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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1921

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

"The Churchman."

We crave permission to say a word of very hearty thanks for the most kind reception accorded to The Churchman in its new style. The January issue was sold out before the end of the month, and the large number of letters expressing warm appreciation of its contents and good wishes for the prosperity of the enterprise was most encouraging and will prove a stimulus to future endeavour. The circulation of the present issue promises to be still more extensive, and we are sincerely grateful to the many friends who have rallied to our support. We venture to repeat the twofold suggestion we made last quarter, viz. : (1) that present subscribers should recommend the magazine to others, and so endeavour to secure a still larger circle of readers ; and (2) that, wherever possible, friends should subscribe for a copy to be sent to one of the younger clergy at home or to a missionary in the foreign field, and so help to strengthen the cause for which The Churchman stands.

A Missionary of Reunion.

The Archbishop of York has begun his round of Conferences with the Free Churches on the Lambeth proposals for Reunion, but it cannot be said that the opening Conference at Manchester, on Wednesday, March 9, afforded much ground for hope that the practical conclusions of the Lambeth Appeal will very readily be accepted by Nonconformists. Nothing was wanting in the courteousness of the reception accorded to the Archbishop, or in the fullness of the expression of the desire for spiritual fellowship, but when it came to the vital point of Nonconformist Ministers accepting a commission through episcopal ordination as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship, the answer was an emphatic negative. The occasion was the annual assembly of the Free Church Council, and the Archbishop put his case before the members with clearness, precision and force.

He explained that the Appeal came from the whole Anglican episcopate, that it dealt with a world situation, that its aim was not to close doors but to open them, and that it was not a statement of the final terms of union with the Anglican Church. It was simply a plea for fellowship, so that they might become fellow travellers along the road towards a fuller life within a great united Catholic Church. Its ideal was unity through diversity and not through uniformity, and within this unity Christian communions, now separated, would retain much that had been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. Could they not, the Archbishop asked, help one another to reach a new starting-point at which old controversies could be left behind, and from which they could advance to a new communion with one another? In reference to the form of commission proposed, he urged, even as the Appeal urged, that no repudiation of past ministries would be involved in either case, but that which was proposed was rather "a new ordination power, with a new motive, to meet a new situation—the acceptance of a new call to wider service in a reunited Church."

The Nonconformist "No." The answer to the Archbishop's speech was delivered by the Rev. Principal E. Griffith-Jones, of Bradford—not, perhaps, the happiest selection—and he was evidently determined that no one should misunderstand his position. He affirmed that the Lambeth definition of membership in the united Catholic Church was seriously faulty, since it imposed a ceremonial test alongside a spiritual one. He claimed that all the Evangelical Free Churches held the same essential Gospel as the Churches with which it was now suggested they should reunite, and said it was a disappointment that the Bishops, having gone so far, should not have gone farther. It was here that Dr. Griffith-Jones interpolated an alternative plan—

"Having gone so far, why had further ecclesiastical tests been imposed, such as reordination and the acceptance of a particular system of Church government? Why not explore the possibilities of a reunion on the basis of frank mutual recognition, with a Council of representatives for common policies, and practical co-operation in the functions of the Universal Church for the nations of the world? Here was a path worth investigating."

He was very emphatic in his rejection of the cardinal point of the Appeal—

"They could not consent to any form of reunion which included a demand for reordination of their ministry. Acceptance of reordination would eliminate in the course of one generation every form of Church government but the Episcopalian. If it were a mere question of order and not orders they might be willing to submit to any formal rite of recognition as the price of reunion. But to be reordained was to receive a gift of grace, not conferred by their own ordinations, not merely spiritual in character, but sacerdotal. They did not believe in the existence of any such sacerdotal gift, and it would be an act of insincerity to submit to any such rite for the sake of reunion."

Dr. Griffith-Jones noted, too, that the Anglicans were desirous of making overtures for reunion with the Roman and Greek communions, and he added that "it was chiefly that attitude which gave them pause." Taking, therefore, the Manchester reply as a whole the outlook is not promising for any immediate action towards unity; but we decline to believe the difficulties to be insurmountable. One thing is certain, we can never go back to the old position. The Lambeth Appeal has given the Churches a new spirit, and we believe its effect will be seen in the formal and considered reply which leaders, representative of the whole of Nonconformity, will, it is reported, publish almost immediately.

"The Beginnings of Christianity."

We are thankful that the dull but destructive volume which professes to carry to a completion the constructive work of Lightfoot has received adequate criticism from Professor Headlam. No one acquainted with the work of the great Cambridge scholar can fail to feel indignant that his name should be associated with a method of approach and a style of criticism that are both foreign to his most cherished ideals. While the theories that Lightfoot combated, and a great many more as pretentious as these, lie buried in the cemeteries of Text Books that alone remind us of their existence, his refutation is still consulted by those who know the difference between pinchbeck and gold. Dr. Headlam proves by abundant instances that Drs. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake have adopted an unscientific criticism. They reject what does not please them and misinterpret what appears to fit in with their ideals. Their passion for modernity shows itself everywhere. Their particular type consists in the determination to prove that the man who spoke before them had not said the last word, and it is their duty to add to it. Truth is

not always with those who believe they are most in accord with truth, when they are uprooting well-grounded beliefs. As a rule they set up new idols that will be overthrown to-morrow. The greatest objection, however, to the work of the two Professors lies in the fact " that it evacuates the Personality of our Lord of all its force and power. When we read the account given of His person and His teaching in this work it does not seem to us conceivable that anything so meagre should have been the creative cause of Christianity. Let us put on one side the divine claims of Christ; we must still remember that there were His human claims, and it is inconceivable that anything so commonplace and unoriginal as the Christ that is left to us by this type of criticism should have been the cause of a great movement such as Christianity. Christianity could not have come into being without Christ, and the Christ of these volumes could not have caused anything." We strongly recommend our readers to study in detail the great article in the January *Church Quarterly Review*. To us the condemnation of the book so fairly dissected may be gained from the fact that its Jewish contributor speaks more warmly and sympathetically of our Lord than the two theologians who have migrated from the Cam and Isis to the " freer atmosphere " of the United States. Even there licence is sometimes considered synonymous with freedom.

Old Testament Criticism.

Some years ago in a famous *Edinburgh Review* article Sir George Adam Smith uttered a warning against the acceptance of extreme views of Old Testament criticism. The pendulum had swung too far and credulity had passed from the traditionalists to the critics. The tyranny of great names and specious theories still has to be fought. " Assured Results " have to be re-investigated, and it is only in the study that they can be revised and set forward in a way that will commend the assent of candid minds. Already men who have studied from the beginning the theories that are now accepted by so many Hebraists declare " we have reached conclusions that will please no one. They will be rejected by the old-fashioned and will be considered old-fashioned by the critics." All this is to the good, and we commend to our readers *The True Value of the Old Testament*, a lecture by the Rev. A. H. Finn (The Bible League, Sixpence), and an extremely important article by Professor Konig of Bonn

which appears in the *Expositor* for February. He reviews very carefully the arguments brought forward to establish the non-existence of Abraham and the patriarchs and the polytheistic character of the early worship of Israel. On the first point he concludes, "We are entitled to give an affirmative answer to the question. The common testimony of the earliest sources, according to which the patriarchs *existed in reality and as distinct personages*, cannot be challenged except by unfounded and unmethodical arguments." He gives the grounds for his conviction that the modern view of the polytheistic character of the patriarchal religion rests on no evidence whatever, while much evidence can be brought against it. His analysis of the reasons why modern theories are so widely held shows that uncritical stress is laid upon these passages which appear to support the theories, while other passages are overlooked. Men are so obsessed by the glamour of prehistoric times that they take a flight into empty space. The doctrine of evolution in its universal application leads them to consider what is mentioned in the sources as an aberration, has equal authority with the prophetic faith. We have by no means reached finality in Old Testament studies, and a return to sanity is greatly to be desired. The discovery of different sources for a narrative is not the same thing as the proof that the story is unhistorical, and dates have been attributed to sources that have only a background of imagination. Even the advanced men are sometimes conscious of this.

The Divorce Question.

Lord Buckmaster's Bill for extending the grounds of divorce seems to be in abeyance for the time, owing to the congestion of business in the House of Commons, but advantage will certainly be taken of Lord Gorrell's Bill now before the House of Lords to insert amendments which would have the effect of providing for such extension. In that case we assume that those Bishops who now support the measure would at once become its most resolute opponents. Indeed, the Archbishop of York stated that their support was limited to the Bill as it stands. Not a few thoughtful Churchmen, however, feel that the Bishops have already gone too far in the expression of their sympathy with Lord Gorrell, for, although his Bill purports mainly to give effect to those proposals for reform on which both the Majority and the Minority Reports of the Royal Commission were agreed, it un-

doubtedly does contain some very objectionable provisions. The all but unanimous vote in the National Assembly declaring that "it is not desirable to increase the grounds on which a divorce may be granted" represents, we are persuaded, the opinion of the overwhelming body of Churchmen, and from this position there can be no drawing back. The Church is bound by her Lord's teaching on the question, and those who have read Archdeacon Charles's new volume, *The Teaching of the New Testament on Divorce* (Williams & Norgate, 6s. net), will see that this is quite clear and unequivocal. In our Lord's day a controversy was raging over Deuteronomy xxiv. 1–2, between the school of Shammai, which held that the phrase "some unseemly thing" meant actual unchastity, and the Hillelites who interpreted the passage as giving the husband the right to divorce his wife on any ground whatever. When, therefore, Christ was asked, "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" (St. Matthew xix. 3), it was really a test question, and the controversy, being based on the passage in Deuteronomy, had no reference to adultery, but to wider issues, for the law, which required the death of the adulterous woman, was still valid, and was recognized as such by our Lord. It is important to bear this fact in mind, when considering the apparent contradictions between St. Matthew and St. Mark. "The sin of actual adultery," says the Archdeacon, "is not so much as thought of in Mark. In Mark our Lord deals with divorce on grounds less serious than that of adultery," and when we recognize that fact the contradictions between the two versions cease to exist. "What is implicit in Mark is made explicit in Matthew. Both Gospels, therefore, teach that marriage is indissoluble for all offences short of adultery." The law as to the death penalty was abrogated later, and our Lord's words came to be regarded as forbidding divorce under all circumstances. "Now," says the Archdeacon, "it was just to correct such a grave misconception, or the possibility of such a misconception of our Lord's words, whether in Mark or other early documents, that Matthew (v. 32, xix. 9) edited the narrative afresh and inserted the clause, 'saving for the cause of unchastity. . . .' By the insertion of these clauses Matthew preserves the meaning of our Lord's statements on the subject for all subsequent generations that had lost touch with the circumstances and limitations under which they were originally made.

Matthew's additions are, therefore, justifiable. Without them the reader is apt to misunderstand the passage on divorce. Our Lord's teaching is, therefore, conveyed in the words, 'Every one that putteth away his wife, saving for the cause of unchastity, maketh her an adulteress, and whosoever marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery.'" Adultery, therefore, is the one and only ground for divorce; and to extend it by a hairbreadth is to go beyond the words of Christ.

The late J. T. Tomlinson.

The debt we owe to some men is never fully recognized until they are dead. J. T. Tomlinson—an able surgeon—turned his great faculty for investigation from living man to his past history. He carried with him into his study the care and insight that marked his work on the human body. He loved truth, and because he saw the Church of England assailed from within by attacks that endeavoured to change its reformed character, he gave himself to the study of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, which he analysed with microscopic thoroughness. Men who opposed him had to acknowledge his ability and the range of his knowledge. Men who worked with him learned to know him as genuinely human, disinterested and anxious to give the most unselfish help to all who looked to him for it. He had none of that refined self-importance that attaches itself to many original investigators. He never imagined that because Tomlinson said something it had more weight than if it was said and well documented by an obscure worker. Many who sought his counsel gained a reputation through the materials he placed at their disposal. He never gave a thought as to its acknowledgment. All he had at heart was the unmasking of error or the establishment of truth. To him and Mr. Dimock more than to any other two men we owe the changed attitude of the Anglo-Catholics who now openly assert they cannot justify their position by appeals to our formularies, and demand their change to enable them to appear honest sons of the Church of England. When he died he saw the altered character of the great debate, and it lies with his successors to resist for the sake of Gospel Truth and the maintenance of primitive Scriptural Christianity the daring attempts to revolutionize the Church of England. The battle he fought has been won. A greater struggle lies before the men of the present generation.

Influence of the West.

The influence of the West for good or evil on Africa and the East is clearly brought out in the April number of the *International Review of Missions*. This influence often makes itself felt in strange and unexpected ways. Thus Dr. Wainwright, in an article on "Western Influence and Missionary Opportunity in the Orient," speaks of the remarkable change that has taken place in the Japanese language, which, in the shortening of its sentences, the modification of its syntax, and the incorporation of new idioms and metaphors, has been gradually approaching to the English language. In China, as Dr. Harlan P. Beach, another American writer, points out, the classical language is yearly diminishing in importance, and the Chinese canonical writings, for a millennium the foundation of China's religious life, are falling into the background. The permeation of Western thought, it is pointed out, can hardly be termed an "invasion," since the English language has been extended in large measure as the result of the demand of Japan and China for it. In an article on "Some Aspects of the Philippine Educational System," the influence of the West is shown in the realm of industrial education, rather than in that of language and letters. Two articles on Africa show the influence of the West being mediated through Colonial administration. In a paper on "Christian Missions and African Labour," Mr. J. H. Oldham outlines the main factors in the economic problems of British East Africa, and traces the history of the successive ordinances and memoranda that have turned round the subject of freed labour. In November of last year a deputation presented an appeal to the Government, pleading that the principle of trusteeship be not allowed to become a mere, empty phrase, but a vital fact translated into administrative and economic life, and urging that a Royal Commission be appointed to inquire into the guiding principles of imperial policy in the British East Africa Crown Colonies and Protectorates. An interesting commentary on this is given in an article by a Belgian, Dr. Henri Anet, who shows a permanent royal commission at work in the Belgian Congo, "charged to watch . . . over the protection of the natives and the betterment of their moral and material conditions."

AN ECCLESIASTICAL CAMOUFLAGE.

By Chancellor P. V. Smith, LL.D.

"IT is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors that from the Apostles' time there have been three Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. . . . And therefore to the intent that these Orders may be continued and reverently used and esteemed in the Church of England . . ." So we read in the Preface to the Church's Ordinal, which was drawn up a few months after the First Prayer Book of Edward VI; and a visitor to this country from another planet, with this Preface in his hand, would expect to find the three orders of the ministry prevailing and utilized with advantage throughout the Church of England. But what would he actually discover? That the third order of the ministry existed only in somewhere about five per cent. of our parishes. Of course he would conclude that these must be the most favoured and best equipped portion of the Church. What, then, would be his amazement to learn that they only had deacons as assistant ministers because they could not get, or could not afford to pay, priests; that they looked forward to the deacons becoming priests at as early a date as possible, and felt that it would be a misfortune to the parish if this did not take place. Surely he would exclaim, and be justified in exclaiming, that the diaconate in the Church of England was a farce and a camouflage.

In Presbyterian churches the elders, and in other non-episcopal churches the deacons, constitute a real diaconate. But in the Church of England a deacon has no distinctive functions which differentiate him from a priest. He is a sort of half-fledged, or probationary priest, performing some, but not allowed to perform all, of the functions of the priesthood. He is addressed by the same title and is expected to wear the same garb as a priest. By statute law, dating from the reign of Henry VIII, but founded, no doubt, upon earlier canon law, he is subject to the same civil disabilities, as to not engaging in trade or business and otherwise, as a priest. Deacons and priests are mixed together promiscuously, in alphabetical order, in all lists of the clergy, whether diocesan or general. Deacons, in short, are distinguished from priests, not by what they may do or ought to do, but only by what they may not do

We have, for generations, been so accustomed to this state of things that we have, most of us, failed to realize its incongruity and the practical injury which it has inflicted upon the Church, and, through the Church, upon the religious life of the nation, But the defect in our organization has not altogether escaped notice. As early as the sixteenth century, Thomas Becon, sometime Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer, and Prebendary of Canterbury, in his *Catechism or Familiar Talk between Father and Son*, wrote: "Would to God that even in the reformed Churches the office of a deacon were restored unto the right use; that our Churches might go right up and not halt in any condition." About the same time the Puritan, Thomas Cartwright, made the absence of a proper diaconate one of his grounds of objection to the Church of England. All that Archbishop Whitgift could reply was: "It is not necessary that every one which is a deacon should be preferred to the ministry. . . . It is not necessary that whosoever is deacon should after be minister, no more than it is that a bachelor of art should be a master of art, or a bachelor of divinity a doctor; for there may be just causes to stay them from proceeding any further."

In recent times such thoughtful and practical men as Dr. Arnold and Dean Hook have taken the same view. Dr. Arnold, in a letter to a young man on his ordination as a deacon, wrote: "You are entering on an office extinct in all but name. If it could be revived in power, it would be one of the greatest blessings that could be conferred on the Church." "Extinct in all but name." There was no exaggeration in these words. The earliest deacons, as we learn from Acts vi., had definite and distinct functions assigned to them, and stood to the Apostles, then the only other ministers in the Church, in the numerical proportion of seven to twelve. In writing to the Church at Philippi, St. Paul addressed his letter to all the saints which were there with the bishops and deacons. We cannot suppose that there was any startling disparity of number between these last and the bishops, who, of course, were ministers of the same grade as those called presbyters in the Asiatic churches of St. Paul's time. And we know that in sub-Apostolic times no Christian congregation was deemed to be complete, nor any Eucharist to be validly celebrated, without the presence of at least one deacon in addition to one or more presbyters or priests. Nothing could be

more glaring than the contrast between that state of things and what has been in existence in the Church of England. Equally glaring, however, is the difference in the deacon's functions, which in old times were entirely distinct from those of the priest, but in the Church of England are, so far as they go, identical with his; the only difference being that a deacon in our Church cannot perform one or two important acts which are the sole prerogative of the priest.

