

THE

CHURCHMAN

JANUARY, 1892.

ART. I.—CHRIST'S KNOWLEDGE.

ANY controversy that seems to derogate from the honour and glory of our Lord must excite thoughts that are painful to any Christian mind. Of late a warm discussion has arisen concerning both the quality and the quantity of the knowledge possessed by Jesus Christ in the days of His sojourn in the flesh. Some who have taken up the question, it may be, are simply desirous of increasing in our minds a sense of the perfect sympathy which Christ has for His people, by bringing Him down more to the level of our weaknesses and our wants, our mental trials and perplexities. Others, assuming that He, as man, did not know more than those that surrounded Him, would lead us to believe that His acquaintance with such subjects as science and criticism was limited by the education He had received in the same way as others of the same age, station, and locality, and, therefore, that His sayings, which involve reference to such questions, are not authoritative or necessarily exact—His infallibility comprised only piety and morals. And some there are who seem as if their object was to lower the Lord altogether to the standard of ordinary humanity, by implying that when He took on Him our nature "He emptied Himself" of Deity altogether, with all the attributes, powers, and properties of Deity. He became man in such a sense that He ceased to be God; or if they would shrink from making this startling confession in plain words, at all events, He ceased to retain any of the activities of the Godhead. They were in suspense and quiescence.

The doctrine which has sprung up of late, both inside the pale of the Church and among the various Christian communities, appears to be the exact converse of the heresy of

Eutyches, which was condemned at the General Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451). He held that the two natures of God and man were united in our Lord, but afterwards the latter was entirely absorbed by the former, so that there remained in the glorified Christ only one nature—the Divine. The new school appears to adopt a contrary error, and to teach that when “the Word became flesh,” it was not the Deity that assumed humanity, according to the Catholic faith, but humanity the Deity, and, further, that the humanity absorbed the Deity, and only the humanity remained; and this humanity was subject to all the laws, the infirmities, and imperfections that belong to the nature of mankind. It would follow, according to this theory, that the perfect knowledge which is one of the attributes of Deity was so laid aside, so voided, that it might be compared to what any one of us might have known at one time, but forgotten at another. This strange heresy, for it deserves that name, is euphemized with a plausible gloss that this state of nescience or ignorance was voluntarily submitted to and assumed at the Incarnation, in order that He might be like to His brethren in all things.

Churchmen should possess a safeguard and a guide in their perplexities in the Athanasian Creed. We are taught to believe and confess that the Incarnate Lord is “perfect God and perfect man,” yet He is “not two, but one Christ.” And He is one, “not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking the manhood into God”; and the unity resulting is not by confusion or commingling of the substances which would make a third substance, neither perfect God nor perfect man, but is a unity of Person. Each nature, the Divine and the human, had its own properties, perfect and distinct, yet they were indissolubly bound together in the Person of Christ. Now, knowledge is an attribute of Deity and also an attribute of humanity—in the one it is full, immediate, perfect, eternal, unchangeable, and in the other, imperfect, dependent upon means, and capable of advance and increase.

These thoughts will tend to show us on the very threshold of our inquiry that before proceeding further a caution is necessary. In reading much of the current literature on the subject, there seems to be often a confusion in the use of the word *knowledge*. *Knowledge* with us means sometimes the power or capacity of knowing—the abstract, active attribute—and sometimes the things which are known, the concrete facts that have been treasured in the mind. It is commonly said that knowledge belongs to the person, and not to the nature; but a little explanation appears to be required here. Much depends upon the sense in which the word is used. The power or capacity of knowledge is a property which dwells

in all living creatures in a graduated scale, according to the nature of the class to which the creature belongs. This capacity varies in comprehensiveness with different kinds of creatures: the natural capacity of an ox differs from that of a horse, and both from that of a dog, and to this may also be added the amount of faculty which most animals possess of receiving training and acting in accordance with it. This shows certainly a capacity of knowledge. Knowledge must, therefore, in some degree belong to the nature, as it varies as a faculty and endowment both in quality and quantity in creatures of a different nature, and it is the nature that imposes the distinction, and enlarges or limits its scope. This power or capacity in man's nature is a talent of a high order, far-reaching in energy, effort, and extent. But, on the other hand, *knowledge*, in the sense of *things that are known*, belongs entirely to the individual, whatever grade it may occupy in the scale of creation, as this is the result of the application and use of the capacity—acquisition, education, training, observation, and experience. The former is an endowment, a natural gift to all of the same species; the latter is an accomplishment or attainment, which the individual of the species has gained by the use and exercise of the faculty.

