

entirely with its brilliant but one-sided arguments, yet inasmuch as its criticisms arrest the attention of the reader and its high ideals inspire him, the most conservative of missionary leaders may hail the book as friend, not foe.

* * * * *

A need has long been felt for a well-written, inexpensive book dealing ably with the facts of missions, and likely to find favour with men not yet interested. Such a book has just come out in the Home University Library. "Missions: Their Rise and Development," by Mrs. Creighton, is likely to do lasting work. It is sane and convincing; its facts—only a small percentage out of the vast mass available—are well chosen and well arranged; the literary style, of course, is clear and forceful, and if one misses a touch of spiritual warmth one finds a sincere and well-based belief in the cause of missions which will carry conviction to many. It would not be easy to make a better missionary investment of a shilling than by buying a copy of this book to give to some friend as yet unenlisted amongst the supporters of the work. G.



Discussions.

[The contributions contained under this heading are comments on articles in the previous number of the CHURCHMAN. The writer of the article criticized may reply in the next issue of the magazine; then the discussion in each case terminates. Contributions to the "Discussions" must reach the Editors before the 12th of the month.]

ASTRONOMICAL EVIDENCE FOR THE DATE OF THE CRUCIFIXION.

(The "Churchman," June, 1912, p. 469, and September, 1912, p. 703.)

I REGRET that I have been unable to write on this subject for some months, as I have only lately recovered from the effects of a severe operation. The astronomical reasons adduced by Mr. Maunder in the June number of the CHURCHMAN appear to me to be very sound and clear, and thoroughly to meet the Rev. D. R. Fotheringham's objections to the visibility of the new moon of March 4, A.D. 29, at Jerusalem. Mr. Maunder is a trained astronomical observer, and one

accustomed to make practical use of the results of observations, one fundamental principle which he employs being to base results upon a large number of observations, not rejecting any of them unless there is proof of error. I fail to see how anyone with astronomical knowledge could follow Dr. J. K. Fotheringham in his attempt in the September CHURCHMAN to refute Mr. Maunder's arguments. Consequently it cannot be maintained that March 18, A.D. 29, is an impossible date for the Crucifixion from astronomical reasons.

Mr. Maunder, however, finished his communication by stating that, in his opinion, it is a serious difficulty to the acceptance of this date—March 18, A.D. 29—for the Crucifixion, that it makes the Passover come at a very early season—before the vernal equinox. The Rev. D. R. Fotheringham agrees with him on this point (CHURCHMAN, September, 1912), giving a simple assertion that this early date in the year is impossible.

But let us consider the evidences and the circumstances. The late Rev. H. Grattan Guinness¹ wrote: "It has been objected by some that if the Passover in A.D. 29 coincided with the full moon of March 18, it preceded the equinox by about three days. 'This objection will be seen to be of no moment, when it is considered that this very day, March 18, was regarded by the Western Church, prior to the Council of Nice, as the anterior Paschal limit.'² 'It is no insurmountable objection that this [date] was three days before the equinox, for we have seen from the preceding testimonies that a Jewish Passover was sometimes celebrated before the equinox, and, as Mr. Benson properly remarks, in the Mosaic law there is no injunction which refers to the equinox at all.'³

The Hebrew method of determining when to insert the necessary extra or intercalary lunar month was an exceedingly simple one, being dependent upon the condition of the crops in early spring. The year began at a new moon, and the particular new moon which was to be the first was determined as follows:⁴ On a certain day in the twelfth month of the year specimens of the earliest crops were sent to Jerusalem, when they were examined by a committee of three, appointed by the Sanhedrim; if the specimens were found to be forward, the next new moon was made the first day of the first month of the new year; if, on the other hand, the specimens did not give promise that the necessary barley in the ear would be furnished by the middle of the following month (Lev. xxiii. 10, 11), an extra or inter-

¹ "The Approaching End of the Age," pp. 534, 535. 1881.

² "Ordo Sæculorum: a Treatise on the Chronology of Holy Scripture," p. 55. H. Browne, M.A.

³ "An Epitome of the Civil and Literary Chronology of Rome," etc., pp. 525, 526. H. F. Clinton, M.A. He mentions that Epiphanius and the author of a Paschal homily on the works of Chrysostom state that the Passover was sometimes observed before the equinox.

⁴ "The Temple," etc., p. 200. Rev. A. Edersheim.

calary month was added to the old year, making a thirteenth, and the new year was not commenced until *another* new moon had appeared, twenty-nine or thirty days later.

This plan is in full accord with the command given to the Israelites when they were in Egypt (Exod. xii. 2, 18), that the first month of the year was to be the one towards the middle of which the barley was in the ear and the wheat not grown (Exod. ix. 31, 32) in that country.

As the climate of parts of the deep depression of the Jordan Valley approximates to that of Egypt, the specimens of the early crops were doubtless, in subsequent years, sent from the almost subtropical neighbourhood of the Palestinian river to the colder uplands of Jerusalem. This circumstance explains the very early season at which the Passover was sometimes held in Bible times. The ears of corn need not have been quite ripe, because the barley-fields of Egypt had not been reaped when all the crops were destroyed by hail and locusts only a few days before the first Passover (Exod. ix. 31 to x. 15).

After a careful consideration, therefore, of astronomical and calendar considerations connected with the subject, we must come to the conclusion that we cannot adduce any valid objections to the date March 18, A.D. 29, for the Crucifixion. On the other hand, when we reflect that this date is contained within the narrow limits possible from astronomical and calendar considerations, and that the weight of historical testimony very strongly supports it, we are bound to accept it as the year of the Crucifixion, because the evidences in its favour are very much greater than those for any other year.

