

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
THE MONTH ... ..	641
THE PROBLEM OF HOME REUNION. By the Rev. Professor STALKER, D.D. ... ..	649
THE CUP IN HOLY COMMUNION. By the Right Rev. Bishop THORNTON, D.D. ... ..	657
A NEW VIEW OF THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM. By the Rev. G. BLADON, M.A. ... ..	665
PRAYER-BOOK REVISION. By the Rev. Prebendary EARDLEY-WILMOT, M.A. ... ..	675
FATHER TYRRELL AND THE JESUITS. By G. G. COULTON, M.A.	684
A LIVING CHURCH. By the Rev. W. S. HOOTON, B.A. ... ..	689
THE VALUE OF TRAINING FOR WOMEN. By MILDRED RANSOM	697
STUDIES IN TEXTS. By the Rev. HARRINGTON C. LEES, M.A. ... ..	704
THE MISSIONARY WORLD. By the Rev. C. D. SNELL, M.A. ... ..	705
THE BIBLE AT WORK. By the Rev. W. ISHER, M.A. ... ..	707
LITERARY NOTES ... ..	709
NOTICES OF BOOKS ... ..	713

# The Church Army

PLEADS EARNESTLY FOR

## **DONATIONS AND COLLECTIONS**

IN AID OF ITS WORK ON BEHALF OF THE

**UNEMPLOYED, OUTCAST & HELPLESS,  
THE UNGODLY & INDIFFERENT.**

**FRESH-AIR HOMES** for Women and Children stifling in London slums.

**LABOUR HOMES** throughout the land for reclamation of criminals, tramps, loafers, and social failures of both sexes. **RESCUE WORK. HOMES FOR YOUTHS.**  
Fifty per cent. gain a real **fresh start in life.**

**MISSIONS IN PRISONS, WORKHOUSES, and SLUMS,** on invitation of responsible Clergy. **TRAINING HOMES FOR EVANGELISTS AND MISSION-SISTERS.** Hundreds working in parishes under Clergy.

**67 MISSION-VANS** continually itinerating.

**MISSIONS TO SAILORS AND SOLDIERS.**

**Funds, Old Clothes, Firewood Orders (3s. 6d. per 100 bundles), and largely increased quantities of Waste Paper (for giving employment in sorting) URGENTLY NEEDED.**

Cheques crossed "Barclays, a/c Church Army," payable to Prebendary CARLILE (Hon. Chief Secretary), or Mr. W. F. HAMILTON, K.C. (Hon. Treasurer), Headquarters, 55, Bryanston Street, Marble Arch, London, W.

---

 TELEPHONE: 602 Holborn.
 

---

# EDE, SON & RAVENSCROFT

(Founded in the Reign of William and Mary, 1689.)

## CLERICAL TAILORS.

---

CASSOCKS « STOLES « VESTMENTS AND HOODS.

---

**93 & 94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.**

---

# NATIONAL CHURCH LEAGUE.

For the Defence and Promotion of the Reformed Faith  
of the Church of England.

"CATHOLIC, APOSTOLIC, REFORMED, PROTESTANT."

Chairman of Council: REV. PREBENDARY H. W. WEBB-PEPLOE, M.A.  
Chairman of Executive Committee: THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF CANTERBURY.  
Honorary Secretary: Sir C. ROBERT LIGHTON, Bart.  
General Secretary: W. GUY JOHNSON, Esq.

---

### OBJECT OF THE LEAGUE.

TO unite in one Association all Members of the Church of England who feel the necessity of supporting the principles of the Church of England as based on the Bible and set forth in the Prayer Book and XXXIX. Articles.

The Council of the League appeal to Churchmen to support them in their much-needed work on behalf of the Scriptural and Reformed principles of the Church of England. The League is spiritual in its aims and educational in its methods, and it is not a party or political organization.

---

**Funds are Urgently Needed for the Maintenance and  
Extension of its Work.**

For further particulars apply to the Secretary,  
6, GROSVENOR MANSIONS, 82, VICTORIA STREET, LONDON, S.W  
Bankers: Messrs. WILLIAMS, DEACON'S BANK, LTD.

---

### ECCLESIASTICAL INSURANCE OFFICE, LIMITED,

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

For information and forms apply to the General Manager, at the Joint Offices of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office, Ltd., and the Clergy Pensions Institution, 11, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

The SURPLUS PROFITS are devoted to Institutions, etc., which are for the benefit of Church objects.

---

### CLERGY PENSIONS INSTITUTION.

SELF-HELP AIDED.

CONTRIBUTIONS and LEGACIES are invited to augment pensions of Clergy who have purchased annuities.

For further Information and Forms apply to the Secretary, Clergy Pensions Institution, 11, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

---

# THE CHURCHMAN

September, 1909.

## The Month.

Father  
Tyrrell.

THE death of the great English Modernist has naturally called renewed attention to the relations of the Modernist movement to the Roman Church.