As a matter of fact the non-episcopal Churches are, in this respect, in closer harmony with the early Church than are the Churches of the Anglican Communion. The office of elder, in the Presbyterian churches, may be compared to that of deacon in the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic ages. The title, of course, makes no difference. *Je ne dispute jamais du nom,* said Pascal, *pourvu qu'on m'avertisse du sens qu'on lui donne.* And it is one of the curiosities of language that in the Presbyterian churches, which derive their name from the fact of their having no grade of ministry higher than what corresponds to that of presbyters in the episcopal churches, the persons occupying this grade are never styled presbyters or elders, but always ministers; while the title of elders is given to a subordinate body of officials, of whom there are several in every congregation, and who rather resemble the ancient deacons. In other non-episcopal Churches, the name as well as the office of deacon is found, with duties somewhat analogous to those of the deacons of old time.

Are we in the Church of England to rest content with the state of things prevailing among ourselves, and if not, how can it be improved? Two remedies for the mischief which it entails have been put forward during the last forty years, one of which has proved practically abortive, while the other has been put in practice on a large scale, but is at best only a palliative and not a remedy for the defect. In 1884 the Upper House of the York Convocation resolved that, in view of the overwhelming need of increase in the number of the ministry and the impossibility of providing sufficient endowments for the purpose, it was expedient to ordain to the office of deacon men possessing other means of living who were willing to aid the clergy gratuitously. The resolution went on to lay down certain conditions as to their subsequent ordination to the priesthood, and rules on the subject were afterwards drawn up by the bishops of

the Northern Province. But the proposal has fallen absolutely flat, having had no result beyond the ordination of one or two individuals very shortly after it was put forward. On the other hand there has in the meantime sprung into existence a large number of unpaid lay readers whose functions are defined by regulations put forth by the English bishops in 1905. Their functions, as prescribed by these regulations, include, under certain conditions, taking a limited part in the services and giving addresses in consecrated buildings as well as in mission churches and parish rooms. In many parishes it would have been impossible during the Great War to have kept up the regular worship of the Church without the assistance of these lay readers. But there is a growing feeling that something more is required ; and it found a voice in the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation in July, 1919, when that House, on the motion of Canon Garbett, who has since become Bishop of Southwark, resolved that they would welcome the extension of the diaconate in the Church of England to include men who might not feel called upon to go on to the office of priesthood, and requested the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a Committee of both Houses to report on the subject. Their Report was presented to the House on February 23 of this year, and, while its consideration in detail was postponed, the House resolved that they would welcome the fuller recognition of the diaconate as an office of the ministry not necessarily leading to the priesthood. It may, therefore, not be amiss to consider the matter independently and to note what the suggested reform would involve, what form it might take, what steps would be necessary for its accomplishment, and what objections and obstacles would have to be met in carrying it out.

In the first place we must make up our minds as to what we want. Shall we be content with such an increase of the diaconate as shall furnish us with an additional number of assistant curates of that order of the ministry, who shall be assigned to parishes where their help is most needed, and be moved from one parish to another, according to circumstances, like other assistant curates, differing only from them in not necessarily proceeding to take priests' orders or looking forward to becoming beneficed ? Or do we desire a radical reform of the diaconate, which, while retaining it as a step to the priesthood for those who have a calling to that higher grade, will open it to individuals who, without abandoning

their secular avocations, or the place of residence which that avocation or some other personal reason leads them to select, are willing to serve the Church gratuitously in their own parish and neighbourhood in those duties which are at present attached to the order of deacons as well as in other functions of a more secular character? The one proceeding would involve no change in the law of the Church or in the status of deacons; the other could not be accomplished without a modification of both. The former might possibly not achieve much greater practical results than the action of the bishops in the Northern Province in 1884, to which reference has been already made. But the latter would undoubtedly have important effects both direct and indirect—direct, in substantially increasing the number of individuals qualified to lead public worship, and indirect, in materially altering the relations between clergy and laity. It is here that objections to the proposal will inevitably be made. Is it right in principle or expedient in practice that any order of the clergy should be at liberty to gain their livelihood by engaging in a secular profession or in trade or business, and that there should be deacons leading a life half clerical and half lay, and thus open to the comparison which old Thomas Fuller, in his quaint way, drew respecting parish clerks? Having regard to the semi-ecclesiastical and semi-temporal character of their office, he likened them to bats, half bird and half beast; though he incorrectly considered that there was more in them of the former character than the latter, that their clerical wings predominated over the lay or mouse part of them.

Seriously, however, when we remember that St. Paul sometimes earned his livelihood by tent-making and that the clergy and even the bishops in the early Church frequently followed a secular calling, it is obvious that there is no objection in principle to deacons being so engaged. The restraint upon the clergy in reference to it was doubtless introduced in order that they might devote their whole time to their clerical duties; and it was rigidly enforced in later times for the purpose of maintaining the separation of the clergy from the laity which it was the object of ecclesiastical policy in the Middle Ages to emphasize. The present law on the subject as regards the clergy of the Church of England is contained in the Pluralities Act, 1838. The provisions of this Act replaced a previous statute of Henry VIII, which, again, was framed in accordance

with previous ordinances of the canon law. The restrictions on our clergy are, however, confined to those who are holding any ecclesiastical office or are licensed to perform any ecclesiastical duties, and are subject to certain not unimportant exceptions. They may act as schoolmasters and take pupils, and do any kind of literary work. They may, under certain limitations, engage in farming, and hold shares in companies, and may even act as directors of fire or life insurance offices. These exceptions clearly show that, with us, the prohibition on the clergy engaging in secular pursuits is considered to be not a matter of principle but, as it really is, a matter of expediency; and the question therefore is whether it is expedient that the prohibition should be abolished in the case of deacons. It may be objected that the abolition would tend to lower their status as well as incidentally that of the higher order of the ministry, and to confuse not only the deacons but the whole body of the clergy with the laity. It would, no doubt, draw a sharper line between the diaconate and the priesthood than at present exists; but no sharper, it is submitted, than the difference between the two orders warrants or than can be justified by authoritative statements. We are accustomed to speak of the clergy of both orders as ministers. But it will be noticed that Archbishop Whitgift, in his reply to Cartwright, quoted above, speaks of a deacon as only advanced to the ministry when he is ordained priest. Canons 32 and 76 of 1603 in like manner distinguish between a deacon and a minister; and the former speaks of the office of deacon being a step or degree to the ministry, although elsewhere in the Canons the words "ministers" and "ministry" appear to include both orders. But in the Prayer Book "minister" seems to be used interchangeably with priest. This is evidently the case in the form of Absolution, since the power there stated to be given to God's ministers is not exercisable by deacons. The force of the distinction thus drawn is not impaired by the fact that it is etymologically incorrect, since "minister" is the Latin equivalent of the Greek word "deacon." We noticed the same disregard for etymology among the Presbyterians whose ministers and elders represent respectively the presbyters and deacons of early Christian times. A careful study of the Anglican Ordinal will disclose further justification for differentiating the two orders in the manner proposed. In The Form and Manner of Making of Deacons there is

nothing which prohibits them from engaging in secular business, provided that they do not neglect their ecclesiastical duties. But in The Form and Manner of Ordering of Priests, the candidates are told that they ought to forsake and set aside, as much as possible, all worldly cares and studies and give themselves wholly to their office, drawing all their cares and studies that way. These words not only indicate that a priest is not to engage in secular and material pursuits, but also imply that he has not been expected entirely to refrain from doing so during his diaconate. Canon 75 of 1603 prescribes that ecclesiastical persons shall not give themselves to any base or servile labour; but with this qualification—which is unmeaning in the present day, when we have learnt to regard all labour as honourable—the only existing restrictions on deacons of the Church of England earning their livelihood by secular means appear to be those in the Pluralities Act of 1838 which apply equally to them and to priests; and it is submitted that these might be repealed as to deacons without any violation of ecclesiastical principle.

If it is objected that this different treatment of the two orders would tend to degrade the office of deacon, it may be replied that it would equally tend to enhance the dignity of the priesthood. But a more serious objection may perhaps be put forward; namely, that it would establish two classes of deacons, the one acting as at present in the capacity of assistant curates and receiving payment as such, leading an exclusively clerical life and looking forward to speedy elevation to the priesthood, and the other having no cure of souls, but merely, as is the case at present with some unattached clergymen, licensed by the Bishop to officiate, rendering their services gratuitously and carrying on their secular pursuits concurrently with their ecclesiastical duties. This would no doubt be the case, and the distinction between the two classes would naturally be emphasized by the deacons of the one class continuing to be styled "reverend" and to wear the clerical garb, while those of the other class would naturally retain their addresses as laymen and their lay attire when not discharging their ecclesiastical functions. This distinction, however, would not be more incongruous nor more unworkable in practice than the difference which now exists between paid lay readers who devote their whole time to Church work, and diocesan and parochial readers who are engaged

in secular pursuits, but give voluntary assistance in Divine service and in other ways under the Regulations issued by the Bishops in 1905.

The benefits which such a modification of the diaconate would confer on the Church of England and on the cause of religion generally, are admirably stated in a little *brochure* entitled *A Plea for a Proper Diaconate*, by the Rev. E. W. J. McConnell, published early in 1919 by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. It would, of course, supply ministrations which have now to be omitted owing to the lack of clergy, or which cannot be performed without overtaxing the strength of the existing staff; but this would be only one of its results. Two or three or more deacons in a parish, according to its size and circumstances, locally connected with it and its other parishioners as fellow-residents or carrying on their secular occupation in it, would form a bond of union between the incumbent and the body of parishioners, and would remove that tendency to estrangement between the clergy and the laity which has unfortunately developed of late years in some parishes. Their ordination as deacons would not only add weight and dignity and energy to their own efforts in every kind of Church work which they undertook, but would bring home to the whole body of the laity, with whom they remained associated in everyday life, the positive duty of all Church-people whether ordained or unordained to be active members of the body of Christ. On a change of incumbency in the parish they would remain the connecting link between the old and the new *régime*, and both then and also on other occasions would be able to smooth and explain away any friction which might arise from alterations or innovations in conducting the worship or affairs of the parish.

The Southwark Diocesan Conference has already pronounced in favour of the change. In 1918 they appointed a Committee to consider the subject and in November, 1919, in accordance with the Report of that Committee they resolved: "That this Conference would welcome the formal and canonical restoration of the permanent diaconate and the recognition of the principle that a deacon is not precluded from engaging in business or professional work." And a further cogent, if not conclusive, argument for what would, in fact, be a revival in our Church of the early diaconate is furnished by the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference of

1920 on the subject of a Diaconate of Women. The Bishops there assembled resolved that the time had come when, in the interests of the Church, the Diaconate of Women should be restored formally and canonically and should be recognized throughout the Anglican Communion; that the office of a Deaconess should follow the lines of the primitive rather than of the modern Diaconate of Men; and that the Book of Common Prayer should contain a Form of Making of Deaconesses, in which provision should be made for (*a*) Prayer by the Bishop and the laying-on of his hands; (*b*) A form of authority to execute the office of a deaconess in the Church of God; and (*c*) Delivery of the New Testament by the Bishop to the candidate. It was further resolved that, in addition to her natural ordinary duties, there might be entrusted to a deaconess the functions of (i) Preparing candidates for Baptism and Confirmation; (ii) Assisting at Holy Baptism and administering it in cases of necessity; (iii) Praying with and giving counsel to women desiring such help in difficulties and perplexities, and (iv) (with the approval of the Bishop and of the Parish Priest and under conditions laid down by the Bishop) Reading in Church Morning and Evening Prayer and the Litany, except the portions assigned to the Priest only and also (as the Bishops decided by 117 votes to 81) Leading in prayer in Church and, under the Bishop's licence, Instructing and Exhorting the congregation in Church. If these resolutions are carried into effect and a general permanent diaconate of women is established in accordance with them, it will render the existing restricted and merely transitional diaconate of men still more anomalous. If the interests of the Church require, as the Bishops recognize that they do, the restoration of the primitive order of deaconesses, they require, no less urgently, the revival of the order of deacons on primitive lines.

Granted, however, that the diaconate ought to be transformed, from the camouflage that it now is, into a reality, and that all these advantages would accrue from this being done, is such a step practicable? How is it to be effected? As has been already pointed out, the sole legal obstacle to it is contained in the restrictive provisions of the Pluralities Act of 1838 as to the clergy engaging in business. If these were repealed as to deacons, there would be nothing to prevent the Bishops from ordaining as deacons men who were earning their own livelihood and did not intend to proceed

to the priesthood. This repeal is one of the reforms which the Church might itself initiate under the Enabling Act. The mention of that Act suggests another advantage which would be secured by the modification of the diaconate. The Act confers powers on the National Church Assembly consisting of the two Houses of Convocation and a House of Laity of each of the two provinces of Canterbury and York. Unless and until the Lower Houses of Convocation are reformed as to their composition and the representation of the clergy in them so as to include deacons, these latter have no place in the constitution of the Assembly. But if their status is modified in the manner suggested, they will naturally be associated with the laity and might be included with them in the organization of the various representative bodies of the Church —parochial Church Councils, ruridecanal and diocesan conferences and the House of Laity of the National Assembly itself. This might be a satisfactory solution of the question as to what should be their standing in connexion with these various bodies. It would fill up the *lacuna* in respect of deacons which at present exists in the constitution of these bodies.

P. V. SMITH.

MINOR PROPHETS UNFOLDED.

THE MINOR PROPHETS UNFOLDED. IV. Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah. By A. Lukyn Williams, D.D. London: *S.P.C.K.* 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

The lack of Bible study in modern days has often been deplored; but perhaps the neglect has in part been due to the absence of handbooks suitable to the general reader. However, in this series, issued by Dr. Lukyn Williams, the reader is provided with some excellent manuals.

In this volume, the fourth of the series, we have another of the books which we have already welcomed. This one is quite up to Dr. Lukyn Williams' excellent standard; it is marked throughout with his careful scholarship; and it provides the general reader with exactly what he wants. It deals with the messages of three of the prophets of the close of the seventh century B.C.—Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah. It is built on the same lines as the previous volumes, being a devotional commentary arranged for short daily readings.

ST. PAUL'S DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

By the Rev. G. Estwick Ford, B.A.

THE object of this paper is simple: it is to examine what St. Paul in his epistles teaches on this subject, without any discussion of the thoriess of Atonement that have from time to time been prevalent. This examination will necessarily include a study of particular words used by St. Paul in connexion with Atonement, and an inquiry into the origin of St. Paul's doctrine.

Throughout the whole of his epistles St. Paul treats the fact that Christ died for our sins as one of the elementary truths of the Christian religion, just as he regards the fact of our Lord's resurrection from the dead; and it is evident from what he says in 1 Corinthians xv. 3 that the gospel of Atonement through the death of Christ was a primary and essential element of his teaching, forming part of that body of Christian doctrine which he himself had received.

In one place only does he attempt to expand that doctrine so as to show in what sense Christ died for our sins; and even there his words, however important, are exceedingly few. We are thus led to the general inference that St. Paul was not concerned about elaborating any theory of Atonement, but that his great object was to impress upon his converts the fact of Atonement, and the means by which that divine fact could be made effective for their spiritual needs.

The passage to which I refer is Romans iii. 21–26. Let us take this passage as our central point of study, and group around the different propositions which it contains the kindred ideas that appear elsewhere in the epistles. The passage is as follows:—

But now, apart from the law, a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe; for there is no distinction; for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by His blood, to show His righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime in the forbearance of God; for the showing, I say, of His righteousness at this present season, that He might himself be just, and the justifier of Him that hath faith in Jesus.

This remarkable statement is preceded by an examination of the moral condition of Gentiles and of Jews, leading up to the conclusion that by works of law—whether of natural law, innate even in heathen, or of revealed law, bestowed upon the Jewish race by God Himself—no flesh could be justified; for the universal testimony of human experience showed that by law there came only the recognition of sinfulness, but not the power to be holy. If righteousness, therefore, is to be achieved by man, it must be in some other way than by the operation of law: and the new method which God has provided is through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; a redemption which implies faith in those who are redeemed, and involves the suffering of death for the Redeemer (cf. Rom. viii. 3–4).

We note, therefore, at the very outset that the fundamental idea underlying the whole of St. Paul's doctrine of Atonement is the Divine effort to produce righteousness in men. It is moral perfection in man that the Heavenly Father is striving after; and because no other means, such as natural law or revealed law, can avail to secure that result, the Heavenly wisdom has devised and carried out the redemption that is in Christ.

This fundamental idea of the object of the Atonement, i.e. that it is God's method of producing moral reformation in man, will necessarily affect our judgment as to the purposes intended to be served by the death of Christ. It will be evident, for example, that the main object of that death could not have been that adequate punishment might be inflicted for man's sin, for punishment is but the sanction of law; it is part and parcel of the operation of law, whether natural or revealed, whether human or Divine; and, however useful and necessary it may be in its place, it is a failure, along with the whole legal system of which it forms a part, as far as the production of righteousness, or moral rightness is concerned. It is just because law, with all its sanctions of punishment, could not get rid of sin that Christ died for our sins. His death, therefore, could not possibly have been intended as a sublime act of punishment.

Similarly when St. Paul speaks of God's justice or righteousness as being manifested in the death of Christ for the sin of man, it is clear that he cannot mean the justice of the law-court, the aim of which is to clear the innocent and to punish the guilty; for on St. Paul's own showing there are, in this case, no innocent to be cleared, and law, in spite of all its punishments, is helpless to effect the purpose which

God designs to accomplish. The Cross of Christ is indeed the

> " Trysting-place, where Heaven's love
> And Heaven's justice meet " ;

but the justice of God that here co-operates with His love in man's salvation is that Divine holiness which makes it impossible for Him to ignore sin, and which lays upon Him the obligation of extirpating it ultimately from His universe.

It is in this sense that we are to understand the words, " to show His righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime in the forbearance of God." It might well seem to any one that God was indifferent to human sin and the havoc wrought by it, seeing that for such long ages men had sinned and suffered and God had made no sign to show that He either knew or cared ; but the death of God the Son is the measure of God's concern for the sin of the world, and the redemption from sin and its consequences which is effected by that death is available for all who have lived and have sinned, even though they may have died before or without the revelation of God's redemption in the death of Christ.