Our Lord, as man, had the human capacity of knowledge, and it may fairly be postulated that He had this property in all its fulness, as much as human knowledge can perceive and penetrate in its highest conditions. But, further, our Lord, being the very Wisdom and Word of God incarnate, remained all that He was before His incarnation, in essence, in attributes, and powers, otherwise He would have ceased to be Divine—to be God; hence perfect and eternal knowledge, being a Divine attribute, was His in all its fulness. Perhaps we may suggest a comparison between this question and that of the two *wills* in Christ which engaged the sixth General Council held at Constantinople (A.D. 681). It was there decided against the Monothelites that as in the Lord there were two perfect and distinct natures, so there were two distinct *wills*, the Divine and the human; that these were never contrary to each other, but that the human will follows the Divine, and is subject to it, and is enlightened and aided by it. So it may be argued that, although will and knowledge are very different attributes, in our Lord there are two knowledges, the one properly pertaining to the Divine, and the other to the human nature, that these are never fused or mixed, but each operates in its own sphere; but as the manhood is taken into God, so the attribute of human knowledge is elevated, aided, and regulated by the Divine in the mystery of the unity of the Person, as was necessary for the accomplishment of the work which the

Father had given Him to do. The subject is, indeed, far beyond the comprehension of man, and yet Scripture brings it down to the level of our understanding in a very practical way, by furnishing us with examples of the use made of His knowledge in the Person of our Lord.

It occurred sometime since to the writer to collect out of the Gospels the passages where the knowledge of the Lord is distinctly referred to. For the sake of brevity it will be sufficient for our argument to refer more especially to those places where the word to *know* is found. By the evidence thus furnished we shall be able in some degree to form a conception of the nature of the knowledge possessed and exercised by our Lord Jesus Christ. It must be observed that there are two verbs in Greek which are generally rendered in our tongue by one word, *know*; but they are considered to differ in this respect, that one of them (*οἶδα*) signifies *natural, intuitive knowledge*, and the other (*γινώσκω*) *acquired knowledge*. The former may well be explained by "I know," and the latter by "I come to know." This distinction, however, does not appear to be universally observed, as there are instances where the rule is not applicable (see, *e.g.*, Luke xvi. 15 and John x. 15). In both these places *γινώσκειν* is used in connection with God the Father; and in the latter, the restricted meaning would hardly exhibit the reciprocal knowledge which the Son has of the Father. Much the same may be said of ver. 27; see also Matt. xi. 27, where *ἐπιγινώσκειν* is found. Several exceptions also will be seen in the following quotations.

The texts which refer to the *Divine* knowledge of our Lord claim the first attention. These are examples in which the knowledge alleged could not have been possessed except in a supernatural, a Divine manner:

Matt. ix. 2: "And Jesus *seeing* (*ιδών*) their faith."

Matt. ix. 4: "And Jesus *knowing* (*ιδών*, v. l. *ειδώς*) their thoughts."

Matt. xvi. 8: "Which, when Jesus *perceived*" (*γνοῦς*). This seems to have been supernatural knowledge, as it refers to the *thoughts* as well as the words of the disciples; but as Mark viii. 16 has *πρὸς ἀλλήλους*, it may be ascribed to human knowledge, on the ground that their thoughts were expressed in conversation.

Matt. xxii. 8: "But Jesus *perceived* (*γνοῦς*) their wickedness."

Mark ii. 5: "When Jesus saw (*ιδών*) their faith."

Mark ii. 8: "When Jesus perceived (*ἐπιγνοῦς*) in His spirit." This verb signifies *accurate knowledge*, and the words "in His spirit" determine the supernatural character of the knowledge.

Mark v. 30: "And Jesus immediately *knowing* in Himself" (*ἐπιγινούς ἐν ἑαυτῷ*). The same may be said as in the last instance.—N.B. *ἐν ἑαυτῷ* is strictly *personal*. The knowledge was personal and supernatural.

Mark xii. 15: "But He knowing (*εἰδώς*) their hypocrisy." The parallel in Matt. xxii. 18 (see above) is *γινούς*.

