination, recalls how Sidgwick pointedly called attention to "cases in which we act contrary to a general resolution, under the influence of a seductive feeling—in short, sophisticate ourselves"; and Stout's explanation is that in such cases "we dismiss judgment on the validity or invalidity of our pretext . . . whilst the seductive feeling leads us to contemplate the pretext complacently, and determines our action by warding off interference"—that is, interference of other thoughts calculated to dissipate the 'pretext.' Sully, Ladd, and the great Bain also testify to the danger to the interests of truth and recognition of fact arising out of the feelings, and the enticing pleasure they can afford.

Yet, again, in the ethical connection, where there is not obstruction, there is a deplorable amount of misdirection of that precious quality, moral energy or earnestness, brought about by this sentimentality or illusory idealization. Mr. Roosevelt's strictures, when he pronounced the dictum that heads this article, were specially meant for the benefit of a certain type of English politician. This latter's imagination has been continuously conjuring up the delectable picture of the tribes of the earth each and all governing themselves peacefully and prosperously. And he has become so carried away with his ideal as to fancy, in the face of all the evidence to the contrary,

that the mere handing over to any given one of them of the reins of administrative control will disclose that tribe's thorough competency to discharge the functions of self-government there and then. And Mr. Roosevelt, looking at Egypt as a representative case, has not felt satisfied with the way in which the theory has been working out when practically applied. Others also have observed that the weakness is beginning to affect us nationally.

In the religious sphere sentimentality at present runs riot among us. Religious sentimentality may be defined as the disposition to entertain and contemplate agreeable images or fancies within the mind, whether they shall have been suggested from outside or simply internally conceived, and to suppose such a mental exercise to be a devotional attitude, divinely guided and approved, on the ground that the fancies or images entertained happen to possess some, often remote enough, suggestion of or association with the Divine; whereas all the while it is mainly or altogether for the pleasing gentle organic sensibility which they tickle into activity that they are appreciated and relished, if need be in cool disregard of some divinely revealed counsel, ay, even of ordinary and obvious reason.

Art here, as has been already observed, is the chief medium of external stimulation. And the best of the authorities on art have themselves been sounding warnings upon our languid ears. According to Ruskin, they who "mingle the refinements of art with all the offices and practices of religion" must beware "how they may confuse their enjoyments with their duties . . . lest we mistake a surrender to the charms of art for one to the service of God, and, in the art which we permit, lest we substitute sentiment for sense." The incontestable "beauty of holiness" is by many confounded with a purely imaginary and delusive holiness of beauty. "There is an error which is not uncommon," says C. H. Waterhouse in his "Signification of Art," "of accrediting the Beautiful with an attribute of sacredness or sanctity. The apprehension of the Beautiful has no *necessary* connection whatever with goodness or righteousness,

or with the dictates of a pious motive." Professor Gwatkin, in his "Knowledge of God," after reminding us that when men were tired of controversy in the eighteenth century they made a tolerable peace in the Church by dropping the religion and preaching morality instead, ventures the question whether we are not now doing the same thing over again, only that art is the substitute this time.

In this connection "religious" painting, "religious" pen-pictures (historical or fictional), "religious" pageantry, embellished phrase of hymn and sermon, are in turn laid under contribution. (We forbear from including music, because we agree with that host of authorities who maintain that music, "sacred" or otherwise, does not, of itself, generate definite ideas; and because the form of sensation which it evokes, though closely akin, is distinct from that with which we are dealing—to speak technically, is afferent rather than efferent.)

Among hymns the phraseology of which ministers to this propensity, Faber's are the most outstanding examples. His "Hark, hark, my soul! angelic songs are swelling," will occur to the mind of any sensible reader who is acquainted with hymnals. His "O Paradise! O Paradise!" is not very much better; as Bishop Chadwick warns us, "Heaven may be longed for with a view to its unruffled sensuous repose, as though it was a pagan elysium, the thought of it being suggested by nothing more than discontent with our toilsome, prosaic life." And his "O come and mourn" veritably passes across the border-line of our subject, and belongs to the heading of emotionalism. The late Bishop Lyttelton of Southampton, in his *Diocesan Chronicle*, when deprecating sentimentality as "one of the chief foes of true worship," urged that, to the great majority of those who delight to sing it, "Lead, kindly Light," has probably no meaning, or only a sentimental meaning.

As regards pictorial language of the pulpit, F. W. Robertson, with reference more directly to the preacher than the audience, defined sentimentality as "that state in which a man speaks things that are deep and true, not because he feels them strongly,

but because he perceives that they are beautiful, and that it is touching and fine to say them." The definition, however, requires qualification. The things spoken may sometimes not be very deep or true. "Clever word-painters," according to the great art-critic, Hamerton, can "dazzle people by sounding phrases and brilliant metaphors into the belief that they have really received a very noble impression, when the whole force of the impression, if analyzed, would be found to be due to the music of the sentences and the splendour of the metaphors." Thus the atheist in his hall of science can have his feelings titillated just as effectively and impressively as a professed Christian in a church. Again, the deep and true things spoken might be felt pretty strongly, but be so enveloped in decorative diction as to have the strenuousness of their import blunted for the hearers. Very many among the rising section of the Non-conformist ministry three or four decades ago, when stung with the taunts of Matthew Arnold and others about their lack of "culture," made haste to cultivate an embellished poetizing pulpit style, and we need not doubt but their motive and purpose was excellent. But it could hardly be claimed to-day that the marked attention bestowed upon this accomplishment has permanently advanced their cause or wrought salvation in Israel. "I make bold to say," Dr. Chalmers had long before affirmed, "that as much delight may emanate from the pulpit on an arrested audience beneath it as ever emanated from the boards of a theatre; ay, and with as total a disjunction of mind, too, in the one case as in the other, from the essence of religion."

But it is far from enough to recognize sentimentality in the religious connection to be a futile and profitless thing. The mischief of it is of a more positive kind, and strikes deeper.

At its suggestion, in the average picture or sketch, religion is made to appear as though it were only the concern of such as stand outside the circle of prosaic, workaday life. It is only the aged and tottering who seem ever to peruse the Bible; it is only pretty, well-dressed children, with head a tilt and eyes unnaturally upturned, who sing hymns; it is only these, and

tense maidens with flowing hair, who know how to pray fervently.

From it have arisen erroneous and unworthy conceptions of our blessed Lord. In the view of the enthusiastic Gambier Parry, who wrote "The Ministry of Fine Art," the noble, loving face of Christ has been degraded by the degenerate modern schools of Christian art. "Taking refuge in His meekness and gentleness, and ignoring the grander elements of His character—His splendid independence, His boldness in denunciation, and, when necessary, His ruthless severity—they picture Him a mere creature of weak sentimentalism—effeminate, inane."