How, then, shall we understand St. Paul's statement in the Epistle to the Galatians, that Christ was made a curse for us in order to redeem us from the curse of the law ? Obviously in the sense in which St. Paul explains his own words, viz. that Christ submitted Himself to the indignity of crucifixion, the doom of the accursed, as it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree. It is voluntary humiliation to the utmost that is here indicated, not punishment. And all expressions to the effect that Christ died for our sins are clearly intended to signify that it was on account of our sins, and not as a punishment for our sins, that Christ died.

Consider next the expression, " The redemption that is in Christ Jesus."

Here there would at first sight appear to be the suggestion that the suffering and death of Christ are to be regarded as a price paid for the liberation of man from the penalty due for his sin. Dr. Dale, in his well-known book, has called attention to the remarkable fact that for nearly a thousand years there prevailed in the Christian Church the rude and coarse hypothesis that the death of Christ was the price paid to the devil for liberating the souls of believers ; and to the kindred idea of Anselm, viz. that Christ, the Mediator, rendered honour to God by sacrificing His life ; that the Son, being

equal to the Father before His incarnation, could receive no recompense; but that this recompense is fitly bestowed upon those for whose sake He became man.

Both these ideas depend upon the use of the word "redemption," in the sense of paying something to another person on behalf of the redeemed; but St. Paul's use of the word involves no such suggestion. He uses it simply to indicate the fact that the salvation of man was not procured without cost to Him Who procured it; for nowhere does he suggest that the cost involved was paid to any one; and twice he explains the word redemption by adding the expression, "even the forgiveness of our sins" (Eph. i. 7 and Col. i. 14). The cost to the Redeemer is "His blood."

There remains to be considered the central statement in the passage with which we are dealing, "Whom God set forth to be a propitiation through faith, by His blood, to show His righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime in the forbearance of God." How are we to understand this word "propitiation"? If there were nothing in the context to govern it the natural course would be to take the word in its ordinary signification, viz., a means of appeasing an angry person. But the context here most effectively governs the meaning of the word. The Divine Being to whom the whole design is ascribed is in no way represented as an angry person who has to be appeased; but, on the contrary, as a holy Governor of the world who is most deeply concerned about the wrong-doing that prevails and has prevailed, and who has planned and carried out a supreme effort, the objects of which are (i) to put it within man's power to attain to that rightness of conduct that has hitherto been found impossible of attainment, and (ii) to make it evident that He Himself, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, has never been indifferent to the existence of the evil, but has always been intensely concerned on account of it.

St. Paul thus finds himself in the position of him who translates the New Testament into the language of races very low in the moral scale, having a noble idea to express but without any adequate word with which to express it, and therefore obliged to use a word, the common interpretation of which may lay him open to misconception. St. Paul therefore selects a word which, although it has a popular significance that may mislead the unwary, has nevertheless a biblical use and interpretation that should act as a safeguard against

any such misconception; for this word ἱλαστήριον is the Septuagint word for the golden cover of the sacred ark—the mercy-seat—the place where, on the great Day of Atonement in Israel, God met with repentant Israel; the place on which the blood of the Atoning Sacrifice was sprinkled. Christ crucified is thus the reality of which the blood-stained mercy-seat was the symbol. He is the meeting-place between the Heavenly Father and His erring children whom He longs to see reconciled to Himself; displaying to the full God's concern with reference to man's unrighteousness, and at the same time providing the only effectual means of putting away that unrighteousness.

The salvation achieved by Christ's self-sacrifice is a salvation from sin. It becomes also a salvation from the final consequences of sin, that moral ruin, with whatever else it may involve, which is the inevitable result of unchecked sin; but primarily and essentially the deliverance is from *sin*, and its operation can only be *through willing renunciation of sin*. In other words, the sinner must co-operate with the Saviour; his heart and will must be influenced; and the death of Christ is the supreme manifestation of two facts, which beyond all else are calculated to move the heart and the will. It demonstrates in the most convincing way the depth and fullness of the love of God, for God commendeth His own love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us; and it impresses upon the mind, as nothing else can equally do, some adequate idea of the consequences of sin, in the fact that in order to avert those consequences God the Son Himself was incarnate, and was crucified, and died.

Thus in Christ crucified the sinner gets into touch with God; he sees the face of his Heavenly Father—all the distress at human sin, all the Divine and infinite love for the sinner, the awfulness of his own danger, and the wide-open door of the haven of refuge. If he is willing, salvation is his. There is nothing artificial or unreal about the matter; none of the fictions, forensic or otherwise, with which theologians have occupied themselves, but heart to heart approach of the Father to the prodigal, and, through the Divine Mediator, the return of the prodigal to the Father's home.

And, having regard to the infinite importance of the death of Christ in thus opening up a way of hope and deliverance for sinners, and the imperative necessity for the fullest assurance that it means all that Christ claimed for it, we can understand why St. Paul has so

closely linked together the death of Christ and His resurrection from the dead. It is not the death alone by which Atonement is effected, but the death and the resurrection combined: Christ died for our sins, and rose again for our justification: we are reconciled to God by His death, and saved by His life: if Christ be not raised our faith is vain, *we are yet in our sins*, we are of all men most pitiable. But Christ's resurrection is the sign from Heaven that all the significance which He Himself attached to His death is real, even as it is also, to all who believe, the visible pledge of immortality.

In thus uniting the resurrection with the death of Christ as an essential part of the work of Atonement, St. Paul is but carrying out in his teaching what had been foreshadowed in the law of the sin-offering of the Day of Atonement, which provided a duplicate sacrifice—one goat for death, its fellow for life; both dedicated equally and identically to Jehovah, and *the two regarded as one offering for sin*: "He shall take of the congregation of Israel two he-goats for a sin-offering" (Lev. xvi. 5; see also verse 7). He is also expressing the teaching of the Lord Jesus Himself who declared that He laid down His life in order that He might take it again: "I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again; this commandment have I received from My Father."

We ask, in conclusion, What is the source from which St. Paul derived his doctrine of Atonement? The answer is, From the teaching and the experience of the Lord Jesus. Let us very briefly note the leading ideas expressed by St. Paul as they appear in the teaching of our Lord.

1. It is God's love, not the necessity for inflicting a penalty for sin, that is the fundamental cause of the incarnation and death of Christ: "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son."

2. The death of Christ is not a necessity imposed upon Him from without, either by God the Father or by the devil; but it is a voluntary sacrifice made for the sake of those whom Christ desired to save, in fullest conformity with the Father's will; and, in a sense, is the occasion of a still fuller intensification of the Father's love: "Therefore doth the Father love Me, because I lay down My life that I may take it again. No one taketh it away from Me, but I lay it down of Myself." It is evident at a glance how utterly inconsistent with such teaching as this is the suggestion that God the Father regarded Christ on the Cross as an object of aversion, as

being identified with human sin, or that Christ was there abandoned by the Father, or in any other way made to endure punishment as the object of God's wrath and vengeance.

3. His death is a " ransom " in the sense that it cost Him something. Into all the meaning of His agony in Gethsemane and the distress which broke His heart upon the cross, it is impossible for us to enter; but the fact of that agony is beyond question, and our Lord anticipated it, and reckoned with it as the costly ransom that He was willingly to furnish in the accomplishment of His purpose of redeeming love.

4. In that sublime prayer in which our Lord, on the brink of Gethsemane, dedicated Himself to God for the sacrifice that He was about to accomplish, He makes it plain that the object of that sacrifice is to bring men into touch with God. The words to which I refer are the following : " Even as Thou gavest Him authority over all flesh, that whatsoever Thou hast given Him, to them He should give eternal life. And this is life eternal, *that they should know Thee*, the only true God, and Him whom Thou didst send, even Jesus Christ." And the climax of His prayer, as of His whole ministry and sacrifice, is this, " That the love wherewith Thou lovedest Me may be in them, and I in them."

G. ESTWICK FORD.

CHURCH MUSIC.

CHURCH MUSIC. By Rev. A. S. Duncan-Jones, M.A. *Robert Scott.*

This, like other volumes in the series—" Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice "—represents the view-point of the extreme party. We are at least grateful to the author for emphasizing the fact that while the Choirmaster has a distinct province of his own, his concern is the proper rendering of the music, but the Incumbent's right to censor the music is unquestionable. As Mr. Duncan-Jones says—" if peace and edification are to be achieved here, the only way is frank comradeship and mutual understanding." We draw attention to this because sometimes the Incumbent's suggestions are resented and resisted. For the rest the author is obsessed with the idea that Anglican chants are the invention of the Devil (he approvingly quotes Dr. C. W. Pearce as saying this), and he pleads for the introduction of plain-song. " Barnby and Dykes have ridden us too long and are doomed." We are freely treated to such-like opinions. We confess to being unconvinced. We know churches in which the experiment has been tried and failed. We suppose that the majority of persons who read this book will not object, as we do, to the way in which the author persists in calling the Communion Office the Mass.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON HOW EMPIRE CAME TO US, AND CAN ALONE BE CONSERVED.[1]

By the Right Rev. Bishop E. Graham Ingham, D.D.

AN Institute bearing the honoured name of "Victoria" may well enter upon such an inquiry as this. It was during that very Victorian Era that Dr. Vaughan once said: "It pleases the self-importance of a good many folk to think of themselves as perpetually passing through a crisis." It is no affectation to apply the word to things as they are to-day! When Mr. Joseph Chamberlain came to the Colonial Office in the same great reign he exhorted us as a people to "think Imperially." It was a call, as he meant it, not to enter upon a Crusade of Empire, but to wake up to existing world-responsibilities, and not to be too self-centred.

You will not find in this paper a story of great wars and their legacies. Nor will you be invited into the political arena. Other movements, quite outside these, will be examined, and such lessons as they may suggest will be noted. Nor will you find here any claim to scholarship or special research, but only plain thoughts and findings of a plain man for the plain man in the street or elsewhere to digest.

Perhaps it may be made clearer to you what sort of Empire it is that forms the subject of this paper, if I quote from the Prime Minister's recent speech at the Mansion House on the occasion of the City's welcome home to the Prince of Wales. He said: "It is the most remarkable Empire the world has ever seen—mighty, powerful, but loosely knit—no Dominion, but Dominions—no centre from which Dominion is exercised, from which you control and from which you direct, but a combination in partnership of free nations controlling themselves, free to choose their own path, free to choose their own population, free to make their own history." These are the conditions I have in mind as I enter upon some reflections as to how we became the cradle and centre of such a family of peoples.

[1] Reprinted by permission of the Council of the Victoria Institute, before whom the paper was read January 17, 1921.

It will make for clearness if I select three dates from which to make excursions both before and behind, in seeking to account for the conditions which the Prime Minister has so eloquently and vividly described.

I.

I take first of all the year 1611. I invite you to stand in imagination on the steps of Hampton Court Palace and watch that historic Conference break up on completing a seven years' task which resulted in the possession by the English people, for the first time, of the Bible in their own language—not only enriching that language, but fixing it for all time as the language of the English people. First of all, look back from 1611. How has this position been reached? There is a passage in the Book of Samuel which reads thus: "The word of God was rare in those days: there was no open vision." That describes sufficiently many centuries of our English history. The loss to the Nation was great. The loss to the Church was greater. There was some foreign enterprise—notably the Crusades, but the zeal was misdirected. For the most part we were a quarrelsome people amongst ourselves, nor did we work any real deliverance abroad. But all the time, some light was on its way. We do not forget the translational work of the Venerable Bede, nor of our Great King Alfred. But we had to wait till the fourteenth century for the man who gave us the whole Bible in our own language, and who took steps to make it generally known. From the time of John Wycliffe—whose Bible was translated into English only half a century before the introduction of the printing press—the English people began to wake up!

A hundred years of Bible reading, under difficult conditions, brought in the greatest event in all our history—the English Reformation. I do not stay to speak of men, whether Kings, Prelates or Commoners. God can use, has used, all sorts of men for the working out of His purposes. It is enough to point out that when the Word of God was no longer rare, open vision began—vision of God, vision of what the Church was intended to be (and was not); vision, too, through an opening door, of a bigger world than the Englishman had ever known before. For these scholars, now emerging from Hampton Court, had produced from several versions what our Coronation Service now describes as "the most valuable thing this world affords!"

Let us now look a little in front of 1611. It is one of the romances of history that the open door waited upon and speedily followed the open book. No man thought of building up Empire when the voyage of *The Mayflower* was planned for 1620. And yet, in God's Providence, it happened only nine years after the authorized version of the Holy Scriptures was issued. But few things have done more to extend the Anglo-Saxon language and civilization than the fact that those Scriptures went forth in the hearts and lives and effects of those 1620 voyagers!

Take another illustration, which happens to come from a bit of Greater Britain that I know very well: On the first of August, 1920 (which happened to be a Sunday), an interesting celebration took place in the Island of Bermuda, which is within some 600 miles of Virginia in the North Atlantic—the last port at which the Prince of Wales touched in his late tour. The whole Island—Governor, Parliament, and people—went to church at, or gathered round the very spot where, in 1620 (and on that day), King James I had granted and established the first Parliament (outside London) of the English people! The Governor (Sir James Wilcocks) had a great story to tell, and the sermon preached on the occasion threw such light upon the spirit in which our brave but unconscious pioneers went through the newly opened door, that I must briefly quote. The Governor said: "Over 400 years ago, one Juan Bermudez, a Spaniard, had the good fortune to sight these Islands. I can imagine his surprise, but I cannot understand his want of taste in merely charting and then leaving them. Could he have foreseen that the day would come when Shakespeare would lay one of his immortal plays in these very Islands, and Thomas More would sing from its shores, surely he would have planted the flag of his most Catholic Majesty of Spain somewhere on the hills which surround this beautiful town. But so it happened as, in the history of the Anglo-Saxon race, has so often happened, is happening to-day, and will continue to do so—that instead of the standard of another power, the Union Jack was planted and still proudly floats over these enchanted islands.

"It was in 1609 (just two years before the Hampton Court Conference had completed its work) that Sir George Somers was wrecked here, and that era of progress began for which we thank God to-day." Here follow a few reminders (from the preacher) of

the spirit that animated these brave pioneers. Here, for example, is a collect then in use on arrival at a port among infidels: "Watch Thou over us, O Lord, and give us grace so to watch over ourselves that we may not anyways so misbehave ourselves that the Gospel which we profess may by our means be evil spoken of by them. Let us strive by all means to draw these heathen to faith in Thy Name."

Here is a prayer then in use in Virginia: "O Lord of mercies, look upon the Gentiles which know Thee not. Be merciful to us; and not to us alone, but let Thy way be known upon Earth, Thy saving health among all nations." Again, "May the heathen never say to us: 'Where is now thy God?' May they rather say: 'Blessed be the King and Prince of England, and blessed be the English Nation, and blessed be the Most High God, the possessor of heaven and earth, that sent them among us!'"

You will find in all the Charters under which our earliest colonies were established, a uniform acknowledgment of God, and the responsibility of His people to deal, on these high and noble lines, with England's Colonies and those who, in them, knew not God.

II.

Let us next look out backward and forward from the year 1807.

William Wilberforce was writing up his diary on March 25th, in that year, and he says this: "The King has given his assent this day to the Abolition of the Slave Trade. God will now bless this country. The first authentic news of the defeat of the French has come to-day." It had taken Wilberforce and his friends twenty long years to right thus a terrible wrong, and purge English merchandise of a dark stain. In order to understand and rightly appraise this great moral triumph it is necessary to look farther back still.

The one bright feature of the otherwise dreary eighteenth century was the Evangelical Revival, dating from 1734. That awakening in many parts of England is judged to have saved the Nation from revolution. It produced and inspired great philanthropic and missionary enterprise. And all such movements had more to do with Trafalgar and Waterloo than England has ever cared to guess.

If Quakers and Puritans were concerned with the overflow to America, no less were they foremost in this matter. The story is not as widely known as it deserves to be, of how Mr. Thomas

Clarkson (a Quaker) happened to see on his college notice-board at Cambridge, somewhere about 1782, that a prize essay in Latin would be competed for at a given time on the rights or wrongs of slavery, and was led to decide to enter his name. He tells us that long before he sat for the prize he was far more interested in the study than anything he might derive from it. He got the prize, and when riding up to London a day or two later, he thought much and deeply, and said to himself: "If half the things I have written down are really happening in the world, the sooner some one sees them to their end the better. But what can I do?" The answer came: "You can at least translate your essay into English, publish it, and send a copy to all your friends." (The place where this decision was reached on the road to London is still shown.)

Among the friends who received a copy was this same William Wilberforce, Member of Parliament for York, a churchman who came more and more under evangelical influence. And this essay had much to do with Mr. Wilberforce's resolve to dedicate his life to this abolition movement. Nor may it be generally known that one of the earliest results of the rising tide of discussion on this subject was a rush to London from the West Indies of English slave-owners with their slaves to protest against abolition. They thought that their slaves would be an object-lesson of the beneficence of slavery. But, unfortunately for their theory, the slaves became restive, and running away from their masters, the matter got into the law courts, and a long period of litigation went on, which terminated at length in the decision of Lord Justice Mansfield that slaves ceased to be slaves on landing on British soil.

It was this decision that determined Wilberforce's friends to found the Asylum in Africa to which I shall presently allude; and Lieut. Clarkson, R.N., was commissioned to go first to Nova Scotia, collect the Africans assembled there who had fought on our side in the American War of Independence, and (if they agreed) repatriate them in their own land. It was a big thing to do, but Clarkson successfully accomplished it, and did more to extend the Empire than he knew.

Take only this instance of unconscious empire-building connected with Wilberforce's twenty years' struggle in the House of Commons. The scene is laid in Western Africa. The time is about 1792. The Clapham Sect (as Wilberforce's friends were generally styled) had

decided on the purchase of a piece of land which might become an asylum for these hunted people. For the whole coast was a slave-market from which Europeans of all sorts were pushing the unholy traffic. They bought the hill country of Sierra Leone with honest money from the Temme people. They hoisted the Union Jack, and for twenty years it was the scene (under tremendous difficulties) of a magnificent philanthropy.

