Just as we go to press we have received the Report of the Committee of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury appointed to consider "the Ornaments Rubric and Modifications of the existing Law relating to the Conduct of Divine Service." The Committee, as is well known, was appointed as the result of the issue of the King's Letters of Business, and it has been deliberating during the past two years. The two subjects in which Churchmen are most keenly interested are the Ornaments Rubric and the use of the Athanasian Creed. The recommendation as to the former is that the use of the Eucharistic Vestments should be permitted, the reasons assigned being that "the Eucharistic Vestments commonly so called cannot rightly be regarded as symbolic of any distinctively Roman doctrines," and that "the historical conclusions underlying the ruling judgments in regard to the Vestments appear to be liable to reasonable doubt." These two statements raise the entire question, for it is well known that in the light of history and of the testimony of those who now use the Vestments they are often regarded as symbolic of the distinctive Roman doctrines connected with the Mass. Whether the other reason urged in support of the permissive use of the Vestments will stand the test of examination is also open to serious question. The *Times* may well speak of "the seductive simplicity about the case for the legality of the Vestments as
put by a capable writer in the current number of the *Church Quarterly Review*.” There is, indeed, a “seductive simplicity” about the writer’s contentions, for it is so easy to make out a case by omitting all reference to the facts of contemporary usage and to the Visitation questions of the very Bishops who drew up the Rubric. When proof is found that the Vestments were ever used under the settlement of 1559 until after the rise of the Tractarian Movement, it will be time to reopen the historical question. The Minority Report, signed by the Dean of Canterbury and Canon Henson, possesses the great advantage of keeping quite strictly to the simple facts of the situation both past and present, and, as the *Times* rightly says, their reasons “will have to be faced.”

On the question of the Athanasian Creed we will only now remark that the problem does not seem likely to be solved by altering the present Rubric from “shall” to “may,” for this would leave the matter entirely in the hands of the officiating minister without allowing any regard to be paid to the wishes of his people. It would be far better to follow the Irish plan of omitting the Rubric altogether while retaining the Creed in the Prayer-Book, or else to omit the monitory clauses, as the Principal of Cuddesdon suggests. We shall return to the general subject of Prayer-Book revision, about which much that is useful and some things that are doubtful will be found in the Report. We can only just add that while the proposals for a new Burial Service are, on the whole, admirable, the insertion of prayers for the dead, even in very moderate form, will undoubtedly meet with strenuous opposition. The subject had better be left where our Church has wisely left it, by the entire absence of prayers for the dead in the public services. Not only will this be in every way safer and wiser, but, above all, it will be truer to Scripture and primitive Church history. The Report should, of course, be carefully studied by all Churchmen. It can be obtained for 1s. from the Oxford University Press, the Cambridge Press, the S.P.C.K., and the National Society.
The address of the Primate at Maidstone, on January 27, afforded welcome proof that he has the courage of his opinions as to the recent attempts at compromise:

"He was still firmly of opinion that the Churchmen of twenty-five years hence, discussing the same or similar problems, would say: 'It would have been better for the cause of religious education if they could have carried the suggested settlement.' The opposite view was not only a tenable and arguable one, but it might conceivably be perfectly right; but he thought quite clearly that the balance of advantage lay the other way, and he was bound to be honest and to say that if it all had to come over again, nothing that had since happened would lead him to speak, or write, or act differently to the way he had in the months past. One thing was certain, that it was not possible, in the present condition of English public life, to pass into law any educational scheme which would not be open to perfectly legitimate criticism and objection. He was certain that that fact was constantly forgotten. It was impossible to provide, in his belief, a scheme which was at once capable of attainment in the present conditions of English life, and really all-round fair, reasonable, logical, and all the rest. . . . The only thing possible was to take the best working plan that they possibly could, and, if it was possible, to unite forces for bringing it into action and working for the good of the children of the country. With regions so different in their conditions, in their popular desires and their administrative life—as, for example, Kent, the West Riding, the great Lancashire towns, the county of Durham, and that of Cornwall—it was impossible to bring forward any scheme which would not be open to some objection."

We believe the Archbishop is right, and that even before twenty-five years are over Churchmen will see that they lost a fine opportunity in 1908 of doing the best that was possible for Church Schools. The harm likely to be done to the cause of truth as well as to peace is plainly visible in the action just taken by a body called the Joint Campaign Committee for Religious Education in Elementary Schools. In a letter issued to Churchwardens all over the country the inference is clearly found, as the Bishop of Carlisle points out, that the Primate and his supporters "were advocates of a measure capable of being perverted to the religion or irreligion of the children in our elementary schools." It seems almost hopeless to expect an understanding between Churchmen when such statements can be made, and we entirely agree with the Bishops of Carlisle and Hereford in deploring these methods of
controversy. We have learned to expect them from the English Church Union, but it is a very different matter when this Campaign Committee is supported by Societies like the National Society and the Church Defence Committee, which are supposed to represent the whole Church. Let us, at any rate, be accurate, even if we cannot agree. The absence of any reference to education in the King's Speech seems to make it imperative that Churchmen should continue to face the problem and endeavour to put an end to our unhappy differences. As the Archbishop of Canterbury so well says, no scheme can be brought forward which will not be open to some objection, and the one thing imperative is to unite all the forces available for bringing about the best results possible for the good of the children of our country. It is simply impossible and impracticable in the highest degree to imagine that the question is limited to the interests of Church Schools. Education has long been a national affair, and must be dealt with as a whole.

The Evangelical Alliance has just published a booklet by that well-known Presbyterian scholar, Dr. Orr, of Glasgow, entitled "The Real Presence" (Evangelical Alliance, 7, Adam Street, London, W.C.; rd.). It is written with special reference to the recent Roman Eucharistic Congress, though it deals with the question as a whole. While the booklet is marked by Professor Orr's well-known clearness, fairness, and ability, we desire to call special attention to the closing words:

"There is, therefore, a most Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Supper on the pure Protestant view—not less real, but infinitely more so, because it is inward and spiritual, and involves no change in the outward substance of the bread and wine. This view, to sum all up, knows of a symbolical Presence of Christ in the elements, a proclaimed Presence in the word, a mystical Presence in the ineffable union between Christ and the members of His spiritual body, and a gracious Presence in the power and plenitude of the gifts of His Spirit. Beyond this, it will be difficult to show that Scripture recognizes any other."
We quote this, first of all, to show that those who are not ashamed or afraid to be called Protestants have a very definite, positive view of the Holy Communion as a means of grace; that they believe in a doctrine of the Real Presence none the less real because it is in the ordinance, and not in the elements. Another valuable point is that the booklet affords proof of the real unity of belief on the subject of the Holy Communion between the Presbyterian Church and our own. In appealing for careful study of Dr. Orr's last two sentences, we wish to ask three questions: Is there anything in these words which is not found in our Prayer-Book? Is there anything not in them which is found in our Prayer-Book? Is there anything in them which is inadequate in the light of Holy Scripture? We believe the true answer to all these questions is an emphatic negative.

Reunion, with the East

A recent article in the Guardian by the Rev. Leighton Pullan, of Oxford, urged that in the settlement of this question

"the matter of signs and ceremonies is not of great importance. . . . It is unity of doctrine, not of ceremonies, which really counts. . . . The first thing that the Oriental wants to know is not the cut of our coats, but if our belief is orthodox. We must not try to use ritual to cloak our differences."

Mr. Pullan rightly urges that, "whether we regard the differences between ourselves and the East as small or serious, we must urge that in all our Churches these differences be fairly faced." We should gather from his article that on such questions as the Filioque, the Eucharist, the Invocation of Saints, and the Authority of the Seventh General Council, he would be prepared to argue that the Church of England is either already in, or could be easily brought into, essential unity with the East. We ourselves do not so read our formularies on these subjects, and, leaving aside for the moment the problem of the Filioque, we believe that on the questions of the Eucharist and the Invocation of Saints our Articles reveal essential differences between us and the East, and express our doctrine in terms which no intelligent Eastern Churchman could possibly accept.
Meanwhile, we commend for consideration the following words of a thoughtful writer in the Canadian Churchman:

"A Greek priest was a prominent figure in the service at the consecration of the Bishop of Montreal a few weeks ago, and was photographed with the officiating Bishops. While he took no part in the service beyond being an honoured and interested spectator, the question arises, What is the exact relationship between the Orthodox Greek Church and the Anglican communion? We are, of course, reminded that the two Churches are in communion, but the further inquiry naturally arises, What constitutes communion, and is it reciprocal? It is evident, we think, that the close relationship suggested by intercommunion has been more apparent in theory than in practice; but is it wise to lay emphasis upon a formal recognition of orders and creeds when ideals and practices seem to be so far apart? The Greek Church, as represented in Russia, for example, according to what we have learned of it, is something of an ecclesiastical instrument for blessing the actions of the powers that be. The old prophetic spirit seems to have gone out of it, and the Christian ideals have been largely abandoned. Why should we hasten to proclaim our affinity with such an organization, particularly since we are so careful to differentiate ourselves from others more closely allied to us in purpose and service?"

Mr. Pullan pleads earnestly and wisely that any answer that we give to the East "must come from all the Churches in union with the See of Canterbury." Here, then, is one answer which expresses what many Churchmen in all parts of the Anglican Communion are feeling. With the writer, we ask: "Is it wise to lay emphasis upon a formal recognition of orders and creeds when ideals and practices seem to be so far apart?" The question is fundamental.

In the current number of the Church Quarterly Review an article on "The Dearth of Clergy" discusses the causes in the light of the recent Report of the Archbishop's Committee and the Lambeth Encyclical Letter. The writer is of opinion that the financial cause is not the primary and fundamental deterrent to men who contemplate taking Orders—that this is on the surface rather than fundamental. It is therefore urged that the change which has come over modern thought during the last twenty years will account for an even greater diminution in the number of ordinands than has been recorded.
"Doubts which would have been hardly conceivable twenty years ago, except amongst the most advanced thinkers, regarding the New Testament, the Church, the Creeds, are now felt on every side. In 1886 people were chiefly alarmed by the promulgation of somewhat extreme views about the origin of the Pentateuch, whereas now the most vital parts of the Gospel are publicly submitted to the most ruthless criticism. . . . The Bishops may have been perfectly right to exclude from their Encyclical all mention of this tremendous revolution of ideas as a cause of the falling off of candidates for ordination, and to dismiss it in the Report with a curt allusion to 'the theological unrest of the present day'; yet we cannot but believe that this is the actual cause of the evil which they deplore. Why is it that the most intelligent class of our possible ordinands, who have all to gain socially and even financially, are unwilling to take Holy Orders? . . . It is not because men fear poverty, but because they distrust themselves that they hang back. They ask themselves, 'What do I believe? What message have I to deliver? What do the Bible, the Church—nay, Christ—mean to me?' and they not unnaturally refuse to devote themselves to a lifelong pledge to preach that which they fear that, as their knowledge increases, they may not be able to believe."

One indication that the writer has rightly diagnosed the situation was afforded by the inaugural lecture of the new Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture—Canon Cooke—at Oxford last month. In discussing some of the principles of Biblical interpretation, he said that, while it was the modern practice to write commentaries on the text, the ancient exegetes used to insert commentaries in the text itself. After giving examples of these editorial changes and additions, Professor Cooke used them to prove his contention that the Bible is to be interpreted as the living Word of God, and therefore as capable of being constantly added to and altered. The Oxford Magazine made the very pertinent remark that "such a method of commentary raises very difficult problems as to the historical character and trustworthiness of the documents which have been so edited, to say nothing of its relation to any theory of inspiration." Surely there is a real difference in the religious value of a history which gives an accurate report of facts as they occurred, and a history which has been altered and modified to suit a subsequent religious conception. Is it not a simple fact that a re-edited work is often practically a reproduction of a later age? And if the books of the Old
Testament are of this character, it is vain to assure us that the actual date is of little consequence so far as the religious value of the books is concerned. The one question we have to face is whether we can trust the Bible—whether its representation of the Old Testament history and whether the facts of Christ as recorded in the New Testament are trustworthy for mind and heart. It is the absence of certitude on these points that prevents many young men from coming forward for ordination, while the free handling of Scripture without any consideration of the bearing of these problems on its Divine authority and inspiration tends to sow doubts and difficulties in many more who in any case are not thinking of ordination. Until our leading scholars give us valid and convincing reasons for trusting the Bible as it has been handed down to us from the Apostles through the Church, we must not be surprised if there is both a dearth of curates, and also a dearth of spiritual vitality and power in our Church life.

This was the title of an article in the Guardian after the "Evangelicals in Transition." His identity was not very difficult to recognize. He said that the Churchmen who were regarded not many years ago as Evangelicals are fast becoming curiosities, even to their more modern Evangelical brethren, and that this year's Islington meeting showed how far things have changed, for the programme was "entirely occupied with definite and important Church subjects." Prebendary Webb Peploe was also described as "the solitary representative of the old-fashioned Evangelicals who used to occupy the platform" at Islington. As we read the article we could not fail to be impressed with its inadequacy, and therefore with its inaccuracy as a faithful report or even impression of what took place, and we were glad to see in the next week's issue a letter from "An Oxford College Tutor" criticizing the article as defective almost to the point of being misleading. The College Tutor also said it is quite unfair to speak of Evangelical transition without realizing the immense changes that are going on on the other side—changes that are
"directly due to the persistence, under conditions often disheartening, of the spirit and doctrine and even the methods associated with the 'Clapham sect.'” And, as the writer went on to urge, the Guardian account of the Islington meeting would have been truer to fact if it had made clear the undoubted fact that Evangelical transition is “strictly limited” in scope, “and does not include any acquiescence in the doctrines and methods distinctive of the Oxford Movement.” Those who recall the Vicar of Brompton’s “brave and withering denunciation of the seminary system,” and the way in which these words were received by the meeting, will have no doubt as to where Evangelicals stand on all points of essential doctrine. No amount of “levelling-up” of Ritual, and, let us add, no amount of interest in Social Reform on the part of Evangelical clergymen, can ever make up for adherence to the old and distinctive paths of the Evangelical doctrines on grace. And if any professed Evangelical thinks that true Churchmanship consists mainly in assimilating the ritual of the ordinary High Church practices, and giving most of his time and strength to combating social evils, he ought to know that he will soon be in danger of ceasing to be Evangelical.

The opening of St. Christopher’s College, Blackheath, as a Training College for Sunday-School Teachers was a noteworthy event. We congratulate the Sunday-School Institute on this new departure, and we hope it is an indication that our Church is becoming more alive to the immense possibilities of Sunday-school work. The Nonconformist Churches are far ahead of us in all that pertains to Sunday-school equipment. When, as the Archbishop of Canterbury said, we realize that one-fifth of the population of England and Wales is now under instruction in Sunday-schools, we can see what a factor they are in our life. In our next issue we hope to call further attention to this matter in an article on “Sunday-School Reform.” We heartily endorse Canon Papillon’s plea in the Times that we should use every effort to strengthen this important branch of Christian service.
Darwinism: Past and Present.

By the Rev. Professor Orr, D.D.

This year sees celebrated the centenary of the birth of Charles Darwin. Darwin was born on February 12, 1809; his "Origin of Species" was published in 1859; he died on April 19, 1882. Amidst tributes of respect from all ranks of society, and all sections of opinion, he was laid to sleep, as one of the most eminent men of science of his generation, in Westminster Abbey, a few feet from the grave of Sir Isaac Newton.

The centenary to be observed will be the occasion of the renewal of these tributes, and of eulogy, carried to its highest pitch, of the distinguished scientist and his work. Deserved honour will be paid to him as a naturalist of the first order, a keen and patient observer, a bold and original generalizer, a man of transparent sincerity and candour, above all as the brilliant thinker who, by his work on "The Origin of Species," first gave to the theory of organic evolution in Nature an assured place in modern scientific belief. The idea of evolution, we shall immediately see, was not of his creation. It was "in the air," and many, as Darwin himself tells us, had been working at it, and seeking to give it a scientific basis. But unquestionably it was Darwin who set it on its feet as a working theory, and secured for it an acceptance it would probably not otherwise have obtained.

Mingled with these eulogiums will be heard in the centenary proceedings, no doubt, much denunciation of theologians for their bigoted opposition to Darwinism—so characteristic, one will be told, of the species—and the triumph of Darwin's theory will be cited as a new proof of how science moves on its untroubled way to assured victory, while theology suffers, as it has always done, humiliating defeat. Darwinism to-day, we shall be reminded in tones of pride, has conquered all along the line, holds undisputed sway, and its conclusions now rank among the settled truths of science.
It might be pointed out, in mitigation of this censure, that there has been no objection to Darwin's theory ever made by theology which was not first, or as early, made by scientific men in the name of science itself. It is not the case that objection was taken to Darwinism only by theologians. Scientific men of the highest eminence entered the lists against the chief assumptions of the theory, and a large body of thinkers can be named who opposed it from the first.

Yes; but now, it will be said, see the beautiful illustration of the invincible power of truth in the fact that such thinkers have since been converted, or have been left hopelessly behind in the race, so that at length Darwinism has become practically the accepted creed of all sensible educated people!

Is it so? It is a pity to dispel illusions; but in the interests of truth a few things must be said, to set the facts in their right light, which go a great deal further than simply a plea for mitigation of censure. We venture calmly to assert—without the faintest tincture of the *odium theologicum*—(1) that there is hardly a single objection to Darwinism made by theological or scientific opponents which time has not amply justified; and (2) that Darwinism, as a theory of evolution, does not to-day hold the field, but is increasingly being departed from, in the scientific world itself.

A primary fallacy in the discussion of this subject lies in the confusion of evolution with Darwinism, as if the two were synonymous. They are far indeed from being so. Evolution, or the general doctrine of descent, has, within limits, received the assent of the bulk of people in this generation; Darwinism, as a theory of evolution, has not obtained general assent, and, in the multiplying schools of evolutionists, is rapidly losing what credit the genius of its author at first won for it.

