

tionalists, and more than one mission field will welcome a visit from leaders experienced in educational work at home. Further, among the young mistresses there are many who may be led to offer themselves for personal service as missionaries.

* * * * *

The report of the British Board of Study for the Preparation of Missionaries for the year ending March 31 shows what real advance is being made in this most important scheme. A valuable Bibliography for Missionary Students has been issued (1s., Oliphant). A second Vacation Course for Missionary Training is planned to be held next August at Cambridge, that held last year at Oxford having been a complete success. A conference on the Training of Women Missionaries, held under the auspices of the Board at Selly Oak, near Birmingham, with a membership of fifty, has issued some suggestive "findings." Courses of lectures have also been arranged. The Board has found its field a wide one to survey, and its full uses are not manifest as yet, but we believe it has a large significance for the future.

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.]

"EVANGELICALS AND THE PROBLEM OF RITUALISM."

(The "Churchman," May, 1913, p. 352.)

As an Evangelical by tradition, who has strayed (or is supposed to have strayed) into the sacerdotal fold, and as one who has been keenly following these discussions, may I add a personal note? What was it that I could not find among the Evangelicals?

Not personal piety, as Mr. Norman Baptie suggests, for no school of thought has a monopoly of those who are the salt of the earth. Nor was it *lack* of ritual that alienated me. Rather it was the slovenliness, which also one not infrequently finds; say, a lack of due decency in the ablutions; a church untidy and locked during the week; the

faded flowers and the dust-sheet atmosphere, which is so unnecessary and so depressing. Again, it was the lack of definite Church teaching on the Sacraments, the Ministry, and the Church; the insistence on personal piety, almost to the exclusion of corporate religion. Surely we do not need a new Evangelical use to remove these.

But is one who has been brought up in a saintly Evangelical atmosphere ever lost, really, permanently to the Evangelical cause? Nay, the Evangelicals have but lent one of their party to teach others great truths.

The youth, because he is a youth, may go over with rather a hasty swing, and, for a time, designate as "Protty" much that he really holds sacred. But will you ever find him, at thirty, a member of the E.C.U. or the C.B.S.? Will you find him talking of "the Mass," and insisting on the Sacraments, to the exclusion of the Word? Will he ever lose his love of the Bible? Will he become a backboneless frequenter of the confessional? I trow not.

As he settles down and reads he will see that no party has a monopoly of truth, and that we have much to learn from each other. If he be ordained, you will find him proclaiming the old Evangelical Catholic Faith, and bringing out of his treasure things new and old.

ANGLO-CATHOLIC.

"EVANGELICALS AND THE PROBLEM OF RITUALISM."

(*The "Churchman," May, 1913, pp. 357, 359.*)

With reference to Mr. Herklots' suggestion to substitute the Comfortable Words for the Ten Commandments, was he not rather meaning the Beatitudes? For we have the Comfortable Words after the Absolution; and how would he bring in the Kyries?

The Kyries could easily be adapted as a congregational response to the Beatitudes, or to the shortened summary of the Decalogue in the Scotch and American Liturgies.

Again, with regard to his concluding suggestion of "scarf or tippet of rich black silk," why should we always be in mourning? The varied colour of the hood of one's University might be well maintained in the scarf or tippet, or the three English colours used alike for the holy table and the minister—red for most times, white for festivals and administration of the Holy Communion, and blue for penitential seasons.

I was once present at a baptism at a church in Torquay where the minister wore a reversible stole or scarf of black-and-white silk, which I at first thought was meant to harmonize with his Cambridge M.A. hood, but as he proceeded with the service I found he used it to symbolize the turning from darkness to light—the "death unto sin, and new birth unto righteousness."

W. S. BARKER.

“THE DECIDING VOICE OF THE MONUMENTS.”

(The “*Churchman*,” *March*, 1913, p. 239, and *May*, p. 387.)

Dr. Kyle has done me the honour of noticing my review of his book ; whether he has strengthened his position remains to be seen. He deals seriatim with my criticisms, and, at the risk of being tedious, I must briefly examine his replies.

1. With regard to the “*Encyclopædia Biblica*” and archæology, while it is quite true that the theme of the chapter is “the function of archæology in criticism,” his exact words about the work are: “The ‘*Encyclopædia Biblica*’ (Cheyne) has no article on either archæology or antiquities, nor is there anywhere in the work sufficient place given to the subject that it should be indexed.” I venture to think that to the ordinary reader, unacquainted with the “*Encyclopædia Biblica*,” this sentence would convey the view that, in Dr. Kyle’s words, “this great dictionary made little reference to archæological materials.” And Dr. Kyle fails to quote his own book correctly. He says: “On pp. 11, 12 I say, ‘Biblical *archæologists* generally . . . have not given this subject a place at all.’” In my copy of his book the charge is brought against “Biblical *encyclōpædist*,” a different class of people.

2. He most ingeniously turns the edge of my remark that the methods of literary and historical criticism have been applied to the Bible only *after* their value has been proved in other fields, by extending the terms of my reference. The “other fields” to which I referred were old literatures, apart from the Bible, such as the Homeric poems. I do not think that in the case of literatures about the origin and authorship of which we have ample evidence anyone would waste his time by unnecessary analysis ; but it is just in the case of such works as the Homeric poems, the authorship of which is only traditional, that there is very general agreement as to their composite origin, established by the same kind of analysis as has been employed on parts of the Old Testament. In this section he passes over the matter of historical criticism, but that may be dealt with next.

