

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

January, 1921

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

No longer can "The Month" appear as the title of these Notes for the reason that, to our great regret, it has become necessary to change THE CHURCHMAN from a monthly to a quarterly magazine and the present number is the first of the new series. This does not mean that interest in the magazine is less keen than it was; indeed, tested by every available means there is abundant reason to know that during the last two years it has been growing steadily in favour. The number of subscribers has increased substantially and many have been the testimonies received as to its usefulness and importance. But the enormous increase in the cost of production, and more particularly in the cost of printing, made it necessary for the Proprietors to reconsider the position. The simplest way out of the difficulty would have been to stop publication even as other magazines—hard hit by the apparently unending rise in prices—have had to stop. But THE CHURCHMAN stands on a footing different from other magazines. It is not run for profit; it is conducted with a great purpose in view; it exists to serve a cause; and it was widely felt that if it were to cease publication a void would be created which no other magazine could well fill. A scheme was, therefore, prepared for publishing it quarterly at half-a-crown (instead of monthly at one shilling), or ten shillings per annum as at present, and the magazine itself to be increased by sixteen pages. But before a final decision was taken it was decided to consult the present subscribers. A circular was accordingly sent to as many of them as could be reached, explaining the position and asking whether we might rely upon their continued support. We are glad to be able to say that the response has been so exceedingly favourable that those responsible for the Magazine feel justified in going forward with their plans. We are most grateful for the kind way in which the proposal has been received; and we take

this opportunity of assuring our subscribers that no effort on our part will be wanting to maintain the high character of the Magazine and to increase its usefulness. We have many indications that **THE CHURCHMAN** is not so well known as it ought to be, and we appeal, therefore, to our subscribers to do all they can to bring it to the notice of their friends and so help to enlist new subscribers. We shall be glad also to receive, from those who feel they would like to help, one or more additional subscriptions to enable us to send the Magazine gratis to younger clergy and others who might not otherwise see it, the subscriber nominating, if so desired, the person to whom it should be sent. In this way not only will the usefulness of the Magazine be extended but also its continuance will be assured.

Dr. Headlam Canon Headlam has published a new Preface to
and his the Second Edition of his already famous Bampton
Critics. Lectures on Reunion. He has carefully read the criticisms made upon them and finds that he has nothing to alter and nothing for which he ought to apologize. It is plain that the criticisms of Mr. C. H. Turner and Bishop Gore not only leave him unmoved but strengthen his convictions. He has been accused of perverting the evidence and he has so strong a grip of facts that he is unruffled by an accusation that would have made a less convinced man angry. He deals with the charge that he ignores the Synoptic Problem, and we have seldom seen anything neater than the way in which he repels the suggestion. He shows that Liberals and Conservatives are not above surrendering their professed opinions and adopting the views of the other side when it suits their case. His own method is marked by shrewd common sense. "I propose to avoid relying on isolated passages and special texts, and to examine the general tendency of our Lord's teaching. If we find that the more definite sayings are in harmony with the rest of the teaching it will be a reasonable deduction that they are genuine." Replying to Mr. Turner's criticism that no mention is made of our Lord's association of the Apostles with Himself in judging the twelve tribes, he discusses the context and adds: "It seems to me that Mr. Turner's failure to understand this passage shows how perverted a view of the Gospel a too eager interest in ecclesiasticism produces." We agree that discipleship was the important feature

of their fitness to fill the post of judges. Nothing could be more complete than the refutation of Mr. Turner's contention that "Baptism with the Holy Ghost really means Confirmation, and therefore Baptism without Confirmation is not Christian Baptism at all." If the ancient writers mean anything they give no support to this sweeping modern view.

Canon
Headlam and
Bishop Gore.

After repelling Dr. Gore's attack on the supposed depreciation of Confirmation, he says that his own method is to try and examine the different documents on the one side of the circumstances in which they were written, and on the other side of the ultimate results. In accordance with this outlook he meets the objections of the Bishop and first asks, "Are we really justified in insisting as a necessary condition of validity in all circumstances on a rule of the Church for which there is no Biblical or Apostolic or, in fact, any early authority at all?" This is a strong statement which he shows to be founded on all the facts in our possession. He says, "I have read every passage which has been quoted in the earlier Fathers about Apostolic Succession, and I cannot find that they did hold it; I do find that they held the other theory. Bishop Gore assumes that they held both." After discussing what Mr. Turner admits, he writes, "I cannot help feeling that Mr. Turner and Bishop Gore have not had the courage to make the necessary deductions from the historical conclusions at which the former has arrived." Bishop Gore insists that all Presbyterian and Nonconformist orders are invalid and that we must insist on reordination in every case. "The transmission of spiritual authority is necessary for the Christian Church." The reply is simple: "The New Testament contains no directions at all from the Apostles about the Christian ministry. In early Christian writers we get certain statements, but they never say the things which from Bishop Gore's point of view they ought to say, and often seem to say things they really ought not." All who have studied the evidence will agree with this, as they will with the observation, "I would say that it is the fear that such theories as Bishop Gore holds may be looked upon as necessary which keeps back many Nonconformists from reunion and the acceptance of episcopacy." "At the present time there is widespread desire for Church unity, and that is accompanied by a strong

feeling that it should be on the basis of episcopacy. But it is accompanied by a considerable fear of theories which seem unspiritual and mechanical ; and it is, I believe, just the emphasis which Bishop Gore gives to those theories which is deterring many from reunion on an episcopal basis." May we add there is a curious slip in the Preface. Dr. Headlam falls into the common error of identifying the Church and the Clergy ! Even a Regius Professor nods !

A great disservice has been done to the Retreat Movement by the publication of two Manuals issued "Retreat Manuals," for "The Association for Promoting Retreats." The two we refer to are Nos. 7 and 8 of a series known as "Retreat Manuals" ; but they are the only two that have come under our notice, just as this is the first time that we have ever heard of the Association. It may be that Nos. 1-6 are not open to the same criticism to which Nos. 7 and 8 are exposed, or it may be of course that they are after the same pattern. In any case we deplore the teaching they convey not only because it is "erroneous and strange," but also because of the injury it must do to a movement which properly conducted, on lines agreeable to the teaching of the Church of England, could do much to deepen and strengthen spiritual life. It is, of course, common knowledge that, in the past, "Retreats," by reason of their association with extreme teaching, have been looked askance at by Evangelical Churchpeople, but more lately endeavours have been made to show that such seasons of retirement from the stress and bustle of life may be made helpful to devout Churchpeople of all schools of thought and pressure has been brought to bear upon Evangelicals to go into "Retreat," not wholly without result. But with such publications before us as these two "Retreat Manuals," we do not hesitate to say that the objections which have been taken to the Retreat Movement are fully justified. We know nothing of "The Association for Promoting Retreats," but if its views are to be judged by these two Manuals, we warn all whom our words can reach against having anything whatever to do with Retreats "promoted" under its auspices. This is not to condemn the whole Retreat Movement ; but there is obviously real need for examining most carefully what is likely to be the teaching advanced in any Retreat before loyal and faithful Churchpeople, such as Evangelicals claim to be, consent to attend it.

No. 7 of these Manuals is entitled "Plain Hints for Penitents" and is openly and undisguisedly an attempt to popularize the Confessional. The author, in his Introduction, says that the object of his little paper is not to persuade people to go to confession, but to help those who do; and this is no doubt the case. But he enjoins upon those for whom he writes the duty of becoming missionaries for the Confessional. "If you find the gift of Absolution unspeakably precious," such is his exhortation, "you cannot help wanting others to find it, and will do all you can to help them to do so." "You will do this best," he proceeds, "by making them feel that Confession is not some terrible and painful duty that ought to be done, but a simple and natural way of securing that complete pardon of all their sins for which our Lord died that they might have, and that any pain or humiliation which it involves is as nothing compared to the joy and strength which Absolution gives." The "hints" given concern both the Preparation and the Confession, and there are others of a more general character. In regard to the wording of the confession the penitent is urged to be as precise as possible, to avoid negative phrases and always to call a spade a spade. "It is often easier," he says, "to call it a shovel. This is perhaps specially the case with sins against purity. It needs courage and real penitence to be honest about these. Don't conceal grave offences under vague and easy phrases which may mean very little. Never mind what you say in confession. If you are really penitent and are conscious that you are speaking to our Blessed Lord you will be quite simple and honest. Under the sacred protection of the Confessional you can say things that would not be possible in ordinary conversation. Try to spare your confessor the necessity of asking questions. It is just as painful to him as it is to you." The hints about the Confession are concerned with such details as going to the church at the time the priest hears confessions and not asking for a special appointment; observing carefully to take one's turn; going to the confessional "the moment you see the person before you leave it"; and so on. "In the confessional the 'personal' element," we read, "must be reduced to its lowest point. Anything approaching conversation obscures the divine character of the Sacrament," and then, "When you have finished listen to the priest." Among the "General Hints" we find this: "Sometimes

it is wise to make a General Confession ; that is a confession of all the sins of your past life. A desire to do this often arises in Retreat. Don't do it lightly. It is not a good thing to go back to old sins in the past. Only do it with the advice of your Director. If the desire arises in Retreat, and you are quite sure the Holy Spirit is moving you to do so, then do it. It is not necessary, of course, to go into much detail." We deplore, as all Evangelical Churchpeople must deplore, such teaching which is plainly contrary to Holy Scripture and to the formularies of our Church. It is enough for us to know that " if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous, and He is the Propitiation for our sins " ; and with Him we want nothing between.

"Plain Hints for Communicants." We cannot deal at the same length with No. 8 of these Retreat Manuals, but it may be explained that it offers (and is entitled) *Plain Hints for Communicants*. We select only one section of it—that relating to the Reservation of the Sacrament. It is claimed that " the object of reserving the Blessed Sacrament is that Communion may be given at any hour to any who cannot come to receive It during Mass, whether from sickness or any other reason." " Many people," the author adds, " do not realize this and go for a long time without Communion." This he declares is quite unnecessary, for " every priest is ready to give Communion at any hour to those who desire It, provided, of course, they are fasting and in a state of grace." He then gives some suggestions to those who would receive in this way. They are to kneel at the " Altar " rail and begin the Confession when the priest " has opened the Tabernacle and taken out the Ciborium." After the Absolution and the Prayer of Humble Access " you will then receive the Most Holy, in one kind only, as the Chalice is never reserved." Upon this it is only necessary to observe that these " hints " are plainly at variance with the regulations laid down by Convocation. Whatever view may be taken about Reservation—and for ourselves we believe it to be wholly unnecessary, as well as fraught with great spiritual danger—it is admitted even by Anglo-Catholics themselves that the Bishop of the Diocese has the right to regulate it. Is there a single Diocesan Bishop in England who would approve of the suggestions of this Manual? We are certain there is not. It is

not unreasonable, therefore, to ask, What, if the practice above described is persisted in, do the Bishops intend to do? The author of both of these Manuals is described on the title-page of each as "The Rev. Francis Boyd," but as no further particulars are given it is impossible exactly to identify him. Is he, we wonder, a benefited clergyman in the diocese of London?

The E.C.U. and the Lambeth Conference. The English Church Union is plainly not satisfied with the Lambeth Conference Resolutions. The Council referred them for examination to its Theological and Liturgical Committee, and this body has issued an interim report dealing with the Reunion proposals and the Ministrations of Women. The reason for this haste is that synodical action may be taken on these matters, and it is "with a view to assisting Synods and the faithful in general" that this Report is issued. Its suggestions are sufficiently sweeping. Thus in regard to Section VI of the Lambeth Appeal it is contended—

Considerable additions are needed if this statement is to be made satisfactory: (1) Unless to the phrase "the Creed commonly called Nicene" there is added some such explanation as "interpreted by the dogmatic decisions and the tradition of the whole Church," a door is left open for the heresies condemned by the Third and Fourth Œcumenical Councils and for other grave errors; (2) unless some addition is made as to belief in the doctrine of the Sacraments, there would be nothing to prevent the official recognition for the first time of Zwinglian errors concerning Baptism and the Holy Communion, and there ought to be security for the acceptance of Infant Baptism, and of a fundamentally right belief concerning Holy Matrimony; (3) it is insufficient to specify only the sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion—for instance, it is necessary that the place of Confirmation and Absolution in the sacramental system of the Church should be distinctly recognized, as in the Book of Common Prayer; (4) in regard to the ministry, a recognition that Ordination is the sacramental means of conferring the grace of Holy Orders, and not merely the appointment to a ministerial position is urgently needed.

It cannot be regretted that the E.C.U. has shown its hand so plainly, but what have Nonconformists to say to proposals of this kind?

Interchange of Pulpits. The Theological and Liturgical Committee of the E.C.U. is gravely concerned, also, about the permission in certain circumstances of the exchange of pulpits

with Nonconformists (Section A, paragraph i.), and in its Report it is urged—

There can be little doubt that the resolution if unamended will be used to cover the admission to our pulpits of men who neither accept the Catholic Faith nor intend to receive episcopal Ordination. It would be in the highest degree improper to entrust such ministers with the ministry of the Word in our churches. The proposal is also definitely both uncanonical and illegal so far as England is concerned, inasmuch as such ministers have not made, and cannot make, the Declaration of Assent which is required by the Canons as well as by the law from all who are to be licensed to preach in the Church of England.

The Committee, therefore, has tried to make the resolution “tolerable” and, with this end in view, suggests that it should read as follows—

(A) In the event of a definite arrangement being concluded with a non-episcopal society on the basis of an *ex animo* acceptance by such society of the Catholic Faith and Sacraments and an undertaking given by it to secure a ministry of validly-ordained bishops, priests, and deacons,

(i.) A Bishop would be justified in giving occasional authorization to ministers of such a society who were, or were qualified to become, candidates for Holy Orders to preach in churches within his diocese and to clergy of the diocese to preach in the churches of such ministers.

But it does not follow that what would be “tolerable” to the E.C.U. would be acceptable to other sections of Churchpeople, and for our part we refuse to recognize the right of the E.C.U. to make the Lambeth resolutions of none effect, for that, after all, is what its proposals come to.

Not less drastic are the recommendations of the **Ministrations of Women,** Committee on the Conference resolutions on the ministrations of women. The E.C.U. would restrict severely the work of the deaconess, and adds :—

It is desirable that the whole idea of women instructing and exhorting the general congregation should be decisively repudiated as (1) based upon an unwarranted assumption of what the office of a Deaconess in the Primitive Church involved ; (2) a breach of Catholic order and custom ; (3) inevitably tending to widen the gulf between the English Church and the rest of Historic Christendom ; (4) *ultra vires* for a provincial or local Church ; (5) likely to lead to increasing division among ourselves.

THE DOCTRINE OF "THE PRESENCE." THE COLLOQUY OF POISSY, 1561.

BY W. PRESCOTT UPTON.

IN the January (1920) number of the *CHURCHMAN* the present writer endeavoured to show that the divergence of our Articles from the Wurtemberg Confession on the question of the "real" presence, is proof that the English formulary—unlike the German—was not designed to shelter, or rather was designed not to shelter, that teaching. The Articles, while following the guidance of Wurtemberg in most of the doctrinal amendments made in 1563, diverged from it in this matter. The purpose of the present paper is to supply evidence that our formularies adopted the characteristic language recognized at the time as distinctive of the "Reformed," and therefore as excluding the Lutheran and Romish view of the presence.

A wealth of illustrative evidence has been accumulated during the last seventy years to prove the identity of the sacramental teaching of the Church of England with that of the foreign Reformed Churches. Mr. Gorham—of the "Gorham case"—was one of the first to cultivate this fruitful field of argument in defence of the doctrinal standards of our Church, against "non-natural" perversions of their meaning; and possibly many who are familiar only with his name would be not a little surprised to discover the remarkable learning possessed by this able if somewhat peculiar divine. Dean Goode pushed the argument still further; but it is most aptly and fully and persuasively employed in the works of the late Rev. N. Dimock. In the writings of such men, students may find that passages in the Church formularies, which are often regarded as teaching "high" doctrine of the Sacraments, are no "higher" than, and often not so "high" as, some which occur in the confessions of the Continental "Reformed" Churches, or in the works of Calvin, Bullinger and other opponents of the "mechanical theory" of Regeneration in Baptism, and of the "real" presence in the Lord's Supper. But even on a well-reaped field there are gleanings which will repay the trouble of gathering them; and in this case the history of the "Colloquy of Poissy" appears to cast a very

strong light upon the meaning to be attached to the eucharistic Articles of the Church of England.

In 1561 the Venetian ambassador in England reported to his Government that "religious affairs will soon be in an evil case in France" owing to the rapid spread of "heresy," which would result either in its toleration, or that to "enforce obedience to the Pope and the Catholic rites" Romanists would "*have to resort to violence and embroil our hands in noble blood*" (*State Papers, Venetian, 1558-80, No. 272*). The callous savagery of this remark would be surprising if history had not all too terribly informed us that murder, wholesale and ruthless, was in fact the means employed for Rome's deliverance. At least, what our Protestant prejudice calls "murder"; for those who take their moral principles from the Canon Law will know that the killing of "heretics" by those who are "burning with the zeal of the Catholic Mother," is not to be regarded even as "homicide."

It must be confessed that at the time of which we write, Rome was in a desperate plight. Scandinavia had been Protestant for a generation. The greater part of Germany had flung off the "Interim" and secured the legal establishment of Lutheranism. Bohemia and Moravia were practically "Waldensian" or "Wycliffite"; Hungary had gone over to Calvinism. In Poland, Lutherans and Calvinists had reached an amicable understanding and were entering into negotiations with the (Greek) National Church; so that they threatened not merely to conquer this wide realm for the Evangelical Faith, but even to carry the Reformation into the bosom of the Eastern Orthodox Church. In Western Europe the accession of Elizabeth had dealt a staggering blow to Romanism.

The young sovereign met Papal diplomacy with an astuteness at once more able and more honest than its own, and with an inflexible determination (despite all that has been written to the contrary by those who should have known better) to defend the faith of the Gospel. Principally by dint of her own personal exertions, she beat down the solid opposition of the Marian Bishops, Universities, Convocations and House of Lords, and secured the passing of Acts restoring the Reformation as it had stood "at the death of" her brother, Edward VI. By swift energetic action she wrested Scotland from the Papacy, and ere she had been two years on the throne, she had united Great Britain in firm alliance for the

defence of the Reformation. Such had been Elizabeth's work in 1559 and 1560. If 1561 was to see Huguenotism tolerated in France as a preliminary to supplanting Romanism altogether, Rome would be well-nigh driven from the central and northern European fields to cower behind the ramparts of the Pyrenees and the Alps.

The death of Francis II of France on December 5, 1560, by separating the crowns of France and Scotland was yet a further weakening of the Romish party in those countries. Therefore, it is not surprising that at a Council of State held at Rheims after the coronation of Charles IX, May 15, 1561, sweet reasonableness prevailed so far as to cause the Cardinal de Lorraine, then chief prelate of the Gallican Church, to suggest that a conference on the disputed points should be held between the Bishops and the representatives of the "Reformed." The Huguenots accepted with alacrity, the Council agreed unanimously, and Poissy was selected as the place of meeting. The Bishops, however, viewed the assembly with well-grounded forebodings, and out of the 130 of them summoned to attend, not more than fifty were present when the young king opened the "Colloquy" on July 30.

All Europe watched the proceedings with keen interest. Our own Archbishop Parker wrote to Cecil on August 11—

"Upon hearing of a diet for a conference of learned men appointed in France, I wished that Mr. Martyr or Calvin, or both, could be procured thither. . . . It could not but turn out to our own quiet at home to have more friends in conjunction in religion" (*Correspondence*, p. 147).

