

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1914.

The Month.

“Hands off!” WE are not surprised that many are saying—and we doubt not that very many more are thinking—that the time has come when Churchmen should unite in a common cry, “Hands off the Prayer-Book!” Whatever views men once held about the wisdom of Prayer-Book revision, it is beyond doubt that the gravest alarm now exists as the result of the action of the two Convocations in regard to it. If we mistake not, the section of High Churchmen, led by Canon Newbolt, have all along been opposed to revision. They are content with the Prayer-Book as it is. In the light of what has happened, we cannot but feel now that it would have been well if Evangelical and Central Churchmen had adopted a similar attitude. They believed, however, that revision would proceed on sane and sober lines, and that the Prayer-Book would emerge from the process a stronger Book, and one more fitted to meet the needs of our time. That view found expression in our own pages, and we are still prepared to concede that a well-ordered revision, which remained faithful to the distinctive principles of English Churchmanship, might be advantageous. But that now seems to be impossible. Proposals have been agreed to in Convocation which, in our view, gravely affect the Reformed character of the Church of England, and many are agreed that they call for the most strenuous opposition. The immediately pressing problem is, What are Evangelical and Central Churchmen going to do? Are they prepared tamely to submit to this inroad upon their position, or will they unite in one strong

protest against the suggested changes? We believe that some of the leaders are counselling delay, urging that there is time enough yet, and that they must wait and see how things develop. We are never in favour of precipitate action, but if anything at all is to be done in this matter, we are confident that the time for action has come. A petition to the Archbishops—reasonably, yet firmly worded—praying that no alterations be made in the Prayer-Book would secure the signatures of thousands upon thousands of loyal Church-people.

It is not possible within the limits of the space at our disposal to indicate the full extent of the changes suggested by Convocation. We trust that before very long someone will find it worth while to co-ordinate the decisions of the two Houses of the two Convocations, and to give the Church at large the benefit of his labours. The result would be startling. Meanwhile it is enough for our present purpose to say that the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury has agreed that the use of Eucharistic Vestments should be authorized; it has sanctioned Reservation for the sick; and it has agreed to the shortening of the words of Administration, when the number of communicants is large, by using only the *first* half of the formula. These are changes of grave significance, and no amount of "enrichment" in the occasional services, or "adaptation" of the ordinary services, can make these new departures generally acceptable. The Upper House of the Convocation of York, by a majority of one, has also sanctioned a form of Reservation for the sick, taking, however, as we should expect, greater precautions against abuse than those which appear in the resolutions of the Southern body. Once more the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation has resolved upon a rearrangement of the Communion Service, so as to bring its order into closer conformity, not only with that of the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI., but with the old Canon of the Mass. These changes are calculated to have a most

serious effect in more than one direction. They concede the principal demands of the extreme Anglican party, and put those who remember that the Church is Protestant as well as Catholic into an extremely difficult position, even in regard to such a matter as Church defence. The Dean of Canterbury has indicated his own difficulty in no uncertain terms. Writing in the *Record*, he says :

“ I wonder whether it ever occurs to the Bishops and their supporters that they are allowing the Church to drift into the gravest possible danger in respect to its position as a National Church. Let it be once rendered evident that changes are being made, or countenanced by the authorities of the Church, which expose every parish in the country to the action of Romanizing influences, and the sinews of resistance to movements for disestablishment will be cut. I do not hesitate to say that the mere proposal of the Bishops to authorize the Vestments will make it more difficult for many men, and among others for myself, to join with as whole a heart as hitherto in agitations for Church defence. I could not defend the continued establishment of a Romanized, or half-Romanized, Church; and matters have already gone so far, that I feel I do not even now know what it is I am defending.”

The difficulty expressed by the Dean is likely to be shared by many others, unless steps are taken to prevent the final and irrevocable authorization of the changes indicated. It is, therefore, of the highest importance that some counter-action should be resolved upon.

It is unfortunate that in the Upper House of the “Reservation”
Unnecessary. Canterbury Convocation there are so few Bishops with wide parochial experience, and not one amongst the English prelates who is in whole-hearted sympathy with the Evangelical view. The decision on “Reservation,” for instance, might have been different if the practical and doctrinal objections had been adequately pointed out. But the defect to which we have referred will soon be remedied. At the May group of sessions the new Bishop of Chelmsford will, we presume, take his seat, and, alike from his extensive practical knowledge of work amongst the poor, and his deep attachment to Evangelical principles, he will be a strong acquisition to the debating power of the House. In his remarkable book, “The Church in

Action," he has expressed his views on Reservation in no uncertain terms :

"The Prayer-Book does not provide for any 'reservation of the Sacrament' for the sick, but it does provide for a celebration in the sickroom. Therefore it is incumbent upon the priest to do everything in his power to give the sick that which they desire, and in the manner which the Church directs. There may be difficulties. The priest may himself have communicated earlier in the day, but, as the late Head of Pusey House points out in his 'Work in Country Parishes,' Bishops of the Early Church frequently celebrated several times a day. No opinions of the priest, as to fasting or any other question, can outweigh his obligation to administer the Holy Communion to the sick and the dying at any hour of the day or night. It is argued that the sickroom may not be a fit place in which to consecrate. My reply is that anything that makes a room unfit for the Consecration makes it equally unfit for the administration of the 'reserved' elements. Let us remember that the Lord, Whose service it is, was born in a stable, laid in a manger, and died upon a cross, and no room can be too squalid or poverty-stricken for Him to give Himself to the hungry souls of men in their hour of need. As one who has worked for many years in a poor district, I should like to bear my testimony to the unfailing readiness, even among the roughest of the rough, of relatives, friends, and neighbours, to do all in their power to make things 'decent' for the clergyman at a time of sickness. A table will be washed, quiet on the stairs will be preserved, neighbours will take the children away, and if the clergyman will wear his surplice, provide a white linen cloth, and take with him his own Communion set and other accessories, there is no reason why the service should not be conducted in a 'slum' room as reverently as in a cathedral. Dignity and simplicity *can* go together."

Dr. Sanday's
Tribute.

Dr. Sanday's tribute to the life-work of the late Professor Driver was, as we should expect, warm, sympathetic, generous, affectionate. The memorial sermon he preached in Christ Church Cathedral on March 8, the Sunday after the funeral, when all Oxford was mourning its great loss, has since been published (Oxford: Clarendon Press; 6d. net), and it will be highly appreciated for its careful and accurate analysis of the value, variety, and quality, of the Professor's remarkable work. These points hardly received sufficiently adequate recognition in some of the obituary notices which appeared in the Press, and Dr. Sanday has adjusted the balance. Even those who, like ourselves, have been unable to accept many of the conclusions to which his independent studies led him, acknowledge with gratitude the greatness of the

services Dr. Driver rendered to students of the Bible. If it stood alone, his work on the Revised Version would be sufficient to place him in the very front rank of Hebraists. Yet his contribution in this connection to the elucidation of the text of the Old Testament was only one incident in a life wholly given up to Biblical research. His most famous work was, of course, his "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament," first published in 1891. But the real charm of Dr. Sanday's tribute is in the beautiful picture it gives of the personal side of Dr. Driver's life. "Absolutely simple, absolutely sincere, absolutely without guile, single-minded and at the same time humble-minded, the Bible and the Home were the two centres of his being, and in both he had the fullest satisfaction. A happier or more united home could not easily be." And again: "Behind and between all that he wrote it was easy to see the outlines of his own simple but most genuine personal religion, itself derived straight from the Bible." Reference is made also to his "great kindness of heart," and his "never-failing readiness to spend and be spent in the good cause." Dr. Driver founded a school—"a school," so Dr. Sanday describes it, "as sound as any in Christendom, fully abreast of all the new knowledge, and yet sober, solid, full of ample promise for the future." He succeeded in the Regius Professorship of Hebrew at Oxford by his best-known disciple, Canon G. A. Cooke, who since 1908 has been Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture.

Dr. Ginsburg's death, following so closely upon that of Dr. Driver, is a still further loss to Biblical scholarship. He was one of the greatest Hebraists of his time, and, so far as he concerned himself with critical questions, his influence was almost wholly in a conservative direction. The *Guardian*, however, in a highly appreciative notice of him, says that the problems about the Old Testament which attract popular attention were not his business. "His ambition, or rather his religious passion, was for the perfecting of the tradi-

tional text of the Hebrew Bible. The great work of his life, the publication in three folio volumes of the Massorah, or Corpus of ancient Jewish textual tradition, was a magnificent prelude. Then came his 'Massoretico-Critical' edition of the Hebrew Bible in 1894, and the invaluable 'Introduction to the Hebrew Bible,' a treasury from which all subsequent writers of such Introductions have drawn. Of the Hebrew Bible, Professor Kantsch said in the Preface to his famous edition of Gesenius's 'Grammatik': 'I have learned to value this edition more and more in the course of the preparation of the present work.' In the second edition, which Dr. Ginsburg began in 1908, and which was being issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society as one of the memorials of its centenary, he collated the Bomberg text with some seventy Biblical MSS. and some twenty printed editions of earlier date. The notes at the foot of each page embody the principal results of this collation, and record in detail the source of each variation in orthography, vowel points, etc. Of this monument of exact scholarship the Pentateuch, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Lesser Prophets, have been published. Yet all this is but a moiety of Dr. Ginsburg's long, unwearying life-work." His exposure of the fraudulent Shapira MS. in 1883 greatly impressed the popular imagination. Some attempt has been made since his death to question the part he took in the exposure, but it is established beyond doubt that the discovery was due entirely to the keenness of his genius. He was a Jewish convert, and for a time in his early years worked as a missionary of the British Society for the Propagation of the Gospel among the Jews. Not the least of the services he rendered to the Christian Church was his work as a member of the Old Testament Revision Committee.

The publication of a series of "Kikuyu Tracts" is warmly to be commended. The public mind has been deeply stirred by the questions which have arisen out of the Conference, and the moment is opportune for

"Kikuyu
Tracts."

discussing calmly, wisely, and reasonably, problems which have to be faced before a just decision can be reached. The names of the authors of these "Kikuyu Tracts" are a sufficient guarantee of the impartiality of their writings. Their desire is to elucidate the truth, and not to score off opponents. Four numbers have reached us. Professor Gwatkin's tract, "The Confirmation Rubric: Whom does it bind?" is an able exposition of the limited character of the rule: the rubric is meant for our own people only. Dr. Guy Warman's tract, "The Ministry and Unity," contains within a very narrow compass a mass of information on the question of Episcopacy, and points out that, with the Apostolic view of the Episcopate, "Episcopacy may become, as it was in the Primitive Church, a centre of unity and a bond of brotherhood." Chancellor P. V. Smith's tract, "The Limits of Ritual and Ceremonial in the Anglican Communion," discusses with legal exactness and precision a question upon which the best light available is earnestly desired. Of the Bishop of Durham's tract, "That They All may be One," it is sufficient to say that it is as beautiful in its expression as it is strong in its appeal. Like all the Bishop's writings, it takes us away from mischievous controversy, and centres our attention upon the Lord Himself. The publication of these tracts lifts the Kikuyu discussion to a higher plane. They meet a real need in an excellent spirit. Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co. are the publishers, and the tracts may be bought for the popular penny.

It is now announced that the Welsh Church Bill

The Welsh Church Bill. will not be taken in the House of Commons until after Easter. It must not be supposed, however, that the delay is indicative of any change on the part of the Government in their general attitude towards the question. If we may judge from Mr. McKenna's speech on Mr. Ormsby-Gore's Welsh amendment to the Address, and still more from Mr. Asquith's reply to the deputation of Welsh Nonconformists which waited upon him recently in support of the Nonconformist

protest against disendowment—a protest as remarkable as it was refreshing—the Bill is to be passed into law this session without the alteration of a single comma. The Welsh Libera- tionists demand satisfaction, and the Government dare not say them nay. We are not altogether surprised that events should take that course. A danger hitherto has been that the Government, by promising considerable modification of the disendowment clauses, should tempt the Church to compromise on the question of disestablishment. That, in our view, would be disastrous, for we agree with those who hold that of the two evils, disestablishment is infinitely the greater. We are confident that the Church will do well to fight this battle out to a finish. The Government may succeed in forcing the Bill into law under the provisions of the Parliament Act, but even so the Church will not be at the end of its resources. The General Election cannot be delayed beyond next year, and the demand for the repeal of the Welsh Church Act will be insisted upon. Indeed, the Unionists—should they be returned to power—are irrevocably pledged to the policy of repeal.

**Nonconformists
and
Disendowment.** The disendowment clauses of the Welsh Church Bill are as cruel as they are indefensible. The fact is recognized by large numbers of Nonconformists even in Wales. When we find 15,321 Nonconformists in the northern part of the Principality alone expressing their “conscientious opposition” to “the proposals to deprive the Church in Wales of her enclosed ancient churchyards, and to take away for secular purposes £157,000 a year of her ancient endowments,” we may be quite sure that their convictions have been deeply stirred. A similar protest is in course of signature in South Wales, and it is believed that it is assuming even larger proportions. Attempts have been made to impugn the genuineness of the North Wales protest, but they have signally failed; whilst, on the other hand, it has been established beyond all doubt that many of the signatories have been subjected to bitter persecution for their faithfulness to the dictates

of conscience. The Government may affect indifference to this unexpected opposition to their proposals, but it will weigh with the country. What many people are asking, however, is why is it that so few English Nonconformists give any sign of their disapproval of the Bill? There are two sections of Nonconformists—the political section and the religious section. The Church does not expect, nor does it desire, any help from the political section, but it is passing strange that the leaders of the religious section remain dumb in the presence of so grave a menace to the spiritual usefulness of the Church. The question they are bound to face is whether it can possibly be right to confiscate funds—in this case amounting to £157,000 per annum—which are used for religious purposes, and to devote them to purposes wholly secular, and without any connection with religion at all. If they allow this great wrong to be done, without any protest on their part, they will incur a responsibility from which even the most callous might well shrink.

A "Serious Disappointment."
 "This is the Bishop's only serious disappointment." The words are those of the Bishop of Bristol, and he uses them in a letter to his diocese concerning the decision of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury on the Athanasian Creed. The Bishop says he has long been clear that the *Quicumque vult* should be restored to its proper place as a Canticle, to be said or sung *before*, not *instead of*, the Apostles' Creed. Convocation has decided by fifteen to seven that the Creed "shall" be sung or said at Morning Prayer instead of the Apostles' Creed, on Trinity Sunday only. The decision has pleased no one, and the *Times* has published a large number of letters protesting against it. The heaviest fire has come from Professor Emery Barnes, who, objecting to the damnatory clauses, says that if, as he contends, they are untrue, it is as wrong to repeat them on one Sunday as on several occasions. His letters cover more or less familiar ground; but in an article he contributes to the *Church Family Newspaper* he takes a broader view, and claims

that the clauses are untrue, for they traverse the teachings of Scripture :

“ ‘Whosoever willeth to be saved——’ We know how the sentence would be completed in the Gospels: ‘Let him come unto Me (the Christ),’ or ‘let him believe on Me,’ or ‘let him eat of Me!’ Always comes the personal note; always the invitation to the poor human being to cast himself on the Divine-human Person! We know, again, what is the teaching of the Epistles. They do not say that salvation depends on holding propositions. ‘In Christ’ is safety. ‘He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life.’ I dare not repeat the first clause of *Quicumque* because I have learnt from the New Testament and from the Prayer-Book (everywhere outside the ‘Athanasian Creed’) that ‘Whosoever willeth to be saved, before all things it is necessary *that he be in Christ.*’ After that, if a man be a student of theology, he may assimilate with profit the teaching of *Quicumque vult* on the Trinity and on the Incarnation, but he will avoid the damnatory clauses to the uttermost if he desires as a pastor to

“ ‘Win straying souls with modesty again,
Cast none away.’ ”

This is a singularly fine passage, and should go far to arrest the attention even of those who claim that the damnatory clauses do not go beyond the teaching of Scripture. If the Bishops desired to deal with the matter at all, it seems a pity that they did not content themselves with changing the “shall” of the rubric into “may.” This would probably have satisfied all but the most extreme men.

The new volume of the *Official Year-Book of*
A Year's
Statistics.
the Church of England (S.P.C.K.) gives some extremely interesting statistics. The voluntary offerings of Churchmen for the year ending Easter, 1913, amounted to £7,900,230, against £7,764,777 in the previous year—a healthy advance. The statistics of Church work show some signs of retrogression; but it is well to remember, when comparing the number of communicants last Easter Day (2,328,767) with those for the previous year (2,428,933), that last Easter the weather was very wet all over the country. There seems no reason to believe that there is really any falling off in the number of the Church’s communicants. But we should all like to see a greater advance.

The Sacerdotal Idea.

BY THE REV. E. C. DEWICK, M.A.

IN the history of religion, there are few ideas which are found to recur more constantly than that of "priesthood." Yet not only are its outward forms many and diverse, but there are also wide divergencies of opinion, even within the Christian Church, as to the essential functions of a "priesthood," or even as to the very meaning of the word "priest." It is therefore a matter of some importance, in order to avoid mutual misunderstanding in present-day controversies, that we should, as far as possible, be clear in our own minds with regard to the significance of "the sacerdotal idea."

