

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

February, 1915.

The Month.

Where we
Failed.

THERE have been great happenings since we last wrote on the events of the month. The first place must of necessity be given to the Day of Humble Prayer, observed by the nation in connection with the war on Sunday, January 3. It was a memorable event, and might have been rendered still more historic if only the precedents of other times had been followed. Notwithstanding all that has been said on the other side, we still regret that His Majesty's advisers did not see their way to call for a Day of *Humiliation*. No doubt the adverse views to such a description expressed by the late Queen Victoria at the time of the Crimea War—to which the CHURCHMAN was the first to call attention—carried great weight ; but they were not pressed then, nor should they have been allowed to prevail now. What could it matter to us as a nation what Germany or Austria-Hungary might think about England "humiliating" herself before God? Nor would it be of any material concern to us if even the Allies misunderstood the position. If—we speak with all reverence—God understood our action and the motives which prompted it, it were enough. On this matter we are entirely at one with the Bishop of Durham, who expressed his regret that in the original call to observe the day more emphasis was not laid upon repentance and humiliation. "I do not mean," he continued, "that we

have, humbly speaking, any call to repent regarding the origin of the war or our part in the warfare. Rather, I thank God that Britain never drew the sword with hands more nobly white and clean. And assuredly she never sent out fleets and armies whose morale of soberness and kindness, along with a sublime and indomitable valour, was so true and high. Nor ever were the lives of her heroic sons yielded up in a purer self-sacrificial spirit by those sons themselves, and by those whose anguish of bereavement over them is so holy to our hearts. . . . But . . . we need to remember, in the dust before God, the grievous modern drift of our society, in all its classes, towards ideals unworthy of Christ." It is just in this respect that the observance of the day failed in what should have been its greatest expression. Sufficient stress was not laid upon our national sins and national shortcomings, which, whatever interpretation may be given to the word, do most assuredly call loudly for national "humiliation" before the Lord if so be that the nation as such is prepared to repent. This brings us to another point of criticism. We are in full sympathy with those who favoured the setting apart of a weekday rather than a Sunday. The observance touched the Churchgoers, but it left outsiders to a very large extent unaffected. If a Royal Proclamation had been issued appointing an ordinary working day to be observed, with shops closed, amusements stopped, and work reduced, as far as possible, to a minimum, it would have had a great effect. It would at least have made people think, and clergy and others would have had the opportunity of pressing upon the nation at large, and not upon their own congregations only, the call to national humiliation for national sins. Many—perhaps the large majority—would have despised the call, but some, at least, would have given heed to it, and, what is of the highest importance, there would have been official acknowledgment before God and man of the need for national humiliation for national sins. We press this point as strongly as we can, because we are sure that it still needs consideration, even though the appointed day has passed away.

**A Great
Observance.**

But, having offered our criticism, we hasten to say that the observance of the Day of Humble Prayer on Sunday, January 3, was of a most impressive character. And it was remarkably widespread. It would, perhaps, be too much to say that the day was recognised in every church in the country, but we imagine that there were not many parishes which deliberately and designedly stood outside the effort. In the public Press most attention was given—quite naturally—to the larger services, but it is important to recognize that in a matter of this kind the humbler gatherings may be equally effective as a factor in the spiritual life of the parish or village or town. All Christian people must be thankful for the great crowds which thronged St. Paul's Cathedral, Westminster Abbey, Canterbury Cathedral, York Minster, and the other great central churches of the country, and for the spirit of earnest prayer and supplication which seemed to have taken possession of those present. In most cases we believe the several preachers used their opportunity to the best spiritual advantage. It is not always safe to judge of the quality of a sermon from the abstract of it which is given as a report in the daily newspapers. If it were, we should begin to despair of the preaching capacity of the Church of England. The reporter is on the look-out for topical "copy." Merely spiritual aspirations do not appeal to him; they are not suited to his purpose; and so it comes about that men who take their impressions only from these published reports are sometimes inclined to think that sermons are now little more than leading articles, instead of what they should be—and what in most cases we believe they really are—a living message from God to the soul. In several parish churches the sermon was dispensed with, and in its place was read the very beautiful Homily provided in the appointed Form. Where this was done reverently and impressively the effect was most stimulating and helpful. In other cases the Homily was omitted altogether—to the congregation's great loss—and the sermon was preached as usual. But, after all, the main interest of the day was not in the sermon or the

Homily, but in the Intercessions, and we are glad to believe that a deep and an abiding impression has been made. Thousands of men and women have realized, as they have never realized before, the importance, the value, and the reality, of prayer in all concerns of life. They have learnt, what perhaps as a nation we have been too slow to appreciate, that God rules in the affairs of nations, and that true national strength cometh alone from Him. And what will be the result of that great Day of Prayer? If we acknowledge—and it is the Christian's profoundest conviction—that God hears and answers prayer, we must believe that a mighty blessing will be outpoured upon our nation. It may not come in the way we look for it; it may even tarry until God shall see that as a nation we are prepared to receive it; but come it will, in His own time and in His own way, in answer to the humble prayer of His believing people.

**The Spiritual
Life of the
Nation.** Much has been said, and we doubt not will continue to be said, about national sins. These are many: some of them open, flagrant, and revolting; others secret, subtle, and fashionable. But the greatest blot of all on our national life, and the hardest to remove, is the indifference to religion which characterizes so many of our people in all ranks and all classes. It is right that these our sins and failures and shortcomings should be denounced, but denunciation does not at all adequately meet the case. Has not the time come when a definite attempt should be made by the Church to awaken the spiritual life of the nation? Beyond all question, many thousands of people have had their religious feelings stirred by the observance of the Day of Humble Prayer, and there is a real danger that unless the impression thus made is speedily followed up it may become effaced. Can nothing be done to take spiritual advantage of so unique an opportunity? The question is engaging the minds of many, and several proposals have been put forward. Let us be careful that, whilst we are discussing ways and means and methods, the opportunity does not slip away. We are profoundly convinced

that if anything is to be done effectively it must be done now. When men speak of influencing the spiritual life of the nation, it seems at first sight to be an almost impossible task. But is it really so? Certainly not. The nation is made up of individuals, and it is the legitimate pride of the Church of England that by its splendid parochial system every individual is within reach of spiritual ordinances. To the Church of England, then, it belongs primarily to use this opportunity, by means of its parochial system, to bring religious influence to bear upon the nation. The proposal has been made that in every parish there should be—possibly in Lent—a week's Mission, with the parson of the parish as his own missionary. The suggestion is one that has our cordial sympathy and support. Objections have been made to it, and we are aware of the many arguments by which it may be assailed. A Mission, it is said, requires a long period of preparation; the parish clergyman is not the man best suited to conduct a Mission in his own parish, and so on. But these are surface difficulties. No doubt a Mission in the ordinary acceptance of the term does need a large amount of preparation; but if we drop the phrase "mission," and speak rather of a definite Evangelistic effort in every parish, is it quite reasonable to suppose that a longer period than a week or two is required to prepare for it? The first day of Lent is February 17; would it not be possible for a clergyman to prepare himself and his people for such an effort, say, in the week March 21 to March 28? The objection that a clergyman is not qualified to conduct such an effort strikes us as less serious. It is in his commission, so to speak, that he has to lead his people to Christ; and we are perfectly certain that the spiritual life of both pastor and people would be greatly helped if from time to time the clergyman gave himself definitely to Evangelistic work, seeking to bring every member of his congregation into living relationship with Christ, and to win as large a number of outsiders as possible. Such an effort is always worth the making; to-day there seems overwhelming reason why it should be attempted. Another proposal is that the whole season of Lent should be

used for Evangelistic purposes, adapting the preaching at the ordinary services as occasion should require. No doubt other plans will readily suggest themselves to other minds ; but what we feel that the present situation calls for is that the parochial clergy should make some determined effort, on lines which they find to be best suited to their parishes, to deepen the impression made by the observance of the Day of Humble Prayer, and to bring their people to definite decision for Christ. If this were done on any large scale—and we see no reason why it should not be attempted—it would mean a real uplift to the spiritual life of the nation.

The whole Church ought to feel a debt of ^{“Christianity and the War.”} gratitude to the Vicar of Islington, and to those associated with him, for assigning for consideration by the Islington Clerical Meeting—held in the Parish Church on January 12—the great subject of “Christianity and the War.” It can hardly be questioned that many devoted Christian people have long been anxious for some guidance and assistance which might help to the solution of the many problems which this war raises in their minds ; and we think that on the whole they will have every reason to be satisfied with the counsel which came from the Islington speakers. There was a readiness to face the real facts of the situation, and to avoid everything sentimental and unreal. In some few quarters where there has been a tendency to arouse what we can only regard as a wholly mistaken sympathy with Germany, but scant justice has been done to our own position. It is quite right that everything should be done to prevent the righteous anger which has taken possession of this nation from developing into anything approaching hate of the German people ; but it is in the highest degree mischievous and wrong to insinuate that there is much in our own action that should make us look with less severity upon Germany. We believe our nation’s hands to be absolutely clean in this war ; we regard Germany as the wanton and wicked aggressor ; and we find no difficulty at all in praying God to

grant us the victory. Nor do we think this attitude to be incompatible with the teaching of Christ. In these circumstances we feel thankful for the sobriety and saneness of the Islington message, which, because it was restrained and wise, lost none of its spiritual power. From first to last the addresses were excellent, and Mr. Procter's own modest contribution to the discussion was not the least remarkable. He dealt frankly with a question which is passing upon many minds. "Our blessed Lord in His Sermon on the Mount," he said, "was, to my mind, setting before His Church a Divine ideal towards which she was ever to press with prayerful aspiration, but the absolutely literal carrying out of its specific injunctions was not always immediately possible in an unchristianized world. Why, if every thief who would take my cloak was to be suffered to take my coat also, and I must not restrain his purpose by locking my door, very soon my whole wardrobe would have disappeared. But this surely was not intended, and in our interpretation we must compare Scripture with Scripture." There is a strong common-sense ring about these words which we are glad to note. When once our part is justified—and of the justification of our nation's action Mr. Procter's address left us in no doubt—it is not unspiritual to recognize that it must be prosecuted to the end.

The Dean of Canterbury devoted his paper to a most careful and able exposition of St. Paul's words :
The Task of
Christianity. "If thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil" (Rom. xiii. 4). It is in this very principle, he declared, that is to be found the only, but the sufficient, justification for the maintenance in a Christian world, and by Christian States, of the awful sword of war. If justice is to be upheld between nations, and, above all, between weak and strong nations, the forces, he contended, must be maintained in adequate strength, which can alone avert or avenge injustice. But perhaps the

most telling part of the Dean's paper was that in which he insisted that the task of Christianity in relation to war was the momentous and supreme office of promoting among men that apprehension and that love of righteousness which ought to be the controlling force of all their actions, and showed how the opposite spirit prevailed in Germany. We cannot forbear quoting the following powerful passage :

"The action of our enemies in this war (unless we ourselves are utterly deluded, which, I am sure, is not the case) is obviously based upon a completely perverted conception of what righteousness and justice are. It is based upon the avowed and violent rejection of the Christian standard of righteousness and justice, upon the repudiation of the Sermon on the Mount, and of the meekness and gentleness of Christ. It is a further illustration of the perversion of which even well-intentioned human nature is capable, that this unchristian ideal should have taken possession of so large a proportion of a nation which, in the past, did as much as any nation in the world to bring the pure and simple Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ home to all their own people and to Europe at large. What perversion of human nature is not possible when the land of some of the gentlest and tenderest of Evangelical influences—the home, for instance, of Kaiserswerth, in which our own Florence Nightingale was trained—becomes the land of Nietzsche and Bernhardi? That which the Christian Church has to do is to proclaim and maintain among all peoples and nations and tongues, and, above all, in those European nations with whom the physical control of the world rests, the Christian spirit—the spirit of Christ—the spirit of love, joy, peace, gentleness, goodness, meekness, temperance. In proportion as that spirit, through the words of our Lord and His Gospels and by the influence of the Holy Spirit, is maintained among individuals, are they granted a right judgment in all things. In any people in whom the Christian spirit was predominant we may be sure that the arrogance, the pride, the passions, and the ambitions which have provoked the present war would have been impossible."

It is thus we see that the cultivation of the Christian spirit tells against war; and if war, unhappily, should come, it will thus be restrained within the limits of just and Christian purposes.

The England
of the
Future.

Canon Simpson, of St. Paul's, dealt eloquently and brilliantly with "God's Call to the Nation," explaining that God is calling loudly for more and better Christianity; and the Bishop of Chelmsford, who followed, read a paper which most aptly illustrated better Christianity

in action. His immediate subject was "The Church's Duty to the State," and he pictured the England of the future in glowing terms, showing the Church's responsibilities :

"The England of the future is bound to be more democratic than ever, but woe to England in that day if Christ be not the people's King! In a letter recently received from the front a chaplain wrote: 'You must press upon the "Terriers" and others whom you may meet that they must know Christ before they come out here. It must be part of their training. They will need all the religion they can get. This they will soon find out.' These words may be applied to the democracy of the future. 'They must know Christ. They will need all the religion they can get.' If this is true—and any man who has studied history knows it to be true—then the duty of the Church to the State is clear. She must preach Christ. Religion and politics must not be divorced as in the past. The mystical and ethical must be mingled together. The Sermon on the Mount must be preached from Calvary, and not Calvary from the Mount of the Sermon. But this must not be taught as two Gospels, but as one. Bethlehem and Golgotha both proclaim the same Christ. Bethlehem saw Him living for men, coming on earth for men from the Father, linking Himself for ever with sinful men; Golgotha proclaims Him as dying for men and commending His soul for men into the hands of His Father. If the full Gospel is proclaimed, then heaven will be proclaimed on earth, for he that believeth will have 'the Life,' the Christ, and where Christ is there is heaven.

"The Church will be quick to teach the State the lessons drawn from the present. She will affirm as a necessity, for both nation and individual, integrity and sincerity of motives. A nation's and a man's word must be a bond. Neither master nor man must be free to break his plighted word. The 'Scrap of Paper' must be held sacred, at no matter what cost. The keynotes of the life of the nation must be Truth, Justice, and Brotherhood. Truth must prevail. Deceit and lying in trade and commerce must cease. Diligence in business must be coupled with serving the Lord. Justice must be in the ascendant. The master must be just to the man, and the man to the master. The difference of position between them must not be a pretext for the violation of justice as between man and man. The Ten Commandments are not destroyed, but strengthened and ennobled, by love becoming the fulfilling of the law, and man must gather the inspiration to love his neighbour from the love begotten in him by his love to God. The Church must teach, in season and out of season, that God is the beginning and end of all Truth, Justice, and Brotherhood."

This is a great ideal, and we trust that the Church may rise to it. The tone of the whole meeting was eminently practical and useful, with its emphatic call to prayer as a panacea for the difficulties of the times. In this connection Mr. Darbyshire's paper was specially noteworthy.

We desire to offer our cordial support to the movement for promoting amongst soldiers and civilians the taking of a patriotic pledge of total abstinence for the duration of the war. The movement arose out of a Conference held in London, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury, which resulted in the formation of a Central Emergency Committee, of which Dr. C. F. Harford is acting as Honorary Secretary. Dr. Harford, in the course of the paper he read at the London Meeting of Lay Churchmen on January 16, referred in eloquent terms to the appeal issued by Lord Kitchener and the late Lord Roberts, but more especially he centred attention upon the action of Russia, which (in the words of *The Times*) "in sternly prohibiting the sale of spirituous liquors has already vanquished a greater foe than the Germans." Dr. Harford added on his own behalf:

"It is said that this action on the part of Russia gained for her army several days in the work of mobilization, and the benefit of that has been incalculable in enabling her to resist the onslaught of the invader. Would that we could follow the example of Russia and save ourselves from this fearful disability, which is even now seriously hindering the efficiency of our troops in training, and thus diminishing the fighting capacity of our all too small, though grandly heroic, army. But we are a democratic nation, and drastic action cannot be taken without the will of the people, and at present we are not half awake to the enormity of the danger which confronts us from this cause, for the nation is tied hand and foot by the great financial interests which are bound up with the drink traffic and the slavery of habit which seriously limited our freedom."

We are inclined to think that Dr. Harford takes too pessimistic a view of the situation. Public opinion moves slowly, but it is moving, and there is reason to believe, to take but one example, that the earlier closing of public-houses has commanded all but universal approval. The offices of the Central Emergency Committee are at 55, Paternoster House, E.C.



The Christ of the Gospel.

No. II.—“INCARNATE BY THE HOLY GHOST OF THE VIRGIN MARY.”*

THESE words, from our English rendering of the Nicene Creed, express the truth which is also set forth in the parallel clause of the Apostles' Creed: “Conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.” They enshrine the conviction of Christendom as to the *mode* of the Divine Incarnation. They declare that our Lord was miraculously born of a Virgin Mother. It lies outside the scope of this article to discuss the stages by which the words found entrance to the great creed of the East, and the verbal modifications which ensued.¹ The purport of the expression is sufficiently clear, and has been quite well understood by those who reject as well as by those who uphold it.

Before attempting to say anything about the credibility of the statement, it may clear the ground if I mention the points that I shall venture to take for granted. The *general* credibility of the Gospel narratives, in their account of our Lord's life and death, are assumed: there was such a person as Jesus Christ, Who lived and died in Palestine. Further, the general teaching of the New Testament, that this Jesus Christ was God's Son, incarnate in human flesh, is accepted as true. It is obvious that, apart from this conception of Christ, the story of the Virgin Birth can only be regarded as an idle tale. Those who have come to a strictly humanitarian view of Christ are bound to regard this miracle as excluded along with all the others.

