

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

The Churchman Advertiser.

AUGUST, 1903.

ELLIOT STOCK'S NEW BOOKS.

In demy 8vo., handsomely printed in large type, and bound in cloth, price 7s. 6d. net.

KEY TO THE HEBREW PSALTER. By the Rev. GEORGE AUGUSTUS ALCOCK, Ethical Moderator and Graduate in Honours of Trinity College, Dublin.

A Lexicon and Concordance combined, wherein are all the Words and Particles which occur in the Book of Psalms, the verses in which to find them, together with their chief Inflections, Roots, etc.

"The amount of care and research which Mr. Alcock must have devoted to his task is little less than marvellous."—*Irish Times*.

"The work deserves the highest commendation."—*English Churchman*.

In foolscap 8vo., paper boards, price 3s. 6d.

ST. PAUL. Addresses delivered in London. By the Rev. ROWLAND W. CORBET, late Rector of Stoke-on-Tern, Author of "Letters from a Mystic of the Present Day."

"Mr. Corbet has evidently been a careful student of St. Paul, and of the expounders of his doctrine, the bearing of which in its personal, social and general, relations he discusses in a manner which by its earnestness cannot fail to command respect."—*Glasgow Herald*.

"A simple and suggestive exposition, from the point of view of Anglican Divinity, of the spiritual teaching in the Epistles commonly attributed to St. Paul."—*Scotsman*.

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 3s. 6d.

SERMONS OF THE AGE. Thirteen Sermons. By the Rev. T. MEREDITH WILLIAMS, B.A., Vicar of Llanarth, Cardiganshire.

"Mr. Williams treats the various topics embraced in this volume most skilfully. The whole volume deserves attention, and we hope it will have an extensive circulation."—*Llan*.

In crown 8vo., gilt lettered, price 1s. 6d. net.

THE WORK OF THE MINISTRY. Five Ordination Addresses. By the Rev. R. G. HUNT, M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Wolverhampton.

"A wise and timely contribution to the subject of pastoral training. Admirable in tone and spirit, thoroughly sane, and profoundly evangelical. The truth is put with great clearness and directness."—*Weekly Leader*.

In large crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 6s.

PREACHING and PREACHERS: Criticisms and Suggestions. By JOSEPH GOWAN.

"A quaintly interesting volume. Mr. Gowan has swept his net through many seas, and brings to land some interesting captures."—*S. S. Chronicle*.

"It is altogether one of the most thoroughly practical works on the subject we have read."—*The Rock*.

"Full of practical suggestions likely to be useful to preachers who are willing to accept friendly criticism."—*Liverpool Mercury*.

In demy 8vo., tastefully printed on thick paper, price 1s. net.

EVIL, NOT EVERLASTING. A Paper read in outline before the Rugeley Branch of the Society of Sacred Study. By Rev. OSMOND DOBBIE, M.A., of the University of Dublin, Prebendary of Lichfield, Vicar of Colwich.

"The author treats the subject in admirable spirit."—*Christian Commonwealth*.

In paper cover, price 6d.

THE DISPUTED PUNCTUATION OF THE CHURCH CATECHISM. By the Rev. N. DIMOCK, A.M.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

NEW WORK BY DR. GREVILLE MACDONALD.

With Illustrations. Crown 8vo., cloth, 3s. 6d.

**The Religious Sense in its
Scientific Aspect.****By GREVILLE MACDONALD, M.D.**

1. The Religion of Service. 2. The Religion of Renunciation.
3. The Religion of Freedom.

"This, the embodiment of three lectures given to the students at King's College, London, last year, is a most interesting book. The religious sense is defined by the author as being 'that acknowledgment of the law which compels all creatures possessing the sense to work or live for objects or attainments, be they immediate or prospective, in which the individual has no personal concern, save perhaps in exalted specimens of the species Man' (p. 35). He then proceeds to show where this religious sense is to be found, and argues that the earliest indications of a germinal religion are to be seen revealed, e.g., in the life of a sponge, in the story of a daisy, or in that of the wild guelder-rose. But while there is much reference to science, yet it is freely acknowledged that 'science alone will not serve,' and a most beautiful passage to that effect will be found on p. 67. The whole subject is treated in a most original way, both in expression and illustration, and the author is not afraid of frequent digressions, which somehow or other invariably lead back to the main subject. Thoughtful readers will much enjoy the various definitions scattered throughout the book, such as those of 'life' (p. 24), 'soul' (pp. 75, 76), 'beauty' (p. 94), and 'environment' (p. 179 *seq.*). This will probably be looked upon as a great book, not so much for what it says as what it suggests."—*Church Family Newspaper.*

HODDER & STOUGHTON, 27, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

*In Crown 8vo., cloth, price 7s. 6d.***THE****GOAL OF THE UNIVERSE***or, The Travail of the World's Saviour.*

By S. W. KOELLE, PH.D.,

Author of "Mohammed and Mohammedanism Critically Considered."

EXTRACT FROM PREFACE.

THE book containing the record of God's revelations begins with the creation of man, but immediately follows the statement that, by the creature's own failure in a testing time, sin has entered into the world, and brought with it a long train of evils, including death. These opening portions of the Bible furnish the necessary light for the right apprehension of all later developments in the history of the human race. What follows in the Sacred Word is a record of the various measures adopted by the Creator for the recovery of His creatures and the restitution of His world to its original 'goodness.' The religion of the Bible is a religion of restoration; its central figure is a 'Saviour'; it is the Creator become the Saviour.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

THIRD EDITION NOW READY.

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 2s. 6d. net.

VITAL RELIGION;

OR,

The Personal Knowledge of Christ.

BY

Rev. G. H. S. WALPOLE, D.D.,

Principal of Bede College, Durham.

"The keynote of this interesting and beautiful book is the thought that religion is essentially the life of friendship and intimacy with God revealed in Jesus Christ. . . . We have no hesitation in saying that Dr. Walpole has given us a work of real spiritual value, and we heartily commend it to all thoughtful readers, especially to those who lament the 'decay of experimental religion.' The present volume is a solid contribution to the solution of the problem how 'to find a basis for faith in actual experience.'"—*Guardian*.

"Dr. Walpole writes with a true moral passion. He pleads for a deeper, more intimate, more vital knowledge of God. Nothing could be more appropriate in a series calling itself 'The Church's Outlook for the Twentieth Century' than a volume like this, that sends us back to the fountain and source of all spiritual life."—*New York Churchman*.

"The perusal of that high-toned book has been to us a source of refined pleasure."—*Weekly Leader*.

"We must congratulate Dr. Walpole on having produced a very valuable work. It is of supreme importance that the personal element in religion should not be neglected, and that due attention be paid to the development of inner spiritual life. Dr. Walpole calls attention to real needs, and he gives excellent advice as to the means of satisfying them."—*Pilot*.

"No one who wishes to follow his argument will regret the half-crown it costs, so exceedingly helpful and uncommon is his treatment of the profoundest of all subjects—Living union with our Living Lord."—*Church Bells*.

"This is a fresh and interesting presentation of a perennially important subject. . . . The book is characterized by a spirit of true devotion to our Lord, and is marked throughout by earnestness of thought and appeal."—*Life of Faith*.

"Contains many new and helpful thoughts."—*Mission Field*.

"It has the tone of sincere and earnest piety and the ring of honest conviction. In other words, we like the book and we like the personality which seems to lie in peace and confidence behind it."—*Saint Andrew*.

"There is a deal of force in the author's words about marriage, the shams of so-called worship, prayer, attitude, and daily duty."—*Family Churchman*.

"Many and weighty thoughts are expressed on the subject, which deserve careful consideration."—*Liverpool Mercury*.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

ROYAL VISIT TO IRELAND.

Some Letters received by the Author.

The Bishop of Cork writes:—"I am sure that the extensive circulation of this beautiful book, 'Crowned to Serve,' in Ireland at this time would promote loyalty and good feeling."

The Bishop of Limerick writes:—" 'Crowned to Serve' pleasingly impresses our memory with the beautiful life of our late Queen, and strengthens our hope that our present gracious Sovereign will follow in the footsteps of his well-loved mother."

From the Archbishop of Dublin.—"I hope 'Crowned to Serve' will have as wide a circulation as its admirable predecessor, 'The Queen's Resolve.'"

From the Bishop of Derry.—"In this beautiful book, which I have read with real interest and pleasure, the author has admirably succeeded in showing the heart and real humanity within the life of Royalty."

Press Opinions in Brief.

THE IRISH PAPERS are giving this volume a hearty welcome.

The *Belfast Evening Telegraph* says:—" 'Crowned to Serve: A Welcome to our King and Queen,' in view of the approaching visit of His Majesty King Edward VII. and Queen Alexandra to this country, should command a wide circulation among all classes. The biography has been specially prepared, not only as a volume for the home library, but as a birthday and other gifts."

The *Irish Times* says:—"Its popularity is attested by the circulation it has already attained. We commend it to heads of schools, religious and secular, as calculated to make an inexpensive and welcome prize."

The *Cork Constitution* says:—"Is a brightly-written, attractive, chatty volume. From the fact of its *extremely low price*, we infer that it is intended for more or less wholesale distribution and parochial libraries."

The "**LIVERPOOL MERCURY**" says:—

"Should be brought to the notice of all who contemplate making a Coronation gift to young people. It is admirably suited for that purpose as well as for a place in popular libraries."

The "**HEREFORD TIMES**" says:—

"Conveniently fitted for wide circulation amongst all classes—the home library, birthday and other gifts, Sunday and Voluntary and Board School prizes, men's Bible and Pleasant Sunday Afternoon Classes, the police, soldiers, sailors, and mechanics."

The "**KENT MESSENGER**" says:—

" 'Crowned to Serve' is one of the most interesting books dealing with the King and Queen that we have yet seen. It cannot fail to bind one's attention. It is a most useful volume for presentation at this auspicious period."

A Single Copy sent Post Free on receipt of 1s. 6d.

All letters and orders for quantities should be addressed to the Publisher, MR. CHARLES MURRAY.

LONDON: "HOME WORDS" OFFICE, 11, LUDGATE SQUARE, LUDGATE HILL, E.C.

FROM H.M. THE KING.

"I am commanded by the King to thank you for the copy of your work which you have transmitted for His Majesty's acceptance."

FRANCIS KNOLLYS.

FROM H.M. QUEEN ALEXANDRA.

"I have submitted 'Crowned to Serve' to the Queen. Her Majesty has been pleased to accept a copy of the volume, and I am commanded to thank you."

I am, dear Sir, faithfully yours,
SIDNEY GREVILLE.

New Edition. Now Ready, 10,000 more Copies,
with 32 EXTRA PAGES and 3 ADDITIONAL
ILLUSTRATIONS.

"CROWNED TO SERVE."

By the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D.

* * The key-thought of the new Book is the Royalty of Service—ICH DIEN, perhaps the lesson most needed to make a Happy Home or a Happy Nation.

We hope that in most of our large towns some loyal and generous friend will be glad to follow the example of **MARTIN J. SUTTON, Esq.**, of Reading, who has given 700 copies of "Crowned to Serve" and 2,000 copies of "Crown Jewels."

WHAT A CLERGYMAN SAYS:

* * In one parish alone, that of Woking, the Vicar, the Rev. W. F. T. Hamilton, tells us 700 or 800 copies have easily been planted and readily paid for in as many homes.

To THE PUBLISHER.—Please send me, in order of rotation, the following supply of "Crowned to Serve":

12 and under 25 . 1s. 1½d. each.	50 and under 250 . 1s. each.
25 " 50 . 1s. 1d. "	250 and over at 11d. "

If desired, a Local Parish Inscription can be placed in gilt letters on the cover of each copy on a slight extra payment; but immediate instructions should be given to the Publisher.

The National Protestant Church Union.

To Maintain the Principles of the Reformation as set forth in the
Prayer Book and Articles of the Church of England.

President—W. D. CRUDDAS, Esq.
Chairman—The Rev. Prebendary WEBB-PEPLOE, M.A.
Treasurer—T. F. VICTOR BUXTON, Esq.
Secretary—Sir C. ROBERT LIGHTON, Bart.

The National Protestant Church Union witnesses for—

1. The supremacy and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God.
2. The sole and sufficient efficacy of the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ upon the Cross.
3. The justification of man by faith only in the Lord Jesus Christ.
4. The right of every believer to direct and unimpeded access to God, through Christ.
5. The freedom and sovereignty of the work of the Holy Spirit in sanctification.

WILL YOU HELP THIS IMPORTANT WORK?

For List of Publications, Terms of Membership, etc., apply to the Secretary, N.P.C.U.

324, REGENT STREET, LONDON, W.

EDUCATIONAL.

TRENT COLLEGE.

A Church of England Public School

Conducted in accordance with the principles of the Reformation. Many successes at the Universities and in the Army. Numbers have trebled during the last six years. Thirty acres of playing fields. Remarkable health record. Fees, £75 per annum; reductions made for the sons of Clergy and Officers.

Apply to the **HEADMASTER, TRENT COLLEGE, DERBYSHIRE.**

ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE,

Near TENBURY, WORCESTERSHIRE.

BOYS thoroughly prepared for Public Schools. Most healthy situation; large playing fields and Fives Courts; separate cubicles. Head master, REV. W. A. RENWICK, M.A., former Scholar of Hertford College, Oxford.

APPLY: REV. THE WARDEN.

DAVENTRY GRAMMAR SCHOOL.

Founded A.D. 1600.

PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION at moderate cost. Resident staff of University Graduates in Honours. Entrance scholarships. Special terms for sons of clergy and medical men. Sound Church teaching, healthy situation, 800 feet above sea-level. Good buildings. Large Playing-fields, Laboratory, Gymnasium, Fives Court. Experienced Matron.

Entrance Scholarship for Sons of Clergy materially reducing Fees.

For Prospectus apply: REV. H. JOHNSON, *Head Master.*

ECCLIASTICAL INSURANCE OFFICE, LTD.

11, NORFOLK STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.
FIRE INSURANCE. BURGLARY INSURANCE. GLASS INSURANCE.

The Surplus Profits are devoted to Institutions, etc., which are for the benefit of the Clergy and of Church objects.

For Information and Forms, apply at the Joint Offices of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office, Ltd., and the Clergy Pensions Institution, 11, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

JOHN DUNCAN, F.I.A., *Secretary.*

"This is a serious attempt made in good faith to help the Clergy to help themselves, and to husband the existing resources of the Church."—*Guardian.*

CLERGY PENSIONS INSTITUTION.

11, NORFOLK STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

The distinguishing characteristic of the scheme of the Institution may be concisely stated in the three words, "Self-help aided." Clergymen who wish to secure the benefits of the Institution for themselves or their families exercise self-help by making payments in purchase of Benefits; while Honorary Contributions are applied to augment the Benefits so purchased. The Institution comprises the following:

1. Clergy Pensions Fund; 2. Sickness Fund; 3. Widows and Orphans Fund; 4. Daughters Fund; 5. Other Benefits Fund; 6. Personal Accident Assurance (Clergy); 7. Accidents to Employees (Assurance of Liability of Clergy as Employers).

For Information and Forms, apply at the Joint Offices of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office, Ltd., and the Clergy Pensions Institution, 11, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

JOHN DUNCAN, F.I.A., *Secretary and Actuary.*

THE SOCIETY FOR RELIEF OF PERSECUTED JEWS

(SYRIAN COLONIZATION FUND)

Employs 70 Jews at Abraham's Vineyard, Jerusalem, in cultivation of ground, quarrying and dressing stone, building, and olive oil soap making, and distributes drinking water to many hundreds of poor Jews who have no supply from—rock-hewn cisterns, constructed by Jews on the vineyard. Also gives clothing and food to 1,500 mothers, mostly sick, feeble, or blind, with families.

FUNDS URGENTLY NEEDED that more of the starving Jews may be employed.

CONTRIBUTIONS THANKFULLY RECEIVED by—

F. A. BEVAN, *Hon. Treasurer*, 54, LOMBARD STREET, E.C.

Messrs. DRUMMOND, *Bankers*, 49, CHARING CROSS, S.W.

AND BY

E. A. FINN, *Secretary*, 41, PARLIAMENT STREET, S.W.,

where the Olive Oil Soap may be had for 4/- per doz. tablets, post free.

"LIBERATOR" RELIEF FUND.

Patron: H.R.H. PRINCE CHRISTIAN.

£10,000 required to Relieve New and Urgent Cases.

HUNDREDS of aged and afflicted victims, so cruelly robbed of their life-savings by the great Liberator Fraud, just as they were hoping to enjoy the fruit of their industry and thrift. Many of them are members of the Church of England. Cheques and P.O.'s should be sent to the Secretary, Rev. J. STOCKWELL WATTS, 16, Farringdon Street, E.C.

THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN.