"Mr. Martyr" was, of course, the famous Italian Reformer who came to England in 1547, and was made Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford the following year. Holding this office he naturally and fitly gave his assistance to our own Reformers in their purification of the Church; and when after the accession of Mary, the slander had been circulated that Cranmer had again set up the Mass in Canterbury Cathedral, the Archbishop indignantly repudiated the accusation, and, defending Peter Martyr from the charge of being "unlearned," offered "with the said Mr. Peter Martyr and four or five others whom I shall choose" to defend the religion of the Edwardine Reformation as "more pure and according to God's Word, than any that hath been used in England these thousand years" (Strype, *Memorials of Cranmer*, iii. 17: E.H.S. edit.). Ritualists are often disposed to over-rate Martyr's influence in order

to depict Cranmer as a weakling who was almost bullied out of holding the "real" presence by "foreign Reformers." The truth is more nearly the reverse of this, for Strype gives good grounds to believe that Cranmer converted Martyr from that error (*Ibid.*, ii. 324).

However this may have been, Martyr was a warm admirer of the English Reformation with which he had been so intimately connected. Just after the Second Prayer Book had been enacted, he wrote to Bullinger, June 14, 1552—

"The Book or Order of Ecclesiastical Rites and Administration of the Sacraments is reformed, for all things are removed which could nourish superstition. . . . As far as regards transubstantiation or the real presence (so to speak) in the bread or wine, thanks be to God, concerning *these things* there seems to be now *no controversy* as it regards those who *profess the Gospel*" (Gorham, *Ref. Gleanings*, p. 281).

On the accession of Mary, Martyr was again driven into exile, but was given the professorship of Hebrew at Zürich. When Elizabeth came to the throne he wrote her a letter of congratulation (*Ibid.*, pp. 389-90), which he followed up by dedicating to her his work on the Lord's Supper, in which he assures the royal theologian—

"It has been my chief object to defend nothing which . . . (or lastly) has not been approved by the *public profession of your Church of England* in the good time" (*Ibid.*, pp. 381-2).

The Queen was greatly pleased with the treatise, and even desired Martyr's return to England to resume his professorship, but he steadily declined the repeated overtures made to him, feeling that he could not in honour disregard his obligations to the Church of Zürich (which had befriended him in adversity (*Zürich Letters*, i. 81 n. ; ii. 57)). The English Reformers esteemed him greatly and held much intimate correspondence with him, so that Parker's mention of him before even Calvin for the Colloquy was natural. Though he was unable to be at the opening, he intervened very effectively at a later stage of the proceedings, in which, with Calvin's great pupil and successor, Theodore Beza, and Nicholas des Gallars, minister of the French Church in London, he was one of the principal representatives of the Reformed.

The English Reformers were peculiarly well informed as to the deliberations there, for Jewel writes to Martyr on February 7, 1562—

"Though the affairs in France were made known to us by report, as usual, and by the couriers, yet the information seemed both more certain and far more agreeable when communicated by yourself, and more especially as I know you have had much to do with them. . . . That disputation of

yours, however, has of necessity much advanced the Gospel and discomfited the adversaries. . . . We do not *differ from your doctrine by a nail's breadth*, for as to the Ubiquitarian theory, there is *no danger in this country*" (*Ibid.*, i. 99, 100).

In des Gallars our Reformers had even a better source of information than in Peter Martyr himself. When the former first came over to minister to the French Church here, he wrote to Calvin, June 30, 1560, mentioning his very cordial reception by Grindal, Bishop of London, who had said, "I might have familiar access to him whenever I wished"; and when he left England, the Bishop wrote a letter of commendation for him to take to Calvin, June 19, 1563, saying that he had not only composed the differences in the French Church, "but has also by his advice and prudence been of great use both to myself and to our churches" (*Ibid.*, ii. 50, 96). Now des Gallars himself published in London in 1562 *A Brief Rehearsal of the Acts of the Synod of Poissy*. This book is extremely rare, for there is no copy of it in the British Museum, though one happily exists in the Rylands Library at Manchester. Des Gallars wrote it in Latin, and it was translated into English by "J.D."; if the Latin original still survives, possibly in the archives of Geneva, it would afford a most interesting study. However, des Gallars collaborated with Beza in the production of the history of the Reformed Church in France, first published in 1580, and there the Colloquy is dealt with very fully. All that is necessary for our present purpose is to show that the English Reformers were in possession of accurate information with regard to the proceedings at Poissy *before* the revision of the Articles in January, 1563.

Beza, the chief Reformed disputant, contended that—

"This transubstantiation doth not agree with the analogy and proportion of our faith, because it is *directly contrary to the nature of the sacraments*: in which it is necessary that the substantial signs remain in order to be true signs of the substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and it in like manner *overthroweth* the truth (*et c'est pareillement RENVERSER la verite*) of His Human Nature and Ascension" (*Beza and des Gallars*, i. 281: Toulouse, 1882).

Hardwick mentions that Beza's argument, which unfortunately he does not quote, "excited the deepest indignation" in Romish circles (*Articles*, p. 128 n. 2: London, 1876). In passing, it may be mentioned that the French Church in London conformed in 1662, and in its translation of Article XXVIII now uses the very word "renverse" for our "overthroweth."

When revising the Articles, Archbishop Parker had before him

in various forms this argument against transubstantiation from its *anti-sacramental* character. For example, in the Wurtemberg Confession it was "non constaret veritas sacramenti"; in the English *Reformatio Legum* it ran, "a natura sacramenti *discrepat*"; in the "Exiles' Confession" of 1559 it was "doth utterly *deny* the nature of a sacrament." When, therefore, we find Parker employing the *exact word* which Beza had used to express the idea that had so disconcerted the Romanists, it is hardly possible to doubt the source of this phrase in the Article.

Against the "real" presence Beza argued—

"We say that His body is distant from the bread as far as the most high heaven is distant from the earth. . . . And if any willeth to conclude from this that we render Christ *absent* from His holy Supper, we say that it is ill concluded; for we do this honour to God, that we believe according to His Word, that although the body of Christ *is in heaven and not elsewhere*, and we are in earth and not elsewhere, yet this notwithstanding, we are made partakers of His body and blood by a *spiritual manner*, and FAITH BEING THE MEAN" (*moyennant la foy*).

This expression is repeated often by the Reformed; for example, by Beza himself in a letter to Catherine de Medici on September 10—

"His body now dwelleth *in heaven and not elsewhere*, but this nevertheless, by His *spiritual virtue*, and a true *faith being the mean*, we . . . are made partakers of His true body and of His true blood" (*Beza and des Gallars*, i. 281, 284).

The Romanists found themselves so sorely handled in the debates that they adopted a stratagem not unknown to our own days. Appeal to reason by way of argument was abandoned in order to see whether the contending parties could not agree together upon some form of words which would express their agreement on positive truth without raising questions upon which they disagreed. For this purpose five deputies from each side were to meet in a sort of "round-table conference." The Romanists were two Bishops, Montluc of Valence and Duval of Seez, with three divines, Despence, Salignac and Bouthillier. The Reformed were represented by Beza, Martyr, des Gallars, Marlorat and de l'Espine. On October 1, 1561, the deputies signed the following formula—

"We confess that Jesus Christ in His Holy Supper presenteth, giveth and proffereth (*exhibite*) to us truly the substance of His body and blood, *by the operation of His Holy Spirit*, and that we receive and eat sacramentally, *spiritually and by faith* this very body which died for us (*ce propre corps qui est mort pour nous*) that we may be bone of His bone and flesh of His flesh, to the end that we may be vivified by it, and receive from it all that is requisite for our salvation. And for that the faith which is stablished on the Word of God, doth make and render present unto us the things that are promised,

and that *by this faith* we do take verily and indeed (*vraiment et de fait*) the true and natural body and blood of our Lord, *by the virtue of the Holy Spirit*, in THIS SENSE (*en cest esgard*) do we confess the presence of the body and of the blood of our Saviour in the Holy Supper " (*Ibid.*, i. 330).

The Queen and the Cardinal both expressed their delight at receiving this confession, the latter indeed remarking that it contained what had always been his own belief. But those who are familiar with the eucharistic controversy will perceive that the document—though employing language necessarily included if the Romanists were to sign—gives away the entire case to the Reformed. It testifies only to a true reception by the faithful from Jesus Christ Himself of His body and blood, through the operation of His Spirit. The word "presence" is only admitted in such sense as expresses the idea involved in such reception; the "presence" depends on the "reception," not the reception on the "presence"; and the reception depends on no priestly act of consecration or administration, but on the work of the Saviour by His Spirit, through faith as the mean.

The question is not whether the "inward part or thing signified" is the "true and proper natural body of Christ"; for we contend that He has only one real body, which "is in Heaven and not here," because it cannot lose its truth and proper nature so far as to be present "invisibly" and "supernaturally" in many places at one and the same time. The question is not whether we believe in a real donation of Christ's body and blood to the faithful in the Lord's Supper, for we believe that this veritable bestowal of the Crucified is made to believers even apart from the Holy Supper. The true question is whether that donation is the act of Christ alone working by His Spirit in our spirits, and whether the reception of the Things Signified is performed only when we "lift up our hearts" to the heavenlies where Christ dwelleth, and there feed on Him in our hearts by faith with thanksgiving. Or, whether there is *also* a bodily giving of the "inward part," by the bodily act of the priest in giving the outward part, so that with our bodily mouths we also eat and drink Christ in a bodily manner here in earth? On these points the formula surrenders the question to the Reformed.

There does, however, occur in it one word ("substance") which may seem to favour Popery. Calvin himself used it, and it had been employed in the Reformed French Confession of 1559, in a sound sense, so that it did not present any difficulty to the Huguenots.

But the English Reformers had unsparingly removed any such entangling words from our formularies ; and Peter Martyr, faithful to his training, would not suffer the perilous term to pass, without disencumbering it, as far as he could, of any erroneous meaning.

On September 25 the conference was very near reaching an agreement, when Martyr entered a strong protest. In order that there might be no possibility for present mistake or future misrepresentation, he reduced his doctrine of the Supper to writing, and the next day read it to the conference, saying that he had

" resolved to read it from writing that I may so make it more clear and distinct to you.

" I hold, therefore, that the real and substantial body of Christ is *only in Heaven*, but yet that faithful communicants do, *by faith and in a spiritual manner*, verily receive His very body and very blood which were delivered for us on the Cross. Wherefore I can by no means admit either transubstantiation or consubstantiation in the Lord's Supper.

" Next, I affirm that local distance is no obstacle to our union with the body and blood of Christ, since the Lord's Supper is a *heavenly* matter ; and although we receive on earth bread and wine with our bodily mouth, yet *by faith* and with the help of the Holy Spirit, our souls (to which this *spiritual* and divine food specially belongs) being raised to *Heaven*, enjoy the present body and blood of Christ. . . . And therefore I admit the formulæ of agreement which have been introduced, in that construction whereby they are referred or may be accommodated to the meaning I have now expressed. . . . And when mention is made in these formulæ of the '*substance*' of the body of Christ, I understand by that name or word *nothing else than the true body of Christ*" (*Ref. Glean.*, p. 425).

In the face of this protest even the word "substance" could prove of no service to the Romanists, however much it might please such as the Cardinal. Nor were the trained Romish theologians slow to discover the trap in which their representatives had been caught. When the confession was referred to the Faculty of Divines at the Sorbonne, they promptly condemned it (October 9) as guilty of three "heresies" as well as of "fallacy" and "insufficiency."

The first "heresy" was in the restraint of the whole formula by the final clause, "*En cest esgard*"; which the Faculty maintained was proof that "the presence can be understood by them *only* as one by *virtue and efficacy*." The second "heresy" was that "They do place (the presence) *only* in the *usage* of the sacrament, as this word *Supper* doth declare, and some words following, to wit, *proffereth, presenteth, giveth, receive, eat*." The third "heresy" was "When they say that *by this faith we take* . . . it doth appear that *without this faith*, one doth *not* take neither receive (*on ne prend ni reçoit-on*), the true and natural body of our Lord Jesus Christ."

The "fallacy" was that the Reformed "captiously" made use of language resembling that of Rome, but meaning thereby a contrary doctrine; and—

"It is also *insufficient*, in that it doth not contain the *real presence* of the body and blood of Christ *under the signs*, and doth attribute no efficacy or operation to the *sacramental words*, neither to the *priest* any ministry in the *consecration* and *exhibition* of the aforesaid body and blood; and that they say merely that *Jesus Christ presenteth and giveth unto us*: the which omissions are not without manifest suspicion of a desire to *deny the real presence* of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ *under the forms* (of bread and wine) by *virtue of the words* (of consecration), and by *the ministry of the priests*."

The Faculty added a "Confession Catholique" in these words—

"We believe and confess that by the *priest*, minister ordained of Jesus Christ of the holy sacrament of the *altar*, the true body and blood of Jesus Christ are made really and solemnly *present under the forms of bread and wine*, by virtue and power of the Divine Word *pronounced by the priest*."

The Bishops subsequently issued a similar statement, in which they use the words "really and *transubstantially*." The Reformed then re-stated their own position in a declaration that—

"The Supper of the Lord is a *heavenly thing*, and although on earth we take with the mouth only bread and wine . . . being by the mean of *faith* (*moyennant la foy*) through the virtue of the Holy Spirit . . . uplifted to *Heaven*, we there receive (Christ's) body and blood, that is, Himself entire. . . . This faith being the mean, they there receive truly and *spiritually* this *spiritual eating* of the flesh of Christ."

Comparing all this with the third paragraph of Article XXVIII and with Article XXIX, both of which were introduced in 1563, it seems impossible to doubt that the language of our formularies was adopted to prove to the world that indeed the English Church did not "differ by a nail's breadth" from the French and Swiss Reformed Churches in regard to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

The "Reformed" representatives had contended that the partaking of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper is effected in a "spiritual manner," "spiritually," that is to say by the Holy Spirit uplifting the souls of the faithful to Heaven, "faith being the mean," and causing them there to feed upon Christ, for which reason they called the Supper "a *heavenly thing*." Article XXVIII takes up the words in the phrase "heavenly and spiritual manner" with the decisive addition of "only"; and it exactly hits off "*moyennant la foy*" in the sentence "The mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." Here and in the (Latin) title to Article XXIX are the only places where our Articles employ the Protestant Gallicism of calling this Sacrament "the Supper"

(*la Cène*) without the addition "of the Lord." Doubtless this was done in compliment to the lynx-eyed Romish Faculty, which had so cleverly detected the "heresy" which lies in God's name for His own Sacrament.

Comparison with the condemnation issued by the same authority, is even more productive of evidence. The *first* of the heresies is adopted by the Article declaring "faith" to be not "a" but "*the mean*"; a statement which serves, like its equivalent in the Poissy formula, to fix the sense of all the other statements on the subject,—a giving *to* and a taking *by* "faith."

The *second* heresy lay in the word "Supper" with its correlatives, "proffers, gives, presents, receive, eat." We find all of them in the two short sentences of the English Article, except "proffers" and "presents," which we wisely avoid as seeming to add to the Scriptural word "give" some vague idea of an outward and ceremonial bestowal. The words "Supper," "receive," "eat," used by the Reformed to limit the "presence" solely to the act of reception, are all found twice repeated; but "given" only once. A sad fact for those who argue desperately from this word to prove that there must be a "presence" outside of the act of reception. Even when such a trivial thing as the use by the Reformed of the two (almost) synonyms "prenons" and "recevons" was picked up by the Romanists in their "on ne prend ni reçoit-on," the English Article retaliates by rendering the same Latin word (*accipitur*) first by "taken" and then by "received," a duplication which the Catechism has since made very familiar to us.

The *third* heresy was that the doctrine of reception by faith *implied* a denial of the "reception by the wicked." This Roman challenge was accepted in both branches by our Articles. *Positively* they affirm that faith is "the" mean, but they do not leave it to be gathered as a mere though inevitable inference from this, that those void of a lively faith "eat not the body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper," for this *negative* position was embodied in a fresh Article (XXIX) whose only possible *raison d'être* is to exclude any variant of the "real" presence from the Church of England.

The "fallacy" of the Reformed was their employment of accommodating language for the benefit of the Romanists. The Articles, not having been drawn up to include Romanists, avoid this

mistake. In them there is no misleading ambiguity about "truly exhibiting" the "substance" of Christ's body, or of "eating sacramentally" His "true and proper natural body" of which we wisely decline to "confess the presence."

The "*insufficiency*" of the Reformed was their omission of all language conceded to be the distinctive livery of the "real" presence, while they did use accommodating phrases which could be accepted by either side. Our Articles are equally "insufficient," for they say nothing of a "real" presence residing "under the forms of bread and wine," effected by the words of "consecration," pronounced by the "priest," whose "ministry" is both the cause of the "presence" and the means of its "exhibition." Where, however, the Romanists dared to place the ministry of the priest in contemptuous competition with the act of our Lord (*ne disent autre chose sinon que Jesus Christ nous presente et donne*), the Article puts in a magisterial "ONLY" in order to shut out any earthly and bodily giving by the priest, and to leave revealed in its unique dignity and glory the "heavenly and spiritual manner" of giving, whereby the Crucified Redeemer bestows Himself upon the faithful through the operation of the Holy Ghost.

One other fact should be mentioned. Beza wrote a "Confession of Faith," the dedicatory epistle to his master Wolmar being dated "quarto idus Martii, 1560," in which he uses the very phrase of the English Article with "modo" for "ratione" —

"As in a natural manner we receive, eat and drink the natural symbols . . . so also *in a heavenly and spiritual manner* (coelesti et spirituali modo) Jesus Christ, Who is now in Heaven and not elsewhere according to the flesh, is truly communicated to us" (Beza, *Tract. Theol.*, i. 31 : Genevae, 1582).

If we may hazard rather more than a guess as to whose was the hand that with Cranmerian skill framed the doctrine of the Reformed into the crystal sentences of our Article, we shall name Grindal. Proof has been given that to him we can trace the connection between the Articles and the Wurtemberg Confession, the main source of their revision in 1563; and that he was in close personal touch with one of the leaders at the Colloquy of Poissy which supplied hints for the language of the Articles on the one important doctrine where they diverge from the German document. This idea becomes more insistent when we find in his *Dialogue between Custom and Verity*, written probably early in 1559, the following teaching—

" Christ's body is food not for the body, but for the soul ; and therefore it must be received *with the instrument of the soul which is faith*. . . . The food of your soul must be *received by faith*. . . . The mouth of the spirit is *spiritual*, therefore it receiveth Christ's body *spiritually*. . . . Christ's body must be *received and taken with faith*. . . . This is the *spiritual*, the very true, the ONLY eating of Christ's body " (Foxe, vi. 338-9).

Hence it would appear that the English Articles employ the words which were the very *tesserae* of the Reformed at Poissy for the exclusion of the " real " presence, the precise watchwords which Rome's technical experts at once denounced as conveying the doctrine of the Reformed, and that they were put into their exact shape by Grindal, who was recognized by the Romanists themselves as the typical example of those Englishmen who were distinguished by their resolute opposition to any theory of a " real " presence in the sacramental elements (Dorman, *Disproove*, foll. 52, 103 : Antwerp, 1565).

W. PRESCOTT UPTON.

WEALTH AND POVERTY.

PERILS OF WEALTH AND POVERTY. By the late Canon Barnett, M.A., D.C.L. With Preface by Mrs. Barnett, C.B.E. *George Allen & Unwin*. 2s. 6d. net.