But a satisfactory definition of "priesthood" is not easy to find; for we need one that will cover the various types of priests, good as well as bad, pagan as well as Christian—one, moreover, which will take us behind the accidental functions of certain priesthoods (such as the offering of sacrifice, the hearing of confessions, etc.) to the root-idea which underlies all priestly functions.

Now, there is one root-idea which seems to remain constant in every form of priesthood, and it is this: the "priest" is *one who stands in a specially privileged relationship to God*. This idea may be either degraded into a crude superstition, or uplifted into a highly spiritual conception. If the privilege is made to rest upon trivial or non-moral grounds, the resultant idea of priesthood is superstitious; but where the conditions of the privilege are moral and spiritual, we find a noble ideal of priesthood, consisting essentially in "nearness to God."¹

It is clear that from this root-idea of priesthood there would arise naturally the familiar sacerdotal functions, such as the offering of sacrifice, or the revealing of the Divine will. They are just the kind of functions which would of necessity be

¹ Cf. Dimock, "Christian Doctrine of Sacerdotium," Longmans, 1910, p. 7.

assigned to men who are believed to stand in a specially privileged relationship to God.

The origin of the sacerdotal idea is a problem on which experts still continue to differ. In primitive religions the priesthood generally appears to be closely linked either with tribal kingship or with the practice of sorcery and magic ; the evidence, however, is scanty. But we can see that when once the "sacerdotal idea" had taken root, its growth would be fostered by certain instinctive tendencies of the human mind. For instance, there is in most men—especially when young—a real delight in rules or customs which have no rational explanation. The primitive "taboo" persists (under other names) even in advanced civilization. Why it should be so is hard to say ; perhaps because it makes life like a kind of great game, in which it is "great fun" to keep to the rules. But be that as it may, the fact is beyond question that the strict observance of a code of rules, or fervent enthusiasm for a party, or loyal devotion to those in authority, are often *most* intense when they are *least* reasonable. Now it is easy to see that this tendency of the human mind would steadily develop the "sacerdotal idea" ; for when once the belief had taken root that certain men stand in a privileged relationship to God, their class-privilege would be sure to be more and more emphasized, and the priestly "caste" more strictly guarded against intruders—just because it is the unreasoning and unreasonable instinct of human nature so to do.

It is well to lay stress upon this, because it helps to explain why the history of every priesthood seems to be a history of ever-growing arrogance and narrow exclusiveness, till the claims become so preposterous that they are broken by a revolution.

Again, another tendency of human nature which has fostered the sacerdotal idea is the love of shifting religious responsibility on to other people's shoulders. A religion with a strict priesthood is often a very *comfortable* religion for the laity ; and the laity—of a certain type—favour it accordingly.

These instinctive tendencies of human nature have always been amongst the most potent factors in history ; they have

helped in the past to fashion the sacerdotal idea ; they are helping to fashion it in our own day.

But turning now from these *a priori* speculations concerning the origin of the sacerdotal idea to the actual forms in which priesthood has appeared, we find in pre-Christian times an immense variety of types. Egypt, Syria, Greece, Rome—each had its own form of priesthood ; sometimes a hereditary class, at other times composed of more or less isolated individuals ; sometimes a great political force, at other times a negligible factor in the secular policy of the nation ; sometimes a power for good, often the worst enemy of true religion.

Broadly, the history of primitive priesthoods seems generally to pass through certain well-defined stages :

(1) A period when there is *no organized priesthood*, but when sacerdotal functions are performed normally by the heads of tribes, or spasmodically by individuals who are little more than magicians or soothsayers ;

(2) *An organized priesthood*, becoming more and more “fenced off” from the nation at large by caste-privileges and regulations, often of no moral value ;

(3) The strict privileges of the old organized priesthood invaded by *an irregular ministry*, often not claiming the *title* of “priests,” but practically exercising priestly functions.

These stages may roughly be illustrated from the Old Testament. Leaving aside details which depend upon complex questions of criticism, we can trace three periods in the history of priesthood in the Old Testament : (1) The early period, when there are no signs of a regular class-priesthood, but the patriarchs offer sacrifice themselves ; (2) the period of the early monarchy, when the priesthood (*e.g.*, of Eli) is closely linked with sooth-saying and the consulting of oracles ; (3) the fully-developed Levitical priesthood ; (4) the various rivals of the priesthood, who gave religious teaching apart from, sometimes in opposition to, the regular priesthood. Such were some of the prophets (*e.g.*, Micah, Amos) ; and at a later period, the Pharisees, who in many ways exercised a more “priestly” influence over the

Jewish populace in our Lord's day than did the nominally sacerdotal Sadducees.

The general impression that we gain from the Old Testament is that at different stages of history different forms and types of priesthood were best in accord with God's Will. No one form, no one method of succession, is appointed to last throughout all the ages. Often, indeed, the opponents of the official priesthood were "nearer to God" than the lawful inheritors of the priestly office. And the synagogue-worship dispensed with the need of any priesthood at all.

In almost every priesthood, we find two main types of sacerdotal functions—functions which naturally belong to one who stands in a specially privileged relation to God. The one type of function is directed God-ward, the other man-ward.

The former type may be called *sacrificial*; it includes all acts by which the priest, in virtue of his privileged position, speaks *to God for man*, and conveys to God man's gifts. Of such acts, the offering of sacrifice is the chief.

The second type of priestly function may, perhaps, best be called *sacramental*, by which term we denote the acts by which the priest, in virtue of his privileged position, speaks *from God to man*, and conveys to man God's grace. Under this heading we place such acts as absolution, consecration, and (in a sense) preaching.

Let us first consider the sacrificial functions of the priest. The origin of sacrifice need not here detain us. Many scholars (*e.g.*, W. R. Smith) hold that it sprang from the primitive tribal meal, in which the god and his worshippers were regarded as joint-partakers, part being set aside as food for the god. But in any case, by the time that sacrifice had come to be specially associated with a priesthood, the dominant idea of sacrifice was that of a *gift offered to God*—the same meaning which has now become normally attached to the word "sacrifice," and the only meaning which concerns our present purpose.

Now, it is important to realize the wide difference which separates various types of sacrifice one from another.

First, let us note the difference between *propitiatory* and *non-propitiatory* sacrifices. These are separated by a fundamental difference of *motive*. The motive of the propitiatory sacrifice is to win God's favour or avert His displeasure; in other words, it is more or less a self-centred motive, though not necessarily, selfish, in the *bad* sense—*i.e.*, "that which would interfere with the happiness of others." In the Old Testament the burnt-offering, the sin-offering, etc., belonged to the type of propitiatory sacrifices; those who offered hoped by their means to *gain* something from God for themselves.

But the *non-propitiatory* sacrifice springs from a quite different motive. It is like the gift which a child offers to its father out of pure gratitude and gladness—not with any view to gaining a reward thereby, but simply to express devotion and affection. The peace-offering of the Old Testament belonged to this type of sacrifice; it was not designed to win God's favour, but to show gratitude towards Him.

It is clear that the difference between a propitiatory sacrifice and a non-propitiatory thank-offering, even though they may at times be similar in outward form, is essential and fundamental.

Another important distinction is between *spiritual* and *material* sacrifices. The line of cleavage between these two is not so clear-cut as in the last case, for the two types "shade off" the one into the other; but none the less it is a real and important distinction, relating in this case to the nature of the thing offered. In the one type, the thing offered is something *material*, and *external* to the offerer—his jewel, his animal, even his child; in the other type, it is something *spiritual* and *internal*—his heart and will and life; not part of his property, but part of himself.

In the history of religion there are few more important chapters than those which tell of the struggle between these two ideals of sacrifice, and of the growing supremacy of the spiritual ideal. In the Old Testament, for instance, the controversy between priest and prophet largely hangs upon the

contrast between the *ceremonial* and the *spiritual* types of sacrifice. We can readily recall the classic passage of Micah, where the ideal of a material, external sacrifice is first pushed to its extreme limit—viz., the sacrifice of the first-born son, the most precious and costliest of all gifts—and then deliberately set aside in favour of the ideal of spiritual sacrifice :

“Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before Him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?” (Mic. vi. 6-8).

A similar strife between the two ideals is visible in most religions; and normally we find the official priesthood laying stress upon the value of *material* sacrifices, and accusing their opponents of withholding from God the honour due unto Him; while the latter reply that they are not withholding sacrifice, but rather offering a more acceptable type of sacrifice: “The sacrifice of God is a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise.”

It is important to realize the differences between these various types of sacrifice, so that we may remember, when we speak of a “sacrificing priesthood,” that the term may be used to connote widely different ideas. And many a weary controversy would have been avoided if only care had been taken to explain which idea of sacrifice was in the mind of the disputant.

We may now pass on to the “sacramental” functions of the priest. The offering of sacrifice, though undoubtedly the most important and characteristic function of a priesthood, is yet only one aspect of its work. For a man who stands in a privileged relation to God is naturally regarded as possessing special authority to reveal the will of God to his fellow-men. So in

most priesthoods we find such functions as the pronouncing of oracular messages, absolutions, formulas of consecration, and even preaching; in all of which acts the priest is regarded as God's mouthpiece, speaking from God to man, conveying to man God's message and God's grace.

Here, again, we find these "sacramental" functions falling roughly into two classes. In the one class, the grace is held to be conveyed by means of an action which of itself possesses no moral value—as when the recitation of a formula or the performance of a gesture is held to be essential to a "valid" sacrament. In the other class, grace is supposed to be conveyed primarily by the contact of spirit with spirit, though a material medium of communication is normally necessary under the conditions of our present life. Familiar instances of the former class of sacramental acts are found in popular ideas of absolution or the consecration of material things, where the word spoken or the act performed effects the desired result apart from the personality of the agent. Among the second class we may place preaching and prophesying, and even (in a broad sense) the circulation of religious literature; for in all of these, though a material means of communication is needed (*e.g.*, the voice, the printed page), the *real channel* by which the Divine message and grace is transmitted to men is the *personality* of the priest or prophet, who, because he is in touch with God, is able to receive God's message and pass it on to others.

It is to be noted that there is no real antagonism between the priestly and prophetic offices. The office of the prophet is to *declare God's will to man*, and the sacramental function of the priesthood, in its highest and most spiritual form, is surely none other.

But as with sacrifice, so with sacrament, we find the influence of the official priesthood generally on the side of the material conception, while their opponents support the more spiritual ideal. For instance, in the writings of the sixteenth-century Reformers in Europe, we meet with constant protests against the consecration or blessing of material objects, and suggestions

that such prayers should be directed only with a view to the blessing of the worshippers, as spiritual beings.

We have outlined above the main features of the sacerdotal idea, and the various functions of the priesthood. It remains to see how far the sacerdotal idea is applicable to the Person and Work of our Lord, and to ourselves as Christians.

The sacerdotal idea, as we have defined it above, is clearly applicable in a unique manner to the Person and Work of our Lord, as set forth in the Catholic Faith. If our Lord be "very God of very God," He certainly holds a uniquely privileged relationship to God; while through the Incarnation He is no less closely related to the human race. And because He is "as human as ourselves, and as Divine as God Almighty," He is able perfectly to perform both the sacrificial and the sacramental functions of the true priest. His Sacrifice of Himself belongs to the *propitiatory* type of sacrifice; but it is altogether free from what may be described as the "selfish" element in propitiatory sacrifice, because the benefits obtained thereby are not bestowed upon the offerer Himself, but upon others, for whose sake He died. And the Sacrifice of Calvary clearly belongs to the *spiritual*, rather than to the material type of sacrifice. It was not the Death, viewed as a material offering, but the Death as the climax and crown of the self-sacrifice of the whole Life, which possesses the unique propitiatory value.

Our Lord is also the perfect example of a priest in His "sacramental" functions. By Him grace is conveyed from God to man, through the healing touch, the spoken word, or the written message inspired by His Spirit. And in His "sacramental" actions the personality of both giver and receiver are indispensable — on the one hand, the Divine will to give, and, on the the other hand, the human faith to receive. The *personal* touch of Christ must normally be met by the *personal* response of the believer, if the sacramental act is to be effectual. But whilst the necessity of the personal element seems clear, there still remains the question whether the grace thus passing

from God to man needs certain fixed material channels as the medium of communication between the Divine and the human personalities. This is, in effect, the view maintained by most of those who teach that a certain formula of words, or a certain ceremonial action, is so essential for a "valid" sacrament, that if these are omitted, the conveyance of grace is no longer assured.

Others maintain that whatever might be said on *a priori* grounds for this theory, it is disproved by the appeal to Christian experience; for oftentimes those who have been most uncompromising in their rejection of the outward forms of sacraments—*e.g.*, the Quakers—have shown forth in their lives the most abundant signs of grace.

The issues at stake between those who hold and those who reject this "sacramental theory" of the conveyance of grace from our Lord to His followers are far-reaching indeed; for the controversy between Catholic and Protestant concerning sacraments and the priests who minister them points to a deep cleavage between two different conceptions of the way in which God normally deals with men. And that is a grave matter on which to differ.

It remains for us to think of the sacerdotal idea as applied to the Church. We have seen that the sacerdotal idea, at its best, is fully applicable to the Person and Work of our Lord. How far is it applicable also to His followers?

A study of the New Testament shows that sacerdotal and sacrificial terms are applied in more than one passage to the Christian *community*—*e.g.* :

1. "Ye are an elect race, a royal *priesthood* (*ἱεράτευμα*) a holy nation" (1 Pet. ii. 9).
2. "He (Christ) made us to be a kingdom, to be *priests* (*ἱερείς*) unto His God and Father" (Rev. i. 6; *cf.* Rev. v. 10, xx. 6).
3. "Through Him (Christ) let us offer up a *sacrifice* (*θυσία*) of praise to God continually—that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to His name. But to do good and to distribute forget not; for with such *sacrifices* God is well pleased" (Heb. xiii. 15).

4. The contribution sent by the Philippians to St. Paul is described by him as "an odour of sweet smell (*ὄσμη εὐωδίας*), a *sacrifice* (*θυσία*) acceptable, well-pleasing to God" (Phil. iv. 18).

5. St. Paul describes himself as "a minister (*λειτουργός*) of Christ Jesus unto the Gentiles, *offering in sacrifice* (*ιερουργῶν*) the Gospel of God, that the offering up (*προσφορά*) of the Gentiles might be made acceptable."

6. "Present your bodies a living *sacrifice*" (*θυσία*) (Rom. xv. 16, xii. 1).

It will be noticed that while in these passages sacrificial language is applied without hesitation to the Christian life and its duties, they have reference only to certain types of sacrifice: (1) praise; (2) almsgiving; (3) the personal life of the sacrificer; (4) the lives of those converted through his ministry. It will also be noticed that these are all *thank-offerings*, not *propitiatory* sacrifices; and all *spiritual*, rather than *material*. They are all thank-offerings, because the thought of a propitiatory sacrifice has been excluded for the Christian, in the light of the Atonement. "He that spared not His only Son, but delivered Him up for us all, shall He not also with Him freely give us all things?" The Christian sacrifices are like children's gifts to a father, designed to please, not to appease; and to describe such gifts as "propitiatory" would be a misuse of terms. And further, the Christian sacrifices are essentially *spiritual*. Songs of praise are pleasing to God, not in themselves, but as signs of thankfulness; almsgiving is an acceptable sacrifice because it is the fruit of brotherly love; personal consecration is unquestionably a spiritual sacrifice.

We conclude, then, that we may apply sacrificial terms to the Christian Church and her members, provided that the sacrifices are defined as non-propitiatory thank-offerings, spiritual and not material in their character.

With regard to the "sacramental" functions of the priesthood, it is surely true that *every* Christian who influences his brother for good, or who tells to others the good news of salvation, is speaking from God to man, and so is performing true priestly

functions of this type. The "Missionary Commission" to evangelize the world definitely imposes such functions upon all Christ's followers. Every Christian sermon, every Christian book, has its priestly character, for it is (or ought to be) a message from God to man through the lips or the pen of one who by his conversion is specially privileged thus to speak. No true Christian lives to himself alone; and so, in one sense, he *does* by his influence mediate between God and his fellow-men, although not in such a way as to annul the individual responsibility of others. Here, again, we need to be on our guard against a double danger: on the one hand, we may drift into a crude conception of vicarious priesthood, which easily leads to the very worst type of sacerdotalism; on the other hand, we may be tempted to forget, or even to deny, the genuinely priestly character of all true Christian influence. The true course is, not to indulge in sweeping denials, but to see that our ideal of the Christian priesthood is built upon the broad and spiritual lines which we find set forth in the New Testament.