Patron: HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

Vice-Patrons:

H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES, K.G.

THE FOUR ARCHBISHOPS, THE BISHOPS, etc.

Labours afloat and ashore, at home and abroad, among seamen of all classes and nations, fishermen, barge-men, and emigrants. Seventy-three harbours

are occupied. Expenditure in 1902, £46,642.

Increased Contributions and Offerings, urgently needed, should be forwarded to the Secretary, Commander W. DAWSON, R.N., 11, Buckingham Strand, London, W.C.



In crown 8vo. Paper cover. Price 6d.

THE ETHIC OF CHRISTIANITY.

A Paper read before the Christo-Theosophic Society.

BY THE

Rev. R. W. CORBET, M.A.

LATE RECTOR OF STOKR-ON-TERN.

Author of "Redemption," "Letters of a Mystic of the Present Day," and "Addresses on St. Paul."

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

NORWAY, SWEDEN, DENMARK, etc.

COOK'S SELECT CONDUCTED TOURS.

WESTERN NORWAY.—Leaving every Tuesday and Saturday. 15 guineas.

ALPINE AND GLACIER DISTRICT OF WESTERN NORWAY.—Leaving August 4th and 18th. 19 guineas.

SOUTHERN AND WESTERN NORWAY.—Leaving July 31st and August 14th. 20 guineas.

CAPITALS OF DENMARK, SWEDEN, AND NORWAY.—Leaving August 17th. 32 guineas.

Inclusive fares, providing travel, hotels, carriage and steamer excursions, fees, transfers, conveyance of baggage, conductor, etc.

Descriptive and illustrated programmes of conducted and independent tours free on application.

THOS. COOK & SON, Ludgate Circus, London, and Branch Offices.

PROTESTANT REFORMATION SOCIETY.

The **OLDEST** Church Society for the Maintenance of the Religious Principles of the Reformation.
The **ONLY** Mission to Roman Catholics in England.

(Established 1827.)

MISSIONARY. EDUCATIONAL. EVANGELISTIC.

Resident Missionaries to Roman and Ritualistic Centres.

Sermons and Lectures by the Rev. C. H. H. WRIGHT, D.D., M.A., Ph.D., Clerical and General Superintendent

Educational Lantern Lectures on Church History by the Secretary.

Cheap effective literature dealing with subjects of present importance.

Donations, Subscriptions, or requests for Lectures or Sermons should be addressed to the Secretary.

Funds are Urgently Needed.

WALTER A. LIMBRICK, Secretary, 62, Berners Street, London, W.

THE RISE and GROWTH of the Protestant Alliance Magazine.

Being an abridged reprint of the Jubilee Issue (with a Series of Illustrations) explaining the Basis, Principles, and Work of the Protestant Alliance. *PRICE ONE PENNY.*

PROTESTANT ALLIANCE,

Offices: 430, STRAND, LONDON. Opposite Charing Cross Hospital.

HOLLOWAY'S PILLS

**CURE INDIGESTION, LOSS OF APPETITE,
DIZZINESS, BILIOUS and SICK HEADACHE, &c.**

**They Purify the Blood, Strengthen the System, and are the
Safest and most Reliable Medicine for Female Ailments.**

Manufactured only at 78, NEW OXFORD STREET, LONDON; sold by all Chemists and Medicine Vendors.

EDE, SON & RAVENSCROFT

 TELEPHONE:
602, Holborn.

Established 1689.

ROBE MAKERS



Royal Warrant Holders.

ROBE MAKERS TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.
SURPLICES FOR CLERGY AND CHOIR. CLERICAL TAILORING.
 Hoods, Cassocks, Scarves, Stoles, College Caps, Clergy Collars, etc.

PEERS', LEGAL AND CORPORATION ROBES.
93 & 94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 2s. 6d.

KING DAVID: A Tragedy. By R. C. FILLINGHAM, Vicar of Hexton, Author of "The Gospel in the Fields," "Christ in London."

In crown 8vo., cloth, gilt lettered, price 2s. 6d.

BIBLE TREASURES IN ENGLISH MEASURES.

A small volume of verses designed to promote other attempts of the same kind to bring the Bible into more general use and favour.

 "We recommend these hymns with the utmost confidence. They have literary merit, and combine sweetness with strength."—*Weekly Leader*.

ELLIOT STOCK 62, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.

BYGONE DAYS: a Story of Village Life.

By JNO. T. PROCTOR. In crown 8vo., cloth, price 3s. 6d. net.

The story is written to illustrate the manners and customs, religion and superstition, of Lincolnshire village life in the early part of the nineteenth century, the redeeming and elevating influence of love in the lower circles of human society giving the picture a bright and cheery tone. Although the characters and places are disguised, neither they nor the incidents narrated are fictitious, but real, and drawn from the writer's personal experience. Many of them will, no doubt, be recognised by older people still living in the district.

LONDON: ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

In crown 8vo., cloth, price 2s. 6d. net.

THE COLLIERIES OF WINDY HILL:

Crucial Moments in a Welsh Village.

By WILFRID SPARROY,

Author of "Persian Children of the Royal Family."

WHEN the curtain rises Myfanwy Phoenix is dead, but her memory lives on, influencing the lives of her friends at crucial moments. Thus the story is episodal; it is also dramatic, impersonal, a bit of life in a field that is fresh to modern literature. The scene, which is laid in a Welsh colliery village, is suggestive of the Celtic spirit, with its earnestness of outlook and its unswerving faith in the realization of its dreams.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

HOME MISSIONS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Additional Curates Society.

39, VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER.

More than 1,200 ADDITIONAL CLERGYMEN are now at work in poor and densely-populated Parishes through the help of grants (about £55,000 a year) from this Society.

No Party considerations affect the appropriation of the Funds.

THE
CHURCHMAN

AUGUST, 1903.

ART. I.—THE TRUE THEORY OF THE SUPER-
NATURAL IN RELATION TO MODERN DOUBT.

THE use of the word "supernatural" is hardly likely to be abandoned, as the late Duke of Argyll has suggested that it should be, by all who make any pretensions to accurate thinking. Regarded as a relative term, and used in a certain conventional sense, it has its value, and we cannot afford to dispense with it—at least, until someone shall have invented a satisfactory substitute. At the same time, it is more than probable that the employment of this ill-chosen term in theological literature has been a fruitful source of misconceptions, and in these days of scientific progress has probably contributed in no small degree to the spread of doubt.

The tendency of all modern and scientific thought has been to represent Nature as one great, self-consistent, and harmonious whole; and the sentiment expressed by Tennyson, that "nothing is that errs from law," has taken so strong a hold on the mind of thoughtful men, that whatever theory appears to be opposed to such a view of things seems to many to be little less than an insult offered to the human understanding. Yet this is what the word "supernatural" is believed to imply by most of those who profess themselves unable to regard it as either thinkable or possible. Is this mysterious something, which is supposed to be above Nature, such objectors are inclined to ask, opposed to Nature, or is it in harmony with it? If it is opposed to Nature, how comes it to pass that it is believed to have produced Nature? Is it conceivable that it actually produced that which is opposed to itself? If, on the other hand, it is in harmony with Nature, how can it be distinguished from Nature, and why should it

be called "the supernatural"? Does it err from law, or not? If it does, how comes it to pass that it has produced the universe of law? If it does not err from law, how can it be distinguished from that great empire of law to which we give the name of Nature?

If the supernatural is to be regarded as an arbitrary force, subject to no control save its own caprice, how more than strange that it should have produced a well-ordered universe that would seem to be a standing protest against that caprice! If, on the other hand, like other forces in Nature, it works true to law, and there is nothing capricious about it, what is there in its operation to distinguish it from these other natural forces of which the same is true?

The plain fact is that the word, although distinctly convenient, when used in a certain limited and conventional sense, will not bear critical examination. It implies an antithesis between God and Nature which has no existence in fact, and it suggests a limitation of the idea expressed by the word "Nature" which is wholly unjustifiable. For Nature is not limited to earth, nor even to what sense can discern or science discover outside the narrow bounds of this planet. If there be such a thing as a spiritual world, all that it contains must have a nature of its own, and therefore must be part and parcel of that mighty whole to which we give the name of Nature.

When Cicero wrote "*De Natura Deorum*," he no doubt regarded himself as investigating one important department of Nature, and had there been gods many and lords many to investigate, he would have judged rightly. But if there be but one God, He, too, must have a Nature of His own; and in contemplating this we are still considering Nature, and that in her most august and exalted manifestation of herself. But if there be such a thing as the Divine nature (*Θεία φύσις*) as St. Peter teaches us to believe that there is, to speak of the "supernatural" will be to go behind the Divine.

We may venture, then, boldly to affirm that there is, and can be, no such thing as the supernatural in the true etymological sense of the word; for the word involves a contradiction, inasmuch as that which we designate the supernatural has a nature of its own, and therefore is not, and cannot be, above Nature. For what is Nature, after all, but the sum total of all that God either is, or causes to be? If we carry our minds back to the very commencement of all things, and imagine the first creative act as only beginning to begin, we have not gone behind Nature, for God will still be Nature to Himself. And if we project our mind into the limitless future, and contemplate all things as brought into subjection to God,

it is still Nature in her completest development that we are thinking of.

These considerations must lead us to abandon all belief in the supernatural if we adhere to the strict etymological sense of the term. But there is no reason why we should be bound by this, and if we assign to the word a certain modified significance, it may yet prove a convenient and useful term, so long as it is clearly recognised that we employ it in this circumscribed sense.

Let it be understood that by the word "Nature" we mean to denote Nature as we know her and are familiar with her, and then the supernatural will be, not, indeed, something higher than Nature, but something higher than that portion of Nature with which we are ourselves in sensible contact, or about which we are able to draw inferences from what we do ourselves know. The supernatural will be thus only the natural on a higher plane, and there will be nothing either unscientific or self-contradictory in believing in it.

Let us attempt to illustrate this use of the term in order that we may form a clear idea of what we must needs mean when we use it; and in doing so we shall find ourselves, as it seems to me, necessarily approaching a true theory of the supernatural. Let us picture to ourselves, to begin with, that which geology teaches us must have at one time existed—a lifeless, or, as the geologist would say, an azoic, world. Here the highest achievements of nature would be discoverable in nothing more wonderful than various chemical combinations, producing crystallization and other phenomena, which, although in themselves very amazing, are a small matter when compared to the miracle of life.

Into this azoic world let the first germs of vegetable life be introduced, and at once we find ourselves face to face with the far more astonishing products of vital energy. Let us suppose that this world of ours could become sentient and intelligent with regard to all that occurs on her surface; surely in that case the novel phenomena of vegetable life would appear "supernatural," as compared with all that she had known of before. And yet to us it seems perfectly natural that this mysterious force, which no one can define, should go on year by year performing the miracles, as we might well call them, which not even our familiarity with them robs of their mysterious impressiveness. And we are quite right in regarding this as natural. It is Nature's work, but wrought on a higher plane.

Let us take a further step, and suppose animal life to make its appearance on this planet, and once more Mother Earth would be contemplating what seemed supernatural, as measured

by all that had gone before. What a miracle the independent motion and activity of animal life must appear to her, when compared with the necessary limitations of all merely vegetable forms of existence! Yet once again we know that this is not the supernatural, but merely the natural working on a higher plane.

We rise one step higher still when we suppose the Earth to detect on her surface the presence of an intelligent being, capable of exercising reason and possessed of moral capacity. A new series of phenomena at once begin to result from his presence, and how utterly supernatural they seem as compared with anything that unreasoning animal life could accomplish! Perhaps the most apparently supernatural element of all in this new display is the presence of moral freedom in the individual. It might seem as if here we parted company with the reign of law, and therefore did actually rise above Nature. Yet reflection teaches us that the moral freedom of man is as much a product of Nature, as is the fixed necessity that regulates the action of lower organic forms. We notice, too, that the moral region has laws of its own, though more mysterious and recondite than those which prevail in the material world.

But does Nature end here? Is it at this point that we can arbitrarily draw a dividing line, as if we would say: "Here Nature reaches her limit, and here the supernatural begins"? Have we any right to do so? In answering this question, it will be as well first to refer to those mysterious phenomena which it is usual to call "psychic," although it is indeed a moot problem how far they belong to the body and how far to the soul. Surely the time is passed in which it was possible to sneer at such subjects as clairvoyance, hypnotism, thought-reading, and animal magnetism. Most thoughtful observers accept the phenomena as clearly proven, though the examination of them has hardly yet received the amount of scientific attention that the facts seem to call for.

Considered from the standpoint of our ordinary human experience, these phenomena have all the appearance of the supernatural. When, for instance, a clairvoyant describes to you quite accurately what is happening in a distant apartment, delineating scenes and persons that she could have had no possible knowledge of before, the feat has the appearance of being quite as supernatural as was the spiritual insight of Elisha, of whom it was reported to the Syrian monarch, "He telleth the King of Israel the words that thou speakest in thy bedchamber."

Yet, just in so far as we find reason for believing that these marvellous phenomena are either psychic or neurotic or cerebral, all disposition to regard them as supernatural passes

away. They belong merely to a province of the natural that has hitherto been left unexplored; nay, further, we feel at once inclined to conclude that much that has been supposed to be supernatural, such as the phenomena of witchcraft, and even of so-called "spiritualism" (which had better be designated "spiritism"), may be explained when we know a little more about these subtle natural forces.

But when we pass beyond this, do we even now leave the natural behind? Let us, without making any rash admissions, suppose, for the sake of argument, that the millions of persons who strongly believe to-day in what I prefer to call "spiritism" are right in their interpretations of the undoubted phenomena of the case, and that there are spirits all around us with whom it is possible, under certain conditions, to come into sensible communication. We may think and speak of such communications as supernatural because they astonish us; but what is there supernatural about them? If spirits exist, their existence is as much a part of the established order of nature as is the existence of mammals; and if there are certain conditions under which it is possible for them to make their presence known to us, that also is part of the same established order. It is only once more the natural on a higher plane—if, indeed, it be higher.

Whatever be the truth about these wandering spirits who are supposed to frequent the séances of those who dabble in these curious arts, Scripture certainly teaches us to believe in the existence, and even in the ministries, of angels. How these mysterious beings stand related to us, and in what way their ministry is carried out, we have no means of knowing; but the thought of their close connection with us would seem to have been a very familiar one, both to our Lord Himself and to the primitive Christians. But when we have granted that they have their place in God's universe, and that their relations to us and to other objects is regulated by law, we have already taken them out of the category of the supernatural, and, once again, in thinking of them we are only contemplating the natural on a higher plane.

Thus we approach the highest level of all, and are pointed to the conclusion that the action of Almighty God is just as natural to Him as the action of man is to him or the action of angels is to them, and that therefore what we call the supernatural is nothing more or less than the natural action of God. We cannot conceive of God as acting in a way that would be supernatural to Himself; that would, of course, involve an absurdity as well as a contradiction. All that we can say of His action is that, being natural to Him on that higher plane on which He has His being, it seems super-

natural to us on that lower plane on which we have ours. And thus we arrive at an approximate definition of what we are to understand by our limited use of the term "supernatural." We mean, not that which is above the natural, but that which is *the natural above*. We mean that which is natural on a higher plane exhibited in operation on a lower plane, where its operation is not usually and normally exhibited.

With this definition the word "supernatural" may still be permitted, and, what is more important, it may cease to some extent to be the stumbling-block to modern doubters of the scientific class that it has so long been. We might venture to go a step further, and affirm that such an employment of the term removes all reasonable objection to the supernatural on abstract grounds, were it not that in God we recognise a Being who is in all Nature, while He transcends the limitations of that particular portion of Nature to which we ourselves belong, and with which we are partially acquainted.

If God were merely a sort of superior archangel residing in another sphere, but capable of exercising a benign influence in this world of ours, we might feel that this definition sufficiently met the difficulties of the case, and cleared it of all anomalies and contradictions. But this is not the relation in which God stands to Nature as we know it, and, we confidently assume, to Nature throughout the universe. What is Nature, after all, but the material embodiment of a Divine idea? and what are her laws but the behests of the Omnipotent? If God were merely an august Personality, outside the limits of Nature as we know them, and only making occasional incursions within this sphere, we should have no difficulty in describing such action on His part as supernatural, in the sense which we have just assigned to the word.

But when we think of God as the great Spirit of the universe, penetrating all things with His mysterious influence, and securing universal order by His presence, His power, and His skill, it may well be asked, What room is there left for the supernatural, even in the restricted sense that we have attributed to the term? If God be the Author of the laws of Nature, must He not stultify Himself by interfering with the operation of laws that He has Himself laid down? If these laws were the best that could be laid down, why should He interfere with them? If they were not the best that could have been framed, what shall we say of His skill?