The prevailing relish for pictures of angels and cherubs with human figures does not tend to fortify the due emphasis that should attach to the grim fact of human sinfulness. The ideal they set forth is one that certainly extends to the skies, but does not first of all plumb the depths of that moral evil which man has been involved in and dare not ignore. Similarly, granted that "natural religion" has its own independent contribution to make, the marked prominence frequently given now to flower services and their details is not calculated to enhance in the minds of our children the relatively far greater importance and preciousness of *revealed* truth—the faith by virtue of which Abel offered a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain.

The disposition develops a spurious catholicity which enables those who become possessed with it to enter into a maudlin sympathy and fellowship with the most alien religious systems. Sir Walter Scott contrived to behold medieval conditions, not as they really were, either ecclesiastically, intellectually, or socially, but in a golden halo of spirituality, chivalry, and romance; and the captivating, though delusive, influence of his representations has been enormous. Latterly his idealisms in this connection are being embodied in pageants, to which Jesuit preachers from their pulpits wish all success, inasmuch as they "reveal in a most striking fashion the intimate relationship between Rome and England."

The purely internal, the directly idealizing modes of senti-

mentality—to which, as being the less obvious form, one ventures to direct special attention—are not absent from the religious sphere, even on its common levels. It is long since sentimentality of this sort first began to play a part in modifying the beliefs of professing Christians. For example, to its influence was due, we can hardly doubt, the transcendental position attributed to the Virgin Mary among one section of Christendom. Heaven became graced thereby with a tender, motherly personage, whom (through the overlooking of passages like Isaiah xxxi. 5, lxvi. 13) it was imagined to be lacking.

The guidance of Revelation, explicit or implicit, it will be seen, becomes of little account when sentimentality, of whichever mode, affects an entrance. Indeed, its votaries are not beyond avowing so. “Let us rejoice,” proclaims an essayist in the *Homiletic Review* (December, 1904), “that the old dogmatic expression of religion has spent itself, and must give way to a more poetic and imaginative expression.” This is very different from the standpoint taken up by a far more sagacious thinker of a former day, Abraham Tucker, when he enunciated that “religion is the art of disciplining the imagination.”

To conclude, it may be observed that, from the more responsive nature of their organic structure, with their preponderant endowment of the finer and more delicate order of nerve-fibre, the feminine portion of the race appears plainly to be more susceptible to this tendency than the masculine. The same may be inferred with regard to some, as compared with others, of the male section as well, so far as they approximate physically to the constitution and temperament that mark the feminine. Happily, though one may be organically susceptible, he or she, through maintaining the empire of reason and will, may prove more immune from this weakness than another who is at better advantage physically. Members of either sex, indeed, who are but passing through the adolescent period, with its physically tense and at the same time unseasoned conditions and its limited experience, are peculiarly liable to be affected with the tendency. Hence it is from persons at this stage of life, to

whom the finer organic impressions (notably those that are stimulated by objects of art) keenly appeal, that the bulk of the "converts" are gleaned to such communions as cater most for these sensibilities. Hence it comes about also that many at this period of life at which professions are chosen, through misinterpretation of feelings in which sentimentality predominates over Spirit-led piety, conclude, and are prompted to the conclusion by their friends, that the ministry is their proper sphere; and consequently are found afterwards, as a rule, swelling the ranks either of the ceremonialists in the Anglican and cognate Churches, or of the poetizing and word-painting class of preachers among other communions.

A pre-eminent safeguard against this weakness, whatever be the age or sex, will be found in a strenuous course of living; and this not solely, though specially, of the intellectual sort. It is recognized by psychologists that even a suitable and balanced muscular efficiency exercises, in a measure, through the connecting medium of the nerve-system, a reflex effect upon the quality of the mental working. Not, indeed, that any development of the kind can do much in the way of neutralizing or dislodging delusive ideals or prejudices already stubbornly formed.

But the Christian believer will look for his security here in nothing less than a constant loyal dependance on his part upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit through the Word. Not His guidance independently of the (written) Word—a presumptuous aspiration sure to terminate in a still more illusory mysticism; nor yet His guidance operating along the lines of selective elements and phases of the Word; but through the Word assimilated broadly and proportionately and as a whole. In the leading of the Spirit who "searcheth all things," and of the Word which "discerneth the thoughts," lies the infallible protective against this insidious tendency.



Yesterday, To-day, and for Ever.

By E. H. BLAKENEY.

DARK towers where autumn roses linger yet,
 Grey walls within whose guarded pages lie
 Time's undeciphered secrets, yield awhile
 Some message from that missal where is writ
 The riddle we are fain to read aright.
 Our hands would disentangle from the Past
 A lesson for the Future ; lift the veil
 Of human life, so moving in its long
 Pathetic sequences ; and hear, behind
 The noises of this Present, that still Voice—
 Calm as the surface of an inland sea—
 Of Him who, silent in the shadow, binds
 The scattered ages, even as a reaper binds
 His scattered sheaves, waiting the harvest-home.



The Missionary World.

By THE REV. A. J. SANTER,

Formerly C.M.S. Missionary in Bengal.

A SUGGESTION of great importance to workers for the Missionary cause is given in the November *C.M.S. Gazette*, and I think it may be found useful to those who desire to help forward the great work. "In remitting a contribution recently, a clerical friend in the south of England made the following remark: 'It costs no courage to C.M.S. writers and workers to press those who already give, and give continually, to give more ; but the cause requires that its writers and workers should have courage to break fallow ground and apply to fresh persons. . . . There can be no doubt that there are untouched resources in every congregation if only a real effort could be made to reach them.'"



Some weighty words spoken by Sir W. Mackworth Young before the Church Congress, on the Right Presentation of Christianity to the Peoples of India, deserve to be reproduced, if only to emphasize their truth. "It has been stated in some quarters that a Western Christ is being offered to India, and that this fact constitutes one of the most serious hindrances to the

acceptance of the Gospel in that country. . . . The evidence taken by the World Missionary Conference is quite to the contrary effect. . . . But the question still remains whether a Western colouring may not have been given to some of the doctrines of the Christian faith. It would appear to be the case that it is not the Western form of Christianity, but the Western character of the missionary which creates the difficulty. I think this is the whole truth. The general impression left upon one's mind is that the Gospel is universal; that it needs not to be nationalized so as to meet the needs of particular countries; and that though individual missionaries make mistakes, the presentation of Christian doctrine by the missionary whose life conforms thereto does not need much mending, except in regard to the two matters I have already referred to—knowledge of the vernacular and of the religions of the people."