¹ The Greek form as commonly received in the East since the Council of Chalcedon is: “*σαρκωθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου.*” The Latin form current in the West since the Council of Toledo is: “*Incar-natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine.*”

* The first article in this series, “Begotten of His Father before all worlds” [“The Pre-Existent Christ,” by the Rev. E. A. Burroughs], appeared in the January issue of the CHURCHMAN.—ED.

There are, however, those who would not subscribe to this very "diminished" Christology: who *do* revere Christ as God Incarnate, and who *do* claim to be His worshippers and members of His Church, but who discard the Virgin Birth and the bodily resurrection as untenable on various grounds. And the present question is whether these alleged grounds for objection seem really valid, or whether we may still continue to believe what from the first has been believed. Those who maintain the affirmative may again be subdivided into two main schools of thought: those who hold the Virgin Birth to be an essential doctrine—essential, that is, in the sense that if it were finally disproved Christianity would collapse; and those who, accepting the doctrine as credible on the grounds of the available evidence, would still find all their main convictions about Christ unimpaired, even if it had to be surrendered.

The grounds for objection to the doctrine are partly philosophic and partly critical. There are those who would assert on *a priori* grounds that virgin birth *could not*, under any circumstances, take place, and therefore no alleged evidence could prove it. To such thinkers it is evidently useless to proffer the Birth narratives in the Gospels: the evidence is condemned before it is seen. There are others who disclaim any such antecedent prejudice, but who find the New Testament evidence to vanish away under "critical" and "historical" scrutiny. For them the story of the Virgin Birth is a legend—a beautiful and, under the circumstances, an inevitable legend—having no relation to actual objective fact. We shall probably not be far wrong if we assert that with these thinkers, too, the *a priori* conviction has played its part; their investigation whether the Virgin Birth *did* take place has been strongly coloured by their underlying conviction that it *could not* have taken place.

It is well to be aware of this philosophic prejudice because we are constantly told, with a pose of judicial gravity, that continued maintenance of our conviction is due solely to theological prejudice. Professor Gardner, in a recent article on the Virgin Birth, says that he has no wish "to disturb the belief of those

who, like our ancestors, take the Birth narratives as true without troubling themselves about the rules of historic evidence,"¹ assuming, apparently, that if the "rules of historic evidence" be followed, only one result, and that a destructive one, will be reached. His whole article is pervaded by this question-begging assumption. It can only be asserted, in flat opposition, that belief in the Virgin Birth as a historic fact is not confined to theological dogmatists; it is upheld by scholars who, after the strictest appreciation of the "rules of historic evidence," are convinced of its truth.

I can only touch, within the limits of this article, upon one or two outstanding features in the discussion. What is the positive Scriptural evidence for our belief in the Virgin Birth? It is contained in St. Matthew i., ii., and St. Luke i., ii. The remainder of the New Testament has no clear categorical assertion on the subject. The Gospel of St. Mark begins its narrative of our Lord's life with the account of His baptism. The Gospel of St. John gives no account of His birth. The Pauline Epistles, with the possible exception of the phrase, "born of a woman," in Gal. iv. 4, are equally silent, and this interpretation of the phrase in Galatians is, at the best, extremely precarious. It may readily be admitted that in the absence of the Matthean and Lucan Birth narratives, there would have been no word of clear explicit assertion in Scripture about the miraculous character of the Birth of Jesus.

We may even go further and say that the evidence would have pointed in the other direction. The people, astonished at the works of Christ, asked: "Is not this the carpenter's son?"² At Nazareth they said: "Is not this Joseph's son?"³ His mother said to Him: "Thy father and I sought Thee sorrowing."⁴ Within the Birth narrative in the third Gospel the term "parents" is more than once used of Joseph and Mary in relation to Him.⁵ These facts, taken along with the silence of St. Mark, St. John, and St. Paul about the Virgin Birth, seem

¹ *The Modern Churchman*, May, 1914, p. 79.

² Matt. xiii. 55.

³ Luke iv. 22.

⁴ Luke ii. 48.

⁵ Luke ii. 27, 41, 43.

to point to a negative conclusion. And yet we have the two Birth narratives with their explicit testimony. How are we to adjust them ?

A rash and hasty criticism answers that they are incapable of adjustment. The evidence of the main stream of Apostolic tradition both in its assertions and its silences is quite self-consistent. The statement of the Birth narratives drawn from different and mutually discrepant sources represents legendary accretion of no historical value.

Let us recall the main facts about the Birth narratives. Their contents are familiar to every student of the Bible. They appear to come from different sources and to be of independent origin. Possibly the source in each case was a private one. It is generally agreed that the one in St. Matthew presents the events from the point of view of Joseph, while that in St. Luke presents them from the point of view of Mary. The differences in the narratives are well known, but they do not amount to contradictions;¹ they are confined to points of detail, and do not impair the general agreement.

They agree as to the main fact of the Virgin Birth ; they agree in attributing this to the special action of the Holy Spirit ; they agree in the name of the child, the places of His birth and boyhood, His Davidic descent. The genealogies, which are clearly independent, agree in this, that they connect Jesus with David through Joseph, and not through Mary. This combination of agreement as to the main facts with discrepancy as to subsidiary detail is, so far as it goes, in favour of the general trustworthy character of each narrative.

Before continuing this examination of the narratives it may be convenient to speak here of the silence of the other writers. It is quite true that St. Mark does not mention the Virgin Birth, nor does it appear to have had a place in Q. The limits of Q and much else about it are wrapped in such complete obscurity that no adverse conclusion can be drawn from its

¹ "Between these two accounts of Matthew and Luke no contradiction exists."—O. Holtzmann, "Life of Jesus," p. 85.

omissions. With regard to St. Mark, it may be observed that his memoir begins with the public life of Jesus. If it represents—as it not improbably does—the “witness” of St. Peter, bearing testimony to the time when our Lord “went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil,”¹ the events of the infancy and boyhood lie outside its scope. It is also worth observing that, while St. Mark calls Him “Son of God,”² and “Son of Mary,”³ he nowhere calls Him the Son of Joseph. There is here no explicit contradiction of the Virgin Birth.

With regard to St. John, it is generally held that he wrote with the Synoptic narratives before him, and that, where he deemed it necessary, he made additions or corrections. There is every reason to suppose that he would know the facts about our Lord’s birth, and it is difficult to believe that if he had regarded the narratives as inaccurate he would have let them pass without protest. Some, indeed, have held that he *did* protest, and that the Logos doctrine as set forth in the Prologue to his Gospel is his substitute for what he held to be an unspiritual narrative. This is a rather far-fetched hypothesis. It is at least equally credible that the absence of any direct contradiction means tacit agreement, and that his Logos doctrine in the Prologue was meant to lead his readers on to further and deeper truth about the Lord—the truth of His eternal pre-existence with the Father. There is no contradiction between virgin birth and pre-existence. The Johannine doctrine may well be supplementary to the Lucan narrative.

The silence of St. Paul has been variously interpreted. For my own part, I think those scholars are probably right who believe that St. Paul was unacquainted with the fact of the Virgin Birth. It would seem natural that the secret should be jealously guarded during the early days by those who knew it, and that possibly during the whole period in which St. Paul

¹ Acts x. 38.

² Mark i. 1 (with BD. \aleph omits); *cf.*, too, Mark iii. 11; v. 7; xv. 39.

³ Mark vi. 3.

was writing those Epistles of his which we still possess, the knowledge of it had not come to his ears. If this be the true solution, it at any rate shows that St. Paul could hold the lofty views of the significance of Christ's Person which are set forth in Colossians and Ephesians without the Virgin Birth as a necessary factor. He certainly could and did teach, not only the Incarnation, but the Eternal Sonship of Christ without reference to the Virgin Birth. It is well to remark this, when the assertion is made that if the Virgin Birth be rejected the foundation-stone of Christianity is gone. The doctrine is to be accepted, if at all, because the testimony to it is good and reliable. And it is at any rate reasonable to suppose that St. Matthew¹ and St. Luke prefixed the narratives to their respective Gospels, not because they felt them to be psychologically indispensable, but because they held the sources to which they had access to be reliable and true.

The silence, then, of the New Testament, apart from the Birth narratives, does not involve negation of their contents. Let us now return to a further consideration of the narratives themselves.

It is well known that each narrative presents a textual crux of some importance. That in St. Matthew is in i. 16. The generally accepted reading is: "Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus which is called Christ." The Sinaitic Syriac, however, has: "Joseph to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin, begat Jesus, Who is called the Christ;" while the Curetonian Syriac has: "Joseph to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin who bare Jesus Christ." At the first glance the reading of the Sinaitic Syriac seems to deny the superhuman Birth, and it is not surprising that, when it became known, it was variously regarded as heretical, or claimed as the original form of text, according to the sympathies of different critics. I think the reasonable verdict on it is pronounced by Dr. Kenyon (no theological dogmatist) in words which I venture to transcribe:

¹ The term "St. Matthew" is used here, and throughout the paper, to indicate the unknown compiler of the first Gospel, without raising the question of St. Matthew's own contribution to its contents.

“That this text, *if* it denies the Divine Birth, cannot be original, may easily be shown, since the context of the passage proves the writer's knowledge of the Christian story (‘*Mary the Virgin,*’ ‘the Christ,’ ‘when Mary His mother was espoused to Joseph, when they had not come near to one another, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost,’ and the reference to the fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy of the Virgin Birth), and the difference of the reading from that of all other authorities makes it highly improbable that it is the true form of the text. But, in addition, good reason has been shown for the belief that the words used in verse 16 were never intended to deny the Virgin Birth at all, the use of the word ‘begat’ being precisely analogous to its use throughout the genealogy, in which, as is well known, it does not always indicate literal descent, but rather an official line of succession. The variant reading, therefore, though interesting (and possibly coming near to the text of the original document from which St. Matthew's genealogy was derived, and in which our Lord would of course be entered as the Son of Joseph), has no important doctrinal bearings.”¹ Zahn's verdict also is to the same effect: “A writer like Matthew, whose purpose was to silence the calumnies raised against the miraculous Birth of the Messiah, and who knew how to utilize the smallest details of an intractable genealogy to this end, cannot at the same time have accepted in his narrative statements directly contradicting his view of that occurrence. Any text of Matthew's Gospel containing such features would be pre-condemned as one that had been tampered with in a manner contrary to the conception of the author.”²

The point of textual interest in the Lucan narrative is in i. 34, 35. These words are unmistakable in their reference to the Virgin Birth. In fact, it has been said that they are “the

¹ “Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament,” pp. 131, 132.

² As quoted by Nestle, “Textual Criticism of the Greek Testament” (E.T.), p. 249. Cf. the full discussion of the passage in Zahn, “Introduction to the New Testament” (E.T.), vol. ii., pp. 565-567.

only reference to the Virgin Birth in the Third Gospel," and but for their presence the whole narrative in chapter i. could be harmonized with the rest of the New Testament silence. But the verses are there; and they are there as an integral part of the text. There is no hesitation in manuscript authority as to their presence. The most famous editions—TR., R.V., WH., Tischendorf, Nestle—contain them without mark or question. The only remedy, then, for those who find their contents unacceptable is to excise them as an interpolation. This is done by various German scholars on entirely subjective grounds, and their action need not detain us longer. Once the principle is admitted of tampering with the text and permitting the removal of what appear to be incongruous passages, sober scientific criticism is at an end. Our space does not admit of any minute examination of verbal details, but it may fairly be said that the attempts made to disintegrate the Lucan text at this point have been attended by signal failure.¹

In this connection a word may be said on the attitude that is frequently taken up towards the Birth narratives as coming from separate sources. The investigation and the criticism of "sources" has gone to great lengths in recent years, and many interesting hypotheses have been made as to the "sources" of the Synoptist writers and the earlier chapters of Acts. We have already admitted the probability that St. Matthew and St. Luke draw their Birth narratives from distinct, and possibly in each case from private, sources. But in each case the matter so used forms an integral part of the whole Gospel going under the writer's name. The writer in each case incorporated the material contained in his source, and did so, presumably, because he believed it to be of equal worth with all that followed in his Gospel. It may perhaps savour of "theological dogmatism" to lay much stress in this connection on the idea of inspiration, though many will not lightly surrender their conviction that the compilers of the Gospel narratives were

¹ For an exhaustive discussion see the article, "Virgin Birth," by Mr. Box, in the "Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels," vol. ii., p. 806.

Divinely guided and controlled. But in the case of St. Luke we may at least remark that his Birth narrative follows directly on his preface, in which he speaks of his dependence on "eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word," and of his "having traced the course of all things accurately from the first," and that there is no reason to doubt that it is as much founded on fact as any other of the narratives embodied in his Gospel.

In addition to the assertion of the general integrity of the texts as we possess them, it may be further maintained that the Palestinian character and origin of each narrative has been firmly established. The intensely Jewish character of the Matthean narrative is admitted. It is thoroughly accurate with regard both to Jewish feeling and to Jewish law. The perplexity of Joseph and his proposed course of action are indicated not only with fidelity, but with the greatest sobriety, reserve, and delicacy. To find any analogy in this with the narratives of heathen mythology is literally absurd, and a comparison with the later apocryphal narratives, such, for example, as that in the "Protevangelium Jacobi,"¹ makes clear the absolute gulf between the Canonical narrative and all others. In St. Luke's narrative it is very obvious, on linguistic grounds, that he is depending on a Jewish source, and the whole character of the contents strengthens the same conclusion. It is needless to insist on the delicacy and purity of the whole narrative. All the internal evidence points to the probability that it comes from a woman, and that woman may well have been the Virgin herself. The intimate touches of personal detail point strongly in this direction. If it came to St. Luke through the medium of others, they were still most probably women, and Professor Sanday's conjecture that it may have been some of the women mentioned in Luke viii. 3, xxiv. 10, is very likely to be true.

In spite of all the indications that point to origins exclusively Jewish and to intimate knowledge, the hypothesis has been

¹ Available for English readers in T. and T. Clark's "Ante-Nicene Christian Library," in the volume containing "Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, and Revelation."

constantly reaffirmed that the origin of the Birth narratives is to be sought in the influence of Gentile mythology, and that these legendary stories about intercourse between mortals and deities form the true analogue. It is well in this connection to remember the logical rule that the value of the argument from analogy depends, among other things, on the ratio of the ascertained points of resemblance to the ascertained points of difference. When this is borne in mind, the great majority of Greek and other non-Jewish fables can be dismissed. The points of difference utterly outnumber any traces of resemblance. There is "in the Gospel story a pure and beautiful reticence which has nothing in common with Greek or Hindu narrations of birth from a Divine and a human parent—narrations which anyhow do not tell of virgin birth at all, but of gods possessed with human passions. It is, indeed, strictly veracious, as Dr. Orr has proved ('The Virgin Birth of Christ,' chapter vi.), to say that no ethnic parallel to birth from a pure virgin has been found. The contrary is often stated, but at the crucial point the alleged parallel invariably breaks down; and even radical critics are obliged to grant that pagan ideas, if adopted by the Evangelists, were transformed out of all recognition."¹ This verdict is endorsed by the trenchant words of J. Weiss: "The shameless glorifying of sensual desire in these myths could only provoke in the primitive Christian consciousness the deepest abhorrence; every endeavour to refer any such idea to Jesus must have appeared a profanation of what was most holy, by thus dragging it through the mire of sensuality."²

It cannot, then, be said that the attempt to trace the idea of the Virgin Birth to the influence of pagan ideas of the generation of heroes by gods and their birth by women has any serious claim to acceptance. What is to be said of the view that it arose under the influence of Jewish beliefs, and in particular of a pre-Christian Jewish belief that the Messiah would be born of a Virgin? Harnack, for example, would trace the genesis of

¹ Mackintosh, "The Person of Jesus Christ," p. 530.

² Quoted by Knowling, "Our Lord's Virgin Birth," p. 42 f.

the whole matter to Isaiah vii. 14. The purport of that text is too large a subject for discussion here. The probabilities, however, would seem to be that in its original form the text does not refer to distinctively virgin birth at all. This is true of the Hebrew, and it is probably true of the LXX also. There appears to be no evidence of any expectation in purely Jewish circles that the Messiah would be born of a virgin. We know of no evidence that the birth of the Messiah was to be abnormal, and it is seriously open to question whether in Jewish circles the text was regarded as Messianic. The general tendency, too, of the Old Testament was to glorify marriage as compared with virginity rather than the reverse. After an exhaustive examination of this point, Professor Buchanan Grey concludes that "the Christian belief that Jesus was born of a Virgin rests either on fact or on the influence in early Christian circles of Gentile thought."¹ This latter alternative he explicitly excluded from the sphere of his discussion. If, as we have seen, it appears thoroughly untenable, then we are brought back to the view that the belief rested on historic fact. It should further be observed that St. Matthew, in his use of Isaiah vii. 14, does not in any way give the impression that he is deriving the fact from the prophecy. He simply quotes the passage as a Scriptural "proof text" to repel innuendoes against Mary's honour.

The disposition to trace the origin of the Birth narrative to Christian reflection in Old Testament prophecy seems to be gaining ground. The alternative and—as it seems to me—the more probable view is that the Virgin Birth is a historic fact, and that when it was disclosed to the primitive Christian community the tendency was to search for Old Testament texts which could in any way be regarded as prophetic of it. The general use of the Old Testament Scriptures in St. Matthew seems to bear traces of this process—the historic fact followed by the attempt to construe it with the aid of prophecy.