This difficulty needs to be honestly faced, and in dealing with it we should endeavour to realize how heavily it must needs bear upon those whose scientific training makes it specially hard to imagine any sort of suspension of the opera-

tion of natural law. To my own mind, I confess the objection seems to be so far valid as to be absolutely fatal to all such theories of the supernatural as involve any interference with, any abrogation, suspension, or even modification, of natural law.

This is a theory of the supernatural that one frequently hears affirmed, but I cannot bring myself to regard it as anything else but a most regrettable mistake, and one that is likely to excite a strong prejudice against Christian religion on the part of thoughtful and intelligent people.

The laws of Nature, as we call them, are either necessities inherent in the nature of things, and therefore incapable of any modification, as is the case with all mathematical truths, and probably with a great deal besides mathematics, or they are the product of creative skill, and are therefore the essential conditions of the maintenance of universal order.

If this be so, we must look for the explanation of the supernatural in another direction, and we shall find it in a full recognition of the personality of God. The laws of Nature do not change, and those laws represent the mind of God with regard to the things that He has Himself created; but it does not follow from this that God has *merged His own personality in the mechanism of the universe* which He has Himself called into being; and if He retains His personality, He must needs be capable of direct personal action. This action will be related to the laws of Nature very much in the same way as is our own. Man possesses no power of neutralizing the forces of nature or of altering her laws, but he can interpose by the action of his own personality, so as to modify the resultant phenomena.

If, to give a homely illustration of my meaning, I see an apple falling from a tree, and catch it in its fall, I have not abrogated the law of gravitation, but I have prevented it from spoiling that particular apple. If, just to do this, I had been suddenly introduced to a world that possessed nothing higher than vegetable life before, my action would be supernatural, as compared with all that previously existed on that planet. It would not, however, have altered the laws of nature there, but in that one particular instance it would have modified *the product* of those laws.

Similarly, when our Lord walked upon the sea, and permitted Simon Peter to do the same, He did not for a moment suspend the law of gravitation, which would have dragged both Himself and Simon down into the depths; but by the personal employment of some other force, unknown to us, but familiar to Him, He prevented the force of gravitation from producing the effect that it was natural to it to produce. It

was there, and hard at work all the time, as was abundantly proved by the fact that the moment unbelief robbed Simon of the support of that other force which held him up he began to sink.

The only objection that occurs to me against such a theory of the supernatural as this is this, that it seems to cast a reflection upon the skill of the Almighty Creator of the universe, when we thus maintain that He has to intervene thus personally, in order to modify the natural results of His own work. If, it might be argued, I make a watch, I make it to keep time, and if it won't keep accurate time without my subsequent interference, clearly I have made a bad watch. The statement of such an objection, however, argues a complete misapprehension of the Christian theory of the supernatural, particularly with respect to its object and purpose.

Supernatural interventions do not occur in order to supplement supposed defects in natural order. They are designed for two great ends: First, they are signs, to use the word constantly employed of them in the New Testament, witnessing to the fact that God is a living Person, and that He desires to enter into direct personal relations with us. I may infer from the normal phenomena of nature the presence in the universe of a great Intelligence, to whom it owes its order and its beauty. But it is only when the abnormal occurs that I begin to gather, from the mysterious telegraphy of the supernatural, that this great Supreme desires to enter into direct communication with man.

And, secondly, they are designed to establish the closest spiritual relations between myself and the Great Unseen;—to make me aware of His interest in me and His love for me. And thus the supernatural pervades all true spiritual experience, rendering it all one long miracle. For Christian life begins with a supernatural birth, and is sustained by a constant supernatural flow of vital influence from the heart of God to man. Every prayer that wins an answer brings about a new manifestation of the supernatural; every spiritual gift and grace is a fresh intervention of God Himself. All that we mean by the life of God in the soul of man, by the indwelling presence of the Holy Ghost, by the forming of the nature of Christ within, and by the power of His resurrection, is dependent upon this direct and personal action of God upon the moral nature of man.

This Divine intervention does not indeed abrogate moral law, any more than the presence of Christ on the waters of Galilee suspended the law of gravitation. But it introduces a new force into our moral experiences, as it introduced a new force into Simon's physical experiences, which saves us from

what would otherwise be the inevitable effect of the operation of law. How many poor fallen sinners who, if left to the inexorable operation of moral law, would have been dragged down to perdition, as surely as ever St. Peter would have been dragged down by gravitation to the depths of the sea, are to-day rejoicing in liberty and safety, because the Son of God has made them free, and now they are free indeed! They may have no theory of the supernatural, whether correct or otherwise; but they know that supernatural facts have transformed their lives, and they are just as sure of their supernatural experience as ever the once-blind man was when he exclaimed, "One thing I know, whereas I was blind, now I see!"

In affirming our belief, then, in the supernatural, we are not merely contending for the authenticity of the Gospel narrative, and for the consistency of the miraculous events described there, with a reasonable view of our relations with God, and His with us: we are defending the very essentials of our faith, and are contending for all that is most vital to our Christian experience.

It would not, indeed, be worth while to make a stand for the miracles of the past, if we expected to know nothing of the supernatural in our present experiences. If there be no such thing as the intervention of God to-day, it is but sorry comfort to retain the conviction that He did intervene in human affairs eighteen centuries ago. What we need in these days, in which wise men are urging us to relieve our religion from the incubus of a senseless faith in the supernatural, is a fuller experience of it in our own personal lives and in our ministry.

It was this that gave to the primitive Church its amazing aggressive force and capacity of rapid and sustained progress. It was because they were "filled with the Holy Ghost" and with supernatural power, that the pioneers of Christianity, although everywhere spoken against, were able in the lifetime of a single man to spread the knowledge of the Gospel from one end of the Roman Empire to another. The secret of that amazing success is disclosed when we read that the Lord worked with these Apostolic missionaries, and confirmed their word with signs following; and it is only the promise of a similar personal intervention of the Divine that can warrant us in hoping for a similar success to-day.

Our best and most impressive answer to the denial of the supernatural, so prevalent everywhere, is to show that we are ourselves possessed of it, and that it makes our life a different thing from the lives of those who have it not, and our ministry a power such as merely natural causes will not explain.

We may be doubtful as to the authorship of the closing verses of St. Mark's Gospel, and may therefore not feel quite sure whether the promise that outward miracles are to continue to distinguish the career of true believers comes to us with the full authority of a Divine utterance. Or, again, we may be disposed to question whether, if this be so, the promise was for all time, or whether these special gifts were only designed to meet the special needs of that early period, when Christianity had all the world against it. But no such doubt can rob us of the testimony that runs through the whole New Testament as to the supernatural phenomena that we have a right to expect to flow from faith, through the whole course of our life's experience.

Let us boldly claim our birthright privileges in this respect, remembering that to have a form of godliness, but to deny the power, is one of the features of the final apostasy. We hail with no small satisfaction the revival of interest in the ethical side of Gospel truth, that is a characteristic of our time, and our hearts respond to any and every call to walk in the steps of our great Exemplar; but we will not let our sympathetic appreciation of teaching of this kind modify, in the slightest degree, our estimate of the supreme importance of what we may well name the dynamics of Christianity. Remembering that what we call the supernatural is only the natural with God, we will dare to expect it of Him that He shall still be true to His own nature in fulfilling His own promises of Divine head and personal intervention. So shall we be able to re-echo with equal confidence the Apostle's exclamation: "I can do all things through Christ, who strengtheneth me."

W. HAY M. H. AITKEN.



ART. II.—THE LIMITS OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

UNLIKE other great religious revivals, the Oxford Movement was at first purely academic, or "aristocratic," as W. Palmer called it. The men who originated it were among the acutest intellects of the University, and the questions raised were such as could be adequately discussed only by professed theologians. Keble himself was a brilliant scholar; Pusey was the most learned man of his time in Oxford; C. Marriott is described by Dean Church as "naturally a man of metaphysical mind, given almost from a child to abstract and even abstruse thought"; Hurrell Froude, Isaac Williams, Copeland, J. Mozley, Ward, and, above all, J. H. Newman, formed a small but remarkable group of men far above the

average in intellectual gifts and force of character. Under one aspect the Movement was a reaction against the prevalent utilitarian philosophy of the day; under another it was a political protest against the Liberal measures of a reformed Parliament, and the attacks openly made upon the Church of England:

“Not as yet
Are we in shelter or repose;
The holy house is still beset
With leagner of stern foes.
Wild thoughts within, bad men without,
All evil spirits round about,
Are banded in unblest device
To spoil love's earthly paradise.”

KEBLE: *Christian Year*
(*Second Sunday after Trinity*).

The first effort, then, of the leaders in the Oxford Movement was to reform the Church of England, to re-examine its credentials, to place it on a firm historical and doctrinal basis, to free it from abuses, to restore its spiritual influence, and to reclaim its rights as a dominant force in the country. In this way alone it was felt could a firm stand be made against the revolutionary tendencies of the age. It was a scheme which precisely suited the character and acquirements of men who “could not bear a bad argument,” but one which placed the Movement in its first stages on a plane far removed from popular sympathy or comprehension. The validity of Anglican orders; the Apostolical Succession; the claim of the Anglican Church to Catholicity, and its relations to the Eastern Church and to Rome; the precise meaning and effect of the Holy Eucharist, are all points of deep interest and importance, needful also to be determined, but had no immediate or direct effect on popular religion. For some years the Movement was almost confined to Oxford, and, indeed, to a limited number of Oxford Common-rooms. It was not till after the angry protest against Tract 90, the condemnation of Pusey's sermon, the degradation of Mr. Ward, the secession of Newman, and the collapse of the Tractarian party in Oxford, that the Movement passed into the dioceses and country parishes.

But in carrying its influence into a wider sphere the Movement bore with it traces of its academic origin. From the first the aim of the Oxford leaders in giving a practical turn to the Movement had been to instruct and stir the clergy. The need was deeply felt. “The fortunes of the Church are not safe in the hands of a clergy who take their obligations easily. It was slumbering and sleeping when the visitation of days of change and trouble came upon it,” says Dean

Church ("The Oxford Movement," p. 4). And the student of the "Christian Year" will recall many passages in which this source of danger to the Church's life is deplored :

"Oh! grief to think, that grapes of gall
Should cluster round thy healthiest shoot!
God's herald prove a heartless thrall,
Who, if he dared, would fain be mute!"

Thursday before Easter.

And again :

"Chiefly for Aaron's seed she spreads her wings,
If but one leaf she may from thee
Win of the reconciling tree.
For what shall heal when holy water banes?
Or who shall guide
O'er desert plains
Thy loved yet sinful people wandering wide,
If Aaron's hand unshrinking mould
An idol form of earthly gold?"

Fifth Sunday after Easter.

Consequently it was to the clergy of the Church of England that the appeal was first made. And on them the principles of the Movement had an immediate and profound result. The stirring arguments of Tract No. 1, and the continuous counsel given to the younger generation of clergy by Dr. Pusey and the other Oxford leaders, at once raised the level of the clerical life, deepened the sense of responsibility, and enhanced the dignity of the calling.

The most effective argument in this revival of clerical life and energy used by Newman in Tract No. 1 was the principle of the Apostolical Succession: "If you have the spirit of the Apostles on you, surely this is a great gift. 'Stir up the Spirit of God which is in you.' Make much of it. Show your value of it. Keep it before your minds as an honourable badge, far higher than that secular respectability or cultivation, or polish, or learning, or rank which gives you a hearing with many. Tell *them* of your gift" ("Tracts for the Times," No. 1, p. 3). This principle was indeed the basis of the Movement, and the impression it has made on the clergy has been deep and lasting. Under its inspiration men like Hook in Leeds and Butler at Wantage effected great things. But, notwithstanding the magnificent work achieved by these and hundreds of like-minded clergymen throughout the country, it is more than questionable whether the principles of the Movement have even yet reached the masses, either in town or country, so as to influence their lives or their religious ideas. The average rustic in a "High Church" parish would find it very hard to express the theological differences between himself and his Low Church neighbour, although their respective

pastors would be at no loss if the need came. One happy result of this is that, so far as the bulk of the population is concerned, there is little or no feeling of antagonism, or even active disagreement, to interfere with efforts made for reunion. On the other hand, it must be confessed that the subjects which interested the originators of the Movement, and which still chiefly interest many of the clergy and the more educated laymen, are not of practical concern for the town or country labourer.

The sacramental teaching, revived and deepened by the progress of the Oxford Movement, has changed the aspect of Church life in all places where the upper middle class is largely represented. The crowded congregations and the large number of communicants in the West-End churches, in the suburbs of London, and in seaside resorts, are evidence of this fact. But the same teaching has failed to be effectual in the rural populations. It is not that religion is non-existent in country villages: religion exists, but it is of a different type. No one can read Tract No. 29, recounting the conversation between John Evans and his Rector, Dr. Spencer, without being conscious of a certain air of unreality about it. What has happened, then, is that the energetic and earnest High Church clergyman influences his flock, but he has not drawn it into the religious life of the Oxford Movement.

2. The Oxford Movement almost from the first parted into two streams of tendency. On the one hand, it was an Anglican revival, a genuine effort to reproduce the seventeenth-century type of English Churchmanship, the Churchmanship of Ken and Andrewes and the Non-jurors. On the other hand, it was the movement of men who felt more and more acutely the evil condition and scandals of the existing Church of England, and who were increasingly fascinated by the grandeur and teaching of the Church of Rome.

The first party claimed some reconsideration of the Reformation settlement. They contended that, while in the vast religious movements of the sixteenth century many and salutary changes had been effected, it was quite certain that the reaction against Rome had carried men too far in some directions, and that practices and institutions good in themselves had been swept away with the abuses which had sprung from them indeed, but were not their natural and necessary results. On the other hand, they found some aspects of the devotional and religious life existing in full and beautiful perfection in the Roman Church. These were claimed as the rightful heritage of Catholic Christianity. Others advanced far beyond this position. With a group of Newman's disciples what was Catholic became identified with

what was Roman.¹ The *British Critic*, now dissociated from Newman's control, began "to run riot in distinctly Roman articles." When the more sober members of the party protested, Ward responded by publishing "The Ideal of a Christian Church." This book contained such sentences as: "In subscribing the Articles I renounced no Roman doctrine, yet I retain my fellowship, which I hold on the tenure of subscription, and have received no ecclesiastical censure in any shape." In his defence before the University, Mr. Ward said: "I believe all the articles of the Roman Church."

The inevitable result followed. Ward, Oakley, and others followed their convictions and were received into the Roman Church. The secession cleared the air, and though it was followed by the complete collapse of the Tractarian party in Oxford, as those who remember Oxford in the fifties and early sixties will testify, the Movement itself proceeded with undiminished energy and success in the country.

What is important for us to note in the present crisis of Church life is that both these streams of thought and doctrine are still represented in the English Church, one section of the High Church party firmly upholding the Anglican position of protest against Rome on the one hand, and the invasions of Puritanism on the other; another section aiming without disguise at the reintroduction into the Anglican Church of Roman doctrines and practices as essentially Roman.

3. The Oxford Movement has had great results. It has revived Church work in manifold directions, opened fresh avenues for the spiritual energies both of men and women; it has widely extended the episcopate and revolutionized its work; it has infused fresh life into ecclesiastical architecture; it has added to the beauty and solemnity of Church services, and increased the frequency and variety of them; it has raised the sense of duty among the clergy and stimulated their zeal. The work of men like Charles Lowder at the London Docks, and of the brothers Pollock at St. Albans, Birmingham, are grand instances of zeal fired by the spirit of the Oxford Movement.

Again, it has certainly influenced Nonconformity. The Free Church Catechism bears witness that Church and chapel are much nearer doctrinally than they were a generation ago. There is a social *rapprochement* and friendliness between the Vicar and the Dissenting minister which would formerly have been considered impossible. The value of such social ameni-

¹ "Ward identifies what is Catholic with what is Roman. . . . He could hold the whole cycle of Roman doctrine and yet remain in the Anglican Church" (Church, "Oxford Movement," pp. 306, 326).

ties lies in the openings which they offer to "dispassionate controversy" on the subjects which have tended to separation.

It must, however, be confessed that one lamentable error in the course of the Movement was the needlessly abrupt and even offensive way in which the teaching was in some cases promulgated. The Evangelical party was then dominant in the Church. As a party it lacked the intellectual power and research of the Oxford Movement. Notwithstanding the contributions of the two Milners to Church History, the records and teaching of the early Church were all but ignored by its leaders. The history of doctrine, the beautiful examples of saintly life, the victories won by martyrdoms, even the struggles of our forefathers against Papal oppression, and, above all, the full force and reality of sacramental teaching, had well-nigh ceased to enter into the experience of the Christian life. There was a tendency to regard the Reformation period as the beginning of the English Church. The antagonism to Rome was carried to an unreasoning excess, and, as a consequence, the conception of the Church as a whole, the idea of discipline and of the authority of the Church, were set aside in the teaching of the Anglican Church. On the other hand, love of the individual soul, the need of conversion, of unworldliness, even of asceticism, marked the best type of Evangelical religion, and produced saintly lives and great results. If that revival was to be known by its fruits, it could point to an outburst of missionary zeal, to effective preaching, to abolition of slavery both abroad and in English labour centres, to Sunday-school work and the education of the poor. If it was less academical and learned than the Oxford Movement, it was more in touch with the people.