It is, indeed, a curious irony which displays itself in the history of Darwinism. There was evolutionary theory in the world before Darwin wrote.¹ The facts on which the case for

¹ See the Historical Sketch prefixed to "The Origin of Species."
evolution mainly rests were for the most part known, and had been insisted on before his time. "A naturalist," as Darwin himself says, "reflecting on the mutual affinities of organic beings, on their embryological relations, their geographical distribution, geological succession, and other such facts, might come to the conclusion that species had not been independently created, but had descended, like varieties, from other species."1 In point of fact, many had done so. But then—it was not satisfactorily shown how this result was brought about. Evolution cannot, Darwin held, be regarded as established till you can show the how. It was here that Darwin struck in. His special claim was that he had discovered the "how" of evolution in "Natural Selection." The title of his book is, "The Origin of Species by means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life." Subsidiary causes came gradually to be admitted, but "natural selection" remained the chief, and it is on the merit of this alleged discovery that Darwin's fame rests.

But what has happened? Lifted into favour by Darwin's theory, evolution has come to be generally accepted, but the theory which has had this magical effect has itself come to be increasingly doubted. Its sufficiency has been riddled by facts and arguments which leave little of it standing. It certainly no longer holds the field as it did. The fact of evolution is regarded as established; the factors in the process—the how of the process—are declared to be still to seek. That such should be the case may seem strange, but it is true that it is so. Those who doubt it should consult the chapters on the subject in R. Otto's book "Naturalism and Religion" (a translation of a German work with a much longer title), in the "Crown Theological Library." There the extraordinary change in opinion which has taken place in Germany and elsewhere on the Darwinian hypothesis is emphasized with ample learning and incisive remark.2

1 Cf. Introduction to "The Origin of Species."
2 "We have for the moment," says this author, " provisionally admitted the theory of natural selection. . . But in reality such an admission is not
It is not the object here to attempt to show the various scientific grounds on which the Darwinian theory is challenged. They touch every point in the system—indefinite variation, transformation by "infinitesimal" changes, the struggle for existence (the newer evolution declares that severity of struggle hinders evolution), the capacity of natural selection to pick out and retain infinitesimal variations for long periods (possibly "millions of generations," says Darwin), and the like. On the other side is urged the absence of clear evidence of transition, the flaws in the geological evidence, the fact of abrupt transitions, the proofs of changes caused by internal conditions, the need of recognizing a "teleological" (purposeful) principle in development. The difficulties arising from these and other considerations have been pressed against Darwinism from the beginning. Owen, Lewes, St. Mivart, Spencer, Lyell, Romanes (latterly), urged them with effect. Even the defenders and "trumpeters" of Darwin's hypothesis did not, with all their zeal, surrender themselves wholly to it. Lyell, e.g., clung to a modified creationism, and viewed with repugnance the "pithecoid" descent of man. Huxley had difficulties about sterility, and doubted the soundness of Darwin's principle, Natura non facit saltum. He rather thought that Nature did make "jumps" now and then. But if once "jumps" are admitted, Darwinism is gone.

The "struggle for existence" in Nature—an idea borrowed from Malthus—is a pillar of Darwin's hypothesis, but it is now a question whether this "struggle" exists in anything like the degree supposed, or has the relation to evolution that the Darwinian theory imagines. In the pictures given of the pro-

to be thought of, in face of what is at present so apparent—the breaking down of this hypothesis, which has been held with so much persistence. . . . If we can rid ourselves of the peculiar fascination which this theory exercises, we soon begin to discover what extraordinary improbability and fundamental artificiality it implies" (pp. 154, 158).

1 How much the success of Darwin's book owed to the well-concerted measures for having it brought before the public is well brought out in the searching chapters of Dr. J. H. Stirling's "Darwinianism: Workmen and Work." See especially part ii., chapters ii. and iii.
digious fecundity of the lower organisms, one is reminded of Sir Archibald Alison’s statement, *a propos* of the British Sinking Fund, that “a penny laid out at compound interest at the birth of our Saviour would in the year 1775 have amounted to a solid mass of gold 1,800 times the whole weight of the globe.” The penny was not laid out in the way imagined. So the enormous increase in animal life in geometrical ratio is not realized; but the elimination is not, for the most part, through internecine struggle—indeed, takes place before the stage of struggle is reached—and survival or fatality has little to do with the infinitesimal advantages of individuals. The verdict of the newer evolution is that, where struggle occurs, “it prevents the establishment of new variations, and in reality stands in the way of new developments. It is rather an unfavourable than an advantageous factor.”

Darwin himself very considerably modified his theory as time went on. This is commonly, and very justly, cited as proof of his candour. But his admissions on certain points are really the giving up of his theory in principle. *E.g.*, in the third edition of his *Origin of Species* he wrote: “If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.” In his *Descent of Man* he writes: “I now admit that in the earlier editions of my *Origin of Species* I probably attributed too much to the action of natural selection or the survival of the fittest. . . . I had not formerly sufficiently considered the existence of many structures which appear to be, as far as we can judge, neither beneficial nor injurious; and this I believe to be one of the greatest oversights as yet detected in my work.”

In the fifth edition of his *Origin* he says: “Until reading an article in the *North British Review*, I did not appreciate how rarely single variations, whether slight or strongly marked,

1 A homely book called “No Struggle for Existence,” by George Paulin (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh), has good remarks on this head. See Stirling, as above, part ii., chapters v. and vi.
3 Third edition, p. 208.
could be perpetuated."\(^1\) Yet the whole theory rests on such perpetuation.

The fundamental objection to Darwin’s theory, however, is that, in abandoning the principle of intelligent design, it hands over the whole work of producing the organic adaptations in which Nature abounds to causes acting fortuitously. This, in the eyes of its foremost adherents, is its supreme merit, that it gives the “death-blow” to what is called teleology, by showing that the fine adaptations in organisms are not “ends,” but “results,” and can be accounted for, without intelligence, on purely mechanical principles. “Chance variations,” blind “struggle for existence,” a “natural selection” which operates without forethought or prudence—this explains it all! Professor Huxley has, indeed, observed that, even on this showing, no one can prove that it was not intended that these results should be brought about; hence teleology in a wider sense is not excluded. Possibly not; but the essence of the theory is, that intelligent purpose is not needed to explain even the most complex and beautiful of organic structures; that it can be wholly dispensed with. Why, then, should it be postulated? Like La Place, with his mechanical theory of the heavens, we can say: “I have no need of that hypothesis.” Multiply what evidences you may of plan, co-ordination, wisdom, final cause, they furnish no proof of an intelligent Creator. His existence and action, therefore, may be dismissed as superfluous.

It could easily be shown by detailed instances that this is no misinterpretation of the meaning of Darwin’s theory. Theologians were, therefore, right in denying its sufficiency as an explanation of the facts of Nature, and in pointing out its shortcomings. For as an explanation of Nature it does break down in the most vital point. The decisive objection to it may be stated in a sentence: *It invokes fortuity to do the work of mind.* David Hume undertakes in one place to show that the Epicurean “fortuitous conourse of atoms” is quite a reasonable hypothesis. Given an infinite number of atoms and

\(^1\) Fifth edition, p. 104.
an eternity for them to tumble about in, they must enter into all possible combinations and permutations; why, then, not into this one among the rest? The fallacy lies in the assumption that atoms colliding and interlacing without end will enter into all possible combinations. There are certain combinations into which they will never enter—those, namely, which depend on arrangement by a guiding intelligence. A world will not arise from chance any more than the shaking of printer's types together for eternity will produce an “Æneid” or a “Hamlet.” Is it otherwise with the casual operations of Nature in unguided, sporadic variations, and selection among these by unintelligent natural forces? Plan, design, adaptation of minute parts to defined ends, will not arise from unthinking mechanism. It is always open to someone to say that he does not see this—that he does not admit it. G. H. Lewes tells of a man who could never be brought to admit the principle that all changes imply a cause. The common intelligence will judge differently. It will be found impossible to banish ends, plan, design, will, intelligence, from the interpretation of Nature.

When the evolutionist turns round and says, “I do not deny God; I see Him as the Cause in all causes, the Law in all laws, the Will whose ends all things work out, the hidden Agent in all the subtlest processes of Nature,” the simple answer to be made is, “This is not Darwinism.” It is a form of theistic evolution, of which Darwin's theory, rightly construed, is the negation. To set such a theory to Darwin's credit is to confuse the issues hopelessly. As said at the beginning, Evolution is one thing, and Darwinism is another, and it is with the latter only we are at present concerned.

With a scientific theory of evolution which has God at the heart of it, and sees His manifested will and purpose in the processes of Nature, there need be no quarrel. The difficulties that attend such a theory, even in the most modest statement of it, are not to be underrated. They are very great, and teach caution in making assertions too large for the facts. Evolution, as science knows it, is not an all-embracing principle. It has
its limits—its initial limit as regards origins, its later limits in the rise of new orders and kingdoms in Nature, its last limit in explaining the origin of a rational and moral intelligence like man's. But, kept within its limits, it is a valuable, if not a necessary, hypothesis, and conflicts with nothing that theism or Christianity affirms.

"NOW ABIDETH THESE THREE"

By the Rev. J. S. Crisall, M.A.

FAITH is a tiny palm,
   Raised at New Birth,
To catch the Hand stretched out
   From Heav'n to earth;
Faith fears not, knows that doubt
   Is nothing worth.

Hope is a shining star
   'Mid clouds of night,
When darkness plays the king
   With pompous might;
Hope doth not cease to sing
   "Soon 'twill be light."

Love is a life laid down,
   Gift of the best,
Seed of the thorn-crown'd Man,
   Fruit ever blest;
Love's God's foundation plan,
   Faith, Hope, the rest.
As in the days when Greek, Roman, and Egyptian heathenism was fading away before the dawning of the Sun of Righteousness, so now in India men are face to face with the great question, as in the West they were then, "Is the Nazarene to conquer?" The old, corrupt forms of paganism, it was then felt, must go; but the difficulty was to find something in the ancient faith which, ennobled, purified, idealized, might be made use of to stem the advancing tide of the new religion. A foreign faith, born among the Jews, but in large measure disowned by them, threatened to shatter the temples of the heathen gods, and had already silenced their oracles. Could not some one of these gods—perhaps the brilliant Apollo, possibly the mysterious veiled Isis—inspire devotion enough into men's hearts to enable them to resist the all-constraining attraction which seemed to draw men in ever-increasing numbers to the Crucified? The attempt was made; the contest lasted for generations; the result was reluctantly proclaimed by the dying lips of the Emperor Julian: "Vicisti, Galilæe!"

In India at the present time the same contest is going on. Amid the multitudinous gods, mostly evil, worshipped by modern Hindūs, none can claim greater popularity than the ever-youthful Krishṇa. Hence it is that an attempt is being made, in large measure by those who have received a European education and who know something of Christianity, so to exalt Krishṇa that he may successfully rival Christ. Krishṇa is at least a native deity, not one introduced by foreigners. Regarding faith in Christ, I have myself heard it publicly asserted by Indians educated at an English University that Christianity was not the religion of England, and that during their whole residence in this country they had never met a Christian. The lives of many Englishmen in India—there are noble exceptions
lend but too much support to the statement that Christ is not believed in nor obeyed by us as a nation. Why, then, it is asked, should Hindus accept Him whom His own "receive not"? Why not rather "cling to their noble ancestral faith," as during the last few years they have been more than once urged to do by Englishmen in high positions under Government? This, it is hoped, may be possible if Krishna can be so idealized as really to attract not only the ignorant multitude, but the philosophically inclined also. For the latter, the Bhagavad Gita has its charm; for the former, the tales told of Krishna in the Puranas and the Mahabharata are of perennial interest.

That the attempt to compare Krishna with our Lord to the disadvantage of the latter is being made in India, with the hope of resisting the progress of Christianity, is clear even from the title of a book, "The Imitation of Krishna," published there a few years ago. That such a movement should have some temporary success is not to be wondered at when we remember that in October, 1907, in a leading English journal, there appeared an article which endeavoured to prove that the "Gospel" of Krishna was, in its aim and spirit, identical with the Gospel of Christ. The latter article must have had some weight with many, for even the writer of a notice of it in the Guardian spoke of its authoress as having apparently proved her contention! No better instance of the exceeding danger of "a little knowledge" could well be found.

What is the character of this, the favourite god of modern India? His name signifies "the black one," and was doubtless given him because of the supposed colour of his skin, since his worship was adopted by the Aryans from the black aborigines whom they conquered. But his moral character, as depicted in the Puranas, agrees admirably with the meaning of his name. There is no proof that he ever existed, though some hold that he was a religious reformer, or perhaps a warrior-king.

1 The Bhagavad Gita is an episode in the Mahabharata, but it has no real connection with the narrative in the epic, and is frequently published and dealt with separately.
Many of the details of his conduct, related for the edification of his Indian devotees, are unfit for publication in these pages. The recital of the folly, dirtiness, and immorality ascribed to him in the Hindu books would serve no useful purpose. His life, according to them, was full of adultery and murder. Among his more than 16,000 wives, eight were his special favourites. Of his 180,000 sons, many slew one another, and the survivors were killed by their father. Under ordinary circumstances a Hindu regards adultery and murder as heinous crimes, but not when committed by a god; for the Bhāgavata Purāṇa says: "Even the lords of the people [Brahmā, Indra, etc.] deviate from the path of virtue and become guilty of ravishment. But their acts do not bring any sin on the powerful and dispassionate ones [who perpetrate them], even as fire is not to be blamed for burning all things." The same principle is applied to Krishna in his human form, regarded as an avatāra or "descent" of the god Vishnu. But Hindu perversity goes further, and urges that Krishna's immorality, which cannot be either concealed or explained away, renders him a far more perfect human character than he could have been had he been free from vice. A modern Hindu writer on this subject says: "The being who is equal in virtue as well as in vice is to us a grander being than the extremely virtuous man. One whose moral equilibrium remains intact in every act which the human mind is capable of imagining is the grandest being in the universe. The great Kosmic law can never affect that being who acts without sāṅgā (or 'attraction'). To teach this great lesson practically Krishna came to the world, and to teach this great lesson practically he treated vice and virtue alike. In every line of the Bhagavad Gītā is stamped this great lesson, and the whole of Krishna's māyāvīc [illusional] life is an embodiment of this teaching. Action committed without 'attraction' is neither virtuous nor vicious. . . . Conceive a man who is trying his utmost to fly from vice to its opposite pole, virtue; imagine also a being to whom heat and cold, virtue and vice, are the same, and you will

find that the latter is infinitely superior to the former. The one is the infinite, the other is the finite; the one is the absolute, the other is the relative."

Such is the logic and such the morality taught by the enlightened followers of Krishna in modern India. But perhaps it may be urged that the teaching of the Bhagavad Gītā itself is very different. It would be strange indeed if those whose religious textbook par excellence this is should be guilty of seriously misrepresenting its doctrines. But it is not so. The Bhagavad Gītā represents Krishna as acting in disguise as the hero Arjuna's charioteer. The latter is about to join battle with his relatives for the throne of a large part of India. When he sees the armies on each side drawn up in order of battle and ready to engage, Arjuna shrinks from the thought of the terrible slaughter which is bound to ensue, and says that, rather than cause so many deaths and so much misery, he would resign his claim and retire into private life. Krishna tells him that if he does he will be reviled as a coward, and urges him to fight, since a man is bound to perform the duties of his caste, even though sinful; and Arjuna, as a member of the Kṣhatriya, or warrior caste, is therefore obliged to shed blood. Krishna states that a man who kills is not guilty of murder if he does it without "attachment" of intellect—that is to say, if he believes that he is not the real doer of his actions because he is indifferent to them. This is exactly the argument which we have been considering above. Krishna further contends that killing is not murder, because of the doctrine of transmigration. "As a man, having put off worn-out garments, taketh different new ones, so the soul, having put off worn-out bodies, proceedeth to other new ones." In modern India also this argument has been used to justify murder, on the ground that the soul cannot be destroyed, and that it is not a crime to help it "to put off an old garment."

But it is not with regard to murder only that Krishna uses

1 "Sahajam karma, Kaunteya, sadosham api na tyajet" (Bhagavad Gītā, xviii. 48).
2 Bhagavad Gītā, xviii. 17.
3 Ibid., ii. 22.
his philosophy to promote evil-doing. He teaches that the one thing needful is for one to perceive that he is not the real doer of any act, but that it is really due to Prakṛiti, or Nature. To grasp this is to attain true knowledge, and those who have thus attained are not liable to suffer any evil consequences from their actions. "Even\(^1\) if thou art the most wicked-doing of all wicked men, just by the raft of Knowledge (jñāna) wilt thou altogether cross over all sin. As the kindled fire, O Arjuna, reduces to ashes the pieces of fuel, so the fire of Knowledge reduces all acts to ashes." He teaches Pantheism, stating that all are but parts of the one, all-pervading, universal Soul (Ātman). Men ought to realize this, and then they are identified with this Supreme Soul. "As\(^2\) the all-pervading ether (ākāśam) through its subtlety is not defiled, so the soul, abiding everywhere in the body, is not defiled." Hence we see that Krishnā's worshippers are justified in every immoral practice by the teaching of the Bhagavad Gītā. And this is the book which, we are gravely assured, is in "surprising agreement" with the New Testament! "Turning from the Bhagavad Gītā to the New Testament," says a modern English lady writer, "we shall find that the ideal which Jesus Christ held up to His followers is essentially the same as that which Krishnā proposed to Arjuna." If so, words have no meaning, and black is white. We might, perhaps, compare Krishnā to Mephistopheles, but certainly to no one bearing a holier name.

The worship of Krishnā as a "descent" (avatāra) of Vishnū was doubtless sanctioned by the Brāhmans in order to incorporate into Hindūism an aboriginal deity who was too popular to be discarded. A new element or principle—that of bhakti or personal "devotion" to this god—has thus found an entrance into the religion of India. Devotion to the Deity is of the very highest value, if the Deity to whom such love and service are rendered be the True God. We know how frequently our Lord appeals to this principle, as, for example, when He says to His disciples: "If ye love Me, ye will [R.V.] keep My command-

\(^1\) Bhagavad Gītā, iv. 36, 37.  
\(^2\) Ibid., xiii. 32.
The constraining love of Christ has in all ages been the mainspring and motive power of Christian life and conduct. But it is far otherwise when the object of devotion is an evil being, the very incarnation of vice, as in Kṛṣṇa’s case. There is a very powerful and influential sect in India who are worshippers of Vallabhāchārya, a man who was supposed to be an incarnation of this god. These people hold that they owe the devotion of “body, mind and property” to everyone who happens to be reckoned among this man’s descendants. The very water in which these man-gods have washed their feet is drunk with religious avidity by their worshippers. Again and again have cases been brought before the High Court at Bombay by the police in which the gross immoralities and the resultant almost incredible crimes committed under the sanction of their religion by these inhuman monsters have been fully exposed. One such revelation of obscene wickedness and cruelty took place when the writer was in Bombay in 1899. No punishment could be inflicted on the culprit, for his conduct was fully sanctioned by his caste laws, and in complete accordance with Kṛṣṇa’s own cherished example.