I have tried hitherto to indicate some of the main objections

¹ "The Virgin Birth in Relation to the Interpretation of Isaiah vii. 14," *Expositor*, April, 1911, p. 308.

made from the side of criticism in history. For the philosophic side a word must suffice. Those who regard Nature as a closed system, working always on strictly uniform lines, from which there is no evidence of any variation, are by their view precluded from any acceptance of the Virgin Birth. Miracle in general, and certainly such miracle as this, is frankly inconceivable. But suppose that the world is in some living relationship to God, and that He is therefore perpetually at work in His world creatively; suppose that what He may do in the future is not exclusively dependent on what He has done in His universe previously; that His government of the world is not of a rigid and impersonal cast, and that He has *not* established an immutable course of things—on this view of Him and His relation to the world “we ought perpetually to hope for new, incalculable, and amazing Divine acts.”¹ Belief in the possibility of miracle is, fundamentally, belief that there is a living God. A conception such as this, at any rate, leaves us free to believe that if God were to become incarnate, He might do so in a way “new, incalculable, and amazing.”

This brings us to what may be called the positive aspect of the general argument. We are not concerned to maintain the general possibility of virgin birth; the birth in question is that of Jesus Christ alone. We believe Him, on many grounds, to be an entirely exceptional Person; we believe Him, even apart from the contents of the Birth narratives, to be God incarnate. We believe Him to be a supernatural Person—and, believing this, we are at any rate prepared for the possibility that He may have been supernaturally born. All well-meant arguments about the biological possibility of parthenogenesis are entirely beside the mark; if we accept the Birth narratives at all, we must accept them as the account of the entrance into the mortal sphere of a supernatural Person. To say that without the Virgin Birth the Incarnation and Redemption would have been impossible is rash and unwarrantable. As Professor Mackintosh well says, the case is one more for the application of the

¹ Wendland, “Miracles and Christianity” (E.T.), p. 85.

category of τὸ πρέπον than of τὸ ἀναγκαῖον. On the other hand, we must beware of arguing that because it seemed fitting, *therefore* it did actually happen. Whether it did happen depends on the historical evidence. Two Evangelists have narrated it as historical. Each one believed it himself, and evidently expected that his narrative would carry conviction. And it is not easy to see how either narrative could have originated without historical foundation. To suppose that any early Christian writer could have invented and penned these stories, as we have them, is to postulate a greater miracle than the historical fact itself would be.

Finally, we have to think of it in relation to the other great miracle of the Resurrection. If our Lord's relation to God was a unique one ; if we believe, as we think we may, that His leaving the world had a unique character corresponding to that unique relation ; then it is at any rate harmonious that His entrance into the world should also have been unique.

In the Creed the statement about His Birth follows on the exalted language about His Person : "God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God." And it depends upon it logically. It is of One so described that virgin birth is predicated. And when we take the character of the historical evidence, along with the profound spiritual fitness of such a Birth, we still feel that without reserve or hesitation we can go on to say : "Incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary."

DAWSON WALKER.

[The third article in this series, "Crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate," will appear in the March issue of the CHURCHMAN, and will be contributed by the Rev. J. Kenneth Mozley.]



The German Anti-Christ.

FEW things are at first sight more serious to the good name of Protestantism than this present war. We are assured that it is a proof that Protestant Christianity has failed. Was not Germany (it is asked) the land of Luther, and is not the present State Church of Germany Lutheran still? Yet contrast the manners of the German soldiers (urged on by Imperial orders) with the kindly humanity, and even chivalry, of the French and Belgian priests in the field. It is not only the question of barbarities and brutalities inflicted upon the dying and the dead, but the desecration of churches, culminating in the bombardment of Rheims Cathedral, that show up in lurid light the appalling results (it is said) of Lutheran teaching. Luther, in fact, says a correspondent in the *Church Times*, is the real originator of this anti-Christian war. And Luther, adds another equally profound contributor to the *Nineteenth Century* for December, stole his religion from his barbarian ancestors who worshipped Thor and Odin.

Now, this charge, apparently in all seriousness made, deeply implicates the English Church and nation. Think what it means! With the genius of Germany we are more intimately allied than that of any other country whatever. Our reformed religion—it is our glory, and Archbishop Lawrence in his celebrated “Bampton Lectures” allows that it is the glory of High Churchmen too!—we owe to the manly Christian protest of Martin Luther. Even our religious revival in the eighteenth century, which produced the Oxford Movement and that of Charles Simeon at Cambridge, we date from Wesley, who ultimately owed his complete conversion to Moravian missionaries. Our Prayer-Book was compiled by Cranmer, who owed all improvements (except his own exquisite English) to the German breviary of Hermann of Cologne and to the personal instructions or private correspondence of German professors like Martin Bucer and Philip Melancthon. Nay, our

present King derives his right to the kingdom of England precisely because he traces his descent from the German House of Hanover; while, on the other hand, the present German Emperor is grandson to our late Queen Victoria. Even the foundation of our Colonial Empire we trace to the magnificent co-operation of their Emperor Frederick II. with our Lord Chatham. And at a later date it was the assistance of their Blücher that served to complete the rout of Napoleon at the hands of our Wellington at Waterloo.

And if we trace still deeper the hidden springs of this world-catastrophe we shall find it in the very pre-eminence of these two nations whom the study of the Bible has made great. It was only between them that such a fratricidal strife could have arisen at all, because it is only between them that any manner of competition could have existed. Germany, great and glorious in arms, in arts, in science, has manufactured nearly all the needles, razors, cutlery, toys and leather goods that supply the demand of Europe. It is her very pre-eminence in these industries that has led her to challenge our superiority in the same fields. It is this very sense of rivalry with the leading nation of Europe that has provoked this more than mortal combat.

And to what is this superiority of these two nations due but to Protestantism—in a word, to the rediscovery of the Bible? For, in the phrase of the immortal Chillingworth, “the Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants,” as it was the religion of Augustine, Chrysostom and Jerome. If, therefore, it is to *Protestantism* we must trace this terrible outbreak of devilry, then it is to the open publication and circulation of *the Bible, and the Bible only*, that we owe it. For it is a fundamental article of our Protestant religion that “Holy Scripture containeth *all* things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, *nor may be proved thereby*, is not to be required of any man that it should be received as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation” (Article VI.).

“Nor may be proved thereby.” If these devilries can be

put down to the natural effects of an open Bible, then we willingly assent to their being put down to the necessary results of Protestantism. If, however, these effects are the inevitable issues of Protestantism, they are singularly out of keeping with several others. The whole of Africa, large parts of India, some parts of China and Japan, are becoming Christian. The light of science, which ever follows in the track of Christianity, is slowly withering up the darkness of their long-established superstitions. Gentle manners, the invariable concomitant of the pure and peaceable doctrines of the Gospel, are slowly taking the place of the most inveterate barbarities of ancient custom and superseding the proud and trivial distinctions created by religious and social caste. And all this we can distinctly trace to one source, and one source only—the circulation of the Bible in no less than five hundred of the prevailing languages of the world.

And for this Britain, the head and front of the Protestant interest, is chiefly responsible. This can be easily tested as a mere question of statistics. Last year's record will alone be sufficient to prove our case. In May of 1914, only three months before this diabolical tragedy began, the actual sums received by the Church Missionary Society, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, the Colonial and Continental Society, and the British and Foreign Bible Society, not to mention the Religious Tract Society and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, were the largest ever received in the history of two hundred years. Such is the work of *Protestantism* in the world! It compasses sea and land, not to make proselytes, but to make converts for the future Kingdom of God by circulating among all the nations of the world, in their own respective language, without note or comment and in the best text obtainable according to the latest lights of the most approved critical science, the *Word of God*. If the Catholic party must (as indeed, on their principle of slavery to tradition, they must) object to this, it is our glory and the glory of our common Lord!

And what about Germany? Situated in the centre of a

continent which, along with the rubbish of Catholicism, has long cast off its faith in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity itself, Germany has stood in the forefront of learned apology for the truth of God's Word. We shall mention only a few names which are typical of the rest. When the Higher Criticism first arose under the evil patronage of Father Simon, and was continued under the auspices of the *Dublin Review* (both Catholic authorities), that part of the controversy which called in question the authenticity of the Pentateuch was settled by the monumental erudition of Hengstenberg in his "Moses and the Egyptians," just as the Book of Daniel in like manner received a not less triumphant vindication at the hands of Hävernäck. When, again, the Catholic Möhler published his famous but utterly unhistorical "Symbolik" in the hope of furthering the Catholic cause, it was in 1833 shattered by the genius of Baur, whose own animadversions on the chronology of some of St. Paul's Epistles and one of the Gospels have since been satisfactorily set at rest by the labours of Ewald and the more recent orthodox pronouncements of Harnack. Nor can we leave the subject of the New Testament without referring to the commentaries of Meyer and Delitzsch, the latter of whom translated the New Testament into Hebrew in order to further the conversion of the Jews. And how shall we sufficiently thank the Providence that gave us David Mendel, whom Lord Acton allowed to be the most learned mind in Europe, and who, on his conversion from the Jewish to the Christian faith, not only routed the infidel positions of Strauss in his invaluable "Life of Christ," but gave us (under the name of Neander) those histories of the Christian Church of the first twelve centuries in a work that will outlast in value the work of all his predecessors since Eusebius?

Let Popery rival this bead-roll of spiritual or material blessings! Turn to any country in which that pernicious curse has been allowed free access! Take Italy, France, Spain, Portugal, South America, Ireland, up to the year 1870, and atheism itself would have proved almost a more beneficent ally

than this degrading superstition. But since 1870, when the Papacy lost its temporal power, what a change has come over those countries! ITALY before 1870 possessed hardly patriotism. Since 1870 she has shown herself a united people with a flourishing trade, clean and well-laid and well-lighted streets, and all the natural results of an independent national life. FRANCE before 1870 was almost in worse case. A sweating system was maintained in French convents; the spirit of espionage and intrigue pervaded her politics; above all, her army and her Generals were educated under Jesuit auspices, whose treason lost her Alsace and Lorraine in 1870, and exposed her to the grinning contempt of Europe in the Dreyfus affair of our own day. But now we see a new France! Her victorious General, Joffre, is reviving the old glories of the Field-Mmarshals of the past. Convents have been pulled down. The last Jesuit left French soil in 1902. The Huguenots are once more free. And a spiritual as well as moral revival is already perceived by thoughtful men, who are themselves Catholics of a better kind, such as Mr. W. S. Lilly and the Abbé Dimnet. SPAIN, since her King's marriage with a Protestant Princess, has opened her doors to a more tolerant régime that invites the co-operation of the Protestant Bishop Cabrera. PORTUGAL, after chasing every monk and Jesuit from her shores, has now joined forces with England in the present crisis. Even SOUTH AMERICA has welcomed the methods and manners of Protestant schools; and Ireland till now has grown more contented with her lot.

It is curious to trace the diabolical hypocrisy of the Court of Rome in fomenting for no less than forty years this very war. It was the loss of the temporal power in 1870 that first drove her to such an appalling act of revenge. Cardinal Manning, himself a claimant for the Triple Crown, only four years later hinted the plan of crushing the two great Protestant countries of Europe by a war of mutual exhaustion, from which the Popedom would take occasion to benefit by rising upon the ruins. These are his very words :

“ There is only one solution of the difficulty [viz., the loss of temporal power]—*a solution, I fear, impending—*

and that is the terrible scourge of a Continental war, a war which will exceed the horrors of any of the wars of the First Empire. And it is my firm conviction that the Vicar of Jesus Christ will be put again in his rightful place. But that day will not be until *his adversaries will have crushed each other with mutual destruction*" (*Tablet*, January 24, 1874).

He repeated this afterwards to the late Mr. Hugh Price Hughes. He was ready, he told him, to *deluge Europe in blood to recover the temporal power and to destroy the unity of Italy*, who had lost for the Pope his temporal crown (*Methodist Times*, August 6, 1896). It was first proposed, by way of revenge, to destroy England. The reason was not far to seek :

"England [Manning explained] is the head of Protestantism, the centre of its movements and the stronghold of its power. . . . Conquered in England, it is conquered throughout the world" (Sermon before Dr. Wiseman, August 6, 1859).

How could Protestantism in England be overcome? Only by stirring up *race-hatred* and fanning the flames of war. It is curious with what subtlety the Roman Curia went to work :

1. Having lost Italy as ally and been repelled by France, they sought for an antagonist of France that would ultimately become the antagonist of England. This Power was obviously Germany. *Revanche* had burned in the breast of every Frenchman since the days of Sedan. The Papacy proceeded at once to work upon the unsuspecting patriotism of the Germans. Germany wanted a fleet, but could not get the Reichstag to pass the burdensome super-taxes for maintaining the fleet. This was accomplished by the Jesuit vote, which commanded the Conservative interest in the Centre. In return for this the German Emperor, after paying a complimentary visit to the Pope, relaxed the stringent laws of his country against the Jesuits, and in his honour a German (Francis Xavier Wernz) was chosen for the new Jesuit General. If, then, Germany has fallen from the Faith, she has for this the Pope's full sanction!

2. The Boer War first showed up the designs of the Vatican.

It is now well known that the plans of campaign, both for the fortification of Pretoria and for the occupation of the Transvaal, were all drawn up in Berlin, who furnished them with £200,000 of guns from Krupp and promised troops that should land in Delagoa Bay. *These assistances had from the first the hearty approval of the Vatican.* "Since the outbreak of the war," wrote *The Times* correspondent, "the Vatican Press . . . has given numerous proofs of bitter animosity towards England. . . ."

"The underlying idea seems to be the expectation that a Franco-Russian-German alliance, by intervening in favour of the Boers, will shatter the prestige of England, now and ever held to be the chief prop and mainstay of Protestantism, and, by depriving Italy of British support, facilitate the restoration of the temporal power" (*The Times*, November 9, 1899).

The correspondent then goes on to remind his readers that the official organ of the Vatican, the *Osservatore Romano*, regarded the destruction of the temporal power as "ordained in the interests of England and Anglicanism." It actually "put the question whether this Anglo-Boer war was not Providential, and whether Protestantism might not be ruined by it?" He then warns *The Times* that in view of this the other Jesuit organ, *Voce della Veritas*, darkly hinted at "impending events of grave import," which would involve "the forthcoming humiliation of England." This may throw some light on some words let fall by the late Pope shortly after :

"Wait! [he said to his interviewer]. I myself choose to wait. When we are able to ascertain the exact plans of our adversaries we will in turn disclose ours. *We are ready.* They would have the humble Vicar of the Lord Jesus Christ abstain from waiting before uttering the irrevocable words which he will have to utter. It will all be done little by little. But I promise you it shall be done" (*Daily Express*: "Interview with the Pope," February 21, 1906).

This is the one Saint whom the Roman Church has put on her throne of late years, and boasts she will not trust herself with another!

3. Let us now turn to Ireland. In 1847 the present scheme of Home Rule was planned by a Jesuit, and afterwards approved by his Father Provincial as a useful lever for increasing the power of the priesthood over that of the people (*Tablet*, June 11, 1873). The *Tablet* itself admitted the fact that it was the Irish politicians who represented the Church rather than the laity. Is it wonderful, therefore, now to read that the outbreak of the war has led to an outbreak of sedition; that Mr. Redmond cannot prevail on his countrymen to enlist because they *will not* fight for England, but only for the Catholics of Ireland; and that they *cannot* fight against the Germans, for they would thus be fighting against the Pope?

When St. John foretold the coming of Anti-Christ as "the False Prophet" that would give religious sanction to the Abomination of Desolation wrought by the "Beast," what were these but symbols of a *world-power*, like that of ancient Rome, that should be abetted by a corrupt *Church*? Were Irenæus and Hippolytus wrong in conjecturing that Power to be "Latin"? Were Jerome and Cyprian wrong in hinting that that Church would be a corruption of *Christianity*? Was Newman wrong in fixing the birth of this twin-portent at the opening of the fifth century? If not, we shall not be wrong in dating this ominous conjunction of the *medieval* Houses of Hohenzollern and Hapsburg with the *Papal* monarchy as the last expiring effort of Feudalism and Catholicism before the coming of the end. Infidelity and Popery were always allies, and are seen to be allies still.

If we wish to trace the fearful effects which have attended the growth of the modern German Empire, we can hardly do better than take Treitschke's "Life of Frederick the Great" as our guide. That brilliant author, whose book has become a textbook in Germany, points out with wonted candour that in those early days the Germans were not looked on as part of the "Teutonic" order of nations, and that, consequently, Lessing sometimes spoke of the Prussians as "foreigners"—which, indeed, they were, belonging in part (by descent) to the

great *Russian* family of Slavs, from which they took their name. Frederick came to the throne an infidel at heart, and by tradition an ardent Protestant in politics; but he saw in the Catholic Powers of Austria and France two such terrible and ruthless enemies that in order to free Germany he descended to fight them with their own weapons. "If we act as Christians," he exclaimed, "we are undone." "The Vatican saw with anxiety," proceeds Treitschke, "how the hated home of heresy received its liberty again. Only through the intervention of Rome was it achieved that those old enemies, the two great Catholic Powers, Austria and France, united in contest against Prussia. Its aim was to perpetuate the impotence of Germany."

Frederick replied by putting into effect two methods which politically saved Germany, but only to ruin her *morale*. He "Prussianized" Germany by uniting her loose confederation of provinces under a military dictatorship. This, says Treitschke, was no easy matter to have accomplished: the Germans were till then an "inoffensive, kindly, modest" people, and "it needed a long time to overcome their aversion to the Frederician régime." Secondly, Frederick abandoned for himself "the religion of Luther and Calvin," and admitted, as a counterpoise to the Catholic influence abroad, the Jesuits, who stamped their methods upon the infidel temper of Prussian diplomacy. Thus the old feudal system of medieval Europe was revived again, and Frederick, by appealing to a superstitious presentiment of the Hohenzollerns that their House was destined one day to bear the sword of the Holy Roman Empire, created the necessary *élan* in the spirit of his people. Modern Germany is but Bismarck's resurrection of Frederick's feudal monarchy with its worship of intellectual cunning and material might.