The Rev. V. A. Boyle, who was closely associated with Canon Barnett at Toynbee Hall, has edited this book which will be welcomed by many who admired the splendid work Canon and Mrs. Barnett did among the poor of London. Of course " cruel cheapness " is now a thing of the past and a " cruel dearness " has taken its place. Anyhow the sweating with which Canon Barnett and other workers were familiar in the old days is now practically a thing of the past. May it remain so ! But this fact of course means that we must take the figures of Sir L. G. Chiozza Money (quoted so freely by the Canon) *cum grano salis*. Even allowing for the fact that these figures cannot apply to present conditions, for wealth has been, and is, still undergoing a process of redistribution, yet there remains much that is sadly too true, and every one who is interested in social reform will find many aspects of the subject considered by one who had unique qualifications for such a discussion and whose work will long remain in grateful recollection.

THE EVOLUTION OF HYMNODY UP TO THE REFORMATION.

BY THE REV. CANON JOHN VAUGHAN, M.A. (Canon Residentiary of Winchester).

I N seeking for the origin of Christian hymnody we turn naturally to the Bible. The Bible, it has been said, rings with music. At the Creation, we are told, the morning stars sang together, and all the Sons of God shouted for joy; while the Apocalypse closes, in the stately language of Milton, "with a sevenfold chorus of halleluiahs and of harping symphonies." In the Old Testament, we listen to the songs of Miriam and of Moses, to the lamentation of David, to the dirge of Hezekiah. Indeed the Book of Psalms—for the modern distinction between psalms and hymns is, as the first Lord Selborne has reminded us, a purely arbitrary one—is a Hymn-book, the Hymn-book of the second Temple. It contains several collections of a distinct and special character—the Passover psalms, the Pilgrim psalms, the Halleluiahs psalms. When we turn to the New Testament, we recognize in St. Luke the first Christian hymnologist. He alone has preserved for us the *Magnificat* or the Song of Mary, the *Benedictus* or the Song of Zacharias, the *Nunc Dimittis* or the Song of Simeon, and the *Gloria in Excelsis*, sung by the angels on the first Christmas morn. It was, we remember, after "they had sung a hymn," one doubtless of the Passover psalms, that Christ and His disciples left the Upper Room for the garden of Gethsemane. In the midnight dungeon at Philippi, Paul and Silas "were praying and singing hymns unto God." More than once in his Epistles, the great Apostle urges on his converts the use of "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs." Now and again too, in the course of his writings, we seem to hear a fragment of an early hymn. We may take as examples the lines beginning "Eye hath not seen nor ear heard," in the first epistle to the Corinthians; "Awake thou that sleepest," in that to the Ephesians; and "He who was manifested in the flesh," in the first epistle to Timothy. And we should not, I think, be far wrong, if we regarded the thirteenth chapter of the first of the Corinthians as an inspired hymn on Christian charity, and the eighth chapter of the Romans (verses 31-39) as one on the eternal Love of God in Christ Jesus.

Outside the sphere of the New Testament, we must look for the earliest relics of Christian hymnody to the Eastern or Greek Church. The oldest examples are in the Syriac or the Greek language; not in Latin. Latin Christianity is derived from the Greek. We have no Christian literature in Latin till towards the close of the second century. But in the Eastern Church we have evidence of the use of hymnody from the earliest times. In Pliny's famous letter to the Emperor Trajan, we read how the Bithynian Christians were wont to meet together early in the morning and "to sing hymns to Christ as God." The blessed saint Ignatius (who suffered martyrdom about the year 107) introduced, we are told, antiphonal singing into the Church of Antioch, because in a vision he had so heard the angels sing. As examples of early Christian hymnody, which have come down to us from the Greek or Eastern Church, we may take two examples, both familiar to modern Christians, and both in general use amongst us. The one example occurs in the English Prayer-book; the other is to be found in most of our modern hymnals. It is perhaps hardly realized that in the *Gloria in Excelsis*, "Glory be to God on High, etc.," of our Communion service, we have the early Greek "morning hymn." Founded on the words of the Angels' song, it was expanded and enlarged, and afterwards translated into Latin; and it is from this Latin form that it found its way into our English Communion Office. It is a thrilling thought that in using the *Gloria in Excelsis* at Holy Communion we are using words which are consecrated to us from the early ages of the Eastern Church. And the other Greek hymn is the one familiar to us as "Hail, gladdening Light." It is the earliest metrical evening hymn, belonging to the second, or even the first century, and is preserved in the writings of St. Basil. Except to scholars, it was unknown until it appeared in the *Lyra Apostolica*, published in 1836, when Keble printed the original Greek hymn, together with his own translation, which has found a place in *Hymns A. & M.*, as No. 18. It was a lamp-lighting hymn, sung when the candles were brought in at dusk. A beautiful use has been made of it by Longfellow in *The Golden Legend*, well known to many through Sullivan's music, in the scene of the forester's cottage, where at twilight Elsie comes in with a lamp, followed by the children, and they all sing together "The Evening Song on the lighting of the lamps," in Longfellow's translation—

“ A gladsome light
 Of the Father Immortal,
 Now to the sunset
 Again hast thou brought us ;
 And seeing the evening
 Twilight, we bless thee,
 Praise thee, adore thee.”

Among other hymns of later date, which have come to us from the Greek Church, through the translation of Dr. Neale, may be mentioned, “ The day is past and over,” from Anatolius ; “ Christian, dost thou see them,” from St. Andrew of Crete ; and “ Art thou weary ? ” from St. Stephen the Sabaite.

In the Latin or Western Church, it is curious to notice that the use of hymns did not become general before the fourth century. To St. Ambrose, the magnificent Archbishop of Milan, belongs the honour of being the true founder of hymnody in the West. The facts are related by St. Augustine, in the ninth book of his immortal *Confessions*. It appears that the Empress Justina, who favoured the Arian party, desired to remove Ambrose from his see of Milan. But the “ devout people,” that is, the orthodox Christians, combined to protect him ; and “ kept watch in the church, ready, if need be, to die with their bishop.” “ Then,” says Augustine, “ it was first appointed that, *after the manner of the Eastern churches*, hymns and psalms should be sung, lest the people should grow weary and faint through the tediousness of sorrow ; which custom has been since followed by almost all congregations in other parts of the world.” Ambrose, it seems, not only composed the tunes, but also provided the words. As many as one hundred hymns, known as *Ambrosian*, are ascribed to him. Of these, a certain number are undoubtedly genuine. We are familiar with many of these *Ambrosian* hymns, through translations which have found their way into our English hymnals, among which may be mentioned the Trinitarian hymn, “ Three in one, and one in three ” ; the Advent hymn, “ Hark, a thrilling voice is sounding ” ; and the fine Easter hymn, “ At the Lamb’s high feast we sing.” A contemporary of St. Ambrose was the Spaniard Prudentius, to whom we are indebted for the magnificent Christmas hymn, “ Of the Father’s love begotten,” with its arresting refrain, “ evermore and evermore ” ; and the Epiphany hymn, “ Earth hath many a noble city.”

After this outburst of hymnody, which marked the close of the

fourth century and the beginning of the fifth, and which is mainly associated with the names of St. Ambrose and of Prudentius, a long period of singular bareness followed. Indeed from the sixth to the middle of the ninth century, we meet with few great names among Latin hymn-writers. We must, however, except that of Fortunatus, who produced the famous *Vexilla Regis*, "The Royal banners forward go," for the reception of a "fragment of the true Cross," at Poitiers on November 19th, 569. A new period in the development of hymnody opens, however, in the latter part of the ninth century, with the invention of "sequences," in the monastery of St. Gall, near Constance. It was the custom of the mediaeval Church, in the Office of Holy Communion, to sing between the Epistle and the Gospel, the word *Alleluia*, extending the last syllable into a cadence of musical notes which were called *sequentia*. It came as a happy inspiration to one of the monks, named Notker, that it would be less monotonous, and far more edifying, if suitable words were set to these musical trills or sequences. He therefore wrote a rhythmical composition, which he placed before the brethren of the monastery, and which was highly approved. The innovation soon found general favour; and the practice of singing a hymn, known as a sequence-hymn, between the reading of the Epistle and the Gospel, was widely followed. A number of these Latin sequence-hymns, some of exceptional beauty, have come down to us, and are familiar to English readers, little though, it may be, they know of their origin. Notker himself is said to have composed thirty-five sequence-hymns; and among those attributed to him is the famous "Alleluialic Sequence," known to us in Dr. Neale's translation as "The strain upraise of joy and praise," a hymn of pure and unadulterated praise. Another sequence attributed to him is the more famous *Media in Vita*, "In the midst of life we are in death," which is said to have been suggested to him while watching some workmen engaged in building a bridge over a mountain torrent near the monastery. Not the least pathetic portion of our Burial Service comes from this hymn, viz., the sentence beginning with "In the midst of life we are in death," down to "Suffer us not at the last hour from any pain of death to fall from Thee." The celebrated hymn *Veni Creator Spiritus*, "Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire," which has taken a deeper hold upon the Western Church than any other mediaeval hymn except the *Te Deum*, has also found a place

in our English Prayer-book—in the service for the Ordination of Priests. Its authorship is unknown; but it has been attributed, among others, to the Emperor Charlemagne (which is clearly an error), although possibly it may have been written by his grandson, Charles the Bald; and it seems in some way to have been associated with Notker and the monastery of St. Gall. The authorship is also uncertain of the very beautiful sequence-hymn, known as the “Golden Sequence,” and familiar to us in its English dress, beginning—

“Come, Thou Holy Spirit, come,
And from Thy celestial home,”

which, in the opinion of Archbishop Trench, is “the loveliest of all the hymns in the whole circle of Latin poetry.”

Two other hymns, of a like nature, but of later date, both belonging to the thirteenth century, may be here mentioned. “The one by its tenderness,” says Dean Milman, “the other by its rude grandeur, stand unrivalled in mediaeval hymnody.” The *Stabat Mater Dolorosa*, “By the cross sad vigil keeping,” said to be “the most pathetic hymn of the Middle Ages,” is known to us as a Good Friday hymn; and the *Dies Irae*, “That day of wrath, that dreadful day,” as an Advent hymn. The latter was written by one Thomas de Celano, the companion and biographer of St. Francis of Assisi. It is known as “the great sequence of the Western Church,” and has been translated into many languages. The poet Crashaw rendered it into English verse, in the time of Charles I. But the translation with which we are most familiar comes to us through Sir Walter Scott’s *Lay of the Last Minstrel*. Towards the end of the poem, he introduces, with marked effect, this mediaeval sequence, in his own rendering, which has been adopted in *Hymns Ancient and Modern* (No. 206), beginning—

“That day of wrath, that dreadful day,
When heaven and earth shall pass away,
What power shall be the sinner’s stay?”

The hymn was a special favourite of Sir Walter Scott’s. We learn from his “Life,” written by Lockhart, his son-in-law, that as the great novelist lay dying, his lips were seen to move, as if in prayer. On drawing near, Lockhart heard him repeating to himself the lines of the mediaeval sequence, *Dies Irae*.

In considering the development of hymnody in mediaeval times,

mention must be made of the two Bernards—St. Bernard of Clairvaux, and Bernard of Cluny—both of whom exercised a marked influence on Christian devotion. St. Bernard of Clairvaux was the most conspicuous figure of his age. He was at once, says Dean Milman, “the leading and the governing head of Christendom.” It is, however, simply as a writer of hymns that we are now considering him. In the retirement of the beautiful Cistercian monastery of Clairvaux, which he had founded, these hymns were written. The most famous of them is one of forty-eight stanzas, beginning *Jesu Dulcis Memoria*; and it well illustrates that form of passionate devotion, of which he may be regarded as the founder. This hymn has been described as “the sweetest and most evangelical hymn of the Middle Ages”; while Dr. Neale speaks of it as “the finest and most characteristic specimen of St. Bernard’s *subjective loveliness*.” Many modern hymns have been founded upon it, of which, as a striking illustration, we may take the following—

“ Jesu, the very thought of Thee
With sweetness fills the breast.”

Similar adaptations will be found in every hymnal, and will occur to every reader. This form of devotion, which applies to the Divine Master the language of human affection, may appear somewhat too familiar to many minds; but it has been popular with a large number of devout persons, alike among Roman Catholics and Protestants. Indeed it marks the beginning of a new school of Christian hymnody, which has maintained its position ever since. Of Bernard of Cluny, unlike his great contemporary, very little is known. He was born of English parents at Morlaix on the coast of Brittany, and hence he is sometimes known as Bernard of Morlaix. But in the magnificent monastery of Cluny he seems to have spent his whole life; and there he wrote his remarkable satire on the vices and corruptions of the age. This long poem, of three thousand lines, *De Contemptu Mundi*, has rendered his name famous. It has supplied—strange that a satire should have done so—some of the best-known and most popular hymns in common use among us. From this poem, through the translations of Dr. Mason Neale, we are indebted for such favourite hymns as “Brief life is here our portion”; “The world is very evil”; “For thee, O dear, dear country”; and “Jerusalem the golden.”

JOHN VAUGHAN.

THE INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE.

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

[*These questions were asked by a student in an American Theological College, in a letter addressed to the "Sunday School Times" of Philadelphia. The article which follows represents the answers given in that paper, and it is here reproduced by the kind permission of the Editor.*]

What is wrong with such a theory as might be summed up thus—

"The Bible is a human record of divine revelation. The revelation is made not so much miraculously as through historical events and individual experiences. Whatever inspiration there is, is in the degree to which is rightly apprehended the mind or purpose of God, in the event or experience. No particular kind of inspiration is required to make the record.

"The truth is progressive; because there is freedom, the progress may be marked by retrogression. This progressive revelation culminates in Jesus Christ; He is its 'telos.' Our principle of Biblical criticism is to look at everything in the light of the mind of Christ.

"We should not hold God responsible for every statement in the Bible, nor expect that wherever it is opened we shall hear God's voice.

"Why should we believe the mind of Christ to be vested with supreme moral authority? Formerly answered: (1) Because asserted by an infallible church; or (2) by an infallible Book. Infallible—why? Because they claim to be (dogmatic assertion)—an argument in a vicious circle. Ground rather in the power of Christ to deliver from evil; in spiritual experience and values.

"God at all times respects the integrity of the human personality; this determines the apprehension (revelation) and expression (record).

"God's self-manifestation comes in a fourfold way through (1) institutions, (2) literature, (3) personalities, (4) a way of life and thought.

"We must give the human element large consideration in thinking of inspiration and revelation. Revelation imparts only truth not otherwise attainable. Inspiration has nothing to do with truth ascertainable by ordinary mental processes. (As writing the books of Chronicles.)

"What shall be our standard? Because revelation, therefore true; inspiration, therefore true; infallibility, therefore true? Such is pure dogmatism, begging the question (*a priori*). This was the curse of the church of the past."—A Theological Student.

THIS letter raises vital questions which call for careful and thorough answers. It is proposed to attempt this in detail, and for the purpose of doing so it will be necessary to quote most of the statements of the letter.

1. "The Bible is a human record of divine revelation." It is essential to define our terms. What is meant by "divine revelation"? The knowledge of God's will for man's spiritual life. What is meant by "a human record"? Of course the Bible is "human" in the sense that it came through man, for there was apparently no other way of becoming acquainted with God's revelation. But does the use of the term "human" here mean what is imperfect, faulty, and liable to error? If so, how can man be sure he is really getting "divine revelation"?

2. "The revelation is made not so much miraculously as through historical events and individual experiences." This is not a correct way of stating the case, because there are proofs of all three methods being employed. Christ was a miracle and revelation came through Him. Historical events are found both in the Old and New Testaments, and revelation came through them. Isaiah, Paul, and many more had "individual experiences," and in these revelation is seen. The truth is that the supreme requirement is to know how a man can be *certain* of divine revelation, whatever the channel may have been. There must be some guarantee of revelation even in "historical events" and "individual experiences." What is this?

3. "Whatever inspiration there is, is in the degree to which is rightly apprehended the mind and purpose of God in the event or experience." By whom is this to be apprehended? Is it the original writer or the present-day reader? If, as seems most probable in the questioner's mind, the latter, what is to be done if one man says he "apprehends" and another says he finds nothing in it of God's mind and purpose? Is the recipient to settle it? If so, inspiration is made to depend on our apprehension, and if any one does not apprehend it, the particular part is not inspired for him. Is this a logical or even sensible position? A thing is inspired, or it is not, quite independent of our apprehension. Truth is fact, not what "I trow," because the latter is variable and uncertain.

4. "No particular kind of inspiration is required to make the record." But what about any guarantee of accuracy? Thus, in John xx. 31 it is said that the Fourth Gospel is a selection out of a larger quantity of material. How, apart from inspiration of some kind, can we be sure that the selection was properly made and drawn from reliable sources? In the preface to Luke a claim to thorough knowledge and accuracy is made. How can this be

proved apart from the possession of some kind of inspiration? Either the Gospels are the result of their author's unaided efforts, or the selection of material was guided by a Divine agency. Is there not, therefore, what has been called an "inspiration of selection"? Is there any other alternative than that the Gospels are wholly human or else composed under Divine guidance? And if the latter, would God guide inaccurately? Then, too, there is need of the assurance that men's (and even Satan's) words have been accurately recorded. When Satan, as in Job's case, tells lies, the statement that he actually did this ought to be assured as true, and in this case the *record* of what he said is true. How can this be guaranteed, apart from inspiration of some kind? And in the case of books like Ecclesiastes, Esther, and Philemon, what does inspiration mean? In what sense are they inspired? If they are not inspired, why are they in a book called the Word of God? It will be seen, therefore, that some "kind of inspiration is required to make the record."

5. "The truth is progressive; because there is freedom, the progress may be marked by retrogression." Of course the truth is progressive (Heb. i. 1), and we find this so all through the Old Testament, and indeed in the New as well. But the reference to "retrogression" betrays a confusion of thought. There never was any retrogression in the progressiveness of revelation; *the retrogression was in the perception of it by the recipients*. The truth of one stage was repealed by a later, *but never repudiated*, just like an Act of Congress or Parliament is repealed, but is not thereby repudiated. On the contrary every new stage is marked by the ratification of earlier stages. Scripture confirms, but does not repudiate, what had been before given. And when we speak of the progress of Divine revelation we mean the progress of what God gave to man. There are no retrogressions in this, but there are many retrogressions, checks, set-backs in the religious history of Israel, and in their acceptance and appreciation of what God had revealed. The people degenerated and apostatized and herein, because of freedom to sin, there was indeed retrogression, but Scripture will be searched in vain for any trace of retrogression in the Divine revelation itself.

6. "This progressive revelation culminates in Jesus Christ; He is its 'telos' (end or object). Our principle of Biblical criticism is to look at everything in the light of the mind of Christ." All this

is very true, and it is on this account that the witness of Christ to the Old Testament is so important. He bore testimony to many of its facts, He quoted from nearly all its books, He claimed to interpret it with finality, and He maintained that every word He spoke was given him by His Father. And so behind the word of Christ is the authority of God, and thus when Christ said "Moses wrote of me," it was the Father who gave Him these words to speak. No one can doubt that Christ set His seal (and thereby God's seal) to the Old Testament as we now have it.

7. "We should not hold God responsible for every statement in the Bible, nor expect that whenever it is opened we shall hear God's voice." No one does. The Bible contains Satan's words, which are lies; the words of Job's friends, which were often untrue; the utterances of wicked men like Pharaoh, Saul, and many more. We do not hold God responsible for these, or hear God's voice in them, except by contrast for warning. But we maintain that, being in the Bible, they were actually spoken, that Satan and others did really say these things. Inspiration does not guarantee the sentiment, but it does guarantee the record.