It only needed tact and generosity on the part of the Tractarians to instruct and supplement what was lacking in the Evangelical system. Where each party was engaged in a common quest for truth there was no need of antagonism. But there was no attempt to conciliate by the recognition of the deep and genuine religious feeling and the devoted lives which could be numbered in the Evangelical ranks.

Some acts were calculated to create distrust and fear, for which there was no real occasion. As, for instance, when Dr. Pusey issued a series of Roman Catholic books of devotion at a time when men's minds were nervously alive to the fear of proselytism. The new doctrines were even ostentatiously paraded; the manner and dress of some of the younger and less considerate adherents of "the Movement," and unnecessary innovations in ritual, naturally provoked opposition. After the condemnation of Tract 90 feeling began to run

high, controversy was embittered, and there was no longer a struggle for union. On the contrary, divisions were intensified. The Tractarians became to the Low Church party what Rome had long been to the English Church as a whole. Everything that came from that quarter was viewed with suspicion and dislike. How unnecessary this was, and how much might have been done by conciliatory and persuasive methods, is shown by the gradual influence of the Movement both on the Evangelical party and on Nonconformity, as already mentioned.

This influence, without friction, has produced in the ranks of the English clergy—perhaps one of the best results of the Movement—a type of men who are Evangelical in their preaching, and in the highest sense of the word Catholic in their teaching and practice. And the same force is beginning to unite in common action the most sincere and religious men of both parties. The most hopeful omen for the future is that this move is being made among the junior clergy of the two great parties of the Church of England. An ardour of co-operation is showing itself in missionary effort, which promises the happiest results. At one of the recent conferences of delegates from the Junior Clergy Missionary Association in connection with the S.P.G., the chairman, in supporting a resolution, “That meetings of the S.P.G. and C.M.S. should be held throughout the country in order to promote (a) mutual sympathy and co-operation between the clergy, and (b) joint efforts of intercession to cover the whole mission-field,” said: “Do not let us be content with passing resolutions. The way we are to carry this out is for one man in this town, and for another man in another town, to make real friends with a C.M.S. man, and get him to say: ‘Why can’t we stand together in connection with the mission-field? Why can’t we pray together in the principal church of the diocese or of the town?’ The only way it can be done is by individual work here and there.”

This is precisely the spirit which is needed at the present day, and precisely that which was lacking in the earlier stages of the Oxford Movement. For the divisions which arose out of that Movement, and were accentuated by it, were for the most part divisions among the clergy and the educated people whom they influenced.

This is indeed a welcome gleam of reunion within the Church itself, which may broaden out into a fuller glow under the influence of dispassionate controversy on disputed points.

Of these points it may be remarked generally that the contention has been most fierce where the impossibility of a certain conclusion has been most decisive. The crucial

instance of this has been the dispute as to the precise mode in which the grace and benefit of the Holy Eucharist are conveyed to the recipient. For error, or supposed error, on this point tens of thousands have been slain by fire and sword. The dispute has separated, and still separates, nations as well as Churches.

Of so vast a controversy it is impossible here to touch the fringe. But with a view to removing this cause of disunion three questions may be asked: Is it possible to recast the form of the controversy, and to state the argument in terms which are not those of a philosophy which but for this particular controversy would never have survived? Is it possible to agree that this dispute can never be determined definitely by human reasoning, and that the revelation of our blessed Lord in regard to it is limited? Is it too much to hope that the Church in this day might be content with what Dr. Swete tells us was the position of the ante-Nicene Church? "She was satisfied with the knowledge that in the Holy Eucharist she had an unfailing provision of the Bread of life . . . the banquet of fish and bread which so often appears (in the catacombs) indicates the assured belief that our Lord gave Himself in the Eucharist, but does not imply more" (*Journal of Theological Studies*, February, 1902, p. 176). The words which follow may well be taken to heart now: "Whatever view may be taken of this attitude, it certainly made for peace."

The famous answer of Elizabeth when questioned on the subject of transubstantiation still holds good:

"Christ was the Word that spake it,
He took the bread and brake it;
And what His words did make it,
That I believe and take it."

Bishop Creighton's comment on this quatrain deserves to be laid to heart: "It was a saying the theological truth of which has become more apparent as controversy on the point has progressed" ("Queen Elizabeth," p. 37).

Another of the chief among the crucial questions which exercised the leaders of the Oxford Movement was, as we have seen, that of Apostolical Succession. It forms the basis of Newman's impassioned appeal in Tract No. 1, and it is pressed home in several others of the series. As an argument and stimulus for work in a great cause it has had an enormous influence. The settlement of the question, therefore, was one of critical importance. Its investigation was suited to the great ability of the Oxford movers. And yet, considering the great issues which hang upon its determination, and the results which have followed the view taken at the inception

of the Movement, the first decision may well claim re-examination. It is a question precisely suitable for dispassionate controversy by students of history and theology, as it is unsuited for popular treatment.

There are at least two reasons which make the discussion of this doctrine very important at the present moment. One is the tendency of the doctrine, as interpreted by Newman, to separate the clergy into a caste by themselves, and to a large extent to alienate the laity. For one of the undoubted "notes" of the day is the lack of a thorough understanding between the clergy and laity of the Church of England. A second reason for a reconsideration of the question lies in the fact that it forms in its present position an insuperable bar to any real reunion with Nonconformists. And what ultimately all true Christians are aiming at is the unity of the Church of Christ, and the removal of all unnecessary obstacles to that unity.

In view of this, the deliverances at the recent Fulham Conference in regard to the interpretation of John xx. 22 are of great importance. And Dr. Sanday, in his sermons on "The Conception of the Priesthood," exhibits the right temper and method in which the discussion should be carried on. As, according to the unanimous decision of the Fulham Conference, the words of John xx. 22 were addressed to the eleven and those with them—*i.e.*, to the whole Church—so Dr. Sanday shows that at the Council in Jerusalem (Acts xv.), although the Apostles "act as leaders of the Church and give shape to its resolutions, those resolutions go forth with the authority of the Church as a whole" (p. 45). Nor does it appear from any passage in the New Testament that special powers were conferred on the Twelve as such. The Church is described as built upon "the foundation of the Apostles and prophets"—*i.e.*, probably the New Testament prophets, not the Apostles alone (p. 50). Moreover, it is clear that the laying on of hands did not, at least in all cases, "denote the transmission of a power or energy from one who had it to one who had it not" (p. 57). Lastly, an important citation is made from St. Augustine to the effect that "none of His disciples gave the Holy Ghost. They prayed, indeed, that He might come upon those on whom they laid their hands, but they did not give Him themselves. A custom which the Church in the case of its officers retains to this day" ("De Trin.," xv., 26, § 46). On which Dr. Sanday raises the question whether the creation of a new ministry, different from the regular and established order with prayer invoked, and not without signs that the blessing prayed for has followed, should prove a permanent cause of division, especially when

that new ministry was the result of a reaction for which the established order was largely responsible.¹

These are questions which thoughtful minds are already discussing. It would be a mistake to press conclusions or to forestall practical results. These will come as the inevitable consequences of convictions formed outside the heat of party conflict, as in the case of many other once burning questions, which have been silently determined by an unwritten consensus, and thereby revolutionized modes, of religious thought.

But these also are academical questions, the discussion and decision of which do not touch either of the two pressing demands of the day, both of which lie beyond the strict limits of the Oxford Movement.

These two demands are concerned, one with the attitude of the Church towards agnosticism and scientific unbelief, the other with the evangelization of the masses. As regards the first, there is need of a school of philosophy, Christian by conviction, whose task it will be to restate and reaffirm the foundations of belief. For the second there is need of a revival, and, therefore, of some great teacher-prophet who shall have power to stir the latent Christianity of the masses, and to create disciples who will follow in his steps. It is from the people, and not from the Universities, that we may hope for the new revolution, for, as Bishop Westcott has taught us, "the movements which have changed the world have drawn their forces from the poor."²

ARTHUR CARR.

ART. III.—A POINT OF TECHNICAL ACCURACY IN
THE GOSPELS—*πλοῖον* AND *πλοιάριον*.

IN an illuminative article on "St. Luke's Gospel and Modern Criticism" in the *CHURCHMAN* for February, 1903, Mr. Jennings makes the following statement. On p. 256, footnote 2, he writes: "John vi. 22-24 shows that there is no distinction in his use between *πλοῖον* and *πλοιάριον*." This is the *prima facie* view, and it has tradition to support it. But writers of commentaries, transcribers of the New Testament who introduced into a margin running in parallel columns with the text their own conjectures of what the author meant, and compilers of lexicons, have not generally as practical a knowledge about boats as they have about

¹ "Ministerial Priesthood," p. 58.

² "Lessons from Life," p. 56.

Greek words; possibly they regard all boats as similar in kind, but differing in some undefined way in degree. Theoretically they are right, practically they are wrong. And as fishing-boats are used by fishermen who, from the nature of their occupation, have a practical intuition of the adaptability of certain boats for certain purposes, we shall not, therefore, be surprised if St. John and other fishermen on the Lake of Galilee had different sorts of boats suited to the different requirements of their work, and that he distinguished between them by the above-mentioned Greek words respectively. It is, moreover, proverbial that the landsman knows little, very little indeed, about a seaman's business, and that these two classes of the community hardly understand each other's language. And as in marine cases litigated ashore it is found to be necessary that a nautical assessor shall sit with and assist the civil judge, so also in matters of exegesis the same principle may be applied innocuously to operations of research and criticism conducted by scholars, historians, and expositors. It is necessary to clear the atmosphere of all misconceptions, be they established by tradition or recent opinion, before the proper meaning and relation of a word can be duly understood with reference to its context. The meaning of a word may, in the lapse of time, so vary that it bears in later writers almost a different idea to what it did in earlier ones. Classical Greek words may have a technical sense when used by a writer like St. John, whose vocabulary was limited when compared with St. Paul or St. Luke. We therefore see no reason why he should have attached the exact shade of meaning to the word *πλοιαριον* that Aristophanes did some four hundred years previously. We maintain that he was at liberty to use it as a suitable vehicle for conveying a local idea contemporary with his own age, and explanatory of the object he had in view, even if it did not quite harmonize with the meaning which classical writers attached to it.

The substantive *πλοιον* is derived from the verb *πλέω*, I fill, possibly connected with the idea of filling with a hollow cavity the space from which the heavier water has been displaced, this being the fundamental condition of floating. This word, used from Homer downwards, means generally a ship for carrying cargo or merchandise, in contradistinction to *ναῦς* (*νάω* or *νέω*, I float), which describes a larger vessel for fighting purposes, or a military transport ship (Acts xxvii. 41). Our object is to ascertain the exact notion that was present to St. John's mind when he wrote *πλοιάριον*. Was he familiar with its classical meaning when he used it four times in his Gospel to express the Hebrew notion of the boats then in use on the Lake of Galilee? The following considerations suggest

a negative answer. His writings do not afford an extensive evidence of his familiarity with Greek literature. His early life was spent among the fishing industry of the Lake of Galilee. His interests were Jewish. His influence in official circles was able to obtain admission for St. Peter and himself to hear the formal judicial examination of Jesus before Caiaphas. His home in Galilee was the stronghold of Hebrew instincts and traditions, and its fishing population possessed the energy and independence necessary to express them. But, on the other hand, it may be urged that before he wrote his gospel he had been sufficiently brought in touch with Gentile influences, Roman manners, and the Greek language to justify the opinion that he used the word with whatever technical meaning it therein had. My conviction, however, founded on the internal evidence of the fourth gospel, is that he uses it in a special manner and in contradistinction to *πλοῖον*, with which it is contrasted in the passages where it is found.

This contention requires justification. We must seek for explanation in those passages which contain both the words under discussion. I would venture to suggest as an English equivalent for *πλοῖον*, in those places where it is conjoined with *πλοιάριον*, *fishing-smack*, or simply *smack*. It may not be possible to translate other passages in the New Testament by the same equivalent uniformly, but it may generally be adopted where matters of the Galilean fishery are concerned. This industry seems to have been most flourishing at the northern end of the Lake, and the gospels infer, moreover, that it was practised in certain families in hereditary succession. We are, therefore, entitled to surmise that a traditional form of boat or smack would be handed down from father to son, and persist with little or no alteration for many generations; and that a Galilean fisherman would describe it by *πλοῖον*, whatever the original signification of that word might be. It is beside our present inquiry to enter into the details of naval construction either of Greek boats or of the fishing-smacks in the Gospel narrative; but the latter would be built to suit the local circumstances of the conformation of the bottom of the Lake of Galilee, the shelving beach, the ground swell, the prevailing winds, and the description of nets they would have to carry and work. The "currahs," still used on the west coast of Ireland, where there is deep water, would be useless either in the bays or river estuaries on the west coast of England, which become dry at low water, or on our east coast, where the ground swell requires a boat with a deep keel forward and a flat bilge in the after-part. This class or build of boat is termed a "cobble," and is beached stern first. The "currah" is not beached at all, but is lifted out of the

water as soon as it comes alongside of the landing-place. Both these classes of boats differ from the "punt," a build of boat used in the estuaries of our west coast rivers. This digression has been inserted only with the view of illustrating my contention that boats "would be built to suit the local circumstances of the Lake of Galilee." There is no evidence in the Gospels that the *πλοιάριον* was ever used for fishing purposes, which, according to the evangelists, were conducted from a "smack." But this want of information does not warrant our assuming that the class of boat indicated by this latter word was never used, or was unsuitable for, such purposes. According to St. John, they seem to be tenders to the "smacks"—*i.e.*, for ferrying or conveying persons to or from them. The word is only found six or seven times in the New Testament, and in the majority of them *πλοῖον* is the alternative marginal reading. Considering, then, only the use of such boats indicated in these passages, and quite independently of the classical meaning the word previously had, or what meaning was subsequently attached to it, I venture to think that our word "dinghy" would best convey the idea of the evangelist. Thus it will be seen that the *πλοῖον*, or "smack," was, as regards the purposes for which it was used, quite distinct from the *πλοιάριον*, or "dinghy."

To make this distinction clear, a more detailed examination of the passages containing the latter word will be required. In John vi. 16 *et seq.*, after the feeding of the five thousand in the neighbourhood of Bethsaida Julias, on the north-eastern shore of the Lake of Galilee, the Lord told His disciples to return to Capernaum, on the western side of the lake, a distance of between four and five miles. They then "went down to the beach, and, getting into a *smack* (or perhaps '*the smack*') went towards Capernaum, on the opposite shore. . . . Having rowed about three miles and three-quarters, they observe, between three and six o'clock in the morning, Jesus walking on the water; and being close to the *smack*, they were afraid . . . and they were willing to receive Him into the *smack*; and immediately the *smack* was at the land for which they were making." The above extract from John vi. 16-21 is that evangelist's account of the sea-passage from Bethsaida Julias to Capernaum, he himself being one of the party. The parallel passages in the synoptists are Matt. xiv. 24-33 and Mark vi. 47-52. Now, it will be noticed that *πέραν* in John vi. 17 refers to Capernaum, the destination of Jesus and His disciples, whereas *πέραν* in verse 22 means Bethsaida Julias, the place from which the party started. In John vi. 17, 19, 21 there is no suggestion, as far as I know, of *πλοιάριον* being in any case an alternative

marginal reading for *πλοίου*. Moreover, Jesus, when crossing the lake, seems uniformly to have performed the journey in a *smack*, possibly because of the number of disciples who attended Him. If John intended to convey no distinction between his use of the two words in question, we are surprised at the silence of transcribers and commentators in not suggesting a similar variation of the text that they do in other places. But it is quite possible that marginal readings may have been originally a genuine attempt to accentuate, or at least preserve, the distinction I plead for. The venial mistakes made in the transcription of manuscripts probably first gave rise to the general impression that the two words involved no distinction.