It is well known that, in pursuance of the old policy of Leo XIII. and his Secretary, Cardinal Rampolla, the present Pope is in full political sympathy with Germany and Austria; hence his easy acquiescence in the horrors of the Belgian invasion; hence his perplexity in dealing with the German arrest of the Belgian Cardinal, Mercier. *Αιλιον, *Αιλιον, τὸ δ' εὖ νικάτω!

Patriotism and Piety.

PATRIOTISM and Piety are frequent companions. When they work together hand in glove their might is irresistible. Recently the earthly remains of the late lamented Field-Marshal Earl Roberts were laid to rest in St. Paul's Cathedral, close to those of Lord Nelson and the Duke of Wellington. These three national heroes have shown how akin is the spirit of dutiful surrender to the Divine Will to that of self-denial for a country's well-being, and how the power of victory is obtained by sacrifice.

The courage of Nelson was admirably displayed in the Battle of Copenhagen. When a shot injured his own vessel and endangered his life, he remarked, to another officer: "This is warm work; and this day may be the last to any of us in a moment; but, mark me, I would not be elsewhere for thousands." The secret of this boldness must be sought in that prayerfulness which he had learned as a boy in a rectory home, which he never forgot throughout life, and which shone most brightly in his latter days. Five weeks before Trafalgar he wrote in his diary: "I drive from dear, dear Merton, where I left all I hold dear in this world to go to serve my King and country. May the great God whom I adore enable me to fulfil the expectations of my country; and if it is His good pleasure that I should return, my thanks will never cease being offered up to the throne of His mercy. If it is His good Providence to cut short my days on earth, I bow with the greatest submission, relying that He will protect those so dear to me whom I leave behind. His will be done." A few hours before the great engagement, so triumphant for the British Navy, but purchased at the cost of the gallant Admiral's life, he wrote in his cabin: "May the great God Whom I worship grant to my country and for the benefit of Europe in general, a great and glorious victory; and may humanity after victory be the predominant feature in the British fleet! for myself individually I commit my

life to Him that made me, and may His blessing alight on my endeavours for serving my country faithfully. To Him I resign myself and the just cause which is entrusted me to defend." The life was not without blemish ; but the real man was a giant in strategy and courage, and withal a humble believer in God.

Wellington's arduous campaigns in India, during the Peninsular War, and at Waterloo, are full of incidents of rare courage and skill. But his succour in defeat, his patience in misfortune, his strength in victory, were due to the inspiration which he found in that Bible which, however much as a good soldier he reduced his personal baggage, he never failed to take with him. The abilities of Earl Roberts entitle him to the distinction, alone with our own first Duke of Marlborough and the Russian Suwaroff, of all the world's great commanders, of never having experienced defeat. But the man is best made known to us in a letter written but a fortnight before his decease, and quoted in the House of Lords by Earl Curzon in a well-merited eulogium, in which he advocated the use of family prayers in every English home, as a result of fifty-five years' experience of their value in his own.

The struggles of the nations afford many illustrations of the superintendence and control of all mundane affairs by the Lord of Hosts, the God of Battles. In 1870 the French decision to make war on Prussia was reached on July 15. Two days later the declaration was signed, and on the 19th delivered at Berlin. Immediately Prussia prepared with prayer and humiliation. At a week's notice the whole country observed July 27 as a day of special supplication before the throne of Heaven. Then Bismarck could keep the plighted word to respect and guarantee the neutrality of Belgium. Lust and rapine were not prominent in the German forces. Within little more than a month, after victories at Weisemberg and Geisburg, and after the bombardment of Strasburg, came the capitulation of Sedan, the march on Paris, and the siege of the French capital. The sympathies of the civilized world were inclined to a country needlessly attacked. Prayer was answered in the complete, and

almost immediate, subjugation of her foe. But the merciless severity in the offered terms of peace, the enormous indemnity demanded, and the blatant arrogance of the conquering forces, soon commenced an alienation of friendship with other peoples. What little thanksgiving ensued was drowned in the multitudinous voices of pride, conceit, and boastfulness. Ingratitude to God, the Giver of victory, opened the way for a dissemination of the preposterous teaching of Nietzsche, Treitschke, and Bernhardi. After four-and-forty years, with an immeasurable self-confidence, Germany is prepared to open war with many nations at once, to shamelessly violate the honour of her word to Belgium, to wage her conflict with an unblushing lack of veracity, and to permit in her ranks acts of cruelty and loathsomeness which have horrified the world. Forgetfulness of God is accompanied by a decay of character which must meet with a just retribution.

Several chapters of our own national history enforce similar conclusions. On the day of the great victory off the mouth of the Nile—August 2, 1798—Nelson gave to his fleet this Order :

Almighty God having blessed His Majesty's arms with victory, the Admiral intends returning public thanksgiving for the same at two o'clock this day, and he recommends every ship doing the same as soon as convenient.

Sir James de Saumarez was the first to respond, giving the signal for his ship's company to assemble at prayer. It was observed that the vessel under command of this remarkable officer was almost the only one in the whole fleet which had not been disturbed by the serious mutiny of the preceding year ; and that his French prisoners, accustomed to the infidelity of the Revolution, were unmistakably impressed by the sight of a crew returning thanks to God before the decks had been cleansed after the sanguinary encounter, or the dead had been interred.

The example spread. Much time was needed in those days before detailed accounts could reach this country. But on November 29 the whole land diligently observed the day of thanksgiving which had been officially appointed. From the "Notes of the Eclectic Society" it appears that the Evangelical clergy—probably others as well—were most careful in their sermons on the occasion to give glory to God, and to avoid the temptations to indulge in a panegyric of national pride or the sophisms of a vindictive triumph. The heart of the people was stirred, and such was the spiritual emotion engendered that the opportunity was afforded for the inauguration of large movements of lasting importance.

To the indifferent it will appear as a curious coincidence, to the faithful as the wise ordering of a Heavenly Father, that practical advantage could now be taken of a religious revival to secure the first accomplishment of designs which had been frequently discussed in the inner councils of the more earnest. The era of foreign missions commenced. The C.M.S. was founded in 1799, the R.T.S. in the same year, the Bible Society in 1804, the London Jews Society in 1809. The movements thus set on foot have steadily augmented in value to this day, and the old principle has been reasserted that "unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance." The recognition of the hand of the Almighty in mercies received prepares the way for still greater mercies to follow. A thankful nation is a privileged one.

But in order that the accusations of Satan against the patriarch Job may be constantly refuted, a receptive faith is ever exposed to most searching tests. The time of trial was not long delayed. The dawn of the nineteenth century found England under heavy clouds. Pitt's resignation at that time was a political convulsion of the greatest moment. The country was then dependent for its food upon home-grown supplies, but a small harvest in 1799, and a total failure in 1800, had caused a sharp rise in prices, with a consequent reduction of the populace to severe poverty and destitution. The King's

health was critical in the first appearance of that mental affliction which obscured the later years of his reign. The foreign outlook threatened immediate calamity. Italy and Spain had been subdued by the armies of Napoleon ; Austria had retired defeated from the great European struggle ; Russia, Sweden, Denmark, and Holland, had sought their own interests by entering into alliances with France ; England stood alone. The ambitions of the French Emperor began to prepare an invasion of our shores. Early in the year a day of national humiliation and prayer was appointed. The answers to the petitions of a united people were both abundant and indubitable. By the summer the King had recovered ; a plentiful harvest removed the distress and fears of all ; a series of victories by land and by sea broke the armed forces of France. Preliminaries of peace were signed in October, and a treaty concluded at Amiens on March 27, 1802.

The absence of reference in several of our usual sources of information leads to the conclusion that no proportionate thanksgiving arose to the praise and glory of God. Again the national troubles fell thickly, and were prolonged for several years. Days of special intercession were appointed in 1803, and annually from 1806 to 1812. The chastisement of ingratitude had to be borne. At length Napoleon was utterly beaten. He fled to Elba. Peace was restored. On July 7, 1814, a day of thanksgiving was reverently and heartily observed throughout the country. As though He would show His gracious acceptance of this sacrifice of praise, God permitted the old difficulties to return awhile in 1815 ; but He limited the outbreak to a period of but little more than three months from Napoleon's return, to the crowning victory of Waterloo, and the lifelong restriction of the liberty of that crafty tyrant and warrior. The long history of the Napoleonic wars should convince the most sceptical both of the value of prayer and of the duty of responsive thanksgiving. These spiritual weapons overthrew a vast world-power which had been erected upon the

offensive infidelity of Voltaire and the blasphemous atheism and immorality of the French Revolution.

In truth, the combination of prayer with patriotism often imperilled the forces of Napoleon. By the Peace of Vienna in 1809 Austria ceded the Tyrol, but the peasantry determined to resist. After some days occupied in prayer, their undisciplined and inexperienced bands encountered the French at the bridge of Laditch. At a critical moment in the conflict a crushing avalanche of enormous stones came rattling down the mountain-side, and wrought such devastation that the battle ceased. The bridge which separated the combatants caught fire, and the French retired. Encouraged by this success, the Tyrolese, with further prayer, five times defeated the armies of a country which in all Europe appeared irresistible. Yielding at length to vastly superior numbers, they accepted the terms of a generous accommodation. Their restoration to Austria was later among the firstfruits of the decline of Napoleon's power. Similarly, during the terrible Russian campaign of 1812, the night before the Battle of Borodino the prayers of the Russian troops were audible to, and greeted with derision by, the French soldiers. But when on the following day the Russians held firm, and afterwards only withdrew in accordance with the strategy of their commander, the French were allured to their destruction in the emptiness of devastated Moscow and the indescribable horrors of their own precipitate retreat.

Reflections upon such incidents obtain confirmation from more recent episodes. For many years after 1820 Christian missions in the Turkish Empire were subjected by the Government to various privations and persecutions. The revolt of the Greeks, the Battle of Navarino, and their final independence, produced no softening effects upon the heart of the Sultan. The Russian occupation of Adrianople, the defeat of the army by the Egyptians, and the surrender of the fleet to Mohammed Ali, only hardened him the more. The position became well-nigh intolerable, so that the American Board arranged the observance of New Year's Day, 1840, as an epoch of united

prayer throughout their stations for the removal of their disabilities. Shortly afterwards a new Sultan conceded the liberty and guaranteed the property of every person without restriction of creed. In 1843 the English, French, and Russian Ambassadors obtained a decree for the cessation of all religious intolerance, and similar pledges have since been given from time to time. Turkish perfidy has frequently violated the plighted word and covered the nation with dishonour, but, nevertheless, since 1840 the conditions of Christian work have vastly improved.

The Crimean War broke out in March, 1854. April 24 was appointed in this country as a day of humiliation and prayer. Before our army could reach the sphere of military operations the Russians had been heavily repulsed by the Turks, and the object of the war secured. But pride and militarism induced our statesmen to refuse discussions of peace, and to continue the campaign. The horrors of Sebastopol and Balaclava ensued, but when in the following year the discomfiture of Russia had been so far completed that the prospect of permanent gains, to the satisfaction of Eastern Europe, was imminent, peace was signed on no better terms than could have been earlier obtained. Prayer was answered; but the benefit was lost by haughty and arrogant demands, and punishment came in the temporary withdrawal of spiritual privileges, so that the attitude of Russia was permitted to close for twenty years the mission to the Jews in Warsaw and the district around.

Another day of humiliation and prayer was appointed in this land on October 9, 1857, in consequence of the Indian Mutiny. The speed with which the most gracious answer was vouchsafed may be realized by the eloquent comment contained in the first words of the Recent Intelligence, published in the *C. M. Intelligencer* for the month of November: "It is with devout acknowledgment to the mercy of Almighty God that we issue our Indian Intelligence this month. It will be found to contain the particulars of losses already recorded in general terms; but there is no more of massacre; there are no fresh instances of the destruction of property."

We turn to quite a different source for a last illustration. Since the Reformation English Churchmen have been taught to pray in the Litany that God would "bless and preserve to our use the kindly fruits of the earth, so as in due time we may enjoy them." The obligation of gratitude is recognized by the use of Psalm lxxvii. as a Canticle at Evening Prayer. "Let the people praise Thee, O God : yea, let all the people praise Thee. THEN shall the earth bring forth her increase : and God, even our own God, shall give us His blessing." But of definite thanksgiving for ingathered harvests the Prayer-Book contains no trace. The religious and civil wars of the seventeenth century, the inertia of the eighteenth, and the distaste of spiritual fervour in the first decades of the nineteenth, produced many separations from the National Church which are now regretted, but cannot be remedied. The historic Church could provide no home for the best and deepest spiritual movements. But her rapid extension the wide world over, and the returning affection of the people at home since the Harvest Festival spontaneously sprang up to replace the orgies of the old harvest-home, and particularly since Convocation in 1870 approved a form of service for use on the occasion of these thanksgivings, give further demonstration of the inseparable bond of prayer and thanksgiving for all who would receive and maintain the blessings of God.

Patriotic ardour is never diminished by piety, but in all directions it is seen to be still true that "righteousness exalteth a nation."

E. ABBEY TINDALL.



Studies in Pauline Eschatology.

II.

ST. PAUL'S DOCTRINE OF THE SECOND ADVENT.

THE other section of Pauline eschatology which it is proposed now to consider is St. Paul's teaching with reference to the time of the Second Advent.

It is now quite customary to regard our Lord and His Apostles as having committed themselves to teaching concerning the nearness of the Second Advent which the course of history has definitely falsified.

With regard to our Lord's teaching, I assert with the utmost confidence that on no occasion did He ever say or imply that His Second Advent would take place soon after His departure. On the contrary, He taught the very opposite of this—viz., that it would be only after an almost incredibly long delay that He would at length return. The teaching by parables is acknowledged to be the form of teaching that is least liable to error in transmission; and it is in two of His most striking parables—viz., the Ten Virgins and the Talents—that He has embodied this particular lesson.

But it is with St. Paul's teaching only that we now have to do, and to this we turn.

We may group the possible references to the nearness of the Second Advent into two classes: First, what may be called the "we" passages—*i.e.*, those in which the writer apparently unites himself and his readers with those who will be alive at Christ's return; and, secondly, a number of passages in various Epistles which have been understood to convey the idea that the Second Advent was very soon to be expected.

The former group need not detain us long. It consists of such statements as 1 Thess. iv. 15, "We that are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord, shall in no wise precede them that are fallen asleep"; 1 Cor. xv. 51, "We shall not all

sleep"; Phil. iii. 20, 21, "We wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, Who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of His glory"—this last passage apparently suggesting that St. Paul and the Philippians would be amongst those who should be alive at Christ's return, and should experience that instantaneous translation from the earthly into the heavenly body which is referred to in 1 Cor. xv. 51-54.

The argument, however, from all such passages as these, is conclusively met by the fact that the same writer, in a precisely similar form of speech, apparently unites himself and his readers *with those who will have died before the Lord's return*. The passage is 2 Cor. iv. 14: "Knowing that He which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also with Jesus, and shall present us with you." The explanation in each case is that the writer is using the pronoun in an indefinite sense, as happens continually in the case of all preachers and writers.

The passages contained in the second group require individual and very careful examination; for it is only by a scrupulously exact exegesis of each passage in its own full context that the Apostle's meaning can be ascertained. Let us take them in their chronological order.

1. First, then, let us consider that remarkable and, at first sight, most perplexing utterance which occurs in 1 Cor. vii. 29-31: "But this I say, brethren, the time is shortened, that henceforth both those that have wives may be as though they had none; and those that weep, as though they wept not; and those that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not; and those that buy, as though they possessed not; and those that use the world, as not using it to the full: for the fashion of this world passeth away."

The superficial interpretation of this passage is that St. Paul regarded the return of the Lord Jesus as being so near that practically nothing mattered—neither marriage nor celibacy, neither sorrow nor joy, neither business nor wealth. But when we penetrate a little below the surface this interpretation appears

by no means so obvious. If we allow the word *ἵνα* to retain its natural force, the Apostle is, on this interpretation of the passage, committed to the assertion that the time remaining until the return of Christ has been cut short (*συνεσταλμένος*) by God, in order that the married may be as though unmarried, the sad as though they were not sorrowful, and so on. In other words, that the advent of Christ was to be hurried forward in order that all the affairs and relations of life might in the interval be more or less dislocated! So that when his words, in this interpretation of them, are thus put quite plainly, St. Paul appears to be writing sheer nonsense. And even if we understand *ἵνα* to denote consequence instead of cause, the question still arises: Why should the shortening of the interval preceding the Second Advent result in the lessening of the value of all human emotions and relationships? Would not joy, at all events, be enhanced for the believer, instead of being as though it were not? Such an attitude as this, in view of the possible nearness of the Lord's return, would be wholly contrary to the teaching of Christ. His ideal is that every servant should be at his post, doing faithfully and fully his appointed business. It is difficult to imagine either that St. Paul was ignorant of this teaching of our Lord's, or that, being aware of it, he would put before his converts so entirely contrary an ideal of duty and of life.