If, then, there is a Christian priesthood, to whom does it belong? Few would contend that it belongs in any *exclusive* sense to the ordained ministry. "The priesthood of the ministry is nothing distinct in kind from the priesthood of the Church. The ordained priests are priestly only because it is the Church's prerogative to be priestly."¹

Certainly the New Testament writers never attribute sacerdotal functions to the ministry as a class, nor do they even suggest that priesthood belongs to the Christian minister (as such) in any degree more than to the Christian layman. It is true that anyone who is engaged in pastoral and evangelistic work has peculiar opportunities of influencing others, and so of exercising what we have called the sacramental functions of the Christian priest. St. Paul was (in this sense) a priest of no ordinary kind, and he uses sacerdotal language to describe his evangelistic labours (Rom. xv. 16). But pastoral work and mission-preaching are not (at least under the Anglican system)

¹ R. C. Moberly, "Ministerial Priesthood," 1910 edition, p. 258.

confined exclusively to the ordained ministry. The latter may indeed be regarded as specially priestly in virtue of their pastoral labours; but it is another matter to regard them as specially priestly simply because of their admission to a certain Order in the ministry.¹

It is sometimes said that the clergy are in a special sense priests because they are the representatives or delegates of the whole Church. Now here it is well to ask whether it is meant that the clergy are the Church's delegates before *man*, or before *God*? In the former sense, there is clearly a measure of truth in the statement. As the leaders of public worship, the clergy do ceremonially represent the whole Church before the world; and therefore in the clergy the priestliness of the Church ought to be specially recognizable. Yet even here it is needful to guard against the tendency which would make public worship and religious ordinances the chief sphere of the Church's priestly activities. If the ordained minister is priestly because he is the Church's representative before the world in the rites and ceremonies of the sanctuary, so also is the Christian layman priestly, because he is the Church's representative in his business or profession.

But are the clergy representatives or delegates of the Church *before God*? It seems difficult to admit this without infringing in a dangerous manner upon the responsibility of the individual before God. Christian priesthood, if interpreted in the wide and spiritual manner which we have advocated above, is surely too sacred, too intimately personal a privilege and responsibility, to be *delegated* to any other soul. No one but ourselves can offer to God the thank-offerings which we owe to Him; no one can discharge on our behalf the privilege, which He has given to us, of speaking (by word or example) in His name to others.

"O, none may reach by hired speech
Of neighbour, priest, or kin,
Through borrowed deed to God's good meed,
Which lies so fair within."

¹ For the significance of the use of the word "priest" in the Anglican Prayer-Book to denote an Order in the Christian Ministry, see Dimock, "Christian Doctrine of Sacerdotium," pp. 77-92.

It is true that we can sometimes so identify ourselves with another's life and outlook, that we may (in a sense) suffer and rejoice with him. This is a privilege of all (whether clergy or laity) who are "members of Christ" and "members one of another"; and if *this* be styled a "representative" or "vicarious" priesthood, we need not demur to the terms. But the terms need to be carefully guarded, for they readily lend themselves to the idea that the ordained ministry can relieve the laity of some of their responsibility in religious matters, or that a layman needs the good offices of a priest to mediate between himself and the Most High. It is absolutely vital to the first principles of Christianity to maintain the direct personal responsibility of each Christian to God, and the privilege of every believer to enjoy free access to the Father through Christ—a freedom of access which no human priest can grant, and no human priest can withhold. If we allow this responsibility and this privilege to be obscured, we are lowering the Christian ideal of "our Father in heaven."

* * * * *

We in the English Church are confronted at the present time with a marked revival of the sacerdotal idea in our midst. It is being applied mainly—often exclusively—to the two higher Orders of the Christian ministry. We are told that they, and they only, have received authority to offer before God the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist. This sacrifice (it is maintained) is not merely a spiritual sacrifice of the heart, nor purely a thank-offering; but it has a propitiatory value, ultimately derived, no doubt, from the Cross, but inherent in the ceremonial presentation of duly consecrated bread and wine upon an altar. It is further maintained that the Christian ministry has received an exclusive power to convey to the laity grace through the sacraments or through priestly absolution, and to withhold such grace by refusing to perform these functions; for the sacrament or absolution is "invalid" unless the rites have been duly performed and the formulæ correctly recited by a "priest," whose ordination can be shown to be "valid" by similar external proofs.

May we not rightly regard a "sacerdotalism" of this kind as utterly opposed to the teaching of the New Testament, and as a dangerous reaction from higher and more spiritual ideals towards the crude conceptions of magic and superstition? If so, it is our duty to oppose it without fear or hesitation. But the true remedy for this one-sided sacerdotalism is not to shrink from all use of sacerdotal phraseology, but rather to discriminate between true and false conceptions of sacrifice and sacrament, and to uphold the New Testament doctrine of the Christian priesthood—a priesthood in which every child of God may claim the fullest privileges by faith in Christ, and in which each priest offers himself as a living sacrifice, and uses his whole life's work and influence as a sacrament of the grace of God.



Studies in Texts :

SUGGESTIONS FOR SERMONS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.

BY THE REV. HARRINGTON C. LEES, M.A.

III.—THE ETERNAL NAIL-PRINTS.

Text :—"Jesus Christ, and Him crucified."—1 Cor. ii. 2.

[Book of the Month : "ST. PAUL"¹=P. Other references : J. G. Simpson's "Christus Crucifixus" = C.C.; Denney's "Death of Christ" = D.C.; Stalker's "Atonement" = A.; Orr's "Resurrection of Jesus" = R.; Figgis's "Civilization at Cross Roads" = C.R.]

"THE Greek perfect participle might be rendered, 'He who *is* the crucified' (*cf.* 1 Cor. i. 23; Gal. iii. 1); goes a great way farther than the aorist, 'He who *was* the crucified'" (P. 173). Paul never applies the latter. "Tense indicates an influence continued into the present": "the Crucified a reality, can be experienced every day" (P. 174).

¹ "St. Paul: a Study in Social and Religious History." By Adolf Deissmann, D.Th., D.D., etc.

I. A PAST ACHIEVEMENT.—“The only thing He is said to have done for us is to die, and this He did because it was determined for Him by sin. His power to redeem dependent on His making all our experience His own” (D.C. 131).

II. A PRESENT POWER.—“Reconciliation not something which is doing : something which is done” (D.C. 146). “Resurrection gives due place to the body of man : meant the redemption of whole personality, body and soul together” (R. 281). “Never been any Christianity as actual power in the world except that of the Resurrection” (A. 23). “Resurrection message an invitation extended to those who had past to be covered, present to be empowered, and future to be faced” (C.C. 126).

III. AN ETERNAL CHARACTER.—He *is* the Crucified: Lamb slain, but enthroned : corn bringing forth much fruit because died. “A window in Evangelical church at Erbach representing the crucified Saviour in conjunction with St. John’s allegory of the Vine. The Cross has struck root in the earth, the dead rood-tree has become the living Vine, and beneath the extended arms of the Saviour the mystic branches stretch down their bright green leaves and heavy clusters of grapes towards the communicants : ‘I am the Vine, ye are the branches’” (P. 179). “My life is a dialogue lived in intimacy with One who died to restore the peace broken by my act and deed” (C.R. 128). “Every merely intellectual Christology that does not arise out of a religious union with Christ is of no value” (P. 166).



The Resurrection Body of our Lord.

BY THE REV. T. A. GURNEY, M.A., LL.B.

IN the glorious Liturgy of the Eastern Church for the great Paschal Festival the one ever-recurring thought is of the Saviour's resurrection as unlike all other resurrections, in being a victory over the grave, not incomplete, isolated, temporary, but a triumph over the whole power of death finally and universally. Again and again, after each reiterated response, the choir bursts in with the same troparion which tells that Christ hath so risen from the dead that in that rising death by death is trampled under foot. (*θανατω θάνατον πατήσας*) "The everlasting bars which held men chained" are shattered, Hell is "spoiled," Death's might is "abolished," the Mighty Conqueror hath so wrought Death's destruction (*θανατώσας τὸν θάνατον*) that through His "life-giving resurrection" the sons of men are free. "We celebrate," they cried, "the death of death, the overthrow of Hades, the firstfruits of another endless life." The Passover has risen and Redemption is secure. "In new beauty from the tomb" as from a bridal chamber, passing the seals and leaving them "unbroken," the Resurrection and the Life has shone forth. It is no mere Resuscitation, and no mere Bodiless Victory over death we have here.

I.

When we turn to the Gospel records to find out how far this exalted idea of our Lord's resurrection—the staying power of the Eastern Church through ages of discipline and sacrifice—is true, we find that, even examined in the fullest light of modern criticism, it does not pass one whit beyond the facts recorded there. The objective reality, the spiritual uniqueness, the representative character, the quickening power, the transfigured beauty of our Lord's manifestations are quietly and consistently affirmed. There are the marks at one and the same time of sobriety, historicity, naturalness, correspondence, a variety

which springs out of a basic unity, and confirms and enlightens faith.

St. Mark comes first in order of time, and affirms the fact of the Resurrection and the empty tomb. Two further features in the Appendix (xvi. 9-20) give us the impressions of the Early Church that His appearance was a "manifestation" (xvi. 12, 14), and that, on one of these occasions (the journey to Emmaus) it was "in another form" that He appeared. St. Matthew, undoubtedly second in order of time, records the visit of Mary Magdalene and "the other Mary," the message of the angels that He was going before to Galilee, the first actual meeting with Jesus when (*cf.* John xx. 17) they "took hold of His feet and worshipped Him" (see Matt. xxviii. 1, 7, 9). He records also the manifestation on the mountain in Galilee, and the fact that, "when they saw Him they worshipped Him (a significant fact), but some doubted," *ἐδίστανσαν* (xxviii. 17). Already we have features in the Risen Lord which did not belong to Him before, which on the one hand inspire awe and adoration, and on the other suggest perplexity by their mysteriousness. Then we pass to St. Luke. Here we meet with several additional features. The state of the linen cloths for some reason fills Peter with "wonder" (xxiv. 12, 13). We are plainly told in the Emmaus story of the subjective limitations, and their removal, which hinder the vision of the glorified Lord: "their eyes were holden," "their eyes were opened" (xxiv. 16, 31). The whole story is full of this. For several miles He walked and talked with them, and afterwards actually ate and drank with them and was unrecognized. It is suggested here, as more than once in other manifestations, that the recognition, when it took place, was due to action on His side rather than mere bodily resemblance. They reached the joy of Easter "by no sort of sensible perception but by the way of faith."¹ He was "known of them in the breaking of the bread" (xxiv. 35). Then follows the first record, in order of time, of the appearances in the Upper Room (xxiv. 36-49). We note

¹ Steinmeyer's "Passion and Resurrection of our Lord," p. 349.

that He "stood in the midst of them," though another evangelist tells us that "the doors were shut" where they were assembled; that, instead of welcoming Him, "they were terrified (*lit.* 'scared') and affrighted, and supposed that they were gazing at a spirit"; that at first they were "troubled," and "reasonings arose in their hearts"; that He bade them "handle Him and see to convince themselves entirely of His bodily reality and identity, an invitation which St. John's words (1 John i. 1, ἐψηλάφησαν) show they accepted; that He then "showed them His hands and His feet," doubtless, as in St. John, that they might behold the print of the nails; and now, instead of terror, they "disbelieved for joy" and wondered—a matchless psychological touch of St. Luke which aids us in accepting his testimony as real; and that He "took" the food they gave Him and "did eat before them." One other important feature emerges before we leave this memorable scene. He speaks of His intercourse with them, not as renewed, but as having already ceased—"While I was yet with you" (xxiv. 44). The story of the Ascension follows, much as in the Acts, but briefer, with His final bodily separation from them.

St. John adds to these features his thrilling account of the visit of St. Peter and St. John to the empty tomb. St. John, arriving first, stoops down and gazes into the sepulchre (*βλέπει*). The Lord is not there, and nothing beyond that fact claims his attention. St. Peter bursts in and "stares" (*θεωρεῖ*) at the linen cloths, something about them arresting and startling him. Then St. John, perhaps aroused by this attitude of his companion, also enters, and, with the spiritual intuition which always enabled him quickly to grasp (*cf.* xxi. 7) the significance of an objective fact, he "understood" (*εἶδε*, and see *οἶδα* in Gospels and Epistles, especially John iii. 11, xii. 41) and "believed." What had they seen? The linen cloths lying flat (*κείμενα*), undisturbed, though a body had passed through them; the napkin about the head twirled up in roll-form still (*ἐντετυλιγμένον*), as though the head which had once filled it had never been removed. The whole scene must have recalled the Trans-

figuration which those very Apostles had witnessed. It was "the Parable of the Grave clothes" which foreshadowed the character of His resurrection-life.¹ St. John goes on to tell us of the first manifestation in the Garden to Mary Magdalene. When she saw Him standing "she knew not that it was Jesus," and even "supposed Him to be the gardener." It was, again, here, as in previous instances, His action, rather than any passive resemblance, which aroused her faith. "Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turneth herself and saith unto Him, Rabboni, which is to say, Master." As she attempts to clasp His feet He forbids her, with the announcement that "He is ascending," implying that already, without waiting for the final withdrawal from sight, He belongs rather to Heaven than earth. St. John gives his own beautiful and heart-stirring narrative of the two manifestations on successive Sundays in the Upper Room. Jesus "came," with His sorely needed benediction of peace. To the features in St. Luke we now have the added bodily features that "He breathed on them," and thus, as a "quickening spirit" bestowed the Holy Ghost. To St. Thomas "for the more confirmation of the faith," He offered the touch-test already offered to the rest, and we note clearly now that the Body so offered bore still, in hands and feet and side, the everlasting scars of His victory over death (xx. 25). And Thomas answers, not as he would have responded to even the most wonderful of past miracles, with words of adoring reverence which span the whole space between earth and Heaven, "My Lord and my God."

St. John has one "manifestation" more to tell of, beside the Galilean lake (xxi.). The narrative here in every feature is full of wonder and stillness and suggestiveness. It has for background the shadowy hills, the quiet shore, the lonely boat, the breaking dawn. The Lord is again unrecognized at first. "The disciples knew not that it was Jesus." When He is recognized it is again by His action. The sense of mystery, of a certainty somehow convincing to faith rather than sense, of an

¹ See Latham's "Risen Master," pp. 1-90.

unusual awe even in the midst of homely surroundings which something must have inspired, is present with us in the whole narrative. We seem to stand, throughout, on the threshold of another world. "None of the disciples durst ask Him, Who art Thou? knowing that it was the Lord" (xxi. 12).

Thus are we brought to the final narrative in the Acts, with the fact of the Ascension. St. Luke describes His appearances during the forty days as so many "presentations" of Himself (i. 3, marg.) to "witnesses chosen before of God." The word *συναλιζόμενος* suggests (see marg., i. 4), instead of "being assembled with them," the words "eating with them." It was certainly at some social gathering that He made His last commands known. Either sense would imply that His manifestations did not become more ethereal and unearthly as the time of departure drew nigh. Then, as they looked, He was "taken up" — "received up in glory" (1 Tim. iii. 16), and "a cloud received Him out of their sight."

II.

What impressions have we gathered from these simple and convincing narratives of fact? What conclusions as to our Lord's risen body and our own future state did the primitive Church derive from them? The answer seems quite clearly twofold: First, if accepted, they establish the fact of His continued identity and of His bodily resurrection; secondly, the Resurrection they record is plainly no mere resuscitation to a former life, but an entry into a new world of being under utterly new conditions.

1. It is plain that the manifestations are put before us by the witnesses as both revelation and proof. Less of detail would have sufficed as evidence of His resurrection. The detail springs from the desire to acquaint us with the transfigured life of the Glorified Lord. "The history is not a history of the Resurrection, but of the manifestation of the Risen Christ."¹ And it is quite evident, on the one hand, that the features of

¹ Westcott, "Revelation of the Risen Lord," p. 4.

Identity and Continuity are present in our Lord's resurrection state. He is known and recognized. They see and hear and handle Him and feel His living breath. He "shows them His hands and His feet." The prints of the nails are in them and the sword-thrust is in the side. He "eats and drinks with them." He has "flesh and bones" such as no mere spirit possesses. He recalls by her personal name the passionate love of the Magdalen. He speaks alone words of pardon to broken-hearted Peter. He gives His new commission to His Church. He answers the doubt of despairing Thomas by accepting his challenge. He meets His disciples beside the lake, reinstates Peter, directs their failure to success, spreads the feast for weary and hungry men. For, of all the unwarranted assumptions made by a certain kind of critic, surely the view of Professor Schmiedel's,¹ that there were no auditory or tactual experiences, has the least to support it. Finally, it is as "this same Jesus" that He is announced to return. In every respect He seems to be fulfilling His original promise, "I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice." The formula, or law, which preserves essential personality, is still the same.

2. Yet, withal, we are conscious of a change. That change is prominent in all the narratives, including the earliest. It is present in the Gospels, but it is equally present in all the allusions to the risen Christ in the Epistles. And the picture presented, in spite of its contrasts with all one might expect, or all that the disciples could have expected, is not inconsistent, impossible, fantastical; but harmonious, self-correspondent, consistent throughout, and to after-ages it alone stands in harmony with all the facts. Our Lord has been "raised"—not, as Lazarus was raised, to die again. Death is not robbed; "Death is swallowed up in victory." The words associated with the last of all the manifestations in the New Testament, recorded by the latest witness years after the first, give the impression which the first brought home—"I am . . . the Living One, and I was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, and have the keys of

¹ Article, *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

death and of Hades" (Rev. i. 17, 18). It is the same aspect of the Resurrection which St. Paul emphasizes: "He was declared" (*ορισθέντος*, determined) "to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection of the dead" (Rom. i. 4). "Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death no more hath dominion over Him" (Rom. vi. 9, R.V.). By death He "has brought to nought death," and "brought life and incorruption to light." The truth of such statements as these is confirmed by the narrative of the facts which the Gospels give us.