Such is the consequence of the perversion of a good principle to sanction and encourage what is essentially bad. Popular as it is in India, the worship of Kṛṣṇa is fruitful in all kinds of evil, of which the above is only a single example. The attempt to exalt him as a rival to our Lord is not likely to succeed except among men who are striving to find religious sanction for their evil practices, and among their unfortunate dupes. But to compare Kṛṣṇa with Christ, though, as we have seen, the attempt has been made both in India and in England, would be ludicrous if it were not blasphemous. Some have fancied that they could detect a resemblance in the two names, though in reality, when they are correctly pronounced, there is not a single letter in the names which has the same sound in one as in the other. In meaning the appellations are essentially different. Probably Kṛṣṇa never existed, though

1 John xiv. 15.

2 “Tan, man, dhan.”
of course the tales told about his crimes may be founded upon the evil deeds done by some aboriginal chief of early days. If so, it is too true of him that "The evil that men do lives after them"; for, whether in part real or wholly mythical, a god made in the image of his worshippers, no deity in India now exercises a more immoral influence over his devotees than does Krishṇa. Regarding our Lord, on the other hand, even Strauss has said that He is "the one character without the idea of whom in the mind personal piety is impossible."

We have indicated the struggle now going on in India. What will be its result? Will it end, as in the ancient world, with the triumph of the Crucified and the fleeing away of the darkness that now broods over hearts and consciences? Or will India finally reject Christ, choosing darkness rather than light through love of evil deeds? The result may be long in coming, but who can doubt that finally the darkness will have passed away, and the true light shine there at least as brightly as among ourselves? It is a trite saying that history repeats itself. In India, however, instead of the grudging confession of the dying apostate to the triumph of Him whom he contemptuously styled "the Galilæan," may we soon hear resounding from the lips of that many-millioned land the words of her own sweet hymn—

"Jai, jai, Prabhu Yesū!"¹

or may she borrow those of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, "Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

¹ "Victory, victory, Lord Jesus!"
Tarsus and the Cilician Gates.

By the Rev. M. Linton Smith, M.A.

In the course of a somewhat extended journey in the summer of 1907, certain impressions of which have already appeared in these pages, the writer was fortunate enough to spend some days on a stretch of road which ranks very high among the thoroughfares of the world, that which crosses the great wall of the Taurus Mountains, and forms the main avenue of land-borne traffic between Syria and Anatolia.

Our starting-point on the north of the range is Kizli (Kilise) Hissar, the site of the ancient Tyana, whose early importance is witnessed, not only by a fine Hittite stele, the two portions of which, long separated, have now after many adventures found a resting-place in the Constantinople Museum, but also by a very remarkable fragment discovered on our journey of a dedicatory inscription in archaic Greek or Phrygian lettering, set up by King Midas, who has been rescued from the legendary position to which he had been relegated by the Greek historians by the discovery of his tomb in northern Phrygia, and by the occurrence of his name on the historical inscriptions of Sargon, the Assyrian conqueror of Samaria: it is now a series of low black mounds, crowned with the usual mud buildings of a Turkish village, with a broken aqueduct of Roman times, the graceful arches of which run eastward across the plain. The track, for at first it is no more, runs southward over level ground, but as soon as the foothills are reached a well-metalled road from Eregli (Heraclea Cybistra) comes in from the west, and climbs for some hours through land which is not unfertile, though very scantily tilled; water is plentiful, and the banks of the streams are fringed with poplars and low shrubs.

After a while the streams are left behind, a little khan marking the last convenient stopping-place, and the road runs upwards till the summit of the ridge is reached, and there
bursts upon the eye the great barrier of the Taurus: for days past its gleaming summits have formed the southern horizon of the traveller from the north, but now the bare limestone streaked with snow appears suddenly to have come within reach; the impenetrable majesty of that long range, stretching apparently unbroken east and west as far as the eye can reach, seems to refuse passage to all but the hardiest mountaineers, and to defy the ingenuity of man to find a road by which he may traffic or fight with the regions beyond. But the clearness of the air is deceptive, and there remain two other ridges each rising, as does that on which we stand, to a height of 7,000 feet, before the foot of the rocky wall is reached; one of these is crossed by the main road into the valley of the Tchakut-Su, which at this point is broad and open; above on a spur of the ridge which has just been surmounted stands the castle of Loulon, a frontier fortress of the Byzantines against the Moslems, with its black mass standing clear against the sky.

The road follows the valley, or at least the line, of the Tchakut-Su; but it is far more interesting to strike across country, and climb the last ridge of the foothills to Bulgar Maden, a small mining town, the silver-workings of which date back to Hittite days; the track leads across the broad glen with its fields, and gardens, and poplar-fringed streams; but the character of the country soon changes, and we now are riding over bare red soil from which spring clumps of scented herbs, and stunted firs filling the air with their resinous fragrance; the streams no longer babble over pebbly beds, but dash down from rock to rock, and from pool to pool, and the summit of the pass with its spring of ice-cold water is covered with low flowering shrubs, which with their pink and yellow blossoms might stand for heather and stunted gorse; but the only flower which is really familiar is the forget-me-not, which grows abundantly among its thornier neighbours. Now right over against us towers the huge mass of the main range, greyer and grimmer than when distance softened its outlines, its ridge capped and its sides streaked with snow. The houses of the
little town lie beneath, but we need not linger there, and soon we find ourselves on the road which leads down the valley of the tributary of the Tchakut-Su which rises just above Bulgar Maden; the scene is one of singular beauty; across the stream on our right the grey wall towers up into the clouds, its lower flanks clad with pine-forests; while the slopes of the hills which we have just crossed are terraced for gardens above and below the road. An occasional spur of rock runs out and falls, sometimes a sheer precipice to the level of the stream, the road being cut round it, sometimes a sloping surface, burying its feet in the débris which have fallen from above; on one such rock-face an incised Hittite inscription has been discovered, in five lines or compartments; the surface has flaked rather badly in places, and it is hard to distinguish natural markings from carved signs; but soon the eye gets used to the task, and the heads and hands, and feet, and circles, which form so large a proportion of the known hieroglyphs, are clearly distinguishable.

As we resume our journey, the road, which has been engineered and constructed with some care, becomes badly broken, and quite impracticable for wheeled vehicles; "The road-making Kaimakam (governor) has gone" was the ample explanation offered. The stream brawls on over its rocky bed below, and soon a village, and cherry orchards in full fruit, come into sight, welcome refreshment on a long day's ride; the valley widens a little, the pine-trees on the mountain-sides are larger and finer, and at last there appears a break in that mountain wall which has blocked our passage southward; we rejoin the main valley, crossing its stream by a stone bridge, by which stands a Turkish guardhouse, Tchifte (i.e., Twin) Khan by name, and find a good road which plunges with the stream into the heart of the range.

We are now again on the main line of communication, and the cuttings by which the road is carried through rocky spurs which break in upon the valley are often of ancient work. Pause for a moment, and think of those who have passed by this way: by it the West has sought the East with force of
arms; Xenophon and the Ten Thousand whom the younger Cyrus led against his brother marched by this road to their unsuccessful attempt upon the Persian Empire; less than a century later Alexander and his Macedonians passed along after one successful fight, to those two later battles which were to give the dominion of the East to a Western monarch; and once more at a later time Godfrey and Bohemond and Tancred led the forces of Western Christendom on the first Crusade which established for nigh two centuries a Latin kingdom in the Holy Land. By it, too, Eastern forces have sought the West, and Harun-ar-Rashid and many another Moslem general advanced against the ever-weakening bulwark of Christendom, the Byzantine Empire. But the East sought the West not so much by force of arms, as with the influences of trade, of culture, and above all of religion. The most notable figure that has passed westward by this route is that of a bald-headed, beady-eyed, hook-nosed, bandy-legged little Jew, "with the face of an angel," whom we may picture as trudging manfully along the road as soon as it was clear of the winter snow, or more likely as crouching in the corner of a covered cart which he and his companions had chartered to save time and unnecessary fatigue. A great task lies before him; he has to "stablish the churches" which he has already founded, and to found others in the centres of communication on the road to Rome, the ganglia of the great Imperial system. Twice at least in his life did Paul of Tarsus traverse this road which the energy of his own city had rendered practicable; and of all those who have passed up and down along it he is to us the most interesting, if not the greatest.

An hour below the guard-house, a considerable stream comes in from the east, and just where it is crossed by a wooden bridge, Tahta Keupreu by name, a large khan with a shady tree in front stands back from the road; timber is plentiful here, for the hill-sides are thickly clothed with pines, and night by night the carters and humbler travellers kindle a great bonfire, the flaring, flickering light of which sheds a glow
over the whole scene; when the pass is clear, this khan is always busy, for it is the end of the first long day's stage from Tarsus, the half-way house to Eregli for the traveller who hurries westwards. Resuming our journey down the valley, which still is narrow with lofty hills on either hand, we come in a short two hours to another bridge, this time a single arch of stone, Ak Keupreu, just above which a great spring boils and bubbles up from the heart of the western mountain, changing with its deep blue waters the colour of the whole stream; below this the valley widens out, as the hills recede on either hand, and we enter the valley of Bozanti (Podandus), a convenient camping-ground for armies traversing the defile; the roadside here is dotted with little sheds, the owners of which dispense coffee to the passers-by, while some of them occupy the long hours of waiting in manufacturing the rude wooden implements of husbandry, threshing sleds, rakes, shovels, and pack-saddles for carrying corn, out of the plentiful supply of timber which the hills afford. Presently the Tchakut-Su plunges once more into a narrow defile, by which it joins in the plains below the Sihun (Sarus) which flows past Adana.

So far we have been following the proposed line of the Baghdad railway, which has already reached Eregli; work has just been begun on the next section, which will be seen from the foregoing account to present very serious difficulties; but now we diverge from its course which is to run down to Adana along the line of the stream which it has followed so far. Our road bends south-westward out of the valley up the course of a little brook which flows through a forest of magnificent pines; the blazing sun brings out their fragrance, and the bracing mountain air takes off from the weariness of travel, while the eye is delighted by the graceful forms and restful colouring of the trees, a welcome change from the glare and bareness of the central plateau. At the watershed, the scene is one of singular beauty; waterfalls plash down from the hills on the left and the sea of verdure is broken by little timber huts, the summer quarters of the herdsmen and shepherds; a broad vale, ringed
by cliffs or tree-clad hills, slopes away at our feet, and beyond the heights that shut it in on the south-west, spurs trending southward rise range above range.

The road runs through the little vale, guarded on either side by Arab forts, and at its southern corner seems to be blocked by cliffs some 400 feet high; a nearer approach does not reveal the exit, and it is not till within some hundred yards or so that a narrow gorge is seen to open, through which the stream escapes southward. The cleft was once wide enough for the waters of the stream alone, and could only have been used as a bridle-path when they ran low; but the opening has been artificially widened, and on the west bank of the stream, an upright face of rock, some 50 feet high, shows the amount of limestone which had to be chiselled away to make room for a road by the side of the stream; an isolated rock between torrent bed and roadway bears an inscription of Marcus Aurelius, and a few yards down the defile stands a Roman milestone; but it is not to the resources of that great empire, or to the skill of its engineers, that this wonderful feat is due; the road was six centuries old when Marcus Aurelius recorded the repairs he had executed; it was the energy and foresight of one city alone which carried out the work, and by it changed the whole course of the traffic of the ancient world. Tarsus lay far south of the passes of the Anti-Taurus, over which the wealth and culture of the east passed westwards by the Royal Road; she lay north of the ordinary course of navigation from Syria and Egypt to Crete and the Ægean; but by cutting this road for wheeled vehicles through the Taurus range, she diverted the bulk of the land-traffic from the Royal Road to a shorter one which passed her very gates, and drew to the harbour, which she had formed out of a lagoon on the course of the Cydnus between the city and the sea, the ships of all nations: what the cutting of the Suez Canal has been to the traffic of the modern world, that the cutting of the road through the Cilician Gates in the fifth century B.C. was to the ancient. Does not this give new point and force to the boast of her greatest son, “I am a
Jew by race, a Tarsian of Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city (οὐκ ἄσήμου πόλεως πολίτης, Acts xxi. 39)? It was widened by Ibrahim Pasha in 1839, to allow his artillery to pass, but even now the gap through which road and stream run is not more than 60 feet wide.

The defile passed, the road winds down for two hours through a narrow gorge, with hills and cliffs rising on either hand some 2,000 feet, clad with pine and fir to their very summits; every turn brings fresh beauties to the eye; the banks are covered with creepers and grasses and flowering plants; the deep rocky pools of the stream suggest a refreshing coolness; a single shapely pine stands silhouetted against the clear sky above; the grey limestone cliffs tower overhead, viewed through a frame of green; and an occasional streak of snow near their summits reminds one of the height at which one is still travelling. At last the pass widens, and a little khan marks the exit from the gorge into the wider and more open valleys below; the character of the vegetation changes; oak and ilex and arbutus mingle with the pines, trees which would not disgrace an English park; and up and down over hill and dale, though ever trending downwards, the road runs through beautiful woodland scenery; cultivation and villages reappear, and the traveller begins as he nears the top of each ridge to expect from it a view of the blue waters of the Mediterranean. But this is not yet; piles of logs lie by the roadside, and here and there is a rude sawmill, worked by the abundant water-power of the mountain streams: strings of mules pass downwards, each with a heavy plank secured to its pack-saddle on either side, the hinder end trailing and bumping along the road, or with a dripping mass of frozen snow from the upper ranges packed in sacking, and hurried down in the cool of the night to the city that swelters in the plain below.

A little hamlet is passed, Mazar Oghlu Khan, in which a magnificent spring (possibly the ancient Mopsoucrene) bubbles out into a rocky basin, with a rough wooden platform built over it, thatched with leafy boughs, a cool sleeping-place in the hot
nights of summer; then the road rises for half a mile or so, turns to the left through a rock cutting, and the whole scene is changed; the woodland has vanished save in the valley on the right, and beneath us the foothills and the plain dance and shiver in the heat, while dimly through the haze can be descried the coast-line, with the waters of the Gulf of Issus beyond, and, closing the eastward horizon, the dim outline of the Giaour Dagh (Mount Amanus) on the North Syrian coast. The transformation is very sudden; one moment you have looked back upon the ridges, and cliffs, and forests of the Taurus; the next moment these are hidden from view, and the rolling foothills, barer and browner than those on the far side, from their southern aspect, descend to the plain and the sea. Down through them runs the road; soon the oleander, with its blaze of blossoms, appears along the watercourses, and the fig-tree and the mulberry take the place of the cherry in the village orchards; the domes and minarets of Tarsus become visible in the plain beneath, rising from a dark ring, the gardens which surround the town.

At last the low hills sink into the plain, and a weary ride of two hours along a level dusty track lies before us; maize and sugar-cane are growing in the fields, which are intersected by sluggish watercourses full of croaking frogs. Presently a dull continuous roar fills the air, and before its cause has been made plain, the horses' hoofs are clanking against the metals of the Adana and Mersina railway; this passed, we are standing upon the banks of the Cydnus, as it tumbles over a rocky ridge into the new channel formed for it without the city by the Emperor Justinian. A crazy wooden bridge leads across it past a mill, and then the road runs, ankle-deep in fine dust, between the high hedges and watercourses which enclose the gardens; great water-wheels, between 20 and 30 feet in diameter, raise water in the troughs round their circumference to pour it into the irrigation channels; orange-trees, and lemons, and an occasional date-palm, give evidence of the different climate, and grow with a luxuriance which is the joint gift of sun, soil,
and river. At length the dusty road yields to paved streets, and we pass through the houses and bazaars of Tarsus. Of its ancient glories nothing remains above the surface, though capitals and other architectural fragments are often turned up in digging foundations; the Bab Bulus (Gate of St. Paul) is really a fragment of the fortifications of Harun-ar-Rashid; the only relic of classical (or possibly earlier) times is the Deunuk Tash, an oblong erection with concrete walls over 20 feet thick, with only one entrance a yard wide, enclosing a long open court containing two other enormous masses of the same material: much speculation has arisen as to its origin and purpose, the most probable theory being that it is the substructure of a temple of Græco-Roman times: at present it is the burying-ground of the Armenians, who not unnaturally cling obstinately to that which is not only the last resting-place of their dead, but also a place of refuge from those sudden outbreaks of popular fury, which they have only too much reason to fear, a fortress upon which nothing short of siege artillery could make the least impression.

We have come to our journey's end; we have traversed the most interesting portion of the greatest road of the Christian era, which in its main direction and features remains unchanged, though its importance has long since gone; we have trodden it till it has brought us to the city to whose vigorous life it owes its existence; and in that city we must leave it; the energy and foresight of its citizens were never more clearly shown than in the greatest of them all; and within its walls Tarsus contains a signal proof of the triumph of the cause for which he lived and died. Is it not one of the ironies of history that the grave of Julian the Apostate should be in the birthplace of St. Paul?
The Problem of Home Reunion.

By the Rev. Chancellor Liias, M.A.

In responding to the request of the Editor of the CHURCHMAN, that I would say a few words on the question of Home Reunion, I may at least claim to have given some little consideration to the subject. I was one of those unfortunate persons who took part in the once celebrated "Grindelwald Conferences," at the time generally represented to Churchmen as a sort of ecclesiastical picnic, at which kindly though benighted or visionary individuals appeared, but which no sensible person would be likely to take seriously. I learned a great deal at those Conferences, nevertheless. I learned that the best, and not the least influential, men among the Nonconformists had a very kindly feeling for the Church in those days, and that, had their approaches to us been received in the spirit in which they were made, the question of federation between Churchmen and Dissenters would very soon have come "within the region of practical politics." Unfortunately, the overtures of Nonconformity then made were received by the authorities of the Church with coldness, and not infrequently with something very like contempt. Was it surprising if there was a strong revulsion of feeling among the leading Nonconformists; that the Free Church Federation, when formed, was actuated by a hostile instead of a friendly spirit and that it has set itself to deprive the Church of those privileges behind which she so churlishly, and it may be added so unwisely, entrenched herself?