Again, there is nothing in the context to show that *ὁ καιρός* must necessarily mean the interval preceding the Second Advent. It is not the nearness of the Advent, nor indeed the Advent at all, about which the Apostle is concerned in this section of his Epistle, but the relations between the sexes in the Corinthian Church, and their social duties in general. We find him accordingly giving the most detailed instruction and advice with regard to the relations of the sexes (vi. 12—vii. 40), and it is in this immediate connection that the words under our consideration occur. He tells his readers that under the distressing circumstances then present it is a good thing for a man to abide as he is. If he is married, let him not attempt to realize a purer ideal of life by living apart from his wife; and if, being un-

married, he is able to be continent, let him remain unmarried. The Apostle then gives a very broad hint that under existing circumstances in Corinth those who sought marriage were looking for trouble. In giving his permission, however, to marry he lays before the Corinthian Christians a new fact—new, that is, for them since they had become Christians—which ought to have a very important bearing upon the marriage relationship, as indeed upon all the conditions and circumstances of their life. This new fact is that from henceforth—*i.e.*, from the time of their accepting Christ—*every occasion of life has for them been limited* (ὁ καιρὸς συνεσταλμένος ἐστὶν τὸ λοιπόν). Nothing in their life is for the future to monopolize their attention as formerly it may have done. A fresh element has come into their life, demanding a share, and that the predominant share, in all their interests under all conceivable circumstances: this fresh element is their allegiance to Christ, and His personal interest in them. Is a man married? his marriage is not to fill for him his whole horizon, however precious it may be to him. Even this occasion has been limited; another interest must share with it his care and attention. Christ and Christ's interests have to be considered, just as though the man had never married; even in his new-found bliss the bridegroom cannot live to himself, for he is the Lord's.¹ And this new element, invading every condition and relationship of life, will have the effect of giving balance and steadfastness to character, and will tend to make the Christian superior to the accidents of life. Weeping will lose its sense of desolation, and even joy will not prevail to sweep away on its flood tide the whole man. Wealth will not mean what once it stood for; and he who uses the world will not seek to drain to the dregs the cup that it offers, for, having in Christ something that abides, he will value only at its true worth the passing fashion of this world.

The explanations which follow in verses 32 to 40 entirely bear out this interpretation. The Apostle is all through intent on safeguarding the Lord's interests in His people: the key-

¹ Compare verses 32 and 33.

note throughout is the *μόνον ἐν κυρίῳ* of verse 39—"only in the Lord." The idea of the Second Advent comes in nowhere at all.

The expression of the universal Christian hope and expectation in the "Maran atha," *Our Lord cometh*, of 1 Cor. xvi. 22, need not detain us here.

We turn next to the Epistle to the Romans in order to deal with the only two passages in that Epistle which by any stretch of imagination can be considered to refer to the near approach of the Second Advent, viz., xiii. 11-14 and xvi. 20. We shall first deal with the latter of these passages, because it can very easily be explained. The words are: "And the God of Peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly." It is just conceivable that this statement may be regarded as referring to the same event as the words of 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25: "Then cometh the end . . . for He must reign till He hath put all His enemies under His feet." The inference in that case would be that as the Apostle in Rom. xvi. 20 declares that the subjection of the arch-enemy is shortly about to take place, he must be considered as asserting the speedy arrival of "the end" referred to in 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25. But a very brief examination of the former passage shows that the subject with which St. Paul is dealing has nothing to do with the Second Advent. He is here discussing the divisions and occasions of stumbling (verse 17) which were being caused in the Roman Church by certain adversaries of the truth; and while praising the obedience of his readers and giving them helpful counsel, he cheers them with the assurance that the God of Peace will shortly bruise under their feet the great adversary of whom these disturbers of their peace were but the human agents. In other words, they should soon triumph over all that was creating strife and disorder in their midst.

The other passage, Rom. xiii. 11 to 12, is as follows: "And this, knowing the season, that now it is high time for you to awake out of sleep; for now is salvation nearer to us than when we first believed. The night is far spent and the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us

put on the armour of light. Let us walk decently as in the day."

These words are generally understood as asserting the Apostle's conviction that the Second Advent was very near. The *σωτηρία* (*salvation*) of verse 11 is regarded as equivalent to the *ἀπολύτρωσις* of St. Luke xxi. 28 (your *redemption* draweth nigh). "The night" is interpreted to mean "the lifetime of the world—the power of darkness," a similar expression being "the world-rulers of this darkness" in Ephes. vi. 12. "The day" is the day of resurrection and of judgment; and so on.

Now, if the crucial words employed in this passage were at all capable of bearing, in this context, the meaning which has been put upon them, then we should indeed have here a clear and decisive instance to show that St. Paul not only believed, but also definitely taught the doctrine of the speedy return of Christ. When, however, we study the passage as a whole, the Apostle's meaning is seen to be something entirely different from what has been suggested above. The clue to the true interpretation of the passage is found in the *ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ* (*as in the day*) of verse 13. It must be evident to even a casual reader that "the day" of verse 13 must refer to the same thing as "the day" of verse 12. But when the Apostle writes, "Let us walk decently, as in the day, not in revelling and drunkenness . . .," he is clearly referring to the time now present, and not to the time of the Second Advent. He is giving the Roman Christians directions for their life in this world, not for their behaviour in the world to come. Let us try, therefore, to get a connected idea of the whole passage in the light of this fact. St. Paul is exhorting his readers to awake out of their sleep; to be up and doing. Their salvation, he tells them, is nearer to them—a more real and personal thing to them—than when they first believed: they are more intimate with it; they realize more fully its privileges, its obligations; and this very realization ought to be to them an incentive to be more keenly alive to their opportunities, and to throw off all their drowsiness of spiritual indifference. Thus understood, the words constitute a

real and cogent argument and appeal ; but if we take the word "salvation" to mean the Second Advent, we commit St. Paul to the incredible stupidity of solemnly informing the Christians of Rome that the Second Advent is nearer to-day than it was a year or two ago!

To return, however, to the Apostle's argument, he is in truth sounding a bugle-call to the Church at the dawn of their day of Gospel light and Gospel privilege and Gospel opportunity. He cries to them to awake, for the long night of their ignorance and unbelief and moral darkness is well-nigh departed, and Christ, the Light of the world, has dawned upon them. "The day is at hand," the morning is come, the true light is already shining : garments of the night, works of darkness, are now indecent in this daylight ; let us therefore cast them off ; let us clothe ourselves with armour that can bear the light of day : *ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εὐσχημόνως περιπατήσωμεν*—"as men who are in the daylight let us walk becomingly" ; not in revelling and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and jealousy ; but clothed in the Lord Jesus Christ Himself ; exhibiting Him to all beholders in our daily walk and conversation, and refusing to make provision for the flesh so as to gratify its lusts. Having thus stirred the hearts of his readers by this rousing call, St. Paul proceeds, in the remainder of the Epistle, to show in fuller detail what is involved in that putting on of the Lord Jesus Christ which alone can enable us to walk becomingly as in the day.

The passage thus interpreted is in closest accord with that section of the Epistle to the Ephesians in which the subject that is being discussed is practically the same. Consider, for example, the following sentences : "For ye were once darkness, but are now light in the Lord : walk as children of light . . . and have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather even reprove them ; for the things which are done by them in secret it is a shame even to speak of" (Ephes. v. 8-12). "Wherefore he saith, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall shine upon thee"

(Ephes. v. 14). "Look therefore carefully how ye walk ; not as unwise, but as wise, buying up the opportunity because the days are evil. . . . And be not drunken with wine, wherein is riot, but be filled with the Spirit" (Ephes. v. 15-18).

The exceedingly close correspondence of subject-matter, context, idea, and expression between these passages in the two Epistles must convince even a reluctant student that St. Paul is not referring at all to the Second Advent in the passage from the Epistle to the Romans, but that the day which is at hand in the case of the awakened Christians at Rome is identical with the shining of Christ upon them in the case of the awakened Ephesians ; and that the works of darkness, indecent in the daylight that had dawned upon the Romans, were just those very things which used to be familiar to the Ephesians when they were once darkness, but which it was shameful even to mention now that they were light in the Lord.

There is no other passage in the Epistle to the Romans which refers, even indirectly, to the date of the Second Advent. We thus arrive at a result which, when it is bluntly stated, must surely afford food for reflection to those who so incessantly and confidently assure us that Christ Himself and the whole of the Apostolic Church were practically obsessed with the conviction of His speedy return—viz., that in this great treatise, the Epistle to the Romans, in which St. Paul leaves hardly anything unnoticed that can be regarded by his readers as important, the nearness of the return of Christ is never once so much as mentioned.

There only remains for consideration one sentence which occurs in Phil. iv. 5 : "The Lord is at hand."

Here, again, the context makes the meaning plain, and shows convincingly that there is no reference whatever to the Second Advent of Christ. The whole passage is as follows : "Rejoice in the Lord always : again I will say, Rejoice. Let your forbearance be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand. In nothing be anxious ; but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made

known unto God. And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall guard your hearts and your thoughts in Christ Jesus."

Here we have an exhortation to rejoice, followed by an encouragement to prayer as a remedy for all anxiety; and standing between the two, looking as it were both ways, is the assurance, "The Lord is at hand," or, more exactly, "The Lord is *near*" (ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς). Now, we may well ask, What sort of help could it afford to a man who was bringing his troubles to God in prayer if he were informed that the Second Advent was soon going to take place? What sense would there be in this statement under such circumstances? But when we understand ἐγγύς to mean nearness *in place*, so that the Apostle's encouraging assurance reads, "The Lord is with you, close by you," at once we see the force and fitness of his words. We recall the Saviour's own encouragement to prayer: "Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them." And the very words that the Apostle uses seem to come straight from the LXX version of two places in the Psalms, either or both of which may well have been in his mind when he dictated the sentence: ἐγγύς κύριος πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις αὐτόν (The Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon Him); and, ἐγγύς κύριος τοῖς συντετριμμένοις τὴν καρδίαν (The Lord is nigh unto them that are of a broken heart).

We have now considered all that there is in St. Paul's Epistles which may be supposed to refer to the nearness of our Lord's return, and we have seen that nowhere does he even express his own private opinion that the Second Advent is near, although at times, as in 1 Tim. vi. 14, we seem to catch a glimpse of a hope that it may be soon. The disciple does not go beyond his Master. All that St. Paul can say is that the day of the Lord will come suddenly, as a thief in the night (1 Thess. v. 1-4), even as the Lord Jesus had said.

The conviction that our Lord and His Apostles definitely taught a doctrine of the near approach of the Second Advent

which has been completely falsified, has served as a starting-point for leaping to the conclusion that all the Lord's teaching concerning His return must now be ignored. "What for him was matter of confident expectation," says Dr. Latimer Jackson in his recent Hulsean Lectures, "has not only turned out otherwise, but, in the shape in which he announced it, is absolutely inconceivable to modern minds. . . . The catastrophic ending looked for by him has not come about . . . He has not so come—Will He, then, yet so come? If in days of old it was asked in mockery, 'Where is the promise of His coming?' the religious consciousness of to-day is untroubled by the question . . . no such external coming of the Son of Man is to be looked for."¹ Well, the religious consciousness of to-day may perhaps prove to be something larger than Dr. Latimer Jackson imagines; there may even be "modern minds" which are not modernist; and to those who still retain their former faith, it may be helpful to realize that just as the Lord Jesus Himself never made any statement that time has falsified, so His great Apostle to the Gentiles, whose letters we have been studying, has written nothing that we need surrender as untrue.

G. ESTWICK FORD.

¹ "The Eschatology of Jesus," pp. 342, 343.



Fasting Communion.

UNTIL the last fifty years the subject of Fasting Communion attracted very little attention, even among devout and well-instructed Churchpeople.

Fasting reception does not appear to have been regarded as a duty by the early leaders of the Oxford Movement. In the long tract on Fasting by Dr. Pusey, which was published as No. 18 of the "Tracts for the Times," although the writer insists on the duty of observing the Church's rule of fasting, and states in considerable detail the times and seasons prescribed for fasting, and although he also speaks of the importance of more frequent celebrations of the Holy Communion than was the general custom at the time at which he wrote, he never so much as mentions a fast before reception. In a supplement to this tract, published in the following year, he does refer to the practice, but in such a way as to make it quite clear that at that time he did not regard it as a rule of universal obligation. In answering the objection that fasting was dangerous to health, he wrote: "A poor woman mentioned, with much respect, her father's practice never to taste food before receiving the Lord's Supper (adhering unconsciously to the practice of the universal Church in its better days, and indeed of our own in Bishop Taylor's time); she added: 'I never heard that his bodily health suffered from it.'"

Although it is highly probable that at the time of the publication of the "Tracts for the Times" there were some who observed the custom of Fasting Communion, it was not until somewhat later that the practice was recommended as one for general adoption by members of the Church of England. The recommendation was made mainly on two grounds: (1) Because, as it was urged, the practice was in accordance with the mind of the Church Universal; (2) because it was regarded as an act of special reverence to the Holy Sacrament. It is now frequently asserted that the practice is a law of the

Church, the observance of which is obligatory upon all Church-people.

To some of those who were not brought up so to regard the matter this insistent assertion is a cause of some uneasiness. They are quite prepared to obey the law of the Church themselves, and to teach it to others, as soon as they can be quite clear in their own minds what the law of the Church in this matter really is. Insistent assertion is not proof. In fact, the very insistency of the assertion gives rise to the suspicion that it is based upon imperfect evidence. To a reasonable person, a clear and temperate setting forth of the evidence upon which a statement is based would be far more convincing than any amount of insistent assertion.

There have not been wanting learned clergy, of unimpeachable orthodoxy, who have expressed it as their opinion that there is no sufficient evidence that Fasting Communion is a rule of universal obligation. The late Bishop Webb, formerly of Grahamstown and afterwards Dean of Salisbury (whom the late Canon Body once called one of the greatest religious teachers of our time), was one of these. In the preface to a little volume of Ordination addresses, he wrote :

“ In the course of the last address I have deprecated the well-meant, but, I am bound in conscience to add, for ourselves, unauthorized insistence upon fasting as a condition of worthy Communion. I have seen much evil resulting from this burden being laid upon some not able to bear it, and from the materialistic and irreverent notions resulting. For some communicants it would mean either very infrequent Communions or ‘slow suicide.’ ”

* * * * *

“ It requires some courage to lay oneself open to the charge of condoning laxity in these self-pleasing times, and making light of an ancient universal custom. The question, however, is not what an individual Bishop or priest may suppose to be right or necessary, but what are the conditions laid down by the Church in which we minister, and the principles upon which she has thought good to act. She could not dispense with the law of marriage within the forbidden degrees, but she can allow a matter of discipline to fall into desuetude in such a case as this, as has been done in other matters, and in reference to the Sacrament of Holy Baptism.”

These words were written in 1888. Shortly after this, the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation appointed a

Committee of its own body to report on the question of Fasting Communion. The Committee consisted of Bishop Temple of London, Bishop Wordsworth of Salisbury, Bishop King of Lincoln, Bishop Ellicott of Gloucester, Bishop Stubbs of Oxford, Bishop Ridding of Southwell, Bishop Bickersteth of Exeter, and Bishop Davidson of Rochester. The Report of this Committee was presented to the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation, discussed and adopted on May 5, 1893. The Report as adopted was as follows :

“ 1. That in the Apostolic Age the Holy Communion was administered in connection with the gathering together of Christians to share in an appointed evening meal.

“ 2. That the practice of communicating in the early morning appears to have arisen about the close of the first century, probably in order to secure a safer as well as a more reverent celebration, and, by the time of St. Cyprian, to have become so fully established that it was regarded, not only as the preferable, but as the proper practice, and as commemorative of the Lord's Resurrection.

“ 3. That the practice of communicating in the early morning, together with the common association of fasting with prayer, led to the practice of communicating only when fasting, and that fasting reception of the Communion became the regular and recognized usage of the Church about the end of the fourth century.

“ 4. That from the close of the fourth century this regular and recognized usage was formulated in rules for the clergy in canons of local and provincial councils.

“ 5. That fasting reception of the Communion was the prescribed rule of the Church of England during the Anglo-Saxon period, and continued to be so to the time of the Reformation.

“ 6. That these strict rules were, nevertheless, subject to relaxation in cases of sickness or other necessity.

“ 7. That at the Reformation the Church of England, in accordance with the principle of liberty laid down in Article XXXIV., ceased to require the Communion to be received fasting, though the practice was observed by many as a reverent and ancient custom, and as such is commended by several of her eminent writers and divines down to the present time.

“ 8. That, regard being had to the practice of the Apostolic Church in this matter, to teach that it is a sin to communicate otherwise than fasting is contrary to the teaching and spirit of the Church of England.”

This Report was adopted, after an interesting debate, all the fifteen Bishops present voting for it, with the exception of Bishop Philpot of Worcester, who, in a learned argument,

which was evidently not considered convincing by his brother Bishops, had urged that there was no sufficient evidence for the historical statements in the second clause.

The pivot of the whole Report, as it affects our authoritative teaching, is in the 7th clause. If the "principle of Liberty laid down in Article XXXIV." is not sound, or if it cannot be rightly applied to the question under consideration, or if the principle is sound, and can be so applied, but if, at the same time, it is not true that "The Church of England . . . ceased to require the Communion to be received fasting," then the practical conclusion of the whole Report is valueless, and may be disregarded.

In considering the question before us, the whole of this Article should be borne in mind, for if the Church of England has not in point of fact changed or abolished the rule of Fasting Communion, anyone who ignores that rule "ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like), as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the Magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren."

A short time ago it became rather the fashion to belittle our Reformers, and to undervalue their work, including the Thirty-Nine Articles. It may not be unprofitable, therefore, to consider what Archbishop Benson had to say about this matter :

"I believe that it is of immense importance, never more so than now, to recognize that the Reformation of the Church of England was one of the greatest historical events—the greatest historical event, I think—in the history of the Church, and that it was conducted by persons of very high capacity and the very largest knowledge. Anyone who will look through almost any one of Cranmer's treatises and verify the quotations at the side, or anyone who will look over the volumes of his commonplace book in the Lambeth Library and in the British Museum, must see how extraordinarily stored they are with data and justifications of the principles of reformation from the literature of his own time and the ecclesiastical literature of all ages. He certainly was a most lucid reasoner; and he and his companions, if they had not taken their great stand as reformers, would have been accounted among the greatest schoolmen that the Church has ever known. If it had not been that they took a firmer and higher line for the sake of mankind, they would have been accounted, I say, among the greatest of schoolmen, and they

deliberately, not only in what is expressed in the Article, but in their whole treatment of subjects of the kind, asserted, and went on that principle which is laid down in Article XXXIV., the principle of liberty."