8. "Why should we believe the mind of Christ to be vested with supreme moral authority? . . . Ground rather in the power of Christ to deliver from evil; in spiritual experience and values." But who is to be the judge of this spiritual value? Suppose a man says that Christ does not appeal to him, which is what H. G. Wells has said more than once. How are we to deal with such an attitude? Must there not be something objectively authoritative in Christ independent of our opinion of Him? If so, what is it? And where is it to be found? And how? What is our best and most accurate channel of information about Christ? And if we are not sure of this, how can we be sure that Christ is "vested with supreme moral authority"? The infallibility of the Church is capable of easy disproof, but the infallibility of the Bible as the most accurate, fullest, and clearest evidence of Christ is altogether different, and is an absolute necessity in the very nature of the case.

9. "God at all times respects the integrity of the human personality; this determines the apprehension (revelation) and expression (record)." Of course He does, but while He "respects the integrity" He uses it and may go beyond it. When it is said that "holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Peter

i. 21), it implies that God used these men. Yet the differences between writers like Paul, John, Peter, and the rest show that He respected the integrity of their personality. And that the revelation is not to be measured by, or limited to, the apprehension of the human personality is clear from the fact that the prophets were often unable to understand fully the purport of their own utterances (1 Peter i. 11). And that God used while He respected the integrity of human personality is clear from Paul's claim that what he wrote (there is human personality) were the commandments of God (there is God's use). "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord" (1 Cor. xiv. 37).

10. "God's self-manifestation comes in a fourfold way: through (1) institutions, (2) literature, (3) personalities, (4) a way of life and thought." Here, again, an explanation of terms is necessary. What is the meaning of "comes through"? How and in what way does it come? How, too, can we distinguish between the Divine manifestation and the medium through which it comes? Thus, in the Jewish institutions, or the Jewish literature, or the Jewish prophet, or the Jewish apostle, how much is Divine, and how much human? Where does the former end, and the latter begin? All this shows the impossibility of the position here maintained, or any proper view of inspiration. What is needed is something objective and unchangeable, independent of all merely subjective opinions and feelings.

11. "We must give the human element large consideration in thinking of inspiration and revelation." Most certainly we must, and no one would wish to do otherwise, because the fact is so patent in Scripture. But the "human element" cannot mean the inaccurate or uncertain element, because this would take away all assurance that God had spoken. The "human" is not the fallible and erroneous, but only the medium through which God conveyed His will. Inspiration means a *concursum*, a union or combination of the Divine and the human in which the Divine truth comes to us in human form, and in such a way that we can both understand and feel sure of it. God's inspiration of man's mind is very different from leaving man's mind to itself, and it is this that prevents the "human element" from leading us astray. Even Christ had a "human element," but no one can separate this from the Divine

or say that the former was fallible and the latter was perfect. Christ the living Word and the Bible as the written Word are alike as being both divine and human.

12. "Revelation imparts only truth not otherwise attainable." But allowing this to be true, there still remains the fact that many things in the Bible need to have the assurance of truth, however they came. Suppose the story of Christ's birth (Luke i. and ii.) was given by Mary to Luke; it was thus "attainable" apart from special divine revelation. But it must nevertheless be true if it is to be accepted. And there are many more cases of this kind, so that the statement now quoted really begs the question.

13. "Inspiration has nothing to do with truth ascertainable by ordinary mental processes." But, as already seen, inspiration is needed for several things, including direct revelation, accurate record and proper selection. And as just stated (see 12), there are many parts of Scripture about which we need the assurance of truth, whatever be the medium. And if where we *can* verify accuracy we find a Biblical author inaccurate, how can we trust him in regard to his spiritual teaching and his claim to speak by Divine revelation where we cannot verify him?

14. "What shall be our standard?" A very pertinent and important question. We must have a standard, and one independent of our changing opinions, anterior to our acceptance, and objective to our personality. This standard must be God's truth, God's will, and however it comes, by book or institution, we must be sure of it. It is not fair to say that a belief in the truth of revelation begs the question, for we maintain that revelation possesses its own evidence of truth, and is capable of verification. But it is also true to say that if God has revealed Himself, He is not likely to have given us an erroneous revelation of His will. Revelation will necessarily be true, for God will not, cannot, mislead us.

The fatal weakness of the position set forth in this student's letter is that there is no proper and clear view of what inspiration really means. It is not difficult to criticize the orthodox view, but weak to know what is to be substituted for it, to learn what inspiration is. Then we, too, may be able to criticize. The great necessity is "certainty" (Luke i. 4), and we get this in the Bible as the clearest, fullest, purest medium of God's revelation in Christ.

EARLY CHRISTIANITY OF IRELAND.

St. Patrick: came over A.D. 432; died, 461.

BY THE REV. S. HARVEY GEM, M.A.

IT may be helpful to us to turn from the sad spectacle of the present state of Ireland, to consider its early brightness and the introduction of Christianity in the fifth century. In various parts of Europe Christians who had been taken prisoners and had become slaves, were the means of spreading Christianity. This was the case with Patrick. The name has been so closely identified with Ireland, especially in its abbreviation "Pat," that we naturally imagine that he was a native. But this was not the case. It has been usually held that he was born in North Britain, somewhere near Dumbarton. His grandfather was a priest, and his father a deacon, for the objectionable rule requiring the celibacy of the clergy in direct disregard of Holy Scripture had not then been enforced. The date of his birth is uncertain. At the age of sixteen, Patrick was made prisoner in a raid of Irishmen, and was carried off into bondage. He was sold to a chieftain, who made him overseer of his flocks. Under the influence of this sorrow, the Christian teaching given him as a child bore fruit in a true conversion. Lonely among the mountains, far from all human aid, he felt that God was revealing Himself to his soul, and learnt that communion with his God and Father in Heaven was a great reality. The Holy Spirit spoke within him in stillness of the Divine Presence. After a while he escaped from Ireland, but the years that intervened between his deliverance from slavery, and his return as missionary to that island, are not clearly recorded. It appears that he was taken a second time, but his captivity was not a long one. He found a ship that conveyed him to Gaul; and while there, he travelled to the south-west and became a student in a monastery famous at that time, on an island near Cannes, called Lérins. This part of Gaul was often in communication with Syria and Egypt, the results of which we shall have to notice in Patrick's subsequent career. Meanwhile, it is related that he also studied at Auxerre, and he is said to have been ordained as missionary bishop to Ireland while in Gaul.

Neander,¹ however, thinks this unlikely, "for we find in the Irish Church afterwards, a spirit of church freedom similar to that shown by the ancient British Church, which struggled against the yoke of Roman ordinances." But there had been previously an effort made from Rome, Pope Celestine having appointed Palladius as bishop for Ireland, and it is certain that there were Christians in Ireland before Patrick. At the death of Palladius, the missionary career of Patrick followed, and it may be left uncertain whether he obtained his authority in Gaul or in Britain. Such details matter little. His work in Ireland and his own spiritual character are the main points of interest for us. He felt himself called from above by a vision, to return to the land where he had been a slave, to deliver his former enemies from the captivity of sin. We have here a remarkable instance of obedience to our Lord's command, "Love your enemies."² On his return to Ireland, about the year A.D. 432, he prepared himself by resorting to a lonely mountain—Crochan Aigli, now frequented by pilgrims—for prayer and meditation. After this time of solitude he went forth to preach with some suitable companions to the heathen chiefs and their followers. He did not escape opposition. Even some who professed to be Christians accused him of unworthy motives. This cannot surprise us, for where real work is being done, Satan usually manages to raise opposition. But friendly chiefs gave him land, and he established centres for the spread of the Gospel by means of monastic dwellings, from whence the missionaries of the Cross might issue forth on their peaceful raids, and then return for temporary rest. He made his principal centre at Armagh, but founded churches in many other localities. "It was not with Irish pagans alone that he had to contend. A piratical British chieftain, Coroticus, fell upon a number of converts who had recently been baptized by Patrick, and sold them to heathen Picts. To this man, who professed outwardly to be a Christian, Patrick wrote a threatening letter, which has been preserved, and excommunicated him from the Church.

Another writing ascribed to Patrick is the hymn called "Lorica," a breastplate. Some part of it is probably his. Its petitions appear to be connected with pagan ideas of the enchantments of demons,

¹ Neander: *History of the Church*, Vol. III, p. 165.

² Matt. v. 44.

which converts to Christianity continued to believe in. Other portions appeal for Divine Strength to be sent down by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Patrick may well have composed these, for they agree in a remarkable manner with his expressions elsewhere, to the effect that in his sinfulness and weakness, he felt that the power of God would be given him, to enable him for his work, and would be definitely manifested in answer to prayer. Every verse begins with an assertion of the reality of the Divine Gift of Strength.

“ I arise to-day in vast might, with invocation of the Trinity,”

“ I arise to-day in the might of Heaven,”

“ I arise to-day in the might of God for my piloting,”

“ for my upholding, for my foresight, for my guardianship, etc.”

The seventh verse consists of an appeal for the presence of Christ ; for instance, “ Christ before me, Christ behind me, . . . Christ in the heart of every person who may think of me ! Christ in the mouth of every one who may speak to me ! ” etc.

The whole hymn, as given in full in Dr. Newport White's little book, is well worth attention, containing passages still very helpful to every Christian reader, as to the “ Strength made perfect in weakness.” ¹

A still more interesting literary relic, which, with the letter above referred to, is considered to be authentic by experts, and that bears every mark of a personal composition, is Patrick's *Confession*.² It was evidently written in his old age, and is a thanksgiving to God for the way he had been led, with all its changes, by the Divine Hand, and for the work he had been appointed to fulfil. It shows a wonderful knowledge of the Bible, in its apt quotations. The simplicity, and earnestness of its expression, has been well shown in Professor Bury's *Life of St. Patrick*.³ “ I must not hide the gift of God, this is the refrain which pervades the *Confession*. Nothing is said of the marvels which monkish writers delight in ; to Patrick his own strange life seemed more marvellous than any miracle. The *Confession* reveals vividly his intense wonder that it had fallen just to *him* to carry out a great work for the extension

¹ 2 Cor. xii. 9.

² Dr. Newport White has just published a translation of the letter to Coroticus, and the Confession, in *St. Patrick, his Life and Writings*. S.P.C.K. (6s. 6d.).

³ Bury's *Life of St. Patrick*, p. 197.

of the borders of Christendom. As he looked back upon his past life, it seemed to him unutterably strange that the careless boy of a British town should have shone forth as a light to the Gentiles, and the ways whereby this had been accomplished made it seem more mysterious still. But what impressed him above all as a divine miracle, was that he should have felt assured of success beforehand. This seemed to Patrick a direct revelation from One who had knowledge of the future. So the motive of the *Confession* was to declare the wonderful dealings of God with himself as a thanksgiving before Him."

"In a strange land," says Patrick, "the Lord brought me to a sense of my unbelief, so that although late, I minded me of my sins, and turned with my whole heart to the Lord my God, Who looked down on my lowliness, had pity on my youth, my ignorance,—Who preserved me ere I knew Him, and Who protected and comforted me as a father doth his son, ere I knew how to distinguish good from evil." As to his own attainments Patrick expresses himself with much simplicity and humility. "I thought of writing this long since, but have hesitated to this present time, for I was in dread lest I should incur censure from men, because I have not had the same opportunity of reading with others, who have had the best instructions in sacred literature and have never been obliged to interrupt their studies." In the closing sentence of his *Confession*, he expresses his motives as follows:—"I protest in truth, and can rejoice in the thought before God and the holy angels, that I never had any motive, save the Gospel and its promises, for ever returning to that people from whom I had escaped. And I beg of all that believe in God and seek and fear Him, whoever may be pleased to examine or read this letter, which I, Patrick, poor sinful and ignorant creature as I am, have written in Ireland, to understand that my ignorance is not to have the credit of it, if I have effected or proved any little matter according to the purpose of God, but believe and be assured for certain that it was God Who has done it. And this is my *Confession* before I die."

Thus we see through the mist of ages a noble character emerging for our contemplation. Patrick, penitent for his early faults, is filled with anxiety to lead others to the great forgiveness which the Gospel of Christ had brought to himself, and to turn those who had once been his enemies "from darkness unto light, and from the

power of Satan unto God.”¹ Brave to risk his life amid the wild heathen chieftains, and strong in the Grace of God, he yet remained simple and humble, and free from all personal aims, he carried out his mission with entire singleness of purpose. He is indeed worthy of our reverence as the Apostle of Ireland.

We have noticed that he does not claim a complete education for himself. But the monasteries to which he gave the impulse were intended to be training grounds both in religion and in all available knowledge. The fervid Celtic temperament took to the wonders revealed by study, and to the impressive revelations of the Christian Faith, with intense ardour. Ireland happily lay outside the limits of the Roman Empire, distracted at that period by barbarian invasions, and thus the student monks could devote themselves to all available learning. The copying of books was a prominent employment, and the manuscripts were beautifully ornamented with interlaced patterns in various colours. The finest remaining example of this is the Book of Kells, which experts attribute to the ninth century. In those early days all learning was closely connected with religion, and not only Latin, but Greek also became a subject for diligent study. This is the more remarkable, as in the mediaeval Church Latin alone survived, and Greek dropped out of notice till the time of Erasmus. On the contrary, in this early age, the Irish monks were such ardent devotees of study that they went out not only as missionaries, but also as teachers, both in Britain and on the continent. We have seen that Patrick studied in the South of France. There was much communication then between Marseilles and Alexandria. Christians of the Eastern rite abounded in Marseilles and all along the Rhone. Gallic clergy went to Egypt for a spiritual retreat. Alms were sent from the faithful in Gaul to the monks of Egypt. The letters of St. Jerome (who died about A.D. 420) show the close connection between Syria, Egypt and Southern Gaul. It is interesting to be told that the outward form of the Irish monasteries was similar to those of Syria and Egypt. We may take as an instance of this the monastery of Innismurray off the coast of Sligo.² It was built on the early Oriental plan, and consisted of a number of bee-hive cells, each monk having a cell, and books were hung on the inside by straps.

¹ Acts xxvi. 18.

² E. T. Stokes, D.D. : *Ireland and the Celtic Church*.

The cells were built either of wood and wattle or of slabs of stone. There was a chapel, and some room large enough for a refectory, and the whole was surrounded by a fence called "a cashel." Greatly did these monastic abodes differ in their simplicity from the grand foundations of subsequent ages. But they were homes of devotion combined with missionary effort, and when the latter ceased, the spiritual life of monasteries began to decay. Bede tells us that in these simple dwellings, the Irish monks used to receive Saxon students, and not only gave them gratuitous instruction, but entertained them without charge. What a contrast with the state of things now!

S. HARVEY GEM

ST. JOHN XIX. 11 : A PROBLEM AND A SOLUTION.

BY THE REV. J. B. MCGOVERN, Rector of St. Stephen's,
Chorlton-on-Medlock, Manchester.

S. T. COLERIDGE is reported, in his *Table Talk*, under date May 20, 1830, to have said:—

"The meaning of the expression, *εἰ μὴ ἦν σοι δεδομένον ἄνωθεν*, 'Except it were given thee *from above*,' in the 19th Chapter of St. John, verse 11, seems to me to have been generally and grossly mistaken. It is commonly understood as importing that Pilate could have no power to deliver Jesus to the Jews, unless it had been given him *by God*, which, no doubt, is true; but if that is the meaning, where is the force or connexion of the following clause, *διὰ τοῦτο*, 'therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin'? In what respect were the Jews more sinful in delivering Jesus up, *because* Pilate could do nothing except by God's leave? The explanation of Erasmus and Clarke, and some others, is very dry-footed. I conceive the meaning of our Lord to have been simply this, that Pilate would have had no power or jurisdiction—*ἐξουσίαν*—over him, if it had not been given by the Sanhedrin, the *ἄνω βουλή*, and, *therefore*, it was that the Jews had the greater sin."

The chief merit of this passage lies in its transmitting to posterity the views of a layman upon an acknowledged Scriptural perplexity; but its author was no ordinary layman. As a ripe scholar, a profound thinker, and the possessor of an acute brain, he takes rank with the foremost giant intellects of the nineteenth century. His acquaintance with Patristic literature was perhaps

comparable only to that of Gladstone, while the keenness of his vision into the heart of things was second to none. It was doubtless a consciousness of this mental superiority that gave to his utterances, both written and spoken, an appearance of an *ex cathedra* dogmatism which lesser lights misunderstood and resented. But his genius justified his manner, though neither implied infallibility, while both challenged and gained attention. And it is as a lay exegete that he is requisitioned to initiate this inquiry, a rôle for which he was eminently fitted by nature and culture. His interpretation of the stock difficulty involved in the verse under discussion is at once subtle and ingenious, as his summary rejection of that by Erasmus and Clarke is couched in characteristic language. That this interpretation would prove acceptable to other exegetes was not to be expected. Nor did it. Yet Coleridge was far more worthy of a hearing than were many of his professional critics. I do not, of course, include Westcott in this category, though he, too (1886), stigmatizes the philosopher-poet's theory of *ἀνωθεν* as "wholly unnatural, though it has the confident support of Coleridge." It has "the confident support" of others than Coleridge, as we shall see presently, when we come to examine the intrinsic value of the theory. Meanwhile let me divide this thesis under headings suggested and provided by the verse in question.

I. *Ἐξουσία*. In apposition (and opposition) to Pilate's arrogant use of the word in the preceding verse. But what "power"? Critics have, to the darkening of counsel, plied their waywardness over it. Thus, Luther, Calvin,¹ Baur, etc., limit its significance to Judicial Authority; whilst Beza, Gerhard and Tholuck confine it to Actual Power. But if *all* power be of God (Rom. xiii. 1) these distinctions are clearly superfluous. Again, Westcott and Lange argue that it is the possession and *exercise* of, not the *power* itself that were given to Pilate. "That which was 'given,' it must be noticed, is not the authority itself," says the former, "but the possession and exercise of it (*ἦν δεδομένον* not *ἦν δεδομένη*)." Why again this further distinction? For, assuredly, the two latter presuppose the gift or bestowal of the former, as this involves the

¹ "Rectius meo iudicio sentiunt, qui locum hunc restringunt ad magistratus officium. Stultam enim Pilati arrogantiam castigat Christus his verbis, quia perinde se extollat tanquam potestas ejus non a Deo esset." Calvin *ad locum*.

other two. And if "possession and exercise" be "given," what are they but the "power" itself? This *gratis asseritur* is obviously based upon the use by the inspired writer of ἦν δεδομένον instead of ἦν δεδομένη, the neuter in lieu of the feminine form. I submit that such a deduction is neither logical nor grammatical. The neuter form may be, as Lange insists, "more general than the feminine," but how do these two critics extract from or read into the first-named "possession" and "exercise" to the exclusion of "power"? To me the use of ἦν δεδομένον is simply an impersonal construction implying (by ellipse) the article τὸ or our pronoun "it"—as is supplied by our A. V., and as furnished by Beza thus:—¹

"Non haberes auctoritatem in me ullam, nisi hoc tibi datum esset superne."

The Vulgate omits "hoc," but gives the same sense:—

"Non haberes potestatem adversum me ullam, nisi tibi datum esset desuper."

Compare also more modern versions of this verse:—

Italian: "Tu non avresti alcuna podestá contro a me, se *ciò* non ti fosse dato da alto."

Spanish: "Ninguna potestad tendrías contra mi, si *esto* no te fuese dado de arriba."