The wider horizon which the Pan-Anglican Congress extended before the eyes of our somewhat too insular, and possibly somewhat too self-satisfied, communion has, unless I am much mistaken, brought about a considerable change of opinion. The papers of Dr. Stock and Canon Henson are a welcome sign of that change. And I have reason to believe that this change of feeling extends to sections of
the Church to which neither of the above-named gentlemen belong.

Dr. Stock's paper views the question from a characteristic-ally British standpoint. The genuine Briton does not, at the first blush, welcome new ideas, and his first impulse is to pile up the difficulties in the way of their adoption. This is a very useful function to fulfil. If we are not confronted with the difficulties at the outset, we are very likely to blunder into positions which may block the road for generations. I confess, nevertheless, that I cannot sympathize either with Dr. Stock or Canon Henson in the objection they take to the phrase "Home Reunion." Neither of them have provided us with a better—and indeed, it would puzzle them to do so—and the reasons they give for their objections do not seem particularly convincing. Dr. Stock, indeed, tells us (p. 1), that union between religious bodies involves the adoption of formularies precisely identical. But as he abandons this contention two pages further on, it seems hardly necessary to spend much time in refuting it. Yet it may be well to remind the reader that though "union" means "oneness," it does not necessarily involve identity. There are various kinds of union, and the union for which we are pleading is not necessarily union of ceremonial or organization, but rather union of heart and spirit. Dr. Stock admits this himself. "Societies and Orders within the Church," he tells us (p. 4), "might have their own rules." And surely our Church, in her wise contention that "every country should use such ceremonies as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing the people to a most perfect and godly living," is not striking a blow against union. On the contrary, as a layman in the fifth century A.D. reminds us, the most diverse forms of ritual and of general administration were in existence in his time and neighbourhood, without the slightest prejudice thereby to the completest union of the Churches.¹

Another point in Dr. Stock's paper, as well as that of

¹ Socrates, "Eccl. Hist.," v. 22.
Canon Henson, to which exception may fairly be taken, is the certainty both of them express that the Diocesan Episcopate was of later introduction in the West than in the East. When we find that Eusebius, a most trustworthy historian, whose accuracy, whenever we are able to test it, is invariably confirmed, gives us the names of the Bishops of Rome in the first century, his statement is not disposed of by the fact that some authorities are found to have placed those names in a different order. We may be induced thereby to suspend our judgment on the point. But our modern habit of esteeming the existence of a difficulty equivalent to the disproof of the definite assertion of a careful historian who had means of information not open to us is hardly justifiable.

Canon Henson, if I may be permitted to say so, amuses me by the vigour and impartiality of his strokes. Our good friend the Church Times is the first to smart under his lash. And certainly its "Short Method with the Dissenters," which comes under Canon Henson’s censure, is a very excellent example of the way in which our Nonconformist brethren ought not to be treated. Then the phrase "Historic Episcopate," though approved by the successive gatherings of the Anglican Episcopate, appears very much to displease him. The phrase "is unmeaning and unhelpful." What does it mean? Does it mean the "Presbyter-Bishop of the Pastoral Epistles or St. Clement of Rome," the "Monarchical Bishop of St. Ignatius and St. Cyprian?" and so on. We need not follow Canon Henson through the whole of his list. But why should not the phrase "Historic Episcopate" include them all? They all come under the genus Episcopate; and every one of them may have done good service in their season.

The phrase "Historic Episcopate" surely means the Episcopate regarded as the universal form of Church government from the second to the sixteenth century, and includes the liberty to modify it in detail so as to suit our modern conditions. It is, moreover, a mistake to identify the character of Episcopal office in the days of Ignatius with its character in those of
Cyprian, or to exaggerate the monarchical character of the Episcopal office in the days of the latter, as is so frequently done by the opponents of Episcopacy. If Cyprian's Episcopacy was monarchical, it was at least constitutionally so. One assumption may, perhaps, be made here. In any and every modification of Episcopacy which may be thought desirable we ought not to depart from its original germ. What was that original germ? The Bishop in those early days, when the size and importance of the community over which he presided is borne in mind, could have been little more than what a Rural Dean is now—the lifelong chairman of the society. When the Apostles were alive, he was frequently nominated by them. After their departure, he was no doubt elected by the community; and, further, he was probably set apart to his office by it. We have no evidence of the consecration of a Bishop by the neighbouring Bishops till the beginning of the third century, though it seems to have become a well-established custom by that time. It is clear, however, that at first the neighbouring Bishops were only called in because of the frequent disputes about the validity or fairness of an election. Timothy and Titus, if Bishops at all (which some dispute), appear to have been appointed to their office by simple nomination on the part of an Apostle. Ignatius and Polycarp seem to have been appointed in much the same way. And Barnabas and Saul were "set apart" as missionary Bishops to the heathen, not by the Apostolic College, though it was in full existence and work at that time, but by sundry "prophets and teachers" then residing at Antioch. After the death of the Apostles, the Bishops would naturally be men of character and experience, calculated to be of immense use to the Churches of that age. The earnest exhortations of Ignatius to "do nothing without the Bishop" were obviously not intended to elevate him into a despot, but to urge younger and perhaps rasher men not to act without his opinion or advice.

From these small beginnings arose the various forms of the Episcopate to which Canon Henson refers. The one condition common to all, or almost all, of them was that to the Bishop
was assigned the oversight of the Church. And when we speak of retaining the "Historic Episcopate" we mean that, in some form or other, that office of oversight shall still be theirs. When Canon Henson goes on to refer to the past history of the Church, and endeavours to show that the Episcopate has been a source of division, he surely can hardly mean that the divisions to which he calls attention were caused by the Episcopal office; for then they would have ceased with the abolition of that office. Yet we know that nothing tended so much to promote the Roman reaction in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as the mutual jealousies of the non-Episcopal Lutheran, Calvinist, and Arminian. The inference, clearly, is that the existence of the above-mentioned divisions was not due to the Episcopal office, but to the "corruption of nature," which, as we are told, "doth remain, yea, even in them that are regenerate." Nor can we trace any of that "petulance" and "confusion of thought" discovered by Canon Henson in the sentence in which Dr. Stock blames those who seem to find "a double dose of original sin" in the office of the Bishop. They seem rather to exist in the mind of his assailant, and to be due to the fact that Dr. Stock does not think so badly of Episcopacy as an institution as his antagonist—for the present, at least—fancies he ought to do. Dr. Stock seems to me to be perfectly right in his belief that, whatever evils may have become inherent in Episcopacy during the course of ages, there are none so ingrained in the office itself as to justify the Church of England in abandoning so venerable, and for many ages so universal, an Order. It may be necessary to remind Canon Henson that the retention of the office by ourselves does not involve the excommunication of non-Episcopal bodies. That here in England there is too great a distance between the Bishop and his clergy; that the Bishops are at present too "few and far between" to have any particular hold upon the laity, may be a good reason for reform: it is none for revolution. The problem before us is to retain an ancient and most useful office, and to be, at the same time, in the most friendly relations with those who do not possess it.
I cannot believe this problem to be insoluble, if approached with tact and discretion.

Canon Henson appears to think that the harshness towards Nonconformists displayed at the Restoration was the fault of the clergy. A reference to the proceedings of Parliament and Convocation at the time will show that the divines of that day were overruled by the Cavaliers, who bitterly resented the treatment they had received at the hands of the victorious Roundheads. I fear that Canon Henson’s new creed will be a long time in supplanting the ancient Catholic Creeds recited in the services of the Anglican Church, and I am very doubtful whether it will be palatable to the majority of Nonconformists. But it is impossible not to relish his timely fling at the “zone of toleration,” which is carefully outlined so as to include those who for three-quarters of a century have been encroaching on the doctrine and discipline of the Church as by law established for the last 350 years, and to exclude everybody else, and most of all those who have been most anxious to see that doctrine and discipline maintained.

But to return to the problem of our relations with Nonconformists. Dr. Stock deserves our thanks for pointing out so clearly that separation itself is undesirable, if not blameable. Yet I think it must be allowed that there are circumstances which would justify it. When a Church lays down unlawful terms of communion as binding on her followers, no honest man can possibly remain in her. Whether the Church of England has done this or not is a question which cannot be argued in this paper. My own impression, I own, is that our Church in the time of Elizabeth stood for breadth and toleration, the Nonconformists for narrowness and intolerance. But there were faults on both sides, and duty bids Churchmen and Nonconformists alike to say: “Brothers, we have erred; let us do all we can now to repair our error.”

Dr. Stock has certainly done well to call our attention to the difficulties in our way. But those difficulties are certainly not sufficiently formidable to justify us in doing nothing.
approach Nonconformist ministers with a demand that as a
c Condition precedent to all negotiation they should all consent
to accept Episcopal ordination would be an insult. But if,
believing that it is God’s will that His people should be one,
we endeavour, in a spirit of obedience and faith, to remove the
hindrances which keep them apart, we may depend upon it that
the way will open out to us as we proceed. When I first passed
through the Straits of Messina, now so famous throughout the
world in consequence of the terrific earthquake which has
desolated that region, I thought our vessel was making straight
for the shore. But by degrees a small opening presented itself,
which gradually widened, until we had entered the Gulf of
Reggio, and were free to direct our course anywhere we pleased.
So in the present case. The way has been opened to us by
the disappearance of the extreme forms of Calvinism on the
one side, and the less rigid views on the necessity of the
Episcopate which are beginning to prevail on the other. We
might therefore begin by friendly conferences, in which we
discussed the interpretation of Scripture, and its bearing on
questions doctrinal and practical. Our next step should be to
encourage our flocks to take the Holy Communion together,
and to cultivate personal intimacies which, as between Church­
man and Dissenter, are at present by no means common.
Next, definite Reunion Conferences might be held, in which
terms of reconciliation might be formally discussed. Not till
then would I introduce the question of interchange of pulpits,
and the reception of Holy Communion together by ministers of
religion and their flocks. To take these latter steps prematurely
would retard the progress of reunion, for which the ground
ought carefully to be prepared beforehand. Then we should be
ready to consider a scheme of federation, in which the various
religious bodies should take their place, as religious societies or

1 Since the above words were written I find that a movement for this end
has already been commenced at Hampstead. Dr. Horton’s fling at “Bishops
and Archbishops” is certainly to be lamented; yet, on the other hand, it must
be confessed that so far “Bishops and Archbishops” have not done much in
the direction required. It may be hoped that, if such gatherings be persevered
in, the long-standing bitterness may gradually disappear.
Orders, within the pale of the one reunited Church. I cannot, I fear, with Dr. Stock, include in my dream of the future our abandonment of the privilege of Establishment. By taking this step we should lose the hold the Church of England now has on men—and I have known many such—who say to the various denominations, “Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian,” but feel themselves prevented by what they consider to be narrow dogmatic definitions from attaching themselves to any particular religious body. On the other hand, we might remove from ourselves the reproach of Erastianism by obtaining from the State a reasonable measure of self-government for the Church, with a Parliamentary veto to prevent legislation of which the people at large would disapprove. Such, in outline at least, is my dream, and I see nothing but prejudice and faint-heartedness on our parts which can hinder it from being realized. But bearing in mind the touching prayer of our Lord, recorded by St. John as having been uttered just before His death, I think the cause of home reunion, to say nothing of reunion on a larger scale, is one to which a man might well be ready to devote his life.

The Evidential Value of the Temptation.

By the Rev. H. M. Sanders, M.A.

The student of Christian evidences may find, it seems to us, more material for his use in the record of the Temptation than the treatises on that subject commonly point out to him. The narrative, independently of the actual words used in the first Temptation, “If Thou art the Son of God” (Ἐι ὦς ἐλ τοῦ Θεοῦ,¹ which does not express a doubt, but a claim on the part of the Person addressed), bears directly both on the question of the character and the nature of Jesus Christ.

1. As to the Character of Christ.—The modern interpretation, which makes the temptations in each case to be addressed

¹ R.V., St. Matt. iv. 3.
to the highest and noblest aspirations of Jesus as Messiah, shows us that there is the most marked contrast imaginable between the Temptation of Christ and that of the ripest of the saints who have borne His name. For example, however mistaken some of the views and ideals of St. Antony the Solitary were, none can deny the true "saintliness" of his character. Yet his enthusiastic admirer and disciple, St. Athanasius, has left us a record of his temptations by the devil and his attendant demons, which, though they may have been the product of "the morbid action of a restless intellect in the silence and loneliness of the desert,"¹ reveal, as all temptation reveals, even in the case of that great saint, the unplumbed depths of evil in the heart of sinful man. It seems that even when you have emphasized as strongly as you can that the temptation came to Jesus "from without," the fact still remains that that only can "tempt" from without which can find some lodgment or some point d'appui within. Take the summary of St. Chrysostom ²—τὰ ηῷον μυρία συνέχουσα κάκα ταύτα ἐστὶ—τὸ γαστρὶ δουλεῖν, τὸ πρὸς κενοδοξίαν τὶ ποιεῖν, τὸ μανιὰ χρημάτων ὑπεύθυνον εἶναι — this great Father would have us learn that the Temptation shows us the evil of and the method of escape from this triple summary of the myriad forms of evil;—the "being enslaved to the belly"; the "doing things for vainglory," and the "being subject to the mania for (great) possessions." Now, it is true that in a derivative sense we may learn these salutary lessons from the Temptation of Jesus, but not directly. Christ, according to our view, was not tempted personally with these. The Temptation of the Messiah consists in the appeal to Him to recognize that mankind is so tempted, and to make His appeal to men on that basis. In His personal immunity from all such attack, we have one of the strongest, because indirect, evidences of His sinlessness. Here, if anywhere, we might have expected the Evangelists to trip if they were portraying any other than a strictly historical figure. The task of imagining a sinless man

was hard enough, without complicating it by the portrayal of a fictitious Temptation. But there is no such failure. The narrative is perfectly consistent with the rest of the portrait of Christ. The apparently impossible is achieved, and that in the simplest and most natural manner possible. Real evil, a real tempter assail the Sinless, and that by appeal not to any latent conformity of His nature, however deep-seated and remote, with what is sinful, but by the effort to direct His sinless beneficence, His loving patriotism, and His sovereign consciousness into other channels than those appointed for them by the will of God. Even though it might be urged in favour of a more "personal" view of the Temptation that there was nothing inherently sinful in an appeal to avoid death by starvation; even "if," in the words of the late Professor Mill, 1 "the highest virtue does not exclude the instinct inseparable from humanity, to which pain is an object of dread and pleasure of desire; which prefers ease and quiet to tumult and vexation, the regard and esteem of others to their scorn and aversion; to which ill-requited toil and experienced unkindness are sources of corroding anguish and depression—this very conjunction which presents but one of these objects of dread as the concomitant of doing God's will, or associates one of these desirable opposites with neglect or disobedience—every such conjunction must produce a conflict between duty and these necessary instincts of humanity sufficient to constitute temptation in the strictest sense"; yet it must be granted that on any other theory than the "Messianic" one the last Temptation presents insuperable difficulties. Whether it be regarded, as St. Chrysostom said, as an attempt to appeal to τὸ μανία χρημάτων ὑπεύθυνον εἶναι (the desire for great possessions), or more generally as addressed to what St. John calls "the vainglory of life" (ἡ ἀλαξονεία τοῦ βίου), if Christ was personally tempted with these things, then it is hard to believe in the reality of His sinlessness. It seems to us that here is the crucial test. Fallen man has in the pride of his

1 "Five Sermons on the Temptation Preached before University of Cambridge," 1844, p. 5.
nature the most subtle of his foes. Its appeal is to no gross sin; it is capable of dissembling itself under the most plausible of disguises. What we learn of the character of Christ from the rest of the Gospel story would lead us to expect that there would be the greatest unlikelihood of even this form of evil seducing Him from His whole-hearted allegiance to God. We approach the Temptation with the inquiry whether what is there told us fits in with our preconceived ideas of the character of Christ, and we find that the test is triumphantly survived. It is not that the evil came to Him with any personal appeal; it comes to Him as it comes to all men, but perforce it must assume a special form. It may not hope to awake in Him any vainglorious self-love; it can only attack the purpose of His life, and that indirectly. It is the effort to turn Him from His oikoumene, as Chrysostom and other Fathers call it. It appeals to Him to recognize the good that lies behind the social order, and on the basis of that recognition to use His master-hand to disentangle the good from the evil, and to build the Kingdom of God on existing foundations, without the upheaval of life involved in an entirely fresh beginning. This is the only way we can conceive a sinless man to be tempted, and this is the way in which the Christ is assailed.

When "the summary of evil" comes to His assault, it finds no niche or cranny in the polished granite of His perfection in which it can insert the thinnest edge of the wedge of temptation. The most it can hope for is that His mind should fail in statesmanship, in foresight; that He should seize upon the moment's advantage and so lose the final good.

How foolish this tempter! He can foresee; he recognizes clearly enough that the Cross means his downfall, and yet he imagines that there is a chance that his Opponent will be less clear-sighted! No wonder that he failed!

2. The Temptation also provides us with evidence on the subject of the Person of Christ.

If He be man alone, however great and good; if He be merely a reformer and a prophet, however inspired, then this
record, which comes to us from information which He Himself must have given, reveals Him as possessing a self-consciousness which it would not be too strong to describe as pretentious and bombastic in the last degree. He would then be presented to us as a man claiming that the fortunes of the race centre in himself, that on his decisions as to his line of action hang the solutions of the greatest problems with which humanity is faced. Other prophets and reformers have felt, and felt rightly, that on them depended whether their contemporaries should advance a step or two along the road which leads to the final solution. With the Christ it is not a question of a single step, or even of a dozen, but of the ultimate issue itself.