Concurrently with the above, it is pleasant to read the following encouraging facts from the Tinnevely District Church Council, as quoted in the *C.M.S. Gazette* for November: "There are Christian congregations in 1,074 villages in connection with the Council, the converts numbering in the aggregate 63,589, an increase of 1,845, notwithstanding that there were a number excommunicated and some backsliders. There was an increase in the contributions of 1,801 rupees over the previous year. The report brings out the important fact that those congregations which contribute most to the Church funds also give most to the Missionary Society carried on by the Tinnevely Christians" (English congregations might make a special note of this in inverse order!) "The non-Christians are sought out by various means, and the different enterprises have met with encouraging results." Here is one incident worth recording. The Christians of a village in one of the circles worked by the Tinnevely Missionary Society "have been trying in vain for the last five years to secure a site for a church. One of the non-Christians of the village, a bigoted Saivite, the very man who misappropriated the site of a former church and has hitherto remained a bitter opponent of the Christians, has quite unexpectedly become a Christian, and has now delivered up the original site for the purpose of erecting a church."



Do we sometimes need an incentive to intercessory prayer? India, China, Africa, seem to be so far away, and our prayers seem to be so feeble and powerless! The following, culled from *The Chronicle* of the L.M.S., may be helpful to many outside its own circle of readers. Several instances are given. I quote only one. "These experiences," it is stated, "were written at a L.M.S. station in China on the very days during which the 'Watchers' in England were praying for the work there." "The close and crowded ward seemed fuller than ever this morning: you know the sort of sights that were around—maimed and emaciated bodies, and, what is worse, debased and evil faces. Oh! the glare of the murky sunshine on those white-washed walls! I was dressing an ulcered leg, and the crushing, unending weight of it all came over me. The patient was ill-tempered, and a harsh word sprang to my lips, when a sudden flood of compassion and love came over me, and something in my manner arrested the poor patient's look. 'Ah, doctor!' he

said, 'you have a kind heart.' I felt like a new man all the rest of the morning. Wasn't it strange? *Someone was praying for him.*"



It is good news to learn from *The Mission Field*, S.P.G., of the re-establishment of religious liberty in Madagascar. "All who are interested in the maintenance of religious liberty will welcome the statements made by the newly-appointed Governor, M. Piquie, who has publicly declared that he is anxious 'to maintain the policy of toleration in religious matters.' Should the policy previously adopted of interfering with the religious beliefs of the people be abandoned, and the Malagasy be left free to provide for the religious instruction of their own children and for their common worship, it is probable that there will be a rapid spread of the Christian faith throughout the island."



From the *North India Gleaner*, C.M.S., we learn with joy that the ancient Syrian Church of Travancore is being stirred to start Evangelistic work. "It may be news to many that the National Missionary Society of India has a branch in the Syrian Church of Travancore; our Syrian brethren are awakening to their privilege, and are henceforth to be a Missionary Church in India. . . . It is three years since the 'Marthoma' section of the Church decided to start work outside their own Church. In the spring of this year 25,000 people met, and the Vicar-General put before them the suggestion, made by themselves, that all first-fruits should be set apart to preach the Gospel in India. Two missionaries are already at work, and a third is ready, as soon as the people can find the wherewithal to send him. . . . May the ancient Syrian Church become a light at last to those lying in darkness around it!"



Under the heading of "Where the Niger and the Binue Meet," in the *C.M. Review* for November, "A Visitor" gives an account of a Conference of Missionaries held at Lokoja, July, 1910. One extract will suffice to show the spirit which prevailed—or, as "A Visitor" puts it, to show "the truth that the need of a world is greater than the creed of a sect." He continues: "At the opening conversazione, when the missionaries were introduced to each other, the Bishop, on being asked to welcome us in his diocese, indicated the spirit which prevailed throughout the Conference, when he replied that we must sink all idea of the *diocese*, for we met as servants of Christ to seek His *Kingdom*. And so, though we represented many denominations and countries (for there were delegates of American, Canadian, and South African birth, as well as English, Scotch, Welsh, and Irish), yet each felt it was an opportunity to *learn* rather than *dissent* from each other—in honour each esteeming other better than himself."



Literary Notes.

DR. R. P. DOWNES, the well-known editor of *Great Thoughts*, has written a book entitled "Mind and its Culture," which is intended to prove a help to those who have little time for reading, and yet wish to turn that time to the best advantage. The book will act as an introduction to general literature, and one feature, its classified list of books in various departments of knowledge, should be exceedingly useful to those in search of guidance towards a wider mental outlook. The work was published a little while ago by Messrs. Cassell.



No serious attempt has hitherto been made to tell the whole story of the book trade through the ages, in spite of the fact that Carlyle once wrote that "ten ordinary and courtiers' histories of kings and courtiers were well exchanged against the tenth part of one good history of booksellers." And so Mr. Frank A. Mumby has brought out, through Messrs. Chapman and Hall, an exceedingly interesting, readable work, entitled "The Romance of Bookselling: A History from the Earliest Times to the Twentieth Century." Curwen's so-called "History of Booksellers," apart from being nearly forty years old and long since out of print, is not, strictly speaking, a history at all, consisting mainly of a series of articles on the leading publishers and booksellers of his day. Mr. Mumby's book carries the story as far back as the baked-brick tablets of Assyria; traces the origin of the modern trade in the book world of Imperial Rome; follows its struggle for existence in the long night of the Dark Ages; throws new light on the early history of the Stationers' Company, and the ways of the pirates who flourished in Shakespeare's day, continuing the narrative thence through the later centuries, with an ever-increasing fund of entertaining anecdotes. The differences between authors and publishers on the one hand, and their rare friendships on the other; the trade wars of the past, which ended in bloodshed and imprisonment; the romantic records of the great publishing houses of to-day, and the secret history, as it were, of most of the masterpieces of English literature, complete a work which should appeal to every reader interested in this story of men and books.



Messrs. Rivington's "The Church Universal" series had a new volume added recently, and another one is still to come. The last one published has been written by Professor M. J. Hedley, who has entitled his volume "The Church and the Empire: Being an Outline of the History of the Church, A.D. 1003 to 1304." The remaining volume has been prepared by the Rev. Leighton Pullan. The title of this will be, "The Church in Modern Days: Being an Outline of the History of the Church from A.D. 1815 to 1900."



In Mr. Murray's new list will be found a new volume by Dr. Wace, Dean of Canterbury, entitled "The Warburton Lectures on Prophecy."