It has been objected that such a revelation is "quite inconceivable," and its stages "cannot be represented" to the mind. But the limits of our present experience cannot be taken as the boundary-line of all truth and experience; otherwise we should be soon landed in a universal negation which would destroy science itself. Even the supernatural is becoming more and more, with our deeper knowledge of nature, merged in the under-world of the natural. It is with great truth that Carlyle has written: "What are the laws of nature? To me, perhaps, the rising of one from the dead were no violation of these laws, but a confirmation; were some far deeper law, now first penetrated into and by spiritual force (even as the rest have been), brought to bear on us with its material force."

(a) They make it plain that *His life is a transfigured and glorified life*. "He is seen to be changed," writes Bishop Westcott, "yet none the less He is seen to be essentially the same. Nothing has been left in the grave, though all has been transfigured."¹ The Body of the Lord is utterly transformed, though it retains its connection with the past. There is "the image of the heavenly," but there are the marks of the nails as well. The Body has gone from the grave, yet it is no mere resuscitation that we see. Gathered up into a richer, fuller, more glorious life are the old familiar physical elements, which death has not annihilated, but transformed. There is no breach of continuity. The mortal has been "clothed upon," and its "mortality swallowed up of life." It has "put on incorruption"

¹ Westcott, "Revelation of the Risen Lord," p. 9.

—transfused, sublimated, transfigured with “the power of an indissoluble life” (Heb. vii. 16, marg.). Mere resuscitation, exposed as it is to a hundred scientific objections, finds no place in the Gospel narratives of the Resurrection.

The identity with His former body lay not in any material continuity of particles, or in identity of physical form, but “rather, as Origen and the Alexandrians maintained, in the continuity or permanence of the spirit which gives the law (λόγος) of its constitution, and moulds or fashions it to be the fitting vehicle of its manifestation under varying conditions.”¹ “It had become the pure and transparent vehicle of spiritual purpose.”²

The parallel with what happened at the Transfiguration at once occurs to us. The significance of that fact, recorded by all the Synoptists, has been too often missed, because its foreshadowing of the Resurrection has been lost sight of. “God appeared in Jesus,” writes Didon, “at His transfiguration, as He will appear in us at the end of time.” “When the spirit and soul of man is bathed in the glory of God; when the soul, pervaded by God, envelops the body which it quickens with its own beauty; when matter, pervaded by the Spirit through all its kingdom, suffers a glorious transformation which renders it a worthy habitation for the sons of God, then the Kingdom of Heaven shall be consummated.” “Jesus,” he goes on, “wished to show to all mankind the glorious goal which He should reach through suffering and death. Sorrow and death are but the way; the end for Him, as for us, is the transfiguration of our whole being into the splendour of God.”³ Hence the glory and mystery of His risen life, which at first staggers and bewilders the disciples. Even with the help of the Transfiguration they cannot at once comprehend it. “They were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit.”

(b) Thus already *His life belongs to Heaven*. His relationships with the world have ceased. “The world seeth Me no more.”

¹ See Article, *Expository Times*, Rev. J. M. Shaw, vol. xxi., pp. 544-547.

² Gore, “Body of Christ,” p. 127.

³ Father Didon, “Jésus Christ,” i. 475.

His intercourse with His own is transformed. The disciple sees Him now rather by faith than sense. He shows Himself at will, and He withdraws at will. "He conforms to the laws of our present life, yet He is no longer subject to them."¹ "He speaks of a time 'when I was yet with you.' His attitude, when He comes, has a strange aloofness. He stands, as it were, apart from them, above them. He calms their troubled hearts, but He does not identify Himself with them. The former intimacy is past for ever."² He "belongs to two worlds, that of sense and that of spirit."³ "The sensible" is "hidden as within a veil of the supersensible; or, shall I say, the supersensible" is "veiled in a robe of the sensible" ?⁴ Such statements as these all describe the reality of the change which has passed over Him. There is nothing to imply that the disciples were less conscious of the uniqueness of such facts than we are ourselves; it is all the other way. Their astonishment is the testimony to their genuineness and scientific accuracy in recording a perfectly new series of manifestations.

(c) *Yet His life is a bodily life still.* The human body has become at last the absolute servant of a human will. He can equally veil and reveal His presence, "stand in their midst" and "vanish from their sight." "We see," writes Steinmeyer, "side by side the newness and identity of His bodily life."⁵ He has a spiritual body, and is become a quickening Spirit. The revelation of His Person now is "the revelation of a victorious spiritual life."⁶ The bodily life retained is no longer the limitation, but the expression, the instrument, the unimpeded manifestation of spirit. It is "the clothing of the spirit with a spiritual body." There is no contradiction with nature here. "Spiritual facts," writes Illingworth, "are not complete until they have expressed themselves; and matter, as we call it, is their language, the

¹ Westcott, "Gospel of the Resurrection," p. 163.

² Forrest, "The Christ of History and of Experience," pp. 148-149.

³ Nolloth, "The Person of our Lord," p. 248.

⁴ Loofs, quoted in Nolloth, p. 248.

⁵ Steinmeyer's "Passion and Resurrection of our Lord," p. 301.

⁶ Forrest, "Christ of History," p. 138.

medium of their expression."¹ And "the risen body of Christ was to His disciples this expression—the exhibition, the manifestation, and therefore the assurance, of the spiritual triumph which it revealed."² It was no mere passing concession to the weakness and ignorance of His followers. It was, as far as we know humanity and life, the necessary, inevitable, and abiding expression of His fulness of Personality. "The whole doctrine of the Incarnation," Sir Oliver Lodge has written, "recognizes and illustrates . . . an interaction between the spiritual and material aspects of reality."³ Even love itself, our most spiritual possession, has, he affirms, "a sacramental or material side, wherein the flesh and the spirit are inseparably united, and where neither can be discarded without loss to the other."⁴ Our whole knowledge of Personality affirms the vital association of soul and body from the first moment of life. No satisfying proof exists so far of the transmigration of souls. Normally, neither can be thought of apart from the other. Our whole relationship with others and the world at large is by the body. It is our only vehicle of communication. If we speak of the spirit-world we use images which are necessarily material. Even a ghost must appear in the likeness of men, and will usually have garments like other beings. "A purely spiritual agency may be active—and the activity may be guessed at or inferred, and may be believed in—but the only evidence that can be adduced is the manifestation of that activity through matter, and the only moments when a glimpse can be caught of its activity are the moments at which action on matter occurs."⁵ The correspondence or connection between matter and spirit seems, therefore, "a symbol or sample of something permanently true."⁶ It is strange that in face of this, and of our Lord's bodily resurrection, Christianity has so often fallen back upon the old and mischievous dualism which has emphasized their contrasts rather than the affinity between them. The true

¹ Illingworth, "The Doctrine of the Trinity," p. 228.

² *Ibid.*

³ Sir O. Lodge, "Man and the Universe," c. viii., s. 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 280.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 270-281.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 292.

contrast to spirituality is not immateriality, but carnality—the attitude of the ego towards that aspect of its life which is its means of self-expression and self-fulfilment. “Christianity postulates a supersensually appreciable vehicle or mode of manifestation,” after death, “fitted to serve the needs of future existence as our bodies subserve the needs of terrestrial life.”¹ We have absolutely no right to assume that the terms “material” and “spiritual” “answer to a real distribution of God’s world into two compartments, when in fact they are merely convenient provisional notions for enabling us to contemplate certain phenomena in this world in a more methodical way.”² Is there any insuperable difficulty in a transfiguration through death which changed the particles of His earthly body, when we recall how, in His transfiguration on the mount, even “His travel-worn and peasant garments” became garments “white as the light,” “glistening,” “dazzling” in their glory, the inner splendour of His Personality bursting through all seeming hindrances? The recent view in “Foundations” of the Resurrection which would rob the “body” of Jesus of all materiality, does not, as the writer of “Some Loose Stones” points out (pp. 68-85), account for all the facts, and sets aside a great deal of positive evidence. Besides, “if it was an immaterial body in which He appeared to them,” how, he asks, were they to know it was not a spirit?

(d) *The essential characteristics of Personality* are identity, permanence, and power of self-expression. All these, in spite of these unique changes, are preserved *in the Person of the Risen Lord*. The “law” or “formula” which governed His personal life is fulfilled, not thwarted, by His “exodus” (Luke ix. 31) out of death. That spiritual body which is “the ideally perfect utterance of spirit” will be His to the end of time. It is to be hereafter the vehicle of His “manifestation,” His “epiphany,” to His adoring saints. Some hold the view that His appearances during the forty days give no clear indication of what He is to-day, or what we shall hereafter become in Him. They

¹ Sir O. Lodge, “Man and the Universe,” p. 280.

² Latham’s “The Risen Master,” p. 70.

were concessions to the weakness of His "friends." During this period He hovered on "the borderland of flesh and spirit."¹ The later manifestations were less bodily in character than the earlier. "The beginning of the final change which transforms the natural body into the spiritual" is discernible.² "The image of the heavenly" is "already upon Him." He "hovers on the borderland of two different worlds, and partakes of the characteristics of both, just because He is revealing the one to the other."³ "His body," writes Professor Banks, "was in process of spiritualization. He had not yet the complete spiritual or glorified body of the heavenly life, but was on the way to it. The final, permanent transfiguration was going on."⁴ What warrant have we for such statements from the records? Some access of glory when He passes into the heavenlies we may expect, and such we find in the later manifestations. But this is indicated as a matter of degree, not kind. There is nothing in the records of the forty days to justify the view of a gradual transition to another state. The intercourse on the morning of the Ascension is marked with less of mystery than the walk to Emmaus, or the scene in the Upper Room on Easter Day itself. Precisely the same conditions of recognition and intercourse on both sides are present in the later as in the earlier scenes. The words at His first interview with the sorrowing Magdalen rather suggest that, *in its personal aspects towards Himself*, the Ascension took place that very day. The definite promise of His continued identity at His return is expressly associated with the very moment of His departure.

III.

Will our resurrection life be like that which He showed His disciples during those forty days? The terms in which the New Testament writers depict it encourage us to believe that as He was during that first Eastertide so shall we, "quickened through His spirit that dwelleth in us," become. For we are

¹ Swete, "The Appearances of our Lord," etc., p. 50. ² *Ibid.*, p. 59.

³ Forrest, "Christ of History and of Experience," p. 150.

⁴ Banks, Article in *Expository Times*, vol. xxi, pp. 419-421.

“united with the likeness of His resurrection” (Rom. vi. 5, marg.), and He is “the firstfruits of them that sleep.” “The body of our humiliation” shall be conformed to “the body of His glory” (Phil. iii. 21). We shall all be “changed.” The “natural body” shall give place to the “spiritual body,” and “death” be “swallowed up in victory.” “We shall be clothed upon with our habitation which is from heaven.” We shall prove and possess “the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body” (2 Cor. v. 2; Rom. viii. 23). The material world will know and share “the liberty of the glory of the children of God” (Rom. viii. 21). Bring all such passages together, and it is one harmonious picture which they present: A bodily life, from which the old features of sin and death are wholly gone, in which the body is the perfect vehicle, the perfect instrument, the perfect expression of spirit, gathering up into itself its complete individuality, knowing others and itself known at will, inheriting its past, yet utterly lifted out of it, proving the “power of His resurrection” in constantly fresh ways, ascending with Him to behold His glory (John xvii. 24; 1 John iii. 2), knowing fully face to face (1 Cor. xiii. 12), and sharing with Him eternally “the power of an indissoluble life.” Such is the splendid goal of which the Easter Day is the beginning.

So, with eyes full open, we can answer Browning’s question with the Old Grammarian—“Wilt thou trust death? Yes.” We can stand, as Browning himself did, by the brink of the newly-covered grave of our beloved, and say, “Death is life,” looking “the Arch-Fear” bravely in the face unabashed, “tasting the whole of it,” “bearing the brunt of it,” paying thus “life’s arrears of pain, darkness, and cold,” and knowing all the time that Death, great Death, is dead.

“For sudden the worst turns to best to the brave,
 The black minute’s at end,
 And the elements’ rage, the fiend voices that rave,
 Shall dwindle, shall blend,
 Shall change, shall become first a peace out of pain,
 Then a light, then thy breast,
 O thou soul of my soul, I shall clasp thee again,
 And with God be the rest!”

Famous Quotations from the Psalms.

By J. EWING.

THERE is something in the Psalms, it has often been said, to suit everybody—something which, at one time or another, comes home to each and all of us. Young and old, high and low, have quoted them; in grief and in triumph, in prosperity and adversity, in life and in death, generally in all seriousness, sometimes in mockery, for even the cynic has on occasions found a stone for his sling in such a dictum, for instance, as that one which always seems as if it must have had Solomon for its author: “So long as thou doest well unto thyself men will speak good of thee.”

It has occurred to me that readers of THE CHURCHMAN might find some interest in a few desultory reminiscences of how the Psalms have been quoted on various more or less remarkable occasions. These citations will carry us from land to land and from one camp to another; we shall find, for example, Charles I., his little dying daughter, his destroyer, and his great minister (alas! that we must add his great victim), all drawing weapons from the same vast armoury.

In 1641, the year before the outbreak of the Civil War, sorrow, but a gentle sorrow compared to what was in store, had broken in upon the happiness which the unlucky King had always found in his immediate family. His third daughter, the little Princess Anne, was taken away from the evil to come before she was quite five years old. Being reminded by one of her ladies to pray, because it was near the end with her, the child made answer: “I am too weary to say my long prayer” (the “Our Father”), “but I will say my short one.” It was a verse from Psalm xiii.: “Lighten mine eyes, O Lord, that I sleep not in death.” And when she had repeated it, says Fuller, “the little lamb gave up the ghost.”

In a far different spirit did the great Earl Strafford make his

last quotation from the Psalms—almost his last recorded utterance. When the news was brought to him that he was abandoned by the master whom he had so faithfully served—obeying him often against his judgment, often, it is to be feared, against his conscience, but always with selfless devotion—the shock of the announcement drew from him the sole reproach he was to utter (we know not if it ever reached Charles's ears): "Put not your trust in princes," he exclaimed, "nor in any child of man, for there is no help in them."

Love lends strength, and love betrays to weakness. In terror for his Queen, whom the mob was already threatening, Charles had sacrificed the one man who might have saved him, the one man whom we can fancy meeting Cromwell on equal terms. Never was an act of selfishness and ingratitude more signally punished. He was now, indeed, though he knew it not, naked to his enemies.

It was rather ominous that in Strafford's honour a title had been revived, that of Lord Lieutenant, which had been borne by the only other English Governor of Ireland who perished on the scaffold, the gallant Essex. "Lord Deputy" had been the style up to his day, and "Lord Deputy" it again became after he had disappeared from the scene.

His death may be held to have been prophesied to him in a remarkable quotation from Psalm lv., made by Burleigh, who, when he laboured for peace in the Council, found himself hotly opposed by Essex. The young Earl, "having been bred to the sword and gained some Reputation by it," stood out so stiffly for war with Spain that "the Treasurer was provok'd to say 'that he seemed intent on nothing but blood and slaughter.'" On Essex still persisting, the aged minister, soon to go to his grave full of years and honours, took out his Prayer-Book and silently pointed to the passage: "The bloodthirsty and deceitful men shall not live out half their days."

Strangely enough, it chimed in with a warning Essex had received from his father, who bade him beware of his thirty-sixth year, at which age he himself died. His son perished a

little before reaching it. If we take the Psalmist's computation of human life—threescore years and ten—Burleigh's prophecy would seem to have been fulfilled to the letter.

Poor Essex, the hot-headed, impetuous man, who had ever "carried his passions in his forehead," made an edifying and even touching end, reciting the Creed on the scaffold, and having just before written to his friend Southampton: "I had many calls, and answered some of them slowly, thinking a soft pace fast enough to come to Christ, and myself forward enough when I saw the end of my journey, though I arrived not at it, and therefore I have been by God's Providence violently pull'd, hal'd, and dragg'd to the Marriage Feast, as the world hath seen."

But to return to Charles I. On one occasion, at the "giving out" of a Psalm in a Church at Newcastle, he showed resourcefulness as well as a ready knowledge of the Prayer-Book. Upon his entering the city just after his surrender to the Scots army in 1646, he was, as a local chronicler expresses it, "caressed with bonfires and ringing of bells." A Scotch minister, perhaps to check this apparent reaction in his favour, "preached very bold stuff before the King . . . and after sermon called for Psalm lii., beginning thus:

"Why dost thou, Tyrant, boast thyself
Thy wicked works to praise?"

His Majesty stood up, and without any reflection on the insolence of the man, with great presence of mind called for Psalm lvi., which begins:

"Have mercy, Lord, on me I pray,
For Men would me devour."

And the congregation were so well pleased with the happy Turn that they wav'd the preacher's psalm, and fell in with that which the King called for."

Ready wit, indeed, may make almost sure of appreciation, and there is not, I think, any irreverence in supposing that our Lord Himself was not insensible to it. To me it always seems that it was not only the perseverance of the Syrophœnician

woman which appealed to Him, but also the "happy turn" which she gave to His saying concerning the children's bread and the unfitness of casting it to dogs.