Again I have to call your attention to a diary. Lieut. John Clarkson, R.N., became the first Governor of this settlement. On a certain Sunday evening he writes thus on his ship in Sierra Leone Harbour: "I have been preaching on shore to-day, and I have said this to the people: 'I do not know five words of an African language; nor am I acquainted with five miles of the African interior, but I am certain that this small beginning now being made here means the turn of the tide in the fortunes of your race and is big with untold results to this land.'" If to-day God seems to be saying to us there, in Nigeria, in Uganda, in South Africa, and other parts, "Arise, go through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it," it is because men like Clarkson and many others on the West, because honoured C.M.S. Missionaries on the East, because Moffat and Livingstone on the South, stood for a moral and spiritual contact with African races, which, all unconsciously to them, has actually extended empire. And thus far, thank God, the British flag has been to all these races a symbol and guarantee of justice, fairness, freedom and progress.

Look again, this time forward, from 1807.

We come to 1834. The story is too familiar to be related in full, but it is not too much to say that the emancipation of the African in British Dominions (with liberal compensation), which came about as a necessary sequel to "abolition" through Fowell Buxton, in the teeth of mighty vested interests, was perhaps the finest bit of history we have ever made. It purged our good name. It righted a great wrong. And probably it had much more to do with the expansion of the Victorian Era than has been usually thought.

There are other and most interesting stories about the spread of our race in Australia, New Zealand and elsewhere. But I will only name here one further bit of expansion which came, in the early years of Queen Victoria's reign. It was in 1842 that China,

having ceded to us an island off its coast by the Treaty of Nanking, exchanged it and gave us Hong-Kong instead. I gathered the following facts on my visit to this now flourishing colony in 1909. The earliest traders on the spot were Scotch people (you will not be surprised to hear *that*). For two decades it was a most hopeless possession. The harbour was infested by pirates. Signal Hill on the Peak was the spot whence the pirates signalled the unhappy ships that were doomed to fall into their hands. At the best Hong-Kong was for long years a cave of Adullam for those who had made the mainland too hot for them. The foreshore, now so impressive, was a tow-path. The Chinese Government, with that remarkable acuteness that characterizes them in some ways, made the cession of Hong-Kong a dead letter by putting forth a Proclamation forbidding any Chinese to go and live there. It was the Tai-Ping Rebellion that made Hong-Kong. Cantonese merchants discovered the fairness, justice and freedom of the British Raj, and they flocked into Hong-Kong for safety. They soon made Hong-Kong and Hong-Kong made them. This was about 1861. It has only been during the last few years that Hong-Kong has assumed its present striking appearance. Its harbour registers the biggest tonnage of any city in the world. It is the gateway to the Far East, and from thence it is the doorway to the West.

It was very interesting to be there at that moment. Chinese merchants had been observing the beneficent influence on their sons of our C.M.S. St. Stephen's College. Archdeacon Barnett was turning out some excellent results. And these Chinese merchants (their fathers) went to the Governor (Sir Frederick Lugard of African fame) and said: "Why should we have to send our sons to Western Universities at tremendous risks in many ways? Why should not we have a Western University here?" The Governor told them that there was much to be said for it, but that it would mean a lot of money. They said: "We will subscribe the money." And they did! Thousands of pounds poured in. King Edward took much interest in the arrangements. And the result is that on these beautiful slopes stands to-day University buildings of which any country may be proud.

This University receives young men from all over the Province, and by the Governor's enlightened arrangement, Missionary Societies are allowed to have their hostels alongside!

The British Government has not always been so enlightened and so wise. Stories could be told about Khartoum and the Gordon Memorial College, about Nigeria, and several other parts of the world where the tendency has been all the other way, and the policy has been rather to patronize other faiths than to support the Religion that has made us what we are to-day.

III.

I come lastly to November 11th, 1918. General Bernhardi (and Germany with him) had completely misunderstood the sort of Empire which our Prime Minister sketched for us so vividly the other day. He had, in his book, *Germany and the Next War*, asked with contempt how we dared pretend to hold India with such a miserably small military establishment. Never were the ideals that have from the first inspired our scattered race and family more splendidly defended! Never was it more clearly demonstrated that there is something mightier than mere physical force! Mr. Lloyd George has said: "It is for the Churches now to build into the Nation the ideals for which we fought in the Great War." Looking ahead from 1918 there is no question more pressing than the consideration of how this Empire can be conserved. I will not touch upon the League of Nations. It is a step in the direction of the peace of the world for which we must be thankful, but it lies outside this inquiry. "When a man's ways please the Lord, He maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him." It is equally true of Nation and Empire.

There are clouds on the horizon! We have seen the great share which the Holy Scriptures had in the movements, reforms and revivals of the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. We are seeing to-day many parts of those same Scriptures largely discredited by higher critics. The great majority of the Nation is standing aloof from Institutional Christianity, and trade disputes are threatening us with national bankruptcy!

Now *everything depends on what we are*, and on the use we make in the coming time of the wide roads that go out to all lands. They were given us, not for selfish uses, but to extend the Kingdom of our Lord. A small part of the Nation only has any real faith in this propaganda!

But there are some good signs. The Prince of Wales's personal

visits to the Empire have well won for him the title of "Our Greatest Ambassador." There is little doubt that our British Throne has remained secure in the midst of a period of wreckage of Thrones through the gracious personalities of the reigning house! It happened to the writer of this paper to hear, from the Strangers' Gallery of the House of Lords, a remarkable speech when the Prince of Wales was born. Lord Rosebery was seconding an address of congratulation to Queen Victoria on the event. He took occasion to trace the decline of monarchical power in this country through successive reigning houses. "But," he said, "what has been lost in power has been more than regained in royal influence. And that influence has been won through the manifold ways in which the Sovereign moves amongst and makes himself one with the people." I once had the opportunity of telling the Prince about this great speech, of which he said he had never heard, and which appeared to interest him. It has already been prophetic! He has come back from Australia just now bidding us "Pull together and pull through!"

Perhaps, as one who belongs by birth to one of those parts of the Empire that grew up when the Homeland was absent-minded, you will allow me, after fifty years now in the Mother Country, to point out that, while thankful for our Prince, we must not be *satisfied* with anything short of a national awakening to our unprecedented responsibilities.

The time when to be a colonist was regarded as belonging to a "lesser breed," has probably passed away. But in days like these, when strong racial instincts and national ideals are newly asserting themselves in many quarters, it behoves Englishmen who move amongst these peoples to be sympathetic, tactful, wise—wiser than some of them often are!

We are called to a great work, and we must let our thoughts expand to its greatness. "A great empire and little thoughts," as Burke asserted, "go ill together!"

An Indian gentleman said to the writer, when passing through his country ten years ago: "Concession will not cure the present unrest in India. The first Englishman who is overbearing and high-handed with the people will undo all the effect of the concessions made! The fact is—my people will almost worship the Englishman for his justice, fairness and impartiality, but when he

begins to call us 'niggers,' we hate him! There are great and noble exceptions to this latter, and we are not slow to recognize them." Many things have happened since these remarks were made in the spring of 1910. And a situation has since grown up in India that is full of menace to the British Raj. Never was the *Suaviter in modo* more necessary to link up with the *fortiter in re* than now. Never was it more necessary for the rulers to *understand* the ruled. Never was it more fatal to speak contemptuously and slightingly of the various races that go to make up our Indian Empire. This will require considerable watchfulness and self-control. Even missionaries in India have confessed to the writer how hard it is for them always to be free from the consciousness that they belong to the ruling class!

Time was, too, a few years back, when African peoples were in the imitative stage of childhood. That stage is rapidly passing away. Race instincts are growing stronger, and demands are being made that it will be difficult to refuse. Let any one consider the racial problems of South Africa, the Negro problem in the United States of America, and the quite new problems (largely arising out of the recent war) in relation to the Jew, the Arab and the Moslem, and he will be compelled to agree that something more than a League of Nations is needed to keep the world at peace and our Empire undisturbed.

Nothing less than a fresh conversion to the ancient Law, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart . . ." and "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," will do it!

If we, as a people, charged with such vast responsibilities, will thus govern ourselves, we shall not only "pull together," but we shall "pull through."

There is something after all, however, bigger than the British Empire! If we, as a people, can serve our day and generation, and work for world-righteousness and world-peace, it will be well. But there are some serious facts that look in another direction, but which it is popular to-day to ignore. There is the fact of sin! There is the fact of the fall of man! There is the fact that mankind largely lost the power to govern when he ceased to obey! And here are signs that developments are going on in the direction of lawlessness and deterioration.

Then, lastly and most mercifully, there is the fact of the Kingdom

of God—a Kingdom coming not with outward demonstration! Its foundations have been well and truly laid. The Spirit of its King is already at work amongst us. The time may not be far off when "He shall have put down all rule, all authority and power, for He *must* reign."

Let this goal be kept well in view. It will correct all wrong tendencies in the matter of race feeling and race pride—a sin that may most easily beset us! Nothing will humble us, nothing will quicken high resolve, nothing more surely increase our influence for good, than a return to the primary duty of world-witness! What will this mean? It will mean that we are not out to get the world converted in a given time, not out even to make heathen nations into Christian nations, but to give out a clear-cut witness to Jesus Christ and to see that in all our world-travels, world-trade and Imperial administration this witness is not blurred by our own shortcomings and inconsistency. The Lord said, "Ye shall be witnesses unto Me . . . unto the uttermost part of the earth." He also said, "Ye shall receive power." No nation has ever been granted such influence, such prestige, such a base of operations before! If we will "think imperially" in this higher and more catholic sense, we shall surely see, gathered out from all these peoples and races, a Kingdom that shall not pass away, and our own Empire, which we have seen grow and expand in so unexampled a manner, will have served its day of opportunity according to the Will of God.

CHARACTER BUILDING IN KASHMIR.

CHARACTER BUILDING IN KASHMIR. By Rev. C. E. Tyndale-Biscoe, M.A. *C.M.S.* 3*s.* net.

Lt.-Gen. Sir R. Baden-Powell contributes the preface to this deeply interesting account of the very remarkable and successful work in which Mr. Tyndale-Biscoe has been engaged for some years as Head of the Boys' High School at Shrinagar. Most friends of the C.M.S. will already know something about this, and many will, from time to time, have seen the delightfully racy booklets in which he embodies the report of the School and gives us an insight into the national character which he is striving to mould into a manly Christian type. Mr. Tyndale-Biscoe has a genius for this by no means easy work—every one who reads this delightful volume will feel that—and he possesses a graphic style which enables him to tell his story in an unconventional way. The charming illustrations add to the attractiveness of the book.

TITUS.[1]

II.

THE PEOPLE HE MIXED WITH.

By the Rev. W. B. Russell Caley, M.A.

WE all know something of the power of influence, how people act and re-act upon one another, and how circumstances affect character. So Titus and these early Christians enormously influenced one another. In a sense all Christians are chameleons and take their colour largely from their environment, and if we always remember this, we shall judge far more kindly of those we differ from.

We have considered that Titus' life-work fell into three parts—Church Morality, Finance, and Organization, and thus we learn something of the people amongst whom he moved, that they were (1) persons of loose morality, largely the result of custom, (2) of generous impulses if rightly appealed to, (3) ignorant, yet willing to be guided, restrained and taught.

Being a Greek by birth, Titus was intimately acquainted with the conditions of the heathen world, and the workings of the Gentile mind, but having also been brought into close contact with Jews, both of strict and liberal views, he was fitted to be an ideal missionary, or, as we might now call him, "Bishop's Messenger," while his close intimacy with Paul made him a convinced sympathizer with the Apostle's doctrines and methods. Titus is, in fact, a revelation of the power of spiritual influence. People could have no doubt of the depth of his personal piety, consistency, sincerity, sympathy, and thus he won his way amongst all. He was thoroughly natural, while at the same time intensely spiritual, for 2 Corinthians vii., viii. reveal to us the spiritual atmosphere which surrounded him, and that Paul's feelings, hopes and fears were largely his also.

We will now consider the constituents of that curious crowd amongst whom he moved with so much brightness, earnestness and power. Jews, Corinthians, Cretans, masters and slaves (Tit. ii. 9–10), men and women of diverse ages and positions (Tit. ii. 2–6), the general throng of merchants, sailors, travellers, he would con-

[1] The first article "Titus: the Man and His Work" appeared in the Churchman for January last.

tinuously meet in the harbours of Corinth and Crete—amid such people Titus became a man of wide outlook and liberal sentiment, and the fact that he exercised such a powerful influence on this jostling community of many races, creeds and customs shows what a truly great man he must have been.

Let us think a little of what each of these classes meant to him, and how they affected him.

(a) *Jews:* Naturally opposed to, and contemptuous of him as a Gentile, they were exclusive and proud, full of religious bigotry and national isolation, yet Titus realized how great was his debt to them; in common with all Christians, he had mixed with them at Jerusalem and in many cities—Crete was full of them—and doubtless St. Paul's glorious tribute to their great past was entirely endorsed by him (Rom. ix. 4, 5, xi. 28).

(b) *Corinthians:* The inhabitants of a powerful, idolatrous, sensual city, yet Titus felt special affection for them (2 Cor. vii. 15). He met them with marvellous tact, and drew out the very best in them, and rejoiced over their growth in grace with the most brotherly delight (2 Cor. vii. 7, 13–viii. 6–7, 23–24). Thoroughly unselfish, he condemned covetousness (2 Cor. xii. 18); manifestly spiritual in his own life, he drew them from sensuality.

(c) *Cretans:* Crete, now called Candia, was inhabited by a wild, degraded race, whom a poet of their own—Epimenides—(600 B.C.) had described as untruthful, cruel, idle, gluttonous—Titus i. 12 (R.V.). They had been conquered by Rome, and Titus had to restrain the infant Church, strongly and wisely, from political agitation—Titus iii. 1. How difficult must it have been to organize a truthful, loving, pure Church out of such material, and composed of such diverse elements of Gentile and Jew! and how reverently we must recognize the Holy Spirit's power through the human instrument.

St. Paul had lived with them—Acts xxvii. 2, 21; Titus i. 13—so he knew how great was the task Titus undertook, and his commission was a splendid tribute to Titus' personal worth.

But Titus not only mixed with persons of diverse nationalities, creeds and customs, but with varying classes and ranks of society.

The world was then one of sharp contrasts; slavery was universal; cruelty was popular; tyranny was unchecked. It was the antithesis of the world of to-day, and it is a matter of immense interest

to see how Christianity was adapted to such conditions. Paul gives Titus advice—as far-seeing as it was wise. Like their Divine Master, Paul and Titus inculcated principles which in their operation were transforming. The change in society was to be effected by the leaven of ideas from within, not by violence from without—Titus ii. 12, xiii. 1, 8. The attitude of Titus to the society of the day is indicated by the advice he is commissioned to give.

(a) *Advice to slaves*—Titus ii. 9, 10. Titus is to remind them that spiritual equality does not mean social equality. Cp. Ephesians vi. 5, 6; Colossians iii. 22–25; 1 Timothy vi. 1–2. The exhortation to elder men—Titus ii. 2—would in this case cover the duties of masters mentioned separately in other Epistles.

(b) *Advice to men, old and young*—Titus ii. 2, 6.

The advice to elder men is fuller than to the young, because their opportunities and responsibilities are greater, but each is exhorted to be "*sober-minded*" (R.V.). This same advice is also given to "bishops," ch. i. 8; "young women," ch. ii. 5 (R.V.), and "all men," ii. 11, 12. The same word is used in the Gospels for being in one's right mind (Mark v. 15), and it is worthy of special attention in these days how strongly the leaders of the Primitive Church insisted on a *sane faith*, one firmly established in truth, and not easily influenced by strange and fanciful ideas (Eph. iv. 14). At the present time Christians are usually ill-instructed in the fundamentals of the faith—breadth is considered more important than depth—and therefore they are the easy prey of false teachers. Titus is instructed to warn all of this peril, and to exhort to self-restraint in our acceptance or rejection of truth—error is usually the exaggeration of some truth—and we need to be on our guard.

(c) *Advice to women, old and young*—ch. ii. 3–5—and we should note the duty of instruction which Titus is most wisely to impress on the older women (*v.* 4), and which is peculiarly needful in these times. It is a beautiful portrait of a true woman. "Reverent in demeanour" (*v.* 3, R.V.), restrained in speech and pleasure, a teacher of that which is good, full of domestic love, pure, industrious, kind, submissive, always keeping in view the glory and presence of God. If Christian women were like this now, what an incalculable blessing they could be in the world, in contrast to the vulgar, selfish, idle spirit of the age. Cp. Proverbs xxxi. 25–31. Titus is an example of discretion in his intercourse with women.

(d) *Advice to Christian workers*—Titus i. 6–9. Titus had had great experience of such in many cities and countries, and the counsel here given shows a profound insight into the temptations and difficulties which then surrounded and threatened workers for God. For the qualities required in the ordained ministry were none the less needful in the rank and file of the Church—ch. ii. 7, 8—and if Christians would spend more time in examining their own lives and works instead of criticizing others we should soon have a vast increase in the Church of Christ. Cp. 1 Timothy iv. 12, 13.

The Christian leaders with whom Titus associated were the elite of the Early Church. *Tychicus*, iii. 12, beloved, faithful, humble (Eph. vi. 21; Col. iv. 7); *Apollos*, iii. 13, eloquent, mighty in the Scriptures, bold—Acts xviii. 24—probably sent to Crete to "water" the youthful Church—1 Corinthians iii. 6—kindred spirits all of them, and a great witness to unity in the aristocracy of holiness.

We must close our study of the people with whom Titus mixed with the reflection how strong must have been the influence he exerted on "all sorts and conditions of men." It is extremely difficult for us to enter into the social arrangements of an age so entirely different to our own. The Church and the home of those bygone times were in many respects the opposite of ours. The home was the abode of slaves; vice, cruelty, pleasure, were its main characteristics. The Church was an assembly of mostly poor and uninfluential people, looked upon with ridicule and suspicion, generally meeting in a private house, or the school of a philosopher, or the open air—just a despised sect.

What a task had Titus before him. Yet he was evidently a man of a cheerful temperament, full of love, and brave of heart.

In the spirit of love, prayer, earnestness, humility and watchfulness, he passed from place to place, teaching, encouraging, sympathizing, correcting, leaving amongst all those he mixed with the savour of a truly holy and lovable life. He is lost amidst the mist of tradition and speculation, yet like all good men, all humble followers of, and workers for the Lord Jesus Christ, he is never really lost, for he has left us a lasting example of the power of influence and sympathy. Christ's influence on him was the secret of his influence over others. Is it so of us?