We will go further, and say that, if Christ be merely man, then the Temptation never had objective reality. The very existence of such a story on that supposition reveals Him as unfolding to His disciples an account of an imaginary conflict intended to create a false impression as to His own importance. It is the boast of the charlatan pretending that even the devil recognizes that he wields supernatural power. It reduces Him to the level of an hysterical enthusiast.

But once it is granted that Christ is Son of God, all becomes simple, natural, inevitable. The Son of God has such a mission, and does wield such authority. The "Prince of this world" must make what effort he can to turn Him from His purpose, and in so doing only reveals the more clearly the authority of Him whose power he fears. Our Great High Priest is tempted "according to all the laws of temptation (κατὰ πάντας) like as we are"; His human nature is tried in the furnace as we are tried, but χωρὶς ἀμαρτίας ("without sin"), and in the strength of that victory we are strong. He is tried and tested under the conditions made imperative by the mission of Him who came into the world to reveal the Father and to atone for sin. The "laws of temptation" demand that He should be tempted in accordance with His circumstances, and His circumstances are those of the Christ, perfectly human and perfectly Divine.

Note.—In this connection I may be allowed to quote the words of the latest of the compilers of a biography of Jesus—David Smith, M.A., in his
brilliant work, "The Days of His Flesh," pp. 40, 41: "His Temptation in the wilderness most strikingly evinces the sinlessness of our blessed Lord. When Saul of Tarsus retired to the desert of Arabia, he was haunted by the remembrance of his "exceeding madness" against Jesus and His saints. It clung to him all his life, and during that season of retirement he would mourn over it, and vow with sore contrition to make the future, so far as he could, a reparation of the past. But far otherwise was Jesus employed during His sojourn in the wilderness. He could look back without regret or shame. It was not the past which concerned Him, but the future; and His only thought was how He should do the Father's will and accomplish the work which He had given Him to do. The past had left no regret, and He faced the future, not with tears of penitence and vows of reparation, but with a prayer for guidance, and a steadfast resolution to recognize no law save the Father's will and seek no end save His glory. It was a spotless life that the Messiah consecrated to the work of the world's redemption."

The Case of the Curates.

By the Rev. Barton R. V. Mills, M.A.

The falling off in the supply of clergy is a common subject of complaint. The number of candidates for Holy Orders has been steadily falling for many years, while that of candidates for other professions has as steadily risen. This is generally attributed to the poor worldly prospects which the Church offers to its ministers in comparison with other occupations. This, no doubt, is one of the causes, but by no means the only one. There are still many clergymen who can disregard this consideration. There never is the least difficulty in filling a "living," however small the stipend may be.

With a curacy the case is very different, as many vicars know to their cost. The dearth is really one, not of clergymen, but of curates. This suggests that one cause of the diminution of candidates may be the unsatisfactory position of this latter class of clergy. That there is wide dissatisfaction at that position hardly admits of doubt. It may be at once admitted that the grievance is not mainly financial. Scandalously low as is the payment of all the clergy, curates, as a class, are probably less
badly off in this respect than a large number of the beneficed. But their position is in many other ways anomalous and unsatisfactory. The object of this paper is to inquire how these anomalies arose, to show the harm they do to the work of the Church, and to suggest a remedy.

I.

The first thing to remember is that the assistant curate is a comparatively modern institution in the Church of England. The "curate" of the Canons and the Prayer-Book was any priest who had the cure of souls. The word, as we now use it, means a clergyman, whether priest or deacon, who exercises his ministry under the direction of a beneficed clergyman. In this paper the word will be used in its popular, though less accurate, sense. It must also be remembered that "curates" and "unbeneficed clergymen" are not identical, though the terms are often used as if they were. The modern "curate" is the result of an attempt—ill-considered and accidental—to utilize the unbenefficed clergyman, who is a much more venerable personage, in the service of the Church.

In the earliest ages of the Church there was no distinction between beneficed and unbenefficed clergy, for the simple reason that none were beneficed. The unit of ecclesiastical administration was the diocese. The Bishop lived in one central place with a college of presbyters, who went to and fro at his direction, and returned to the home in which they led a common life. These itinerant clergy are referred to by Bede, who complained to Archbishop Egbert of York that their visits were too infrequent. But there is no mention of them after the Council of Cloveshoe—A. D. 747—and parochial cures began to be established about the end of the eighth century.\(^1\) Parish churches were built and endowments given for resident clergy. These, however, were still members of the college of presbyters, administration was diocesan rather than parochial, and the dependence of the clergy on the Bishop was complete. Benefices arose with

\(^1\) Dansey, "Hœœ Decanicae Rurales," i., p. 77.
lay patronage. The landowner who gave the endowment claimed the appointment of the priest, and invested him with the outward signs of his office. This, as well as institution by the Bishop, was held to be necessary to a valid appointment. The benefice thus came to be regarded as a piece of property, and its holder to be to a large extent independent of the Bishop. This establishment of beneficed priests with a definite cure of souls probably began in France earlier than in England, and was not completed in this country till the reign of Edward the Confessor. From that time it has been a settled rule that there should be in every parish one responsible "spiritual person" with cure of souls.

The first trace that I have been able to find of any division of this responsibility is in a decree of Archbishop Langton's—A.D. 1222—in which he orders that two or three priests shall be provided for large parishes, but nothing is said as to the subordination of one priest to another. At a somewhat later period we find evidence of the existence of unbenefficed priests, who appear to have been rather troublesome persons. They are required by Archbishop Winchelsey—A.D. 1305—to be under the direction of the incumbents, and are forbidden to stir up strife or interfere with the rights of the beneficed clergy. Archbishop Islip—A.D. 1362—requires "chaplains unbenefficed, but especially fit for the cure of souls" ("Capellani non beneficiati, præsertim idonei curis animarum"), to assist in parish work as well as officiating in their chapels, for a moderate salary. An Act—36 Edward II., cap. 8, A.D. 1362—orders such priests "to serve the parishes and attend the cure of souls," if required to do so by the ordinary, for salaries of from five to six marks. These salaries were raised by 2 Hen. V., cap. 2, A.D. 1414; but the obligation remained, at least in theory, until these Acts were repealed in 1623.

This all looks as if there were assistant curates in England.

1 Selden, "Origin of Tithes," vi., p. 83.
before the Reformation. But it must be remembered that these unbeneficed clergy were no part of the regular ministry, but were looked upon more or less as outsiders. They generally had endowed chantries in which they were to celebrate Mass, or they were maintained for this purpose by wealthy laymen. The best of them, to some extent, supplied the place now taken by assistant curates, but as a class they were regarded as rather a nuisance, and they disappeared soon after the Reformation.

The "curate" of the Canons and the Prayer-Book differs in character both from his medieval predecessor and his modern namesake. The word in the formularies always denotes the priest who has cure of souls in a parish. But he was often the representative of an absentee incumbent. Pluralities were never approved by the Church. They are condemned by the Lateran Council, and one of the earliest Acts of Parliament after the Reformation—25 Hen. VIII., cap. 18—is directed against them. But they continued to exist in large numbers till comparatively modern times. The authorities seem generally to have contented themselves with enforcing the provision of a suitable curate, and an occasional visit from the holder of the benefice. That assistant curates existed as early as A.D. 1584 is, indeed, clear from the answers given by the Bishops to some articles offered to Parliament, in the first of which they say that there "must be curates of necessity," or "such as have great cures will be overburdened with the saying of service, preaching, ministering of Sacraments, all themselves." And in Canon LVI. —A.D. 1604—it is provided that "every minister, being possessed of a benefice that hath cure and charge of souls, although he chiefly attend to preaching, and hath a curate under him to execute the other duties that are to be performed for him in the church . . . shall twice, at the least, every year read himself the Divine service," etc.

But nearly all the references to "curates" in official documents of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are to the deputies of non-resident incumbents. The modern use of the

word is said by Cardwell\(^1\) to have occurred first in a letter of Archbishop Sheldon's in 1665. Even then it is not used exclusively in this sense—indeed, throughout the eighteenth century the other was the predominant one. And there is ample evidence that, as lately as 1831, the number of assistant curates was very small. For in that year a return was made to Parliament of the number of clergy of each kind in each diocese in England and Wales. From this it appears that there were 10,560 benefices, of which only 4,649 had resident incumbents. But 1,684 incumbents, though non-resident, were discharging their duties. This leaves 4,227 benefices in which the incumbents did no duty. There were 4,373 curates, so the number available after the vacant benefices had been served must have been very small, even allowing for the fact that one curate may sometimes have served two parishes. There are now, according to the latest figures obtainable, about 14,300 beneficed and 8,200 unbeneficed clergymen. This last figure probably includes all unbeneficed clergymen who hold a Bishop’s licence to officiate, and many of these are not assistant curates in the ordinary sense of the word. But there can hardly be less than 6,000 of the latter. And the tendency is—and probably rightly—to meet the needs of an increasing population by the multiplication of curates rather than by the division of parishes.

II.

From this historical survey it appears that the assistant curate is not only a comparatively modern, but an anomalous and almost accidental institution.

During the last century the population of this country has not only largely increased, but has been far less evenly distributed. The growth of the great towns has entirely altered the conditions under which the Church has to do its work. The system of working by assistant curates is the rough-and-ready way in which the Church tries to meet these altered circumstances. It

was never formally established, but came into existence through the operation of that powerful factor in the making of institutions—the "chapter of accidents." This, however, would not of itself condemn the system or preclude its adoption by authority. The English mind has ever been tolerant of anomalies so long as they work well, and if that could be said of the one under consideration, there would be no need to ask for its alteration. But, in fact, it is not only anomalous in its origin, but mischievous in its working, and this in several ways.

1. It entails unnecessary hardship on the individuals whom it affects. First, it involves incumbents of large parishes in pecuniary obligations which they ought not to be asked to incur. They are legally liable for the stipend of any curate licensed by the Bishop until that licence is revoked by the authority which granted it. This is surely unfair. The endowment of the benefice is for one clergyman, not two or more; and if the work is beyond the power of one man, the necessary assistance should be provided by the Church. It was quite right to make incumbents liable when the need for a curate was due to their own non-residence, but it is altogether different now. The stipend of the curate should in all cases be provided from a diocesan fund, to which the holders of the more valuable benefices might be called upon to contribute.

But the effect of the existing system on the curates is still less favourable. It is true that, by the Act 1 and 2 Vict., cap. 106, they are given certain rights which they had not before. The most important of these is the requirement—by § 96—of six months' notice to terminate a curate's engagement, which can only be given with the consent of the Bishop. The only exception is in the case of a new incumbent, who can dismiss a curate with six weeks' notice, and without the consent of the Bishop. This last proviso is a clear injustice, and ought to be repealed. And the rest of the clause does not give the curate the protection which it seems to do. For at best it only secures him his stipend, and leaves him entirely under the control of the incumbent as regards his work. And it is the
general practice of the Bishops to advise a curate to resign when he disagrees with his vicar, even though he may have been guilty of no dereliction of duty. This must make the position of a curate more precarious than that of a beneficed priest.

Another very real grievance from which he suffers is the diminution of his stipend and the increased difficulty of getting work at all when he ceases to be a young man. In every other service remuneration is progressive until the maximum is reached, or the age of retirement comes. In the clerical calling alone the reverse is the case. This, again, is due to the fact that the curate is regarded as the personal assistant of the incumbent rather than as an officer of the Church. Another disability from which he suffers is his exclusion from Convocation, which is due to the fact that there were practically no assistant curates when that august assembly was a real power in the Church. Far less excusable is his exclusion from participation in certain Church funds, of which the Queen Victoria Clergy Fund and the recent augmentation fund of the Ecclesiastical Commission are perhaps the most flagrant instances.

2. These are disabilities which affect the curate's *temporal* status. They involve inconvenience and injustice to a hard-working body of men, and on that account alone their removal is required. But what is much more serious is the effect on the *ministerial* status of the clergy concerned, and so on the work of the Church, of the notion that the unbenefticed clergy exist to be the personal assistants of their beneficed brethren. This is seen in the almost universal relegation of the curate as such to a subordinate position in which his chief, if not his only, duty is to carry out the instructions of his vicar. This has various mischievous results.

It is certainly one of the main causes of the falling off of candidates for ordination—at least, of those whom it is most desirable to attract. And it tends to lessen the efficiency of those who are ordained. It is perfectly true that in every calling a beginner must learn his work under the direction of
his seniors, and carry it on for some time under supervision. But it is no less true—though much less generally recognized—that when the period of apprenticeship is passed, the great majority of men work much better in an independent than in a subordinate position. This is specially true of such a calling as that of a clergyman. In some cases, when the work is that of carrying on a great organization, it may best be done by all engaged in it acting under the direction of one governing mind. But in such a work as that of the ministry, which is almost all individual, the exact reverse is true. The chief requisite is not obedience to orders, but a high sense of responsibility and some power of initiative, and these are just the qualities which the position of a curate under our present system tends to retard rather than to develop. The discipline which is excellent and necessary for a learner is thoroughly bad for a man of mature years and experience.

The natural objection which capable men feel to the prolongation of the period of tutelage hinders that redistribution of the clergy which the altered conditions of Church-work make so desirable. With our great and growing town populations we want to diminish our number of rural and increase our supply of town clergymen, and we want our strongest men in the prime of life where there is most work to be done. And many such men would rather stay in the towns than go into the country; but they take country livings to get a position in which they can work on their own lines. It would surely be to the advantage of the Church to retain these men in positions where their energy and ability would find adequate scope.

3. For these reasons some change in the present system seems to be urgently required. The remedy is often sought in some reform in the system of patronage whereby there should be more discrimination in appointing to "livings." This, no doubt, is eminently desirable, but it would not meet the case. The present writer is convinced that the only adequate remedy is frankly to abandon the principle that each parish can have only one responsible head by whom its whole working must be
controlled. This was quite a sound principle when all cures were of such a size as that one man could administer them with, at most, a single assistant in the case of a few of the largest parishes. It is quite unsuitable now, when a large number of our parishes can only be properly worked by the division of labour amongst a number of colleagues. And it would probably tend to greater efficiency if more of the smaller parishes were combined. This cannot be done at present owing to the impossibility of reducing the number of independent positions.

We have, in fact, to substitute collective for individual responsibility, and to make the relation between vicar and curate one of partnership—not of employer and subordinate. It is sometimes said that to do this would be to introduce disorder into the work of the Church. But it is the principle on which great businesses are managed, on which the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge are governed, and which exists in our cathedrals. These latter afford a visible proof of the possibility of partnership in matters ecclesiastical. Such a question as the introduction of a Choral Eucharist or an Evening Communion into a cathedral would be settled by a vote of the Chapter, not by the authority of the Dean; nor could the latter dictate to any of the Canons the position that they should take in celebrating the Holy Communion. If this can be the rule with perfect harmony in a cathedral, there seems no reason why it should not be so in a parish church.

It would, of course, be necessary to secure that the members of such a parochial Chapter should be men of capacity and experience. This might be done if the Bishops could see their way to grant a special licence or diploma to all clergymen who, with seven years' good record of parochial work, passed a prescribed examination, in which they might be allowed to obtain a certificate of distinction in special subjects, such, e.g., as preaching or Church music. A licence so given would not be withdrawn except for such grave misconduct as would justify the removal of an incumbent from his benefice. This would introduce among the clergy a distinction somewhat resembling that which
exists among barristers, between King’s Counsel and the Junior Bar. The ministerial status of a priest would then be determined by his possession or otherwise, not of a benefice, but of a licence. A clergyman who could not obtain such a licence would remain, as he would deserve to do, in a subordinate position.

The adoption of such a plan would not entail so sweeping a change in our present system as might be supposed. During the last seven years there have been a little over 4,000 ordinations. Allowing for some deaths and removals to foreign service, there must be nearly 3,500 clergymen who would be available as assistant curates, as at present. The change would mainly affect the large churches, which would become collegiate in their character, for their “canon-curacies” would no doubt be confined to men holding this special qualification. And the system would have the enormous advantage that, under it, every clergyman would know that the attainment of an independent position would be determined by the possession, not of interest with patrons, but of qualification in himself. The effect of this in encouraging the efficient and eliminating the incapable candidates for ordination can hardly be over estimated.

A strong argument in favour of this course is that it could be adopted by the action of the Bishops without resort to legislation. The granting and withdrawal of a curate’s licence rests with the Bishop alone—with the single exception of the case of a new vicar, to which reference has been made. In these cases the Bishops could not guarantee the perpetuity of their licence, but the pressure of public opinion and episcopal influence could go a long way to discourage the dismissal of qualified men. In fact, the Bishops could practically secure this result by refusing to license curates where this power had been unreasonably used.

The writer of this paper ventures to suggest this solution of the problem in the hope that its consideration by Churchmen may lead either to its adoption or to the proposal of a better one. It is not to be expected that any scheme will command general approval. The one thing that appears to be certain is that things must not, and cannot, remain as they are.
The Ritual of Leviticus in the Book of Numbers.¹

By the Rev. Andrew Craig Robinson, M.A.

The true key to the understanding of the development of the ritual of Leviticus, which we find prescribed in the Book of Numbers, would seem to be the change which was about to take place from the wilderness life to the Promised Land. The modification of the ritual in view of this change is concerned especially with three materials used in sacrifice—flour, oil, and wine. It is easy to understand that these commodities were not very readily procurable in the wilderness; for although no doubt the Israelitish camp was visited from time to time by many a caravan of "Midianites, merchantmen," from whom fine flour, oil, frankincense and wine could be purchased, yet in the wilderness such things were luxuries, and though men might from time to time elect to offer of their own free-will the meal offering of fine flour, with oil and frankincense, yet to require that such an offering, with wine besides, should be presented with every victim would be to demand from the people something which in the wilderness they would find it impossible to give. But the case would be quite different after the people had entered into possession of the Promised Land. In that land flowing with milk and honey, with plenty of corn, and wine, and olives, a regulation that every sacrifice should be accompanied by an offering of flour, and oil, and wine would involve no difficulty whatsoever.