In illustration of John vi. 16 *et seq.* we will compare John xxi. 3, 8. There we find the two words in juxtaposition, and presumably in contrast and involving a distinction. This occasion is one of the appearances of the Risen Lord. Seven of His disciples had gone out for a night's fishing. They used a *δίκτυον*—*i.e.*, a striking net, which drifted with the current. The fish would strike against it: its mesh would be too small to allow their bodies to pass through, yet sufficiently large to permit them to insert their heads as far as their gills, when they would find their progress checked; they would then naturally endeavour to turn round—for a fish cannot swim backwards—and this act would entangle their gills in the mesh of the net, and they would remain prisoners in it. This description of net was, according to the evidence of the Gospels, generally used from a *smack*, though it is quite possible that a smaller amount or lesser length of this netting might be worked with a *dinghy*. When, however, John recognised the Person of the Risen Redeemer on the beach in the early morning, and suggested to Peter that it was the Lord, the latter Apostle waded ashore out of the *smack*, while the remaining six came ashore in a *dinghy*, a distance of about one hundred yards. This circumstance shows that a *dinghy* was able to approach nearer to the shore than a *smack*. We therefore conjecture that it was used to save the fishermen wading as Peter did on the present occasion, that it drew less water, and that it was a convenient vehicle for ferrying the fishermen and their fish between their *smacks* and the shore. If the *dinghy* was in every respect equivalent to the *smack* it is hard to imagine why St. John should have used these two words in describing one boat—if there was but one indeed, as those who maintain that no distinction exists between the two Greek words seem to argue—in the Gospel narrative. My contention, however, is that there were two boats: one the *smack* which they used when

fishing; the other the *dinghy* that they went ashore in. The author was a practical fisherman, and familiar from childhood with the classes of boats in question, and that his use of the distinguishing words was not only on his part intentional, but that it is an incidental disclosure that the fourth Gospel was written by a fisherman, thereby affording additional proof of its genuineness and of its authenticity.

We will now recur to the occasion of the passage in the *smack* from Bethsaida Julias to Capernaum (John vi.). The multitudes which stood on the opposite shore—*i.e.*, at Bethsaida Julias—naturally wondered where Jesus went to after He had supplied their wants in such an unexpected manner. John, the author of the narrative, is now at (or near) Capernaum, and he is describing events as they appeared to him from that place. When, therefore, he uses the expression *πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης*, he refers to Bethsaida Julias, because it is on the other side of the sea from Capernaum. He states that “on the morrow”—*i.e.*, the day after the feeding of the five thousand—those who had been fed, and who had remained at Bethsaida Julias, observed that there was no other *dinghy* there, except the one that the disciples of Jesus got into previous to their departure in the *smack*. It is clear that they did go away in it to Capernaum, or it could not have been at the eastern Bethsaida. John, moreover, tells us that the voyage was performed in a *smack*, and with this the synoptists agree verbally. We can only conjecture, then, that the Apostle and Evangelist's use of the two words in chap. vi. is analogous to that of chap. xxi. In vi. 22 he states that there was no other *dinghy* at Bethsaida Julias except the one that the Lord's disciples got into, and that they went away alone in the *smack*. In xxi. 3, 8 he tells us that seven disciples went out for a night's fishing in a *smack*, and that six of them went ashore early the following morning in a *dinghy*. What can be more clear than the almost irresistible conclusion that on both occasions, in the same neighbourhood, under similar circumstances, and at no great interval of time apart, a *dinghy* was used for embarking into or disembarking from a *smack*, a *dinghy* was used as an accessory boat? In John vi. 22 the majority of manuscripts read *πλοῖον*, but the edition of Rob. Stephanus in 1550 reads *πλιάριον*; this is evidence of the traditional view that the Evangelist intended to imply no distinction between the two words, but this view, it is contended, is based on the want of technical experience of transcribers and commentators. Opinions founded on the similarity of Greek words, quite irrespective of the classical meaning they bear, are not safe guides for the exegetical interpretation of those words, where

it is evident that an author is writing purely from a local and technical standpoint, and uses them to convey a particular signification. John vi. 23 states that other *dinghies* arrived from Tiberias, near the place where they ate bread—*i.e.*, they were sailed or rowed over by those who were interested in or inquisitive about the doings of Jesus. Tiberias is on the western shore of the Lake of Galilee, and the wind that was contrary to the disciples' *smack* in its western progress would be favourable to the eastern (or north-eastern) progress of the Tiberias *dinghies*. There is a difficulty arising out of the topography of Bethsaida and Tiberias which is connected with the narrative we are considering, and therefore not entirely irrelevant to the subject of the present discussion. We will therefore confine ourselves, by way of explanation, to the remark that these two places were distant about eight miles across the lake; our authority for locating the former place in the district of Gaulonitis, near where the upper Jordan empties itself into the lake, is Grimm's Lexicon of the New Testament (*s.v.*) Βηθσαϊδά. In Luke ix. 10 *et seq.* we read that Jesus took His Apostles away privately to a place belonging to the city called Bethsaida, and that crowds followed Him there, where He fed five thousand people. In Mark vi. 45 we are informed that the Lord, after the feeding of the five thousand, constrained His disciples to go to the other side of the lake, "unto Bethsaida." Luke does not record the event of the Lord's walking on the water; but Mark does, and, moreover, he states that it happened on the occasion of the disciples being sent in a *smack* to Bethsaida. John likewise records it, but with the variation that the disciples were rowing towards Capernaum. We therefore are entitled to conjecture that there were two places bearing the name of Bethsaida (or fishtown)—the one mentioned in Luke ix. 10, to which the Lord withdrew His Apostles and where He fed the five thousand; the other named in Mark vi. 45, to which He sent them after He had fed the five thousand. From John vi. 17 we conclude that the Bethsaida mentioned by St. Mark was near Capernaum, and from John vi. 23, 24 that it was on the same western side of the lake as Tiberias. John vi. 22-24 is an involved sentence, but the accuracy of its statements is a proof of its genuineness and of its being written by one who was familiar with the topography of the neighbourhood.

We must now resume the thread of the Gospel narrative. When the people at Bethsaida Julius saw the arrival of the *dinghies* from Tiberias, they persuaded those who had brought them over to give them a passage to Capernaum, probably thinking that they would find the Lord there, judging from

the direction in which His disciples had gone away in the *smack*. The word *πλοίαρια* in John vi. 23 has an alternative marginal reading *πλοία* (Ν ἐπελθόντων οὖν τῶν πλοίων); the same word reads *πλοία* in the third edition of Rob. Stephanus. The circumstance that *dinghies* should have gone over from Tiberias in sufficient numbers to be capable of conveying any appreciable part of five thousand persons from one side of the lake to the other indicates the fact that either *smacks* were not much used at Tiberias, or that they were temporarily engaged in fishing, while the *dinghies* were unoccupied. Another possible explanation is that fishing operations were suspended to enable the fishermen to duly attend to their religious duties consequent upon the season of the Passover, to celebrate which the crowds were making their way up to Jerusalem. The distinction, or the identity, of meaning between the two words which is the subject of the present article certainly has occupied the attention of New Testament transcribers and editors from the earliest times down to the middle of the sixteenth century, but their evidence throws no further light upon the subject beyond confirming the traditional ambiguity that exists concerning their meaning. The solution to that difficulty, to my mind, can only be settled by careful attention to the internal testimony of the fourth gospel witnessed by the testimony and authority of the fisherman Evangelist. This, then, sums up the case as far as his gospel is concerned.

It now only remains to collate the evidence of the synoptists and note its bearing upon what St. John wrote. The passages for examination are Mark iii. 9, iv. 36; Luke v. 2. (1) In Mark iii. 9 we read that Jesus was densely thronged by a representative audience from all parts of Palestine, and even from the Syro-Phœnician towns of Tyre and Sidon. The scene is laid by St. Mark at "the sea"—*i.e.*, the Lake of Galilee. The exact spot is not disclosed, but we may reasonably suppose, by the presence of a *dinghy* there, that the place was either the western Bethsaida, Capernaum, or Tiberias. The Lord possibly wished to address the multitudes from the boat, or else to employ it as a means for placing Himself at a respectful distance from them, so that He might enter into more intimate relationship with the twelve Apostles. On the assumption that Mark wrote under the inspiration of St. Peter, we here trace the influence of the practical fisherman in the Greek word used by the Evangelist. At any rate, the word "dinghy" seems to betray that familiar association with the fishing industry of the Lake of Galilee that we should expect from one who had been practically connected with it. We are not told that the Lord on this occasion made any lengthy

journey in the boat, and, to my knowledge, *πλοίου* is not read in the margin of any manuscript as a variation from the text. (2) Mark iv. 36 contains the second of the two instances where the Evangelist uses the words under discussion; and here we again meet with the same variety between text and margin that we found in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel. Here the authorized version (so-called) reads, "And when He had sent away the multitude, they (the disciples) took Him even as He was in the ship. And there were also with Him other little ships." The marginal substitution of *dinghy* for *smack* rests mainly on the authority of R. Stephanus, whose edition (in the absence of any evidence to the contrary) is presumed to have been the text used by the translators of 1611. The circumstances of the Gospel incident are as follows: The Lord was crossing the Lake of Galilee in a *smack* with His disciples, and other vessels were sailing or being rowed in company with His *smack*; during the passage a storm of wind arose, which He rebuked, and He calmed the sea. The parallel passages in the other two synoptists uniformly use the word *smack* to describe the vessel conveying the Lord on this occasion, but neither of them contrast it with the other word *dinghy*. St. Mark's Gospel contains both words according to the edition above quoted, but the evidence preponderates in favour of the word *smack* being read in both instances. The mere fact that "*dinghy*" should have been introduced in the second instance, notwithstanding the weight of testimony against it, seems to be additional proof that the person responsible for it admitted the distinction between the words, and imported it into the text by using them both instead of one only; no other important consequences are attached to this variation. (3) In Luke v. 2 we are again confronted with a conflicting reading as to which of the two words truly and genuinely represents the original text. This passage receives a certain amount of illustration by the reference it contains about the nets (Luke v. 4) mentioned in it. We will give its general outline and drift, and then examine its statements in detail in order to extract its full meaning. A crowd of persons were thronging the Lord on the shore of the Lake of Galilee. He wished to instruct them, and was doubtless looking about for an advantageous place from which to do so. His eye fell upon two *dinghies* close to the shore, but the fishermen were gone out of them and were washing their nets. There was nobody to take charge of them and to manage them while He was speaking. He then noticed Simon Peter in his *smack*, so He got into it with him, and sitting down therein He taught the people who were standing on the beach, while the future

Apostle maintained it in a suitable position for Him to do so. It will be further noticed that nets (observe the plural $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\tau\upsilon\alpha$) were afterwards used from the *smack*, which caught a miraculous draught of fishes. Now, it seems at first sight as if there could not, at least here, be any distinction between the two Greek words, but this view is dissipated upon a closer examination of the passage. Two empty *dinghies* were standing beside the Lake, but the Lord did not get into either of them. He next observed some *smacks*, "and getting into *one of them*, which was Simon's, He asked him to put out a little way from the land." This passage demands further explanation owing to the confusion introduced into it by the authorized version and the Greek text which is presumed to underlie it. When the substitution of "*smack*" for "*ship*" is made that version reads: "He . . . saw two *smacks* standing by the lake; but the fishermen were gone out of them . . . and He entered into one of the *smacks*, which was Simon's, and prayed him," etc. This involves a contradiction by saying that the Lord saw two *smacks* without any fishermen in them, and finding Simon on board one of them, He prayed him that he would thrust out a little from the land. But this contradiction vanishes when, translating from Tischendorf's text, we read $\pi\lambda\omicron\acute{\iota}\alpha\rho\iota\alpha$ instead of $\pi\lambda\omicron\acute{\iota}\alpha$ with R. Stephanus, as I have ventured to paraphrase the passage above. This reading of Tischendorf best satisfies the demands of common-sense by indicating that a distinction between those two words existed in the mind of St. Luke. The plural "*nets*," in Luke v. 4, should be compared with the singular "*net*" in John xxi. 6. The former evangelist has vindicated his claim to be a first-rate historian by his careful collection of the materials for his history, and his accurate expression of them in the technical language used among Galilean fishermen and in the Gospel of St. John the fisherman. The former records that "*nets*" were used to obtain two *smacks* full of fish; the latter that "*a net*" was employed to catch 153 fish. The nets in Luke v. 4 would be temporally fastened together while fishing, and separated when they were cleared, mended, or washed; this practice still prevails with striking nets. In John xxi. 6 only one net is used, with a proportionately small catch of fish, and is cleared on the beach. The careful regard to minuteness of detail shows that each evangelist is relating a distinct event, and each, moreover, mentions the technical words *smack* and *dinghy*.

I do not press either of them as being the best English equivalent for their Greek congeners, but simply use them to convey the distinction that I plead for. More competent scholars than myself may correct me in these matters, and

their corrections will be most sincerely welcomed; but yet when anyone writes he must express his own opinions. My efforts have been confined to an examination of the internal evidence of the Gospel narratives, and my criticisms are rather those of a nautical assessor than of a judge. Persons living solely in the atmosphere of grammars, lexicons, commentaries, and the apparatus of textual criticism may be excused for their want of technical information about boats and nets. With the classical use of these words this article does not deal, nor yet with the external influence that Greek literature may have had on the mind of the fourth evangelist; the subject would far exceed the limits of a single article, and would only be remotely connected with the object it has in view.

J. E. GREEN.

ART. IV.—ABRAHAM, MOSES, AND CHRIST.¹

THERE are many religions in the world. Most of them have some elements of truth in them. It would be strange if they had not. As systems of belief and practice they differ much from one another. The religion of the Bible, though one of these, differs from all the rest more widely and radically than any other. It is obvious that all these religions, though with some truth in them, might be false. But if one is true, it follows logically that all must be false so far as they differ from it.

The religion of the Bible claims to be the one true religion, and it rests that claim upon the fact that it has been divinely revealed. It has not been thought out by man. It is not the result of any evolutionary process of human reasoning, or experience, or the remembrance of ancient myths and traditions, but has been made known to man from the beginning by the One, True, Living God.

This great truth lies at the root of our Christian Faith, which perishes if that root is destroyed.

It will help us to realize this if we consider how much our Christianity rests upon our belief in the recorded history of three great personalities who stand out conspicuously upon the page of history—Abraham, Moses, and Christ.

Some of our modern critics have got rid of Abraham as anything like a real historical person; a University Professor has now disposed of Moses; and "What think ye of Christ?"

¹ A paper written for the Winchester Clerical Association by the Rev. Canon Huntingford, D.C.L.

has received more than one not very satisfactory answer. That is why I have chosen Abraham, Moses, and Christ for our subject this evening. Let us consider the case of Abraham first.

For the biography and religion of Abraham we go to the Book of Genesis. But few of us realize how distinct the Book of Genesis is from the rest of the Old Testament. It is separated from the rest of the Pentateuch by a period of about four hundred years. As a portion of the revealed religion it stands by itself. It has nothing to do with the law of Moses, but looks onward to Christ. "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day, and he saw it and was glad." And as Genesis looks onward to Christ, so Christ and His Apostles overleap all the rest of the Old Testament, and refer their hearers to Abraham as the great example of the true religion of the Gospel—a filial, trustful religion, the religion of "faith which worketh by love."

Now, if we take the Book of Genesis as it stands—and we must remember that Christ has set His seal even on the introductory chapters—if we look upon the book as real history, we see that Abraham was not the founder of the true religion, but a reformer. It is a mistake to think that Terah was not a worshipper of the true God because it is recorded that he worshipped idols. You might just as well say that Romanists do not believe in Christ because they worship the Virgin and the Saints, and their idolatrous images. Laban, we know, believed in the true God, for he referred to Him as the God of his father Terah, and yet Rachel carried off some of his little idols, which he called his gods. This mixture of true and false worship has, in fact, been a practice in all ages, from that of Abraham to that of Leo XIII.

Abraham, then, was a reformer; and he was specially called to be a reformer and prophet, a friend of God, and a great example of living faith, of the filial, trustful, and fruitful religion to be finally established by Christ.

Is it conceivable, then, that Genesis, standing out so conspicuously distinct from Mosaism, could have been invented by any of the disciples of the Mosaic Law? It matters not by whom it was written, for the seals of Moses and Christ have been set upon it. And Christ and the prophets refer to it as pre-Mosaic.

If we take the Bible, then, as it stands, and accept it as a Divine Revelation, it is clear that Abraham was not the founder of the true religion, but a divinely-chosen reformer. A law with sanctions was given to Adam at the beginning, and was broken. And his descendants were early divided into the sons of God, or true worshippers, and the children of

men. Thus, a knowledge of the Living God was not lost in the days of Abraham, for as before Enoch and Noah had "walked with God," so in Abraham's day Melchizedech was a "priest of God most High" (Gen. xiv. 18).

But Abraham was not only a divinely-appointed prophet and reformer; he was also chosen to be the founder of a nation specially selected and separated from all other nations to hand down the knowledge and laws of the living God, until the Eternal Son should be incarnate as the second Adam and Saviour of the whole human race. For this purpose God made a covenant with Abraham, gave him the sign of circumcision, and promised that in his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed.