Luke vi. 8: "But He *knew* (*ᾔδει*) their thoughts."

Luke ix. 47: "And Jesus *perceiving* (*ιδών*) the thoughts of their heart."

Luke xx. 23: "But He *perceived* (*κατανόησας*) their craftiness." This word signifies complete perception. In Matthew the parallel has *γινούς* (see chap. xxii. 18, and Mark xii. 15, *εἰδώς*).

John i. 48: "Nathanael saith unto Him, Whence knowest Thou (*γινώσκεις*) me? Jesus answered and said unto him, Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig-tree, I *saw* (*εἶδον*) thee."

John ii. 24, 25: "But Jesus did not commit Himself unto them, because He *knew* all men, and needed not that any should testify of man, for He *knew* what was in man." In both places the verb *γινώσκειν* is used. The sense clearly demands that the knowledge should be regarded as intuitive, and not acquired.

John iii. 11: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, we speak that we do *know* (*οἶδαμεν*), and testify that we have seen."

John v. 6: "When Jesus saw him lie, and *knew* (*γινούς*) that he had been now a long time in that case." The sense here must be supernatural, for no one had told the Lord the particulars of this man's suffering.

John v. 42: "But I *know* (*ἔγνωνκα*) you, that ye have not the love of God in you." Here, again, the knowledge must have been Divine, for God alone searcheth the hearts.

John vi. 15: "When Jesus therefore *perceived* (*γινούς*) that they would come and take Him by force," etc. This might be Divine or human knowledge, but it seems most probably the former.

John vi. 61: "When Jesus *knew in Himself*" (*εἰδώς ἐν ἑαυτῷ*). This is strictly personal and Divine knowledge.

John vi. 64: "For Jesus *knew* (*ᾔδει*) from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray Him."

John vii. 15, 16: "And the Jews marvelled, saying, How *knoweth* (*οἶδε*) this man letters, having never learned? Jesus answered them and said, My doctrine is not Mine, but His that sent Me."

John vii. 29: "But I *know* (*οἶδα*) Him, for I am from Him, and He sent Me."

John viii. 14: "For I *know* (*οἶδα*) whence I came and whither I go."

John viii. 55: "I *know* (*οἶδα*) Him (God)."

John x. 15: "As the Father *knoweth* (*γινώσκει*) Me, and I *know* (*γινώσκω*) the Father." This must be Divine knowledge. The verb cannot be used in its radical sense.

John xiii. 3: "Jesus *knowing* (*εἰδώς*) that the Father had given all things into His hands."

John xiii. 18: "I know (*οἶδα*) whom I chose."

John xvi. 30: "Now are we sure that Thou *knowest* (*οἶδας*) all things."

John xvii. 25: "O righteous Father, the world hath not *known* (*ἔγνω*) Thee, but I have known (*ἔγνων*) Thee, and these have known (*ἔγνωσαν*) that Thou hast sent Me." The same verb is used here with reference to the world, and to the disciples, and to our Lord. In the two first it must point to human knowledge, but in the case of the Lord it could not be meant that He had come to know the Father. Both verbs are used to signify Christ's supernatural knowledge (see above, chaps. viii. 14, and x. 15). It would seem to be used here to bring out both the comparison and the contrast between Himself and others.

John xviii. 4: "Jesus therefore *knowing* (*εἰδώς*) all things that should come upon Him." Here is a clear knowledge of futurity.

These passages containing verbs which specify knowledge are sufficient to show the absolute and perfect knowledge which was possessed by our Lord. We have restricted ourselves to the occurrences of these verbs, but every reader will remember how many examples are given in the Gospels of absolute and perfect knowledge displayed by our Lord, such as the history of the Samaritaness, His perception of the touch upon the fringe of His garment, the *stater* in the mouth of the fish, the exact description beforehand of His own persecutions and sufferings at Jerusalem, the signs of the destruction of that city, the place of preparation of the Passover, the ever-living memory of the act of anointing His feet, the denial of Peter, and the treachery of Judas. These and numberless other examples which will occur to the reader's mind corroborate the testimony of the texts that definitely declare the perfection and divinity of our Lord's knowledge. Neither can the knowledge possessed by our Lord be compared, much less identified, with that which illumined the prophets, as some have recently argued, because the knowledge of the Lord, as being one with the Father, comprehends and unfolds the eternal past as well as the proximate and eternal future; and further, the Lord claims this knowledge as His own proper prerogative, whereas

the prophets declare that their knowledge was derived from the revelation and inspiration of God—a borrowed light, a gift received.