There are quite a number of excellent works in Mr. Murray's list. There is, for instance, Dr. Grundy's "Thucydides and the History of his Age." This volume contains a great deal of new matter with reference to Greek history in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., such as can hardly fail to introduce considerable modifications into the current views of the history of this period. Sir Herbert Risley has also prepared an important book on "The Castes and Tribes of Eastern India." There is to be found in this work a description in popular language of the characteristics, history, traditions, social grouping, religion, and folklore of the people of the two provinces of Bengal and Eastern Bengal and Assam. It will embody the results of the ethnography survey of India, which was sanctioned by Lord Curzon nine years ago, and carried out under the author's supervision. The book is amply illustrated.



Likewise an important work is Sir Henry Trueman Wood's "Industrial England in the Middle of the Eighteenth Century." "Industrial England before the Industrial Revolution" is the scope of this work, and the various industries are all dealt with separately, with a certain amount of detail, and the object of the whole book is to present a picture of the manufacturing condition of the country about the period 1754, without going further than is necessary into the earlier history or the later development of our manufacturing system.



Three other works of Mr. Murray's are "Dulce Domum: Being an Account of Bishop Moberly and his Family," which has been written by his daughter, Miss C. A. E. Moberly. Bishop Moberly was for thirty years Headmaster of Winchester College, and this interesting book tells of the intercourse which subsisted for many years between him and Keble, Mark Pattison, Dean Church, George Ridding, Charlotte Yonge, and many others whose names rank high in the annals of English life and the Church. The two other books are "A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects, and Doctrines," edited by Dr. Wace and Rev. W. C. Piercy; and "Captains and Comrades in the Faith," being a collection of the sermons which the Archbishop of Canterbury has preached on special occasions.



We may expect at once "The Reminiscences of Goldwin Smith," which has been prepared by Dr. Goldwin Smith's secretary and literary executor, Mr. Arnold Haultain. The work is to be fully illustrated, and Messrs. Macmillan and Co. are the publishers.



The writer of these notes would like to draw the attention of the readers of the *CHURCHMAN* to the new volume which was published a little while since in "The Anglican Church Handbooks," edited by Dr. Griffith Thomas, Professor of Old Testament Literature, Wycliffe College, Toronto, entitled "New Testament Theology," by the Rev. F. S. Guy Warman, B.D., Principal of St. Aidan's, Birkenhead. The price of the books in this excellent series is one shilling net per volume. It is certainly worth while sending to the publishers, Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co., for a full list of the series.

Among Messrs. Putnam's forthcoming publications are several of particular interest to our readers. "Papers of the American Society of Church History," being the reports and papers of the second and third annual meetings held in New York City in December, 1908, and December, 1909, is a work down for immediate publication. Then the same house is publishing Mr. Roosevelt's "African and European Addresses," delivered during this year; a seventh series of "Shelburne Essays," by Paul Elmer More; "Cathedrals and Cloisters of the Isle de France," by Elise Whitlock Rose and Vida Hunt Francis, with a map, four photogravures, and 200 other illustrations from original photographs; "The Lady," a series of studies, scholarly as well as entertaining, of the woman of social position from the Greek days to the twentieth century; two splendidly produced and particularly low-priced presentation books for Christmas—Goldsmith's "She Stoops to Conquer" and "The Good-natured Man"; and a delightful children's gift-book, entitled "The Chicken World," capitably illustrated, by E. Boyd Smith.



Alpine resorts are in such demand as winter comes round that to hear of a new and delightful one is a real boon. Mr. Lampen, who is resident English chaplain in Switzerland, and therefore in a position to know, describes very minutely, in his new book, entitled "The Chateau d'Ex," which Messrs. Methuen and Co. have recently published, the beauties and characteristics of that delightful spot, which is becoming such a happy hunting-ground—and how suitable the phrase is!—of English visitors. Chateaux d'Ex is beautifully situated in the Pays d'Enhaut, within easy reach of Berne. It can also be reached from Montreux by the Montreux and Bernese Oberland Railway, up through the magnificent Les Avants.



Messrs. Methuen have also just issued, under the title of "Innocence and Death," a little anthology of verse and prose extracts on the loss of little children, in the hope that some of the thoughts it contains may bring beams of light and comfort to fathers and mothers who mourn. Mrs. Dent has prepared the little work.



"The English Church in the Nineteenth Century," by Mr. F. W. Cornish, Vice-Provost of Eton College, brings to a conclusion the complete history of the Church, edited by the late Dean Stephens and Dr. William Hunt, the seven earlier volumes of which are written by Dr. W. Hunt, Dean Stephens, Canon Capes, Dr. J. Gairdner, the Rev. W. H. Frere, the Rev. W. H. Hutton, and Canon Overton (assisted by the Rev. F. Relton). The present work is in two parts, for it was found impossible to deal with the nineteenth century within the compass of a single volume. The first part carries the story down to 1851, and embraces, therefore, the Oxford Movement, to which several chapters are devoted. The history ends with the death of Canon Liddon, in 1890, and Archbishop Benson's judgment in the Bishop of Lincoln's case.



The foregoing book is published by Messrs. Macmillan and Co. We wonder if our readers have seen another book issued by this firm? It is a new book on missionary effort in India, by Mr. Bernard Lucas, author of "The Faith of a Christian" and "The Empire of Christ." It will probably find many readers, especially among those who are acquainted with the author's earlier book. "Christ for India" is the title, and it is "chiefly interesting because it combines with remarkable skill an illuminating criticism of the current Hindu theologies with an attempt at the presentation of Christianity in a form most likely to meet the needs of the people of India." Certainly the volume will find readers among those who are interested in missionary work in India. The sub-title of the work is: "Being a Presentation of the Christian Message to the Religious Thought in India." We have not read the book at the time of writing this note, and we are unable to say exactly what stand the author takes, or how he endeavours to present Christianity to the people of India.



"Life in the Roman World of Nero and St. Paul," by Professor T. G. Tucker, is a new work which, besides being an examination of the Imperial City, attempts to realize the conditions of life in the Empire as a whole. The book is certainly a comprehensive work, and deals with a period of history of the ancient world which is, perhaps, more interesting to the general reader than any other, and in writing his book Professor Tucker states that he has had special regard for this class. The work is provided with a good index, three maps and plans, and over 120 illustrations.



Somewhat in the Bensonian way, Major Gambier Passy has written a book which he has pleasantly called "The Pageant of My Day." These essays deal with thoughts and feelings with which many are familiar, and that most people experience at one time or another in their lives: the scenes depicted are those of every day. But through the chapters, held together as they are by threads more or less slender, runs so much of the story of a life as seems worth indication and serves some purpose. Messrs. Smith, Elder and Co. are the publishers.



Notices of Books.

ENGLISH CHURCH MANUALS.

THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE. By the Rev. Principal Tait. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

If God has revealed Himself to man in Christ, where is the final authoritative expression of that revelation to be found? Principal Tait makes this question the basis of his treatise. The New Testament revelation is final and all-sufficient; therefore the Pope is deposed from the seat of final authority. The New Testament writers speak as messengers, not of the

Church, but of God ; therefore the Bible, not the Church, is the authoritative vehicle of revelation. A carefully-written book ends with an excellent compendium of early Christian opinion on Scriptural authority.

CONFIRMATION. By the Archbishop of Sydney. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.*

Dr. Wright's little book needed no preface of apology. Its simplicity is its charm. Intended primarily for Confirmation candidates, there is hardly a phrase in the doctrinal sections which will be above their heads. The practical portions are marked by an earnest directness and force of appeal—the two chapters on "Christian Self-control" strikingly so. The devotional side is provided for by well-chosen words on "Sanctification" and "Prayer." For communicants, as for confirmees, the manual will be found helpful.

THE APOSTLES' CREED. By the Rev. W. S. Hooton. *Longmans, Green and Co.*

By careful sifting and selection of materials, the writer has presented us with an exposition of the Apostles' Creed in the small compass of 28 pages. What is more, he has been able to clothe the skeleton and breathe life into it. It is the kind of serviceable outline which the parish clergyman might well place in the hands of the Bible-class as the basis of a fuller, more detailed, exposition of the Creed.

ROADS TO FAITH. By Canon A. E. Barnes Lawrence. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.*

Apparently the writer mentions only one road—the road of inquiry. Inquire without—to find the Christ of history. Inquire within—to find the Christ of experience. Yet they are not two, but one, Christ. And to find Him is to find the way to God. The booklet grips from its opening sentences, and owes much of its apologetic force to the skilful interweaving of anecdote and illustration.

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION. By Principal F. S. Guy Warman. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.*

Principal Warman gives us a crisp and popular piece of writing, marked by proportionate treatment. He has omitted nothing that is essential to the true understanding of the causes and effects of the great sixteenth-century movement in England. He presents it, not as the work of a few wire-pullers, not as the sequel to a political manoeuvre, but as a *national* awakening to the truth. And the truth was England's emancipation. The open Bible and the direct access to God through Christ took the place of Papal tyranny and superstition.

The editors are to be congratulated on these latest additions to their series of penny manuals. They are not badly-digested summaries, flung together in a slovenly, slipshod fashion, but scholarly presentations of Evangelical doctrine and practice, and of Church history from the Evangelical standpoint. So long as such literature appears on the market Evangelicals can never be taunted with indifference to the demand for cheap theological literature. We shall be surprised if Evangelical clergymen do not "buy up the opportunity"—and the booklets, for circulation in the parish.

LIGHT FROM THE ANCIENT EAST. By Adolf Deissmann. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Price 16s. net.

The translation of Deissmann's "Licht von Osten" into English by Mr. L. R. M. Strahan has rendered a service to the study of the New Testament in England which cannot easily be overestimated. A little band of scholars during the last few years have opened a new world to us by their investigations of the papyri and ostraca of ancient Egypt and Asia Minor. English scholarship has contributed prominent members to this little band—Drs. Grenfell, Hunt, and Milligan. Of the German helpers in the work, Dr. Adolf Deissmann is the most prominent and the most helpful, and this his latest book will be read with ever-increasing interest and profit. It will help to make us appreciate the importance of these new discoveries. Most of our literary memorials of New Testament times, apart from the sacred writings themselves, represent the language and thought and life of the upper classes. Our pictures of Roman and Greek life are really pictures only of a section of that life, and of a section, indeed, with which Christianity at first had little to do. As Deissmann points out, by its social structure primitive Christianity points unequivocally to the lower and middle class. Its connections with the upper class are very scanty at the outset (p. 7). Of that lower and middle class until recently we knew nothing. Now we know much, and shall soon know more. The rubbish-heaps of ancient cities have preserved for us in the dry sand of a still dryer climate great collections of the waste-paper of the old world. Papyrus was the notepaper of the upper and middle classes, the ostraca were the postcards of the poor. From these slips of papyrus and broken pieces of earthenware we are able to gather a coherent idea of the life of the day, and an accurate understanding of the language in common use. Hellenistic ceases to be a debased form of classical Greek; it becomes the common language of a civilized world. Some of the papyri and ostraca are Christian in character, but the large majority of the newly-discovered non-literary texts have nothing to do with the story of the Church. But they are not, on that ground, the less valuable.

In three ways this new departure in archæology will help us as students of the New Testament. Philologically we shall be able to study the uses of words, and more accurately translate them. Much light has already been thrown upon difficult words, and presently we may be able to find solutions for such difficulties as, e.g., ἐπιούσιος. From a literary point of view we shall be able to rightly apprise the New Testament writings. For instance, we must cease to attribute to Hebrew thought most of the simplicities and some of the seeming solecisms of the New Testament. And from the point of view of the history of religion, culture, and daily life, a flood of new light is beginning to illustrate our New Testament. Deissmann's book proceeds along these lines. He discusses words, he discusses literary style, he discusses common life. To the general reader the last will be most interesting. He speaks of papyri representing such diverse forms of literature as police news, love-letters, schoolboys' exercise-books, diaries, and tax-papers. On p. 160 we have a Form IV. of Nero's time, dealing, not with land, but with farm-stock, which seems to imply that increment taxation is not a discovery

of the twentieth century. The book is illustrated with some excellent plates of the papyri themselves, and even more effectively illustrated by numerous Greek and English texts, which give us a vivid picture of the common life of early Christian times.

To the critic of the New Testament, Higher or Lower, the student of books or the student of words, to the student of Church history and of early Christian life and culture, the papyri present a field of fascinating and ever illuminating study. To the working clergyman, anxious to find the freshness which we all too easily lose, such an introduction to this new field as Dr. Deissmann's book will give him will be invaluable to himself and to others. It is impossible to review the book in detail, but no excuse need be made for giving to our readers an unblushing recommendation to read it and use it.

THE POLITICAL THEORIES OF MARTIN LUTHER. By Luther Hess Waring, Ph.D. New York and London: *G. P. Putnam's Sons*.

"Had there been no Luther, the English, American, and German peoples would be thinking differently, would be acting differently, would be altogether different men and women from what they are at this moment."

This saying of Froude's, quoted on p. 264 of the book before us, amply justifies Dr. Waring's attempt to expound the political theories of Martin Luther. It is a wise plan to set out these theories as far as possible in Luther's own words, quoted directly from his writings and utterances, particularly from his great "Appeal to the German Nobility."