The rule of Fasting Communion has never been laid down in a Canon of a General Council. It has been laid down (*for the clergy*) in Canons of Provincial Synods, and it is arguable that, although a National Church has power to "ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority," yet until, by formal decree, a National Church definitely abrogates a rule laid down by a Provincial Synod, the Canon of the Synod remains in force. But, although such a principle may be advanced in argument, no one is prepared to act upon it, or to lay down a line of conduct, for himself or others, based upon it. To do so would lead to some remarkable results. Not only would the rule of fasting be obligatory upon everyone who either receives or administers the Sacrament of Baptism, but numerous regulations, as to conduct and dress, which no one professes to regard, would still have to be observed.

On the other hand, the argument that fasting reception cannot be necessary because the first Communion was after a meal, appears to me to be of no force whatever. The necessity of Fasting Communion is not urged on the ground that non-fasting reception invalidates the Sacrament, but that it violates a rule of the Church. If the Church has the right to direct that the Communion shall be received kneeling, although the Apostles received it reclining, she has also the right to direct that it shall be received fasting, although the Apostles were not fasting at the first reception.

The sole point at issue is whether this particular rule of the pre-Reformation Church is binding upon loyal members of the Church of England in the present day.

The late Bishop Collins discussed the authority of so-called "Catholic customs" in a learned pamphlet on "The Rights of a Particular Church in Matters of Practice," which was published as No. LXXXII. of the pamphlets of the Church Historical

Society. Every word of this pamphlet (like every other utterance of that saintly scholar) is worthy of careful attention. He wrote :

“ It is contended that a custom which has come to prevail throughout the whole Church is thenceforth stereotyped unless the whole Church should happen to agree to vary it. Such a contention practically means that the history of the Church is one of gradually increasing bondage, since it is plain that the difficulties in the way of such agreement on the part of the whole Church are and must be very great. Instead of being a growth into the liberty of the glory of the sons of God, it is a gradual deterioration into merely mechanical and lifeless uniformity, for the further the process goes, the less of liberty will there be.”

He then proceeded to show that every individual branch of the Church had in point of fact abandoned customs which had once been universal, and that even the unchanging East had not been free from innovations. Although some of the changes may not have been wholly desirable, no one would contend that they were all *ultra vires*.

“ In the face of facts such as these (and they are, after all, but specimens from a list which might be prolonged almost indefinitely) I fail to see how it is possible to contend that universal customs can only be abolished by the act of the whole Church.”

In the Convocation debate, the Bishops, one after another, expressed their strong conviction that the particular rule in question is not binding upon us now. Perhaps the clearest statement of their reasons for arriving at this conviction was that made by Bishop Creighton :

“ It would be an entire limitation of the practical power of the Church of England, as an independent branch of the Catholic Church, if we were to suppose or admit for a moment that the practice of the Church since the sixteenth century did not in itself establish an abrogation of customs which before that time had been in use. The real argument of those who maintain the view from which we dissent is an attempt to tie round us principles and usages of particular Churches in times of antiquity, and because they have not been by any formal decision of the Church of England abrogated, to suppose that they are still binding.”

The Bishops of the Church of England do not claim to be infallible. Although everyone would admit that all those who drew up the Report, and all the members of the Upper House

of the Canterbury Convocation who accepted it, were learned and pious men, they may have been honestly mistaken. But this at least must be said : we have no right to assume that they were mistaken, until we have individually gone through all the evidence ourselves.

What, then, would be the effect on our practice and teaching of a cordial acceptance of the Report? Obviously, so far as our own practice is concerned, it would have no effect whatever. If we have been in the habit of practising a rule of fasting reception, either as an act of personal reverence, or because it is an old-established custom, we are fully justified by the Report in continuing to observe the practice. But we are also justified, if we have been accustomed to take food before Communion, in continuing to do so. The effect of the Report on our teaching is an entirely different matter. It leaves us at liberty to recommend others to adopt the practice of fasting reception for either of the reasons which have led us to adopt the practice ourselves, if we have adopted it. But it does not justify us in teaching that Fasting Communion is a rule of the Church, which it is obligatory upon all loyal members of the Church of England to observe.

We must remember that the insistence on the universal obligation of fasting reception would have certain very serious practical results. If we have to tell farm labourers, who live, it may be, two or three miles from a church, and have to get up at five o'clock in the morning to milk the cows, that they must not receive the Holy Communion after having tasted food, we ought to be quite certain that we have the authority of our Church for the statement. There can be no question that it would practically prevent many of them from becoming Communicants.

But it seems to me that there is something more to be said. I say it in fear and trembling, both because in dealing with the mystery of mysteries, I am treading on very holy ground, and also because it is exceedingly difficult to use words which are approximately appropriate and adequate to express our deepest spiritual convictions. To each individual there are, or seem to

be, things which are certainties of spiritual experience. They pass man's understanding. They belong to the region in which spirit may hold converse with spirit, with no intermediary of human language. When we attempt to convey them to others, in the most carefully selected words, it is often only to "learn from vacant looks that we indeed are dumb." But I feel that I must at least attempt what I am fully aware is quite beyond my power.

In the Sacrament of the Holy Communion, there is God Who gives, and man who receives. From God, there is an outpouring of Himself. But this outpouring of God cannot be an inpouring into the soul of man, unless man does his part. Man's part in the vital reception of the outpouring of God is twofold. It is a reverent passive acceptance of God's unspeakable gift. It is also an active uplifting of the soul to God, because the soul is athirst for God, yea, even for the living God. The two are interdependent; the one cannot *permanently* exist without the other, although there are times, I suppose, with most of us at which our conscious desire for God is so weak as to be practically non-existent. God forbid that I should venture to suggest that at such times we are incapable of receiving spiritual gifts. But it is, at the very least, highly doubtful whether we could receive an inpouring of God in the Sacrament if there had *never* been a thirst for God in the soul. This appears to me to be the essential difference between the truths of Sacraments and the vain imaginings of magic.

The rigorous insistence upon the observance of bodily rules, by laying exclusive emphasis on the passive acceptance of God's favours, may tend to ignore the need for active spiritual effort. When the need for active effort is ignored, the character of the passive acceptance will inevitably be changed from the adoring self-surrender of true Christian worship to the terrified self-abasement of heathen idolatry. God stoops that man may rise, but if man makes no effort to rise, he will gain no spiritual advantage from God's condescension.

All this has a direct bearing upon our teaching about ecclesiastical rules and customs. They were not, in their origin,

arbitrary enactments, but are—so to speak—the crystallized results of individual spiritual experience. While, on the one hand, it would be most unwise to disregard the experience of holy men and women of old, yet, on the other hand, it is right and lawful to abrogate the rule and give up the custom, when they have come to be looked upon as mere arbitrary enactments. It seems to me in the highest degree important that if we insist upon fasting reception as, in any sense, a duty, we should treat it as a custom which arose from the spiritual experience of others, which should not be disregarded until its value had been tested by our own personal experience. For my own part, I could never teach it as a duty at all—

1. Because it might encourage the idea that Fasting Communion is the law of the Church (binding upon members of the Church of England), which I have shown to be erroneous, for,

(a) Although it is highly probable that this custom was once universal, Bishop Collins has conclusively proved that the universality of a custom does not make it unlawful for any particular Church to abandon it, and that every particular Church, in every part of the world, has exercised, and is exercising, its liberty to abandon customs which were once universal; and

(b) The Church of England, at the Reformation, in accordance with the principle of liberty laid down in Article XXXIV., did in point of fact cease to require the Holy Communion to be received fasting; and

(c) No individuals, however numerous, without authority from the Church to which they belong, have any right to select, according to their own judgment, certain old Church customs and proclaim them to be laws of universal and perpetual obligation.

2. Because, if some of the Communicants in a parish will never communicate except at an early Celebration, while others, on account of age, infirmity, occupation, or for other reasons, are never able to communicate except at mid-day, the Christian

family in the parish can never all meet together at their Father's Table.

3. Because a rigid insistence upon Fasting Communion lays a disproportionate emphasis on a mechanical act of bodily preparation.

JOHN P. WRIGHT.



Hymn for Use in Time of War.

LORD, we, Thy people, ask of Thee,
In this most trying hour,
That Thou wouldst our Defender be,
And shield us by Thy power.

Thou knowest, Lord, we do not fight
With any hope of gain ;
Thou knowest, too, we seek the right,
Nor take Thy Name in vain.

The wondrous workings of Thy Will
We seek not to divine.
Lord, we would trust Thee, and be still ;
Conform our will to Thine.

But Thee we ask, in humble faith,
That Thou wilt hear our prayer,
From men of wrath, from war's dread scathe,
Our island home to spare.

Our fathers trusted Thee of old,
In times of storm and stress ;
They proved Thy mercies manifold ;
E'en now Thy people bless.

Giver of Victory art Thou,
" Lord of all Power and Might " ;
In Freedom's cause, we pray Thee now,
O God, defend the Right !

ROBEY F. ELDRIDGE.

The Quakers.

IN numbers the Quakers are "a feeble folk," but their influence on the social and religious life of the nation is very considerable. Nor are they a decreasing quantity; for, while many of the Churches have been deploring lessened numbers, the Quakers have during the past ten years more than maintained their ground.

Before George Fox the principles of Quakerism began to assert themselves, but he is usually regarded as the founder of the sect. Fox was born at Drayton-in-the-Clay, a little village in Leicestershire, in the year 1624. In early life he worked with a shoemaker, who was also a dealer in cattle and wool. Then a great change came into his life. He had come across two friends at a fair, and observed that, though they both professed religion, they did not act in harmony with their professions. He began to ask himself, "If these men are the followers of Christ, where do I stand?" He went to London to hear some preachers of the day; they gave him no relief. He was miserable.

At last light came. "The Lord," he wrote in his "Journal," "did gently lead me along, and did let me see His love, which was endless and eternal, and surpasseth all the knowledge that men have in the natural state, or can get by history or books. Now I was come up in spirit through the flaming sword into the paradise of God." Now he had a message for all men—the message of "the inner light," which is lit by the Spirit of God in every man.

This message, this new thought—which was really not new—spread. Fox had many followers. In the North of England the movement received a great impetus from Margaret Fell, the wife of Judge Fell, who at the age of thirty-eight determined to devote her life to the cause. Seventeen years later, on the death of her husband, she married Fox. But before this event occurred Fox suffered much from his

opponents, who handed him over to the mercy of the mob. He was beaten and stoned, and even his life was attempted. Nothing, however, daunted him, and when free he was constant in his efforts to spread the tenets of Quakerism.

So little is known of the Quaker Church that it may be well to mention a few facts respecting its inner working. First, there is the "Meeting," so graphically described by Charles Lamb: "Wouldst thou know what true peace and quiet mean; wouldst thou find a refuge from the noises and clamours of the multitude; wouldst thou enjoy at once solitude and society; wouldst thou possess the depth of thine own spirit in stillness, without being shut out from the consolatory faces of thy species; wouldst thou be alone, and yet accompanied; solitary, yet not desolate; singular, yet not without some to keep thee in countenance; a unit in aggregate; a simple in composite. Come with me into a Quakers' Meeting."

A "Meeting" is also held monthly for business purposes, when matters are discussed relating to the work of the Society. The transactions are, when necessary, passed on to the Quarterly Meeting of the district, to which delegates are appointed from the Monthly Meetings. The final authority expresses itself in the Yearly Meeting, a general assembly of the representatives of the Society, which is held at Devonshire House, Bishopsgate, London. This, by the way, is the headquarters of the Quakers, and consists of two large halls and a series of offices. The question of rebuilding these premises has been before the Society for some years, but no final decision has been reached as to the best course to adopt, one party desiring to retain the present buildings and have a hall in some other part of London, whilst others of the older school are opposed to this course, and would erect new premises on the present site. At all these meetings—monthly, quarterly, and annual—questions of the day are discussed at length, and the deliberations are carried on with grave decorum, the presiding officer being assisted by the "clerk," who gauges the sense of the meeting without any formal vote, and duly records it.

Besides these statutory meetings that we have enumerated, there is yet another, which is known as the "Meeting for Sufferings." It was established as early as the year 1695, to investigate cases of persecution, which were then constantly arising. Since then, however, it has extended its work, and discusses questions relating to the welfare of communities who require assistance in different parts of the world. Nor are these efforts fruitless, as it has been shown from time to time. Though opposed to war, this Meeting for Sufferings is foremost in aiding those in need, and sending food and money to succour the distressed. During the present war this is being done, and the more wealthy members subscribe liberally to the war funds.

As is well known, Friends have no paid ministers. They accept the services of men and women who have proved their special adaptability, and, though the office confers no special status upon the individual, he or she devotes much time and care in guiding the Church both in spiritual and temporal matters. Two other officers are known in the Quaker Church—those of Elder and Overseer. The former acts as a guide and adviser to the younger members, while the latter exercises a general supervision over the members generally.

What, it may be asked, is the main teaching of the Friends? It is that every man and woman can have direct communion with God, and that the Divine Presence is immanent in the hearts of all. Friends believe that "worship is like the fragrance exhaled from a flower, that gives joy to men and praise to God at the same time." Outward observances are regarded as of little value; every form of institutional religion hinders the soul's progress. The spiritual life is an experience, a being and a doing, and we receive God for ourselves in our appropriation of Him.

J. C. WRIGHT.



The Missionary World.

MEN are naturally being drawn to fix their thoughts upon the problems which beset the home base of missions in every country, whether belligerent or neutral, at this time. These problems are great and real, and will grow more pressing month by month, but to gain strength to face them it is needful to look far afield and see how the great cause goes forward under the fostering hand of God. The evangelistic movements in the Far East are full of encouragement, and are being pushed forward by the combined efforts of native and foreign workers in a prayerful and capable manner. The principles and methods both of organization—central and local—and of approach will be found rich in suggestion if the idea of a national mission in Great Britain, which some are urging, takes shape. The plans for the Japanese campaign are outlined in the "Christian Movement in Japan," a book which we have already commended in these pages, and in spite of the distraction of the war are being carried out with much spiritual result. A recent number of the *Chinese Recorder* is entirely given up to an account of preparations for an evangelistical campaign in China, which has already in Fukien in the south, Changsha in the centre, and Peking in the north, borne remarkable fruit. In the "Survey of the Year," in the *International Review of Missions*, we read that, through the work of Mr. Sherwood Eady and others, "in the first seven cities touched, there were about 7,000 inquirers, and the meetings averaged an attendance of 3,000. In Peking more than 2,000 inquirers have been enrolled, many scholars and officials among them. In Changsha there were over 1,500 inquirers, and scores of Bible classes have been organized." And the work is only at its beginning still. The fact that the Spirit of God is thus mightily working should nerve us to a new courage and persistence in prayer and in work.

* * * * *

The great island of Madagascar has had a thrilling missionary history, and the work there is to-day full of promise. The

C.M.S. Mission has long been withdrawn, the only Anglican work in the island being undertaken by the S.P.G. The London Missionary Society and the Friends have strong missions, so has the Paris Missionary Society. It will be remembered that not long ago an important joint commission visited the island, and that noteworthy steps in the direction of fuller comity and co-operation were taken. The European War immediately improved the relations between the missions and the French Government, who have in the past pursued a very repressive policy. The Paris Mission is, of course, heavily crippled by the necessary reduction of expenditure, but the response of missionaries and of native workers to the requirements laid on them by the Home Committee has been unflinching. The letters are most touching, full of confidence in God, and showing the relations of love and mutual sympathy which exist between missionaries and converts. Nor is it only by ready self-sacrifice that the Malagasy converts are examples to us in Europe. One of the French missionaries, describing a scene at the close of some special meetings last autumn, writes :

“ Nous avons eu le privilège d'avoir à la réunion deux Sakalaves, venus de Morondava, de la Mission norvégienne, pour visiter les églises des hauts plateaux. Ils demandèrent pardon à l'assistance des pillages commis par leur compatriotes qui, chaque année, avant la réunion de Madagascar à la France, venaient brûler les maisons et emmener les Betsiléos en esclavage. Un évangéliste, qui a failli être pris autrefois par les pillards Sakalaves, se lève pour leur pardonner, en signe de réconciliation des deux tribus, il met sa main dans celle du Sakalave. L'assemblée est émue jusqu'aux larmes. Un veillard traduit l'émotion générale en montrant dans cette étreinte fraternelle un fruit palpable de l'Évangile. . . . Quand donc les peuples chrétiens d'Europe accomplir ont-ils ce geste ? ”

* * * * *

“ The Missionary Survey of 1914,” in the *International Review of Missions*, is a document of extraordinary interest. In any year the grouping together of missionary events from every field is impressive, but this year, with the great “ fault ” of the war (to use the striking illustration with which the Survey opens) cropping up and distorting all the strata of work, the Survey is of surpassing value, and no student of missions should fail to

find time to read the sixty pages of condensed but luminously stated facts. The work of missions is shown in relation to all the great world movements, and yet the true centre of missions is never obscured. On reading right through the Survey, the impression left on one's mind is that the war has come as a ghastly tragedy, an appalling interruption, to a great and prospering work. Yet through all there is an absence of discouragement, even a tone of hope. Even the ravages of war can be repaired by the mercy and power of God working through an awakened and reconsecrated Church. To the mind of the writer the Survey suggested the memory of two Continental scenes: One, the devastation immediately after a landslip in Switzerland, where the heart of a riven mountain lay bare and torn and distorted, all its beauty of green alp destroyed; the other, the peaceful loveliness of a lake in the Austrian Tyrol, formed by a vast landslip of former years. Rock and soil from two adjacent mountains had crashed into the valley, damming a little torrent and flooding meadow and village street. Slowly destruction was turned into beauty; the hindered stream formed a lake of exquisite beauty, and fell over the rocky lip of the landslide in a foaming cascade; seeds took root in the riven heart of the mountain, and green meadows and young foliage of growing trees hid the scars from sight. The fact of the landslip remained, but it had been over-ruled for good.