3. Dr. Kyle makes merry over my questioning of the exactment of his statement that certain archæologists have by their discoveries “shown the ghostly heroes to have been substantial men of flesh and blood.” I never questioned but that cities and walls were built by “substantial men of flesh and blood,” but his language is calculated to leave the impression that the individual heroes named in Greek legends about Troy and Crete have been demonstrated to be real personages. That, so far, is not the case ; and historical criticism, which welcomes all the aid that archæology can give, is still sceptical about the historical existence of the individuals named in early Greek story, not one of whom has received as yet attestation like that given in Egypt to Menes.

4. I need not dwell on the matter of the Hittite inscriptions, where Dr. Kyle pleads extenuating circumstances for an error of fact.

5. My positiveness as to the date of the entrance of the Hyksos into Egypt astonishes Dr. Kyle. It is true that I should, more strictly, have spoken of the establishment of their rule in that country; but, with this correction, I venture to think that my assertion is justified by two considerations:

(a) The date is fixed, not primarily by Cretan synchronisms, but, as I said in my review, by a definite astronomical datum—"the rising of Sirius [which] fixes the advent of the Twelfth Dynasty at 2000 B.C., with a margin of uncertainty of not more than a year or two either way" (Breasted, "History of Egypt," p. 22); and the length of that dynasty does not allow the domination of the Hyksos to begin before 1788 B.C.

(b) The view has rapidly won acceptance, not only in Germany (the papyrus making the statement is at Berlin), but also in England, and, as the above quotation shows, in America.

And Dr. Kyle has failed to note that when I speak of Khammurabi's date I only assert that the *latest possible* date of that king is 1958-1916 B.C. It makes no difference to my argument if the date be three centuries earlier; it would only make Dr. Kyle's position even more hopeless. All I was concerned to point out was that the latest possible date for Khammurabi was separated from the generally received date of the Hyksos by 140 years, and that therefore Abraham could not have been entertained "at the Bedouin Court in Egypt."

He protests against my criticism of his ethnographical arguments as "unjust," and says that as it is "almost entirely insinuation it is very difficult to reply to it." Let me be more explicit. Dr. Kyle claims to state facts, and asserts that *all* that archæology reveals as to the origin of the Sumerians is that they were not a Semitic people. He seems to have overlooked certain facts which go beyond this—the type of face in the portrait statues, the affinities of the language, and the forms of the earliest hieroglyphic writing (from which the later cuneiform sprang), all of which point, not to a Hamitic (*i.e.*, Ethiopian) origin, but to a Mongolian. The facts are not merely negative in their indications, but positive; and they point not towards, but away from, Dr. Kyle's theory. And, once again, Dr. Kyle is not quite accurate in his reference to his own work. He quotes from p. 196, where he states, quite correctly, that "the first Babylonian civilization, according to the Bible, was Hamitic, by a son of Cush"; but he claims that this is "everything that *I say on the subject*" (the italics are Dr. Kyle's), and yet on the next two pages (197, 198) he goes on to assume, without any qualification, that the early civilization of Babylon *was* Hamitic—a statement for which archæology gives him not a shred of support, but rather the opposite, and in these passages he goes beyond the assertion on p. 196, which he quotes as his last word on the subject.

In my review of the book I was constrained to say that it abounded in "loose reasoning and incorrect statements." Dr. Kyle has given me no reason to alter my opinion; rather has he confirmed it. In the four pages of his reply he has misquoted his own book, he has misquoted my review; he has quoted, as his final statement upon a point, words beyond which he makes a distinct advance in the two following pages; and he has obscured clear issues by irrelevancies. The deciding voice of archæology, whatever it may be, in the delicate problems raised by the literary and historical criticism of the Old Testament will need to be interpreted with a more rigorous accuracy and a clearer vision of the issues before it can hope to come to its own.



Notices of Books.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY ON ISAIAH. Vol. I., by Professor G. Buchanan Gray, D.D., D.Litt. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 12s.

The late Professor A. B. Davidson had undertaken to contribute "Isaiah" to this well-known series of Commentaries. His lamented death, in 1902, was an irreparable loss to all students of the Old Testament, for no other English scholar had so profoundly and sympathetically entered into the spirit of the Hebrew Prophets as he. The preparation of a commentary was then entrusted by the editors to two other scholars—Professor G. B. Gray, of Mansfield College, Oxford, and Professor A. S. Peake, of Manchester University. Professor Gray alone is responsible for the present volume, which consists of an Introduction and a Commentary on the first twenty-seven chapters. The author's wealth of scholarship, no less than his desire to be fair to those from whom he differs, is evident in almost every page. Nevertheless, many of his assertions about the date, the authorship, and the interpretation of crucial passages seem to us, on purely objective grounds, to be highly speculative and contrary to all historical evidence. We single out for examination a few of the assertions made in this volume, and, for the sake of clearness, will arrange them under separate headings:

I. THE CANONIZATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

We are told that the Canon of the Jewish Scriptures was fixed "about the end of the first century A.D." (p. 33). What evidence have we for such an assertion? Dr. Gray gives none, but refers us to standard books on the Canon, and evidently has in mind the so-called "Council of Jamnia." It is alleged that between the years A.D. 90 and 118, a "Council" of Jewish Rabbis was held at Jamnia (= Jabneh) to finally decide the Canon of the Old Testament. This is pure assumption. From the Talmud, our only authority, we gather the following facts: About the Fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70), Rabbi Yohanan ben Zaccai removed the Sanhedrin ("Council") from