French: "Tu n'aurais aucun pouvoir sur moi, *s'il* ne t'était donné d'en haut."

German: "Du hättest keine Macht über mich, wenn sie dir nicht wäre von oben herab gegeben."

Norwegian: "Du havde aldeles ingen magt over mig, dersom den ikke var given dig ovenfra."

I may add that, in addition to the above, similar renderings are supplied by the Welsh, Irish, Russian, and Bask versions.

Finally, Westcott draws a further hazy distinction between "power" and the "right to exercise authority." What are they, too, but synonymous terms? The whole contention, therefore, is self-destructive by its subtlety, and would have escaped allusion here were it not for the weight attached to its author's name. It is mere literary jugglery or camouflage to bandy these words about

¹ Another neuter form (as supplied by Meyer) would be τὸ ἐξουσιάζειν κατ' ἐμοῦ, but this likewise "includes possession of authority or power, together with the manner in which it is exercised."

indiscriminately whilst admitting that "power is a divine trust" as evidenced by the *διὰ τοῦτο*.

2. Upon the question of Pilate's unconsciousness as an agent of the Divine purpose I judge it futile to speculate. We know nothing absolutely about it, though I would hazard the opinion that he ranks with Balaam, Caiaphas, and Gamaliel, all instruments, conscious or unconscious, of "the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God." Pilate's guilt, which lay in his conscious condemnation of an innocent man (vv. 4, 6), was not affected by this surmise.

3. *ἀνωθεν* = from above. The rock upon which the conflicting views of expositors split. Coleridge and Semler take the meaning of this expression to be "from the Sanhedrin, a higher tribunal, to the Roman Court," which Westcott declares to be "wholly unnatural," yet he owns that Caiaphas "represented the theocracy." But is it so? "From above" may very well mean "from a higher tribunal," which would very naturally indicate the Sanhedrin—a tribunal higher in the Jewish polity than that of the Roman Court, and which, like the Mediæval Christian Church, passed its victim from the ecclesiastical on to the civil authority. This view is less improbable than Usteri's opinion that the Roman Emperor is referred to. And I do not contend that the word may not be taken as the equivalent of *ἐκ θεοῦ* or *ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς*, but I do maintain that Coleridge's exegesis is not to be so glibly rejected as "wholly unnatural."

4. *διὰ τοῦτο* = therefore, on this account, for this reason. Coleridge may well ask "where is the force or connexion of this clause?" if the common, or orthodox, interpretation is to be enforced. The expression has both a retrospective and prospective action, qualifying what precedes and succeeds it. Because power, or authority, or their exercise was given to thee, "therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin." But why and who? What had the grant of power to Pilate from a higher authority—whether God or the Sanhedrin—to do with the guilt of the deliverers of Christ to him? Herein lay Coleridge's difficulty, which is only solved on the hypothesis that the higher authority is represented by Jews. Of course, as he admits, primarily and ultimately, the power to judge and condemn Christ, to whomsoever given, came from God by actual concession or passive permission—as it does in all exercise of power here below, i.e., directly or indirectly, but

why should, and how does, the power given to Pilate directly (if it be so) by God to work out His purposes accentuate the guilt of the deliverer or deliverers? This was Coleridge's dilemma and it is mine. Pilate's guilt was engendered by violation of conscience and cowardice, and the fact of his being empowered and used as a channel of the Divine will did not modify, still less condone, it. It was *sui generis* and stands alone. But how, as *διὰ τοῦτο* distinctly seems to hint, can this misuse of authority render the deliverers the more guilty? Coleridge's answer is, to my mind, the only satisfactory solution of the problem, which leads to my last paragraph.

5. ὁ παραδιδούς. This is really the crux of the whole contention. Is the phrase one of multitude or not? And if either, who was, or were, the delinquents? Was it Judas, or Annas, or Caiaphas, or they collectively with the Sanhedrin, or the Jewish nation? Lange renders the expression as in the present, "because the act is just going on" (this, however, is immaterial), and decides that the deliverer is "unaptly" considered by some to be Judas "who is now out of sight." And Westcott equally peremptorily pronounces that "there can be no reference to Judas in the surrender to Pilate (*to thee*)." Very likely not, though all are not of that view, and, after all, Judas, the arch-traitor, did deliver the Lord up *indirectly* alike to Annas, Caiaphas, and Pilate. But I am not unwilling to concede that in all probability (not in certainty) he was not included in this condemnation. His treason was unique and apart from that of either Annas, Caiaphas or the Jews. Certainly the action of Annas and Caiaphas was more direct, yet it must not be overlooked that others shared in that action. "The responsibility for the act," to use Westcott's verdict, may be "concentrated" in Caiaphas, but most assuredly Annas, the Sanhedrin and the Jewish nation were implicated in that act, for I conceive that though the former acted on his own official responsibility, he fully represented the latter, as *primus inter pares*, that is, as head and spokesman of both bodies. If Caiaphas was the one referred to by the Lord, his, then, would be the "greater sin," but as he was not so designated by name the matter is clearly open to conjecture. Moreover, Annas seems not to be without some share in the delivery of the Lord to Pilate, for in Luke iii. 2, both he and Caiaphas are called "High Priests," and in Acts iv. 6, the former only is termed such,

On this, Edersheim (*Life and Times of Jesus*, Vol. II, p. 547) has a pregnant passage:—

“Annas was as resolutely bent on His [Christ’s] death as his son-in-law, though with his characteristic cunning and coolness, not in the hasty, bluff manner of Caiaphas.¹ It was probably from a desire that Annas might have the conduct of the business, or from the active, leading part which Annas took in the matter; perhaps for even more prosaic and practical reasons, such as that the Palace of Annas was nearer to the place of Jesus’ capture, and that it was desirable to dismiss the Roman soldiery as quickly as possible—that Christ was first brought to Annas, and not to the actual High-Priest.”

From this I venture to maintain that the share of Annas in the “greater sin” is within the province of argument, for *Ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἄννας δεδεμένον πρὸς Καϊάφαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα* (xviii. 24).

I come now to the Sanhedrin. This is Edersheim’s view of their complicity (*Ibidem*, p. 556, 7):—

“Alike Jewish and Christian evidence establish the fact that Jesus was, not formally tried and condemned by the Sanhedrin. . . . But although Christ was not tried and sentenced in a formal meeting of the Sanhedrin, there can, alas! be no question that His condemnation and death were the work, if not of the Sanhedrin, yet of the Sanhedrists—of the whole body of them (‘all the Council’), in the sense of expressing what was the judgment and purpose of all the Supreme Council and Leaders of Israel, with only very few exceptions.”

It is clear from this weighty passage that the distinction between a formal and informal trial is too subtle to affect the fact that the Sanhedrin did actually, in conjunction with their Chiefs, condemn the Lord and deliver Him to Pilate, and so is a confirmation of the τὸ συνέδριον ὄλον of Matthew xxvi. 59, and the more emphatic line in Mark xv. i. “ὄλον τὸ συνέδριον . . . παρέδωκαν τῷ Πιλάτῳ. This is the *ἄνω βουλή* quoted by Coleridge, and the strength of his view—that the “whole Council” were the deliverers, and on them, as a Jewish assembly, rested the “greater sin.” His idea seems to me to be that they constituted the jury, and that Caiaphas was both Judge and Foreman, and directed their verdict by his famous utterance recorded in xviii. 14. The chief difficulty which this interpretation has to confront is, of course, the Lord’s words, ὁ παραδιδούς, being in the singular, which, in my view, is met by widening it so as to embrace alike Annas, Caiaphas, the Sanhedrin

¹ Dante, of course, places Annas, Caiaphas, and the Sanhedrin in Hell (*Inf.* xxiii. 115–123) amongst the Hypocrites of the Eighth Circle, but metes out a special punishment to Caiaphas which “seems,” observes Dean Plumptre, “to reproduce the thought of *Isaiah* li. 23.” This consisted of being impaled naked on a cross, and experiencing “The weight of whoso passeth by his feet.”

and the Jewish people. Stephen himself mulcted the Sanhedrin with the crime (Acts vii. 52) as *προδότηι καὶ φονεῖς*, as did Peter in Acts iv. 10, *ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε*; while the *τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν* (Matt. xxvii. 25) of the Jewish people besmirched them with it also, in addition to Peter's charges in Acts iii. 15, *τὸν δὲ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἀπεκτείνατε*. And a minor objection may be unearthed from Acts iii. 17: *οἶδα ὅτι κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν*. Is this to be regarded as either a deliberate and inspired plenary absolution of the Jews and their rulers from their criminal share in the anti-judicial murder of the Christ on the score of ignorance, or a mere human gush of generosity wrongly directed? Neither, assuredly. To me it simply aggravated their guilt, for both people and rulers—the latter especially, as they, at least, *should* have discovered their Messiah through their prophets. Nor can the Apostle have meant to absolve them from this guilt, but merely to point out that a way of escape was not precluded by it. Culpable ignorance was their then normal state, but, for the reason just alleged, final obduracy, as Lange well points out, was not to be imputed to all, for many passed through the open door of repentance and pardon. Neither can the First (if genuinely transmitted) of the Seven last Words (Luke xxiii. 34)—*Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί ποιοῦσι*—which undoubtedly was uttered for the Jews and not the Roman soldiery, be consistently understood in any other sense. Some theologians hold that ignorance, apart from malice, or which acts *in bona fide*, excuses guilt, but malice and ignorance were here conjoined. And though, unlike human legislation, divine laws may attenuate *bona fide* ignorance, yet, from the view expressed above, I am disposed to deny this quality to the Jews and their rulers. Thus, in my contention, this third obstacle is shorn of its force.

But to close.

I suggest that, on the evidence adduced and sifted, Coleridge's contention stands unassailed, viz., that the power given to Pilate came directly from the Sanhedrin, and that they with their people incurred "the greater sin," which they would not have done had Pilate condemned the Lord *proprio motu* or directly by Divine impulsion. Any other exegesis renders the *διὰ τοῦτο* meaningless—which is utterly unthinkable.

THE LAMBETH APPEAL.

HOW WE CAN BEST RESPOND TO AND FOLLOW IT UP.

BY THE REV. W. ELLIOT BRADLEY, M.A.,
Vicar of Croothwaite and Rural Dean of Keswick.

NO one can read the Report, Resolutions and Appeal of the Lambeth Conference on Reunion without being filled with a deep sense of gratitude to God for the wonderful unanimity which was obtained and for the Christian spirit of brotherliness and fellowship which it breathes. And this sense of gratitude gives rise most naturally to a great longing and desire to contribute something towards the realization of that most necessary ideal. It seems to be the opinion and testimony of all those who were present that in answer to the prayers of God's people the Holy Spirit moved over that assembly and that His power was really felt. To His unifying influence and operation we must ascribe the remarkable findings to which their deliberations led them.

Reunion with the great historic episcopal churches of the East and West must be kept before us as the ultimate goal in any scheme of reunion if the vision of one Catholic Church is to be realized, and I believe that no Church of West or East, historically, doctrinally and ecclesiastically, is more suitable as a rallying ground (from the historic, doctrinal and ecclesiastical point of view) than our own beloved Church of England. But reunion with the great non-conformist churches in our own land (in our colonies, dependency, and protectorates)—what is known as Home Reunion—must be our immediate concern and objective. For the accomplishment of this object, I venture to believe and maintain that no school of thought in the Church of England is more suited as a rallying ground than the Evangelical. We are one with them on the great Fundamentals of the Faith, e.g., the Incarnation, Atonement, Centrality of the Cross, Resurrection and Ascension, Justification by Faith. Like ourselves they do not exalt the Sacraments to the belittlement of the preaching of the Word. Like ourselves they regard the errors, casuistry, intrigues and the whole system of Roman Catholicism as inimical to true religion and to the best interests of the State and of our beloved land. They are as apprehensive as ourselves of the

tendency of the extreme party in the Church of England to Romanize the Church of England, because their avowed object is to bring about Reunion with Rome at Rome's price, and that is our renunciation of the Reformation settlement and our complete submission to the Pope of Rome. Reunion with Rome on those terms is impossible, and were it ever seriously mooted it would split the Church of England in two and put back Home Reunion *sine die*.

I shall therefore confine this paper as to how we can best respond to the Lambeth Conference Appeal with a view to Home Reunion. Before doing so let us remind ourselves what the Spirit saith to the churches on this great subject of Unity through the Scriptures.

St. Matthew vi. 33 : " Seek ye first the Kingdom of God." Had the Church always made this her prime object, the unity of the Church might have been maintained. This injunction faithfully carried out would have made for unity. The Kingdom can only be successfully realized by a united Church. St. Mark x. 42-44 : Our Lord after reminding His disciples that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them, tells them " it is not so among you ; but whoever would become great among you shall be your minister or servant." This is another injunction which, if the Church had faithfully adhered to, would have made for unity. The Church would then not have established or acquiesced in an Autocratic Hierarchy or Episcopate, and much of the sad history of the divisions of christendom would never have been written. St. Luke ix. 49-50 : Here Christ sanctions diversity of operations in His name for the one Cause. St. John xvii. 21 : The Lord's prayer for the unity of His Church.

Acts iv. 31-35 : A description of the unity of the Church. Acts xv. deals with the averting of schism by apostolic consultation, resulting in a concession and an exhortation to the Gentile churches conveyed in a fraternal letter drawn up in the spirit of love.

Romans xii. 9-21 : An exhortation to love, meekness, one-mindedness and peaceable living. Romans xiv. 19 : An exhortation to follow after the things which make for peace and mutual edification. 1 Corinthians xii. 4-22 : The analogy of the one body, many members and one head, with the one Body of Christ having its many members, controlled and operated by the one Spirit. Ephesians iv. 1-6, 13-16 : The unity of the spirit kept in the bond of peace with an exhortation to unity. Philippians ii. 2-4 : An exhortation

to unity. Colossians iii. 8-15 : The " new man " knows no barriers of race, class or custom. An exhortation to the practice of those virtues which make for unity, especially those of love and peace. I Thessalonians iv. 9-10 : An exhortation to increase more and more in brotherly love. James iii. 14-18 : A warning against strife, because it makes not for unity but confusion and every evil work. I Peter ii. 1-5, 17 : An exhortation to put away malice, guile, hypocrisy, envy and evil speaking. He reminds his readers that they are built up a spiritual house on the one foundation Jesus Christ. They are to " Honour all men, love the brotherhood." I Peter iii. 8-12 : An exhortation to unity, forbearance, love, goodness and peace. I John iii. 11, 18-23 ; iv. 11-21 : Exhortation to brotherly love.

From these various references we are not left in doubt as to the mind of God in this matter. And judging from the findings of the various conferences culminating with the Lambeth Conference, we know that the minds of all men of goodwill in the churches is one with the mind of God on this matter of Reunion and Unity. And this oneness of mind is without doubt the result of the operation of the One Holy Spirit moving over the chaos of our unhappy divisions. It is an evidence, if we need one, that the Spirit is striving with men, bringing home to their consciences the sin of acquiescing in divisions, the grievous harm that these divisions are doing to the cause of Christ, and working in them and with them that they may break down the barriers that divide and draw them together in love as brethren.

This fact and the testimony of God's Word that a united Church is His plan and purpose, are two powerful incentives to our working and praying for Reunion, but there are two more. One is that the divisions of Christendom are weakening the effectiveness of the Church's witness to the world and hindering the successful evangelization of the world. The whole world will only be evangelized and won for Christ by the whole Church praying, working and witnessing—unitedly in the spirit of love, obedience, sacrifice and service. And the other is the opportunity that the churches in union have of saving the country. " The Christian churches have now a great opportunity," says Dean Inge—" the last, perhaps, that an offended Providence and a justly impatient public will allow them—of showing that they can put aside intestine divisions and their preoccupations with matters of small account and unite to save the country. . . . If the moral forces of the nation could be organized and focussed by the

churches acting together, the conscience of the whole community might be shamed into penitence, and the politicians, who, it is fair to remember, can only play the cards which are dealt to them, might feel strong enough to resist the wreckers of civilization" (*Times*, September 7, 1920). "If Christian witness is to be fully effective it must be borne by nothing short of the whole body of Christian people" (Lambeth Conference resolution). "This hits the nail on the head," as Dean Inge says.

Let me suggest a few ways in which we Clergy can respond to the appeal and follow up the Lambeth Conference resolutions on Reunion. I will place them under three heads: I. *Prayer*. "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem." We shall do more by prayer than by anything else, for Prayer is a force which sets in motion the power that makes for Righteousness, Peace and Love, and these are the foundations of Unity. Therefore, I would urge that we make Reunion a matter of personal prayer, and get our people to do so. Let us make it a subject of corporate prayer in the congregations and in the prayer meetings. If we issue subjects for prayer in our magazines let us make Reunion one of them. Let us pray that the appeal of the Bishops may be met and responded to by our Nonconformist brethren in the same spirit of brotherly love in which it was issued. Let us pray that the Spirit of God may move mightily and effectively in their hearts and minds as He evidently did in those of the Bishops as they prayed and took counsel together.

II. *Propaganda*. (i) We should draw the attention of our Church people and the Nonconformists in our parishes to the Appeal and Report. We can do it by the spoken word in Church and by the printed page in the magazine. We should get them to buy the Report and read it, especially our Church officers and sidesmen and Church Councillors. In poor parishes it would be worth while to buy a few copies out of the offertories and circulate them among the people. I would urge the issue of a simplified form of the Report for this purpose. (ii) We should print the Resolutions and extracts from the Report in the magazine. This could be extended over a few months to get them all in. (iii) We should form Conference Circles to read, study and discuss the Appeal and Report. (iv) We should preach a few sermons on the subject.

III. *Action*. (i) Let us form where possible a branch of the Christian Social Service Crusade on interdenominational lines and

make it as far as possible a lay movement. This will help to promote fellowship and co-operation in matters that relate to the welfare of the community. The public will then see the churches working together for the public good (*vide* Resolution 13). (ii) Let us promote interdenominational prayer meetings on the lines of the Evangelical World Alliance which promotes the Week of Prayer in the New Year. (iii) Let us promote interdenominational open-air services encouraging the lay people of the churches to lead and assist in speaking and singing. (iv) Let us encourage attendance by invitation at one another's annual congregational gatherings. (v) Let us promote and encourage confraternals between clergy and ministers to discuss the Lambeth Conference resolutions and see how far it is possible to carry out Resolutions v., vi., vii., viii., ix., x., xi., xii., xiii. (vi) Let us visit and speak at one another's missionary meetings, recognition of new Ministers' services and meetings. (vii) Let us in our parishes set ourselves to discover communicants among the nonconformists who would wish to avail themselves of Resolution 12 ii., and submit their names to the Bishop for his approval and sanction. (viii) Let us in our gatherings initiate and foster the interchange of pulpits within a given area between the clergy and ministers who are ready to make this move towards an ideal of reunion such as is described in the Appeal, and get the Bishop's sanction for the working of such a scheme (*vide* Res. 12 A i.).

It has often been said that the lay people of our own and of non-episcopal churches are more opposed to Reunion than are the clergy and ministers. If this is so, we must do all in our power by promoting and fostering brotherly intercourse and fellowship, by conferences and co-operation, to heal old wounds, remove antagonisms and clear away prejudices. Reunion of the whole Church and the Vision of one Catholic Church must be our aim and object. Towards this end we must keep moving, though we may have to move slowly, lest we do more harm than good by hurrying our own people to run in this matter before they have learnt to walk. While working for Reunion in our own area we must not lose sight of the great whole, and above all we must move forward in dependence upon the Holy Spirit of God, be led every step of the way by Him if we would truly realize the Vision, translate our purpose into achievement and attain to the glorious Ideal.