Before leaving Abraham, let me quote the words of Max Müller about him :

"How is the fact to be explained that the three great religions of the world in which the unity of the Deity forms the keynote are of Semitic origin? Mohammedism, no doubt, is a Semitic religion; and its very core is monotheism. But did Mohammed invent monotheism? Did he invent even a new name of God? Not at all. And how is it with Christianity? Did Christ come to preach faith in a new God? Did He or His disciples invent a new name of God? No. Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfil, and the God whom He preached was the God of Abraham. And who is the God of Jeremiah, of Elijah, and of Moses? We answer again, the God of Abraham."

Thus, the faith in the one living God, which seemed to require the admission of a monotheistic instinct, grafted in every member of the Semitic family, is traced back to one man, to him in whom all the families of the earth shall be blessed. And if, from our earliest childhood, we have looked upon Abraham, the friend of God, with love and veneration, his venerable figure will assume still more majestic proportions when we see in him the life-spring of that faith which was to unite all the nations of the earth, and the author of that blessing which was to come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ. And if we are asked how this one Abraham passed through the denial of all other gods to the knowledge of the one God, we are content to answer that it was by a special Divine revelation granted to that one man and handed down by him to Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans.

Our second great personality is Moses. What are we to think of him and his law?

As regards the moral law, summed up in the Ten Commandments, the religion of Moses was the religion of Abraham, of the prophets, and of Christ—a pure, spiritual, filial, trustful,

and fruitful religion. Moses was a divinely-called and inspired prophet, but also a legislator. And his civil and ceremonial laws were intended to isolate the chosen people, to preserve them from idolatry, and to prepare the way for Christ.

That the God of Moses was the God of Abraham is clear from the narrative of his call by One who called Himself the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel. But the work assigned to Him was very different from that of Abraham. He was to deliver Israel from Egypt, and to form them into a nation under God as their King.

As the subjects of a theocracy they required a code of civil laws. But as Jehovah was not only their King, but their God, they required instruction also in the forms and ritual of His outward worship. This was given them in the ceremonial law. The Mosaic Law, therefore, embraces three elements differing widely from one another, though not given always in separate codes—the moral, ceremonial, and civil laws.

There is a tendency in all religions to attach more importance to outward forms than to the religion of the heart.

The divine institutions of Moses form no exception to this tendency. All through their strange and varied history the Israelites were at one time relapsing into idolatry, and at another into formalism. And so it was the work of divinely-called prophets, from Elijah to Malachi, to call them back to the heart-worship of the God of Abraham.

We know how it ended. The exile in Babylon cured them in a measure of idolatry, but resulted in that which we call Judaism, a system regarded by some modern critics as an advance towards a better state of things, but which ended, nevertheless, in the crucifixion of Jesus, and called from Him the sad retrospect of the history of His people: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not" (Matt. xxiii. 37).

It has often been considered remarkable that Moses tells us nothing about another life. It would be more remarkable if he did. He had to legislate for this life. He had to found a temporal theocracy, to establish laws for the temporal government of a theocratic nation. To have said anything about rewards or punishment in a future life would have been as much out of place in his system as it would be in the civil or penal codes of a Christian nation. Our Legislature frames laws for the civil government of the English people. We have also a penal code, and he who sins against this is punished without any reference to another life. The man convicted of

murder is condemned to death. As individual Christians we urge him to repent, and we often pray for him in our churches, but not at all with the idea of saving him from the temporal punishment of his sins. We pray for his soul, but we kill his body. The penal code of Moses is framed on this principle, but it is better than ours. It punishes with death such sins as adultery, seduction, and blasphemy, which our laws leave almost wholly unpunished.

We must remember also that the civil and ceremonial laws of Moses were not only temporal, offering temporal rewards and punishments, but also temporary, intended to last only for a time until Christ should come to fulfil all its types and figures and to confirm and renew the covenant of Abraham and his spiritual, filial, and trustful religion, the religion of "faith which worketh by love"; a religion no longer national, but Catholic as at the first, the religion of every nation under heaven, the religion by accepting and acting on which all the families of the earth should be blessed.

The work of Moses, then, was completed when St. John, the last and greatest of the prophets, baptized Jesus in Jordan and proclaimed Him to be the promised seed of the woman, the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world, and thus "the law and the prophets were until John."

And all through the history of the chosen people it was the work of divinely-chosen and inspired prophets to protest against the superstition and formalism of Israel and to keep alive in the hearts of the faithful the religion of Abraham, the friend of God—the spiritual, filial, trustful, and fruitful religion of him "who staggered not at the promises of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; and was fully persuaded that what He had promised, He was able also to perform" (Rom. iv. 20).

And then in the fulness of time Christ came, the greatest Personality which has ever appeared in the world. And so, "What think ye of Christ?" is now the question of questions which we are all required to answer.

The answer of the modern Jews is that He was the best Jew who ever lived. The answer of all is that He was the best man who ever lived, and that His teaching and example, had they been followed, would have done more than those of any other man to heal the political and social evils of the whole human race.

What is our answer as faithful Christians? We may give it in the words of the Apostle: "Whom say ye that I am? . . . And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God" (Matt. xvi. 16).

And now let us consider how the teachings of Christ and

His Apostles rest upon a belief in the historical truthfulness of the Old Testament, upon a belief in what is written of Abraham and Moses.

Christ is "the son of David, the son of Abraham" (Matt. i. 1). That the departed saints are living is proved, says our Lord, by the words of God to Moses: "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For He is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto Him" (Luke xx. 37).

"Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day: and he saw it, and was glad. Then said the Jews unto Him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast Thou seen Abraham? Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am" (John viii. 56-58).

Whatever may be said or thought about the Kenosis, it was after He was risen from the dead and was conversing with the two disciples that our Lord, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, expounded to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself" (Luke xxiv. 27).

He Himself observed the ceremonial laws of Moses, and directed others to do the same. To the cleansed leper He said: "Go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing those things which Moses commanded" (Mark i. 44).

"As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John iii. 14, 15).

In fact, He rests His claim to be the Christ on the testimony of the Old Testament Scriptures. To the unbelieving Jews He says: "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of Me" (John v. 39). What an evident proof that the Old Testament saints looked for eternal life! though it is a modern fancy to deny this, a matter of which Article VII. says that they who teach it "are not to be heard." He refers the unbelieving Jews to Moses: "Do not think that *I* will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me: for he wrote of Me" (John v. 45, 46).

And thus these three personalities—Abraham, Moses, and Christ—are so knit together as to form as it were a threefold cord to hold fast the anchor of our hope in the stormy ocean of a doubting and unbelieving world.

We shall be wise in these days to consider well the evidences of the truthfulness and inspiration of the Bible, remembering

that it is a collection of more than sixty Scriptures written during a period of about fifteen hundred years by men differing very greatly in rank, character, and attainment.

From Genesis to the Apocalypse they teach the one true religion—belief in the One, True, and Living God, and His holy law, the law of purity, righteousness, and truth—thus differing widely from every other religion of the world.

What but Divine inspiration can reasonably account for this? This unity of teaching is itself one of the greatest of miracles. Whether any of these writers were J. E., D., or P. matters very little, so long as they do not teach us to believe in any other than the One, Living, and True God. Personally, though I have long looked for it, I have never found any solid proof that the persons represented by these letters ever existed. I am inclined often to say, "Moses and the prophets I know, and Christ I know, but who are ye?"

I do not wish to speak slightly of the higher critics. Their work has in many respects been very useful. But though I have long studied their arguments, I can rarely accept their conclusions. Many of them appear to me to go to their imagination for premisses, and from these draw very often illogical conclusions. But the more sober modern critics have done a good work in sweeping away a vast mass of rubbish which had gathered round the interpretation of the Bible, the accumulation of many ages of ignorance and superstition. The critics whose conclusions we shall be wise not to accept at secondhand from the writers of periodicals, are those negative critics who are doing their best to undermine the faith of believers in the historical truthfulness of the Bible without even attempting to give them anything in its place. We will not allow them to rob us of our faith in Abraham, the father of the faithful, in the Divine inspiration of Moses, or our belief in the miraculous conception of Christ, His atonement for our sins on the cross, His resurrection from the dead, His ascension into heaven, and His second coming to judge the world and to establish that kingdom which "shall have no end."



ART. V.—CHURCH WORK IN INDIA.¹

THE subject of Church Work in India is rather a well-worn subject, and yet it is such a vast one that it is difficult to know how to deal with it in a concise and interesting way. At the Church Congress in 1900, two admirable papers were read on the "Church's Progress in India during the Nineteenth Century," by Bishop Johnson, the late Metropolitan, and Sir C. Elliott, who was recently Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. Probably most of us have read those statements, but if not, they are well worth a careful perusal, and more especially the statement made by Sir C. Elliott.

Now, at first, one is almost appalled at the magnitude of the work before us in India, and it seems terrible to think that at present there are only 2,000,000 Christians out of a population of 300,000,000. But if we look at the rate of increase during the last forty years there is reason for encouragement.

The first general census of India was taken in 1871, and the number of native Christians then returned was 1,270,000. In 1881 the figure had risen to 1,600,000, and in 1891 to a little over 2,000,000, and in 1901 to about 2,500,000. These statistics, taken from the Government census reports, show that in thirty years the native Christians increased by 60 per cent., while the increase of the general population was about 20 per cent. Of course, by far the larger proportion of the native Christians belong to the Roman Catholic and Syrian forms of Christianity, and are mainly the result of conversions made in earlier times. The Church of England now claims 305,917 adherents affiliated to her through the S.P.G. and the C.M.S., and the number of ordained native clergy of the Church of England, which was only 16 in 1850, is now about 300, and they are aided by a large body of about 9,000 lay-workers.

These results, as Sir C. Elliott says, give us cause for earnest and thankful congratulation, for they show how large a blessing has rested on the Church's work; so that Bishop Welldon is justified in asserting that the Church of India is no longer a weak body suing for recognition and even for toleration at the hands of the Government. Although it is less than a century since the constitution of the English Episcopate in India, she has already struck her roots deep and spread her branches wide in the national life.

God has given India to Great Britain, and Great Britain will

¹ A paper read at a Conference.

give India to God. The evangelization of India will be the fulfilment of the responsibility laid upon the spirit and the conscience of the British race. It will come about, as the Bishop truly says, not soon or easily, but by the gradual dissolvent influence of Christian thought upon the traditional beliefs and practices of India. Perhaps one of the most remarkable proofs of this "dissolvent influence" is evident in a very encouraging religious movement in India, known as the *Brahmo Somaj*. When it was first started in 1830 its religion was only a hazy form of monotheism, as inculcated in the Vedas, but gradually this was so influenced by Christianity that the founder of Brahmoism wrote as follows: "The consequence of my long and uninterrupted researches into religious truths has been that I have found the doctrines of Christianity more conducive to moral principles, and better adapted to the use of rational beings, than any other which have come to my knowledge." The so-called Brahmo theology is now saturated with Christian ideas, and a former Bishop of Bombay was not far wrong when he said that Brahmoism was a half-way house to Christianity. Indeed, it seems in some cases more than this; for another leader of that movement has made this remarkable statement: "If we were not to be false to the teachings of our own forefathers, could we be false to the teachings of that great Prophet of the lost, Christ Jesus and His disciples? They have come, and are changing the face of the country, revolutionizing our manners and institutions, our households, our souls. Jesus has conquered India." And the present leader of what is now called the New Dispensation party has gone even a step further than his predecessor, and has spoken in unmistakeable language of the Atonement as a cardinal doctrine of his belief; and there is now in this movement a prominent development of earnest religion in the strong sense of sin, the need of a regenerate life, and the passionate thirst for God as Saviour and Comforter. No wonder that Brahmoism is claimed as *one of the results of the advent of Christianity in India*; for, in the words of an able missionary writer, the movement is an impressive testimony to the living influence "of Christian ideas, and to the irresistible and growing power of the personality of Christ on the mind and heart of the world."

It is interesting to remember that one of the last things that Professor Max Müller wrote to his Indian friend was an earnest appeal to the Brahmos to cast in their lot with Christians.

I mention this particularly to show what strong ground there is for hope that, if wise and gentle methods are perse-

veringly used, the keen and subtle intellects of the higher classes in India will be won over to Christianity. "The Church comes to them with the Gospel of Christ," says Bishop Weldon, "not as wishing to wound their hearts by bitter attacks upon the faiths that are consecrated to them by the usage of centuries, but as bringing them, at the cost of much suffering and self-denial, and the sacrifice of many lives, the treasure that she holds most dear, and as willing to give it to them if they are willing to accept it. The missionaries have been and are in many parts of India the people's best friends." Nor is there the slightest truth in the supposition that they are the special objects of native dislike. A non-Christian newspaper, the *Indian Spectator*, wrote lately that "the days are long past when the people of India regarded the preaching of a foreign faith as a grievance, and in the case of Christian missions they have even learnt to value them for the wholesome moral influence which they diffuse all around. "We absolutely subscribe," says the writer in this paper, "to Lord Lawrence's opinion that notwithstanding all that the English people have done to benefit India, the missionaries have done more than all other agencies combined."

Now, all this is distinctly encouraging, and when to this you add the great work that is being carried on in the different schools and colleges established by the Church societies, we may look forward with confidence to greater successes. But here there is a need of a word of caution, for there is grave doubt in many minds as to whether there is not much more of the imparting of secular knowledge in these institutions than the inculcating of religious truth. I am afraid it is true, that very little is seen now at all like Dr. Duff's work in Calcutta. In his college of 700 youths he always had several converts every year; but can this be said of our S.P.G. schools and colleges now? And it is remarkable that the Bishop of Madras, who was for several years a missionary of the S.P.G., lately spoke very strongly on this subject in the S.P.G. College at Trichinopoly. He said: "The experiment of divorcing education from religion has been tried for the first time in the Christian world during the last fifty years; it was introduced into India soon after the Mutiny, and in India it has proved and is proving a disastrous failure. It is removing the old landmarks, disintegrating family life, sapping the foundations of society, and bringing the educated classes of India face to face with a moral chaos, in which they will find no fixed principles of moral or social life and no guarantee even of intellectual or material progress. And the great question that must now force itself upon the more thoughtful members of Hindu society is

whether they will carry through this novel and rash experiment in education to the bitter end, or whether they will pause and consider seriously the issue before them, and the necessity of going back to that union of religion and education which has been sanctioned up to this generation by the instinctive judgment of mankind."

These are strong words, and one hopes that they will do good, for they are certainly needed. In the same speech the Bishop said: "I do not think anyone could regard the present state of things in our mission schools and colleges as satisfactory, or as in any degree a solution of the great problem which lies before Indian educationists."

As corroborative of this, I may quote an extract from a paper lately written by Professor Saththianadhan in Madras: "As for English education, we are informed that it has had a more destructive than constructive effect, for having succeeded in destroying the faith in the old gods, it has left no definite creed in its place." A well-known American writer, who travelled recently in India, said: "The best Hindus with whom I came in contact—men cultivated, profound, and clear-seeing—are free-thinkers to a man."

Professor Saththianadhan, however, does not believe altogether in the alarmist view; he admits that there is a great deal of indifference in matters of religion, and that there are certainly sceptical tendencies in New India; but he thinks that these tendencies "are the natural products of the state of transition through which the country is passing."

We hope this may be so; but if so, there is all the more need for care and caution in our missionary schools and colleges. No one would disparage the right use of education: its result must always be manifest, and a striking instance of this came within my own experience in India of a young Brahman on the West Coast converted in a C.M.S. school, and led to this by the right teaching of geography.

But what is really needed in this, and indeed in all missionary work in India, is the establishment of colleges of mission priests in different centres of the mission-field: members of the different colleges living together with a common fund on the same system as the Oxford Mission to Calcutta or the Cambridge Mission to Delhi, receiving no salary, but having all their expenses paid. And it is this kind of work for which the five years' foreign service system, that has lately been established in England, would be (as the Bishop of Madras says) admirably adapted.

The great advantage of this system to Church work in India would be that it would do away with the "one man" system which so largely prevails now.

Everyone heartily admires such devoted work as that of Mr. Rivington in the Canarese country, working alone there for twenty-three years, and of Mr. Margoschis in the Tinnevely Diocese, and of Mr. Blake at Tanjore; but in the event of their removal, who can immediately take their places, or carry on their work with the same efficiency? And one is thankful to hear that the Bishop of Madras is already taking steps to establish two colleges of mission priests in his diocese, and undoubtedly, if they are successful, others will be formed, and would be most useful in supplying help when sudden vacancies occur. My friend Bishop Morley, writing about his diocese of Tinnevely last year, said: "The great want, as elsewhere, is devoted men and women. At present there are only four S.P.G. missionaries, and for some months there was only one in my diocese: two were away on furlough, suffering from overwork."