W. B. RUSSELL CALEY.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF HYMNODY.[1]

II.

IN POST-REFORMATION TIMES.

By the Rev. Canon John Vaughan, M.A. (Canon Residentiary of Winchester).

IT is a remarkable fact, as Dr. Schoff of New York has pointed out in Julian's *Dictionary of Hymnology*, that some of the greatest religious revivals in the Church were sung as well as preached, and that the leaders of those revivals were themselves hymnists. The remark is specially true with regard to the Reformation in Germany. To Luther belongs the extraordinary merit of having given to the German people in their own tongue, not only the Bible and the Catechism, but also their own hymn-book. Indeed it was said by Coleridge that "Luther did as much for the Reformation by his hymns as by his translation of the Bible." He was "the Ambrose of German hymnody." His hymns, we are told, were sung everywhere—"in the streets and fields, as well as in the churches, in the workshop and the palace, by children in the cottage, and by martyrs on the scaffold." It was also by his hymns that Luther gave to the new Protestant worship its congregational character. And he was but the first in a long succession of hymn-writers who have made German hymnody famous. We have but to recall the names, from a multitude of others, of Paul Gerhardt, John Scheffler, Martin Rinkart, Hiller, Zinzendorf, and Tersteegen. No other country, it has been truly said, is so rich in good hymnody as Germany.

Notwithstanding the example of Germany, the development of hymnody in England was sadly retarded by the Reformation. This was no doubt due to a variety of causes. The fierce hatred of Rome tended to discredit the use of the old Latin hymns. In spite of the desire of Archbishop Cranmer to present to the people, in an English dress, some of these beautiful compositions, it was found impossible to do so. The intense love of the English Bible was another factor in limiting the scope of public devotions. But the main reason was undoubtedly the influence of Geneva. In the matter of hymnody, our reformers followed Calvin rather than

[1] The first article, "The Evolution of Hymnody up to the Reformation," appeared in the Churchman for January.

Luther. Calvin had imbibed the ancient notion, formerly held by Paul of Samosata, and censured by the fourth Council of Toledo—an opinion which appears more than once in the course of Christian history—that the Bible alone should supply the devotions of public worship. He therefore discarded entirely the hymnology of the mediaeval Church. In its place he used the French metrical version of the Old Testament Psalms by Clement Merot and Theodore Beza, which opportunely appeared about the year 1540. The example thus set by Calvin at Geneva was most unfortunately followed by the English reformers, with the result that for nearly three hundred years hardly any hymns were used in public worship, except the Canticles, and the metrical Psalms. It cannot but be regarded as a great misfortune to the English Church that she was thus deprived, during a long period of her history, of the use of hymnody in public worship, which in Germany and elsewhere was found to be of such high spiritual value.

The story of our metrical version of the Psalms is not without its interest. The French metrical version was originated, as we have seen, by Clement Merot, who was valet or groom of the bed-chamber to Francis I. Strange to say, the English metrical version was begun by Thomas Sternhold, who held a like position in the household of Henry VIII, and afterwards of Edward VI. Sternhold's psalms were originally composed for his own "Godly solace," as Strype tells us, and were sung by him to his organ. He published in 1549 metrical versions of thirty-seven psalms, with a dedication to King Edward, and shortly afterwards he died. The work was continued by John Hopkins, a Suffolk clergyman and schoolmaster, and by others. It was finally completed in 1562, and is known as the "Old Version" by Sternhold and Hopkins. For a long period it remained the only "hymn-book" of the English Church, until indeed it was superseded, in the reign of William III, by another metrical version, known as the "New Version" by Tate and Brady. Indifferent as is the "Old Version" from a literary standpoint—for its authors, as old Fuller says, were "men whose piety was better than their poetry"—it yet became very popular, and great crowds of people, we are told, were wont to assemble at St. Paul's Cross for "psalm singing," to the "sad annoyance of mass-priests and the devil." In its favour, we will not forget that the fine rendering of the "Old Hundredth" psalm—"All people that on

earth do dwell"—said to have been written by William Kethe, a Protestant refugee at Geneva, comes to us from this Version.

The so-called "New Version," which eventually ousted the "Old," is associated with the time of the Restoration, and is the work of Dr. Brady and the poet-laureate Nahum Tate. It appeared in 1696, under the sanction of "an Order in Council," permitting its use among such congregations "as should think fit to receive it." A few years later, in 1703, a "Supplement" was added, which contained new versions of the Canticles, and also six hymns for use at Christmas and Easter and at the Holy Communion. These were the first hymns authorized to be used in the English Church; and it is interesting to find among them the famous Christmas paraphrase, believed to have been written by Tate, "While shepherds watched their flocks by night." The relative merits of the two metrical versions of the Psalms has been often discussed, and to the "Old" must certainly be given the praise of fidelity to the Hebrew original; but the literary standard of both is miserably low, and surprise must be felt, as Lord Chancellor Selborne said, that "in the country of Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton, and notwithstanding the example of Germany, no native congregational hymnody worthy of the name arose till after the commencement of the eighteenth century."

The honour of introducing the use of hymns among the English people belongs, not to the Church of England, but to the Nonconformists. Isaac Watts must be regarded as the true founder of English congregational hymnody. He was born at Southampton in 1674. His father was an "Independent," and had twice suffered imprisonment for his religious convictions. Watts' *Hymns and Spiritual Songs* appeared in 1707, and contained a number of excellent congregational hymns. Indeed some of Watts' hymns reach a very high standard of merit; and one of them may probably be regarded as the best hymn in the English language. This, we need hardly say, is the magnificent hymn, or paraphrase of Psalm xc., beginning, "O God, our help in ages past." Among other excellent hymns, still in common use among us, may be mentioned his Good Friday hymn, "When I survey the wondrous cross," and the beautiful composition, inspired by the view over Southampton Water of the New Forest beyond, beginning, "There is a land of pure delight." With Isaac Watts may be associated Philip Dod-

dridge, also an Independent minister, to whom we are indebted for the familiar hymns, "Hark, the glad sound," and the Holy Communion hymn, "My God, and is Thy Table spread?"

What is known as the Methodist movement, which began about the year 1738, produced a large number of good hymn-writers. The movement at length divided itself into two branches, the Armenian or Wesley branch under the leadership of John Wesley, and the Calvinistic branch under the leadership of Whitefield. Both these sections were fortunate in possessing hymn-writers; indeed it may be said that the success of the movement was due, in no small measure, to the use of hymnody. Of the Methodist hymnologists, the greatest was Charles Wesley. He was a true poet, as well as a writer of hymns. The prodigious number of over six thousand hymns are said to have been written by him. In so vast a number many are naturally of inferior quality; but some rise to a high degree of excellence. His most popular hymn is beyond question, "Jesu, Lover of my soul"; others that may be mentioned are: "Hark, the herald angels sing"; "Soldiers of Christ, arise"; "Rejoice, the Lord is King"; "Love divine, all love excelling"; and "Let saints on earth in concert sing." For literary merit, we should however have no hesitation in placing first, among Charles Wesley's compositions, the fine poem, founded on the wrestling of Jacob with the Angel until the break of day, beginning, "Come, O Thou Traveller unknown," and his beautiful lines on Catholic Love, "Weary of all this worldly strife." Of other Wesleyan hymn-writers, we must not forget the Welsh shoemaker, Thomas Olivers, whose stately ode, "The God of Abraham praise," is one of "singular power and beauty." Nor would we pass over James Montgomery, who has given us, among other lyrics, the popular hymns, "Angels from the realms of glory"; "Go to dark Gethsemane"; "Hail to the Lord's Anointed"; and "Songs of praise the Angels sang."

Turning to the Calvinistic section of the Methodist party, we at once call to mind a hymn which, in the opinion of many competent authorities, is the finest hymn in the English language. We mean Augustus Toplady's "Rock of Ages, cleft for me." It first appeared in the March number of *The Gospel Magazine* for 1776, of which journal Toplady was the Editor, under the heading, "A living and dying prayer for the Holiest believer in the world." This "song of

grace," says Dr. Grosart, "has given Toplady a deeper and more inward place in millions of human hearts, from generation to generation, than almost any other hymnologist of our country, not excepting Charles Wesley." It has been translated into many languages; and it will be remembered that Mr. Gladstone rendered it into Latin. To William Williams, the Apostle of Calvinistic methodism in Wales, we are indebted for the fine hymns, "Guide me, O Thou Great Jehovah," and "O'er the gloomy realms of darkness." The famous *Olney Hymns*, though Newton and Cowper, like Toplady, remained in communion with the English Church, also belong to the Calvinistic school. The volume appeared in 1779; sixty-eight of the hymns being by Cowper, and two hundred and eighty by Newton. Few of them now find a place in our modern hymnals; but Newton will be remembered for his beautiful lines, "How sweet the name of Jesus sounds"; while many of Cowper's hymns, as we should expect, are of high quality. Among them, we would mention, "God moves in a mysterious way"; "O for a closer walk with God"; "Jesus, where'er Thy people meet"; and above all, the touching words, "Hark, my soul! it is the Lord."

Thus by the beginning of the nineteenth century a considerable number of good congregational hymns were in general use, especially among the Nonconformists; and to a certain extent, among the Evangelicals in the Church of England. But the High Church clergy stood rigidly aloof, and continued to use "Tate and Brady" only. The ancient prejudice against the use of hymnody still existed. It seemed no doubt to lack ecclesiastical authority, and to savour too much of that religious "enthusiasm" with which the Methodist party were associated. But in the year 1827 two works appeared, which at length broke down the barrier of prejudice, and introduced a new epoch in the development of hymnody. The one work was Bishop Heber's *Hymns*; and the other was John Keble's *Christian Year*. From henceforth, hymns were used alike by High Churchmen and Evangelicals, to the spiritual enrichment of the worship of the Church of England. Reginald Heber had won the Newdigate prize at Oxford for his admirable poem on *Palestine*; and his hymns are marked by a fine literary instinct. His best hymn is the truly majestic composition, beginning, "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty." He has also given us the popular Missionary hymn, written, strange to say, before he was appointed

to the bishopric of Calcutta, "From Greenland's icy mountains"; and a touching funeral hymn, "Thou art gone to the grave," composed on the death of his first-born child. With Heber's *Hymns* were included several by Dr. Milman, Professor of Poetry at Oxford, and afterwards Dean of St. Paul's, of which two must be mentioned, "Ride on, ride on, in majesty," and "When our heads are bowed with woe."

The *Christian Year*, by John Keble, who succeeded Milman as Professor of Poetry, while in no sense a book of hymns, yet contains several compositions which have found a place in most modern hymnals. His Morning and Evening hymns are as well known as those of Thomas Ken's; while "Blest are the pure in heart," and "There is a book who runs may read," are familiar to most English Christians. Since the publication of the *Christian Year*, a great number of good hymns have appeared. The *Lyra Apostolica*, which was published in 1836, contained John Henry Newman's immortal poem, "Lead, kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom," and also, as we have seen, Keble's rendering of the Greek "lamp-lighting" hymn, "Hail, gladdening Light." Henry Lyte's famous hymn, one of the most beautiful we possess, "Abide with me, fast falls the eventide," was written at Brixham in South Devon in 1847. Many others might be mentioned. We have only to remember the contributions of such hymn-writers as Dean Alford and Chatterton Dix, of Samuel Stone and Baring-Gould, of Mrs. Alexander and Charlotte Elliott, of Frederic William Faber and Horatius Bonar.

Such, very briefly, is the evolution of Christian hymnody, from its first indications in the New Testament to its vast development to-day. A modern hymn-book bears a striking witness to the true catholicity of the Christian Church. It contains contributions from ancient and modern sources, from the Eastern and the Western Church, from mediaeval saints, from Anglican poets and from Protestant dissenters. It testifies to the inspiring truth of the Communion of Saints. For a true hymn, it has been well said, knows nothing of the differences that divide us; it knows only of Christ and God.

JOHN VAUGHAN.

"LAMBETH AND REUNION."[1]

By the Rev. Thos. J. Pulvertaft, M.A.

WE are met at the outset of our inquiry into recent developments of the Lambeth pronouncements by the question, "Is it not wrong to investigate critically the findings of two hundred and fifty Bishops brought from all over the world, when they tell us they have seen a vision and have been drawn together by a Power greater than themselves? Have we not been asked to wait before discussing, to pray before criticizing?" Even the strongest advocates of the claims of the Lambeth Conference to speak with an authority due to the marvellous spirit that was evoked during the discussions, cannot attribute to it as much importance as we pay General Councils of the Church. The Anglican teaching on the inerrancy of these bodies is left beyond doubt in the Article which declares they "may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining to God." The number of Bishops is no guarantee of the permanence of their work or of their convictions. In A.D. 400 there were no fewer than 600 Bishops in North West Africa, and their Conciliar pronouncements are not universally accepted, and of their work outside the written pages not a trace remains. God has promised to them who ask Him His Spirit to guide them into all truth. His Son is present wherever two or three are gathered together in His Name. We believe with all our heart that both promises are fulfilled, but we know by experience that the conclusions of General Councils even have not always been in all respects trustworthy and final. Their chief value lies in their witness to the belief of the Church of their own time. They attached anathemas to their conclusions, and as this age will not have anything to do with anathemas, the modern custom of either an individual, or a group, or a Council convinced that it has reached right conclusions, is to claim to have seen a vision and thereby to be exempt from the criticism that falls to the lot of less convinced bodies. No one can have a higher opinon than the writer has of the devotion and the honest search for truth of the Lambeth Bishops. He has too many friends among them to have any doubt on this point, but he respect-

[1] *Lambeth and Reunion*, 1920. By the Bishops of Peterborough, Zanzibar and Hereford. (London, S.P.C.K., 3s.)

fully dissents from the claim made by many, that the decisions are to be accepted as the fruit of the Spirit of God working inerrantly through them in Council.

After all the Anglican Communion only represents about one-seventh of the children of the Reformed Churches. It represents numerically a much smaller proportion of the Roman and Greek Churches, and the Decrees of the Vatican Council nominally speak for at least ten times as many Episcopal Christians as were represented at Lambeth. Truth does not always lie with the big battalions, and it is our sacred duty to test all utterances in the light of Divine revelation, history and experience. If Churchmen will not fully and frankly discuss the Appeal, Reports and Resolutions of the Conference, other people will. In this connexion we may quote the words of Dr. Salmon on the dictum of St. Francis de Sales, who maintains that " the arguments take place only in the porch, the final decisions in the sanctuary." " This appears to me to put a severe strain on the faith of those who receive it. We might accept the pretensions of a professional accountant without dreaming of examining his work. But if we heard him performing his additions in the process, six and four are eleven, and five are thirteen, and seven are twenty-four, how could belief in him be restored? Who could have the face to say, It is true not a single column in my preliminary calculations is added correctly, but you may rely implicitly that I never fail somehow or another to bring out the correct sum total? " This can only be deemed correct when, like a schoolboy who knows the only possible answer, he manages to get it in some unconventional manner during the last few summaries of his results!

The problem presented to the Lambeth Fathers may be stated in this fashion. " To-day in opposition to the declared mind of God His Church is divided. Every part of the Church acknowledges the necessity of a Common Faith in God, belief in the Scriptures of Truth, acceptance of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper as means of grace and of a Ministry which ministers the Word and Sacraments to His people. How can we bring together these divided groups of Christian men and women? We can only do so by determining what is the Highest Common Measure imposed on us by loyalty to the revealed mind of God. The Ministry is the crucial point, for while all accept the first three requirements,

all do not accept a common ministry, and it is therefore essential that we must have a ministry of a type accepted by all, which will enable us to worship and serve God together without any doubtfulness of mind." The need for fellowship which God wills has never been so clearly expressed by a great ecclesiastical Assembly as by the Lambeth Conference. Every member of the Body felt this, and their conclusion was reached with practical unanimity as that which by common consent—although differently interpreted —expressed the mind of God as revealed to the Bishops.

Behind the Reports and the Resolutions, as well as the Appeal, lies a theory which to many seems novel. Unlike the Church of Rome which considers the Anglican rites (except Baptism) to be no Sacraments, the Appeal does not call in question for a moment "the spiritual reality" of the Ministries of those Communions which do not possess the Episcopate. "On the contrary we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace." These words mark an advance in official Anglican thought of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries for which we cannot be too grateful. They are a return to the thought of the days when the Church of England recognized herself to be in communion with the non-Episcopal Continental Churches. They are the most hopeful feature of the whole Appeal, for they provide a basis for brotherly discussion and exchange of views that will do more to make for reunion than any other words that have fallen from their pen. We thank God for their frankness and believe that they have cleared away a barrier of stumbling stones. The Resolutions, however, with the disapproval of the celebration of the Holy Communion in Anglican churches for members of the Anglican Church by ministers who have not been episcopally ordained, and the assertion "that it should be regarded as the general rule of the Church that Anglican communicants should receive Holy Communion only at the hands of ministers of their own Church, or of Churches in communion therewith," are reminiscent of the Roman treatment of the Uniate Churches, whose members though in communion with the Pope are deprived of the privilege of reciprocal communion.

This leads to the remark that although the Pope is not in communion with the Greek Church the validity of its orders is not questioned by Rome. They are schismatic, not invalid, as ours

are said to be, and therefore a different problem arises when the relation of the Greek to the Roman Church is considered. Underneath the whole difficulty in the relation of the Anglican Communion to the non-Episcopal Churches lies the character of the Ministry. Many efforts have been made to show that the Lambeth documents have made no pronouncement on this subject—the burning question of Apostolic Succession. The three Bishops have no doubts on this matter when in *Lambeth and Reunion* they expound the situation:

"The Appeal asserts that the bishop stands for continuity. The bishop is by the nature of his office a successor in an unbroken line of witnesses to the Christian religion. From the Apostles' time there have been officers in the Church appointed to preside over the local Churches, to hand on the Gospel story, and to maintain the family tradition of faith and worship. This office has been kept filled down the ages in unbroken succession. The Church's rule has always been that no one can hold the office who has not been appointed to it by the laying-on of the hands of some one already holding it." (The writers seem to have forgotten the Alexandrian custom of appointing bishops.)