W. ELLIOT BRADLEY.

TITUS: THE MAN AND HIS WORK.

BY THE REV. W. B. RUSSELL CALEY, M.A.

PROFESSOR RAMSAY has called Titus "the most enigmatic figure in Early Church history," and this is unquestionably largely true, but yet there are sufficient notices of his life and work in Scripture to enable us to form a fairly complete portrait of this earnest and active disciple of primitive days. The process is rather like piecing together the scattered portions of an old glass window, by carefully fitting the coloured fragments we can get a general dea of what the window was like in its ancient glory.

It is surprising to find such a keen Christian was not mentioned in "The Acts." Many reasons have been suggested for this omission, but the most probable seems to be that he had been a test case regarding the circumcision of the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 3) and therefore his name might arouse angry feelings, though he was most likely among "the certain others" of Acts xv. 2. There can be no doubt such a trusted worker and tactful messenger must have been well known in "the household of faith." He was the spiritual child of St. Paul (Tit. i. 4) and comes into publicity in 2 Corinthians, in which epistle he is mentioned nine times, as one whose companionship Paul earnestly desired (2 Cor. vii. 6, 13), and whose cheerful presence delighted the Apostle's heart (2 Cor. vii. 6, 13). The Epistle to Titus was almost certainly written between Paul's first and second imprisonment, and we can imagine the sense of satisfaction and confidence that the Apostle would experience when he left the organization of the infant Church of Crete in such capable and trusty hands (Titus i. 5). "The care of all the churches" pressed heavily on the Apostle, specially as he realized the uncertainty of his own life and the precarious nature of his liberty, and it must have been an infinite relief to feel he could pass on this burden to such a successful organizer.

It is as we consider the work which we are told Titus did, that we begin to understand what manner of man he was. The character of persons is revealed more accurately by what they do, and how they do it, than by anything else. Faint endeavour in the cause of

Christ shows weak love and faith, while strenuous perseverance indicates a true love and a strong faith. Titus' life's work can be summed up under three heads: 1, Church Morality; 2, Church Finance; 3, Church Organization. And as we study his conduct in these respects the character of the man himself will stand revealed.

The first two are connected with the Church in Corinth; the last with the Church in Crete.

We may reasonably surmise that Titus was one of those people who rather enjoy having to tackle a difficult business: the troubles in the Corinthian Church awakened his interest, and he evidently felt that if wisely handled they might tend to the ultimate benefit of that important community. It has been generally assumed by scholars that Titus was one of the bearers of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and if so, we can understand he saw much that was lovable and attractive in them, so that he eagerly acceded to Paul's request that he would go and see what effect that solemn letter of warning and exhortation had had (2 Cor. vii. 6, 13), for Paul must have known by his intercourse with Titus how disinterested was his love, and how sincere his interest in the growth of the Corinthian Church in faith and purity (2 Cor. vii. 15). The result of that first Epistle was manifestly an immense and joyful surprise to Titus; it had effected more than he had dared to hope, and his glowing report had given Paul the most profound satisfaction (2 Cor. vii. 11, 13). The immorality of the heathen world was then so appalling and general (Eph. v. 3, 12) that it was small wonder that persons recently converted, young in faith and ill-instructed in doctrine should be found guilty of moral offences, but Titus being a Gentile and brought up amongst these habitual and popular corruptions, had proved a singularly wise and sympathetic counsellor, and doubtless Paul realized that much of the success of that first letter was due to the tactfulness of its deliverer, and that no one was better fitted to ascertain the condition of affairs at Corinth than Titus himself.

There is no Christian work more unpleasant, difficult, or perilous than that of dealing with the sins of the flesh: it requires immense self-control, great delicacy of feeling and speech, constant prayerfulness and heartfelt sympathy; so we can be sure Titus possessed all these qualifications in a marked degree. Learning how success-

fully Titus dealt with the question of Church Morality, workers for Christ faced by moral problems can take courage.

The second question which engaged the time and attention of Titus was *Church Finance*. Possibly during his visit to Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 1) he may have noted the poverty of the Jewish believers (for we can only picture the Early Church as poor) (Rom. xv. 26; John vii. 48; 1 Cor. i. 26; 1 Cor. xvi. 1-3), and it occurred to him, and the idea was heartily endorsed by Paul, what a wholesome effect on the spiritual relationship of Jews and Gentiles would result from a practical expression of brotherly sympathy from the Gentiles. Titus therefore became the founder of Foreign Mission Funds, for the matter mentioned in Acts vi. was purely domestic and concerned only the Church of Jerusalem, and that in Acts xi. 29 was probably Jews to Jews; but this collection at Corinth was the first attempt to organize help for those outside one's own community, and the experiment has had world-wide results. Paul honoured the originator by entrusting him with the completion of his scheme (2 Cor. viii. 6, 10, 11, 16, 17; ix. 5). It must have been an immense joy to Titus to find how cordially his plan had been adopted, and even if in his absence there had been a little slackness (2 Cor. viii. 11, 24; ix. 3-5), yet his return, full of zeal and love and courage, would soon put things right, and Paul was certain his pride in their generosity would be fully justified (2 Cor. ix. 12-14).

We may well in these days of continuous money collecting for various Christian objects, consider seriously the principles which Paul and Titus regarded as essential for true generosity and acceptable in the sight of God (Phil. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 16). That Christian liberality is right we all readily admit, but we do not so readily examine the principles which ought to govern it. Titus was a spiritually-minded business man, and he shows (for we can be sure he and Paul arranged the whole matter between them) the correct basis of Church finance, and those principles which received Apostolic approval.

I. *Generous impulses originate with God* (2 Cor. viii. 1, 5). It is important we should test whether our generous impulses are emotional or spiritual, and if so, at all costs we must obey them. We should give not because man solicits, but God inspires.

II. *There must be readiness of will* (2 Cor. viii. 3, 12; ix. 7; cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 9; Rom. xii. 8). In the sight of God, the

spirit of the gift is more important than the gift itself. "Jesus sits down over against the Treasury" (Mark xii. 43, 44).

III. *The giving must be regular and proportionate* (1 Cor. xvi. 2 ; 2 Cor. viii.). Spasmodic giving shows emotion governs our liberality, not principle. Christians are bound to exercise self-control in their religious generosity. God expected specified sums in the Old Testament for various objects at regular times.

IV. *Action must follow resolution* (2 Cor. viii. 11). When we see our duty clearly, we must not allow the good intention to evaporate—delay is dangerous.

V. *The standard* (i.e. proportion) *fixed is to be a high one* (2 Cor. ix. 6 ; cf. Mal. iii. 10). The standard now is to be fixed by love, not law.

VI. *The real standard is Christ's love to us* (2 Cor. viii. 9 ; ix. 15 ; cf. 1 John iii. 16-18). This annihilates all pride over our generosity.

VII. *We must remember to give so that God is glorified* (2 Cor. ix. 12, 13 ; cf. Matt. v. 16). Self-glorification must be foreign to Christian liberality ; the sole object must be God-glorification.

Thus to this almost unknown disciple we owe this brilliant initiation of systematic almsgiving which laid the foundation of Church Finance according to the will of God.

III. Many years must have elapsed (probably ten) before Paul left Titus to exercise his remarkable talents of tactfulness and firmness in organizing the Church in Crete (Tit. i. 5), and in this paper we need not go into the details of his administration, but merely note that prolonged knowledge of his capability and character confirmed Paul's high estimate of him, and induced the Apostle with happy assurance to leave in his hands the complete organization of an infant and difficult Church, that he might evolve order from confusion.

IV. Having considered the work which Titus accomplished, as far as Scripture teaches us, we can now form a fair idea of the personality of the man, for a man's interests and occupations most surely reveal his character.

There are six features which stand out with great distinctness, and they are all worthy of our imitation. He was—

(1) *Earnest and active for God*. No one could doubt his sincerity ; life and lip told the same tale. His earnestness impressed the Apostle : he was the most eager of the two (2 Cor. viii. 16), and it

was no ordinary man whom Paul styled his "partner" (2 Cor. viii. 23), an expression only used again in Philemon 17. His energy and ceaseless activity testified to the intensity of his love.

(2) *Sympathetic and tactful.* The work he was engaged in both at Corinth and Crete in rebuking sin and stirring up to righteousness required no hard moralist, but one tenderly appreciative of the circumstances and feelings of others, and keenly alive to the power of the personal touch (2 Cor. vii. 7, 9, 11, 13). Paul must have had the greatest confidence in his judgment of character, when he left in his hands the choice of leaders for the Cretan Church.

(3) *Brave and willing to face difficulty and loneliness.* He went often on errands which must have involved danger from fanatical Jews or "false brethren" (Gal. ii. 2, 4). St. Paul's experience in 1 Corinthians iv. 10-13 must often have been his, and though he had companions (2 Cor. viii. 18-22), yet as the leader of the band he must have sorely missed the Apostle's advice and encouragement, which probably made him a deeply prayerful and thoughtful man.

(4) *Sound in faith, neither fanatical nor schismatical.* One who being very sure of his own beliefs could deal firmly yet gently with the errors which grew up on all sides in an ignorant and youthful Church (Tit. i. 9-11; ii. 1, 7, 8; iii. 9; cf. 2 Tim. ii. 23-25).

(5) *Contagious zeal.* No one can read of Titus' work as recorded in the Corinthian Epistle and the personal letter to himself, and not realize what an extraordinary enthusiasm for holiness and generosity he was able to inspire in others. Being on fire he set others on fire (2 Cor. viii. 1-6; ix. 2).

(6) *Rejoiced over good and deplored evil.* There was no palliation of sin with Titus: he sternly denounced it, but as sincerely rejoiced at the growth of personal holiness (2 Cor. vii. 6-7, 13, 15).

The man and his work are therefore so intertwined that we can only interpret the one by the other.

W. B. RUSSELL CALEY.



STUDIES IN TEXTS.

Suggestions for Sermons from Current Literature.

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

I. ENEMIES OF THE CHRIST.

Text.—"Those Mine enemies, bring hither" (St. Luke xix. 27).
 [Book of the Month: THE PHARISEES AND JESUS* = PJ. Other
 reff., *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible* = HDB. *Hastings'
 Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* = DCG.]

Christ never lacked enemies from Bethlehem to Jerusalem.

The text is a plain reference to the Pharisees (see Luke xix. 14; and cf. Matt. xxi. 45; John xix. 39, 40). And the turmoil of Christ's life in the gospel pages, which began even when Herod hunted a new-born infant, is most of all due to the hostility of the Pharisees. "The short earthly ministry of our Lord . . . fairly bristles with the struggle made by the Pharisees to break the power of Christ's popularity with the people" (PJ. 1). "His work cannot be understood without a knowledge of them. The Pharisees and Scribes were the first to assume an attitude of hostility and criticism to Jesus" (HDB. III. 828). We may date their rise from Maccabean times. "The Pharisees were the successors of the Hasidim, the Puritans, who resisted Antiochus Epiphanes," a story "told with simple power in 1 Maccabees i.-ii." (PJ. 17).

The Sadducees represent the Jewish Church in alliance with the world. The Pharisees think of it more as theocratic and "separate," as their name implies. "These *Hasidim*, or Puritans of the century before Christ, became the Pharisees of N.T. times." "The name 'Pharisees' means *separated* because they withdrew from the Sadducee court party of the Maccabean rulers under John Hyrcanus" (DCG. II. 351). "The Pharisees wish the high priesthood to be separate from the civil government and are opposed to the union of Church and State" (PJ. 13). "In the ministry of Jesus the Sadducees control the high priesthood" (PJ. 17).

* *The Pharisees and Jesus*, by Professor A. T. Robertson; published by Duckworth & Co. 5s. A wonderfully concise and illuminating book by this highly esteemed scholar, with mines of information about the greatest foes Christ had. There is a list of over three hundred reference books at the end.

But the Pharisees "had won the sympathy of the masses of the people" (P.J. 17).

I. THEY WERE A POWER IN THE NATION. "The Pharisees formed a fraternity with peculiar vows, which separated them from the heathen, the common people, and the Sadducees. The great majority of Jews were Pharisees in belief, but only about 6,000 or 7,000 were members of the brotherhood. Edersheim compares them with the Jesuits in the Roman Church (Sketches of Jew. Soc. Life, ch. xiv.)" (DCG. II. 352). "The small Sadducean aristocracy had great power, but the Pharisees had representatives in the Sanhedrin, and were able to exercise great power with the people" (P.J. 19). "The Pharisees largely created the atmosphere which the people breathed, and into which Jesus came" (P.J. 2-3). And up to a point our Lord recognized the wholesomeness of their sway. "Jesus recognizes the right of the Pharisees to sit upon their places of ecclesiastical eminence, see Matthew xxiii. 2" (P.J. 1).

II. THEY HAD A WELL-DEFINED DOGMATIC POSITION. "Pharisaic Judaism in the time of Christ included the best, as well as the worst, of the people. The Jewish Saints in the N.T., the parents of the Baptist and of our Lord, Simeon, Anna, and others, Hillel too, and Gamaliel, were noble types of Pharisaic Jews" (DCG. II. 352). The Pharisees (a) "held both to divine sovereignty and human free agency" (P.J. 37); "the standpoint about God and man that modern Calvinists maintain" (P.J. 37). (b) "They placed the oral law on a par with the Old Testament Scriptures" (P.J. 38). This became a serious objection. (c) "They believed in the future life" (P.J. 39), following "the main lines of Jewish doctrine, cf. Daniel xii. 2" (P.J. 40). (d) "They had Messianic expectations" (P.J. 40), "but it was a political Messiah" (P.J. 41), "not a suffering or dying Messiah" (P.J. 42). "The Gospels do not make a point of blackening the Pharisees *per se*" (P.J. 63). "Their aim was in daily life to be as ceremonially pure as the priests were in the Temple" (DCG. II. 351). "Hillel said 'Love men and lead them to the Law'; and the international Synagogue, inspired from Jerusalem, compassed sea and land in making proselytes. The Sadducees had no such interest" (DCG. II. 352).

III. BUT THEIR SPIRITUAL INFLUENCE BROKE DOWN. It failed to understand or even to obey God's real will. "It is the dis-

crepancy between conduct and creed" (P.J. 2). And they failed to help the weak, while over-praising the strong. "From the Pharisaic standpoint there were two great classes of society, the righteous and the sinners" (P.J. 22). "Jesus is the incarnation of the spirit of love, pity, sympathy, help. The Pharisees stand for the regulated order of things as they are, constituted authority even at the expense of life and love" (P.J. 72). "Religion was not a fellowship with God, but a strictly legal walk before God" (HDB. III. 828).

"This high plea for Pharisaic puritanism did not always imply moral cleanness, but did demand religious purity, a very different matter" (P.J. 76). "They paid no attention to the ethical content of a law. Ethically indifferent precepts were as important as those bearing on really moral duties, simply because they were contained in the law or tradition" (HDB. III. 829). "The Pharisees, though made finally an aggressive political party from necessity, were at bottom a brotherhood with oath of initiation and rules for life that distinguished them from other Jews" (P.J. 19-20). They cultivated "the avoidance of the *'amha-'arets* ('the ignorant and careless boor' who disregarded the Levitical requirements, and see John vii. 49)" (P.J. 20). "One thinks at once of the caste system of India" (P.J. 22).

Christ's charge against them is sevenfold. "1. *Spiritual Blindness* (cf. Matt. ix. 13; xv. 14; John ix. 40)" (P.J. 111). "2. *Formalism* (Matt. v. 17 ff.)" (P.J. 120). "3. *Prejudice* (John v. 40; Matt. xi. 16-19, etc.)" (P.J. 126). "4. *Traditionalism* (Matt. xv. 1-20, etc.)" (P.J. 129). "5. *Hypocrisy* (Matt. vi. 2-7; xxiii. 13-39, etc.)" (P.J. 133). "6. *Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit* (Matt. xii. 31)" (P.J. 148). "7. *Rejecting of God in Rejecting Jesus* (John v. 42; Matt. xvii. 12, etc.)" (P.J. 151).

IV. THEY, ON THE OTHER HAND, HAVE ELEVEN CHARGES AGAINST CHRIST. "(1) *Assumption of Messianic Authority* (John ii. 13-22)" (P.J. 66). "(2) *Downright Blasphemy* (Luke v. 17-26; John v. 18; x. 22-42; Matt. xxvi. 65; Mark xiv. 64)" (P.J. 71). "(3) *Intolerable Association with Publicans and Sinners* (Matt. ix. 10 ff.; Mark ii. 15 ff.; Luke v. 29 ff.; vii. 29; xv. 1-32)" (P.J. 76). "(4) *Irreligious Neglect of Fasting* (Matt. ix. 14-17; Mark ii. 18-22; Luke v. 33-9)" (P.J. 81). "(5) *The Devil Incarnate or in league with Beelzebub* (Matt. ix. 34; xii. 22-37; Mark iii.

19-30 ; Luke xi. 14-36) " (P.J. 83). " (6) *A Regular Sabbath Breaker* (John v. ; Matt. xii. 1-14 ; Mark ii. 23 ; iii. 6 ; Luke vi. 1-11 ; John ix. ; Luke xiii. 10-21 ; xiv. 1-24) " (P.J. 85). " (7) *Utterly Inadequate Signs* (Matt. xii. 38-45 ; xvi. 1 ; Mark viii. 11 ; Luke xi. 16-32) " (P.J. 90). " (8) *Insolent Defiance of Tradition* (Matt. xv. 1-30 ; Mark vii. 1-23 ; Luke xi. 37-54) " (P.J. 93). " (9) *An Ignorant Impostor* (John vii. 14-30 ; Matt. xxvii. 63 f.) " (P.J. 97). " (10) *Plotting to Destroy the Temple* (John ii. 19-22 ; Matt. xxvi. 61 ; Mark xiv. 58 ; Matt. xxvii. 39 f. ; Mark xv. 29) " (P.J. 102). " (11) *High Treason against Cæsar* (Luke xxiii. 2 ; John xviii. 8-30 ; xix. 15 ; Luke xxiii. ; Matt. xxvii. 17-25 ; Mark xv. 9-14) " (P.J. 104).*

V. BUT THE GREATEST DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CHRIST AND THE PHARISEES IS HIS UNIVERSALITY. " 'It was never so seen in Israel' (Matt. ix. 34). This itself was a reflection on the Pharisees, and placed the crown on the head of Jesus as the supreme teacher who acted as well as spoke " (P.J. 83). " Real goodness does rebuke sin, but it is attractive to the sinner " (P.J. 80). " The Pharisees had no gospel to the lost," " Jesus not only allowed them access, but He actually welcomed them " (P.J. 80). " The Pharisees had a perfect horror of contamination from association with the masses of the people," " Jesus not merely associated with the masses . . . but went among the diseased and the immoral in His efforts to heal body and soul " (P.J. 76). " The term 'sinner' (*ἁμαρτωλός*) had a wide application as an expression of Jewish scorn, not only to the openly immoral (Luke vii. 37), but to Gentiles as a class (Gal. ii. 15), to heretics (John ix. 16, 31), to publicans (custom-house officers) as a class (Luke xix. 7), and even to Jesus Himself (John ix. 24) " (P.J. 77). " Jesus came to glory in the taunt flung at Him by the Pharisees, . . . though they probably gave a sinister meaning to 'friend,' as boon-companion and sharer in their vices " (P.J. 79). " Luke (xv. 1) pointedly says 'they were continually drawing near' " (P.J. 80). " It was now a custom on the part of all, of both classes, when Jesus was around. They were no longer afraid of Him as they were of the other rabbis " (P.J. 80). And ultimately this is the uniting point for the best of the Pharisees as it is the dividing line for the worst.