* * * * *

The war is directing thought toward the great problem of Islam, both in a political and in a religious sense. In the *Moslem World* for January Dr. W. St. Clair Tisdall discusses the national responsibility of England and her dependencies to the world of Islam, and since his article was written that responsibility has been largely increased by the proclamation of a British Protectorate over Egypt. Dr. Tisdall emphasizes the fact that the British Government, in its desire to be neutral in religious questions, is apt to favour Islam, and thereby to discredit Christianity. There is need for alertness and earnest

purpose in prayer if, as the result of this war, our national relations with Mohammedans are not to drift on to lines which shall do them still greater injustice than in the past, in withholding from them the best which England has to give. Our hearts are full of thankfulness for the loyalty of Indian Moslems and for their splendid support of our nation in this hour of need ; but our debt can only be repaid by the fullest offer, lovingly and efficiently made, of a share of that which has been given to us as a Christian Church in trust for all whom we can reach. To its usual interest, an added importance is attached now as quarter by quarter we read the *Moslem World*. More fully than any other periodical, it keeps us in touch with the many currents in Islamic life and thought. For instance, the January number opens with a symposium on "The War and Islam," in which resident missionaries record the actual feelings and statements of Moslems in Southern Arabia, Turkey, Algiers, and India. This quarterly should be studied by all who guide the prayer of the Church.

* * * * *

Holland is brought to mind at this juncture in European affairs as a nation which has afforded a generous shelter at great personal sacrifice to refugees, whether they be Belgians flying from assailants, or troops interned after the fall of Antwerp. But the January periodicals show Holland in another light. In the *Moslem World* Dr. J. W. Gunning, the representative of the Netherlands on the Continuation Committee, gives a stirring account of Dutch missions to Moslems in Java, an island in which there are now 24,000 native Christians. Seven Dutch societies are at work. In 1913, 82 Moslems were admitted into Church fellowship ; the year before, 161. The work is strongly evangelistic, and special attention is paid to the training of Javanese workers. The Christians frequently gather into communities known as *desa*, in which, however, Moslems are free to come to reside if they like. There are five large mission hospitals and several smaller ones, but further extension of medical work is needed. In the *International Review of*

Missions, a Dutch missionary belonging to the Society of which Dr. Gunning is Director gives a record of his experiences among the Toradja tribes of Central Celebes. He takes us into their thought-world, recounts the difficulties and hindrances which the Gospel has met among them, the points of contact which have been found, and the aspects of the Christian message which appeal to these primitive people. Dr. Kruyt's paper is full of human interest as well as of missionary zeal.

* * * * *

Two articles in *The East and The West* on mass movements in India are well worth reading. One, by Professor Griswold, of the Forman Christian College, Lahore, deals with the Panjab; the other, by Bishop Gill, of Travancore, with South Western India. The question of the early baptism of Chuhra inquirers in the Panjab is one calling for further consideration than it has yet received. Dr. Griswold, however, cites some striking instances of the reality of Chuhra Christians whom he has known. One of these we must quote :

"Then there is Labhu, formerly a *sadhu*, or religious mendicant, now employed as a watchman (*chaukidar*) on a salary of seven or eight rupees a month. In the church of which he is a leading elder there is a harvest festival once or twice a year. On one occasion, when the harvest offering was being collected, he brought as his offering the equivalent of about three months' salary. A great giver is Labhu, and a man of strength and spirituality. His employer, a retired police superintendent, bears strong testimony concerning his good character and faithfulness."

Bishop Gill regards these mass movements as an impulse of the Spirit of God, and believes in their great strategic value for the evangelization of India. During the past sixty years the C.M.S. has been at work among the Pariahs and Pulayas, and no less than 35,000 of them have been gathered into the Church. Bishop Gill bears testimony to the efforts of the Maharajah's government to uplift the submerged masses. Elementary vernacular education is free throughout the State; the children of outcastes, whether Christian or not, have free entrance into all schools and sit side by side with high-caste children; young men of the despised class have been sent for

training as subordinate police officers, and, most revolutionary of all, two members of these depressed classes have been made members of the local parliament, and for two sessions have sat side by side with representatives of the aristocracy and taken part in the deliberations.

* * * * *

Two other papers of great interest to closer students of Indian Missions are published in *The East and The West*. One, signed only by the initials "C. S.," is a critical discussion of the present organization of mission agents in India, a system which many supporters of missions have long felt to be unsatisfactory on the lines indicated in this article; the other, a study of a clan system among the Mundas in Chota Nagpur, which is hindering the work of the Anglican, Lutheran, and Roman Catholic missions in the district.

* * * * *

There are numerous other matters of living interest in the January magazines to which we can only refer briefly. Women's work occupies the whole number of the *L.M.S. Chronicle*, and has a prominent place also in the *Herald* of the B.M.S. This year is the jubilee of the women's work of the S.P.G. In a recent issue of *The Challenge*, which begins to issue missionary matter of some distinctiveness, there is a charming account of the religious ceremony following the official coronation of the young Christian Kabaka of Uganda, in which a "Cap of State" was placed upon the head of his bride (daughter of one of the African clergy, and formerly head girl in the C.M.S. High School at Gayaza), thereby for the first time lifting womanhood to a share in public affairs in Africa. It is held that the influence of this act will be far-reaching. Two other jubilees fall in 1915: one, that of the organized medical mission work of the C.M.S., the other of even wider significance for the missionary enterprise—the jubilee of the China Inland Mission. We note, in a brief survey of 1914 in the current number of *China's Millions*, that the past year has been the most fruitful in the whole history of the Mission. *The Missionary Review*

of the World begins with a strong number. Dr. Robert Speer writes on some missionary aspects of 1914, and the larger spiritual aspects of the war are discussed at length. A paper in the *C.M. Review* by the Rev. C. D. Snell, on "War and the Work of the C.M.S.," provides a number of interesting facts and parallels. A delightful story of a Ghurka bandsman who is actively seeking to evangelize in Nepal, in the same number, will prove of special value to speakers. Perhaps the most encouraging page in all the missionary literature for the month is that in the *Student Movement*, which contains the list of student volunteers who have sailed during 1914. G.



Correspondence.

BISHOP BERKELEY.

To the Editor of the CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—If I have unconsciously done “less than justice” to Bishop Berkeley’s methods of thought, I am inclined to think that Mr. King has, equally unconsciously, done rather less than justice to what I said, kindly as his criticism is expressed.

Probably anyone reading his letter would imagine I had, with surprising ignorance of my subject, credited the Bishop with a fondness for abstract general ideas! But in one of the very sentences criticized I stated that “he persistently inveighed against abstract general ideas as a principal root of all error and confusion.” I remembered this statement at once, but I was surprised to find it in that very context; and I venture to submit that it should have led Mr. King to express what he meant in clearer terms.

He is quite right to claim the remarks about the abstract idea of a triangle as a proof of the Bishop’s robust common sense. I quoted them as an amusing illustration of his fondness for subtle questions; and I dare say Mr. King’s application is much more logical. I am sorry that I did not provide against the allusion being taken in the way indicated—unless, indeed, the passage quoted above should have been sufficient provision.

I have an impression, by the way, that Leslie Stephen himself mentions this very example in a “chaffing” sort of way, somewhat as I meant to do. It was, in fact, this impression that led me to refer to it. But I have not the book at hand to verify the reference. And, of course, he may have mentioned it in a different connection.

W S. HOOTON.

12, KING EDWARD’S DRIVE,
HARROGATE.

ST. PAUL’S DOCTRINE OF RESURRECTION.

To the Editor of the CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—Mr. Estwick Ford’s paper in the January CHURCHMAN on “St. Paul’s Doctrine of Resurrection” calls for drastic criticism from first to last. May I be allowed one or two brief fragmentary comments?

1. Mr. Ford teaches *resurrection by dribblets*, those who die in the Lord being, according to him, immediately clad in their final and everlasting body. He seeks to establish this by the wholly unwarranted interpolation of “then and there” in his paraphrase of 2 Cor. v. 1, and of “in the very act of death” in his paraphrase of 2 Cor. v. 2-4.

St. Paul tells us in 2 Cor. v. 1 that we have a “house not made with hands,” etc. In another place (1 Cor. xv. 23) he tells us *when we shall get it*, namely, at Christ’s coming. Mr. Ford, however, is disposed to agree with Hymenæus and Philetus that the resurrection is past already in the case of

the blessed dead. But to call their return to earth with Christ, already clad in bodies which some of them had possessed for thousands of years, by the name of resurrection is a misuse of language.

2. If Scripture teaches anything clearly, it is that resurrection takes place *from the grave*, not from Paradise. John v. 28 is not to be so cheaply explained away as in this article, and its teaching is, of course, amply confirmed by other Scriptures—*e.g.*, Dan. xii. 2—where “dust of the earth” cannot possibly be an Old Testament designation of Paradise, nor can “dwell in dust” in Isa. xxvi. 19. Moreover, we have an instance in which our Lord, by a kind of rehearsal of the day of John v. 28, actually *did* call a dead man from the *grave*. “Lazarus, come forth!” and he that was dead came forth.

3. Mr. Ford asserts that the disciples at Emmaus saw no wounds in the Lord’s hands. But surely the fact that they recognized Him as He blessed the bread rather points the other way. His wound-prints became noticeable in the act of handling the bread, and that clinched their identification of Him. To say, as Mr. Ford does, that the exhibition of the Lord’s wounds to the disciples in the upper room was an unreal assumption for a purpose is incredible. Shall we believe that Thomas was invited to thrust in his hand, etc., into wounds that were a mere sham? And that when our Lord challenged them to “handle” Him He was seeking to prove the most momentous fact of our religion, namely, His resurrection from the dead, by what was after all a mere deception?

JAMES I. COHEN.

10, SANDYMOUNT DRIVE,
NEW BRIGHTON, CHESHIRE.

To the Editor of the CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—We may well thank Mr. Ford for his paper on “Pauline Eschatology.” It should carry conviction to all candid minds. And since “the *exception* proves the *rule*,” that *exception* I venture to submit to his judgment. Let us render verbatim, and in Greek order, 2 Cor. v. 3 as thus: “If, that is, actually clad—not denuded—we shall be found.” The Apostle *hopes* for himself, amongst other believers, that he may survive until the advent of the Great Change, in which case he expects to be “clothed upon,” much as when a surplice is put over one’s common garb; and he adds, “*that is, if we shall be found in our (fleshy) casing.*” So would the *mortal* garb be, in some mystic way, *merged* in the imperishable one. It is a wish which, as we know, he suggests more than once elsewhere.

Personally, as one who is not sanguine of the *imminence* of “That Day,” and, quite against my will, I feel compelled to expect disembodiment; and I fail to find one hint of St. Paul’s to the contrary in the whole passage under discussion.

CUTHBERT ROUTH.

Vicar of Hooe, Battle.



Notices of Books.

COMMON OBJECTIONS TO CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. C. L. Drawbridge.
London: *Robert Scott*. Price 5s. net.

Mr. Drawbridge is widely known as the Honorary Secretary of the Christian Evidence League, and as a doughty champion of the Faith in the parks of London. A book coming from him, therefore, and bearing on its title-page the evidence that it is the fruit of his wide experience, is a book to be bought and studied and used by all who are engaged in driving away from our parishes all pernicious and strange doctrines—and which of us in these days, when working men read and think, should not be doing this far more than we do?

We should like to mention two obvious merits of the work. The first is that it covers a wide field, and therefore provides a panoply of armour for the Christian apologist. Rationalism, Materialism, Determinism, Secularism, Atheism, Agnosticism, Anthropomorphism, have each a chapter devoted to them. There are also chapters on Pain, Evil, Natural Science and Religion, Evolution, Immortality, and other subjects. The second merit is that in most chapters there is first a statement of the Anti-Theist position, and then a reply to it from the Christian apologist. Mr. Drawbridge tells us in his preface: "I have taken quite as much pains to state the anti-theistic position in each case, as well as I was able to do so, as I have taken to present the Christian reply to it. The former is of much more importance to Christians than the latter. It is the former about which Christians know least, and it is the former about which I know most." It is most valuable to be told what enemy we are fighting. It is useless to fight enemies of our imagination.

With regard to the "form" of the book, one remark may perhaps be allowed. It clearly arises from Mr. Drawbridge's park experience, and arguments in parks are wont to be extremely disjointed. The more satisfactorily you answer your opponent, the more likely he is to start a new subject. Now, it seems to us that the disjointedness of the park has not been entirely shaken off in the literary composition. In some of the chapters, some more than others, there is a decided tendency to jump from one subject to another, and then back again to the first. An analysis of the chapter in the margin reveals this. Such an analysis would be a real addition to the book if space could be found for it in the next edition, and by its aid, perhaps, there might be a little rearrangement which would conduce to lucidity and ease of apprehension.

With regard to subject-matter, Mr. Drawbridge confessedly writes for the ordinary sceptic, and not for the academic critic. Hence there is a paucity of literary references. This means that such a book as Flint's "Anti-Theistic Theories" is not superseded, but supplemented, by "Common Objections." The two ought to stand side by side on the shelf.

It is, we fear, temerity to criticize Mr. Drawbridge as an apologist. To do so is like discussing Hannibal's mistakes in his great Italian campaign. But we may be pardoned for mentioning two chapters.

In the chapter on moral evil much that is helpful is said, and the

ultimate solution is offered that, while God is responsible for making man capable of sin, man is responsible for turning the capacity into an actuality. This certainly seems as far as we can go from the speculative standpoint. But it always seems to the present writer that the speculative answer is not all that can be said. There is the Atonement, and much can be made of it as God's final remedy for the evil for which He was, in an indirect way, responsible.

The last allusion shall be to the chapter on Determinism. Here, again, there is much that is good; the testimony of consciousness to freedom, the witness of morality, etc., are all dealt with. What we would ask is a more careful treatment of the relation of will to motives, for it is here, so far as the writer's experience goes, that the shoe really pinches. It seems better not to use "motive" in the common and inaccurate sense, as Mr. Drawbridge does, but rather, with the Bishop of Down in his "Short Study of Ethics," to distinguish between "desire" and "motive," and to lay stress upon the need for self-identification of the subject with the desires that spring up in him, and to find the essence of freedom in the power of self-identification. Dr. D'Arcy gives the following scheme, which may be compared with that which Mr. Drawbridge gives on p. 187. There is—(1) The want; (2) the feeling of the want; (3) an idea of an object by which the want can be satisfied; (4) an idea of the satisfaction actually taking place, the work of the imagination; (5) the presentation of this satisfaction as, under the circumstances, the greatest good. The self identifying itself with the attainment of the object; finding in the realization of the idea, not the satisfaction of a want merely, but the satisfaction of self. Only in the last stage can there be said to be really "motive," and action inevitably follows.

We end by thanking Mr. Drawbridge for a most useful book.

THE LIFE OF ISAAC WATTS. By Thomas Wright. *Farncombe and Sons.*
Price 5s. net.

This is Vol. III. of the series of "Lives of British Hymn-Writers," of which the previous volumes have dealt with Hart and Toplady. It is certain that no such series could possibly omit the name and work of Watts, and the publisher has found an author who has given full glory to his subject. Watts's personal life and history is given in detail, and much of the inside history of those stirring days, as viewed from the "Nonconformist" standpoint, is told with frankness and sympathy. The author's own position is not concealed, and special attention is paid to the "dull, vacant, and mischievous" Queen Anne, who is described also as a "wretched woman," and whose death is the signal for intense joy throughout the Nonconformist world, of whom the famous "Bold Bradbury" seems a fitting mouthpiece when he preaches, at the Queen's death, on the text, "Go, see now to this cursed woman and bury her, for she is a King's daughter."

Watts's boyhood, early manhood, ministry at Mark Lane, his love-making, his conflicts with the mighty Bradbury, who lashed Jacobites and spurned bishoprics, all serve to show his development and lend colour and meaning to many of his hymns. That these differ in quality no one would deny, and even our author goes so far as to say that "as a hymn-writer Watts died at forty-four." On the other hand, it is equally certain that

Watts has given to the Church at large hymns which will remain while the English language is spoken, and such poems as "O God, our Help in ages past," "Come, let us join our cheerful songs," "When I survey the wondrous Cross," reach a height and sound a depth which prove them indeed to be of God. Although Watts belonged to one special and rather narrow school of the Body of Christ, which suffered much and must be forgiven much, such hymns as these belong to the whole Church, and prove that he, too, is greater than any party, greater than himself knew. The author will have none of modern "improvements" upon Watts's lines (though he himself dubs certain lines or verses "grotesque," and waits for the coming of one who can remodel such), and asks the "disgusted public" to judge of the way in which it has been "defrauded" by the publishers of "Hymns Ancient and Modern" in the substitution of the word "offering" for "present" in the well-known verse commencing "Were the whole realm of nature mine."

Nothing is more interesting than the inside view one gets of the Nonconforming men and worship in days that were full of tumult; for Watts lived in the reigns of Charles II., James II., William III., Anne, and two Georges. Men had not yet fully learned to separate political power from religious oppression, and days that saw the Stuarts go out and the Hanoverians come in were days indeed to the men among whom Watts lived, worked, and died. The book has entailed hard and detailed work, and serves its purpose well.