Cromwell, as beseemed a Puritan, had the Scriptures constantly on his lips. But the best-remembered of his quotations is one from the Psalms which he made at Dunbar. Captain Hodgson, who was present at the battle, gives a vivid account of the straits to which the invading English were reduced: "A poor, shattered, hungry, discouraged army," with the Scots under Leslie posted on the heights of the Lammermuirs, right across their homeward road, "having got us in a pound, as they reckoned." Most imprudently, but it must be said, most unwillingly, Leslie yielded to the persuasion of the ministers in his camp, quitted his post of vantage, and descended to the attack, drawing from Cromwell the famous exclamation: "The Lord hath delivered them into our hands." Hodgson relates how the General came himself and altered the position of his (Hodgson's) regiment just as the battle began. "And the sun appearing upon the sea, I heard Nol say, 'Now let God arise, and his enemies shall be scattered.' A little later, and his cry was, 'They run! I profess, they run!'"

How many great men have died with a Psalm on their lips! The famous St. Dunstan, almost the earliest English example of the combination, so often to be repeated in after-years, of the ecclesiastic and the brilliant statesman, closed his long, crowded career in peace, in his metropolitan city, surrounded by his monks. His dying words, after he had received his viaticum, form part of Psalm cxi.: "The merciful and gracious Lord hath so done His marvellous works that they ought to be had in remembrance. He hath given meat unto them that fear Him."

And the lion-like Hildebrand on his death-bed at Salerno, whither Robert Guiscard had withdrawn him from his turbulent Roman flock, exclaimed with all the uncompromising, intrepid spirit that had ever distinguished him: "I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile" (Psalm xlv. 8).

How often, on the scaffold, the last sound before the thud of

the axe has been some plaintive word from a Psalm! The gallant Egmont, magnanimous in death as in life, prayed for his merciless master, Philip II., repeating, as he passed through the lamenting crowd (for the very Spanish officers were unable to restrain their tears), Psalm lxi., containing the petition to "grant the King a long life," unmindful of the cutting short of his own days in their prime. The historian Motley is half-contemptuous of such almost superstitious loyalty, yet it shows the fine and rare temper of one whom no injuries could provoke to revilings.

No Psalm, we may suppose, has been more used devotionally than the Miserere dear as it has been to the lips of countless dying sinners. Yet it is specially intertwined with the memory of Henry V., that King who, notwithstanding the bloody and unjustifiable quarrel in which his laurels were chiefly won, still bears about him the glamour of his heroic temper, his piety, his personal beauty, and his early death. As he lay at Vincennes near his last agony, his chaplains beside him chanted the aspiration for the holy city with which the greatest of the penitential Psalms closes. The dying man, roused for the moment by the sound of the name, caught it up, exclaiming, "Hierusalem! Lord Thou knowest that my mind was ever to have re-edified the walls of Hierusalem." And with this characteristic regret, he passed away.

Even more touching is the incident related of the young conqueror's ill-fated but most guiltless son, the meek and devout Henry VI., "so innocent to others that he was hurtful to himself," who, a prisoner in the hands of his enemies, confined in the Tower, whose walls were to witness his murder, could yet, happier and better in his delusions than some of us in our sanity, with serene content apply to himself the words of Psalm xvi., and bless God that "the lines were fallen to him in pleasant places, that he had a goodly heritage."

A less innocent victim of a cruel age, though youth and folly made him almost as helpless, was Darnley, through his ill-omened marriage the shadow-King of Scotland for a few restless months. If we are to take Froude's lurid picture as historically

accurate, the young man, by a strange dispensation of the *sortes liturgicæ*, opening his Prayer-Book an hour or two before his murder, found and read Psalm lv., which chanced to be one of those appointed for the dawning day, the last that he was to see. The Psalm, *Exaudi, Deus*, contained an almost prophetic description of the fate which Froude, at least, has no doubt was his—betrayal to death by the wife who had just quitted him with soft words and kisses, but with the significant saying which “marred all his pleasure”: “It was just this time last year that Rizzio was slain.”

“Hear my prayer, O God,” the Psalm began, “and hide not Thyself from my petition . . .

“My heart is disquieted within me; and the fear of death is fallen upon me.

“Fearfulness and trembling are come upon me; and an horrible dread hath overwhelmed me. . . .

“It is not an open enemy that hath done me this dishonour; for then I could have borne it . . .

“But it was even thou my companion; my guide and mine own familiar friend.”

Time would fail to mention the many occasions on which the Psalms are known to have strengthened and consoled the victims of misfortune, men’s cruelty, or their own errors. Strafford and Mary Stuart spent their last moments in reciting them. Francis I. found the Psalm of the day bear with strange appositeness on his forlorn and captive state after the Battle of Pavia.

As to the myriads of lonely and humble hearts which have been lifted up by the music of the Psalms, they are uncounted and unrecorded upon earth. We can only guess at the number of them, only imagine the varied and multitudinous sorrows and dangers through which they were supported.



St. Paul as a Man of Science.

BY THE REV. F. W. ORDE WARD.

INTIMATIONS here and there transpire, through St. Paul's Epistles, of acquaintance with philosophy, as we should naturally expect from a man of his culture and power. His speech on the Areopagus, as recorded by the Acts of the Apostles, confirms this impression. And so we may not unreasonably hope to discover in his writings evidence betraying some knowledge or theory of physics, and proofs that he had formed a working hypothesis, at any rate of the cosmos, as to its structure and laws and meaning. Itinerant philosophers, such as the Cynic (with his *baculum et pera*), were visible and audible everywhere, and went everywhere, carrying new doctrines and old divinities. And it seems certain that St. Paul's learning was not confined to the literature or the teaching and tenets of Rabbinical professors. Evidently he possessed and cultivated an open mind. Even if he had never listened to any public lectures of Stoics or Epicureans as a regular pupil, he must frequently have heard their views discussed, whether as matters for doubt and discredit, or as subjects for repudiation. His age was emphatically an age of many opinions, like our own, and discourses in the open air and not restricted to the privacy of private rooms eagerly courted criticism and invited inquiry. The "goniobombukes" (or "corner-buzzers") did not hide their light under a bushel, and had become by practice far too ready-witted to be apprehensive of any questioning. And, as philosophy and science in his time strode about the streets and mouthed their paradoxes in the market-places, the great Apostle to the Gentiles could not have escaped some tincture of the different principles held by the different schools, and indeed must have been more or less familiar with their cardinal convictions. We know that the populace, the mere mob of Byzantium or Alexandria, argued in the very thorough-

fares of these cities the most knotty points of speculative theology. And we need not doubt that Antioch and Tarsus also threshed out in public the thoughts of cosmologists, amid the buying and selling and chaffering of cheap pedlar's merchandise, and the perpetual stream of idlers who sought and found amusement at each fresh point of arrested progress. The travelling philosopher in those days, half missionary and half pioneer, in search of proselytes and a humble pittance on which to live, took the place of our itinerant vendor of quack medicines or low-priced goods. Accordingly, the greatest recluse, the most bigoted zealot for the Jewish faith, grew gradually and inevitably acquainted with all that was town talk or common street chatter, whether he chose to believe or disbelieve. Agnostics abounded, prepared to prove at a moment's notice that nothing really existed. Short cuts to complete happiness or omniscience were proffered to the bypassers or bystanders on the easiest possible terms by Greek or Asiatic cheapjacks. All the conundrums of all the creeds, all the problems of life, all the riddles of knowing and being, could be solved for a few small coins in a few minutes by the expounders of patent panaceas or universal wisdom. Where we seek remedies for the body, people in St. Paul's period sought remedies for diseases of the mind or soul.

It appears absolutely certain, as we shall discover in the course of this brief inquiry, that St. Paul was conversant with, and practically accepted the physics of, the popular Stoics, and employed their terminology, while applying and extending it to higher and more spiritual purposes. This can be shown without difficulty. Of course, the Stoics were materialists. But the Apostle took and used, for instance, their *πνεῦμα* (the aboriginal substance from which they made everything proceed) and adapted it to his own sublime ends. Indeed, he could hardly have acted otherwise with any amount of success. We are well aware that our Lord did precisely the same thing in adopting the standpoint in knowledge of his hearers, which obviously did not imply or commit Him to an acceptance of

common fallacies and errors. He simply took the materials which He found ready to His hand, and worked them up into His illustrations for precept or parable. A revolutionary iconoclasm, at the commencement of His ministry, would have been fatal, and created a hopeless prejudice against Him and His teaching. So He embraced for the vehicle of His instructions the moulds of current expression, the prevailing metaphors of thought, and the machinery of the fashionable eschatology, and the language of the great Wisdom literature. St. Paul naturally followed in His footsteps. The best-known and best-approved cosmology then before the world was the Stoics, and to this he appealed, and on this he constructed his more spacious and spiritual universe. Thus with Him the *πνεῦμα* of the materialists was transformed into the truth of an all-penetrating and all-pervading Divine Spirit. We must not make the mistake of supposing that the Stoic's principle or matrix of everything was coarsely and crudely substantial, for it answered to nothing of the kind. It resembled neither the fire of Heraclitus nor the air of Anaximenes and Diogenes of Apollonia, but was far more like our modern ether. It seems that the Stoics borrowed their *πνεῦμα*, or vital breath, from the medical schools of Hippocrates and Praxagoras and Erasistratus. We know that Praxagoras, after dissection, finding that the arteries were empty, immediately arrived at the conclusion that these conveyed the *πνεῦμα*, or vital breath. These philosophers held that their universal principle was present even in stones and metals as a binding force, or *ἔξις*, as if they had some vague anticipation of modern chemistry and cohesion, or even the electric theory of matter. Though we have no record that they knew birds (especially the toucan tribe) to be literally pneumatic machines, with air in their hollow bones. Indeed, at first they taught that animals were merely *ζῶα*, and not *ἔμψυχα*, though finally they did concede to them a soul. If we take only the Epistles to the Romans and the Corinthians and consider these, we shall be astonished at the frequency with which the word *πνεῦμα* occurs. It appears to be St. Paul's favourite term, and we need not

imagine that 1 Cor. xv. 47 is a contradiction, for the first in revelation would undoubtedly not be the first in order and importance. It would require a big book and not a short essay to elaborate the Apostle's persistent use and application of the term before us. He employed it so often, evidently because it would be familiar to his readers, and was a stock expression of the Stoics.

Another favourite doctrine of this school was that of Tension, introduced by Cleanthes. And the *πληγὴ πυρὸς*, as well as *ἐντονία*, played a most important part in the development alike of their physics and ethics. But, while the Stoics limited the possibilities of action to positive contact, St. Paul, as we should expect, transferred them to mere presence and a distance. However, the Stoics were invariably logical and consistent. Thinking only *σῶμα*, or body, existed, they maintained that even its very qualities were corporeal. St. Paul may allude to this teaching in Rom. xii. 5: "So we, being many, are one body in Christ." And, let us notice here in passing, that the Stoics in their views of Extension and Resistance approached very near to the modern doctrine of Attraction and Repulsion. And their geocentric philosophy held sway from Eudoxus down to Dante and Copernicus. It is impossible to believe St. Paul was not thinking of the Stoic doctrine of Tension when he wrote Phil. iii. 13, etc.: "This one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." It will be observed that he uses the word *ἐπεκτεινόμενος*. But the idea of strain and effort, while, of course, illustrated by the bodily discipline demanded by the athletic games of Greece, seems unquestionably to derive rather from philosophy than a spectacle, though such bodily exercises were taken by the Greeks at least as seriously as ours, and perhaps without quite so much intrusion and consequent degradation of mere professionalism.

Moreover, the Stoics held a distinctive doctrine of the *λόγος σπερματικός*, or the germinal reason, in which we may almost

discover a principle the precursor of Evolution. They used the word *λόγος* where Aristotle used *εἶδος*, and they certainly anticipated the purely modern tenet (as we should claim it to be) of two bodies occupying one and the same space—in their *κρᾶσις δι' ὄλου*. But we may fairly conclude that St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 38, clearly alluded to the *λόγος σπερματικός*, when he wrote: "To every seed its own body." And the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who may just possibly have been St. Paul—now that even the Higher Criticism seems giving us back our Moses and St. John—in chap. iv. 12, bears surely a witness to this peculiar teaching: "For the word (*λόγος*) of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and body, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." The "logos" doctrine should have lifted the Stoics out of materialism, and rendered Deism quite impossible. But the common mistake, shared both by metaphysicians and men of science, that the transfer of purely physical metaphors to things spiritual rendered these therefore incredible, was one that great thinkers should not make or have made. We must never forget we have no choice whatever on the subject. Language was built up by observation of, and reflection on, material processes. And it is probable that St. Paul, following the Stoics, might well have explained everything by the *λόγος τῆς οὐσίας*. Their teaching that there were two grand principles, the efficient, or positive and the passive, or the capability of acting and being acted upon, or action and reaction, was clearly taught in spiritual precepts and pictures by the Apostle, and was good science as well as good theology. Indeed, the Stoics, in some questions, were greater and wiser than they knew, and in some respects practical evolutionists. Zeno proclaimed the inseparability of form and matter—form being always attached to matter, and matter being always informed by the controlling principle and conformed to its particular type. And the *λόγος ἔμφυτος* of St. James must have been as familiar to St. Paul as to the Stoics themselves. For,

in spite of those easy assumptions laid down by an airy omniscience, assuring us that the Bible contains no evidences of secular knowledge, and was never intended to reveal what the reason can discover, and that it merely tells us the way we should go to heaven, and not the way the heaven goeth, it seems absolutely demonstrable that the Apostle was abreast of the science of his day.

St. Paul, again, appears to have accepted the theory of Heraclitus more thoroughly formulated by the Stoics—namely, the *ὁδὸς ἄνω κάτω*. This view of progress, terminable in a definite time, running in cycles that repeated themselves, through inexorable stages of growth and decay and final catastrophic destruction, bears a very strong resemblance to the modern belief of Evolution ending in dissolution, integration and disintegration returning eventually to a fresh reintegration, as expounded by Herbert Spencer in his "First Principles." For the Stoics proclaimed a perpetual transformation of the one eternal substance. Form succeeded form, passing from one *ἀποκατάστασις* to another, and no form was, or could be, immortal. St. Paul, with his usual insight and sense of adaptability, applied this cosmic theory to the exposition of his eschatological creed and apocalyptic conceptions. "Every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is." "If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire" (1 Cor. iii. 13). And once more: "To you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance" (2 Thess. i. 7). Of course, the *locus classicus* is 2 Peter iii. 10. But in 1 Cor. xv., and in 1 Thess. iv. 16, and in 1 Cor. vi. 2, and in other passages, we have clear indications of a Christological extension given to the cosmic theory of the Stoics—a definitely long dispensation of one kind superseded by a new dispensation of all things. And we may fairly conclude that the Wisdom literature, treasured and interpreted in the Rabbinical schools

and the teachings of Zarathustra, would not have been so extensively known and become such public property as the familiar tenets of the Stoics with their then popular philosophy and morality and science. Unbelievers, the Apostle wrote, would be "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power, when He shall come" (2 Thess. i. 9). And again: "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming" (2 Thess. ii. 8).

St. Paul, besides, elaborated in his various spiritual applications the sympathy and symphony and "synectic" forces, the continuity and harmony of Nature. The special character of his nomenclature manifests this point at once to all who have learned to read between the lines and understand open or obscure allusions. A considerable philosophic vocabulary might be readily constructed from St. Paul's verbal resources. In the Apostle's persistent endeavour to elucidate the meaning of heavenly mysteries, he shows that the ultimate expression of the physical and the hyperphysical is one and the same. No doubt, he wrote: "Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual." But this does not alter or even affect the case. He wished to assert that the materialism of the Stoics, so well known to everyone, when rightly considered and rationally worked out, ended in a logical spirituality. He borrowed his weapons from the armoury of his opponents and pierced them with their own shafts. In the admitted unity of Nature he perceived and preached the confirmation of the Trinity in Unity and the Three Persons in the One God. Metaphysical or scientific phraseology would not be strange to his humblest hearers or readers, though with Galilean peasants it might have been otherwise. But the Apostle of the Gentiles, while he numbered among his devoted adherents and disciples recruits from the lowliest labouring classes, nevertheless always addressed a quick-witted, cultivated audience. And if our street arabs can

and do quote Shakespeare appositely before police magistrates, we need not doubt the intelligence or information of Greeks and Græco-Romans or Asiatics.

But it is, perhaps, in other directions that we shall find St. Paul most powerfully impressed by the physical theory of the Stoics. Their system could not possibly avoid an iron determinism. And we shall see how admirably the hypothesis was used and transformed by the Apostle. Necessitarianism of any kind has no part or place in our religion. It is entirely abhorrent to Christianity. Free will has been and always must be the universal postulate of our faith. Even the omnipotence of God Himself becomes powerless when measured against the self-will of a midge-like man. He cannot, and does not, and will not, ever force us to do what we choose not deliberately of our own initiative. Let us restrict as much as we like the area of our unbiassed volition, there remains still a centre of indifference, or a neutral ground, over which the individual alone reigns and rules without a rival, whatever the influence of environment or the burden or handicapping of heredity. There he stands,

“Sufficient to have stood, yet free to fall.”