In searching for passages that refer to the human knowledge in our Lord, as contrasted with and distinct from the Divine, it is surprising that so few are to be found, we might almost say none, containing the verbs which definitely signify to *know*, though one or two cases may be doubtful; but there are other passages which are claimed as belonging to the category of human knowledge, such as those that relate to our Lord's inquiry for information, or His receiving intelligence of certain facts, e.g., Matt. iv. 12: "When Jesus had *heard* that John was cast into prison" (see the same in ix. 12; xiv. 13). Again in Mark ix. 33: "He *asked* them, What was it that ye disputed among yourselves by the way?"

Luke viii. 30: "And Jesus *asked* him, What is thy name?"

Luke viii. 45: "And Jesus said, *Who* touched me?"

John vi. 5, 6: "He saith unto Philip, *Whence* shall we buy bread that these may eat?" This looks at first like an ordinary inquiry based upon ignorance and desiring information, but the context sets this aside: "And this He said to prove Him, for He Himself *knew* (*ᾔδει*) what He would do."

John xi. 17: "Then when Jesus came, He *found* (*εὑρεν*) that he had lain in the grave four days already."

John xi. 34: "Where have ye laid him?"

None of these passages contain either of the verbs to *know*, and all these passages, and others like them, have really little or nothing to do with the question, as such expressions are only used in the ordinary course of conversation or narrative, and imply nothing more than intercommunication, as may be seen by similar expressions in the Old Testament, where no doubt can exist as to the meaning—e.g.: "Where art thou?" (Gen. iii. 9); "I will go down and *see* whether they have done, etc." (xviii. 21); "Because the Lord hath *heard* that I was hated" (xxix. 33); and in the frequent expression that God *hears* prayer, though He knows our necessities before we ask Him.

One or two places may be doubtful, as John vi. 15: "When Jesus therefore perceived (*γινούς*) that they would come and take Him by force and make Him king." This may be attributed to Divine knowledge of the purpose of the throng, or it may be a natural and merely human conclusion from the excited appearance of the multitude.

One feature in this body of texts is certainly noticeable, that all the passages, except one or two of doubtful application, which contain the definite words for *knowledge*, set forth the knowledge of Christ as absolute, infallible, and exact—in one

word, *Divine*. Indeed, from the passages which speak categorically of Christ's knowledge, we should not gather the existence of a lower or limited knowledge at all; if such existed, acting independently, it must be sought for elsewhere. Hence from this inquiry thus far the only conclusion we can arrive at is that, as the manhood was taken into God, the human knowledge was so united with the Divine in the Person of Christ, though without mixture or confusion, that they were never used apart, and thus the knowledge which He possessed and exercised was full and perfect, and His authority, therefore, on all points final, infallible, and indisputable.

But although the texts which contain reference to the human knowledge, under the form of the verbs to *know*, are so few and fractional, or even undiscoverable, apart from the Divine knowledge, there are two passages in the Gospels which have been produced and pressed with no inconsiderable amount of zeal, as furnishing proof positive of limitation in the knowledge of our Lord when on earth. The first of these is Luke ii. 52: "And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour (or grace) with God and man." We have no desire to evade the force of this or any other testimony of Holy Writ; but it is a matter of importance to ascertain what was the intention of the writer, or, in other words, what is the truth. In order to get at the real meaning, we must consider the whole passage. The statement that Jesus was advancing (*προέκοπτε*) in wisdom creates the difficulty. We must therefore compare this with the other words with which it stands connected. "Jesus was advancing," we are told, "in stature" (or age). This was a fact that was visible to the eyes of all around Him. And He was advancing in favour with men; this was the impression made upon the minds of His friends and neighbours. Both these are parallel with each other, and both clearly refer to the evidence before the eyes of men. Now, the "favour or grace with God" was the cause of the favour with men, and this stands parallel with wisdom, an abstract and invisible attribute, which can only be made intelligible to us by its results. Thus it would appear that by the advance in wisdom we are to understand that, as Jesus developed in His physical frame before the eyes of men, so to their appreciation, in His mental powers He appeared to grow in wisdom as He gave evidence of His abilities. All is spoken in a general way, as an ordinary observer would express his impressions as he witnessed the remarkable youth growing up as a pattern of intelligence and piety. It may be observed that many writers of late, when quoting this passage, confound *wisdom* with *knowledge*, whereas the words are different both in form and meaning. That the above must have been the