We quote the interpretation of the Lambeth documents given by the Dean of Wells—one of the most acute minds in our Communion:

"The Church must have some doctrinal interpretation of "the fact of episcopacy," and that interpretation is found firmly but moderately enunciated in our Ordinal, especially in the words used in the act of consecration. The "office" is committed, and the Holy Ghost is given, by the laying-on of hands. We must be quite plain on this point. An episcopacy which does not connote the transmission of office from the Apostles and through them from Christ Himself, and at the same time the giving and receiving of the spiritual gift which is required for the due exercise of that office—an episcopacy in short—which is little else than an elective magistracy—is not what is meant, or ever has been meant, by what we know as the Historic Episcopate. The important matter is not expressly dealt with in any part of the Lambeth Report. But two quotations will serve to show that the position of our Church in regard to it is left in no doubt. The opening words of the Encyclical letter are these:

"We who speak are bearers of the sacred commission of the

ministry given by our Lord through His Apostles to the Church."

And again, the Report of the Sub-Committee which considered "Relation to, and Reunion with, Episcopal Churches" speaks thus (p. 148): "We need at the present time not only or chiefly to afford to the Easterns historical evidence of the handing down of our ministry, but also to explain the doctrinal position held by our Communion. It is in particular of the first importance, in order to remove Oriental misconceptions, to make it clear from our formularies that we regard Ordination as conferring grace, and not only as a mere setting apart to an ecclesiastical office."

It is possible to put another interpretation on the Appeal and the associated documents, but it is plain that the view taken by the three Bishops and Dean Armitage Robinson is one that was adopted by a considerable section of the Bishops.

As is well known the vision of the Conference was of a reunited Church consisting of groups preserving their own identity and particular customs, enjoying a common ministry which would bring all into communion with one another. We have to look for the source of this view of the Church which has in it elements that would have been considered, to say the least, novel some years past. Twenty-six years ago the Church of England was deeply agitated by the "intrusion" into a Roman Catholic Diocese of three Irish Bishops who consecrated a Spaniard, Bishop of the native Reformed Church. It was then laid down that this action was contrary to Catholic principles, as there could only be one Catholic Bishop in the same place. Much time and learning were wasted on the discussion, and those of us who were compelled to study the by-ways of ecclesiastical history were impressed by the contrast between the ancient and the modern Christian world. The futility of applying old-time Canons to modern instances was proved when it was found that their application practically made the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States an "intruder" in the great majority of its home Dioceses, while its missionary Dioceses in the American Continent, the Islands and the Philippine Islands were condemned by the principles supposed to be inviolate in the practice of Catholic Christendom. We forgot also the strange position of the Diocese of Gibraltar, and it is interesting to know that probably its greatest Diocesan (Dr. Collins) held that jurisdiction is primarily over persons and secondarily over places. That view

lies at the basis of the administrative side of the Lambeth theory. There would be a group synod of each group. The local Bishops representing the several groups would sit in synod and this common synod would deal with all matters affecting the whole fellowship and mediate where necessary between group and group. "Each group would retain its own characteristic mode of self-determination. The Conference was quite clear that each group must be autonomous, exercising its autonomy in the way it likes best. Provided the whole fellowship be not harmed by its acts, each group would remain self-governed. There is no conceivable reason why the Presbyterian, or the Congregational, or any other mode of autonomy should not be preserved within a group. The bishops expressly desired that all should bring into the one fellowship the riches of their past experience." We see here conditions similar to those in some continental cities where American Episcopal Churches are under the jurisdiction of their own Bishops and Anglican Churches under their Bishops, and the Churches are in full communion with one another. The difficulties that would arise from this group system can be overcome with good will and brotherliness, and they need not concern us further.

But it is important to discover the source of the ideal of a common ministry of an Episcopal character and what it involves. Two missionary Bishops took a leading part in the Reunion discussions. Every one was impressed by their earnestness and passion for reunion. Both Bishops looked as much to reunion with Rome and the East as with our non-Episcopal brethren. Both have a hatred of what is called Pan-Protestantism. Both have given outside the Conference expression to their convictions. We are therefore able to see for ourselves what is involved. The Bishop of Zanzibar made many friends and no enemy at Lambeth. His transparent zeal for God and personal charm won all hearts. Those who expected to find him cast-iron *intransigeance* personified, discovered him to be a delightfully human person with a real passion for reunion. At the Kikuyu Conference in 1918 he was present and put forward an alternative scheme. He secured in the addendum to the constitution of the Alliance the clause, "In the meantime we adopt the basis of alliance, not as the ideal, but as the utmost possible, in view of our unhappy divisions. And the members of the alliance pledge themselves not to rest until they can all share

one ministry." The Bishop of Uganda describes his attitude as, broadly speaking, "Secure the absolute essentials, and in everything else allow to each the widest possible liberty." We need only quote the following clauses from his proposals to show their fundamental identity with those accepted by Lambeth. "Episcopacy need not involve us in a monarchical, diocesan episcopate. Many bishops may serve one local Church. The bishops should be freely elected, and should rule with the clergy and laity. Nor is it essential that we hold any one *view* of episcopacy on the doctrinal side, provided the *fact* of its existence and continuance be admitted." "Non-episcopal bodies accepting episcopacy would remain in full exercise of their own constitutions working parallel with the present episcopal Churches." This is the foundation conception of the Lambeth vision, and we are told by Bishop Willis (Uganda): "The bishop assured the conference that, if the non-episcopal bodies would accept some such proposals as these, and consent to some episcopal consecration and ordination so as to enable them to minister by invitation in episcopal churches, he for his part would gladly come before any of their congregations, and accept any form of popular recognition." He could not move from his own position, or allow doubt to be cast upon his ministerial authority received by ordination and consecration. In *Lambeth and Reunion* the three Bishops—of whom the Bishop of Zanzibar is one—say, "They claim to be Catholic bishops in the same sense in which the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris is a Catholic bishop. None the less they are aware that possible objection to their ministry might be raised in Eastern or Roman congregations. To meet these objections they declare themselves ready to accept from Constantinople and Rome such a form of commission as would make their ministry acceptable within the other groups. They do not refuse ordination, provided they be not asked to deny their present orders. They say frankly in effect that (were all other terms of union satisfactorily settled) they would humble themselves, out of deference to Eastern and Roman consciences, to receive what the East and Rome might wish to give them. It is not likely that the Orthodox Churches would wish to act upon this suggestion. It is almost certain that Rome would. In any case the bishops at Lambeth have made this offer. To them it is a sign of their sincerity. They really desire unity. All have sinned in the matter of disunion. The English bishops would

lead the way in confessing their share of the sin." If this means anything it implies that the Bishops believe Rome cannot give them anything they have not already. "Other terms of union satisfactorily settled" is a phrase that covers much. Do the non-Episcopal ministers claim that they are Catholic Priests or Bishops in the sense the Bishop of Zanzibar claims to be a Catholic Bishop? We ask this as an introduction to the Bishop of Bombay's answer to the query.

Dr. Palmer (Bishop of Bombay) has written an inspiring volume, *The Great Church Awakes*. Like the Bishop of Zanzibar he made a great impression on his Lambeth brethren, and reading his book we find the theory of groups expounded with freshness and vigour. He says much that all will admit, and he is specially frank in his discussion of the Sacraments in non-Episcopal Churches. "There seems no object in continuing to talk of invalidity. God's will is constant. He wills to give men grace through the Sacraments. The first and governing expression of His will is the institution of two Sacraments by His Son. A Sacrament can only be really invalid if God refuses to send forth His grace in it. It is hard to me to conceive any reason sufficient to cause such a refusal on God's part, except a deliberate intention on the Church's and recipient's part *not to obey His Son*, that is an intention *to do otherwise than as the Lord Jesus commanded.*" "I cannot dismiss all Eucharists celebrated by ministers, not episcopally ordained, as invalid, because not implying the will to obey the Lord and do what He commanded to be done." These sentences, and many similar might be quoted, are a welcome contrast to the Roman Catholic view of Anglican Sacraments. We are indeed glad to place them on record as coming from a man of Dr. Pal er's recognized learning and leadership.

It is desirable to state in his own words Dr. Palmer's idea of the contrast between the non-Episcopal and his ideal of ordination. This is the real crucial point from which there is no escape. "The Free Churches (*a*) *recognize* a gift of God to a man which he knows by an inward call that he has received, and (*b*) give him licence or jurisdiction that he may exercise it within the Church and as a representative of the Church. To the Great Church ordination has meant much more than this. These aspects have not been absent from its idea of ordination, but they have been subordinate to it. The characteristic meaning attributed to ordination has been (*a*)

that God at the prayer of the Church gives a gift of the Holy Spirit—an empowering grace, which the man most likely did not possess before—to enable him to fulfil the commission to a certain ministry; (*b*) that at the same time Christ through the Bishop gives a commission to the man to perform a certain definite ministry in the Church; and (*c*) that the body of ministers who are already possessed of that commission, pass on, through their representatives to the man ordained a share of their God-given authority. Ordination incidentally gives a man 'social opportunity' in Dr. Forsyth's sense, *i.e.*, opportunity to work within the Society. But it gives this as a consequence of the commission to work."

Here we may quote Dr. Garvie's conception of the meaning of the laying-on of hands. "The laying-on of hands does not confer grace; it is a significant symbol of benediction accompanying the prayer which invokes the divine blessing upon the ordained. He who responds to the solemn appeal of the ordinance in faith is often conscious of an increase of grace, as this outward seal is set upon his self-dedication; and he looks back to his experience as a manifest divine appointment of himself to his work. In Presbyterianism elders as well as ministers are ordained, but in the one case by their own minister, in the other by the Presbytery. Experience has confirmed the wisdom and rightness of the Apostolic practice, although it cannot claim the Lord's direct authority as do the two sacraments." He adds: "When the Eucharist came to be regarded as a sacrifice the bishop or presbyter became a priest. Protestantism rejects both these transformations as illegitimate."

Dr. Palmer sheds a flood of light on his position when he informs us that the Church insists far more strongly on having a priest for the minister of the Eucharist than for the minister of Baptism. The former takes the part of Christ, the latter does not. Christ Himself did not baptize. "His own action made the Eucharist. To 'take the part' of the Lord in the Lord's Supper, a man must be His specially commissioned representative."

The careful reader will find again and again the ideals of Dr. Palmer expressed in the Lambeth documents. He maintains the doctrine that from bishops to bishop "the grace gift *charisma*" is received, and he is convinced that this is essential in the constitution of the Church. Therefore according to him Episcopal Ordination gives to men something that cannot possibly be obtained elsewhere

and that involves additional ordination for all who have received non-Episcopal ordination if they are to be admitted to the ministerial roll of those authorized to administer the Lord's Supper to members of the Anglican Communion. On the other hand the bishops and priests who receive recognition in non-Episcopal communions will simply receive a legal extension of their commission. They are welcomed into the family life of the groups, but do not, in any way, receive a special gift such as the Bishops of Zanzibar and Bombay insist on, as characteristic of Episcopal ordination. That constitutes a real difference between the "give and take" proposals. The Bishops say to Rome and the East: "You cannot give us anything that we have not—we admit your men to our fellowship without further ordination, and the terms of union we arrange, make it plain that you are not conferring on us anything additional to what we have already as Priests and Bishops of the Church of God," whereas they say to the non-Episcopal ministers: "You have not the grace of orders which will permit you to administer the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to our people, and before this is permitted you must receive the gift from those commissioned as representatives of Christ and His Apostles in the Succession."

Our non-Episcopal brethren who are as anxious for union as the bishops feel they are asked to make a sacrifice, and if they are sure that it is in accord with the will of God they will do so. It is not for them a matter of humbling themselves—it is the surrender of the whole conception of their work and ministry and the acceptance of theological and historical opinions they cannot find in Scripture or in the Primitive Church. They feel that this is a barrier to union that has been made by man and not imposed by God. Some of them—a small minority—are prepared to accept the proposals, but the vast majority of the ministers are unable to look upon the question as one of expediency for the obtaining a great boon they fervently desire, but of principle as implying the abandonment of the convictions derived from study of the Bible and the Primitive Church.

Non-Episcopalians are also faced by an ambiguity which we Churchmen do not so strongly feel. What is the type of unity desired by God? Is it unity of organization displayed in common membership of a great Church marked by unity in diversity? Or is it the unity of the Spirit manifesting itself in brotherly co-operation, in sharing on occasion the ministry of one another's pulpits and of

joining together in the reception of the Eucharist—asking no questions but fully admitting the right of the officiating minister to consecrate and deliver the elements? Both types of unity are advocated in non-Episcopal circles, but it is probably true to say that the latter is the prevailing view at present. They are no more eager than Lambeth is for absorption—but they hold that by an alliance they can best display their essential unity. They are convinced that unity in the Body of Christ already exists. They have unity of faith—unity in sacrament—unity in love for the Bible, and in addition they have living unity of command under the Great Captain of our Salvation. The divisions are to them matters of non-vital importance, for in spite of them they can work together, pray together, worship together in every department of Church life without any doubtfulness of mind. They appreciate to the full the noble spirit of fellowship that breathes through the Lambeth Appeal, and are convinced that if for the present the realization of the unity they have at heart be delayed, the free working of the Spirit of God in the hearts of Anglicans and non-Anglicans will remove what they consider arbitrary in the resolutions and unjustified in the proposal for additional ordination. They will go with us as far as they can; when they part company they do so unwillingly, for they would gladly join with us at the Lord's Table and are now ready to admit us to His Table in their Churches. Lambeth has done much to kill the old rancour that embittered the relations between us and them. The war had already accomplished much, but the formal expression of brotherhood has set its seal upon the comradeship.

Frankly they are disappointed. They expected that the views so nobly expounded by Dr. Headlam would prevail at Lambeth. They looked forward to the abandonment of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession by the Bishops and the frank recognition of their existing Ministers as equally commissioned ministers of the Word and Sacraments with ourselves. That hope has not been realized, but they are convinced that when Bishops recognize "spiritual reality" in their ministries the road to full acceptance of their commission to administer the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper must inevitably follow. The time is not yet, but the day of the Lord will see the perfect work of unity established. We shall be one in heaven, and the prayer "Thy will be done in earth as in heaven" is a prayer for Unity.

May we point to a possible means of overcoming some of the conscientious difficulties of our brethren. The Prayer Book of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States has an alternative formula for use with the imposition of hands at the ordering of Priests. It reads:

"Take thou authority to execute the Office of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands. And be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God, and of His Holy Sacraments: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," The Wesleyan Ordination service has the formula with the laying-on of hands by the President: "Mayest thou receive the Holy Ghost for the work of a Christian Minister and Pastor, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His holy Sacraments: In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." In both services the Bible is afterwards delivered to the newly ordained with the words, "Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to administer the Holy Sacraments in the Congregation" (the American Ordinal adding, "where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto").

There is not any striking doctrinal difference between the two formulæ. The word Priest certainly occurs in one, but there are many hundreds—if not many thousands of Anglican ministers—who reject its sacerdotal implications. Seventy years ago only the exceptional Anglican clergyman accepted them. The Tractarian movement and its more recent developments have unhistorically changed the sixteenth century interpretation of the word within the Church of England. If the American formula be valid in the United States and those ordained according to it minister freely in English Churches, no objection can be raised to its validity. By good will on the part of the non-Episcopal Churches and by our acting in the Church of England in a Christian spirit for the sake of that unity and brotherhood we have at heart, the American formula might be adopted as an alternative, and by so doing a great step forward would be taken in preparing the way to unity.

Would it not also make for unity if the careful statement of the Preface to the Irish Book of Common Prayer were adopted by the Anglican Communion as a permissible position? "No change has been made in the formula of the Ordination of Priests, though desired by some; for upon a full review of our Formularies, we deem

it plain and here declare that, save in the matter of Ecclesiastical censures, no power or authority is by them ascribed to the Church or to any of its Ministers, in respect of forgiveness of sins after Baptism, other than that of declaring and pronouncing on God's part, remission of sins to all that are truly penitent, to the quieting of their consciences, and the removal of all doubt and scruple; nor is it anywhere in our Formularies taught or implied, that confession to and absolution by a Priest are any conditions of God's pardon; but, on the contrary, it is fully taught that all Christians who sincerely repent, and unfeignedly believe the Gospel, may draw nigh, as worthy communicants, to the Lord's Table without any such confession or absolution." This pronouncement of the Disestablished Irish Church has to our knowledge removed the scruples of many.

The great wind of God is blowing throughout the world. The time has come for the unity of the Spirit to be manifested in the bonds of peace and holy brotherhood. Lambeth has reached its conclusions not by the path of compromise, but by the only path open to it, if the Anglican Communion was to avoid a schism within itself for the sake of a wider unity. It is vain, as all who know the facts and read history, to hope that Rome will reform and come to acceptable terms with the Anglican Communion. God wills us not to wait until the stubborn will of a long inherited and deeply entrenched exclusiveness be broken. Gwatkin was right when he wrote, "An infallible Church must go on setting truth and reason at defiance in intrigues for political supremacy, till she either breaks in pieces, or withers away, or sinks into some gulf of anarchy. Meaner Churches may repent and amend, but for Rome reform is suicide." Union with an unreformed Rome is unthinkable. Of the East we know so little and the voices that reach us are so discordant that we cannot determine or gauge the future. Eastern Christianity is something generally unknown to us of the West. We do know our non-Episcopal brethren. We sit at their feet in our studies. We work by their side in our parishes and we share the privilege of joint work in the Mission Field. We who have prayed with them and have felt our deep underlying unity yearn for its expression in outward form, in our pulpits and at the Table of the Lord. May the way be found for us hand in hand to walk together to the City of God where we shall all recognize ourselves as wrongly separated brethren during the days of our pilgrimage!

THOS. J. PULVERTAFT.

ENGLAND TO THE UNKNOWN WARRIOR.

UNKNOWN Warrior! I have brought thee
From a resting-place elsewhere,
Since my loving heart hath thought thee
Worthy sepulture to share
With my sons, the noblest, greatest,
Whom my British Isles have bred—
Fitting tomb for thee, the latest
Of my unforgotten dead.