He can so far devolve the responsibility on no one, neither on the Devil nor on the Deity, neither on his birth and antecedents nor on his miseducation and misfortunes generally. Let him come even upon the scene like a member of the criminal classes, damned into the world (so to speak), without a chance or an opportunity or an opening in his favour. And yet even here he can, at the last moment, draw back and answer the temptation to evil with something of the power and dignity of the categorical imperative and the rudimentary conscience, which even exists in him and bears its infallible testimony till his final dissolution. And in this particular aspect of the Stoic science St. Paul rose to the full height of the occasion. He translated the principle which he recognized so clearly into an effective teleology. Determinism in his hands, and from his inspired and inspiring instruction, was converted into a noble purposeful-

ness. Fate, destiny, necessity, the grinding of the grim, blind, inexorable machine grew a gracious τέλος, or end, which proved to be really and truly and finally Christ Himself. For unless the New Testament witnesses to Him as the ultimate Principle of Progress and the ultimate Interpretation of life and everything, it teaches nothing. The doctrine of election and selection at last runs out thus with irresistible logic. "For we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, who are the called according to His purpose." "According as He hath chosen us to Him before the foundation of the world . . . having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ, according to the good pleasure of His will . . . according to His good pleasure which He hath purposed in Himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in Him: in Whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of Him Who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will."

It seems quite needless to multiply proofs of our assertion after these quotations. God's great end reveals itself gradually to free moral accountable agents in the history of His paternal Providence through a selection appealing to and answered by a deliberate personal election. The multitudinous evidences of an Almighty Will, energizing for good in the cosmos and its evolution, respond to the passionate requirements of every human will. The grand overruling and immanent Divine action, nearest when most transcendently removed, invites the appropriate and inevitable reaction of man's heart and mind. Deep calls to deep, Will to will, and Personality to personality. The brute pressure of a fatalistic force is rebaptized into the gentle suaviseness of a just direction that inclines, but never compels. Awful engines and instruments of a merciless might, grinding down into dust whatever opposes or thwarts them, prove to be but the tender drawing of the cords of Love—the

golden chains, as Tennyson says, that bind the world about the feet of God.

“For so the whole round earth is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God.”

The Apostle, here as everywhere, proclaims the eternal incidence of the ideal on the actual, and the coincidence of the ideal and the real. Never was a finer revenge wreaked upon materialism, which now is a dead, or certainly a dying and desperate, cause, than that of the Apostle. He took the terms, the conceptions, the physical theories of the Stoics, he carried them to and passed them through the transfiguring mint of the Cross, and then reissued them recoined and glorified into new creative ideas and immortal hopes. He revealed in the altar they had erected to the Unknown God an unconscious tribute to Christ, the summing and saving end of all.

“For I doubt not one increasing purpose through the ages runs,
And the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns.”



What is Evangelical Churchmanship?

BY THE REV. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D.

THE question asked above clearly implies that there is a Churchmanship other than Evangelical. And this is true, for there are three great sections of Churchmanship, popularly known as High, Broad, and Evangelical. It is a temptation to say Broad, High, and "Low," but it may be questioned whether the Low Churchman now exists, and, further, however convenient it may be to use these three epithets, the Evangelical Churchman refuses, as he always has refused, to be called a "Low" Churchman. It is well known that in the eighteenth century the Low Churchman was the inveterate and often fierce opponent of the Evangelical. The Low Churchman represented the sporting, unspiritual parson of latitudinarian view and low morality, and it is not surprising that he was the sworn foe of Churchmen who pleaded for the salvation of souls and emphasized spirituality of life and conduct.

There is no need to be afraid of parties or sections in the Church, for a party only means, as Mr. Balleine well puts it, "a section of a larger society united to carry out the objects of the whole body on principles and by methods peculiar to itself." There always has been, there always will be, those who, while agreed in substance, nevertheless view Divine truth from different though not insuperably differing standpoints, and who emphasize various aspects of that truth. The views can be different without being really divergent, as the Church history of over three centuries shows with such great and representative names as Cranmer, Ridley, Parker, Jewel, Hooker, Whitgift, Bancroft, Andrewes, Reynolds, Cosin, Tillotson, and Barrow, not to mention later names. There is, of course, a real danger of parties becoming partisan, and of so narrowing their views as to treat matters exclusively from their own particular and party standpoint. But there is no necessary connection between party

and narrowness. As a French essayist once said : " It is possible to have preferences without exclusions."

One question, however, necessarily arises out of these differences of thought and party, and that is, as to the limitations of differences within the Church of England. All varieties of view must of necessity be compatible with loyalty to the general position of the Church, and this was undoubtedly the case until the rise of the Tractarian Movement, which was very largely an effort to make out that the Church of England was after all not essentially different from the Church of Rome. Tract XC. by Newman marks the most familiar and ablest attempt in this direction. He endeavoured to explain the articles in such a way as to make them virtually identical with the teaching of Rome. But facts were too strong for him, and this non-natural, or rather unnatural, interpretation was soon seen to be impossible, and Newman with others went over to the Church of Rome. Unfortunately, however, there has remained in the Church of England to the present day a large party who hold essentially Roman Catholic doctrines and observe Roman Catholic practices. This party is in no sense the lineal successors of the High Churchman of the seventeenth century, and they are also to be carefully distinguished from those High Churchmen of the nineteenth century who were absolutely opposed to Roman Catholic doctrines and practices.

Thus the Church is faced with a real problem to-day in connection with men who call themselves " Catholic," and who are called by others Ritualists or extreme Anglicans. To show that I am not alone or unfair in regarding this party as in no proper sense belonging to the Church of England, I will appeal to the Bishop of Durham :

" I cannot but maintain that their theory of the Body of Christ, and of the way of salvation, was not so much development as a really new thing in the main stream of our post-Reformation theology."¹

It is the presence of this problem that calls for renewed emphasis on Evangelical Churchmanship.

¹ " The Evangelical School in the Church of England," p. 29.

I.

The first word that calls for attention is "Churchmanship," and Evangelicals claim to be absolutely loyal to the Church of England, with no wish or intention to be anything or anywhere else. They find themselves in a body which they believe to be at once Scriptural in character, historical in continuity, and valuable in practical effect, and they are more than content to be loyal, devoted Churchmen, rejoicing in their position, and perfectly satisfied to abide in it. But of course their Churchmanship is in harmony with the great work done in the sixteenth century, known as the Reformation, because the Prayer-Book as we now have it is the product of that age and movement. With the greatest possible readiness Evangelicals admit that the word "Protestant" is not found in Church of England formulas, but with equally great readiness they insist that the *thing* "Protestant" is there. And the question turns not on words but on realities. Evangelical Churchmen take their stand on the four words so frequently associated with the late Archbishop Benson: "Catholic," "Apostolic," "Reformed," "Protestant," and they agree with him that not one of these words can be spared, the last not least of all.

This convinced Evangelical Churchmanship is perfectly compatible with sympathy and co-operation with other Evangelical Christians of non-Episcopal communions. Evangelicals claim to be the lineal descendants of Cranmer and Ridley in their attitude to non-Episcopal reformers. I was once asked whether as a condition of Reunion I was prepared to give up Episcopacy. I replied, "Certainly not," and I added that I saw no reason why Evangelicals to-day should not do what an Archbishop of Canterbury and a Bishop of London did in the sixteenth century in regard to friendship, fellowship, and even intercommunion with non-Episcopal Reformers. It is, of course, sadly true that the exigencies of political and religious controversy caused severances between 1563 and 1662, but even so no true representative of the English Church ever

ventured to deny the validity of non-Episcopal Churches and ministry. The same attitude was shown during the eighteenth century, and it was not until the rise of the Tractarian Movement that any real Anglican exclusiveness was seen. There were great and serious differences before that time with Non-conformists, but these were concerned with separation, never with invalidity. Evangelical Churchmen, while holding firmly to their own position, have always been able to associate with Christians of other Evangelical communions. Various movements in the nineteenth century show this, such as the Bible Society, the Religious Tract Society, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Keswick Movement, and Moody's Missions. These have been, and are, strongly supported by Evangelical Churchmen, and I have yet to learn that their Churchmanship has been essentially impaired thereby. Certainly, if figures mean anything, the fact that 450 clergy went to Rome during the nineteenth century, and eight or ten to Nonconformity, ought to be sufficient to show the essential reality of the Churchmanship of Evangelicals.

II.

But it is time to ask precisely what "Evangelical" means.

1. It means an emphasis on the *theme* of the New Testament "Evangel." Evangelicals have always proclaimed and concentrated attention on the Atonement, the sacrificial work of Christ for sinful man. They believe with Dr. Denney that "in the New Testament the centre of gravity is not Bethlehem, but Calvary," and they have ever made the Cross, or rather Christ crucified, the centre of their preaching and life. The great Evangelical hymns like "Rock of Ages" and "When I survey the wondrous Cross" are a fine testimony to this fact. It is, of course, quite easy to caricature the belief of Evangelicals about the Cross, and this is often done ; but, caricature or not, the fact remains that the preaching of the Cross does its work. The truth that "Jesus died for me" is the simple yet sufficient message of Evangelicalism, and it carries us into the heart of the New Testament Gospel. The Cross is at once the mani-

estation of Divine righteousness and the evidence of Divine love. What God's justice demanded His love provided. And in Jesus Christ "mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other." This is Evangelicalism, and the glory of it is that it can be preached and lived and exulted in. Dr. Denney points out that any doctrine of Atonement which cannot be preached is not true, because it is not that word of the Cross which St. Paul describes as God's power unto salvation. He gives an illustration which, though familiar to some, is worth while repeating to others :

"I have a friend in Scotland—a convert, I dare say you will be glad to hear, of Mr. Moody during his first visit to us in 1874—who has himself been wonderfully blessed by God as an evangelist and carer for souls. He is a fishing-tackle maker and an enthusiastic fisherman, and told me once of losing his bait in a mysterious way without catching anything. The explanation was that by some accident or other the barb had been broken from the hook. It was my friend himself who made the application of this, when he said that this was exactly what happened when people preached the love of God to men, but left out of their Gospel the essential truth that it is Christ on the Cross, the substitute for sinners, in Whom that love is revealed. In other words, the condemnation of our sins in Christ upon His Cross is the barb on the hook. If you leave that out of your Gospel, I do not deny that your bait will be taken—men are pleased rather than not to think that God regards them with goodwill—your bait will be taken, but you will not catch men. You will not create in sinful human hearts that attitude to Christ which created the New Testament. You will not annihilate pride, and make Christ the Alpha and the Omega in man's redemption."¹

A similar testimony is borne by another modern writer, who tells of a conversation with the late Professor Pfeiderer, to whom he gave an account of a dying quarryman, absolutely illiterate, resting with satisfied conscience on the simple story of Jesus Christ as his substitute. Says the writer, after telling the story : "I can never forget Pfeiderer's emotion as he replied in effect, 'If a doctrine really meets a deep human need, it must be true.'"¹ This is the Evangelical view of the Cross, and I make bold to say that it is the essential view of the New Testament ; and if a man caricatures this he is not merely caricaturing Evangelicals, but St. Paul and the other inspired Apostles.

¹ "Studies in Theology," p. 127 (lectures given in America).

² Falconer, "The Unfinished Symphony," p. 243.

2. It means an emphasis on the *source* of the New Testament Evangel, the Bible. Evangelicalism has always made prominent a belief in the Bible as the rule of faith, as something Divinely given, historically trustworthy, supremely authoritative, and personally redemptive. Evangelicals take their stand on the great Reformation position of the supremacy and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures according to Article VI. And in spite of all that modern thought has to say on the Bible—indeed, it may almost be said, all the stronger (though by contrast) because of this—Evangelicals are more convinced than ever in their allegiance to the Bible as the supremely authoritative Word of God.

3. It means an emphasis on the *character* of the New Testament Evangel. This is regarded as at once simple and spiritual.

(a) Its view of Religion is simple and spiritual. It brings the sinner face to face with Jesus Christ, and allows nothing and no one to come between. Justification by faith is taught because it introduces the soul to God and leaves it in God's presence.

(b) Its view of Worship is simple and spiritual. Ornateness of building and ritual is known to possess the danger of spiritual distraction; and while there is no necessary connection between Evangelicalism and bareness, still less between Evangelicalism and tawdriness, less still between Evangelicalism and slovenliness, and least of all between Evangelicalism and dirt, there can be no doubt of the need of perfect simplicity of adornment in ritual and service. I remember my beloved old rector, Canon Christopher, justifying his expense in the building of St. Matthew's, Grandpont, by saying he wished members of the University to see that an Evangelical building could be of the very best quality and construction; and I recall the words of a former Simeon Trustee, the late Prebendary Tate, who said that while in his village church of Kippington the music of necessity had to be simple, yet he arranged for it to be of such a quality as that the most sensitive musical ear should not be disturbed by it. Thus is Evangelicalism in worship, at once simple, spiritual, and Scriptural.

(c) Its view of the Church is simple and spiritual. The Evangelical, following the New Testament, teaches that the true view is "through Christ to the Church," not "through the Church to Christ," and herein lies the fundamental difference between Evangelicalism and Rome. A good many years ago the late Bishop Ellicott pointed out with convincing force that the question of the relation of the individual to the Church was at the basis of everything between us and Rome. And within the last few years a leading Roman Catholic theologian has said the same thing, pointing out that in the Roman Catholic system the proper order is Christ, the Church, the individual; while in Protestantism it is Christ, the individual, the Church. He added that as long as there was this fundamental disagreement there could not possibly be any reconciliation. This opinion we heartily endorse, and are particularly glad to find ourselves in exact agreement in regard to the fundamental and insuperable difference between New Testament Evangelicalism and the Church of Rome.

(d) Its view of the Ministry is simple and spiritual. The minister is not a ruler, for the laity have their rights and privileges. The clergyman is a pastor, not a priest; a medium, not a mediator; a mouthpiece, not a substitute. With Lightfoot, Evangelicals say that the Kingdom of Christ has no sacerdotal system, and they maintain that those are the real "Low" Churchmen who hold the sacerdotal view; for instead of the truly "High" Church view of the Epistle to the Ephesians, they are not in the New Testament sense "High" Churchmen, but, if one may put it so, high-ministry men.

(e) Its view of the Sacraments is simple and spiritual. In opposition to anything like the medieval view of spiritual magic, the Evangelical emphasizes the Word, and the response of faith thereto in connection with the Sacraments. Ministers are described in Prayer-Book terms as Ministers "of the Word and Sacraments," never of the Sacraments and Word. Sacraments are at once simple, symbolical, significant, and sufficient as pledges of God's love and means whereby we receive the same,

but they derive their benefit from being the pledges and guarantees of Divine grace mediated through faith in Him and His Word.

4. It means an emphasis on the outcome of the New Testament Evangel. Evangelicalism means evangelization at home and abroad, and no Churchmen have been so prominent in connection with Missions of all kinds as Evangelicals. The existence of the Church Pastoral-Aid Society and kindred organizations proves this in regard to home missionary work; indeed, it is only the Evangelical who can really tell the man in the street that he must be born again. Anyone who wishes to know what Evangelicalism stands for in regard to home evangelization should read that striking and convincing little booklet by my honoured friend, Canon Hay Aitken, "The Importance of Divine Evangelical Teaching."¹ So also with foreign missions; the C.M.S. is itself one of the great proofs of Evangelicalism, and it is well known that in all parts of the foreign field Evangelicalism is very prominent as compared with work which is not Evangelical. In our own M.S.C.C. in Canada, it is simply true to say that if Evangelical Churches severed their connection with it, the work of the society would be very appreciably less, and would tend towards non-existence. Further, the interest shown towards Canada in England in recent years has been due more to the efforts of one man than to any other cause, and I make bold to say that the Archbishops' Western Canada Fund owes more to Principal Lloyd than to any other single individual.

As to philanthropy and social reform, it is sometimes said that Evangelicalism does nothing to alleviate conditions and to bring about social regeneration. But, first of all, it should not be forgotten that the personal interest in social and moral questions is due more than anything else to the Evangelical individualism which starts from "Ye must be born again." It is familiar almost to triteness that "the soul of all improvement is the improvement of the soul," and as long as Evangelicalism

¹ J. F. Shaw and Co.

keeps to this, it will be doing much for social uplift. But further, we must not forget that the slave trade was abolished through Evangelicals, like Wilberforce and Buxton. Many social reforms were brought about through one who gloried in being an Evangelical of Evangelicals—Lord Shaftesbury. And in spite of Mr. Winston Churchill's "The Inside of the Cup," there is no incompatibility between a loyal adherent to the orthodox creed and a thorough sympathy with social reform. There is nothing more ludicrous in that now well-known book than its readiness to show that the hero only took up social work when he had shed all his orthodoxy, such as it was. This shows that neither the hero nor the author has any conception of the connection between Evangelicalism as the cause and the uplift of life as the effect. A recent work from one who is at once an Evangelical and a social reformer will show the proof of this. I refer to Dr. Clow's book, "Christ in the Social Order." Evangelicalism insists on the fact that whatever may be done for the masses, it will not be identical with the ushering in of the Kingdom of God. Pulling down the rookery and building the model dwelling is often absolutely essential, but it will not destroy the fascination for crime. There will still remain the need of that new birth which is the foundation of Evangelicalism, and which always makes Evangelicalism so hard for the ordinary man.