The Reformation in its spiritual aspect was the attempt to cast out from the Church the spirit of Cæsar, and to make it a fitter abode for the Spirit of God, and it also involved the revolt of nations against medieval cosmopolitanism, which was being worked for the benefit of a corrupt Papacy that had degraded its world-wide possibilities in order to pursue local and family interests. Luther stands out as *the* prophet of the Reformation, and as the spokesman of this new national sentiment. Dr. Waring points out that Luther, in the course of his religious reform, was led almost inevitably to suggestions of political reform. He put forward a theory of the State which flatly contradicted the central idea of the medieval polity. Luther laid down that the State was as Divine as the Church in its origin, and therefore could justly claim the full obedience of all its citizens in all things not directly contrary to the Word of God. It was not the business of the Church to control the State. Each organization had its own sphere, within which it was supreme, but the State had full control over all persons residing within its domains, and both clergy and laity were equally subject to its law and discipline. The business of the State was to maintain peace, order, and security, to provide education—secular and religious—for its youth, to care for the poor, to protect the good and punish the wicked. Yet the State had its limits. It must allow reasonable liberty of conscience and speech to the individual, who may lawfully resist tyranny. Illegal or unconstitutional authority may be overthrown, and government may be constitutionally reformed and altered. Such are the principles which Dr. Waring deduces from Luther's writings and utterances, but they are stated therein rather as practical maxims than as a coherent system of political theory. In fact, we find serious inconsistencies in Luther's political suggestions on different

occasions—inconsistencies which Dr. Waring tries to explain away with little success. On the whole, however, the author has compiled a large amount of first-hand information, which gives a valuable indication of Luther's position and influence as a political thinker.

But while there is much excellent material in the book, it suffers from serious defects of workmanship, and leaves a distinct impression of hasty compilation rather than independent thought.

In the first place, it is not till p. 73 that the author really gets to his subject. Over one-quarter of the book is occupied with introductory matter, much of which has but the remotest connection with Luther. The author seems to lack a clear perception of what is directly relevant to his subject. Secondly, there is far too much quotation from various modern writers of every degree of importance. Hence the style reminds the reader strongly of "scissors and paste." We expected a treatise; the author has given us an album. The frequency of quotations gives a patchwork effect, which merely irritates by its discontinuity, without enlightening us or leading us to any definite point. We wish Dr. Waring had given us the fruits of his wide reading in his own words. He gives us too many opinions of other people. When he speaks for himself his book becomes very readable.

There are also instances of needless repetition—*e.g.*, the quotation from Bryce's "Holy Roman Empire" on p. 255 is repeated in part on p. 268. A few minor blemishes may be noted. On p. 7 there is an apparent self-contradiction. We are told that Constantine's Edict of Toleration recognized freedom of conscience, and two lines lower down that "he banished dissenting ecclesiastics, prohibited assemblies of heretics, and confiscated their houses of worship." On p. 21 Dr. Waring says that the King of England obeyed the Bull "Clericis Laicos" of 1296. As a matter of fact, Edward I. outlawed the clergy for pleading that Bull as exempting them from secular taxation. Again, Latin was the common language of learning and worship, hardly of commerce (p. 54). On pp. 100 and 101 Dr. Waring speaks of the "Fourth" Commandment, obviously meaning the one we reckon as Fifth in the Decalogue.

A useful working bibliography is provided.

DAVID J. DAVIES.

ST. PAUL THE ORATOR. By Maurice Jones, B.D. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 6s.

This contribution to the life, personality, and teaching of St. Paul is not, nor does it profess to be, an original thesis. Much of the material has been supplied by recent literature, but the author has woven it into quite a new and attractive pattern, and therein lies the value of the book. Its great feature is the literary plan. Each speech is treated in a framework: an analysis, a free translation, interwoven with exegesis, an examination of its Pauline features, the sequel to its delivery. The writer's aim is to justify St. Paul the Orator; incidentally he justifies St. Luke the Historian. The three sets of St. Paul's speeches which the latter has preserved for us in the Acts are representative—a testimony to the historian's discrimination—and they are comprehensive—a testimony to the versatility of the great Apostle. No matter what the conditions, the audience, the locality, St. Paul is equally

at home. His evangelistic sermons in the mission-field, his pastoral talk to the Clerical Union at Miletus, his apologetic speeches in Jerusalem and Cæsarea—they all witness to his unfailing tact and faculty of accommodation.

The writer, evidently a thorough-going disciple of Professor Ramsay, ably champions the authenticity of the speeches against the attacks of Professors Davidson, Bacon, and McGiffert. He points out that the artificiality and the sensationalism, even the starched consistency, which we should expect in a manufactured production, are conspicuous by their absence. Quite properly, he piles up argument and illustration to emphasize the fact that the portrait of St. Paul the Orator drawn by St. Luke is in complete harmony with the portrait of St. Paul the Author drawn by himself. The interest in the closing section of the book naturally centres round the question of the Apostle's conversion. The writer sees a twofold reason for the prominence given to it in the apologetic speeches. It was the only key to the Apostle's life: the swift transformation from blasphemer to Christian missionary needed an adequate explanation. It is the key to the Apostle's doctrinal system: the vision on the Damascus road was the inspiration of its three prominent texts—the Resurrection, the Process of Salvation, Justification by Faith. "The story of the conversion," he aptly says, "is not rejected because of the discrepancies in various editions of it, but on *a priori* objections to the supernatural element connected with it." He himself regards the vision as a real revelation of the living Christ, and the accounts of it as the real utterances of the fruit of the vision—Paul, "slave of Christ."

MEMOIR OF GEORGE HOWARD WILKINSON, BISHOP OF ST. ANDREWS.
By A. J. Mason, D.D. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 6s. net.

This is a shorter edition, in one volume, and at a much reduced price, of the memoir which has already been reviewed in our columns. The reduction in size is mainly due to the omission of a large number of letters, which, though interesting in themselves, can be spared without spoiling the portrait of the Bishop. Many to whom the size and price of the larger work were prohibitive will be glad to have this shorter account of one so universally respected as George Howard Wilkinson.

MANUAL OF ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY. By the Rev. Charles Hole, B.A., formerly Fellow and Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History, King's College, London. With biographical preface by the Dean of Canterbury. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

On the memorial tablet to Bishop Creighton in Peterborough Cathedral are inscribed the words, "He tried to write true history." The same epitaph might be written for Mr. Hole. His labours in Church history were not confined to this volume, but this volume is the maturest fruit of those labours. It may be said without fear of serious refutation that this book is distinguished by three of the most important qualities which Church history can possess; competent and well-digested learning, painstaking accuracy of thought, and sympathetic insight into varying and even conflicting aspects of Church life, which is widely different from, and much better than, a frigid impartiality.