G. MACKINLAY, *Lieut.-Colonel.*

“SOME THOUGHTS ON THE CHURCH OF INDIA.”

(*The “Churchman,”* October, 1912, p. 792.)

“AN Englishman in India” has every right to call to order an Englishman in England, if it is true that he makes trouble and “light-heartedly” leaves it to be faced by others, as your correspondent suggests; so perhaps an assurance to begin with, that the writer of the article in question would dearly love to have still the privilege of being an Englishman in India, may not be out of place. His sole purpose and desire is to try and serve that land where he would gladly have spent his life.

But apart from the expressions which your correspondent feels it necessary to use—and “who can refute a sneer?”—I am concerned with the two points which underlie his letter. First, he seems to deny the possibility of that event occurring to which he makes reference; and secondly, he disputes the wisdom of recognizing and stating the fact that, to some minds, the possibility appears even in the light of a probability in the remote future. As to the first point, no doubt much

might be said either way, but it is at least arguable that the divisions and mutual hatreds of early England, under heathen conditions, were as racially fundamental and as openly avowed as those which now afflict non-Christian India. And yet England began to become united and strong when once the native kings became in name, and in fact, Christian. I cannot help thinking that were we agreed on the depth and reality of the word "Christian," our differences of opinion would be somewhat composed. I "day-dream," if thus it may be called, of the time when the Face and Figure of our Lord Jesus Christ shall have won India's heart, when India shall be truly Christian, not at all of a time when the "grim," and rather unworthy, "story" of the "virgin" and the "rupee" can be quoted in serious argument. It *may* be that India's choice will for all time fall on England's king, but it may also be held, I trust without reproach, that India's millions may one day prefer a prince of their own blood.

But it is probably on the other point that the gravamen of the protest lies. It is stamped as "the folly of the unwise," "an airy castle of political and ecclesiastical fancies built in the study of an English vicarage," etc., to give any utterance to the possibility of such an event. I would call the attention of your correspondent to the following words of the Edinburgh Conference, which has had the very best opportunities of gauging the opinions of Indian missionaries. They summarize their investigations thus: "Whilst differences may exist among missionaries as to the proper *rate* of change, they are, on the whole, agreed that *a transfer of power to the natives of India* should proceed, *pari passu*, with their advance in enlightenment and moral stability" ("Missions and Governments," vol. vii. p. 34). I might urge, reasonably enough, that this plain and unquestioned statement as to the opinions of those well qualified to judge, is only pushed to its logical conclusion in matters political and ecclesiastical, in the passage criticized by your correspondent.

His illustration of the "growing lad" at first sight seems apt and impressive, but I really fail to discover any attempt in my article to impress upon that lad "the grand times he will have when he is freed from parental control," nor can I think that your readers will find me guilty of "sowing seeds of discontent and rebellion." I find a curiously exact statement of what I ought to do in the next sentence: "He is the true friend who encourages the lad to fit himself to enter into his parents' noblest aims." And I would continue the illustration by adding that sometimes our wisdom is not to withhold from the lad altogether the fact that one day he will have to act for himself. To make him believe that he will be in leading strings all his life tends to paralyze the faculties of mind and soul. To train to independence is the main purpose of a wise father in his dealings with his son, and he is seldom ashamed to own up to it.

But I can only add my earnest hope that the article may be at once

robbed of whatever interest attaches to these "gorgeous visions" (contained, by the way, in twelve lines), as your correspondent is good enough to suggest, if only some attention may be given to whatever of truth there may be in the remaining pages.

I heartily agree with "An Englishman in India" that "many a long year" will pass, probably more easily reckoned by generations, before England's work in India will be complete. And if that be so, perhaps it may be deemed premature to think or speak of it now. Certainly if the thought raises such indignation in the mind of *one* Englishman in India, and adds in the slightest measure to his difficulties already overwhelming, it had far best be left unspoken. But the meanwhile presents so many problems of practical and pressing interest, that I believe your readers would have welcomed more gratefully from your correspondent some further criticism of the remaining nine-tenths of the article, which doubtless he is fully qualified to give.

STUART H. CLARK.



Notices of Books.

THE REASON OF LIFE. By W. P. Du Bose, M.A., S.T.D. *Longmans*.
Price 5s. net.

Dr. Du Bose has given us some hard reading, and the plain man is sometimes constrained to rub his eyes and wonder where he is. We found the four or five chapters which follow the introductory one packed with difficult thoughts and needing the closest application on the reader's part. In the next half-dozen chapters we met with much more that appealed, and it seems to be here that the main theme of the book is worked out and "the reason of life" discovered. Christianity is seen to be a life, a life of Christ, a life like Christ's, a life of Christ in us. There is no "other life" save as a sequel to this, and our desire should be, not to go to Heaven, but rather to bring Heaven to us. Love is the fulfilling of all law, and is the "seminal principle" of life. By bringing Christianity into the common life we make Heaven out of earth, and in this happy service every individual member of the Church should be engaged, co-operating with God. A quotation from p. 118 is a fair summary of much of this central portion of the book: "The truth we are trying to carry along with us is, that life or salvation is not away from the natural to the spiritual, but through and by the natural into the spiritual. We are not to love God instead of our neighbour, or heaven instead of earth, but to love God in our neighbour, and make heaven out of earth. If we have not loved the visible, how shall we love the invisible?"

There are further seven chapters which again need careful following. We have such familiar doctrines as those of Imputed Holiness and Justification by Faith "properly and scientifically" demonstrated. The rival claims of the teachers of Divine Immanence and Divine Transcendence are tested and harmonized. God is both, just as Christ was seen to be both "Encosmic and Incarnate" in the early part of the book. Should we speak