There is one other subject to which I should like to refer—viz., the increase of the number of native clergy in India. Sir C. Elliott urged this strongly in his speech at the Church Congress, and he mentioned the remarkable fact that when Schwartz's assistant, Satyanathan, was ordained in Tanjore in 1790, he preached a sermon which was so remarkable that the S.P.C.K., in printing it, expressed a hope that native suffragan Bishops might soon be appointed in India. Well, more than a century has passed since then, and yet there is no native suffragan Bishop yet, and, as Sir C. Elliott says, "the hesitation and reluctance to make such an appointment are natural and intelligible." Anyone who has been in contact with the native clergy in India can well understand this hesitation and reluctance on the part of the English Bishops in India; for though many of the native clergy are in many ways admirable men, yet as a rule they lack firmness and independence, and many of them think too much of emoluments and position. Not long before I left India, a retired S.P.G. missionary told me that native S.P.G. priests who came to see him talked a great deal about their salaries and the amount of land and house property they had acquired by them; and a shrewd old Brahman once said to him sarcastically: "It pays well to become a native padre!" Many think it was a mistake to have granted such a high rate of payment to the native clergy, for it put a strong temptation in their way, and checked the true spirit of self-sacrifice. Before concluding, may I venture, as a commissary of one of the Bishops in India, to ask for sympathy with and interest in the *Indian Church Aid Association*. It was founded in 1880, but has lately been gathering much more force and vigour under the presidency of Bishop Johnson. Its

object is, first, to enable the Bishops of the Province of India and Ceylon to provide the ministrations of the Church for our fellow-countrymen scattered throughout that vast portion of the British Empire; and, secondly, to help to establish the large and increasing body of native members of our Church, who greatly need our support, especially as it is through them that the non-Christian mass may best be brought to the knowledge of the truth. Of course, funds are greatly needed for all the different objects connected with this association. The other day, at a meeting of the Council at the Church House, it was lamentable to hear the poor sum of £140 being doled out to the different dioceses in the huge Province of India and Ceylon. And we shall be doing a good work if we turn the attention of anyone interested in the Church's work in India to the efforts of the Indian Church Aid Association; and I may mention that an *Indian Church Magazine* is now published quarterly, which gives very interesting information about Church work in India.

Looking back over the past century, we should indeed be thankful for the success which God has given to all the Church's efforts in India, and we may look forward into this century "in fullest faith and hope that the progress will be more rapid and the success more complete"; only let us bear in mind our Lord's caution, that in this dispensation the Gospel is to be preached in all lands *for a witness*, and that we are not to expect national conversions until the Jews have first turned to the Lord; and then Zechariah's prophecy "about many people and strong nations" (chap. viii.) will be fulfilled. Meantime, let us wait patiently, and pray for God's blessing on the Church's work in India and in all lands, and do all we can to support and further it.

WALTER WACE.



ART. VI.—"THE AGE OF THE FATHERS": BEING
CHAPTERS IN THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH
DURING THE FOURTH AND FIFTH CENTURIES.¹

THE ground covered in these volumes is almost exactly the same as that traversed by Dr. Bright in his earliest work, "The History of the Church from A.D. 313 to A.D. 451." But the treatment is very different. That book was written for

¹ By the late William Bright, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford. In two volumes. Vol. i., pp. x, 543; ii., pp. 597. London: Longmans, 1893. Price 28s.

students; references to authorities enabled the students to verify all statements. The present work is more popular, and no notes are given. At the same time (says Dr. Lock, the editor of the work, in his preface) it is more learned, because enriched by the varied reading of thirty-five additional years.

A posthumous book is, by its nature, unsatisfactory. Who does not regret that the great scholar, F. J. A. Hort, did not live to witness the publication of the various volumes that, since his death, have been edited and issued by grateful and pious hands as a memorial, *ære perennius*, to the teacher? One must needs miss those finishing touches, those added notes, that delicate pruning, that a fastidious scholar ever deems it necessary to execute. No other hand, however deft, can manipulate the material with quite the skill of the original writer. And so, perhaps, it is with the present work, admirably finished off, as it has been, by Mr. C. H. Turner and Dr. W. Lock. All that painstaking revision could accomplish they have done.

As to the book itself, the reading of it—despite the ease of its style—has been a more exacting task than might have been anticipated. The very absence of footnotes has proved (to one reader at least) rather a hindrance than a help, inasmuch as there was no clue provided whereby to test this or that statement, or weigh this or that conclusion. And the verification has frequently proved laborious, and, at times, intricate.

What strikes one most about the book, perhaps, is the consummate ease with which Canon Bright moves through a mass of detail—biographical and political, as well as theological—that would go far to swamp most men. Evidently his knowledge is a first-hand knowledge; the scenes he depicts—and with so forcible a pen—he depicts from intimate knowledge; he is in close living touch with his heroes; they speak to him, across the gulf of a millennium and a half, as though he too were of them; he has entered into their interests, has watched them at their work, has seen and appreciated their struggles, anticipated their victories, and solaced them in their defeats. Such a knowledge as this—and it is everywhere apparent in Dr. Bright's massive and crowded volumes—comes not from reading *about* the Fathers in the latest German encyclopædia, or the last theological pamphlet from Leyden or Zürich, but from close intimate acquaintance with the actual writings of the Fathers themselves. To this the editors have called attention in their judicious preface, when they say: "It must be acknowledged that Dr. Bright was not well acquainted with German. . . . On the other hand, few (if any) scholars of our generation have moved with such ease among the primary

Latin and Greek contemporaneous writers.” This is what gives his work its peculiar quality; one feels instinctively that the writer has read Jerome’s “Letters”; has mastered Augustine’s “De Civitate”; has followed Chrysostom’s “Sermons,” with tender interest and pathetic regard, in their original Greek; and is as familiar with the correspondence of Leo the Great as a modern man of letters is with the correspondence of Horace Walpole or Fitzgerald.¹

Doubtless the weak element in the book as a whole lies in the fact that the chapters are rather biographical sketches in a historical framework than a closely-knit organic history. The book has the charm of discursiveness, but not the ordered efficiency of such a work as Gibbon’s. The details give life and colour to a narrative; true, but they require a strict subordination to the main account. Biographical details are sometimes apt to distort the historical perspective. And that is, possibly, the impression left on the mind by parts of the book. Parts, on the other hand, are admirably conceived and rendered—*e.g.*, the story of Chrysostom, from the summons from Antioch to that dark day when he fell a victim to Imperial treachery and the jealousies of an ecclesiastical cabal.

The following is a very brief sketch of the contents of the book as a whole. A short introductory chapter leads us to the Donatist troubles that eventuated in the Council of Arles. Then follow two chapters, the one containing an account of the Councils of Ancyra and Neocæsarea, the other an account of the relations between Licinius and Constantine. Next comes one of the most important sections of the work—the story of the Nicene Council, and the Arian factions which were the *fons et origo* of that celebrated meeting. Dr. Bright does ample justice to the part taken by Athanasius at the Council, and devotes a considerable portion of the subsequent chapters to an account of Athanasius and his place in the development of Christian doctrine. This is not the first time that Dr. Bright has written, with singular affection, yet equal impartiality, of this, the greatest of the Fathers; readers will call to mind his masterly book, “Lessons from the Lives of Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Augustine.”

The Pagan reaction under Julian is next dealt with; and this is followed by the chapter on Basil—not, we think, the most satisfactory portion of the book. Basil evidently appeals strongly to Dr. Bright’s sympathies; yet, somehow, one gets a much less vivid impression of the life of that Father from these pages than of Ambrose, for example, or Cyril.

¹ The student may usefully read, alongside of Bright’s volumes, Prof. S. Dill’s admirable volume, “Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire” (1898); and Farrar’s “Lives of the Fathers” (1888).

Of Theodosius Dr. Bright writes with uncommon admiration and respect, though no attempt is made to gloss over the growing tendency of the Emperors generally, and of Theodosius in particular, to advance the interests of the Christian Church by persecution of dissentients and (so-called) "heretics."

The chief chapters in the second volume are those—already alluded to—which recount the troublous episcopate of Chrysostom, and of the work of Augustine in, practically, welding Western Christianity into a doctrinal unity. No man ever left so lasting an impression, not merely on the thought, but the organization, of the Christian Church as this extraordinary man—a man who, despite certain intolerances, certain weaknesses (*e.g.*, the unhappy business of Pinianus, not referred to by Dr. Bright), and certain superstitions (possibly inevitable amid the growing superstitions of the fifth century), has given to Western Christianity a forcefulness, a character, that Eastern Christianity has conspicuously lacked.

The rise of Nestorianism, the Councils of Ephesus and Constantinople, the "Latrocinium," and the events that led up to, and included, the great Council of Chalcedon, occupy the rest of the book—viz., some 300 closely-printed pages. The reader will do well to weigh Dr. Bright's temperate verdict on Cyril of Alexandria, the best-abused of all the Fathers, not, perhaps, undeservedly. Much as we may detest, and rightly detest, Cyril's relentless persecution of Nestorius, and his connection with the shameful murder of Hypatia, it must be confessed that the Church of Christ is in his debt for the services he rendered her at a critical juncture. He had the misfortune to begin life under the care of an evil-natured man, Theodorus of Alexandria; he had a fierce opposition to contend against, and that under the burden of ill-health, sharp censure, bitter imputation, misconstruction, and never-sleeping suspicions. Whatever his faults—and they were many—"the thought," says Bright, "as well as the heart of Christendom has pronounced judgment" in his favour, as against the attempt of Nestorius to empty the Incarnation of its Divine content.¹

Three facts rise prominently into notice, if we carefully study these two volumes: First, the extraordinary decline in the best Christian ideals and in concepts of true Churchmanship, from the moment the Imperial mantle was flung over the shoulders of the Church. Individuals might—nay, did—adorn the Church they served with the graces of consistent living; but the Church, as a whole, seemed to lose that savour

¹ See Bright's "Waymarks in Church History," chap. vii., for an interesting paper on Cyril. For his "dogmatic" position *cf.* Harnack, *History of Dogma*, E. T., vol. iv. (*passim*).

of *other-worldliness* and to be robbed of its ancient purity, in proportion as it ceased to be a struggling and a persecuted Church. After all, it was to be expected. “Blessed are ye when men shall persecute”—these words had (and still have) wider applications than men suppose. The union of Church and Empire—Christ’s little flock and the World-Power—was certain to end in a spiritual declension. So it proved; and all after-history has but exemplified that truth of truths: “*My kingdom is not of this world.*”

Secondly, from a persecuted community, the Christian Church grew to be a persecuting power. The Bishops prayed for the *unity* of the *Spirit*; they worked for *uniformity* of *doctrine* and *organization*.¹ Even Augustine was not exempt from the increasing tendency to invoke the secular arm to carry forward the mission of the Redeemer; nay, he strove to justify his action by (the usual) appeal to expediency.

Thirdly, one cannot but mark how, as the primitive simplicity and purity of early Christianity declined, and as the Church of Christ, receding from its first affection, embraced within itself alien teachings, rites, and modes of thought, so there grew up, within its borders, strange superstitions—many of them purely childish, all of them detrimental to the spiritual life—that gradually preyed upon the body of primitive Christian doctrine, eating deep into the heart of morality. The evil was only too apparent even in Cyprian’s day; in Augustine’s time it was far advanced; and the upas-tree of hierarchical supremacy grew swiftly as the long night of the Middle Ages drew on. Not for, at least, a millennium was the axe to be lifted that should cut at the root of this baleful supremacy. It was lifted—at last; and the world rose up, once more, free. But at what a cost! Christianity has not yet recovered from the mischiefs received during the fourth and fifth centuries of our era, when the seeds of sacerdotalism were sown into the furrows of a dying civilization. True, during that epoch noble and permanent work was accomplished: creeds were formulated, doctrine enforced, the lines of organization laid down. But we search in vain for the gracious spirit of the Church’s golden age—its humbleness, its sweetness, its unworldly temper, its upward glance, its Apostolic faith and fervour. It is only now, after 2,000 years’ bitter experience, that the world begins to realize all that is signified in the watchword, “Back to Christ.”

E. H. BLAKENEY.

¹ Zwingli might have taught them better. “*Christiani hominis est non de dogmatis magna loqui,*” said that Reformer, “*sed cum Deo ardua semper et magna facere.*”

ART. VII.—"THE CONFLICT OF DUTIES."¹

AMONG the social changes which have taken place in the last forty years, few have been, and few are destined to be, of greater influence than the improved facilities for education offered to girls in the higher middle and middle classes of society. I speak of forty years because it was in 1864 that the House of Commons gave authority to a Royal Commission to extend its inquiries into the state of the education of *girls*. It was in 1865 that Miss Davies and Miss Buss, and in 1866 that Miss Beale and six other ladies, were called to give evidence before this Commission.

When we speak of education to-day, apart from technical and professional training, we are accustomed to divide it into "elementary" and "secondary." Forty years ago, in the sense in which we now use the term, *organized* "secondary" education for girls did not exist. Besides the elementary and dames' schools (attended by the children of the poor), there were the "seminaries for young ladies," the private boarding-school, and the daily or resident governess. I have no intention of estimating the education then given in girls' schools, but probably, as a rule, when judged by the standard of to-day, it was extremely inefficient, though certainly brilliant exceptions existed; but I fancy it would generally be found in those days that a really well-educated woman was one who had been educated at home.

To-day the conditions are entirely different. We have now all over the country a very large number of both public and private schools for girls, which, judged by even a high educational standard, must be pronounced as exceedingly satisfactory. Among the "public" schools, I refer, of course, to the many high schools, and girls' grammar-schools, and the schools of the Church Schools Company and of the Girls' Public Day-Schools Company. Of public "secondary" schools for girls there must to-day be at least two hundred in England alone.

Besides these schools, there are the "University" colleges for women, such as Girton and Newnham at Cambridge, St. Hugh's and Lady Margaret Halls and Somerville College at Oxford, Holloway College at Egham, Cheltenham, Bedford, and Westfield Colleges, and the women's departments in connection with the Victoria University in Manchester and Liverpool.²

I believe that anyone who has at all an intimate acquaint-

¹ "The Conflict of Duties, and other Essays." By Alice Gardner, Lecturer of Newnham College, Cambridge. London, 1903.

² This list is not exhaustive.

ance with the education of girls will admit that between these women's colleges—where, to all intents and purposes, a University education is offered—and the various public high schools for girls, as well as a great number of the best private schools, there is to-day a very close connection. This connection, if I may so define it, is both “downwards and upwards,” or, perhaps still more correctly, both “backwards and forwards.” My meaning is as follows: (1) A very large and constantly-growing proportion of the teachers in these schools have been educated in one or other of these University colleges. *From* these colleges these teachers bring *into* the schools, not merely the scholastic knowledge they have there acquired, but those indefinable qualities of character and influence—thoughts, ideas, and ideals, mental and moral atmosphere, views of human nature (its purposes and possibilities), as well as standards of life and conduct—which, to a great extent, permeate every really good educational establishment, in which, under the same teachers, engaged in the same studies, and many of them having the same purpose in life, a number of men or women live and work for months and years together.

(2) On the other hand, not a few of the girls in these schools are looking forward to proceeding to these colleges, and of these a large proportion are hoping ultimately to become teachers; thus, they are particularly anxious, even before entering these colleges, to learn from their teachers, who have already passed through them, something of their life and ideals.

My purpose in all I have so far written is to show what an immense influence these University colleges for women must have upon the girls (the future mothers) of the upper middle and middle classes of English society. Indeed, it would be impossible to exaggerate either the strength or the importance of this influence. And, of course, the influence of the colleges will, to a great extent, be the influence, not merely of the heads, but of the teachers and lecturers in these colleges. Personally, I have a strong conviction that this great movement for the higher and better education of girls owes its remarkable success mainly to the excellent nature of the influence which these women, as a body, have exerted upon their pupils, and, through these, upon the secondary schools for girls throughout the country.

Now, every true parent will surely seek to know, not merely what branches of knowledge (commonly called “lessons”) his or her daughters are learning at school, but under what kind of influence they are—what ideas or ideals of life, duty, conduct, and religion, are being, directly or indirectly, placed before them.

As a very valuable help towards acquiring this knowledge, may I commend to the study of all who are interested in higher education, and especially to those who have daughters either at school or college, a volume of short essays which has quite lately been published—viz., "The Conflict of Duties," by Miss Alice Gardner, who has for some years been one of the lecturers at Newnham?

In the preface the origin of the essays is clearly explained: of the eighteen which the book contains, sixteen were read at the Sunday afternoon meetings of a society of students at the college. "The members of this society were not all of one way of thinking or of upbringing: they belonged to various Churches or to no Church; they pursued various lines of study, and differed greatly in their acquaintance with the world and with books." Miss Gardner further states that, "In writing papers for such an audience, one naturally tried to keep on ground that was common to the larger number, and to throw out suggestions for the more independent thinkers, without becoming unintelligible or repellent to such as had not looked far beyond the traditional landmarks."