* The preacher will of course be unable to quote all these references, but it seems a pity not to embody them here.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

ESSAYS ON PRAYER.

THE POWER OF PRAYER: being a selection of "Walker Trust" Essays, with a study of the Essays as a Religious and Theological Document. Edited by The Right Rev. W. P. Paterson, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh, and David Russell, of the Walker Trust. *Macmillan & Co.* 18s. net.

In May, 1916, the Walker Trust of the University of St. Andrew's issued a circular in which a desire was expressed "for the gathering together of a record of the thoughts of those who have recognized the meaning and power of Prayer, and are willing to share their experiences with others." With this end in view, and with the object of publishing what may seem helpful, the Walker Trustees invited essays on Prayer—"The meaning, the reality and the power of Prayer; its place and value to the Individual, to the Church, and to the State; in the everyday affairs of life; in the healing of sickness and disease; in times of distress and national danger; and in relation to national ideals and to world-progress. It is suggested that the length of an essay be from 4,000 to 6,000 words, but no word limit is imposed. Contributors may write in any language. A prize of £100 is offered for the most widely helpful essay—open to any one in any part of the world."

In response to this invitation 1,667 essays were received. They came from every quarter of the globe, written in nineteen languages, living and dead—English, 1,604; French, 21; Welsh, 8; Tamil, 6; Norwegian, 5; Danish, 4; Italian, 3; Sanskrit, 3; Swedish, 2; Hindustani, 2; Hebrew, Latin, Spanish, Russian, German, Maratha, Burmese, Syriac, Xosa, 1 each. The essays reflected widely different grades of intelligence, culture and religious experience, and represented every standpoint of the positive religious thought of the higher civilizations. This enormous mass of material, possessing a significance as a revelation of contemporary religion, merited a careful analysis and yielded some interesting generalizations as to the consensus and differences of modern thinking upon the great theme.

The task of adjudication was laborious. At the preliminary stage, the essays, after a first reading, were arranged in four classes according to *prima facie* impression of merit. It was comparatively easy to relegate 721 to the fourth division as possessing no possible claim to final recognition, although most of them were submitted to more than one reader. At the next stage, the essays of the two higher classes were carefully re-examined, while even the 722 which had been assigned to the third class were again sifted in order to avoid any possible injustice. As a matter of fact, more than one essay, after making an unpromising start, found its way to the

front. Throughout this searching scrutiny stress was laid on the quality of "helpfulness" in the essays, and not until the order of merit had been settled was the identity of the contributors disclosed.

The prize of £100 was awarded to the Rev. Samuel McComb, D.D., Canon of the Cathedral of Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A. And additional prizes of £20 each were awarded to William Loftus Hare, Director of Studies in Comparative Religion and Philosophy to the Theosophical Society, London; the Rev. Edward J. Hawkins, Minister of Southernhay Congregational Church, Exeter; the Rev. S. H. Mellone, M.A., D.Sc., Principal of the Unitarian Home Missionary College, Manchester; the late Rev. Alexander Forbes Phillips, Vicar and Rector, St. Andrew's Parish Church, Gorleston, Suffolk, and Officiating Chaplain, Royal Naval Base. The following authors of representative essays were also adjudged to be worthy of honourable mention:—Charles Auguste Bourquin, Pasteur, St. Cergues/Noyon, Vaud, Switzerland; Manital Maneklal N. Mehta, M.A., B.Sc., LL.B., Professor of Physics, Bahauddin College, Junagadh, Kathiawar, India; Pandit Bishan Dass, B.A., Government High School, Hoshiarpur, Punjab, India; S. A. Abraham, Missioner, Tinnevely Children's Mission, Palamcottah, S. India. And two prizes of £10 were awarded to two students of St. Andrew's University.

In a lengthy essay of some fifty pages, entitled "Prayer and the Contemporary Mind," Dr. Paterson, one of the joint editors of this most valuable volume, examines the essays sent in, classifies them from several points of view, and draws certain conclusions that are striking. From a consideration of the nineteen essays printed in this volume the reader may have some idea of the value of the total mass examined as "a revelation of the place of prayer in contemporary religious life, and of the thoughts concerning prayer which fill the contemporary religious mind."

Dr. Paterson's "examination" is without doubt the most useful part of the whole of this unique volume. He has done his work with remarkable thoroughness and insight. First of all he supplies a General Classification and Analysis; and certain interesting facts emerge. The women essayists outnumbered the men in the proportion of 8 to 7. The clerical contributors were outnumbered by the laity by nearly 3 to 1, and formed less than one-eighth of the whole contributors. Among the clergy competing were three bishops, none of whom were placed among the winners. Of the 1,667 essays sent in, 1,489 are classified as "Christian," 164 as "Predominantly Christian or Eclectic," 14 as "Non-Christian," i.e. Oriental, Mohammedan and Jewish. The "Eclectic" group bears witness to the vitality of the Christian Science movement, of which thirty-one essays; and of what is termed "New Thought," which was represented by nineteen essays. A very important fact emerges, and is recorded on page 14: "Over two-thirds of the essays impressed the 'readers' as evangelical and not as Churchly or philosophical." This "is in contradiction to the sedulously spread report that during the last generation evangelicalism has

been a waning, if not an exhausted, force ; and it also justifies a protest against the frequent claim that it is in Catholicism rather than in Evangelicalism that the atmosphere of prayer is most widely diffused." But this preponderance of "evangelical" essays, while maintained in figures of each country, showed a tendency to diminish in the English-speaking world outside of the Empire. Thus, of the English essays, 75 per cent. were marked evangelical ; Scottish, 72 per cent. ; Australian, 67 per cent. ; American, 56 per cent. ; Oriental countries, with Missionary contributions, 50 per cent. Another feature of great importance is the marked preponderance in Great Britain of the undenominational type of Christian thinking, as distinguished from a definitely ecclesiastical type. The Roman Catholic contribution from Ireland was surprisingly small as compared with that from England. The American essays bore strange testimony to the influence of the Christian Science movement. Table viii. and the deductions therefrom are the greatest value ; e.g., "The disclosure in Great Britain of a vast amount of solid and serious thinking on religious subjects by men and women on a high level of intelligence and culture."

While the essays as a whole bear the stamp of "modernity," the general attitude is one of confidence ; and there is practically universal agreement as to the privilege, the duty and the efficacy of prayer.

The second half of Dr. Paterson's "examination" is beyond all praise, and forms a most valuable and up-to-date treatise on the subject. Among the many questions dealt with are those of prayers for healing ; the possibility of answers to prayer, and the method of the Divine response ; subjective conditions and proved methods of effectual prayer ; and the problem of unanswered prayer.

Dr. Samuel McComb, Canon of the Cathedral, Maryland, Baltimore, who won the prize by contributing an essay—"Prayer : Its Meaning, Reality and Power," has produced a real masterpiece, in the space of thirty-five pages. It is comprehensive, thorough, scholarly and up-to-date. He declares that "one of the most remarkable facts in the modern history of man is the rediscovery of prayer."

Eighteen essays follow—of varying merit, and written from widely different points of view. Thus, while one deals with prayer "from the anthropological point of view," another takes prayer as "The Meeting-place of Science and Mysticism." One treats prayer in the light of "New Thought from South Africa," and a fourth is "An Oriental Conception of Prayer," and a fifth presents "A Study of Bahai Prayer." "Prayer and Experience" is the theme of one writer, and following essays deal with this side of the subject from different points of view, e.g., "A Chaplain's Thoughts on Prayer," "The Faith of a Missionary," "The Autobiography of an Evangelist." One essay deals with "Prayer Under the Guidance of the Church," another "Prevailing Prayer—A Message from Keswick," another "Prayer in the Light of the Divine Immanence."

Many of the essays are helpful and stimulating, but some are fanciful, and though interesting, of little profit to "the average reader."

"The Impressions and Reflections," by David Russell, of "The Walker Trust," form an admirable summing-up of the evidence gathered from the 1,667 essays contributed; while the excellent "Bibliography," drawn up by the Rev. W. C. Fraser, is a most valuable addition. An Index of Texts and a detailed Index and Glossary lend interest to a fascinating volume. This book has a message in days of abounding materialism, and though some of the essays do not reach the level of the Christian Faith, there is none that has not something to teach the pilgrim on earth journeying to a home beyond the skies. C.E.W.

THE BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD'S CHARGE.

THE CHURCH AND HER PROBLEMS. By the Lord Bishop of Chelmsford. *Robert Scott.* 2s.

Last May Dr. Watts-Ditchfield delivered his Primary Charge, and between its delivery and publication the Lambeth Conference and Church Congress took place. In a postscript to his Foreword he says that some of the statements in the Charge have been modified or expanded in his Southend Address. With these modifications we have no concern, and it is our duty to give some account of a document that bears all the marks of spiritual virility and independent thinking which we are accustomed to associate with the Bishop, whose diocese is co-terminous with urban and rural Essex. He briefly sketches the history of his diocese, and then turns to the condition of Church life in the diocese. He informs us that the number of Parliamentary electors within the diocese is 611,799; the number of communicants, 74,868; and the number on the Roll of Electors is 95,525. He considers this satisfactory, but he has not commented on the fact that the qualification—age and status—for electors to parochial Councils is lower and different to that for Parliamentary elections. We believe that he is right in maintaining that no other organization than the Church could have formed such a Roll so successfully. He offers words of counsel to Clergy and Wardens as regards their duties, and emphasizes the insurance of churches at not less than thirty to fifty pounds per seating accommodation.

On the question of Establishment he is strongly in favour of the maintenance of Church and State, and says that one of the disadvantages is the hindering of the Church in maintaining discipline by the difficulty of adjusting her Courts to fit in with her position as a National Church, which has tended to produce her present chaotic state. He says "that for some reason or another, rightly or wrongly, large bodies of Church-people regard the various Courts before which they were brought as unsuitable or objectionable, and that some clergy appear more concerned about the character of the Courts than about the uncanonical action of the priest."

He observes three bodies within the Church, of which the first is a wild and impossible class, who are not Anglican and are not Catholic, and who repudiate every change made at the Reformation. They throw over all restraint and simply appeal to some outside authority, supposed or real, in support of what they do. "They are a foe to order and discipline, and are a danger to the Church."

He discusses the services of the Church and the duty of the Clergy to obey the Book of Common Prayer. His views are enforced by quotations from the older Tractarians, whose actions are contrasted with those who say, "We cannot use the Prayer Book even for our private office, without breaking our promise to give canonical obedience, nor can any gentleman ever mention the Book to us again." His counsels to his clergy are such as we should expect from one who believes in the comprehensiveness and limitations of the National Church, and show a due distinction between matters of doctrinal significance and those which are not significant of teaching. He is not in favour of the Confirmation of young children, and is deeply distressed by the perilously large number of lapsed communicants. "When the numbers confirmed year by year are remembered, it is an amazing fact that the number of communicants remains almost stationary. I fear the reason is twofold, viz., the lack of adequate preparation before Confirmation, and the lack of sympathy and help afterwards." He suggests as remedies the remodelling of Confirmation preparation, the appointment of "Confirmation" godparents, the compilation of a careful Roll of confirmees and the setting of the newly-confirmed to work for God. All the Bishop says on this vital subject deserves prayerful consideration.

Most of the problems before the Church are treated wisely, if briefly, with a single eye to the performance of the main duty of the Church to bring people to their Saviour and to train them in the doctrine of Christ. "If the problems are not solved by the Cross and all that it means, they will remain unsolved. There, and there only, could Bunyan's Pilgrim cast off his load, and so to-day the world can never rid itself of its load of social, moral and intellectual burdens at any other spot; and so we who are meant to be teachers and healers of the world must, like the great Apostle, know nothing among men save Jesus Christ and Him crucified. The Cross is the only and all-sufficient remedy for the whole world. May the Holy Spirit help us to realize more fully among ourselves the fruits of our redemption, through it and by our witness of word and life reveal it unto men."

We close on this note which runs through the whole Charge. We commend its burning words to all who have at heart the future of our National Church. Even those who cannot agree with all its contentions will find in it help and inspiration. Dr. Watts-Ditchfield thinks for himself, and says what he believes. A man so vigorous and endowed with such a strong personality cannot avoid taking positions that will not be supported even by his most intimate friends. One thing is certain; he is consumed with zeal

for his risen Lord and Master, and when we undertake to criticize his opinions we always do so in the spirit of love for one who teaches us all much it would be well to practise, and always strives to discover what is in accord with the message of the Saviour. We hope that this Charge, whose arrangement, if not perfect from the point of view of strict logical sequence, is profoundly impressive, will be widely read and prayerfully studied by all who wish to know the real mind of one who believes he has been sent by God to serve his diocese.

BUSINESS PAPYRI.

JEWISH DOCUMENTS OF THE TIME OF EZRA. - By A. Cowley, S.P.C.K. 4s. 6d.

Between the years 1898 and 1908 a number of Aramaic papyri were discovered at Elephantiné, a picturesque island in the Nile, opposite Syene (modern Assuan). These documents, nearly all of which are dated, cover practically the whole of the fifth century B.C. (494-400), during which time, Egypt was under the Persian rule. The writers of these business papyri were Jews and kept the Passover. They bear Jewish names, and, as of old, were divided into "standards." They were accompanied by their families, and lived apparently on equal terms with the people of other races and intermarried with them. The origin of this hitherto unknown colony of Hebrews in Egypt is obscure. The Letter of Aristeas incidentally mentions that Psammetichus, King of Egypt, employed Jewish mercenaries in his campaigns against Ethiopia. Dr. Cowley is inclined to identify this King with Psammetichus II (595-590 B.C.), but it is more probable that Aristeas is referring to Psammetichus I, who reigned from 666-610 B.C. See Petrie (*Hist. of Egypt*, Vol. III, p. 330), who quotes Herodotus to the effect that in the reign of Psammetichus I, garrisons were "stationed at Elephantiné against the Ethiopians." At any rate, when Cambyses went to Egypt, in 525 B.C., he found that these Hebrew colonists had a handsome Temple of their own, which had been erected by their fathers.

Now, a temple built of hewn stones, cedar wood and bronze, and having gold and silver utensils, would not be erected by a people who had just arrived in the country. It is more probable that such a building was the work of a community which had resided in Egypt for a considerable number of years and had prospered. When did such a community settle in Egypt and what induced them to go there? We would suggest that the original colonists belonged to the kingdom of *Israel*, who, during the frequent waves of the Assyrian invasion, took refuge in Egypt (see Hosea ix. 3; viii. 13). These would later be added to by refugees or traders from the kingdom of *Judah* and by recruits from Persia and Babylonia (see Documents, No. 6). This theory is borne out by the following facts:—

(i) In contravention of the Deuteronomic law about a central sanctuary, these colonists had built a temple in the fortress of Yeb. A Judean community would have had some scruples in violating the

law ; but an Israelitish community would not have experienced any qualms of conscience, for their ancestors had done a similar thing in Palestine. (ii) The religious and internal affairs of the garrison were directed by the "priests," though these "priests" are not called "the sons of Aaron." (iii) When the Temple of Yahu at Yeb was destroyed, these colonists appealed for help to "Johanah the high priest" and "the nobles of the Jews" in Jerusalem ; but the Jerusalem authorities did not respond, evidently because they considered them schismatics. (iv) Failing the Jerusalem authorities, the colonists appealed to "Delaiah and Shelemiah, the sons of Sanballat, governor of Samaria." Had they been Judeans, they could hardly have expected help from the Samaritans. (v) Their religious laxity in intermarrying with non-Israelites and in swearing by the name of heathen deities, also points in the same direction.

If the above theory be accepted, the discovery of these papyri has thrown unexpected light on a period of Israelitish history which for centuries had remained obscure.

Dr. Cowley has arranged these documents in chronological order and translated them into English with brief notes and an interesting Introduction. That Dr. Cowley's work is thoroughly sound and scholarly need hardly be stated. We hope he will give us also an inexpensive edition of the Aramaic text with a facsimile of one of the papyri.

KHODADAD E. KEITH.

SAYINGS OF JEWISH SAGES.

THE SAYINGS OF THE JEWISH FATHERS (*Pirqé Aboth*). By W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. S.P.C.K. 5s. net.

Pirqé Aboth is by far the most important Tractate of the Mishnah. It is the oldest collection of the pithy "sayings" of the Jewish sages who flourished during the two centuries preceding and the two centuries following the birth of our Lord. It has been frequently translated into European languages, and is of utmost value to the students of the New Testament. It is within its pages, as in nowhere else, that we get the authoritative doctrinal teaching of the orthodox Jews of the times of our Lord and of His Apostles. Here we meet with such famous Rabbis as Simeon the Just, Hillel, Shammai, Gamaliel, Yohanah ben Zakkai, Judah the Prince, and many others, some of whom sat in judgment at the Trial of our Lord. This small tractate throws also much fresh light upon words and phrases used in the New Testament, such as "the yoke of the Law," "the Voice from Heaven," "the Paraclete," "the world to come," "in David" (Acts i. 16), "in Elijah" (Rom. xi. 2), etc.

The following quotations will give an idea as to the nature of these sayings:—

Antigonos, a man of Socho, used to say: "Be not like slaves who minister unto their lord on condition of receiving a reward ; but be like unto slaves who minister unto their lord without (expecting) to receive a reward ; and let the fear of Heaven be upon you."

Rabbi Tarphon said : "The day is short, and the work is great,

and the labourers are sluggish, and the hire is abundant, and the master of the house is urgent" (cf. John ix. 4; Matt. ix. 37).

Rabbi Eliezer ben Jacob (second century) said: "He who fulfils one precept (of the Law) gains for himself one advocate ['Paraclete'], and he who commits one transgression (against the Law) gains for himself one accuser" (cf. Rev. xii. 10).

Rabbi Jacob (second century) said: "This world is like a vestibule of the world to come; prepare thyself in the vestibule that thou mayest enter into the banqueting-hall."

Dr. Oesterley's translation of the Hebrew text is almost literal, his notes are ample and most valuable, his references to the New Testament passages are exceedingly instructive. While thanking Dr. Oesterley for his admirable work, we must draw attention to a minor defect, which, we hope, he will rectify in subsequent volumes. We refer to the transliteration of Hebrew words. He uses the English letter k to represent three different Hebrew letters—k, kh, and q—which is most confusing, e.g., for *Hakhamim* he writes *Chakamin*, which is simply barbarous. He uses z where other scholars use either tz or ç. These, however, are minor defects, and do not affect much the general excellence of the book. K.E.K.

AN ESTIMATE OF JOSEPHUS.

SELECTIONS FROM JOSEPHUS. By H. St. J. Thackeray, M.A.
S.P.C.K. 5s. net.

Mr. Thackeray's estimate of the character of Josephus is, we believe, quite just. He regards Josephus as a man of "inordinate egotism," but neither a traitor nor a renegade. He was alienated in many ways from his own nation, and his adherence to Jewish dogmas lacked depth and sincerity.

The preservation of the work of Josephus is due to the interest that Christians took in his writings, and yet, with two or three notable exceptions, Josephus *ignores* Christianity, although he was too well informed of what the Christians had already done and suffered. He nowhere attacks Christianity, he simply ignores it. Why? Because "he studiously avoids a topic to which, in the circumstances of the time, it would have been dangerous to allude." For the same reason he is reticent on the subject of the Messiah. He altogether omits Jacob's blessing, and in his interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream uses these cautious words: "Daniel also showed the King the meaning of the stone, but I have not thought proper to relate this, my duty being to describe past, not future events."