It is a pity that to these three qualities Mr. Hole could not add a fourth—namely, that of a beautiful style. I do not mean that he is peculiar in this defect. A vicious depreciation of good writing has been the bane of many recent English historians; and it is certain that no history can be quite perfect if it is deficient in the quality of style.

Mr. Hole's history describes the Church of England from its remote and obscure beginnings in the second century to the middle of the reign of Queen Victoria. To the British Church he gives the honour which is its due. His account of the gradual Romanization of English Church life is critical and illuminating, for he frankly recognizes the ingredients of good which were present in that process; and his summary of the Benedictines' influence on England from its rise to its disastrous close is one of the finest examples of Mr. Hole's just and discriminating temper.

He is not less judicial in his treatment of Henry VIII. and of Queen Elizabeth; and not many better guides than he can be found through the thorny and intricate movements which issued in the Reformation settlement.

Upon the vexed question of the dissolution of the monasteries, the learning and acumen of Mr. Hole throw an abundant and searching light. With more Christian perception than Hallam, but without any of the romantic nonsense of the "King's Achievement," he sums up the case against monastic life as a thing incompatible with the expansion of England and the genius of her national Church. This passage (p. 149), as also a similar passage on Church life (p. 56), should be read not once or twice by those who wish to be taught what is true rather than what is agreeable about the period of the Roman ascendancy in England.

Neither to the Puritans nor to the Wesleyans does Mr. Hole do quite equal justice. The truth is that he was an unqualified Anglican, and deviations from Anglican orthodoxy were little to his taste. But he compensates for some asperity of treatment to Puritan and Methodist by his just and generous appreciation of the Anglican Evangelicals. Nor will his searching critique of the ingredients which composed the Oxford Movement be lost upon those who have usually heard that movement acclaimed with unmixed and unmeasured praise.

For busy clergymen, for the superintendents of day and Sunday schools, and for many who in various minor ways are expected to teach Church history, this book is admirably adapted. The Chronological Table and Index will be found of the greatest service for purposes of reference; and those who have scant leisure or capacity for original investigation may contentedly follow the guidance of Mr. Hole. It is to be hoped that this manual will quickly take its place upon the Diocesan lists.

This book is as opportune as it is useful. It will serve as an antidote to picturesque but misleading descriptions of Church life, which have appeared far too frequently of late.

HERBERT J. R. MARSTON.

SUNDAY EVENING. By W. Robertson Nicoll. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*.

Price 5s. net.

Fifty-two sermons by the learned Editor of the *British Weekly*. When Sir Robertson Nicoll leaves the region of controversy and writes for the general edification, how truly does he appeal to us all! The sermons are

short, but they are not thin. They are full of suggestiveness and of illustration, they tell of scholarly work, and they tell, too, of loyalty to Christ. We warmly commend them to the reader of sermons.

A PEACE SCOUT. By Irene H. Barnes. London: *Church Missionary Society*. Price 1s. 6d.

Miss Irene Barnes has a genius for writing missionary books for boys and girls—perhaps we may say especially for boys. Her latest book will enhance her reputation in this respect, and increase her usefulness. She has chosen an apt title in these days of scouts. She has remembered that boys like excitement, and, best of all, she has got her message home without appearing to preach. The missionary hope of the future lies with the children, and Miss Barnes is doing much to make the hope brighter.

BLACK-LETTER SAINTS OF THE PRAYER-BOOK. By R. E. Granger. London: *Messrs. Dent and Sons*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

The Black-Letter Saints of the Prayer-Book are to most Churchmen more or less entirely unknown. This little book, with a few pages about each, written in simple and readable form, will completely remedy the defect for those who care to read it.

CHILDREN ON THE KING'S HIGHWAY. By Rev. Charles Brown. London: *Religious Tract Society*. Price 2s. 6d.

The best testimony to this book is the fact that it has proved fascinating to a little maiden of seven, to whom it was lent. Since she found it attractive, it is pretty certain that other children will find it so too. Nor will children of an older growth object to it, for "Pilgrim's Progress" is of perennial interest to us all. Mr. Brown has done his work well, and this second volume is worthy to stand side by side with his former one. Both together, they form a most helpful commentary on Bunyan's immortal work, which ought to be widely used by parents and teachers.

THE REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND. By David Hay Fleming, LL.D. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 10s. 6d. net.

This stout volume contains the Stone lectures at Princeton Theological Seminary for 1907-08. But these lectures have been enlarged and revised before their appearance in print, and we are inclined to think the revision might have been even more thorough than it is. Dr. Fleming, already favourably known to students by his "Life of Mary Queen of Scots," here essays to give us the causes, characteristics, and consequences of the Scotch Reformation Movement. On the whole, despite the fact that the writer's prejudices are rather too sharply marked, the work has been excellently done. He takes us to the very heart of the movement; shows how imperative that movement was if Christianity was to be saved at all; and depicts the chief actors with a good deal of vigour and skill. The book will prove very unpleasant reading for the anti-Reformation party in our midst; but the plain facts of history, collected by Dr. Fleming and set here in their true setting, cannot be made away with. We are not sure that he has made out his case that the destruction of churches and ecclesiastical buildings cannot be laid to the charge of the Reformers; but he has shown, in no small detail, that the charges made against those Reformers of being mere ruthless

iconoclasts cannot be upheld. We doubt, too, if Dr. Fleming is really justified in painting the characters of the pre-Reformation clergy in such unrelieved black, and, by implication, in depicting the Reformed clergy as angels of light. As a matter of fact, there were many gradations of colour among both sets; and it will probably be found that the unrelieved black and the clear white did, in a large number of cases, approximate to a dull grey tint. We shall look forward to the writer's promised "Life of Knox" with uncommon interest. Such a life has long been a desideratum, and Dr. Fleming is well equipped, both with learning and industry, for this important piece of work.

THE CREED IN THE EPISTLES. By the Rev. Wilfred Richmond. London: *Methuen and Co.* Price 2s. 6d.

This excellent little book purports to give a survey of the creed of the first age of the Church as exhibited in the early Epistles of St. Paul. The writer makes out a very good case for his contention that the popular view, according to which the "Gospels" contain the simple Gospel, is incorrect. The Gospels give us the *incomplete* Gospel, not the whole of it; the story of the actual past facts of Christ's life is not the end, but has to be interpreted in the light of the developed Gospel which we find in the Pauline theology. Thus the Gospels are preparatory to and prophetic of the Gospel. It is not easy to give an outline of the book; it must be studied bit by bit, with the text of the Epistles open before one, in order to appreciate the cumulative effect of its evidence.

CÆSAR. Words and Music by the Rev. J. Mountain. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 6d.

Verses set to music, expressing what King Edward's dog Cæsar might have been expected to have thought and uttered if he had been able to speak and sing. "Dedicated to the Boys and Girls of the Empire."