Nameless art thou, though around thee
Names of famous men appear;
None may say e'en where they found thee,
Yet this much, at least, is clear:
Thou wert one among the many
Who for *my* sake fought and fell,
Though, alas! there are not any
Of thy chivalry to tell.

Not as one alone I laid thee
Where my Kings and Queens repose,
But that honour hath been paid thee
In the name of all of those
Who, like thee, have died defending
Freedom's cause, at Duty's call,
O'er whose life's heroic ending
Mystery hath drawn its pall.

Thou, perchance of lineage lowly,
Liest where my great ones are
In my ancient Shrine, so holy;
But I think of graves afar,
And of heroes who are lying
Sepulchred beneath the sea:
E'en though dead, they, Death defying,
Live, for aye, in memory.

ROBEY F. ELDRIDGE.

MELROSE,
NEWPORT,
ISLE OF WIGHT.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE CHURCHMAN."

DEAR SIR,—Surely the perception of the true meaning of John xix. 11, discussed in your last issue, is *not* so much a matter of scholarship, as of "common sense"?

Was not the "power" ("authority," ἐξουσία) possessed by Pilate, one that "was ordained of God," as in Romans xiii. 1, 2?[1] In which case, he could *not* well *avoid* "trying" any one brought before him, as was Jesus Christ. Hence, he was not to blame (was *not* sinful) for so doing. And "For this reason"[2] our Lord said, "He that delivered ("betrayed"[3]) Me unto thee, hath the greater sin."[4] Where is there any difficulty, or anything lacking in such an explanation?

I have read with much interest the article on The doctrine of "The Presence," and the result agrees with the doctrine of our Prayer Book and Articles. But surely the *first* thing for a Protestant to inquire is *not*, What does the Church of England teach, or any of the old Protestants, but What is the teaching of the *New Testament, i.e.*, "What does the Holy Spirit say unto the Churches"? Now there are two or three points about the ordinance of the Lord's Supper which seem to me to have generally *escaped* the notice of Protestants.

(1) The *objects* respecting which our Lord spake at the Institution were NOT His *united* "Body-and-Blood," but "His Body *given*-in-sacrifice-for-us," and "His Blood-*shed*-for-us";—two *separate*, inanimate, material objects, resulting from His death and blood-shedding on the cross. In fact, when Christ died as "our Paschal Lamb," it *necessitated* the Institution by Him of a *new* "Paschal Supper,"—the *second* part of the complete ordinance of "Christ our Passover,"—at which the "sacrificed Body" of "the Lamb of God" *must*, in some way, be "eaten" by us. And, if the "Sacrifice" was a *literal* one, so must "the Supper" be,—"eaten with the *mouth*." And the fact that the bread and the wine ARE our Lord's "sacrificed Body" and "shed Blood," is *demonstrated* by the fact that they were *separately* "given," "taken," and "eaten" and "drunk," at an *interval* of time, thus "showing, declaring the *death* of the Lord" in the past,—"till He (the now-*living* Lord) come."

(2) The verbs "eat" and "drink" occur thirteen or fourteen times in connection with the accounts of the Institution, and an unbiased study is *bound* to admit that these two commands of our Lord refer *exclusively* to acts performed with the *mouth, i.e.*, the *only* method in which He bade us "eat" and "drink" *anything*

[1] Cp. Matt. xxi. 23. [2] διὰ τοῦτο, cp. Jn. vii. 22.

[3] For ὁ παραδιδούς,—"the traitor," cp. Matt. xxvi. 48; Jn. xviii. 2, 5; xxi. 20. And compare ὁ κλέπτων,—"the thief," in Eph. iv. 28.

[4] Cp. Matt. xxvi. 25; xxvii. 2, 3, 4.

at the Supper, was with the *mouth*. Hence, if we are to "eat our Lord's Sacrificed Body," and "to drink His shed Blood" *at all* at the Supper, we must do so with the mouth.

(3) Our Lord did *not* bid us "eat" and "drink" "His Body" and "His Blood" *directly*, but *in*directly,[1] *i.e.*, He did *not* say, "Take, eat My Body, etc.," and "Drink ye all My Blood, etc."; but He said, "Take, and eat *this* (object, bread), for *This* is My Body, etc."; and "Drink ye all of *this* (object, wine), for *This* is My Blood, etc." The *only* method in which He intended us to "eat His Body," was by "eating that which He said WAS His Body,—the *bread*; and the *only* method in which He intended us to "drink His Blood," was by "drinking that which He said WAS His Blood,"—the *wine*. And if, as we have seen, the verbs "eat" and "drink" invariably mean "eat" and "drink" with the *mouth*, it is obvious that by "His Body" and "His Blood" He *could not* have meant any "inward and spiritual *grace*," or "spiritual food," which *cannot* possibly be "eaten" and "drunk" with the mouth.

The *only* method in which "the Body" and "the Blood" of Christ *can* be separately "eaten" and "drunk" with the *mouth*, at an interval of time,—*in* and *by* the "eating" and "drinking" of the separate, material, visible objects which our Lord said WERE that "Body" and "Blood," *is* upon the assumption that the bread and the wine ARE the *substitutes* of His "sacrificed Body" and "shed Blood." In this case *only* is "the eating of the *bread*" the "eating of the sacrificed *Body*," and "the drinking of the *wine*" is "the drinking of the shed *Blood*." Just as "the taking of *twelve pence*" is "the taking of *one shilling*"; and "the taking of twenty shillings" is "the taking of one pound." And this is the *real* meaning of St. Paul's questions in 1 Corinthians x. 16;—"The cup of blessing, which we bless (and then drink), *Is it not* the partaking-in-common of the (shed) *Blood* of Christ? The loaf which we break (and then eat), Is it not the partaking-in-common of the (sacrificed) *Body* of Christ?" "For we, the many, are (form) one loaf,—one body;—for we all *share* in the one loaf."

The interpretation of "the Body-and-Blood of Christ" to mean some "inward and spiritual *grace*" or "spiritual food," has arisen from *confusing* the *non*-figurative words of the Institution, with the *purely*-figurative language of the "parable" in John vi. 31–58, respecting "eating the true Bread-from-heaven,—manna";—where the *food* to be "eaten" and "drunk" is *spiritual* throughout, and the *method* of "eating" and "drinking" that food is necessarily spiritual *also*. But the *type* of Christ referred to in that "parable," is that of "the *manna*,—bread-from-heaven";—whereas, the *type* of Christ referred to in the ordinance of The Lord's Supper, is that of "the *Passover*,—or Paschal Supper";—two different types, which had *no* connection whatever, and *no* allusion to one another. And, to confuse the *Antitypical* "Manna"

[1] In John vi. 53–56, our Lord spake of "eating His flesh, and of drinking His blood" *directly*.

with the Antitypical "Passover, or Paschal Supper," is to make *as great* a mistake as to confuse the *typical* "manna" with the typical "Passover, or Paschal Supper." This confusion between the words of the Institution and the language of John vi. 53–56, has been made by *both* Protestants and Sacerdotalists. Protestants *interpret* the words of the Institution BY what they *correctly* understand the language of John vi. 53–56 to mean,—"*spiritual* feeding" upon "*spiritual* food."[1] Whereas Sacerdotalists interpret the language of John vi. 53–56, BY what *they* understand the words of the Institution to mean,—"*physical* feeding" upon "*material* food."

Similarly, the fact that our Lord "suffered outside the gate" of Jerusalem, *constituted* Him "the altar or sacrifice" known as "the Sin-offering for the people of God,"—"*of which* (in the type) *no one* had any *right to eat*,"—or any *power* to do so, because "the body was wholly *burnt* outside the camp." Hence, no one has any *more* right, or *power*, to eat "of the *actual* sacrificed Body of Christ,"—because it is now *non*-existent. "Of the sacrificed Body" of the Paschal Lamb, the people were *commanded* to "eat the *whole*"[2]—whereas, "of the body of the sin-offering for the people of God," they were strictly *forbidden* to eat one morsel. How then, *could* there be *any* allusion in Hebrews xiii. 10 (written to *Hebrews*), to the ordinance of the New "Paschal Supper,"—the Lord's Supper? The fact that our Lord "suffered outside the gate of Jerusalem," as "the Sin-Offering for the people of God," as plainly *forbids* us to "eat His *actual* sacrificed Body,"—as the *other* fact, that "He was sacrificed-for-us as Christ our Passover," *commands* us to "eat" and to "drink" the bread and the wine, which He gave us as the *Substitutes* of His *actual* "sacrificed Body" and "shed Blood."

Is there, I would ask, a *single* point in the above-mentioned facts which can be *fairly* disputed, or even doubted?

Yours faithfully,
WERNER H. K. SOAMES.

6, ALBANY ROAD,
BEXHILL-ON-SEA.

[1] See the third rubric after the "Communion of the Sick."
[2] Cp. Exodus xii. 3, 4, 8, 46, 47.

[*** We regret to state that since this letter was written the Rev. Werner H. K. Soames has passed away. He died at Bexhill on March 2, aged 75 years.—ED.]

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

PRESENT-DAY PROBLEMS IN RELIGIOUS TEACHING. By Hetty Lee, M.A. London: *Macmillan & Co.* 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

THE CHILD'S KNOWLEDGE OF GOD. By the Rev. T. Grigg-Smith, M.A. London: *Macmillan & Co.* 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Both writers protest vehemently against the methods of the present-day teaching of religion in our schools. Mr. Grigg-Smith would have drastic reform; Miss Lee would have a revolution. Both writers have had wide experience and speak with deep conviction. They know what they want and they agree in alleging that a totally wrong and injurious conception of God is given to young children through being taught the Bible as it stands.

Mr. Grigg-Smith's book is the less drastic of the two, but it is sufficiently startling. He says, "There is great need for a Society for the Prevention of Spiritual Cruelty to Children" (p. 12). "Details of the Crucifixion should never be told to young children" (p. 41). He has a whole chapter dealing with "The Sacrifice of Isaac" in which he strongly deprecates the usual method of dealing with the account, and quotes instances to prove real harm done by it. All ideas of God sending judgments or calamities or punishments for sin must be abandoned. This eliminates a good deal of Old Testament teaching. Sin may and does bring evil consequences, but the greatest calamity is the moral loss, and it is this that the teacher should stress and not the physical results. At the end of the book there is an Appendix giving a suggested syllabus of Religious Instruction which is in use in the Manchester Diocese. This gives details of courses for every year from the Babies' Class up to the top classes where scholars are fourteen or fifteen years of age.

"The aim" of Miss Hetty Lee's book "is to provoke thought." It will certainly do so. It will also rouse a good deal of distress to many minds. Miss Lee accepts the position of the Higher Criticism and (apparently) much of the teaching of Christian Science and Spiritualism. She recommends Mrs. Eddy's Book *Science and Health* for study. "Our only written records of the Master come to us through the imperfect medium of erring though devoted disciples" (p. 30). We must therefore be prepared for mistakes, and must fearlessly reject some of the stories as "incomprehensible accounts." "The standard test for us teachers, as to the credibility of any Gospel or record, must lie in the compatibility of the particular event or saying in question with our general impression of our Lord's personality and teaching." Anything that does not reveal Him as Infinite Love—*according to our conception*—must be regarded as an incomplete or erroneous report. A large part of the Old Testament receives very severe handling. Miss Lee describes the sacred volume as "the tangled and confused mass of

parable and fact, legend and history, prose and poetry, through which the perplexed teacher is to make his way" (p. 68). "Many of these Old Testament stories do serious harm to our children," as told by the simple believer. Any story that does not reveal God as acting in tender and infinite love to man and beast must not be taught to very young children, and must never be taught as true at any time. "Such stories as Noah's Ark, the Tower of Babel, Adam and Eve," are "myths" and ought not to be taken in the religious but in the weekly or daily 'story hour,' with other myths from other lands" (p. 82).

Concerning the growing belief in Spiritistic Phenomena Miss Lee asks, "May not such beliefs and convictions lead the thoughtful teacher to find new reality and credibility in the Gospel accounts of the Transfiguration on the Mount, the Ascension, the Resurrection, the Conversion of St. Paul on the Damascus road?" (p. 17).

One chapter is devoted to "The Problem of Memory Work." The ordinary methods of learning the Catechism or Scripture are condemned. The child must only learn that which appeals to it and which it understands. "If our memorizing is to be 'religious,' it must be free from all force, dislike, drill, bribery, etc. . . . Our test question for any piece of memory work as a means of religious teaching is: Will it be done by the child without compulsion, dislike, drill, bribery? If so, it is right; if not, it is wrong" (p. 116). The same is true of Expression Work. "There must be no force, no compulsion, no bribery." In fact Miss Lee would abandon for ever all physical force from the school. There must be no such punishments. The cane ought to go to the museum. "The sword will not disappear from the nation while we whip our children in the nursery and cane them in the schoolroom" (p. 145). The Christian method of dealing with offences is one of unlimited mercy and forgiveness.

In the last chapter on "The Child's Unrealized Universe" the author endeavours to awaken in teachers and parents a conception of the infinite possibilities that lie in every child *without exception*, and she believes that only by the adoption of some such methods as are outlined in the book can these possibilities find adequate expression and become realities.

It is a bold and daring book. It will be of practical interest to learn the actual results where its principles are put into operation for a lengthy period and to compare such results with those obtainable under the best teachers of the older methods.

IMMORTALITY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

IMMORTALITY AND THE UNSEEN WORLD: a Study in Old Testament Religion. By W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. London: *S.P.C.K.* 12*s.* 6*d.*

Dr. Oesterley is an acknowledged authority on Old Testament problems, more especially those problems which arise out of a study of the post-Exilic literature: hence a volume from him is sure to

be well worth study. But we venture to think that he is a little *too* prolific, and that his recent books suffer somewhat in consequence. This last volume is a case in point: despite its learning, it seems to us a trifle thin in places. Many problems are raised, to be partially dealt with, it is true, but not with the fullness of treatment that so important a subject demands. Hence one lays down the book with a feeling that an adequate solution to the vexed question of Immortality in the Old Testament has not been given us.

After some preliminary observations, Dr. Oesterley proceeds to lay some stress on the fact that inconsistent ideas on Immortality are found in the pages of the Old Testament. No doubt there is such inconsistency. We do well to remember that the Old Testament is a literature, not one homogeneous book; although it is only fair to point out that some at least of these "inconsistencies" are more apparent than real. The remarkable thing about it is that the "divine library of the Old Testament"—written as it was at varying periods and by men whose outlook on the world was often so different—should contain so much that is all of a piece.

After dealing with the Old Testament teaching on the constituent parts of man (pp. 12–20), Dr. Oesterley passes on to consider belief in supernatural beings; this he does in three chapters: (*a*) The Demonology of the Semites, (*b*) The Demonology of the Old Testament, (*c*) Angelology. We are then introduced to a discussion of the Spirits of the Dead and their abode; next to ancestor worship and the Cult of the Dead, combined with a section on Necromancy—the least convincing part perhaps of the book; lastly to mourning and burial customs. In the two final chapters Dr. Oesterley deals with the doctrine of Immortality. In these chapters he maintains that the belief in Immortality as "the normal lot of man" existed from the earliest days in Israelite religion; it was, he says, always the popular belief, and it is probable that the official exponents of religion in later days (the "Yahwists") believed this too in a vague kind of way. It will be noticed that the writer postulates a contrast between "Yahwism" and the popular creed, much in the same way as scholars detect a sharp distinction in Greek theology between the popular cult of Demeter and the Chthonian deities, and the official "Olympian" cult. This may be true, partially; but not too much stress should be laid upon it. No doubt the discipline of the Exile did much to emphasize the individualist side of Judaism; but to say—as it is said—that, previous to the Exile, Immortality was conceived of only as national and not individual, is to assume a great deal. Despite all appearances to the contrary, right through the Old Testament (we believe) runs the golden thread of a belief in Immortality; what happened after the Exile is that this belief received a new formulation, and an added force.

Dr. Oesterley assumes throughout the truth of the advanced "Critical" view of the Old Testament, which is, after all, a theory, not a demonstrated truth; and at any moment some fresh discoveries in the Near East may profoundly modify the critical view.

We are not disposed to accept all Dr. Oesterley's exegesis, even

where, at first sight, it appears to be conclusive. One example must here suffice: it is connected with one of the most famous incidents in the Old Testament, the story of the Witch of Endor. Surely the whole point of the narrative is this: the witch, accustomed to fraud-practices in her mediumistic methods, expected so to hypnotize Saul as to induce a *belief* that Samuel appeared. But what appeared was not a mere wraith, but the prophet himself. Hence her loud cry. "And when she saw Samuel she cried with a loud voice"—terrified, as well she might be: she had indeed expected to materialize a phantom-form, and her terror arose when she saw that it was Samuel himself. Dr. Oesterley gets rid of this interpretation however by reading (conjecturally) Saul for Samuel, and explains that her fear was due to the fact that she feared to be punished for breaking the law by indulging in forbidden practices. Dr. Oesterley may, of course, be correct in his conjecture; but a conjecture it is, and *not* the reading of our text. Again: he interprets "Elohim" as meaning Samuel; but the plural is a difficulty, and it is quite conceivable that—if we allow that, for a special purpose, the real soul of the prophet had actually been allowed to return—the word means "gods," *i.e.*, a cohort of attending angels charged with the duty of escorting "Samuel" from his abode in Sheol (cf. the words "why hast thou disquieted me?" viz., why caused me to return to this mundane scene from the peace and rest of the intermediate state). *Sed haec hactenus.*

Dr. Oesterley has written an interesting book, and we wish fully to acknowledge this; and it is a scholarly book, well furnished with references to recent literature; but it is not wholly satisfying.

In another edition we should suggest that an Index of Biblical Texts be added: it would materially add to the usefulness of the book for reference. Secondly, some notice should be taken (in the purely "Semitic" sections) of Mr. Campbell Thompson's learned and instructive work on Babylonian magic; that book would supply Dr. Oesterley with not a few corroborative parallels.

A STUDY IN ESCHATOLOGY.