And so accordingly it was ordained. Under the existing code of Leviticus it was not required that an animal offered in sacrifice should be accompanied by an offering of flour, oil, and frankincense—the offering of the animal was complete in itself—a burnt offering, peace offering, etc., as the case might be, the only exceptions being the daily sacrifice of the two lambs

¹ For a discussion of the ritual of Leviticus the reader is referred to a small book on Leviticus by the present writer (Marshall Brothers), in which the subjects of sacrifice and ritual are dealt with. The limits of the present paper preclude the discussion of the general subject.
and a "sacrifice of peace offerings for a thanksgiving" (Lev. vii. 11). If flour, oil, and frankincense were offered they were mixed together, and constituted a completely independent form of offering—the "meat [or meal] offering" (Lev. ii.).

So, too, the offering of wine under the early code was only prescribed in the same case—the daily sacrifice of the two lambs (Exod. xxix. 40, 41). The only passage in which a drink offering is mentioned in Leviticus has reference to the time when the people should be settled in the Promised Land.

But in the Book of Numbers, in view of the settled life in the Land of Canaan, a change passes over the ritual, and a remarkable development takes place; for in the code of Numbers it is prescribed that with every animal offered in sacrifice there is to be presented an offering of fine flour, oil, and wine, in specified quantities according to the importance of the victim.

Another point, again, in which the earlier ritual of Leviticus is expanded in the Book of Numbers would also seem to be connected with the impending change from the wilderness to the Promised Land. The question as to what particular animals should be offered on the occasion of each of the great feasts was left in the code of Leviticus in great part undefined, in consideration, no doubt, of the limited conditions of the wilderness life; but in the ritual of Numbers it is commanded that at each of the feasts the sacrifices should consist of a very large number of animals distinctly specified, with their meal offerings and their drink offerings; and these prescribed sacrifices were to be in addition to the free-will offerings of the people (Num. xxviii., xxix.). These requirements would seem to be adapted to the future condition of the people in the Land of Canaan, where they would be wealthy in flocks and herds.

Then a third modification and development of the ritual was that, in addition to the daily sacrifice of the two lambs, a weekly burnt offering of two lambs on the Sabbath Day and a monthly burnt offering at the beginning of each month were prescribed.
In the twenty-eighth chapter of the Book of Numbers is re-enacted the law of the daily burnt offering of the two lambs, morning and evening (Exod. xxix. 38); and in this re-enactment the Book of Exodus is presupposed, because the law in Numbers goes on to say: "It is a continual burnt offering which was ordained in Mount Sinai" (Num. xxviii. 6; cf. Exod. xxix. 42).

These are the changes in the ritual of Leviticus ordained in the Book of Numbers—changes which appear to be very natural in prospect of entering the Promised Land. There are many indications of a most convincing character which show that the code of Numbers presupposes and rests upon Leviticus. Thus we see that the minute directions as to how the various sacrifices are to be performed contained in the early chapters of Leviticus are absent from the Book of Numbers; they are tacitly assumed as having been already laid down. So also, whilst Numbers refers to the fast of the Day of Atonement, on the tenth day of the seventh month, in the words, "Ye shall have . . . a holy convocation, and ye shall afflict your souls," and prescribes certain sacrifices for that day, including "one kid of the goats for a sin offering," it adds the words, "beside the sin offering of atonement" (Num. xxix. 7, 11), but gives no particulars of the ritual of the Day of Atonement—no doubt because that ritual had been already so fully laid down in Leviticus (Lev. xvi.).

And, in accordance with this resting on Leviticus, we see that while the people were still in the wilderness the ritual followed the wilderness code. The offerings of the princes of the tribes at the dedication of the altar, recounted in the seventh chapter of Numbers, will be seen to have conformed to the regulations laid down in Leviticus. Each of the princes offered all the principal offerings mentioned there. Each of them offered (a) a meat (or meal) offering, consisting of fine flour mingled with oil, presented in a silver charger and a silver bowl, accompanied by incense in a golden spoon (cf. Lev. ii. 1); (b) a burnt offering, consisting of one young bullock, one ram, and one lamb of the first year (cf. Lev. i. 2); (c) a sin offering,
one kid of the goats (cf. Lev. iv. 22, 23); and (d) peace offerings, two oxen, five rams, five he-goats, and five lambs of the first year (cf. Lev. iii.).

The reader will observe that in these offerings by the princes of the tribes the meal offering is a distinct and independent offering by itself; and, on the other hand, that in the burnt offering, sin offering, and peace offerings the animal victims are not accompanied by any meal offering or drink offering. All this was in accordance with the ritual of Leviticus, but not in accordance with the ritual prescribed subsequently in Numbers.

The remaining sacrifice mentioned in Leviticus, the trespass offering, was of course not offered by the princes, because this offering had always reference to a definite wrong, done either in the holy things of the Lord or against a fellow-man; but this offering is also fully mentioned in one of the early chapters of Numbers (the fifth), where we read, at the close of the other regulations as to confession of the sin and restitution and fine in the case of a trespass against the Lord, the following words: “Beside the ram of the atonement, whereby an atonement shall be made for him” (Num. v. 6-8). The reader will observe how a sacrifice always accompanied the trespass money (the *ashâm*).¹

In this manner, then, the ritual of the sacrifice in Numbers is linked in continuation with that ordained in Leviticus, of which it appears to be a natural development, in prospect of the people entering the Promised Land.

The modern school of critics, for the most part, recognize that the ritual contained in Numbers is a development of that laid down in Leviticus,² but they, of course, attribute that development to the times after the return from the Exile. Thus Kuenen, speaking of Numbers expanding, explaining, and supplementing Leviticus, says: “All alike may be explained by the practical requirements revealed or developed soon after

¹ For the important bearing of this point on the critical theory of the late origin of the trespass offering, see the present writer’s “Leviticus,” p. 78.
b.c. 444, and provided for either by the incorporation of a tora which had previously only been delivered orally, or by the framing of a new precept to meet the demands of the time.\(^1\)

What these "practical requirements revealed or developed soon after b.c. 444" might be is not added, nor what the "demands of the time."

To such vague and shadowy conjectures are the critics driven when they tear the Book of Numbers out of its natural position in the Mosaic age, and drop it down in the days after the Exile; but if the book be left in its natural position, the reason for the development of the ritual can be seen to be natural also. The ritual was modified in view of the people entering into possession of the Promised Land.

The injunctions laid down in Numbers complete the development of the Mosaic code of sacrifice, leaving nothing more to be done. Dr. Driver observes: "With the table of sacrifices in Num. 28 \(f\); there is no point of contact in Dt."\(^2\) But, seeing that the sacrificial code was complete in Numbers, and that Deuteronomy consists, for the most part, of exhortations to the laity, it was only natural that the technical prescriptions of Numbers should not be repeated.

That the ritual in Numbers is not in any way dependent on that laid down by Ezekiel for his ideal temple is shown by the difference between them in regard to the quantities of meal and oil to be offered with each victim, and also by the circumstance that Ezekiel appoints no offering of wine. It is fully admitted, however, by the critics that wine as an accompaniment of sacrifice was much more ancient than the times of Ezekiel. Dr. George Buchanan Gray says: "In Ezekiel wine is not even mentioned; but it would be, in view of the references to early literature just given,\(^3\) a wholly erroneous conclusion to infer that wine was first made an accompaniment of offerings after the time of Ezekiel."\(^4\) This writer, then, who fully holds the

\(^1\) "Hexateuch," 1886, p. 309.  
\(^2\) "Introduction," p. 76.  
\(^3\) Judg. ix. 9, 13; 1 Sam. i. 24, x. 3; Hos. ix. 4; Mic. vi. 7.  
\(^4\) "Numbers," 1903, p. 171.
views of the criticism, freely admits that wine offerings were ancient, as no doubt they were. And although no mention of wine connected with sacrifice occurs in Ezekiel, yet drink offerings are mentioned—viz., in Ezek. xx. 28, and xlv. 17, where we read: “It shall be the prince’s part to give burnt offerings and meat offerings and drink offerings in the feasts, and in the new moons, and in the sabbaths, in all the solemnities of the house of Israel.” It would seem as if Ezekiel, who himself prescribed no drink offerings, had the ordinances of the twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth chapters of Numbers before his mind.

The antiquity of the drink offering is amply proved by passages cited by Dr. Gray himself—for example, 1 Sam. i. 24, 25. This passage not only proves the antiquity of the offering of wine, but also clearly shows that the ritual prescribed in Numbers, whereby with every free-will offering of a victim a meal offering and a drink offering were to be combined, was observed in the house of the Lord in Shiloh. So in later, but still pre-exilic, times we have Hosea saying: “They shall not offer wine offerings to the Lord, neither shall they be pleasing to Him” (Hos. ix. 4). And in the sixteenth chapter of 2 Kings we find it said that King Ahaz “burnt his burnt offering and his meat offering, and poured his drink offering . . . upon the altar.” In this passage also we have the drink offering mentioned, and we find the ritual of Numbers in full action at the Temple in Jerusalem 150 years before the Exile.

Ezekiel, then, in not assigning a drink offering to be presented with the sacrifices which he prescribes for his ideal temple, exhibits a contrast to Numbers which ought to preclude any idea that Numbers could possibly be dependent on Ezekiel; and a further proof of this is that, whilst Numbers very particularly prescribes the sacrifices to be offered at the Feast of Weeks, or Pentecost, Ezekiel makes no reference to that great feast whatsoever, although he prescribes regulations for the Passover and the Feast of Tabernacles. As the Feast of Pentecost, however, is mentioned in what the critics call “the
earlier codes,” they fully admit that it must have been in existence in the days of Ezekiel. It would seem that the prophet, in his conception of the ritual of his ideal temple, did not feel himself bound to conform in all points to existing regulations.

Four developments, then, of the ritual of Leviticus are to be particularly noted in the Book of Numbers:

(a) The meal offering is to be an accompaniment of almost every sacrifice.

(b) The drink offering is to be an accompaniment of almost every sacrifice.

(c) The sacrifices at the great feasts—hitherto for the most part undefined—are fully and expressly ordained.

(d) In addition to the daily sacrifice of the two lambs, stated weekly and monthly sacrifices are commanded.

But all these developments of the ritual are only to take effect after the people have entered into possession of the Promised Land.

Studies in Texts.

SUGGESTIONS FOR SERMONS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.

BY THE REV. HARRINGTON C. LEES, M.A.

I.

TEXT: “The joy of my heart.”—Jer. xv. 16.

[Books consulted: (a) “How to Enjoy the Bible” (Bullinger = B.); (b) “Solomon’s Temple” (Caldecott = C.); Davidson’s article “Jeremiah” in “Hastings’ Dictionary” (= D.); see also Payne Smith’s “Jeremiah” in “Speaker’s Commentary” (= P.S.).]

Much of Jeremiah’s message is in a minor key. Why this exultant tone here? The verse is a reference to a personal spiritual episode.

I. The Finding of the Word.—Verse 16 is linked by the word “found” (Heb. matza) with 2 Kings xxii. 8, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 14 (B., p. 3). The young prophet was moulded by the discovery. “‘Jeremiah was a child of Josiah’s reformation” (C., p. 169). Mrs. Bell, in a book now preparing for the press, suggests that the volume of the Law was found in Joash’s old money-chest, which appears to have been used again for Josiah’s offertory (cf. 2 Kings
II. The Feeding of the Soul.—Jeremiah "devoured" the old book, new to him and to others. There is nothing surprising in the famine of the Word. The determined suppression of the truth for fifty-seven years accounts for all (C., 171, note). "With this may be compared the effect on Luther of the discovery of a complete copy of the Bible at Erfurt" (C., 181). If Jeremiah's father were High Priest, as P.S. (p. 312) thinks (2 Kings xxii. 4, Jer. i. 1), the youth had special opportunities of study. The results appear in his book, "Most numerous quotations from Pentateuch, especially Deuteronomy" (P.S., 326, and any reference Bible).

III. The Felicity of the Prophet.—The external testimony of authority to his internal convictions made his heart exult. Soul-hunger was appeased. "Joy" (Heb. sus) = lip-gladness. "Rejoicing" (Heb. samakh) = face-gladness. A song and a smile. Contrast xx. 9 R.V. for the reverse effect of withheld testimony.

IV. The Fruit of the Message.—"Thy name is called upon me" (mar.), i.e., "I am consecrated to Thy service, am ordained to be Thy prophet" (P.S., in loco, 411). "O Lord, Thou didst induce me, and I was induced" (xx. 7, D., i.). Learning issues in labour. Joy strengthens for the Cross, xv. 17 (cf. "sweet and bitter," Ezek. ii. 8 to iii. 3; Rev. x. 9, if).

Lessons.—I. God's openings. II. Man's use of them. III. God's seal of blessing. IV. Man's return in service.

The Missionary World.

By the Rev. C. D. Snell, M.A.

THE Rev. Bernard Lucas, of the London Missionary Society, not long ago made an effective protest against missionary statistics as tending to concentrate attention on individuals rather than races, "on the momentary result rather than on the permanent influence, on the present actuality rather than on the future possibility." Undoubtedly there is much force in his contention, but all the same statistics have their value, since a steadily increasing number of converts, provided, of course, that proper care has been exercised before admitting to baptism, shows that the work is not in vain. "There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth," and no reason can be given why the Church militant here on earth should not share in that joy. The evil lies, not in attaching importance to statistics which indicate success, but in the assumption that all forms of work which cannot be so justified are necessarily a failure. Home sup-
porters of Foreign Missions should remember that a vast amount of spade work is being accomplished, and that proofs of the influence of Christianity on the thought and actions of those who have not yet embraced it are of great value, as affording grounds for the expectation of mass movements in the more or less immediate future.

Proofs of the character referred to are not uncommon, but they are not often put forward so clearly as lately has been done by the Rev. C. B. Clarke, of Burdwan, in Bengal. Writing to the North India localized Church Missionary Gleaner, he says: “I was talking last week to a Hindu pleader here, and he told me of a most interesting piece of advice that he had once received from a Hindu of the Hindus in the centre of Benares. Some years ago, he said, he had visited Benares on purpose to see the famous Swami Bhaska Ananda, who was regarded as beyond dispute the holiest man of his day in that holy city. My friend told him that he wanted to learn from him about the Hindu religion. ‘But,’ said the Swami, ‘you don’t know Sanscrit. How can I teach you?’ ‘Oh,’ said my friend, ‘I only want to learn from you some of the deeper truths of the Hindu faith that you yourself have discovered.’ ‘There is one book,’ replied the Swami, ‘that can tell you all you want to know. It is the Bible. Read the Bible, and you will learn all that is worth knowing about Hinduism.’”

Mr. Clarke proceeds to give other instances. He tells of a man who, losing his only son, consoled himself with the thought that God is love; of a member of the Brahma Samaj, one of the reforming sects of Hinduism, who conducts service every Sunday with extempore prayer and reading of the Scriptures; of a Brahman dying in the midst of Hindus, with but one name constantly on his lips, the Name which is above every name; and of the headmaster of a Hindu high-school, who has requested an Indian pastor to hold Bible-classes for his staff and some of the boys, and has ordered and paid for twenty copies of the New Testament. Cases like these are more than straws showing which way the wind blows in India.

Something akin to a mass movement towards Christianity is evidently going on among the Miao, among whom the China Inland Mission is at work. In an account of a tour among the Miao villages by Mr. Adam, he tells of one place where “On the Lord’s Day several thousand Miao attended the services, and about 900 sat round the table of the Lord”; of another where there were 500 communicants; of a third where 287 persons were baptized during his visit, and communicants numbered 613; of another where there were 118 adult baptisms; of another with 234 baptisms and 798 communicants; and so on. Moreover, it appears that there is no reason to fear that baptism is administered too hastily, for Mr. Adam is able to state that of the 1,200 persons baptized in 1906 only three have fallen away.

Both the Baptist Missionary Society and the China Inland Mission have been experiencing times of revival at several of their stations. Mr. Goforth, of the Canadian Presbyterian Mission in the Northern Provinces of Shan-Si and Ho-Nan, has been greatly used to lead the
Christians to a conviction and confession of sin, and those who have been brought into closer touch with God have gone forth, and in their turn have been instrumental in leading others to the blessing which they themselves have found.

"I am slow of speech, and of a slow tongue. . . . I will be with thy mouth" (Exod. iv. 10, 12). "I cannot speak: for I am a child. . . . Whatsoever I command thee, thou shalt speak" (Jer. i. 6, 7). A missionary of the Church of England Zenana Missionary Society in the Fuh-Kien Province of China writes of those whom she describes as "fear-hearts," and of the wonderful change seen in a woman among them. A year ago this woman was so shy that it was painful to watch her efforts to answer questions in class or to speak to heathen visitors; indeed, it often happened that, though her mouth would open, she was unable to utter more than the faintest whisper. Now she is to the fore in the work of visiting, and has obtained an entrance into some upper-class houses in the desire that her relatives should know what it means to worship the true God. Moreover, she and her crippled son have asked that they may be sent to an altogether unevangelized village, where years before she lived as the wife of a small mandarin, in order that there they may bear their witness for Christ.

The Missionary Review of the World gives a translation of a sermon preached last summer in the Mosque of St. Sophia, Constantinople, by Ismail Hakki Effendi. In it the following remarkable passage occurs: "Islam abhors oppression and despotism. . . . Our law demands liberty, justice, and equality. There are non-Moslems among us. They are God's trust to us. We will try to keep their rights even more than our own. Our religion commands us to do so. There are three last admonitions of the Prophet. The first of them is to keep from oppressing the non-Moslem citizens. . . . They have the same rights which we have. We must leave them free. Their good is exactly our good; their loss is exactly our loss." This is hardly what missionaries in Mohammedan lands are accustomed to!

The Bible at Work.

By the Rev. W. Fisher, M.A.

It is said that no rock is perfectly impervious to water; through many it finds a ready passage, and on not a few it acts as a quick solvent. In addition to its directly converting power, there is a penetrating force with "the water of the Word." Japan is at present showing somewhat interesting signs of it. A Japanese firm in Tokio has recently published, as a purely commercial venture, the New Testament as a diglot—the Japanese on one side and the English revised on the other. Bishop Foss, S.P.G. Bishop at Osaka, tells how Christian novels by Japanese authors are being published in Japan, with such titles as "Spirit or Flesh," "Fruit Without Flower." It is encouraging to learn that the Bible Society's agent reports an increase of
25,000 copies during the first nine months of 1908, for while the Bible has an open pathway throughout the Empire, the figures are not so large as such remarkable liberty should enjoy. Correspondingly, in China are many signs of penetration, one of which is particularly suggestive. A non-Christian publishing syndicate in Shanghai proposed (1) to have a good encyclopædia translated, (2) to have an extensive series of textbooks for schools and colleges, (3) to have the best religious books printed. They asked that the Secretary of the Christian Literature Society for China should be allowed to engage and manage their translating staff for this purpose. All necessary funds were to be supplied by the syndicate. Such a proposal by a Chinese firm, so distinctly commercial, is indicative of a market, and therefore of a mind increasingly influenced by what is Western, and disposed towards it.