intention of the Evangelist or of the Virgin Mary, to whom this portion of St. Luke's Gospel has been attributed, seems clear from a passage which stands in close connection with this verse. In ver. 47 we find the great teachers of the day "astonished at His understanding and answers." This entirely refutes, as all must admit, the limitation theory that Jesus knew only what could be gathered from His own surroundings, and that His knowledge was not above the ordinary level of a Galilean peasant, as it appears it surpassed that of the most learned Rabbis of Jerusalem when He was only twelve years of age. And that without having received the special training of their schools. On the other hand, is not the presence of supernatural knowledge here recognisable? and do we not find here an answer to the question which was afterwards raised by His neighbours, who knew what His education was and what it was not, "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?" (John vii. 15). Further, it is to be noted that the text tells us that "Jesus was advancing in favour (or grace) with God." "Grace with God" "and wisdom" are, as we have seen, in parallel connection with each other; but how could Jesus really increase in God's favour? How could the Father love or regard His Son more at one time than at another? The thought is impossible. But it is easy to conceive that as the fruits of God's grace and wisdom were ever increasingly manifested, as the time for His entering on His public career drew nearer, all men recognised and bore witness to the preparation that was being made to effect the redemption of the world.

The second passage is Mark xiii. 32: "But of that day and hour knoweth no man—no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." This is the passage which is most tenaciously held to prove the limited nature of the Lord's knowledge. When a text seems to any extent to be at variance with the rest of Scripture testimony, it demands the most careful investigation to see if the apparent meaning is really the true one. A doctrine which depends on a solitary text has always excited some hesitation. In this case the context must be carefully and candidly examined, and then search must be made to discover some parallel passage which may throw light upon the difficulty. The first thing that strikes us in the context, going back to the beginning of the chapter, is that our Lord certainly did possess and exercise on this occasion supernatural knowledge, and that of a most minute and accurate kind, when He predicted to His disciples that not one stone should be left upon another of all that gorgeous temple that reared its glories before their gaze. Moreover, when they asked Him what would be the sign when

all these things should be fulfilled, He informed them of a series of events concerning themselves, the Jewish people, the temple, the city, the setting-up of the abomination, the captivity, the banishment—matters many of which have all become history long ago. But to the question *when* the last things should be, our present passage was intended to be the reply. Now, if this is pressed by some to prove that Christ had only human knowledge, and that of a limited character, it is equally open to others to press the proof He gave of Divine knowledge in the preceding predictions, and to urge the reminder that one part of Scripture is not to be interpreted contrary to another. There must be a mode of reconciliation even in this place. Could any one of the disciples who asked the question have furnished such an answer as Jesus did? If not, why not? The only rejoinder possible is that the Lord possessed what they did not, a knowledge far above the reach of man. The discourse certainly contains an argument as valid for one as it does for the other. In the next place, we must prosecute a search for a passage which shall supply a similar statement. It is granted by most of the advocates of the limitation theory that after His resurrection the Lord resumed His attributes, which, they say, He had laid aside; but in Acts i. 6, 7, we find the Apostles coming to our Lord with practically the same question, for the manifestation of the kingdom and the second advent are contemporaneous events: "Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? And He said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, *which the Father hath put in His own power.*" It is to be remembered that Christ was now risen from the dead, and about to ascend into heaven. Any limitations to which he had been subjected were now removed, and yet His testimony on this point is precisely the same: "The Father put it in His own proper authority"—*ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ*. Further, in this passage there is a special emphasis of position given to the words rendered "It is not for you," *Οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστὶ*, at the beginning of the sentence which discloses the purpose of the secrecy. "It would not be good for you, or for mankind in any generation, to know the period of the Lord's return. Such knowledge would have the effect of curtailing, or even of cancelling, the duties of watchfulness and prayer." Comparing the two passages, both as to the times when and the terms in which they were uttered, the meaning of the former one can be no other than that which has been most widely adopted by the Catholic Church, that the secret of the exact date of the winding-up of God's dealings with men has not been entrusted to any ministering angel to disclose, nor even was the Son,

either in the depths of humiliation or on the summit of exaltation, commissioned to reveal this mystery. Our Lord has told us on other occasions that the words which He spoke were the words which the Father had given Him to speak ; and this one word, the date of His descent in glory, was, in the deep mystery of the union of Deity and humanity in the Person of Christ, not given Him to utter or make known. A distant comparison may be made between this and the case of St. Paul, who in his rapture heard and knew unspeakable words, and adds, "which it is not lawful for a man to utter" (2 Cor. xii. 4).