This is essential Evangelicalism, and if it be said that others as well as Evangelicals hold and proclaim these truths, the fact is readily admitted; though at the same time it is contended that there is such a thing as proportion and prominence, and we believe that nowhere, as in Evangelicalism, is the proper proportion of the New Testament emphasized and urged. To quote again from the Bishop of Durham :

"To his own thought and heart the 'school' here dealt with has long approved itself, on the whole, as faithful in essentials to the all-important test of *the scale* of Christian verity as presented in the Holy Scriptures. It places, as it seems to him, 'the first things first,' as the things of salvation are set before us in the Divine Book of Appeal."¹

¹ "The Evangelical School in the Church of England," p. 6.

This question of Evangelical Churchmanship has a special point in connection with a sermon preached some months ago at St. Alban's, Holborn (of all places), by Canon Simpson, with the title, "What is an Evangelical?" The preacher is now well known for his view of the Atoning Sacrifice which it is the joy of Evangelical Churchmen to welcome. I for one am never tired of speaking of Canon Simpson as one of three (Denney and Forsyth being the others) who are doing much to bring us back from the undue emphasis on the Incarnation to the New Testament view of Christology. Ever since I read Dr. Simpson's paper on the Old Testament at the Weymouth Church Congress, I have learnt to look for his utterances with interest, and his little book on the Holy Communion, "The Thing Signified," is essentially Evangelical, with its acute criticism of the Bishop of Oxford, even though the writer seems to be somewhat surprised, and perhaps concerned, in the second edition, at Evangelical appreciation and approval of his book. But his valued emphasis on the Cross must not blind us to the impossibility of accepting his bold paradox in describing the people of St. Alban's, Holborn, as a congregation "so notably evangelical." He thereupon spoke in warm terms of the Evangelical Alliance, and stated the conditions of membership. I wonder what his hearers at St. Alban's thought of this. Evangelicalism is rightly described by Canon Simpson as consisting of the preaching of Christ's Death, Resurrection, and Second Coming, and then he goes on to say that the most "Protestant" feature in St. Paul's Cathedral is the reredos with its crucifix and Latin version of "God so loved the world." Well, when the reredos was erected we never heard of this "Protestant" idea connected with it, and Canon Simpson well knows that for at least five centuries there was no crucifix used in the Christian Church, and that the Greek Church to this very day has a remarkable form of the crucifix in a picture of Christ as alive and reigning while nailed to the Cross. All this is a testimony to the real insight of the early Christians, that Christ is not on the Cross but on the throne, and Protestantism

likewise stands to-day for this essential Gospel of Christ as the One Who, though once dead, now lives for evermore (Rev. i. 18).

Then Canon Simpson goes on to speak of the belief of the Evangelical Alliance in "one body." This is true, but here again the view is not that of St. Alban's, Holborn. To that congregation, the "one body" is limited to the three branches—Greek, Roman, and Anglican; while the Evangelical Alliance includes all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. To many of Canon Simpson's readers the reference to a C.M.S. missionary being able to fill out his Old Gospel from writings like those of Bishop Gore will suggest that there must be something curious in a mind which can seriously regard the Bishop's writings as a complement to Evangelicalism. I suppose this must refer to the corporate as complementary to the individual aspect of truth. And yet I will undertake to prove most of the essential principles of Evangelicalism on the Church and Ministry from the admissions that Dr. Gore is compelled to make in his book, "Orders and Unity." Let me adduce a very different example from that of the C.M.S. missionary referred to by Dr. Simpson. A friend of mine, who was once in the trammels of a narrow, extreme Churchmanship, told me that his first step towards Evangelicalism was the reading of Bishop Gore's commentary on Romans i.-viii.—that he first saw the possibility of the Evangelical view in the Bishop's treatment of St. Paul's great chapters. Just so; but this man is now in a position which is not complementary to, but contradictory of, the essential position for which Bishop Gore stands.

It is, of course, quite easy for Canon Simpson, with his love of paradox, to speak of the Evangelical as being a Churchman; but the question is, What is meant by such Churchmanship? Does he mean the Ephesian view of the Church as interpreted by Moule, Hort, and others? Or does he mean the view of Moberly, Bishop Gore, and men of that school? Canon Simpson ought to know that the highest views of the Church are found in Ephesians, but that which is associated with St. Alban's, so far from being "notably Evangelical," is utterly

narrow, and exclusive of millions of the noblest Christians now in the world, to say nothing of some of the finest spirits of the last three centuries. And so, in spite of Canon Simpson's fine spirit and his real large-heartedness, there are fundamental differences between St. Alban's, Holborn, and the Evangelical Alliance, which not even he, with all his ability, can bridge over. The Evangelical "early Communion" is not one and the same thing with "Low Mass" at St. Alban's, and if Canon Simpson thinks it is, someone ought to undeceive him quickly, and remind him of that which has been true from the time of the Galatians downwards—that between legalism and spirituality, between so-called "Catholic" exclusiveness and New Testament Christianity, there is a great gulf fixed.

It is easy to say that Evangelicals are pure individualists, despise learning, ignore worship, contemn ritual, neglect sacraments, and sit lightly by Episcopacy. But they do nothing of the kind. They believe in learning, they hold to the necessity of worship and ritual, they adhere to the New Testament view of the Sacraments, and they hold firmly to that conception of Episcopacy which was the predominant and almost the entire view of the Church of England from Cranmer and Hooker to the Tractarian Movement. There is no finer testimony available than that given to Evangelicals by Professor Gwatkin :

"In their chief message there is an impressive monotony. It is the old word ascribed to Jesus of Nazareth, 'Ye must be born again'; and surely they were right in teaching that what does not touch the heart is worthless as a religion. If there is a God, and if there be such a thing as right feeling towards Him, then plainly neither learning, nor right belief, nor works of law will do instead of it. These men have been the prophets of the modern world. Many a time their preaching has been like streams of water in a barren land of orthodoxy and formalism. . . Many a time they have gone down among the outcasts of England and made them into self-respecting men, fearing God and eschewing evil. They have been foremost in the war against public wickedness and wrong—say, the abominations of the old prisons, the iniquities of the slave trade, the oppressions of the truck system, the sordid cruelties of the old factories. They have been foremost also in every good work of social help, from the modest beginnings of the Pietists at Halle to the mighty rescue agencies working round us now. It is the fashion to sneer at them, but no man who cares for truth can fall in with it. Darwin for one did not despise their mission work. Perhaps these men had

more of earnest purpose and less of maudlin sentiment than we ourselves—I mean in England—have shown in the general debasement of the last twenty years.”¹

Of course, there are dangers surrounding Evangelicalism, and no one wishes to ignore or even minimize them. There is an intellectual danger—Evangelicals may be tempted to follow the latest phase of intellectual, scientific, or doctrinal opinion. They may be urged to accept as among “assured results” that which is not assured. They may be charged, as they have been, with ignoring modern thought, when all the while they may be only anxious to see where modern agrees with ancient—that is, Biblical—thought, and to accept it when it does. Thus it is sometimes said that Evangelicals ought to have accepted at once the Darwinian theory of evolution; but, as it has been well pointed out, that theory was associated in the minds of most of its exponents with a materialistic and naturalistic view of religion, which made it impossible for any Christians, Evangelical or others, to endorse it. And time has shown the wisdom of this attitude, for to-day the leading evolutionists have departed far from the Darwinian position, and are teaching a view that approximates much more nearly to the conception of a Divine Source and Cause. In the same way, Evangelicals may be tempted to shift their doctrinal basis by incorporating certain aspects of modern thought which contain elements not found in the Evangelical Gospel. But to such temptations Evangelicalism will turn a deaf ear, even though it is charged with obscurantism. A native Japanese evangelist has been so successful in winning souls that he is known as the Moody of Japan. Some of the advanced teachers tell him that he is one hundred years behind in his theology, and he replies that he is nineteen hundred years behind and expects to stay there. It is sometimes said that we must not teach anything to our children that they will afterwards have to unlearn, and with all my heart I agree with this. Thus, on the

¹ “The Knowledge of God,” p. 242.

Atonement Evangelicalism holds by the simple word which we teach our children :

“ He died that we might be forgiven,
 He died to make us good,
 That we might go at last to heaven,
 Saved by His precious blood.

“ There was none other good enough
 To pay the price of sin ;
 He only could unlock the gate
 Of heaven, and let us in.”

God forbid that we should ever have to unlearn this view of the “ old, old story ” !

Ecclesiastical dangers may also loom in front, and Evangelicalism may become enamoured of a view of the ministry which has done little or nothing but harm—a doctrine of the Church which, while it seems to stand for the New Testament truth of corporate Christianity, is in reality essentially narrow and an utter contradiction of New Testament catholicity, and a doctrine of Episcopacy which is not only against Scripture, but finds no warrant in history or present experiences. If Evangelicalism ever weakens on these points, it will suffer, and deserve to suffer. But this will not be for long, since Truth is mighty, and these things have a wonderful way of righting themselves.

Another danger is worldliness—the growth of the secular spirit which makes Evangelicalism fashionable. But when Evangelicalism becomes the fashion it inevitably tends to spiritual powerlessness. “ In the world, but not of the world,” must ever be the characteristic of New Testament religion.

Not least of all, there is the moral danger of nervousness—of being afraid of Evangelicalism, and of yielding to the clamour for everything modern, scientific, and “ up-to-date.” But if ever Evangelicalism loses moral fibre and spiritual courage, it will warrant all the opprobriums of spiritual powerlessness that it will obtain. There could not be a finer testimony to this aspect than that given in the book already quoted from by the Bishop of Durham :

"Recently I was told by a friend that a Bishop, not of our school, had lamented to him the fewness at present of candidates for orders trained in Evangelical homes. Such candidates had as a rule, in the speaker's opinion, 'so much Christian backbone.'"¹

In spite of all these dangers, it is impossible for an Evangelical to be other than hopeful, because he knows that the New Testament is on his side, and his constant endeavour is to be more and more on the side of the New Testament.

Professor Gwatkin writes as follows of Evangelicals :

"If ever the full power of religion is to be brought to bear on the mass of the people, these are the men who will have to do it. Evangelicals and Nonconformists are still the backbone of serious religion in England, and its future chiefly depends on their willingness to receive new truth from the world around them; and of such willingness there are many hopeful signs. If they will only thank God and take courage, they have it in them to represent religion more worthily than any who have gone before them."²

What are wanted to-day are men of conviction, men of courage, men of consistency, and then the old Evangelical Gospel will continue to demonstrate its worth as "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

¹ "The Evangelical School in the Church of England," p. 115.

² "The Knowledge of God," p. 246.



The Missionary World.

“**S**TRENGTHEN the things which remain, which are ready to die.” Out in the mission-field there are stations whose work languishes, inquirers who have come only halfway, schools which lack visible spiritual results. Here at home there are central and local missionary organizations which are not dead but moribund, committees which meet but effect little, meetings which have no vitality, letters written toilsomly which do not grip. Life is scant. To all in such case comes the radiant Easter message of the One Who is alive for evermore, the power of Whose endless life is set to usward, Who can—and will, in answer to the claim of faith—give life abundantly, the One Who can flood dry channels and make the desert blossom as the rose. Is there any reason why we should lack the Life released by His death?

* * * * *

Missionary interest at the moment tends to centre upon the Far East, where Japan has emerged, and China, though with some backward steps, is emerging, from medievalism into modern thought and life; or upon India, where great aspirations are surging upward and restlessly seeking outlet in nationhood. But there are tokens to the seeing eye that the day of Africa is coming, and that problems as complex and as far-reaching wait there to be considered and solved. Men are learning that it is misleading to estimate the possibilities of the negro from those places where, as in South Africa, he is in sharp racial collision with the whites. Experiments, such as those made in America at Hampton Institute and at Tuskegee, are proving what education, manual and literary, and the discipline of a well-ordered institution, can do to make the negro, even after he has been degraded by slavery, into a self-respecting and useful citizen. Those responsible for the policy of missions in Africa would do well to go on pilgrimage to these American colleges, where industrial work is combined with fullest mental training, and

men are turned out well equipped for life. The approach to the real heart of African missionary triumphs is by way of industrial work—not work ordered primarily for profit or even for self-support, but for the sake of the moral results of physical discipline. The followers of Jesus of Nazareth should not omit the lesson of the carpenter's shop. The idea that industrial missions are inherently unspiritual still lingers in certain minds ; it should be relegated to the limbo where similar theories about educational and medical missions have long taken up their abode.

* * * * *

Those who desire a true view of the African should read Mr. E. D. Morel's striking article in the *Nineteenth Century* for March. Well known for his fearless attacks, specially in the pages of his paper, the *African Mail*, upon forced labour and its evils, Mr. Morel, in his paper on "Free Labour in Tropical Africa," gives instance after instance of what Africans have accomplished working on their own land, held under their own tenure, using their own methods, and developing their own trade with the minimum of help from white administrators or traders. The returns of palm-oil, cocoa and cotton production and export confirm his statement that we have in Africa "a great trading and agricultural population of free negroes and negroids." "The native of tropical Africa . . . is producing annually as a free man millions of pounds' worth of raw material required by European industry, in addition to the immense quantities of foodstuffs and forest produce which his own food consumption and internal trade demand." The facts which Mr. Morel arrays with such incisive force not only shame the selfish policy which exploits the black man's land for the white man's gain, but stimulate the friends of African missions to press forward with new faith in the possibilities of the peoples to whom the Glad Tidings are sent.

* * * * *

A valuable survey of some outstanding features of Mr. Gait's concluding volume of the 1911 India Census Report, for which so many have been watching, will also be found in the March

number of the *Nineteenth Century*. The writer of the survey describes the Report as "the most complete and informing picture of India's 315 millions at the commencement of the second decade of the twentieth century which it is possible to provide." Though the Report gives no definite information as to the extent to which the caste system is being undermined by Western influences, there is much incidental evidence that the work of uplifting the degraded classes, begun by Christian missionaries, is now being taken up by educated Indians; and, though the underlying motives may not be entirely disinterested, we are confronted by the significant facts that Indians are working for Indians of lower social status than themselves, and that modern reform movements, such as the Arya Somaj, are slowly but surely moulding public opinion in regard to the necessity for educational progress, the evils of child marriage and perpetual widowhood. "Unmistakably, however," says the writer of this survey, "the most important element of religious evolution in raising the Indian masses is the growth of Christianity." It induces outward refinement as well as raising the moral standard; and though the first generation of converts are often very disappointing, each succeeding generation will have a stronger hold on the Christian virtues and principles, and the type of Christian character will be loftier and more stable. The full effect of Christianity cannot, as we know, be gauged by the numerical successes of the existing work, but, as is pointed out in the Report, "through the mission schools and colleges, Christian thought influences large numbers who remain Hindus, and Christian ideals and standards are everywhere gaining ground." This is valuable testimony to the work of the Christian missionary, and we commend the whole article—suggestively called "The Social Dawn in India"—to the attention of our readers.

* * * * *

Just a year ago the whole Christian world joined with the Christians of China in prayer for the country and its newly-instituted republican government. One cannot doubt that the

prayers were heard and will have answer. Yet the present situation is anxious and reactionary in many ways. Disturbance and change have been frequent, and only by successful autocracy has the President maintained his rule. Strenuous efforts, met by equally strenuous opposition, have been made to establish Confucianism as the State religion of China, which would be a direct breach of the promise of religious liberty. So far this has not been done, but the decree, published in the *Times* of March 14, in obedience to which the President is to worship officially at the altar of Heaven and offer sacrifices to Confucius, is significant in the highest degree, and restores religious sanction to the Government. That the act binds the State to Confucianism is explicitly denied; and the call to citizens to offer universal worship likewise is designed to rob it of some of its imperial function. But neither of these qualifying clauses will veil the eyes of China, and the Act will be interpreted there, it is feared, as a practical assumption of imperial function by the President, and a practical reinstatement of Confucianism above other faiths. Some swing of the pendulum was expected by all thoughtful students of the situation. There is no cause for discouragement, but much call for prayer. Leading Christians in China are standing firmly together; the very stress of the conflict will deepen the life of the Church and close its ranks.

* * * * *

For the third year in succession the Board of Study for the Preparation of Missionaries is arranging to hold a Vacation Course for missionary training. It will be held from August 1 to 29, at Oxford; the fee for the whole course will be £3 3s., and for the half-course £2 2s. In order to secure registration, a fee of 5s. must be sent with the application. The course will include lectures and discussions on missionary history and methods, the religions of the mission-field, phonetics as a basis of language study, outlines of educational method for missionaries, together with opportunities for personal intercourse and public lectures on subjects of general missionary interest.

There is wide evidence of the need for special training for missionaries, and testimony to the value of these Vacation Courses is by no means lacking from students and missionaries both at home and on the field. Every effort is being made to secure lecturers who are highly qualified to deal with the subjects chosen for special study, and to maintain the level of previous Vacation Courses. Copies of the syllabus, application forms, and all other information, may be had from the Rev. H. U. Weitbrecht, 33, Onslow Gardens, Muswell Hill, London, N.