How does Josephus stand as a *historian*? The apologetic nature of his *Antiquities* is self-evident. His aim is to defend his countrymen against the slanders of a malignant world. He therefore leaves out certain Biblical incidents which may not present his nation in the best light to his Greek readers. He also incorporates certain legends in his narrative. "Granted some blemishes of this kind, there remains no very serious charge against the writer of

Antiquities." As to his *Jewish Wars*, "Josephus comes before us with the highest credentials." He was exceptionally well qualified for this task. "We may therefore unhesitatingly accept the general trustworthiness of his account." The value of Josephus for the history of the century before the Christian era is of supreme importance.

Mr. Thackeray has given us a new translation of those passages which are most relevant to Christian origin and New Testament study. His translation combines "faithfulness to the original with a fastidious regard for English style." In the Appendix, Mr. Thackeray discusses Josephus's alleged witness to Christ, and comes to the conclusion that "the whole tone of the passage suggests a Christian hand." Professor Burkitt and Professor Harnack on the other hand accept the genuineness of the passage.

K.E.K.

THE BISHOP OF ELY'S REJOINER.

THE CREED AND THE NEW TESTAMENT. By F. H. Chase, D.D.,
Lord Bishop of Ely. *Macmillan & Co. 2s. 6d.*

In this able and closely written volume, Dr. Chase closes as far as he is concerned his controversy with Canon Glazebrook, as the defender of that type of Modernism which permits and advocates the symbolical interpretation of the Virgin Birth and Resurrection. It is a Review of "The Letter and the Spirit" which, under the analysis of the Bishop, is seen to be unworthy of the scholarship and character of Canon Glazebrook, who is convicted of loose statements and what looks like misrepresentation of his Episcopal critic. No candid reader of the New Testament can have any doubt that its writers believed in the Virgin Birth and Resurrection. In fact it is not too much to state that if we believe that our Lord's body saw corruption, it is impossible rationally to interpret the Gospels, the Acts and the Epistles. Dr. Chase has no difficulty in proving this to be the case. He devotes much space to a discussion of St. Paul's view of the Resurrection of the "dead in Christ." Much has been made of the Bishop's remark that the evidence for the Virgin Birth "is slight." It is sufficient to quote his words to show his meaning: "The evidence is slight. Ultimately, the story, if true, must have rested on the word of our Lord's Mother. But to estimate the force of the admission just made we must ask the question—Can we, if we assume the truth of the history, conceive of evidence being essentially different from what it is? We keep our birthdays; we veil all that concerns the first beginnings of our physical life in reverent silence. It cannot have been otherwise in the Holy Family. The evidence, then, is slight, but in a case of this nature it could not be otherwise than slight." The concluding chapter deals with "The Resolutions of the Bishops," in which the Bishop makes plain that the resolutions lay no claim to infallibility, and must simply be taken as giving responsible guidance as to what are the doctrines and the position of the Anglican Church. We have read

carefully the whole discussion and believe we express the conviction of most of those who have followed it, that dialectically, historically, and on grounds of scholarship, the Bishop has proved his case against the Canon. We thank Dr. Chase for the work he has done in strengthening our faith and making plain that the Creed says plainly what it means to convey to the mind and thought of those who recite its clauses.

LIFE IN PALESTINE.

EVERYDAY LIFE IN THE HOLY LAND. By James Neil, M.A. With 32 coloured Plates by James Clark, R.I., assisted by J. Macpherson-Haye and S. B. Carlill. *S.P.C.K.* 15s. net.

The late Rev. James Neil had lived many years in Palestine and had made himself intimately acquainted with the various features of life in the Holy Land. By his books, describing the manners and customs of the natives, he laid Bible students under a great debt of gratitude. The present volume will enhance that gratitude.

The Bible, he says, is an Eastern book, written in the East, by Easterns, in the highly figurative style of the East. Hence to understand it fully, an intimate knowledge of everyday life in the Holy Land is absolutely necessary. "Without this, in a thousand places, it is impossible to elucidate its meaning, remove its difficulties, picture its scenes, or realize its beauty" (p. viii.). "No great book has suffered more than the Bible at the hands of its would-be illustrators." Even the ablest artists, in their glorious works of art, have allowed imagination to mar their labours. Hence the need for pictures which are true and unconventional at all points. Mr. Neil was fortunate in securing the services of three eminent artists, who had painted in Syria and were willing to work under his constant supervision. They painted for him fifty-three oil paintings, which are at present in the possession of the London Jews' Society and are exhibited at their Palestine Exhibitions. Thirty-two of these paintings are reproduced in colour in this volume. They are the most accurate pictures of the Eastern life we have seen. They are perfectly realistic and portray almost every feature of life. The general impression is very pleasing. The letterpress is intensely interesting and throws a great deal of light on the sacred Scriptures. Very rarely does the author advance a theory which is doubtful. His suggestion that the Hebrew word in the Song of Songs which is translated "apple" in the English versions should be rendered "orange," is exceedingly doubtful. This, however, is a minor detail.

We should like to see a copy of this truly delightful book in the library of every clergyman and of every Sunday School teacher.

K.E.K.

LEADERS OF THOUGHT.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE FROM GALILEO TO BERGSON. By the Rev. John Charlton Hardwick. *S.P.C.K.* 8s. net.

The chief value of this small volume to general readers will be the way in which it demonstrates the breakdown of the "mechanical cast-iron" conception of the universe. The new facts brought to light in physics, biology, and psychology have tended to discredit the mechanical view as an explanation of reality; "the days of its tyranny are at an end."

What Mr. Hardwick has attempted is a general survey of the history of Thought since the time of the Renaissance. It is, of course, no easy task to give brief, lucid reviews of the ideas advanced by the various scientists and philosophers; but the author has done exceedingly well in this work, in which we have a singularly clear, readable, and suggestive volume. As it extends only to 146 pages, the book is naturally not a deep one; but it forms a most valuable survey. The author has had to make selections; we notice that Euchen is not included.

Mr. Hardwick traces the breakdown of the Aristotelian-Ptolemaic system elaborated by Aquinas, bringing under review Cusanus, Copernicus, Galileo, Giordano, Bruno, Galileo. Then he notes the growth of the mechanical explanation of nature. After tracing the seventeenth-century reaction in Spinoza, Leibniz, and Pascal—a threefold protest against the exclusion of the spiritual from the human view of life—and after taking full notice of the rise of German Idealism and the Romantic Movement, he gives close attention to the nineteenth-century return towards Naturalism. Then follow valuable chapters on the way in which Naturalism was checked by F. H. Bradley, A. J. Balfour and others; and on Recent Tendencies in Philosophy and in Science.

In the volume careful accounts are given, among many others, of Hobbes, Locke, Kant, Rousseau, Hegel, Darwin, Spencer, Huxley, T. H. Green, Boutroux, William James, Bergson. The book forms a most useful survey of Thought; and it ought to be in the hands of every student of Theology.

GREAT TEXTS FOR CHILDREN.

THE CHILDREN'S GREAT TEXTS OF THE BIBLE. By James Hastings, D.D. In six volumes. Edinburgh: *T. & T. Clark.*

Readers of the *Expository Times* are familiar with the sermons to young people, under the heading "Virginibus Puerisque," and we are not surprised to learn from Dr. Hastings' preface that they constitute a feature greatly appreciated. Save for a few which have already been published in the *Expository Times*, the addresses in these volumes are all new. They are certainly the best we have ever seen brought together in this way. Four volumes are to be given up to the Old and two to the New Testament. Three volumes only are issued at present. Striking titles, telling anecdotes, apt

poetical quotations and homely illustrations abound in these delightful sermons. Dr. Hastings has once more shown his consummate skill as a compiler, and he has displayed sound judgment in the task of selection. Of course, a work of this kind may be described as undenominational, and we miss distinctive Church teaching, but this notwithstanding there is sound theology and sane exposition, and the work is Evangelical in the truest sense. It should find a place in every preacher's library.

S.R.C.

MISSIONARY PUBLICATIONS.

From the Religious Tract Society comes an important volume—a British edition of Dr. Sherwood Eddy's *EVERYBODY'S WORLD* (6s. net). This notable contribution to the study of missionary problems comes from the pen of an astute American who is, as the editor says, possessed by a great passion for the advancement of the Kingdom of God, and it embodies the impressions of a recent and extensive tour. He has certainly given us a work of absorbing interest. He quotes Mr. Lloyd George as saying to a Labour deputation, "Get a really new world." He reminds us that millions have died for this new world and that it is our imperative duty "to live for it and make it a world worth their having died for." His opening chapter, entitled *Everybody's War*, is a trumpet call to service and sacrifice, and he then proceeds to tell us of the awakening of India, of the crisis in China, of the problems of the Pacific—Japan and the Far East,—the new Near East, "the birth-place of the three great monotheisms of the world, Judaism, Christianity and Islam," and the Appeal and Hope of Russia. He is always graphic, lucid and convincing. To take only the last—Russia—there is not only a vivid picture of the country as it is to-day—we must, as he says, know something about the past, "the record of a thousand years of human suffering," and so he gives us in a few pages the outline of a history that falls into four clearly defined periods. Not the least interesting section of the book is that which deals with the Anglo-Saxon Allies.

Dr. Eddy's tour ended in London, and it is useful for us to see ourselves as another sees us! He confesses to a sincere admiration for the English, and he frankly contrasts the national character with the American. He thinks the Englishman more judicious and cautious in mind, while the American possesses more executive ability and efficiency in administration. He would like the Englishman to be more friendly and the American more frank. Altogether in ten striking contrasts he compares the two races, and he wishes each to cultivate a more generous appreciation of the other. He sees in a better understanding between the British and American peoples the hope of the future. We are indebted to the editor of this British edition—Mr. Basil A. Yeaxlee, O.B.E.—for preparing for the press this fascinating work so full of facts and ideals.

S.R.C.

- From the Church Missionary Society come two volumes:
 (1) **THE REBUKE OF ISLAM.** By W. H. T. Gairdner, B.A. 3s. net.
 (2) **WOMEN WORKERS IN THE ORIENT.** By Margaret E. Burton.
 2s. 6d. net.

The first of these is the fifth edition (the first appeared ten years ago) of the work better known as *The Reproach of Islam*. It has been thoroughly revised and in part re-written by the author. He has changed the title with the explanation that nothing more was meant by the old, than that Islam was a perpetual reminder to Christendom of the latter's failure truly to represent her Lord, and he thinks that if she had done so Mohammed would have been a Christian, and the world had by this time been won for Christ. He admits that the Biblical sense of the word "reproach" had escaped him—namely, a thing so unspeakably vile that its very existence is a shame. The study of this handbook will give the student of missions a complete view of Mohammedanism as it is. More than this—*how to save it* is the important consideration to which three telling chapters are devoted.

The second volume deals with the Women's Movement in the East, and mainly, of course, in its relation to foreign missions. The work of the emancipation of woman is proceeding apace—abroad as well as at home—and the opportunity of the Church must not be lost. Miss Burton's book places us in possession of some startling but inspiring facts, and it constitutes, as a whole, a powerful appeal to Christian women for service in the interests of their sisters in other lands.

S.R.C.

BIBLICAL STUDIES.

- ST. PAUL ON THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN.** By the Rev. W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, D.D. *S.P.C.K.* 6d. net.

This is a careful examination of the two *loci classici* in 1 Corinthians, viz. xi. 5, and xiv. 33 *et sqq.* From the former the writer deduces the principle of subordination of woman to man, founded in the constitution of human nature. The prohibition contained in the second passage is enforced by the unanimous verdict of all the Ancient Communities, in which women have never been admitted as preachers in the mixed congregation. It appears to be historically certain that it is just as contrary to the immemorial and consistent custom of the Catholic Church for a woman to preach to the general congregation, as it is for a woman to be a priest. Tradition no more supports the one than it does the other; and the question is inevitable whether the English Church would be well advised to diverge from an interpretation of St. Paul in which the rest of the Ancient Communions agree. The writer's final conclusion is thus stated—"The fact is that either you must maintain that the spiritual equality of men and women involves identity of religious functions for the sexes, or else you must maintain diversity of functions. If you maintain the former, then women may be priests as well as

preachers ; if the latter, then you virtually accept the principle of St. Paul."

THE ORDINATION OF ST. PAUL. *S.P.C.K.* 6d. net.

This question, which involves the principles of the Christian ministry, and consequently relates to the problem of Christian Reunion, is one of present and pressing consequence. It is really a matter of twofold importance. When did St. Paul receive his apostolic office? On what occasion was St. Paul ordained? To the first of these the answer is that he derived his apostolic office direct from God on the way to Damascus, as the Apostle maintains in his Epistle to the Galatians. The second question has received an answer in the events that transpired at Antioch some years later (Acts xiii. 1-4). The laying on of hands in the primitive Church was employed for four purposes: in fatherly blessing (St. Mark x. 16), for the removal of disease (St. Mark vi. 5, xvi. 18), in Confirmation (Heb. vi. 2; Acts viii. 17, xix. 6), for conferring ministerial office in the Church. It is contended that in Acts xiii. 4 we have an instance of the first of these four uses, and not of the last—the incident being a primitive "dismissal of missionaries."

The second part of the pamphlet is a painstaking and exhaustive examination of the history of the interpretation of Acts xiii. 1-4; and the conclusion is reached that the historian's narrative in Acts must be understood in the light of the Apostle's own distinct affirmation. And on the whole it seems that Catholic interpretation is gradually moving in this direction.

LIFE UNTO GOD. By the Rev. A. A. David, D.D., Headmaster of Rugby. *S.P.C.K.* 1s. net paper; 2s. net cloth.

This little booklet is the expression—in the form of notes—of an attempt to provide stimulus and guidance to the religious thinking and practice of boys and young men. The Christian Truth demands an effort to think as well as to learn. The Christian Life is the outcome and reward of self-discipline in religious observance.

There are three sections: (1) Life unto God—What is it? How is it attained? (2) Truth about God—The Apostles' Creed, The Trinity. (3) Approach to God—Bible Reading, Private Prayer, Public Worship, The Sacraments.

Within the compass of its sixty-four pages there is packed away a great amount of helpful and devotional instruction. It is a little book that will do much good.



CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

A NEW book, entitled *The Reformers and the Reformation*, by the Rev. F. B. Llewellyn, B.D., has just been published, price 5s. net. In its 210 pages will be found a readable account of the Reformation period, and the life-story of five Reformers—Luther, Calvin, Tyndale, Cranmer and Jewel. The book is not written as a text-book, but for Churchpeople generally who wish to know what we owe to the Reformation and have not time to read the larger volumes. It is particularly valuable to place in the hands of young people, Sunday School teachers, and members of Church Councils. It will not be *dry* reading and will interest.

From the time of its commencement to the present day the Reformation has been the battleground of contending parties and partisans. The Romanist has endeavoured to defend, to deny, or to minimize the doctrinal errors, the popular superstitions and the moral corruptions which rendered it inevitable. The Ritualist asserts that it is to be repented of "in sackcloth and ashes." The answer to those who disparage the Reformation is to be found in the above book, and in the Rev. C. Sydney Carter's *English Church and the Reformation* (1s. net), which deals with the English Reformation in particular, and which may be mentioned again in these notes with advantage. The facts are set out with luminous clearness. Short, clear, comprehensive, full enough for all practical purposes, it is just the kind of book which is helpful.

Knowledge of the Prayer Book is very necessary to all who are engaged in Church work, and especially to members of Church Councils, Ruridecanal and Diocesan Conferences, and to members of the National Assembly who will have to consider and vote upon many changes. Dr. Flecker has provided students with a very clear and serviceable handbook to the Morning and Evening Prayer Book and Litany, entitled *The Student's Prayer Book*, now obtainable for 1s. 6d. net. The text is given and short, crisp, informing notes added. *The Protestantism of the Prayer Book*, by Canon Dyson Hague (1s. net), is another valuable work. It is intended to demonstrate the essential Protestantism of the Prayer Book, and to give a brief but exhaustive account of the true principles on which the English Book of Common Prayer was finally compiled when the Reformation of our English Church was completed, and the Second Book of Edward VI was substituted for the First Book. It shows that those principles were carefully retained in the Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth's reign, and were finally preserved unaltered in the revision of 1662.

We referred a short time ago in these notes to the issue of a new edition of *The Holy Communion: Its Purpose and Privilege*, by Canon Barnes-Lawrence, at 1s. 3d., 1s. 9d. and 2s. net. This book will be found very valuable to give to young people on the occasion of their Confirmation. It cannot be too highly recommended. It deals, by the method of positive teaching rather than controversial treatment, with the fact that the Holy Communion is central to those foundation truths which underlie the whole Christian life. Its thought-

fulness, its spirit of sober and quiet devotion, its clear and definite teaching, all combine to render it a truly beautiful book. We know of no volume on the subject better fitted to be given to the young of the more thoughtful and educated classes. It is, moreover, a valuable addition to the devotional library of elder Churchmen and women.

My First Communion, by the Rev. A. R. Runnels Moss, with a preface by the Bishop of Manchester (1s. 3d. and 1s. 6d. net), is a welcome little devotional manual. It can be described as being a simple and clear explanation of the nature and meaning of the **My First Communion**. Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, with a brief comment upon the Communion Service.

A short and simple statement of the meaning of the Thirty-nine Articles has been a long-felt want, particularly by clergymen who wish to give to their Confirmation candidates and Sunday School scholars

The Thirty-nine Articles, a handbook containing a brief and accurate explanation of the contents of the Articles. *The Thirty-nine Articles*, by the Rev. B. C. Jackson (3d. net), is clear and concise, and the teaching which it contains is excellent in every way. He gives an historical introduction covering the main facts of the Articles, and in five groups he deals with their chief points. Each of them contains an explanation of things essential, and a longer reference to matters of special difficulty. For Church-people generally, who desire to make themselves better acquainted with the Articles, and yet have not time in this busy age for the study of large commentaries intended for the use of divinity students, nothing could be more suitable.

The Rev. Herbert Rowsell says his object in his pamphlet, *Rome and Babylon*, is to show the identity between Romanism and the ancient idolatry of Babylon. He regards Romanism as having no right to the title of Christianity, as it is practically a pre-Christian idolatry, with just sufficient Christianity to give it currency. He acknowledges that this is a hard saying, but his pamphlet is intended to show that it is true. He goes through the series of Babylonian beliefs and practices, and shows their counterpart in the Roman Church. It has always been difficult to explain such things as the black "bambino." Mr. Rowsell attributes it to Babylonian origin. The mysteries of Babylonian religion found their way to Rome, and some of them, through the paganism of the Roman Empire, found a place in the Christian Church. Mr. Rowsell points out that many of the heathen symbols have been adopted in the Roman system, the mitre, the rosary, holy water and holy fire being among the number. Some of the festivals of the Church can also be traced to the same source. Mr. Rowsell's book gives rise to much reflection on the tendency of human nature to fall back from the height of spiritual insight upon material elements that tend to debase and lower the standard of spiritual truth.

A very few copies remain available of *Steps Towards Reunion*, by Bishops Willis and Peel (price 9d. net). This is undoubtedly one of the ablest contributions to the whole question of Church policy that has been issued, and must of necessity be a historical document. In days to come it will take its place with other classical statements of the Church of England position. It is written with a sense of the responsibility of the importance of the occasion, it is clear and statesmanlike, and states its principles with logical force and accuracy.