This interpretation satisfies all demands ; it removes difficulties, does not set one passage of Scripture against another, but yields a sense harmonious throughout ; for inasmuch as Christ was perfect God, and His Person was Divine, in His personal knowledge He must of necessity have known the day and the hour, the exact particulars of which He had already disclosed and defined, and so given proof of His omniscience ; but in His office of Teacher it was not in His function to make known that which the Father had not entered in the code of revelation which it was His purpose to consign to mankind.

There is a passage in St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians (ch. ii. 7) to which teachers of the limitation-school always have recourse : "He emptied Himself"—*Ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε*. It is astonishing to see how some people are satisfied the moment that a text is quoted. It does not seem to occur to some minds to ask here, "Emptied Himself" of what ? Is it of the Divine essence, or powers, or attributes, or of what ? The passage is perfect in its enunciations, hence the answer is ready. What does it say that Christ originally had ? *He subsisted in the form (μορφή) of God*. What was it He assumed ? *The form (μορφή) of servant, by becoming in the likeness of men*. What was it, then, of which Christ divested Himself ? It was the *form of God*. Now, *μορφή (form)* is the *recognisable* side of essential or intrinsic reality—that which makes it knowable to us. It must, therefore, be the external and intelligible tokens of the Deity of which the Lord divested Himself. The essence of Deity He could not lay aside, as this was His own very Self and Personality, the core and centre of His Being. Such an interpretation as severing Himself from Deity, though only for a time, involves a patent impossibility which would negative the whole testimony of Scripture on this doctrine, and nullify the Incarnation, as the Nestorians of old did, and set aside the work of redemption altogether. Neither could it be the Divine attributes or operations, as these were the necessary concomitants of Deity, which were manifested

throughout His earthly career. Neither could it affect the Divine knowledge, as Deity without omniscience would be no longer Deity. Further, without perfect knowledge how could He be a Teacher sent from God? how could He reveal the Father, and how be the Light of the world? Hence the only conclusion is that the "self-emptying" must refer to that which concerns the *form*, the recognisable and intelligible tokens of Deity. He unrobed Himself of the *insignia* of the Godhead, such as the glory which He had with the Father before the world was; the equipments of the Deity, which if exhibited would have compelled submission and belief, and rendered humiliation and death impossible; but the intrinsic and eternal qualities of Deity, with all the powers and attributes, knowledge included, remained unchanged and unchangeable, for "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever" (Heb. xiii. 8), "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Col. ii. 3).

It is to be feared that on some lips the "truly human life" seems to mean a truly human life *minus* the Divine life; but the creed of the Church has ever taught us to believe in the "truly human life" *plus* the Divine life and all that appertains thereto.

F. TILNEY BASSETT.

Dulverton Vicarage, October 28, 1891.



ART. II.—THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL QUESTIONS.

THE discussions and disputes in connection with labour questions during the last two or three years have extended far beyond the limits of the trades and communities more directly affected by them. There is, therefore, no impropriety, but rather the contrary, in the Church collectively and the clergy interesting themselves to some extent at least in the issues raised. Whilst I distinctly deprecate the clergy doing anything to lay themselves open to the imputation of being political partisans, I nevertheless see no reason why, in due and moderate measure, and on suitable occasions, they should not consider themselves, and invite their flocks to consider, some of the political and social problems of the day. I do not wish to be misunderstood herein, and therefore had better *préciser*, as a Frenchman would say, just what I mean and what I do not mean. I do not mean that they should indulge in advice, scolding, and denunciations from the "altar," such as are in vogue with the Romish priests in Ireland; nor do I mean that the clergy, under the pretence of preaching sermons, should indulge in pulpit deliverances in the nature of *Contemporary Review* articles, as do some of the Broad Church clergy.