* * * * *

Anniversary announcements are already beginning to find a place in the missionary magazines. The S.P.G. annual service will be held in St. Paul's Cathedral on Wednesday, April 22, at 11 a.m., and the annual afternoon meeting at the Church House on Thursday, April 23, at 2.30. The Archbishop of Canterbury will be in the chair, and it is hoped that the speakers will include Bishop Scott (late of North China) and the Bishop of Accra. The annual evening meeting will be held in the Royal Albert Hall on Friday, April 24, at seven o'clock. The chair will be taken by the Bishop of Lichfield, and Bishop Montgomery will be one of the speakers. The C.M.S. announces that its annual sermon will be preached at St. Bride's on May 4, at 6.30 p.m., by the Bishop of Durham. The annual meeting will be held at the Queen's Hall, Langham Place, on Tuesday, May 5, and the evening meeting in the Royal Albert Hall on the same day. As last year, there will be two services for young people, one in Southwark Cathedral on Saturday, May 2, and one in St. Paul's Cathedral on Saturday, May 9. A complete list of meetings and speakers will be found in the Society's magazines for April.

* * * * *

As in previous years, the C.M.S. is preparing to hold two Summer Schools, one at Lowestoft, from May 22 to 30, and one at Greystones, Co. Wicklow, from June 12 to 20. Full

particulars of the arrangements will be found in the *C.M.S. Gazette* for March. A preliminary announcement of the S.P.G. Summer School at Buxton, from June 20 to 27, also appears in the *Mission Field* for March.

* * * * *

Amongst many articles of interest in the March magazines, we note one in *India's Women* by Miss McDougall on "Educational Missionary Work in India." Miss McDougall has lately returned from a tour of investigation of educational work in India. The *C.M.S. Gazette* has an account of the opening of the new buildings for St. John's College, Agra, and the *C.M. Review* has an article on the college by the Rev. J. P. Haythornthwaite, who formerly held the office of Principal for twenty-one years; and also a paper on the "Continuation Committee Conferences in Asia," by the Rev. F. Baylis. The Baptist *Herald* has an article by Miss Angus on "Women's Work in India," and the *Student Movement* publishes a correspondence between an Indian student and an English friend, which provides food for thought. The *Bible in the World* contains an interesting account of the work of the B. & F.B.S. in Nigeria. The *L.M.S. Chronicle* has a deeply encouraging account of the progress towards self-support made by the churches in Samoa, and in the *Foreign Field* the Rev. H. Highfield enumerates some of the "Factors that make for Change in Buddhist Ceylon." The *Missionary Review of the World* publishes an address given at the Student Volunteer Convention, Kansas City, by the Rev. S. M. Zwemer, of Cairo, entitled "The Fulness of Time in the Moslem World." G.



Notices of Books.

SACRIFICE OR SACRAMENT: WHICH IS THE TEACHING OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION OFFICE? By the Right Rev. E. A. KNOX, D.D., Lord Bishop of Manchester. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 4s. 6d. net.

The Bishop of Manchester in this timely book has managed to place in brief compass a powerful argument as to the position and doctrine of the Church of England. The interest is twofold—doctrinal and liturgical. A short exposition of the doctrine of the Mass is followed by a careful statement of the changes through which the Prayer-Book has passed from 1549 to the last revision in respect of the service of Holy Communion. With reference to the First Prayer-Book of King Edward VI., the Bishop of Manchester makes the suggestion that it is a mistake to suppose that the Altar and God's Board are different names for the same place, but are in reality two separate things. In proof of this he refers to Bishop Ridley's reasons for substituting Tables for Altars, and to Mr. Micklethwaite's paper on "Ornaments" in the "Alcuin Club Tracts," in which it is stated that "Communion was not necessarily given at an Altar."

In favour of the Bishop's contention, we may refer to (1) the rubric of the Communion Order of 1548, in which the priest is told that, if it is necessary to consecrate more bread and wine "he may go again to the Altar," which he had apparently left for the distribution of the elements. (2) The rubric in the book of 1549, referring to the use of the Ante-Communion Service alone on Wednesdays and Fridays, for which he was not to wear the Vestment, and is to "say all things at the Altar (appointed to be said at the celebration of the Lord's Supper) until after the offertory." (3) The condition of the churches at a slightly later period, for Archbishop Grindall, first at York in 1571 and then at Canterbury in 1576, ordered the complete demolition of the Altars against the east wall, which would render the administration of the Sacrament impossible unless a Table were already provided elsewhere in the church.

From this the Bishop argues that the service of 1549 was in part sacrificial and taken at the Altar, and in part purely sacramental and taken at God's Board.

In 1553 the Second Prayer-Book of King Edward, which was re-enacted in 1559 with a few minor alterations, eliminated the sacrificial doctrine and provided a sacramental service, the whole of which was to be read at the Lord's Table, the Altar not being so much as mentioned. Only after Altars had been entirely abolished was the Table ever placed in the position at the east end of the church, which formerly the Altars had occupied.

A second very interesting suggestion which the Bishop makes is that, when using the First Prayer-Book, the priest would discard before distributing the elements the Vestment which he had worn during the sacrificial service. For proof we are referred to a letter of Il Schifanoja, describing the reception of the Communion by Queen Elizabeth on the Easter Day after her accession. The intimate connection of the Vestment with the Sacrifice would render this most probable. If it were so, it follows that with

the Sacrifice and the Altar the Vestment at once dropped completely out of use. From these facts a reasonable explanation of the present Ornaments Rubric, agreeing with the disuse of the Vestments throughout the Church for three hundred years, is clearly and forcibly presented to us.

This summary will leave no doubt as to the Bishop's doctrinal position. The Holy Communion is a memorial of our Saviour's Passion, a sign and a seal to us of His gracious forgiveness of our sins; it is also a Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and of ourselves. "The opposition is not in these beliefs, but in their relation to the consecrated elements. History has shown that the attempt to put the thought of Sacrifice with the elements into dramatic action has inevitably resulted in attaching to material objects spiritual value, apart from, and independently of, their use."

We conclude by quoting two more sentences—one from the Preface, the other being the last words of the Postscript: "The author ventures to submit to his more learned brethren and to the public that a most grave wrong will be done to the Church of England by importing through ornaments into the Prayer-Book doctrines which are contrary to its prayers." "Earnestly also we implore our Fathers in God not to betray that form of Liturgy to which they have declared their allegiance, and not to corrupt it by meretricious ornaments which belong to a distinct and wholly alien teaching."

E. ABBEY TINDALL.

THE EVANGELISTS AND THE RESURRECTION. By the Rev. Ralph W. Harden. London: *Skeffington and Son*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

Mr. Harden is an aged and much respected clergyman of the Church of Ireland, where, we believe, he has won a wide reputation as a Bible student. In this book he gives us the fruit of ripe thought and deep meditation upon the narratives of the Resurrection. He believes in the Easter message as firmly as he accepts the Easter faith. The empty tomb is for him as much a fact as the Risen Lord, and in this careful study he shows how it is possible to harmonize the accounts of the Evangelists and to free them from difficulties that have been suggested to many minds. He holds that the appearance of our Lord to St. Paul "was no mere vision, but an actual revelation of Himself made by the Lord Himself to the eyes of the Apostle," and insists that the appearances recorded in the Gospels are so different as to make their evidence as superior in character as they are prior in point of time. He will not have the appearance to St. Paul co-ordinated with or substituted for those of the Gospels. For him the Gospel narrative is an inspired relation of facts, and on this basis he dissects the accounts and brings out the relation between the various manifestations of the Master to those who were His companions in His ministry.

We cannot discuss in detail all he says, but we may mention two points that are well worthy of consideration. It is generally accepted that the words (John xx. 17) "Go unto My brethren" refer to the Apostles. Mr. Harden protests against the mistranslation, and renders the passage (with Dr. Moffatt) "Go unto My brothers." He gives the strongest reasons for believing that the reference is to "His brothers after the flesh, His mother's children." He uses the same expression to the group of women (Matt. xxviii. 10), and, in Mr. Harden's words, He sends "by Mary a message to

set right their perceptions regarding the spiritual brotherhood, without disowning or annulling the natural brotherhood entailed by His humanity; the message sent by women being calculated to awaken hopes and desires of higher blessings in the near prospect of their meeting in their Galilean home." If this exposition be correct, the faith of His brethren after His resurrection, as contrasted with their disbelief during their life, becomes easy of understanding.

We sympathize with the strong objection taken by Mr. Harden to the marginal note in the Revised Version to St. Luke xxiv. 12—"Some ancient authorities omit ver. 12." There is really no solid ground for this doubt on the authenticity of a strong confirmation of an important witness to the fact that the tomb was empty. We notice that Dr. Moffat includes this verse without any comment in his translation, and he is so careful a writer that he would not have done so had he any doubt as to its genuineness. Mr. Harden is right when he says that "it is the very importance of this visit, as first-rate evidence, that lies at the root of the whole assault that has been made against it." His commentary on the Lucan and Johannine narratives deserves the closest study, and will illuminate the text to those who wish to see how they can be combined without any distortion. We must take leave of this thoughtful work, but cannot do so without expressing our gratitude to the author for his vindication of the Gospel narrative against the criticism of recent years. He is always fair, and is inspired by reverence for the text, and by the conviction that the Evangelists were competent authorities. Certainly the plain acceptance of their message is freer from difficulty than the attempt to believe in the Resurrection as interpreted by those who assert that the tomb was not empty, and that our Lord's appearances were either objective or subjective visions.

THE WORLD'S REDEMPTION. By C. E. Rolt. *Longmans, Green and Co.*
Price 7s. 6d. net.

The author of this contribution to the study of a theme so full of difficulties to the thinker has a facile pen which lures him on, perhaps, even farther than we are sometimes disposed to go. He presents the old doctrine of original sin incisively when he says: "Take away the doctrine of original sin and substitute a doctrine of original righteousness, maintain that man has no inherited taint, that he is naturally pure, and that he could attain to heaven by his own efforts—teach, in short, that man does not need salvation—and the whole Pauline system falls to pieces."

There are certain passages in his "Evolution and Human Personality" to which exception may be taken. We cannot agree that "an animal is a thing without rights of its own." And why has evolution "no certain message of encouragement for the human race"? On the other hand, what could be better than the following?—"So far as any individual man feels the attraction of the heavenly ideal, and, feeling it, responds to its call; so far as he is drawn towards high and noble things, loving them for no hope of reward, but simply because of what they are; so far as he patiently turns his face towards the light, and seeks to attain but one glimpse of that celestial vision, to that extent does he give a Divine meaning and purpose to his own individual life and to that of his brother man; nor does this

blessed brightness rest only upon the human race, but it strikes with heavenly glory on the whole vast process of evolution, and on every stage and every unit of the struggling and suffering creation."

It was not to be expected that the author would succeed in his endeavour to explain the "fall theory" where others have failed before him. The finite cannot comprehend infinity. Indeed, he acknowledges himself that the "fall theory" does not explain in the smallest degree the fact of human sin. As he states in his Preface, he "is hampered by limitations of which he is conscious, and can only present his subject as fairly as he is able." And he has presented it fairly, ably, and in such a form that it will be welcomed by all except those who have pet theories of their own.

IN THE GARDEN WITH HIM. By Dora Farncomb. With Introduction by the Bishop of Chelmsford. *Robert Scott.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

The Bishop of Chelmsford heartily commends this book to "all who love the Lord"; and, indeed, the sincere Christian will find it a source of delight and enjoyment. The poetry of the title is reflected in all its pages. Delicacy, grace, and refinement, mark each successive chapter. It was a happy idea to take the Garden—one of the many beautiful symbols in Scripture of the living Church—and use it to illustrate various phases of the Christian life. The Garden speaks of life, growth, fruit, beauty; and these things, regarded as types, are full of spiritual meaning to which the author appeals with telling power. There are twelve chapters, and each has its own message to the soul. The relationship of the Owner of the Garden to His precious plants is the dominating theme, and His constant presence in the Garden, with all that it implies, is shown to be a source of ever-increasing strength. "In the Garden with Him" is one of the choicest devotional books we have read for a long time.

THE PARABLES OF THE GOSPELS. By Laurence E. Browne, M.A. *Cambridge University Press.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

So much has been written on this intensely interesting theological study that it would appear little can be added. Presenting no doctrine in an abstract form, the parables solve many difficult questions. By them true knowledge is communicated which actualizes the whole life. The author shows the difference between allegory and similitude: "The purpose of similitude is to explain higher conceptions by means of lower ones; but the purpose of allegory is to draw the thoughts from one set of conceptions to another, generally, of course, from a lower to a higher plane." He then shows what form parables take in the Gospels.

Perhaps one of the most interesting chapters is that on the Fourth Gospel. It has been said that allegory is the characteristic trait of the Johannine teaching, and yet we find the author using not so much the figurative forms of similitude and allegory as the philosophical thought of ideas and essences. The explicit utterances of the Fourth Gospel on the subject of Jesus' method of teaching are here put before us with lucidity. To take one example—that of xii. 35-41—Mr. Browne says: "Our Lord tells the multitude that the light is at present with them, but they must use it now, lest darkness overtake them. Evidently our Lord was teaching in clear language, and warned the people to accept the teaching while they might, or else they would find themselves unable to grasp it. In fact, this

did happen to many, and Jesus was hidden, or hid Himself, from them (verse 36)."

THE MENDING OF LIFE. By Richard Rolle. Edited by the Rev. Dundas Harford. *Allenson*. Price 1s. 6d. net.

Richard Rolle was a mystic of the early half of the fourteenth century. Entering upon a hermit's life at the age of nineteen, his friends thought him mad. The whole of his work is a song of love. He is one of the most musical of the mystics. He thinks in images and symbols of music, and his songs are full of spiritual joy. In a valuable Introduction the editor details the steps in the development of this remarkable personality, and he believes that this little book will bring to hearts that are cold new warmth, to lives that have been embittered fresh sweetness, and put a new song in lips that have forgotten to sing.

A NATIONAL SYSTEM OF EDUCATION. By J. H. Whitehouse, M.P. *Cambridge University Press*.

Mr. Whitehouse is an enthusiast in educational matters, and, like every enthusiast, he is apt to become occasionally impractical in his suggestions. But he puts his finger on the weak spot of English education when he states that "the vital weakness of our system is the lack of any proper relation between primary and later forms of education." He believes that legislation is needed to bring together primary and secondary education. But, in theory, is not this already done? The fault, it appears to us, lies in the application of a system which has hardly passed beyond the theoretical stage.

Mr. Whitehouse urges central control of a joint Government Committee, with headquarters at the Board of Education, consisting of representatives of all the departments who are in any way concerned with legislation affecting persons under twenty-one. This would include the Home Office, the Board of Trade, the Local Government Board, and the Treasury. Such is this co-ordinated scheme, and it remains for the Government to work it out.

Received: GYPSY COPPERSMITHS IN LIVERPOOL AND BIRKENHEAD. By Andreas (Mui Shuko). Liverpool: *Henry Young and Sons*. THE TRAINING OF THE TWIG. By Rev. C. L. Drawbridge, M.A. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 6d. in paper, 1s. in cloth, net. A. H. K. B. A volume of selections from the writings of Dr. A. K. H. Boyd. London: *T. Nelson and Sons*. Price 1s. THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS. By John Bunyan. London: *Morgan and Scott*, 12, Paternoster Buildings. Price 6d. THE SURRENDERED LIFE. By J. Wilbur Chapman, D.D. London: *Morgan and Scott*. Price 6d. net. CONFIRMATION AND THE PRAYER-BOOK. By Rev. J. W. Hayes. London: *Robert Scott*, Roxburghe House, Paternoster Row. Price 1s. THE TRUTHFULNESS OF THE SCRIPTURES. By Rev. Gavin Carlyle. London: *Elliot Stock*, 7, Paternoster Row. Price 2s. 6d. net. A HOUSE DIVIDED. By Rev. T. Caleb. London: *J. and J. Bennett, Ltd.* Price 2s. 6d. A book of sermons. HYMNS OF THE EARLY CHURCH. By Rev. T. Brownlie, D.D. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* Price 2s. 6d. net. PUBLIC BAPTISM OF INFANTS AND THE CHURCHING OF WOMEN. Specimen cards. Arranged and published by Rev. Theodore Bull, III, St. Andrew's Road, Southsea. Price 4s. and 1s. 10d. per dozen respectively. INTOLERANCE IN IRELAND. By an Irishman. London: *Simphin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co., Ltd.*, Stationers' Hall Court. Price 1s. net. ROME AND ST. PETER; OR, THE PAPAL TWINS. By John Jamieson. London: *S. W. Partridge and Co., Ltd.* MCCHEYNE FROM THE PEW. By Rev. Kirkwood Hewat, M.A. London: *S. W. Partridge and Co., Ltd.* THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL FROM THE CODEX LAUDIANUS. By E. S. Buchanan, M.A., B.Sc. With four colotype facsimiles. London: *Heath, Cranton and Onseley, Ltd.* Price 12s. 6d. net. THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE PRAYER-BOOK. By Rev. James Haughton, A.M. With Forewords by Bishop of Albany and Bishop of Pennsylvania. London: *Seely, Service and Co., Ltd.*, 38, Great Russell Street. Price 6s. net. THE PEOPLE OF EBRENEZER. By Mabel King. London: *S. W. Partridge and Co.*