I can well understand some parents being at least startled at the thought of the possibilities of treatment which these words might imply. If there are such, I would only ask them to reserve their judgment upon the teaching which the book contains until they have read through it from cover to cover. With particular sentences and judgments they may strongly disagree, but, taking the book as a whole, of its influence for good there can, I think, be no possible doubt.

A teacher of experience who wishes to interest the members of a society where attendance is purely voluntary will naturally choose subjects for treatment or discussion which she feels sure will be of interest to the majority of the members of the society. A glance at the titles of the various papers in this book shows the nature of the subjects of which Miss Gardner found this to be true. Among these we find, "The Conflict of Duties" (which gives the title to the book), "The Religious Needs of the Intellectual Life," "Sectarianism," "Wear and Tear," "Symbolism in Religion," "Religious Instruction in Schools," "Religion and Good Taste," "Confession and Spiritual Direction," "Man's Responsibility for his Beliefs."

The very titles of these subjects may seem to confirm the fear of that possibly unwise freedom of treatment which the preface at least suggested. But again I plead for reservation of judgment, and I ask my readers to remember: (1) That these subjects *interested* the hearers; (2) that everything depends upon the *spirit in which* they are approached, and in the nature of the judgments of the writer herself.

With regard to the *tone* of the teaching—the *spirit* in which the subjects are treated—the most fastidious could take no exception. The tone is throughout dignified and lofty; the spirit is altogether reverent. Upon the writer's particular judgments the opinions of various readers will naturally differ.

Undoubtedly, for good or for evil, there are questions and subjects which are regarded as "matter for discussion" to-day, which were certainly not so regarded in the past. The present, if we read its literature, seems to be an age of "problems." They are of very various kinds, and they meet us at every turn. In the past, when questions arose, it may have been the custom to settle them by "authority." That method—at least, to the same extent—is no longer possible. Not only the subjects, but the authorities upon them, to-day are "questioned."

Miss Gardner, in her preface as well as in her essays, realizes that the pressure of some of these problems—especially those which may be described as "social and religious"—upon the minds of those who are beginning to think for themselves is undoubtedly great, and that it is neither possible nor wise for the teacher "to be prepared with ready-made solutions, adapted to the needs of every inquiring mind." She would not attempt to give decisive answers, but would rather help, by means of "general indications"—by which, we presume, she means "principles"—"to indicate along what lines, and in what conditions, each inquirer may hope to find his personal difficulties solved."

It is easy to see that there may be dangers in the "cut and dried" or decisive answer to a social or religious problem. I am considering such an answer as given to a girl who, as I said, has already begun to think for herself. Parents may, of course, quote "the Church." But within even the Church of England different parties give very different answers to the same question. Again, parents may give their own personal opinion, but that opinion may have been formed to meet circumstances and conditions very different from the present. They may quote some authority eminent in their own younger days, but the heroes of our children may be very different from, without being any worse than, our own.

An admirable example of the wisdom of Miss Gardner's method is found in the short paper upon "Confession and Spiritual Direction," which, a note tells us, was written as suggestions preparatory to a general discussion.

Here, if anywhere, is a subject upon which people hold the most contrary and the most decided opinions; it is also a subject upon which the vast majority seem incapable of speaking calmly. How does Miss Gardner approach it? To

begin with, she shows that to some, from force of circumstances which never should have arisen, even regular and systematic confession has become something more than even a help; it may unfortunately have become, so they think, a necessity, if they are to live their life at its best. To others the very mention of the word "confession" is sufficient to excite a feeling of horror, and to call forth at least strong, if not unguarded, language.

Miss Gardner—who evidently knows human nature, especially in its younger years—recognises that this human nature of ours "needs advice, guidance, exhortation, inspiration, and not seldom rebuke, or revelation of its own weaknesses and deficiencies to itself"; and that it needs all these more directly and more personally than "any general pulpit exhortation" can ever provide.

What clergyman is there who does not know of young people of both sexes—*e.g.*, members of his Confirmation classes—starting upon the path of an earnest Christian life, full of questions, and longing for help and sympathy, and yet who cannot obtain these from their parents? To these, even if religion be a form and a convention, it may be nothing more. The young people soon learn that their parents cannot enter into, much less sympathize with, their difficulties. In cases like these, if the young people seek "spiritual direction" outside the home, the cause and the blame lie with the parents, who have not qualified themselves to foster and nurture the best and deepest elements in their children's natures.

Miss Gardner then shows the difference between regular, systematic, compulsory confession, as taught by the Church of Rome, and "spiritual direction" as permitted by the Church of England. She shows how "we find men in various ages who had a reputation for understanding the needs of the spirit, and whose characters commanded confidence. Such was Jeremy Taylor, whom John Evelyn looked to as a spiritual adviser. Many Puritan ministers held strong views as to the necessity of spiritual discipline and of a stringent examination before Communion." As to the growth of the custom of private or auricular confession, Miss Gardner shows, from an intimate knowledge of the life and conditions of the early Middle Ages, how the practice gradually became general. It may then have served a purpose, and in rough and lawless times may have even supplied a want. At the same time Miss Gardner very clearly points out the terrible dangers with which the practice is attended, and the evils with which it has been, and must be, fraught.

The whole treatment of the subject is eminently charitable

and sympathetic, and is so pursued that it could not hurt the most sensitive feelings. Perhaps Miss Gardner's own opinion may be regarded as expressed in the following sentences: “We want some means of availing ourselves of the experience of other people. We can, of course, do this to some extent by conversation with experienced persons or by reading good biographies. Yet many people have no friends from whom they can get much real moral help, and are unable to find their experiences exactly like those recorded in books. How many of us may have gone the wrong way to work in trying to make head against a bad habit! . . . How much help some suggestive thoughts of others might at times give to us, whether in the way of encouragement or of warning! There seems a field open for spiritual experts, who, like skilled physicians, might use their knowledge to recommend to one sick person a remedy which has proved effectual in a similar case.”

Another subject which Miss Gardner treats in a similar spirit is that which she has chosen as the title of the volume. One of the chief difficulties which frequently confronts a girl who has arrived at the age of “young womanhood” is admirably described as a “Conflict of Duties.” In other words, what, under certain particular circumstances, is her *paramount* duty? Now, so long as that word can be used only in the singular her course is clear. But, unfortunately, she finds herself constantly arriving at a “cross-roads,” where the various arms of the signpost may each be inscribed, “To Duty.” Which road ought she to pursue? She cannot, as Miss Gardner says, walk to the right hand and to the left at the same time; and even important duties sometimes are in very real conflict, with such other, just as are very admirable ideals, and even principles of life. On the one hand may be the duty to parents, to home, to society; on the other may be that duty which may be described as “self-culture, with a view to an ultimately wider usefulness to our fellows.” Again, there may be the duty of a more rigorous self-discipline, the duty to religion, which seems to conflict with an apparently worldly life. Here, again, Miss Gardner refuses to give any ready-made answer; she even recognises that the rule which would bid us follow “the supreme authority of the individual conscience” needs careful qualification, because “those who rest on this as an ultimate ground make two immense assumptions: (1) That the voice of conscience is always to be clearly distinguished from the promptings of affection, of habit, or of tradition; and (2) that the conscience itself does not need training and cultivating.”

How rarely do we find it so clearly recognised as here that

“I have done what my conscience told me” may be an utterly insufficient reason for a certain line of conduct! The *qualification* of the individual conscience to acquit or condemn—depending upon its training, cultivation, and refinement—must be taken into account.

In this same chapter we find many examples of another feature and charm—indeed, of the usefulness of the book. By this I mean the value of the “by-products” discovered or thrown up in the course of some investigation. Take the following dicta from this same chapter: “People have no right to complain of a conflict of duties when they have undertaken more than lies within their capacity.” Or again: “This thought—that most of us habitually acknowledge the obligation lying upon us to do a good many things which we are quite incapable of doing, if we adequately discharge other obligations, which we regard as more seriously incumbent on us—this thought should, I say, make us more tolerant in judging the shortcomings of other people, and may sometimes lead us to attribute the conduct of our neighbours to their peculiar notion of the relative importance of various duties, instead of stigmatizing them as negligent of duty altogether.” And when occasion demands it Miss Gardner can be most decisive—viz.: “After all, the most important and undoubted duties of man cannot collide. Truthfulness, kindness, loyalty, courage: these are virtues which we are bound to practise under all circumstances.” And again: “Our thirst for personal happiness can never be satisfied till we cease to attend to it.”

Another extremely valuable essay is that upon “Wear and Tear,” by which Miss Gardner means the tremendous cost, materially, physically, and intellectually, and, alas! too often morally and spiritually, at which modern life is too often lived.

The whole of this essay is a striking combination of keen insight, shrewd observation, and eminently wise advice. First, Miss Gardner deals with the *cause* of this “wear and tear.” It lies in “the competition and the restlessness which pervades social life at the present time. Everybody is struggling for something—either for a living, or for what he regards as better living, for elbow-room, or for a position of vantage.” People who work at all must work at such pressure that they all too frequently break down. Hence “the cry for more holidays and more frequent change of surroundings.” But wherefore this fierceness of competition? To a great extent, Miss Gardner believes, it is caused by the desire to be able to maintain a high (material) standard of comfort, which so many now regard as necessary. “Young people . . . com-

monly insist on making their start in life from the point which their parents only reached after years of laborious effort and frugal living." The luxuries of an age not long past have become the necessaries of to-day. "We almost all fix our standard of expenditure by that of those in our circle of society who have the largest means, and consequently men overwork themselves and women harass themselves to prevent the horror of having to lower that standard, and confess that it never should have been theirs."

What admirable advice is contained in the following words: "The change I would wish to see made is a revision of our list—I mean of the list that we practically make each for ourselves—of the 'necessaries of life,' and the striking out of all such as are not of vital importance to health, decency, culture, social amenity, and morality." And again: "Let us provide for necessaries first; and among necessaries, let us put prominently forward freedom from harassing and fruitless cares."

As an example of the way in which a subject of constant, and sometimes very unedifying controversy may be lifted upon a higher plane, discussed with reference to far wider issues, and shown to have a close connection, not merely with personal likes and dislikes (so called), or with knowledge and ignorance—as is sometimes assumed—take the essay upon "Symbolism in Religion." How much more dignified is such a title than one like "The Ritualistic Question"! There is little of the controversial in Miss Gardner's treatment; and I would heartily commend a careful study of this essay to anyone—and how many such there are!—who is inclined to judge and hastily condemn their neighbours, who in their worship may prefer more or less symbolism than themselves.

To those clergymen who are called upon to minister to more or less educated congregations, this book should prove a most valuable help. It will give them an admirable insight into the mental and religious atmosphere in which the women and girls among their hearers either have been or are being educated. It will show them the difficulties with which many of these are struggling, the problems with which they are face to face. There is, however, a somewhat painful side to the book as far as some of the clergy are concerned. But, even if painful, this aspect may be salutary. More than once Miss Gardner hints that in the preaching and teaching of many of the clergy educated women do not find the help for which they are longing. It may still be true of some women, that whereas "men go to church for the sermon, women go for the service"; but it is not by any means true of all. If the clergy wish to retain and strengthen the hold of Christian truth upon the future mothers of the educated classes, they

will find an admirable help towards learning how to do so from this book.

I would end as I began—viz., by a strong commendation of this book to all who (1) would know what subjects are evidently interesting the more thoughtful young women at the present day, and who (2) wish to have some assurance of the excellence of the influence which the centres of the highest education are exercising upon them.

W. EDWARD CHADWICK.



ART. VIII.—THE MONTH.

THE joint meeting of the Convocations of Canterbury and York, with the Houses of Laymen of the two Provinces, resulted in fairly satisfactory conclusions, but served also to illustrate the unpractical elements which must at present attach to all such gatherings. The most satisfactory part of the proceedings was the conduct of the business by the Archbishop of Canterbury, which elicited the warm admiration of the whole Assembly. But one circumstance alone was sufficient to give a mark of unreality to the debates. After the opening remarks of the Archbishop, the preamble was moved by the Bishop of Salisbury in a speech of due comprehensiveness and consequently of due length; but after these opening statements all speakers were limited to ten minutes. Of course, such a regulation was imperative if the business was to be got through in two days; but if the constitution of a Council really representative of the Church of England had been seriously contemplated, its discussion in ten minutes speeches would have been absurd. A generation ago, a ten minutes Reform Bill was a matter of political ridicule; but to construct what was intended to be a governing body for the whole Church of England, which would practically supersede both Parliament and the Convocations, within two days, after a discussion in ten minutes speeches, would be at least reckless. A greater legislative operation than transforming the government and administration of the English Church can hardly be imagined. The reconstitution of the Irish Church, which occupied the best energies of Parliament for a considerable part of one Session, was a small matter in comparison. Fortunately, even if the construction of such a body were really proposed, the proposals when drafted by this scratch assembly would have to be submitted to Parliament before they could become effective, and we may be quite sure that the House of Commons

would give much graver and more prolonged deliberation to so momentous a matter.

Happily, however, the result of the morning session was to lead to a modification of the preamble by which the proposals were reduced to more modest dimensions. The preamble, as proposed, alleged that "it is desirable that provision should be made for the calling together of a council representing the Church of England, and consisting of clergy and laity of the provinces of Canterbury and York." Objections were at once raised to so ambitious and far-reaching an aim. It was pointed out that large numbers of laymen who, though generally silent, form a most important element in the Church, would find no real representation in the Houses of Laymen as at present elected, while practically, even if anomalously, the Houses of Parliament represent large and vital interests in the Church of England. The Bishop of Salisbury incidentally illustrated the impracticable character of the views by which many of the supporters of the scheme are actuated, by asking: "Why should we go to Parliament to reform our system of patronage? Why should we go to Parliament to alter our judicial and executive administration?" Why? Because, as was pointed out in the debate, every Englishman, or at least every English Christian, has a deep interest in such subjects. Patronage, in particular, is a matter in which not only great pecuniary interests are involved, but in which every Nonconformist has a practical concern. Upon the way in which patronage is exercised and controlled depends the character of the Christian influences at work in his village, and may depend the question whether he remains a Nonconformist. As long as the Church is established, the governing power in the country, which is practically Parliament, must keep a firm hand upon the methods by which the men are appointed in whose hands the chief spiritual influences of the country are placed. The case is even stronger with "the judicial and executive administration" of the Church. Upon its judicial administration depends the character of the teaching of the Church of England, and upon that character must ultimately depend the question whether Parliament will continue to maintain the Church in the sole enjoyment of the privileges it possesses throughout the country. One would think, from the manner in which some Churchmen discuss this question, that the Church was in possession, not merely of its endowments, but of its exclusive right to the use of the Cathedrals and parish Churches by some eternal decree. On the contrary, these privileges, of which that exclusive right is perhaps the greatest of all, depend for their legal effectiveness on the authority of Parliament. The Clergy of the Roman obedience, who were

originally in possession of them, are excluded by the authority of Parliament, and the same authority was once exerted, and might be again, to exclude Clergy of the Canterbury obedience. A Church cannot hold such privileges from a National authority without conceding great claims to that authority, or, we may add, without being under an obligation to treat it with great deference and consideration. Attempts to treat Parliament as an alien body are, therefore, both unwise and ungrateful; and it may be hoped that the Bishop of Salisbury did not represent the feelings of many of his episcopal brethren.

But the result of the morning's discussion was that when the meeting reassembled in the afternoon the most questionable terms had been removed from the preamble. The Archbishop announced that the words of the preamble would run as follows: "That whereas it is desirable that provision should be made for the calling together of a representative council, consisting of clergy and laity of the provinces of Canterbury and York." This avoids the supposition that such a council will represent the Church of England. A meeting of the two Convocations and the two Houses of Laymen will certainly be representative of a very important body of opinion within the Church, and the union of the Clergy and Laity of the two provinces in one deliberative body is no doubt desirable for the purpose of eliciting and forming that opinion. In direct negative of a motion which had been announced, it was further proposed "That the question of obtaining legal constitution and authority for such a council be reserved for consideration until after the council has, upon a voluntary basis, come into working order." This resolution places the whole matter upon a purely experimental basis, and provides the only safe method of entering upon so considerable a scheme. Obviously the first practical measure to be adopted will be, as a subsequent resolution proposed, to take steps for reforming the two Convocations, for it is manifestly unreasonable to attempt to form a representative Council out of Convocations which are confessedly not truly representative. Until some such reform of the Convocations has been effected, any attempt to enlarge their powers, either acting alone or with the Houses of Laymen, would be futile. The main result of the meeting would thus seem to be that all who took part in it are pledged to work for a reform of the Convocations. That will be a matter of no little time and discussion; and meanwhile the Council, when summoned, may perhaps be usefully exercised in discussing momentous matters in ten minutes speeches.