BIBLE ANGELS. By Charles Moss. London: *George Routledge and Sons.* Price 3s. net.

The writer attempts the very difficult task of telling the story of the angels of the Bible in rhyme, and with, it must be confessed, only moderate success. The following lines are typical:

"Nebuchadnezzar's fifty days were fled,
His wayward son Belshazzar, too, was dead."

We candidly confess that Nebuchadnezzar is a difficult word for a poet.

GOD'S FELLOW-WORKERS. By C. B. Keenleyside, B.D. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 6s.

An interesting story of the progress of missions throughout the world, calculated not only to encourage the missionary spirit, but to make for general co-operation.

THE BOILING CALDRON. By Lettice Bell. London: *Hodder and Stoughton.* Price 3s. 6d.

THE SWEET STORY OF OLD. By Hesba Stretton. London: *R.T.S.* Price 2s. 6d.

These two books tell Bible stories in language which young people can understand. The former deals with the prophet Jeremiah, tells his story in simple language, and weaves into it the very words of Scripture. Chapter references are given in the margin, and space is left for the verses to be filled in. Miss Stretton's book tells the story of the life of our Lord, with illustrations by Harold Copping. Both books deserve to be used as gifts for the children.

BLACKIE'S CHILDREN'S ANNUAL. Price 3s. 6d. **MORE JUMBO STORIES.** Price 1s. **HOW THEY CAME HOME FROM SCHOOL.** Price 2s. 6d. **MOTHER GOOSE.** Price 1s. **THE ROUNDABOUT BOOK.** Price 1s. London: *Blackie and Co.*

Five excellent books for the tiny folks, illustrated in colours, and with simple letterpress well worthy of the reputation of this well-known firm.

A MANUAL OF THE ARAMAIC LANGUAGE OF THE BABYLONIAN TALMUD. Grammar, Chrestomathy, and Glossaries. By Professor Max L. Margolis, Ph.D. London: *David Nutt.* 10s. net.

Semitic scholars are often deterred from prosecuting the study of the Talmud by its barbarous style, and the immense number of irregularities which are to be found in its language. It must be confessed that, to a person acquainted with Hebrew, Arabic, Syriac, or any other Semitic language, it comes somewhat as a shock to find a Semitic tongue using the prefix *qd* (a contraction of the present participle of the root *qum*) as one method of forming a strengthened participle of another verb; or, again, to find *l* instead of *n* used as the preformative of the first plural imperfect; or to discover that "bread" is both *lahmâ* and *nahômâ*. He is not less horrified to discover that the suffixes *-hâh* and *-thû* (*thû*) may be used for *-hôn* and *-hûn* (*-tûn*), *ihâ* for *ithâ* ("there is"), and *leykhâ* for *leythâ* ("there is not"). *Mî*, as an interrogative particle (= *num* in Latin), wrongly reminds him of Turkish, and *lâyimâ* strikes him as strange for the third singular masculine imperfect of *âmar*. But Professor Margolis supplies the key to all such puzzles, and thus enables us to read with comparative ease a book which is, next to the Old Testament, "the most essential source of the Jewish religious law," and which contains the record of centuries of the life and thought of the Babylonian Jews. Even its dialect is worth studying, with the able assistance of this excellent and learned manual, for it reveals to us a Semitic tongue in its last stage of corruption as a spoken and written language. For those who desire to gain an acquaintance with the Talmud, we can heartily recommend Dr. Margolis' work, the result of more than twenty years' study and practical experience as a Professor of Biblical Philology. The grammar is admirably lucid, the Aramaic vocabulary is full and carefully compiled, and it gives the vocalization of the words, which is not given in the unpointed text. The well-selected chrestomathy contains pithy sayings, legends, and tales, some of which at least show that their authors had no lack of imagination, and could tell "tall" stories. As one example, take the following (Chrestomathy, pp. 71, 72):

"Once upon a time we were voyaging in a ship, and we saw that bird which was standing up to its ankle in the water, and its head reached the sky. We fancied that there was not much water. We wished to go down to cool ourselves (bathe). The *Bath Qôl* came forth, and said to us: 'Do ye wish to bathe yourselves where the axe of the carpenter's house fell seven years, and did not reach the ground—not because the water is deep, but because the water flows mightily.'" W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL.

Received: **THE HERALD OF MERCY ANNUAL.** *Morgan and Scott.* Price 1s. **THINGS SEEN IN SPAIN.** *Seeley and Co.* Price 2s. A well-illustrated story of Spain and its people. **THE NUMBER OF MAN.** By Philip Mauro. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 2s. An attack by this well-known writer on the New Theology, Modernism, Capitalism, etc. **ABRAHAM, JOSHUA, JEREMIAH, JOHN THE BAPTIST.** Four vols. 1s. each. By F. B. Meyer. *Morgan and Scott.* A reprint in handy form of the well-known Bible readings which have already had so large a circulation. **DEVOTIONAL HOURS WITH THE BIBLE.** By J. R. Miller, D.D. Price 5s. *Hodder and Stoughton.* Another volume of Dr. Miller's work, dealing with the Old Testament from Solomon to Malachi. This volume maintains the same high standard as its predecessors in spiritual suggestiveness and devotional insight. **THE PROFESSOR'S WALLET.** By H. N. B. Reid, D.D. Price 6s. *Hodder and Stoughton.* A series of theological, ecclesiastical, educational, biographical essays, dealing with such subjects as the ethical test of doctrines, the historic significance of episcopacy in Scotland, the training of the young, etc. **THE LITTLE PSALTER.** By E. W. Shalders. Price 1s. 6d. net. *Andrew Melrose.* A series of selections from the Psalms for devotional use. **THE ANCIENT CELTIC CHURCH OF WALES.** By David Davies. Price 2s. 6d. *Stimpkin Marshall.* A new and greatly enlarged edition of a book which has already had a large circulation. Its appearance now is particularly apposite, in view of the report of the Royal Commission. **THE BEAUTIFUL NAME.** By Prebendary Webb Peplow. Price 1s. *Marshall Bros.* The book contains the four Bible readings given at this year's Keswick's Convention. **CLEAR EYES.** Price 1s. *Marshall Bros.* A book for lads and young men, dedicated to Two Clear Eyes, that look out into life and seem to say, "I will play the game." **DEAN RAMSAY.** Nelson Sixpenny Classics. **LIFE OF COBDEN, LIFE OF PARNELL.** Nelson's Shilling Library. **SHERIDAN'S PLAYS.** *Blackie and Sons.* Price 2s. 6d. A well printed edition. **THE BIBLE IN THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL.** By Henry Iselin. *Hunter and Longhurst.* Price 1s. 6d.