The changes, rapid in many respects, that are taking place in China are particularly active in the direction of literature. Two hundred newspapers are now being published, and every provincial capital is said to have its daily paper. Correspondingly, there is a demand for translations of European and American literature. This must tend to a larger or, in any case, a deeper circulation of the Scriptures. Even now there are indications of the influence of that circulation which are not immediately registered in the form of baptisms, and yet are significant. An Amoy missionary tells us that in collecting funds for the Community Hospital he found a copy of the New Testament on the desk of an Amoy native banker. The banker told him that he was in the habit of taking up the book during a lull in business, and said that he felt assured that no reform could be brought about in China without the Ki-tok (Christ) portrayed in the Gospels.

These penetrations are effective in two ways. In view of that day of trouble in the Far East that seems but too possible, though it may never come, they provide an indestructible anchorage, and should there be another and a greater uprising in China—as Sir Robert Hart once feared might come in the future—and should it mean suspension of missionary work, even to the dismissal of the missionaries, it would be beyond the power of any future Boxer movement to exterminate the millions of Scriptures that have been of late years circulated in China. Within the last five years scarcely less than 1,000,000 copies have been distributed by the combined efforts of the British and Foreign, the Scottish, and the American Bible Societies.

In the meantime they afford ground for hope. "The rain filleth the pools"; pools overflow into streams, and to peoples, as to individuals, comes what St. Peter calls the "day of visitation." A well-known missionary says: "I have seen it in print that not less than 300,000 inquirers are knocking at the door of India's Missions to be received under instruction. They want to become Christian." A remarkable spiritual movement is reported by the staff of the Regions Beyond Missionary Union at Ikau on the Upper Congo. "Old and young men and women have enrolled themselves as inquirers... No special effort has been put forward. It is the Holy Spirit gathering to
Himself the result of years of labour. Almost nightly we are besieged by a band of young fellows asking to have the way of salvation made more clear to them. . . . The coming of the Lo-Mongo New Testament has done much to influence the young men.” It is hard to escape the conviction that the Word of God is preparing for a day of God.

One notable activity of the Bible is the instant interest that is quickened by any discovery in the East. Even the acquisition by Lord Ffrench of the complete Kah-gyur, or Tibetan version of the Buddhist Scriptures, reported in the issue of the Times for January 28, illustrates in an emphatic manner the exquisitely portable size of the Bible for universal distribution. The Kah-gyur consists of 100 volumes or more, each with 1,000 pages. Such Scriptures will never know a world-wide distribution.

The 4,000 manuscripts found by Dr. Stein, of the India Government Mission to Central Africa, excite wonder as to the light they may throw both on Buddhism and Christianity. So many Buddhist traditions indicate very clearly a Christian source, that the testimony of volumes going back, in some instances, as far as A.D. 100, may possibly offer most valuable evidence. At present there is no truly authentic source of any such tradition earlier than the Christian era.

The excavations being carried out by the German Oriental Society at Babylon, under the direction of Dr. Koldewey, as illustrated in the Graphic of January 30, are full of interest. They show unmistakably that the prophet rightly described Babylon as “the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldee's excellency,” and that the proud boast of Nebuchadnezzar had at least its material justification, even judged by the stupendous remains that are now being unearthed. The prophet's word likewise has been absolutely fulfilled, for Babylon became “heaps,” and has remained “heaps” to this day. “From the East” came all the light that we enjoy, and “From the East” is calculated to become significant of a light that in many respects will make the truth of the Word all the more remarkable. The archaeological relationships of the Bible are as wonderful as they are interesting; but possibly we are as yet only in the dawn.

---

**Literary Notes.**

The other day Mr. St. Loe Strachey gave an address to the members of the Authors' Club upon the difference between literature and journalism. I suppose that as long as both exist there will always be a great diversity of opinion as to what this difference really is. To instance: the Spectator itself is a weekly journal, but I suppose most of us, irrespective of political views, will admit at once that in its pages may be discovered as good literature as is to be found in the writing of to-day. Of course, this fineness of expression, this fairness of view, and this restraint of opinion, reflect in a large measure something of the mind which occupies the editorial chair. And, also, there
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is the tradition weaving its atmosphere around the personalities of those whose business it is to see to the conduct of the paper. It would be strange if the directors of this particular journal should miss the spiritual influence of some of their greater forbears. It was, therefore, most fitting that its editor should address the members of the Authors' Club upon such a subject. His opinion—his unique opinion, I think I may justifiably say—would carry considerable weight. Good journalism is assuredly good literature. Yet literature, in the fullest sense of the word, is good; therefore the qualification is superfluous. It seems to the writer that journalism—I mean pure journalism of the Spectator type—is a distinct condition from that other kind of journalism (sic) which lives its unsatisfactory life upon the carrion news of sensationalism. It points to the fact that there are many grades of journalism. This modern method of writing news and producing "live" articles should not, under the greatest stress, be called journalism; it is an insult to it, and a gross impertinence. Journalism is dovetailed into literature; both have a dignity which is theirs by right of birth; both have a hemisphere of their own, which they can fill by the grace of their own virtue. But the former needs our compassion when its name is associated with much of the wicked method of writing which obtains to-day. In one way journalism should be a help to literature—I mean to the person whose immediate motive in life is to write and publish a book. The writing for the press is a great refining fire. Pedantry, flamboyancy, arrogance, verbosity, and the like, receive their quietus in the ruthless demands of the canons of journalism. It teaches us by hard—perhaps sometimes it is cruel—experience that all these things are so much verbiage, which must be calmly cast upon the mental dust-heap as useless. Simplicity should be the paramount feature, coupled with a directness of attack which goes right to the root of the subject under treatment. At first the writer will find his work bald and unpalatable, but the harvesting time will come along eventually, and with it a picturesque-ness of expression which no set of rules can possibly teach.

Dr. Bradley's "Oxford Lectures on Poetry" contain selections from the lectures delivered during the author's term of office as Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford which are not to be found in his well-known volume on "Shakespearean Tragedy." Of course, anything that Dr. Bradley has to say on poetry may be accepted as authoritative, and one is anxious and glad to have on record his various lectures on such subjects as "Poetry for Poetry's Sake," "The Sublime," and "Hegel's View of Tragedy." Then there are five sections dealing with the poets and poetry of the early nineteenth century, while another four treat of Shakespeare.

At this point perhaps I may be permitted to call attention to a new work by Mr. Arthur Symons, entitled "The Romantic Movement in English Poetry." This is being issued by Messrs. Constable, who are also bringing out a translation of "The Last Days of Papal Rome." It is being done into English by Miss Helen Zimmern, who has much knowledge of Italy and the Italians, and the literature, past and present, of the country. This publication which she has translated is an abridgment of the original work in two big volumes.
What Cesare has done in the past in giving us a trustworthy account of the gradual death of the jurisdiction of the Pope over Rome, between 1850 and 1870, Signor Guglielmo Ferrero is doing in the present for the rise and fall of Rome in its great historical aspect. His stupendous and most scholarly work, "The Greatness and Decline of Rome," is a masterly production. So far four volumes have appeared: Vol. i., "The Empire-Builder"; vol. ii., "Julius Cæsar"; vol. iii., "The Fall of an Aristocracy"; vol. iv., "Rome and Egypt." The new fifth volume will bring the work (it is the completing volume) to the close of the reign of Augustus, A.D. 14. I cannot give any better description of the work than a quotation from the review of a certain critic: "His largeness of vision, his sound scholarship, his sense of proportion, his power to measure life that has been by his observation of life that is, his possession of the true historical sense, stamp him as a great historian." At the moment of writing Signor Ferrero has just returned from America, where he recently delivered a course of lectures at Columbia University. He has also been lecturing at the University of Chicago, and at the Lowell Institute, Boston. It is interesting to compare his work with Gibbon's, inasmuch as the spirit of the modern age must affect the ultimate decision of the present-day historian. And there is Mommsen's work, which, of course, always has its place upon the shelves of thinkers and students. Naturally, as years go by, research provides new material; hence Signor Ferrero's five-volume work is a valuable undertaking.

I wonder if the ordinary man and woman know much of Bartholomew de Las Casas? There is an important biography of him just issued—"His Life, His Apostolate, and His Writings"—by Francis Augustus MacNutt. Las Casas was the sixteenth-century historian of early Spanish America. He was also the devoted Dominican missionary and the defender of the Indians who fared so ill at the hands of their Christian conquerors. Mr. MacNutt recently published a very fine translation of "The Letters of Cortes."

Among many important books to come from the notable publishing house of Messrs. Smith, Elder, and Co. is one entitled "Pre-Tractarian Oxford," a volume of reminiscences by the Rev. W. Tuckwell, late Fellow of New College. The book should make very interesting reading, as it deals with a rather memorable period. In it will be found sketches, among others, of Archbishop Whately, Dr. Arnold, Hampden, and Blanco White. These were men who were known as "Noetics" or Intellectuals, whose teaching, preceding the Newman movement, found its expression in "Essays and Reviews," and may be said to have some kinship with the higher criticism of to-day. There will be several portraits by that wonderful photographer, Mr. Frederick Hollyer.

A new series of books is in the making. It is called "Harper's Library of Living Thought." Its object: To furnish the living central thought in a permanent book-form as soon as it is born. The idea is based upon immediacy. A writer feels at times that he has a new living thought to express. Often he does not wait—there is too much hurry to-day—calmly and philo-
sophically to develop the idea and clothe it in its appropriate raiment; he just sits down, makes a fairly long article of it, and sends it to one of the many magazines. So, then, Harper's will assist the Hotspur of the great new thought out of his difficulty, help him to expand it a little, and then publish it in its middle-aged form. The price of the series is to be, in cloth, 2s. 6d. Among the first volumes are: “Personal Religion in Egypt before Christianity,” by W. M. Flinders Petrie; “The Teaching of Jesus,” by Count Leo Tolstoy; “The Life of the Universe,” by Svante Arrhenius; “Three Plays of Shakespeare,” by A. C. Swinburne; and “Poetic Adequacy in the Twentieth Century,” by Theodore Watts-Dunton.

Here is a somewhat astonishing book, although the surprise will abate a little when I say that it comes from America. It is called “Principles of Successful Church Advertising.” At first glance one wonders what it means, but on a second consideration the motive of the book, although a trifle foreign to our own methods, is clearer. The author is Mr. Charles Stelzle, who says his book is the result of wide study and considerable experience. Some of the chapters deal with such subjects as will give pointers to the incumbent of a church for bringing them prominently before the people. The author gained plenty of readers in the United States through his former books: “Christianity’s Storm Centre: A Study of the Modern City;” and “Messages to Working Men.”

Another new American book is Dr. George Barton Cutten’s “The Psychological Phenomena of Christianity,” which, I understand, is meeting with a considerable amount of attention on the other side of the Atlantic.

Among Mr. Elliot Stock’s new books are: “Infidelity and Miracles,” by Samuel Knaggs, a volume which should prove useful to inquirers after religious truth; and “Light for Lesser Days,” by the Rev. Canon H. F. Tucker. This is a volume of readings, meditations, devotions, and illustrations for the minor festivals commemorated in the English Kalendar.

Mr. T. Fisher Unwin has just published a “History of Contemporary Civilization,” by Mons. Charles Seignobos. It is the third and concluding volume of the author’s “History of Civilization,” a comprehensive yet concise summary of universal history, which has had a very wide circulation in France. The present volume starts with the eighteenth century, and goes down to the present day. It deals not only with political and military events, but with art, literature, science, and industry.

Last week there came from the house of Methuen “The Creed in the Epistles,” by Wilfrid Richmond, M.A. This book is a study of the first chapter in the history of the Creed. The writer traces the articles of the Creed as they occur in the earliest Christian documents—the first group of the Epistles of St. Paul. The Creed which St. Paul assumes as the Creed of those to whom he wrote is distinguished from his own particular teaching. The preface deals with the bearing of the results of this inquiry on the inter-
pretation of the Gospels, written as they were in the age which held the
Creed of the Epistles, and maintains that "the Gospel," in the full sense of
the word, is to be found, not in the Gospels, but in the Epistles.

Archdeacon Sinclair's history of St. Paul's Cathedral, which he finished
the other day, is bound to be interesting. There is, anyhow, a wealth of
material to draw upon. The scope of the book will be of such a kind as shall
appeal to the populace. A good idea. At the same time, of course, the
Archdeacon will not sacrifice accuracy to colour. The title is to be
"Memorials of St. Paul's Cathedral," which is rather apt, and it will be
illustrated by Mr. Louis Weirter.

Mr. Roger Ingpen possesses the true literary instinct. Moreover, he is
one of the most conscientious of workers, and knows much of the eighteenth-
century lights of literature. I hope Mr. Ingpen will give us in the near
future a series of studies of the writing-men of the period, of which he is
already so very familiar. His latest effort is an important work in two
volumes, entitled "The Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley," which Messrs.
Pitman are issuing. The largest edition of Shelley's letters that has hitherto
been obtainable contains only some 127 letters. Mr. Ingpen's volumes will
have some 450 letters in them, many of which have never appeared before.

"With Christ in Bethlehem" is the title of a new Lenten work by Miss
Helen Thorp. The Bishop of Rochester has supplied a preface. This book
will be found especially useful to girls and young women.

Here are four new periodicals: Travel and Exploration, a shilling monthly;
the Englishwoman, a paper for women, as the title indicates; the Tuesday
Review, a new Oxford undergraduate's sixpenny weekly; while the fourth
item is the Anti-Socialist.

M. C.

Notices of Books.

A Commentary on the Whole Bible. By Various Writers. Edited by the

A commentary on the whole Bible in one volume! Surely the task is
impossible. Yet here it is, accomplished. The editor who conceived the
idea was induced to undertake the work from a belief that, "notwithstanding
all the commentaries in existence, there was still room for another more
suited to the needs and means of the general public." And, quite apart
from any question of the views here set forth, it must be at once admitted
that he has been successful in a high degree in realizing his ideal. The
contributors number forty-three, and are drawn from this country, Canada,
and the United States. They include well-known scholars of different
Churches, though we regret, from our standpoint, that there seem to be
but two representatives of Evangelical Churchmanship. First come twenty-nine “General Articles,” covering over 100 pages and including some of the most important and essential subjects connected with the Bible. Thus, in addition to general introduction, we have papers on Hebrew History to the Exile, The Creation Story and Science, Introduction to the Pentateuch, Genesis and the Babylonian Inscriptions, Introduction to Prophecy, The Messianic Hope, The History of the Period between the Testaments, The Life of Christ, The Preaching of Christ, The Life-Work and Epistles of St. Paul, and The Synoptic Problem. Then there are seven doctrinal articles on Belief in God, The Person of Christ, The Trinity, Miracle, The Resurrection, The Atonement, and Inspiration. Last of all come articles on Bible Study, Palestine, Antiquities, Hebrew Coins, etc., Chronology, and The Elements of Religion. While these vary in quality and length, they provide clear, simple, scholarly information, sufficient for all ordinary purposes. Then comes the Commentary, extending to 1,100 pages, followed at the end by seven well-printed maps. We have one serious criticism to make, and we will get this out of the way first. It is that the Old Testament articles are written only from the standpoint of modern criticism. We hasten to say, and we say it gladly, that they are moderate and reverent in tone, and here and there they make allowance for differences of opinion. But still, they are manifestly and definitely on the higher critical side, which we think is not only erroneous in itself, but a mistake when viewed from the standpoint of those for whom this volume is intended. For, surely, when a leading critic like Dr. G. A. Smith can say that the usage of the Divine names is too precarious a foundation on which to base critical arguments, we ought not to have the Pentateuch divided on the basis of this very usage. Nor is it fair to make the older view of the Pentateuch stand or fall with the Mosaic authorship, instead of resting it on historical trustworthiness. The Pentateuch would be just as credible if a contemporary of Moses had written or compiled it. Nor is it accurate to represent those who accept the conservative position as holding the Pentateuch to be the original work of one man rather than a compilation from previously existing documents (p. xxvi). Conservative scholars have long admitted that the Pentateuch, whenever and wherever composed, contains previously-existing documents. What they deny, with all the archaeologists, and, as it would seem, with Professor Ramsay also, is that gradual development through the centuries is the necessary and only explanation of the Pentateuchal strata. In view of the reopening of these questions at the present time, it ought to have been possible to present the other side to the readers of a popular commentary like this, and if, as we hope and believe, the book goes into another edition, the editor should rearrange his space in the general articles to admit of a statement of the conservative position from the standpoint of such a scholar as Dr. Orr. This could easily be done by shortening the unnecessarily long article on the History between the Testaments. Then the reader will be able to see both sides and judge for himself. As it is, he cannot avoid obtaining the impression that the side here represented is the only possible one—a view which we most strenuously combat. But having said this—and, because of its importance, we have felt it necessary to say it frankly—we have scarcely
anything but praise for the book as a whole. While naturally unequal by reason of the variety of writers, it seems to give the ordinary reader the very help he needs. By limiting the insertion of the Biblical text to the words and phrases elucidated, it has been possible to include explanations of all the important points of each book. Brief, but clear and adequate, introductions are given before the commentary, and in difficult parts, like the Pauline Epistles, there are very useful paraphrases. On New Testament questions and in all matters of essential Christian doctrine the standpoint is thoroughly conservative, and true to the old paths, and, so far as we have been able to test the commentary, we believe it will afford adequate guidance and suggestion. The book is wonderful value for the money. It consists of over 1,200 octavo pages, clearly printed in double columns, well bound, and costs only 7s. 6d. The convenience of a commentary on the whole Bible in one volume is too great to need mentioning, and we can only express our surprise that the editor has been able to accomplish a task which beforehand we should have judged quite impossible. It would have added interest to the book if the work of each contributor had been indicated, but this, perhaps, could not have been done. The editor is to be congratulated, both on the idea and its realization. Subject to the qualification made above, we believe his hope that within the compass of one volume "much will be found to remove difficulties, to strengthen faith, and lead to a wider study and fuller comprehension of the Word of God," will be realized.