THE OTHER SIDE OF DEATH: a Study in Christian Eschatology. By R. G. Macintyre, M.A., D.D. London: *Macmillan & Co.* 8*s.* 6*d.*

Many attempts, ancient and modern, have been made to cover the field of Christian Eschatology; but none that we are acquainted with covers it in a more satisfactory fashion than the present. The doctrine is restated here with knowledge, with great reverence, and with skill. The tone of the book is admirable: the writer can attack competing or antagonistic systems effectively yet with Christian charity; he knows how to put forward his own solution of difficulties with vigour yet with urbanity. With the general question of Immortality he does not profess to deal, but only with those aspects leading up to and embraced within the Christian Revelation. Prof. Macintyre, as a whole-hearted believer in the

truth and adequacy of that Revelation—with its doctrine of Christ's atonement as its centre—is anxious to tell "troubled souls" (and many to-day are sadly perplexed and troubled) what the Bible has to say and what are the great principles it enunciates. Very aptly he remarks that, if people are left without some clear and definite teaching on so vital a point as the implication of Death, they will become the prey of Spiritism or—even worse—those fatal forms of latter-day Theosophy which appear to exercise so strange a fascination upon those whose minds are neither rooted nor grounded in a knowledge of God. The doctrine of God is the writer's guiding principle—"the dominant note which gives coherence to the whole."

After three brief but helpful introductory chapters, (1) The Eschatology of Israel, (2) Yahwism and Immortality, (3) Apocalyptical Eschatology, the Professor devotes the remainder of his work to his proper theme, the Eschatology of the New Testament. It is not easy to sum up his teaching in a few lines; it is too full of important matter to be dealt with cursorily; but, briefly, we may say that of the three great competing systems, (*a*) The eternal suffering of the wicked, (*b*) Universalism, (*c*) Potential (or as some people prefer to call it "Conditional") Immortality, he decides, quietly yet effectively, for the last. Let it not be supposed that Prof. Macintyre's view involves any minimization of sin: far from it! In his hands, the doctrine of Potential Immortality becomes an urgent appeal to all humanity to have done with easy-going delusions and facile optimism in regard to Death and the Hereafter, and to accept the salvation so freely offered by God through Christ. Indeed, we have never read a more earnest appeal. In any case, whether we accept the author's argument or not, we should do wisely to read and ponder this admirable work—so persuasive, so moderate, so full of the spirit that should actuate all who profess and call themselves Christians.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

DR. SCOFIELD'S LIFE STORY.

THE LIFE STORY OF C. I. SCOFIELD. By Chas. G. Trumbull. *Oxford University Press.* 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

"The Scofield Reference Bible," since its first publication in 1909, has attained a world-wide circulation. It has been of great help to missionaries, preachers and Bible students in practically every country. Not only are there editions in the English language, but translations have been made into several foreign tongues. The editor, Dr. Scofield, has received expressions of gratitude from men of all types, who have been helped by the chain references, the simple definitions of the great words of Scripture (as adoption, atonement, election, predestination, etc.), the short introductions to the various books, the analytic summaries of the teaching of Scripture on all the important subjects—and other features. For Bible Readings and for Bible Classes the book is invaluable. Those who have learnt to value this unique Bible will naturally be interested

to know something of the story of its origin and production, and also of the life of the editor. Mr. Trumbull has endeavoured to tell that story. He has known the Doctor for six years. The book, however, is somewhat disappointing. First of all the price (10*s.* 6*d.*) seems excessive for such a small publication of only 138 pages. Next, there is no introduction or preface to tell how "The Life Story" came to be written. Only towards the end of the book (p. 116) do we discover that it is mainly a reprint of some articles which appeared in the *Sunday School Times*, of which Mr. Trumbull is the editor. From the first, however, one assumes something of this kind. The story is disjointed and irregular, and there are so many unnecessary repetitions of certain facts that one feels that the biography was not written for this book. A preliminary explanation would save the reader much irritation. Better still would it be if the book were carefully re-written with no trace of its serial publication. The subject deserves more careful and detailed treatment.

Cyrus Ingerson Scofield was born August 19, 1843, in the Southern States. The birth cost the mother's life. Just before she passed away she prayed earnestly that the child might be spared to become a minister of the Gospel. This fact was kept from him, and was never revealed until after his decision in 1882 to devote his life to the service of God in the ministry of His Church. As a boy he was most studious and fond of research. In early life he took up the profession of a lawyer and was called to the Bar. He was remarkably successful, but he yielded to the temptations of his environment and gave way to drink. In 1879 he was converted in his own office, and "instantly the chains were broken never to be forged again—the passion for drink was taken away." He soon began to work for the Master and to try to win other souls. Later he gave up his legal profession and became Pastor of a church at Dallas. From there he went to Moody's Church at Northfield. In all details he endeavoured to maintain a high Christian standard, and would only accept money for the support of the work from "God's children, taking nothing of the Gentiles." The Bible was his constant study, and his expositions became famous until he was led to start the "Scofield Bible Correspondence Course." His creed can be gathered from one he composed himself for a Mission he was instrumental in originating and financing. "We believe in one God, revealed as existing in three equal persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit; in the death of Jesus Christ for our sins and true substitute; in salvation by faith alone without works; in good works as the fruit of salvation; in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as verbally inspired in the original writings; and in a future state of unending blessedness for the saved and unending conscious suffering for the lost."

The Reference Bible was begun in 1902 and occupied seven years. For a time he tried to combine the work with his pastorate, but at last, after two illnesses, had to devote himself entirely to the production of his *magnum opus*. The illnesses and some other

misfortunes are attributed by the writer to the direct attacks of Satan in order to frustrate the publication of the work. The preliminary researches were steeped in prayer. Scholars at several universities were consulted on exegetical difficulties. Indebtedness is acknowledged to Professors S. R. Driver, W. Sanday, A. H. Sayce and S. Margoliouth. "More than once . . . he spent a week on a single word, determined to know the facts before permitting himself to come to any conclusion" (p. 104). The correcting of the proofs was a laborious work. The Doctor and his wife toiled from about 5 a.m. each day until it was too dark to see at night. At last it was finished and sent forth to the world, where undoubtedly it has been instrumental in bringing joy and new life to thousands of the servants of God, who are also lovers of the Word of God.

In spite of the drawbacks mentioned above, we welcome these glimpses into the life of such an earnest, devoted student of the Divine Revelation, who has been of real service to the whole Christian Church.

INFLUENCE OF PURITANISM.

THE INFLUENCE OF PURITANISM ON THE POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS THOUGHT OF THE ENGLISH. By the Rev. John Stephen Flynn, M.A., B.D. London: *John Murray*. 12s. net.

We apologize for a somewhat belated notice of this most excellent book, but it is far too important to be passed over altogether. Three years ago we were glad to welcome from Mr. Flynn a book which whetted our appetite. It was his volume, *Cornwall Forty Years After*. His present volume gives a general review of the Influence of Puritanism on the Political and Religious Thought of the English.

It is very easy, of course, for any one to make jibes at Puritanism. No other movement since the Reformation, says Mr. Flynn, has been more exposed to unfriendly criticism. But while Mr. Flynn does not attempt to justify the glaring blemishes which made Puritanism unpopular, he suggests that there is a "need for a fresh treatment of the subject, presenting the movement in a juster light than that in which it commonly appears." And so he has taken up the pen.

The whole ground has been carefully examined by him. He has freely used the well-known authorities—*e.g.*, among the earlier writers, de Rapin and Neale (Daniel Neal?—in the index, Mr. Flynn has "J. M. Neale"); and, among later writers, Macaulay, Green, Gardiner, etc. He also has had access to several little-known political pamphlets of the period, which, by the courtesy of Viscount Clifden, he examined. These, with many well-known works, have formed his chief authorities. For the Puritan spirit he has gone to the Puritan writers themselves. He has thus been able to write with full historical knowledge.

But it must not be imagined that this volume is in the form of a historical treatise. On the contrary, Mr. Flynn decided to cast his work in such a form that, by its brevity and popular style, it might commend itself to many readers who might be repelled by a more

exhaustive and ponderous treatise. Hence it is that we have a most readable as well as informing volume, written in a racy, interesting style, and brimming full of witty sayings and shrewd remarks.

The book presents some twenty chapters on various aspects of Puritanism. There is no elaboration of historical detail, nor is there any necessary observance of chronological order. What Mr. Flynn has given us is an attempt at appreciation of general tendencies: he has sought, he says, not to give a historical treatise, but rather "sketches of an impressional character." Thus he takes up its Religious Tendencies; its power in Parliament; its Home Life; its Relation to Art and Literature. There are chapters on Baxter and Bunyan; The Puritan as Educationist; The Evangelicals; The Freedom of the Press; Puritanism in the Twentieth Century. This selection will be sufficient to indicate the nature and scope of the book.

In his treatment of the subject, Mr. Flynn has tried to relate it to the present age. Hence throughout the work we get many modern touches—*e.g.*, references to the Labour Party (for which he is rather enthusiastic); the Factory Acts; Ireland of to-day; the Tractarian Movement; the present position in Education, etc. Many of these references are shrewd and full of wisdom; some, however, seem to us rather too hasty generalization. But all of them greatly add to the general interest of the volume.

We heartily welcome this work, particularly as tending to put Puritanism in a more favourable light. Mr. Flynn has written with full knowledge, and he does not hesitate to express his opinion when it is in opposition to views generally received. We are quite sure that this volume will give the general reader a more real idea of Puritan Influence in England. So interestingly is it written that no reader who takes up the book will be able to rest till he has completed the whole. It is eminently a work which should be in the hands of all Churchmen who desire to have a knowledge of the influences which have shaped Church and State in England.

DR. McNEILE'S ADDRESSES.

HE LED CAPTIVITY CAPTIVE. By A. H. McNeile, D.D. Cambridge: *W. Heffer & Sons.* 3*s.* net.

This is another of Professor McNeile's helpful books. It contains fifteen short chapters, most of which were addresses given at Quiet Days. The last chapter is a reprint of a paper read at the Leicester Church Congress in 1919, and is entitled "The Gospel of the Holy Spirit." In the opening chapter on "Christ's Intercession," Dr. McNeile deprecates localizing Heaven. "Heaven is not a place; it is oneness with God. We are all in Heaven at this moment in proportion to our oneness with God." "We are in Heaven in proportion to our holiness and love." Psalm lxviii. 18, together with St. Paul's quotation in Ephesians iv. 8, form the basis of the first eight chapters. The remainder of the book (except Chap. XV) deals in a parabolic form with the story of the Apostles Peter and

John being sent by our Lord to prepare the Passover (St. Luke xxii. 8–13). Many of the passages are very heart-searching, and are meant so to be. "Let us burn this fact into our souls; burn it in so that it hurts" (p. 66). The last chapter but one, on "The Law of Liberty," is one of the best, and contains some modern illustrations of a helpful and illuminating character. The book is written in a lucid style, and, being small and light, would be most useful to lend or give to any one prevented from attending Church on account of illness. One address shows the spiritual value of suffering.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND THE PENTATEUCH.

THE PROBLEM OF THE PENTATEUCH: a new solution by archæological methods. By the Rev. Prof. Kyle, D.D., LL.D. (Archæological Editor of the *Sunday School Times*). London: *Robert Scott.* 8*s.*

This book is one that requires a good deal of careful study: it is packed with details and references, and cannot be read in an easy chair. The advocates of the Documentary theory will be obliged to deal with it, for it is hardly a book to be overlooked. The trouble is that the Documentary theory has so far imposed itself on the minds of students that it has become a prepossession: it is difficult to get them to revise their judgments. Yet it is not to be presumed that the critics have made out a case that cannot admit of revision: it is still a theory, at most a high probability, and therefore not a fact to be finally accepted without demur. At any moment new facts may be brought to light which will considerably modify that theory. Prof. Kyle in his book believes that he has, by his investigations, helped to establish the trustworthiness of the Pentateuchal records *at their face value.* It is a large claim, and it will have to be (or ought to be) impartially considered. Prof. Kyle's book will be helpful in enabling reasonable men to come to some conclusion consonant with *all* the facts of the case: and what we need to-day is to take *all* these facts into consideration.

THE PLAN OF THE DIVINE ARCHITECT. By Rev. J. H. Townsend, D.D. *Marshall Brothers, Ltd.* 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Dr. Townsend belongs to a little group of expositors to whom the Church owes a very special debt of gratitude because they keep before us the ultimate and the permanent and in particular the Return of the King. In this book he has drawn attention to the plan that is outlined in that section of St. Matthew that extends from chapter xxi. 28 to xxv. 46, with special reference to chapter xxiv. 4–44—indeed the rest he calls the "outworks," but he regards this as the Citadel and the most important. These seven short but illuminating chapters are worthy of prayerful study by those who would understand where these perplexing days we live in come in the Divine scheme of things.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

Confirmation.

WHY should I be Confirmed? Can I be a Christian without being Confirmed? What is the meaning of Confirmation? These are questions often asked, and many books and pamphlets have been written in answer. One of the latest, *Confirming and Being Confirmed*, 1*s.* 6*d.* net, by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, B.D., Rector of Bradfield, is admirable in its clear, forcible and scriptural teaching. As the Bishop of Liverpool says in a preface, it will help three classes of people: (1) the young clergyman in the preparation of his candidates. It will give him the right tone, useful matter, and telling illustrations; (2) adult candidates for Confirmation who need some full and arresting account of the nature of the promises they are about to make; and (3) if it fail entirely to convince those who are not members of the Church of England of the meaning, nature, object, and value of Confirmation, it will at least remove prejudices and give occasion for serious thought.

Confession.

The practice of Confession is being very energetically spread by a number of clergymen, and it is being introduced into many parishes practically without protest. It is by no means uncommon for us to receive particulars of newly appointed Vicars insisting on all workers in the Church confessing to him, and making it obligatory to go to the Confessional before Confirmation and marriage. Before yielding to this practice all who wish to be true to the Church of England should inquire whether it can claim the authority of Scripture, or the example of the early Church. They should also make themselves acquainted with the light thrown upon the practice by history, and the practical consequences of the system. It cannot be too strongly urged upon Church people to educate themselves in this way. If they do they cannot but be convinced that few greater injuries can be done to the English Church, and the English people, than the re-introduction of a practice so condemned in the past. We urge the circulation of *The Confessional*, by Canon F. Meyrick, a new edition of which has been published with a preface by the Dean of Canterbury at 3*d.* The method adopted by the author in dealing with the questions arising from this subject is historical, and, as he says, this in the present case proves that the finest and noblest ages of the Church were entirely free from the benumbing influence of auricular confession and absolution which was laid as a yoke on the neck of Christians in the thirteenth century by the most arrogant of the Popes of Rome. Two smaller manuals may also be recommended: *Confession—As Taught by the Church of England*, by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, B.D. (1*d.* net), especially written to show what the teaching of the Church of England actually is in distinction to the teaching of the advocates of Confession in the Church; and *Confession* in the Church Leaflet series (½*d.* or 3*s.* per 100), which gives quotations from the various revisions of the Prayer Book indicating the importance of the changes, and the real meaning of the instruction as it appears in the Communion Service and the Visitation of the Sick in our present Prayer Book.

In view of the recent introduction of Eucharistic Vestments into Winchester Cathedral, and the activity shown by advocates to introduce them into

Vestments. parish churches, it may be useful to name the following pamphlets on this subject, and to recommend them for distribution—*What Vestments are Legal in the Church of England?* by Sir Edward Clarke, recently revised, and a third edition issued at 2*d.* net, or 14*s.* per 100, giving particularly and forcibly a statement of the historical position of the law as it at present stands in regard to the matter; and *Eucharistic Vestments*, by the Rev. The O'Shea, and *Shall the Vestments of the Roman Mass be used in the National Church?* by Mr. W. Guy Johnson, at ½*d.* each, or 3*s.* per 100, both of which are suitable for more general distribution.

The National Assembly. The Parochial Church Councils (Powers) Measure recently passed by the Assembly will probably receive the Royal Assent next month and become law. Immediately this is the case it is proposed to publish the Measure with an Introduction and Notes by Mr. Albert Mitchell, who so ably did a similar service in connection with the Enabling Act. The pamphlet is now being prepared and will be published at 6*d.* net, 8*d.* post free. Orders can now be booked in order to secure delivery immediately on publication.

Three Pamphlets. Three pamphlets have recently been published of particular importance in view of recent controversies. One published by the Bible League is by the Rev. A. H. Finn on *The True Value of the Old Testament* (6*d.* net) and is a report of a lecture recently given at Caxton Hall. It is printed with the introductory address of the Dean of Canterbury who presided. The second pamphlet is called *Satanic Counterfeits of the Second Advent*, by D. M. Panter, and is also published at 6*d.* net. It contains five chapters on *Christadelphianism*, *Millennial Dawnism*, *Christian Science*, *Mormonism*, and *The Order of the Star in the East.* All these schisms have active propagandists working throughout the country, and the five papers included in this pamphlet contain a forcible warning. They are written by one who has made it his aim to know that he may warn. The third pamphlet is of a rather different nature, and is by the Rev. James Holroyde, Vicar of Patcham, Brighton. It is entitled *Two Lessons Well Learnt* (9*d.* net), and the author aptly and interestingly answers the questions which he asks—"What is the test? What are the marks by which a living faith and a real obedience should be tried? Are there marks intended always to 'accompany salvation,' the absence of which indicates a deficiency, and possibly an unreality, in the professor of Christianity?"

The Spirit of Unrest. A report of the papers read at the eighth London Meeting of Lay Churchmen held at the Church House on February 12 has been issued, price 1*s.* net, post free. The subject chosen for this year's Conference, *The Spirit of Unrest: its Origin, Meaning and Remedy*, was most timely. It is the one subject uppermost in the minds of all, and the papers read were courageous, wise and effective. Professor Beresford Pite opened the Conference with a general survey, and he was followed by Mr. Martin H. F. Sutton on the Spirit of Unrest in the World; Sir William Joynson-Hicks, Bart., M.P., followed with a paper on the Spirit of Unrest in the Nation; Mr. G. A. King, M.A., on the Spirit of Unrest in the Church, and Mr. J. Gurney Barclay, M.A., on the Spirit of Unrest in the Mission Field. The following papers read in former years are still obtainable at 9*d.* post free, *The Layman and Common Prayer*, papers of particular importance, and useful at the present time when the question of Prayer Book Revision will shortly be before the National Assembly, *The Word of God*, and *The Second Advent of our Lord.*