W. HEATON RENSHAW.

INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH. By George Salmon, D.D. London: *John Murray*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

It is twenty-six years since Dr. Salmon's great work was first published, and a new generation is taking the place of the men to whom first his words were addressed. To say that the book is still needed is not to say that it did not accomplish its endeavour to confute the claim of the Papacy to "infallibility," but simply to recognize that a new generation has to deal with the same boastful claim, and that the same splendid arguments which so successfully did their work before are as powerful and irrefutable as they were then. Mr. Murray, therefore, is to be congratulated on publishing this fourth edition at the low price of 2s. 6d., as an exact reprint, without any alterations, of the second edition, first published in 1890. It is a book of 500 pages, and is nicely printed and bound. The pages are packed with solid and relentless argument, which exposes false positions and demolishes them. Newman's essays are dealt with and replied to. Milner's axioms are carefully discussed. The vacillations and hesitations of the "infallible" Roman Church are displayed, and the historical progress of Roman supremacy outlined until it reaches that stage of temporal power for which the claim of infallibility, if admitted, gives an unanswerable title.

Mr. ROBERT SCOTT is to be congratulated on the issue of a most practical quartette of volumes that will prove valuable aids to speakers and preachers. In the *KNIGHT AND THE DRAGON* (2s. net), the Rev. Will Reason has put forth a number of very helpful addresses to boys and girls, that form a most helpful guide to those whose ministry is among the young. Each "talk" is made attractive by some interesting anecdote, and the teaching

given is likely to "stick." The volume is marked by freshness of thought and simplicity of language. Boys and girls will read it with pleasure. *THINGS TO GRIP* (2s. net), by Charles Edwards, is well named, and contains thirty-five suggestive addresses in outline on various subjects. The outlines are broken up into "heads" and subdivisions, which will serve to guide the young speaker to clearness of thought and expression. For a teachers' and speakers' instruction class this little volume would be most valuable. The writer is a believer in alliteration, assonance, and parallelism, in the headings and subdivisions of his subjects. Such addresses would give the hearers "something to carry away" which they would not readily forget. *STRAIGHT TO THE TARGET* (2s. net) is a collection of 350 apt illustrations for use in pulpit, desk, men's meetings, school, class, and open air, arranged by S. Ellis, who has already put forth "Stems and Twigs," "Sermons in a Nutshell," etc. In a book of this sort some of the illustrations must be better than others, but here there is a general level that is very high. An alphabetical index serves to make the collection the more useful for reference. *TEACHING BY ILLUSTRATION* (3s. 6d. net), by the Rev. J. W. W. Moeran, M.A., is the best book of its kind that has issued from the Press for a long time. The writer brings to bear on his task a wide experience gained in more than one responsible sphere, and a well-stored devotional mind. The selection of illustrations is made with taste and skill. The high praise given in the introduction by Bishop Ingham is well deserved: "I can only say that, next to my Bible, I should like to have this book near me when I am preparing a sermon." Of the 367 illustrations, many are choice extracts from the writings of modern preachers and authors, and all are well deserving of a place in the collection. The volume is a real boon to preachers and speakers.

A SOWER WENT FORTH TO SOW. By the Rev. T. W. M. Lund. A Second Series of Sermons preached in the Chapel of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Hardman Street, Liverpool. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 5s. net.

There are fifty sermons in this volume of 342 pages. They form a collection of interesting little essays (illustrated by unconventional and out-of-the-way incidents) dealing with a variety of disconnected subjects, which are more or less suitable to Sundays and seasons of the Christian year. Three are devoted to "Broad Church Ideals," three to the "Holy Communion," and three to the "Athanasian Creed." There are some arresting "texts" and strange "titles"; and there are some very startling utterances—*e.g.*, "All the miracles are on the same footing of incredibility" (p. 61). The reader misses the emphasis upon the Cross, and is pained by a sense of confusion with regard to the deepest facts of Redemption—*e.g.*, "A man once died to show me how to live" (p. 51). The book is interesting enough—even diverting at times—but it leaves the reader with a sense of something lacking.

THE VALUES OF THE CROSS; OR, THINGS THAT MATTER. By the Rev. W. Yorke Fausset, M.A., Prebendary of Wells and Vicar of Cheddar. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

These are six addresses delivered in Lent, 1913, and the titles suggest an admirable Lenten course for those who are not afraid to preach doctrinal

sermons. It is good to read addresses that maintain the centrality of the Cross, and for this the author may be forgiven some passages of a somewhat strong sacramentarian character. There is teaching in the last address—"The Cross the Key to Paradise"—that is un-Anglican and without Scriptural warrant. Since this book was published the author has passed within the veil.

GRACES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHARACTER. By the Rev. S. M. Berry, M.A.
London: *Religious Tract Society*. Price 2s.

This little book consists of twelve articles reprinted from the *Sunday at Home*, and written by the successor of Dr. Jowett, of Carr's Lane Church, Birmingham. They deal in pleasant and popular manner with those "graces" (such as obedience, humility, love, sympathy, and joy) which combine to make up the life that is lived by the Spirit of Jesus Christ. The different chapters deal in turn with these different "graces," and the result is a very attractive little book with a most helpful message, delivered in a way not hard to be understood.

THINGS LEARNT BY LIVING. By John Bascom. *Knickerbocker Press*.
Price 5s. net.

This American book is made up of the personal reminiscences and impressions of one who is now an old man. He has keen interest in all social topics and problems, of which he says, truly enough, that "religious ideas are the true solvents." He does not hesitate to give many personal details of his own history, and is definite in his attitude on many themes sometimes regarded as debatable (*e.g.*, the habit of smoking). The things which he has "learned" in his "living" include, he feels convinced, "many truths in my published works of which the world is finding, or will find, the need." His chapters deal with such subjects as health, recreations, persons, writings, work, and religion. He is the son of a "Puritanic" minister, and is a religiously-minded man of the type who is "steadily shaking off formal theological opinions as not sufficiently grounded in facts, as subtle beyond knowledge, putting in their place a spiritual rendering of the events of the world."

THE REVISED VERSION. Edited for the Use of Schools. Isa. xl.-lxvi.
By the Rev. W. A. L. Elmslie, M.A., and the Rev. John Skinner, D.D.
Cambridge: *At the University Press*. Price 1s. 6d. net.

The reader will first inquire what position the editors take in reference to the date, authorship, and unity of these chapters, and the interpretation of the servant-passages. The endeavour is made to weigh the arguments in either direction, without very decisive results, but with a strong inclination to modern critical opinions. But the difficulties of a balanced statement are insufficiently faced. The traditional ascription of the authorship to Isaiah is very ancient. It is not enough to say that "if someone found these twenty-seven chapters without any name attached to them, various reasons might occur to him inclining him to add them to the Isaiah collection," as an honest but mistaken belief, a fraudulent intention, or the thought that they form a desirable continuation to Isaiah's prophecies. In contrast with a sentence on the one side, pages are devoted to the other, and every argument

is adduced, even to that drawn from the use of the name Cyrus, although in the commentary on the words "that saith of Cyrus," in xlv. 28, it is said that "the text is probably incorrect," and of xlv. 1, that "the metrical form suggests that 'to Cyrus' is an interpretative gloss." The Introduction is disappointing, but the subsequent notes are frequently of great use for elucidation of the sense and explanation of allusions.

TRAIL TALES OF WESTERN CANADA. By the Rev. F. A. Robinson, B.A. Toronto: *Marshall Brothers*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

As Mr. Ralph Connor in his introductory note says, this is a true rescript of events which have happened in the author's personal experience. The book tells in simple and vivid style the story, always fascinating and thrilling, of the triumph of the Gospel in the souls of men. The new West is full of the broken driftwood of humanity, showing the marks of the attrition of time, and conflict, and defeat. Good stuff it is, but waste and lost. The book tells of its salvage to the infinite joy of men and the glory of God. The author has the further distinction of having seen himself a large part of the events he describes. This book will do good wherever it goes.

WHEN WILL OUR LORD RETURN? PROPHETIC TIMES AND WARNING EVENTS. By Harold Norris. London: *C. J. Thynne*. Price 1s. net.

Many attempts have been made since the days of Dr. Cumming to fix the date of our Lord's return, and we intuitively dislike and distrust them. Although, to do Mr. Norris justice, he says that he is convinced the precise day or hour is not to be known, yet he has fixed upon a period within which he expects it. This period is the week of years from October, 1915, to October, 1922; and he holds that the central soli-lunar epoch within that week of years—namely, from October, 1917, to April or June, 1919, is the most "particular time." His book appeared before the outbreak of the present war, so of course it is not included among the warning events. It seems a little stretch to include among these the loss of the *Titanic*, as well as several disasters in October, 1913. But there is much that is striking in the book, and students of prophecy will like to have it to refer to, even if they cannot accept all the conclusions of the author.

JAYA: WHICH MEANS VICTORY. By Beatrice M. Harband. London: *Marshall Brothers*. Price 6s. net.

This is a missionary book, somewhat off the ordinary lines. It is not a volume of impressions, nor yet a collection of more or less disconnected incidents in the career of a missionary, but the life-story of a Hindu girl, the daughter of a wealthy lawyer, who is a product of Western education and Eastern superstition. Jaya was betrothed while yet a baby to a man rather older than her father—a man, too, bitterly opposed to mission work, and who was disconcerted to find that his bride had been educated in a mission school, though he himself had been given his first start in life by missionaries. The interest of the reader is sustained from the first pages to the last, in which Jaya—left a widow and an orphan—becomes at last a Christian in more than name.

Publications of the Month.

[Insertion under this heading neither precludes nor guarantees a further notice.]

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

- PLAIN AND PRACTICAL LESSONS FOR CONFIRMATION CANDIDATES AND OTHERS. By the Rev. G. A. Tindall. (*Elliot Stock*. 2s. 6d. net.) A well-arranged handbook, which clergy will find useful, dealing in Part I. with the beginning, in Part II. the strengthening, and in Part III. the continuation, of the Christian life.
- MIRACLES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Arthur C. Headlam, D.D. (*John Murray*. 6s. net.) In this work, which contains his Moorhouse Lectures delivered in Melbourne last year, Dr. Headlam treats the various problems arising out of the belief in miracles in relation to current ideas of science, philosophy, and criticism.
- WORDS OF LIGHT AND LIFE. By E. C. Wickham, D.D. (*Humphrey Milford*. 5s. net.) Sermons preached by the late Dean of Lincoln at the nave services of the Cathedral, marked by quiet dignity, grace, and charm. The Bishop of Southwark contributes the Preface.
- HOLY GOSPELS OPENED, THE. By the Rev. J. Stuart Holden, M.A. (*Morgan and Scott*. 2s. 6d. net.) A new book by Mr. Holden is always welcome, and this volume, with its daily message for the Bible reader, is stimulating and helpful.
- JESUS, THE BRIDEGROOM. By E. E. C. (*Sonthend-on-Sea: W. Smalls*. 2s. 6d.) A Second Advent study.

GENERAL.

- "NOR'ARD OF THE DOGGER." By E. J. Mather. (*Simpkin Marshall and Co., Ltd.* 1s. net.) A new edition (forty-second thousand) of a truly remarkable book, which tells of the early work of the Mission to Deep-Sea Fishermen, of which the author was practically the founder. The vivid picture it gives of life in the North Sea is of more than usual interest just now. The Bishop of Durham, in a Preface of singular warmth and beauty, recalls the immense success of the book when it was first issued in the eighties, and expresses the hope that the second life of this book, so homely, so great, may be even more fruitful than the first. We have pleasure in commending a volume which abounds in living interest, and is a great stimulus to faith and prayer.
- FIFTEEN CHAPTERS OF AUTOBIOGRAPHY. By the Right Hon. W. E. Russell; and FIFTEEN THOUSAND MILES IN A KETCH. By Captain Raymond du Baty—two volumes in *Nelson's Shilling Library*. THE VELVET GLOVE. By H. Seton Merriman; and THE LUCK OF THE VAILS. By E. F. Benson—two volumes in *Nelson's Sevenpenny Series*.
- ROMANISM IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY. By Rudolph H. McKim, D.D. (*E. Putnam's Sons*. 5s. net.) A frank examination of Leo XIII.'s "Encyclical on Reunion," together with other essays on the Roman controversy.
- HEALING POWER, THE. By Helen Mary Boulnois. (*Simpkin, Marshall and Co.* 1s. 6d. net.)
- TRAIL TALES OF WESTERN CANADA. By the Rev. F. A. Robinson. (*Marshall Brothers*. 3s. 6d. net.)
- OUR WONDERFUL BIBLE. By Gertrude Hollis. (*S.P.C.K.* 2s. net.) Presents a number of facts about the Bible in a fascinating way, but we are not quite with the writer in her views on Inspiration. With this we may join a companion volume, OUR WONDERFUL CATHEDRALS, by Gertrude Hollis (*S.P.C.K.* 2s. net), which is most interesting throughout. The illustrations in both books are excellent.
- OUR EMPIRE. (*S.P.C.K.* 2s. 6d. net.) GOLDEN SUNBEAMS. (*S.P.C.K.* 1s. 4d.) Annual volumes of two well-known monthlies.
- WHAT TO KEEP FROM AND WHAT TO KEEP. By the Rev. James B. Wane. (*C. Murray*.) A little volume of friendly advice to young men.
- REAPING, A. By E. F. Benson. (*T. Nelson and Sons*.) Shilling Library Series.
- WALKING GENTLEMAN, A. By James Prior. BROTHERS. By H. A. Vachell. (*T. Nelson and Sons*.) Sevenpenny Library Series.
- DAVID IN HEAVEN, AND OTHER POEMS. By R. Gales. (*Simpkin, Marshall and Co.* 3s. 6d. net.) THINGS OLD AND NEW. By G. H. (*Simpkin, Marshall and Co.*) Two volumes of verse.
- MODERN MIDAS, A. By Mabel King. (*Drummond's Tract Depot*.) A beautiful story with excellent Gospel teaching.

CHURCH IN THE MODERN STATE, THE. By Frederick Rogers. (*Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd.* 2s. 6d. net.) A fresh volume in Dr. Hermitage Day's "St. Paul's Handbooks" series. The writer discusses theories of Church and State, and shows us in succession his views on the Church in Europe, England, and Scotland.

MISSIONARY.

GOSPEL IN FUTUNA, THE. By William Gunn, L.R.C.S., and L.R.C.P. Edin. With Introduction by the Rev. Alexander Miller, D.D. (*Hodder and Stoughton.* 6s.) Futuna, despite its insignificance on the map, occupies a position of pre-eminent importance in the Mission history of the New Hebrides, and in this illuminating volume Dr. Gunn, a medical missionary of the United Free Church of Scotland, tells the story of the wonderful progress of the Gospel in that region. The chapters on the Islands, the people, their customs, religious beliefs, etc., are of abiding interest. Including Futuna, over twenty islands of the New Hebrides have already been Christianized.

WITH THE BIBLE IN BRAZIL. By Frederick C. Glass. (*Morgan and Scott.* 2s. 6d. net.) A really thrilling narrative of the experiences of a colporteur and missionary of the Evangelical Mission of South America. The Rev. J. Stuart Holden contributes a commendatory Foreword.

AUSTRALIAN ABORIGINAL AND THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, THE. By the Rev. Herbert Pitts. (*S.P.C.K.* 2s. net.) The author was some time S.P.G. missionary in North-West Australia, and writes from first-hand knowledge. The chapters dealing with customs and beliefs are widely descriptive, and those treating of missions and missionary work (are sufficiently comprehensive, giving, as they do, accounts of Roman Catholic as well as Anglican missions.

PROFESSOR EXPLAINS, THE. By J. A. Stanton Batty. (*C.M.S. House.*) An excellent presentation to young minds of missionary problems.

SUN CHILDREN AND MOON CHILDREN. By T. (*C.M.S.* 1s.)

WAR LITERATURE.

GOD AND THE WAR. By Archdeacon J. Paterson-Smyth. (*Hodder and Stoughton.* 2s. 6d. net.) Lessons of the present crisis contained in a series of ten sermons or essays in Dr. Paterson-Smyth's best style.

"**THE END IS NOT YET.**" By "G." (*Hunter and Longhurst.* 6d. net.) Five war sermons discussing the outlook, and asking the question, "Where does the National Church come in?"

AMOR VINCIT OMNIA. By Lillian Stevenson. (*Student Christian Movement.* 3d.) A pamphlet with suggestive thoughts on the war, and most useful notes on what to read.

PAPERS FOR WAR-TIME: NO. 10. THE REAL WAR. By W. E. Orchard, D.D. No. 12. AN ANSWER TO BERNHARDI. By D. S. Cairns, D.D. (*Humphrey Milford.* 2d. each.)

WAR. By J. B. Mozley, D.D. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 3d.) A reprint of Dr. Mozley's famous sermon before the University of Oxford in 1871.

PERSONALITY AND NATIONALITY. By Richard Roberts. (*Headley Brothers.* 1s. net.) A comparison of Modern Germany with Modern England, and showing where Germany went wrong.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE WAR. Papers read at the Islington Clerical Meeting by the Dean of Canterbury, Canon Simpson, Bishop of Chelmsford, Rev. J. R. Darbyshire, Rev. W. Temple, and Rev. F. T. Woods. (*Record Newspaper Office.* 3d. net.)

GERMANY'S WAR INSPIRERS—NIETZSCHE AND TRIETSCHKE. By Canon E. Maclure, B.A. (*S.P.C.K.* 4d. net.) A pamphlet which should be in the hands of everyone who desires to know the influences which led up to the war.

PAMPHLETS.

A CHILD'S BOOK OF PRAYER. By J. E. Ward. (*Elliot Stock.* 6d. net.) A beautiful little book, simple and fresh, and likely to cultivate in children the habit of prayer.

HOLY COMMUNION. Compiled by "G." (*Hunter and Longhurst.* 2d. net.) A service of preparation for congregational use.

RELIGION AND MORALITY. By the Bishop of Winchester. **THE SACRAMENTS OF THE GOSPEL.** By Canon Simpson, D.D. **THE VERIFICATION OF CHRISTIAN FAITH IN EXPERIENCE.** By the Rev. J. T. Mitchell, D.D. Being Nos. IX, X, and XI, respectively, of the Liverpool Board of Divinity Publications. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 1s. net. each.)