This important series is making steady progress towards completion, though we hope it will not be long before we receive an addition in the form of a commentary on one of the more important books of the Old Testament. The present volume follows soon after that on Ecclesiastes. As there are no complicated problems of documentary analysis, and as there is a general agreement among modern scholars as to the date and unity of Esther, the author tells us that he has concentrated attention on the serious textual problems raised by the book. These problems have no parallels in the criticism of the rest of the Old Testament. The versions of Esther reveal a number of remarkable differences to the Hebrew text that have no analogies in the versions of other books. As these are not found in full in any of the commentaries, and are not usually accessible to the student, the present commentary gives a complete account of them and discusses their value. The first fifty pages are thus occupied with textual matters, in which the relations of the versions to the Hebrew text are carefully stated and fully discussed. Ordinary readers will find the sections on the Higher Criticism, Canonicity, and Interpretation more interesting. Ahasuerus is identified with Xerxes, and the purpose of the book from beginning to end is alleged to be solely the institution of the Feast of Purim. The book is dated from the Greek period, and is said to be late in that time. The most important section of the introduction deals with the historical character of the book. Dr. Paton calls attention first of all to three facts: (1) The book wishes to be taken as history; (2) the book was regarded as historical by the Jewish authorities, who admitted it to the Canon; (3) a few of the state-
ments are confirmed by external historical evidence. But after this we are given five other statements to prove that the book is not, and cannot be, historical—indeed, it is doubtful whether even a historical kernel underlies its narrative (p. 75). Its omission of the name of God is thought to be due to the fact that the book was read at the annual merrymaking of Purim, and as amidst the drunkenness of these occasions the name of God might be profaned, it was therefore omitted. We are told that there is "not one noble character in the book," and that it is so conspicuously lacking in religion that it should never have been included in the Old Testament Canon (p. 97). This will be regarded by many as an unduly sweeping assertion in view of the facts of the history of the Old Testament Canon. If it is true, it is impossible to help wondering why it was necessary for Dr. Paton to spend so much time and strength in giving an elaborate commentary and providing all these detailed discussions of the textual problem. For our part, we are not prepared to part so lightly with a book which the Jews have included for centuries in their Canon, and we believe that there is a great deal more to be said in favour of its religious character and value than Dr. Paton has been able to admit. For everything connected with moderate critical scholarship this book, perhaps, says the last word, but we cannot think that its deep spiritual problems have been faced. There are heights and depths even in the Old Testament which are not to be reached merely by critical scholarship.


(Communicated)

We venture to characterize these Anglican Church Handbooks as great little books. The covers are tasteful, the contents notable. They will strengthen the case for Christianity, stir up the love of God's Word and world, and inspire the clergy to a fuller ministerial life.

The Bishop of Ossory covers an enormous area in the short space of 124 pages. He deals with the Supernatural in Nature and Experience, Miracles, the Incarnation, Divine Immanence, the Atonement, the Trinity, the Future Life, and Faith. He is acquainted with ancient and abreast of modern thought, and his grasp is firm and sure. He is not afraid of a difficulty, and is strong in his championship. He is a Christian philosopher of a high order, and every word he writes carries weight. To those who have been perplexed by the New Theology this little volume will be particularly valuable.

Mr. Joynt is eminently sane and practical in his counsels. Speaking the truth in love, he sets before the Christian minister the highest and the only ideal. The laity should read to the end, that they may pray more earnestly for their minister. The clergy should read and examine themselves. All theological students should have the book put into their hands. Mr. Joynt has looked into his heart and experience before writing; it remains for us to read and reproduce.

The personal touch in the title of Mr. Harrington Lees' book is as
delightful as it is true. He writes for that engrossing personage the “man in the street,” but specialists may well read and follow these suggestions. His practical hints, hewn from his own experience, are very useful. He urges the study of God’s Word from every point—biographical, topical, contextual, comparative, verbal, metaphorical, missionary. He will call up all forces that throw a light on the Book, and he makes it “speak” to us. The reader will feel more than ever the value, the perpetual youth and the supreme authority of the Word of God.

Dr. Chadwick writes on “Social Work,” with real insight and great practical force. He will not allow that gifts of money can ever take the place of personal service. He emphasizes the need of training the social worker, and the necessity of an all-round facing of facts and circumstances. He deals with the problem alike from the economic and the ethical point of view, and knows that inner change will beget outer improvement. From Chapters V. to XIV. he takes a typical family in a poor district of a great manufacturing town. As he deals with each member he has something of importance to say on unemployment, outdoor relief, education, sweating, etc. His method is a vivid one. In his last two chapters he speaks with authority on temperance and the co-ordination and organization of social work. The book sets us on the right lines and fits us to specialize in due course. We shall expectantly await the issue of the further volumes promised us in this series.


“A Book of moral wisdom, collected out of the ancient Philosophers.” Such are the words on the title-page; and they are descriptive enough. The book was put together in 1547, and is here reprinted with a brief introduction. The book would have been really valuable had the originals of the collected passages been given side by side with the English.


The biography of this great yet simple soul is a sermon on the text, “Seek ye first the kingdom of God . . . and all these things shall be added to you.” Each young man should learn his secret, and strive to imitate his life. His set of rules, on p. 178, for daily life give us an insight into his greatness. We are again confronted with the fact that social service depends for its sinews on personal salvation. His work was and is of national, imperial, and world-wide importance. The contrast between the beginnings and present returns of the work of the Y.M.C.A. is astounding. He is happy in his biographer, and his memory will be cherished by all who knew him, but most of all will he be known as the young man’s friend.


We commend this story of the life of Christ to busy folk. It gathers together the threads of the wonderful life for them, and in simple and beautiful language tells them all particulars they need to know. The in-
vestigations of experts are pressed into service, and the result gives us a
valuable and connected story. Several useful illustrations are scattered
about the book.

**HAECKEL AND HIS RIDDLES.** By Rev. J. F. Tristram, M.A., B.Sc. *S.P.C.K.*

Price 6d.

This special edition is most excellent. Mr. Tristram is a sturdy, straight-
hitting opponent, and he deals Haeckel some merciless blows. The latter's
unfair yet specious and pretentious attack on Christianity is met and routed
in a most effective manner. The poison has done harm, but the antidote
is here.

**THE CHURCH IN MODERN ENGLAND.** By the Rev. F. C. Kempson, M.B.

London: *Pitman and Sons.* 1908. Price 2s. 6d. net.

The author of this book is Demonstrator in Human Anatomy at the
University of Cambridge, and is known as the author of a book, not long
ago published, entitled "The Future Life and Modern Difficulties." His
new venture is described on his title-page as "A study of the place in
Christendom and the distinctive mission to the world of the Anglican Com-
munion." It is a frank enough book, and may well be welcomed by the
party which looks to Lord Halifax as "guide, philosopher, and friend." It
is well, however, that the book should be pondered, not least by those
who are certainly not prepared to endorse its teaching. The attitude of
Mr. Kempson to our Nonconforming brethren is thus stated (p. 28): "The
Church of England cannot recognize as constituent portions of the Catholic
Church bodies not organized under the jurisdiction of the ancient ministry,
as no other jurisdiction derives from Christ Himself." Mark the pre-
posterous assumption! Needless to say, the writer advocates "the restora-
tion of the Mass as a whole" (p. 128), teaches the doctrine of Baptismal
Regeneration as *ex opere operato,* and, of course, supports the practice of
Auricular Confession. *Quid multa?*

**GRIFFITH JOHN.** By R. Wardlaw Thompson. London: *Religious Tract
Society.* Price 3s. 6d.

The story of this noble missionary career for full fifty years in China,
and still continuing, should be obtained by every missionary-hearted reader.
It is a deeply interesting and impressive record. It is also particularly
timely, for it tells of the life-work of an apostle of Central China, who is
honoured and beloved throughout the Christian Church. Dr. Wardlaw
Thompson is to be congratulated on the production of this contribution to
missionary literature. It is a popular edition revised up to the present year,
embODYING an account, not only of Dr. John's whole career, but of his
present great work of supplying pure literature of a Christian character for
the growing needs of China. A splendid enterprise indeed.

**THE ROMANCE OF PROTESTANTISM.** By D. Alcock. London: *Hodder
and Stoughton.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

This is in every way an admirable book. We should like to know of its
being read far and wide. It shows that in Protestantism are to be found
high deeds of courage, endurance, and love; that it is a warm religion, and
not a cold one. The history and meaning of the name are attractively and
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accurately stated. The story of the ages, and chiefly the story of Holland and Bohemia, are narrated. And then in a concise, well-printed, and easily readable way, the hindrances to present-day witness are pointed out. There is much information and well-put argument, all tending to show what Canon Henson called at the Manchester Church Congress "the essential solidarity of the English and Continental Reformation."

Price 5s.

The attractive Latin title has an alternative, "a practical study in the art of money-raising," and the contents of this portly book are found to describe a curate-in-charge and his organization of a Church council, a Sunday-school anniversary, a rummage sale, a harvest festival, a cantata and conversazione, and a final vestry meeting. All this seems hardly worth while, for it has little or nothing to do with the title of the book. What is worth preserving are innumerable jottings from a variety of literary sources of tales and incidents. The author has poured out the contents of his commonplace book, and has given many an apt quotation and many a good story; but as for the examples of Church methods, we can only say that they are quite out of keeping with the true idea of both "pastor" and "ecclesia."


This new and cheap edition is a boon. To move in the company of Dr. Edersheim is to see and learn. He has spoken to us on the religious side in the Temple, its ministry and services. He speaks to us here on the pedestrian or social side of Jewish life, and shows us, as only he can do, the homes, habits, and manners of the period.


A professed "apologetic of Judaism" is not commonly met with nowadays. Mr. Paul Goodman supplies, in this very interesting and readable work, a most decided "apologetic." Indeed, its militancy is a quite unusually prominent feature. We have no complaint to make on this score, but we do think that, in his attack on Christianity, the writer should have been careful to substantiate some of his "facts." When we read, for example (p. 375), that "there is nothing in the New Testament in praise of work," we are certainly surprised. Has Mr. Goodman never heard of the text, "If a man will not work, neither shall he eat"? Mr. Paul Goodman acts throughout as a consistent advocatus diaboli, and no doubt, from his own point of view, thinks himself justified in so doing. Calmer reflection, and a careful study of Edersheim's works, however, might do something to correct his over-emphasizing of the values of Judaism, and his under-estimating the true genius of Christianity.


A devotional study, by the author of "Three Bulwarks of the Faith." The book may prove useful to many, despite a certain fancifulness in the drawing
of analogies. It is written in a profoundly reverent spirit, and we are glad to recognize this.

**Spiritual Torrents.** By Madame de la Mothe Guyon. London: Allenson. Price 2s. 6d. net.

It is important to note the increased interest shown by readers in the works of one of the most noteworthy of the French mystics. There is a subtle danger, we doubt not, in appropriating, without reserve, some of Madame Guyon's dicta; but the beauty and spirituality of much of her teaching are things to be thankful for indeed.


Mr. Miller is the author of a very voluminous treatise upon the Thirty-Nine Articles. These sermons are intended to deal with certain points, in connection with that treatise, that the author is anxious to discuss more fully. Mr. Miller suffers from the vice of prolixity, and his audience, in consequence, is not likely to be a considerable one. We regret this, as the writer appears to be a man of some learning and of undoubted spirituality.


A series of Bible lessons, primarily intended for teachers in schools. There are fifty of these lessons, and, as far as we have examined the book, we think Miss Knox (who is Principal of Havergal College, Toronto) has done a useful piece of work with a good deal of insight. The book is in no way pretentious, and we like it the better for that.

**Four Talks to Mothers.** By Louise Creighton. S.P.C.K. Price 6d.

The subjects are "Infantile Mortality," "The Christmas Message," "Causes of Drinking and Gambling among Women," and "Religious Teaching in the Home." They are full of sound sense and good advice, both practical and spiritual.

**Skeleton Parallel of Gospels.** By Ellen Frere, S.TH. S.P.C.K. Price 6d.

This little book has a threefold value. It helps to make the Synoptic Gospels chronological; it shows the historical and geographical course of our Lord's ministry. The study of it must draw us nearer to the Divine Master. There are excellent maps, and the work is painstaking and valuable.


This companion to the Holy Communion is excellent in every way. As Bishop Robert Bickersteth says in his Preface, the teaching is in harmony with God's Word, and should "awaken us to a livelier apprehension of the spiritual benefits to be received in the right use of Holy Communion."


Here is a further addition to this publisher's miniature reference library. It is clear, handy, and full of the necessary information concisely put.


A reprint, with some additions, from the writer's "Truth of Christianity." To say that the evidence is clear, comprehensive, and convincing is to say that it was marshalled by Colonel Turton.


The essential features and the differences between Brahminism, Buddhism, Mohammedanism, and Christianity are clearly and succinctly put.
NOTICES OF BOOKS


The Canon has given us a suggestive little book on seven symbols connected with our Blessed Lord (e.g., I.H.S., ☧). They teach us, under his skilful guidance, the cardinal truths.


Two brief essays. The first is written to show that St. John's doctrine of the Logos is also in accordance with St. Paul—that the Christ of history and of theology are one. The second, on Immortality, traces Old Testament anticipations of the doctrine, and is followed by an examination of r Cor. xv. in regard to the resurrection body. Useful and instructive, and written in the light of recent theological thought.


It would be a great advantage if all clergy and choirmasters would give a quarter of an hour to this little publication, in order to discover the structure of the Te Deum, with a view to its correct rendering. They would discover that the chants and the "services" as usually rendered make great confusion of this wonderful hymn.

PERIODICALS, PAMPHLETS, AND REPRINTS.


The opening article on "The Mind of the East," is by Sir Thomas Raleigh, who writes with authority and insight, as well as with frankness and sympathy. Then comes an article on "The Ornaments Rubric Legally and Historically Considered," which is at once remarkable for the clearness with which the writer puts his own case and for the significant omissions of facts which would have damaged that case beyond repair. Truth is never served by omitting what we do not like. "Presbyterianism and Reunion" is a useful contribution to the problem of reunion. The writer is sympathetic to the suggestion of the Lambeth Conference that the precedent of 1660 should be followed, whereby Presbyterian ministers were consecrated Bishops without having received episcopal ordination. The Rev. Herbert Kelly contributes a paper on "Revelation and Religious Ideas," which is difficult to follow, owing to the writer's involved style. A valuable article on the dearth of clergy attributes most of our present difficulty to the intellectual unrest of the time. Other papers making up this number are "Causes and Remedies of Unemployment," by Professor Urwick; "Novels of M. René Bazin"; and "The Mohammedan Gospel of Barnabas," by Mr. Lonsdale Wragg. The short notices are again disappointing compared with what we used to enjoy and value in this review in old days, but the articles are almost uniformly good and timely, and make this a distinctly valuable number.


The opening article, is a continuation of the very able series of papers by Mr. C. H. Turner on "Historical Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament." This instalment deals with the Canonicity of the Four Gospels. Sir Henry Howorth again does battle against the Lutheran subjective criterion of Canonicity, and makes some good points, though it is not quite accurate to speak as though Luther's was the only Protestant view of Canonicity. There is another Protestant position, which is as objective as Sir Henry Howorth can wish, but evidently he has not yet met with it. The reviews are, as usual, very good, and we are particularly glad to see that in the notice of Dr. Moulton's new Greek Grammar Mr. G. C. Richards urges caution in accepting Deissmann's view of Hebraisms in the New Testament. It is curious to observe how a new discovery is apt to set even scholars off their balance and send them to the other extreme. A useful number of a magazine that no student of theology can afford to neglect.


Out of the eight articles which constitute this number there are three of general interest and real importance. A fine discussion on "Preaching to the Church of Our Times," by Dr. H. M. Scott, is well worth consideration by all preachers, young and old. An able and searching criticism of the New Philosophy, Pragmatism, by Dr. Huizinga, is very
timely; while the long article on "Pentateuchal Criticism," by Mr. H. M. Wiener, is of exceptional value. It adduces proofs against the modern critical view of the Old Testament which seem to us absolutely convincing, and certainly demand the attention of the critical school. Other articles are: "Immortality"; "Kant's Philosophy of Religion"; "What is Jewish Literature?" The number is a good one, but it is well worth getting for Mr. Wiener's article alone.


A handbook for the study of social problems, and intended specially for colleges and universities. The author describes his work very truly as "Social Study with Religious and Missionary Intention." It calls our attention to poverty from the standpoint of the Christian ideal for human life, and in the course of four chapters it provides an immense amount of well-arranged material for study, either privately or in connection with study circles. An admirable handbook, well worthy of attention.


Five sketches of the progress of missionary work connected with the S.P.G., reprinted from the Times, in which they appeared a few months ago. They were written by a member of the Times staff, who had himself seen something of missionary work, especially in India. Although primarily intended to create interest in S.P.G. work, the sketches contain interesting information suitable for all who are interested in and working for missions.


Coming events are said to cast their shadows before, and we hail the publication of this useful handbook as an indication that the desires and hopes of Sheffield Churchmen with regard to their diocese will soon be realized. It contains full particulars of Sheffield churches, with historic notes, notices of church societies, and other valuable information connected with the life and work of the city. The editor has done his work well, and the handbook will prove useful both in and outside of the city.


Full of information on every examination connected with the University of London.

Gathered One by One. An Eighty Years' Retrospect of the Operative Jewish Converts' Institution.

An interesting sketch of one of the most valuable adjuncts of Jewish missionary work.


The diary of a journey from Port Darwin to Adelaide taken by the writer. All who wish to know something of the life and problems of Northern and Central Australia should read this booklet.


An appeal written by a layman, with special reference to the relation of the Church of England to Nonconformity. Here and there we observe a tendency to identify the Church of England with the Church of Christ, but several important points about loyalty to the Church of England are made by the writer.


The most recent issue of this useful and valuable series. It should be studied and circulated by all temperance workers.
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