While we have no sympathy with the attempt of Rome or of any other community or individual to stifle criticism and to crush inquiry by excommunication, yet it has always been difficult to understand the position of Father Tyrrell in remaining in the Church of Rome. If his intellect was as acute and powerful as his friends make out, it is certainly astonishing that he could not see the inconsistency of his position. A friend of his, writing in the *Westminster Gazette*, tells us that Father Tyrrell admitted his reasons for remaining in the Church of Rome were not a development of those he had for entering it, and that he had come to regard these original reasons as "a tissue of ignorance and sophistry." And to show how inaccurately he gauged the religious situation both in the sixteenth century and in the present day, we have only to read what he said to another friend: "What we need is to recognize the Reformation and the counter-Reformation as two false solutions of the sixteenth-century problem—to go back behind Trent and pick up the path of Erasmus." Everyone who has even a fair knowledge of the facts knows well that of all the names and policies connected with sixteenth-century reform, that of Erasmus was the most futile and impossible. To crown all we have but to

read Father Tyrrell's statement about the Roman Church published a year ago in his *Medievalism* to see the impossibility of his position. After speaking of "that all-permeating mendacity, which is the most alarming and desperate symptom of the present ecclesiastical crisis," he goes on in these words :

"What would it avail to sweep the accumulated dust and cobwebs of centuries out of the house of God ; to purge our liturgy of fables and legends ; to make a bonfire of our falsified histories, our forged decretals, our spurious relics ; to clear off the mountainous debts to truth and candour incurred by our ancestors in the supposed interests of edification ; what would it avail to exterminate these swarming legions of lies, if we still keep the spirit that breeds them ? In a generation or two, the house swept and garnished would be infested as before. The only infallible guardian of truth is the spirit of truthfulness. Not till the world learns to look at Rome as the home of truthfulness and straight dealing will it ever look to her as the citadel of truth. It will never believe that the spirit of Machiavellian craft and diplomacy is the spirit of Christ. Can the same fountain send forth bitter waters and sweet ?"

After such a statement, coming not from an Ulster Protestant, but from a priest in the Roman Church, it is hardly surprising that Tyrrell was excommunicated. The truth is that the tendency of the Modernist movement is essentially rationalistic, as may be readily seen from a striking article by the Reverend C. W. Emmet in the *Expositor* for August on Loisy's latest book. We commend this to any who think there is hope for the Roman Church in the Modernist movement. Modernism as represented by Loisy, and also to a great extent by Tyrrell, is neither Roman Catholicism nor Evangelical Christianity, and it is curious that Tyrrell could not see what others with much less acute intellects could see quite plainly.

We take the following from the August number  
 A Word in  
 Season. of the *Mission Field*, the monthly magazine of  
 the S.P.G. :

"More than one of the supporters of the S.P.G. tell us that if the land-tax proposals now before Parliament are enforced, they will be unable to subscribe again to the work which the S.P.G. is doing. We would venture

to point out to our correspondents, and to others who sympathize with the expression of their views, that no law, which this or any other Government could pass, can in any degree weaken our obligation to co-operate with God in the work which He is doing to extend His kingdom to foreign lands. If a law were passed the effect of which was to consign every landowner in the country to the workhouse, they would be under quite as real an obligation to help Foreign Missions as they now are. . . . The fact that such a suggestion as that which we have referred to has arisen shows that the writers have not realized that it is their duty to contribute some definite proportion of their annual income towards promoting religious work at home and abroad. Let us imagine that *A* has been accustomed to contribute a tenth, and that *B* has been accustomed to contribute a hundredth part of his annual income towards such purposes, and that each has an income of £500, and that by new legislation it was to be reduced to £400. The result will be (if we assume that each continues to realize the same obligations) that in future *A* will contribute £40 instead of £50, and that *B* will contribute £4 instead of £5. We feel quite certain that God's work, whether at home or abroad, will never be properly supported until all Christians accept the fact that it is their duty to contribute a definite proportion of their income, and till they cease to expand and contract their contributions according as their feelings are moved."

This strikes a true and welcome note, and we rejoice in its frankness and fearlessness. The great principle of proportionate giving needs strong and constant emphasis from our pulpits. As we remarked last month in another connection, there is a world of difference between giving *out of* and *according to* our means, and only when the latter is realized as our one and absolute Christian duty shall we ever prove ourselves in this respect to be Christians in deed and in truth.

Quite recently we have had a fresh and striking **Continuity.** testimony to the meaning of continuity in the minds of extreme Anglicans. The preacher at the anniversary service of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, the Reverend F. F. Irving, Vicar of All Saints', Clevedon, stated his view of continuity as follows :

"Do we not stand for continuity with the Church of Augustine, of Lanfranc, of Anselm, and of Becket? This very week has seen at the historic palace of the Bishop of this diocese an eloquent and picturesque expression given to this claim. But if our opponents are not to twit us, as they have not been slow to do, with unreality, if it is a claim to be made and sustained seriously, it must be founded not in the mere outward trappings of Church

pomp, not merely in the possession of the historic episcopate, which many heretical and schismatic bodies, frankly outside Catholic Communion, can lay claim to equally with us; nor even in the actual possession of the ancient sees, for this alone proves nothing, for it may be but the mere cuckoo descent of those who have ousted the rightful occupants. But we must be prepared to show, over and above all this, identity with the past in all essential doctrine, all that has been held throughout the ages by the whole Catholic body, East and West. And at the centre, where the heart beats and the life-blood is warmest, we find enshrined the Mystery of the abiding Presence of Jesus with His own, under the visible and outward forms of His appointment."

We are glad to have the issues so clearly stated. It shows that there is no real halting-place between union with the Roman and Greek Churches and the Protestant Reformed position of the sixteenth century. We are more than content that the alternatives should be so definitely laid down, for it will enable us to emphasize fundamental differences still more effectively. One of the most urgent tasks incumbent on true Churchmen to-day is to accentuate in every lawful way the essential divergencies between the position of the Anglican Church as a Reformed community, and the Roman Catholic Church as expressed in such a statement as is quoted above. It is of no use whatever attempting to bridge over the differences, for the two positions cannot both be true.

The Education Question. Although there is a lull at present in the education controversy, it is impossible for it to last much longer. For this reason we call attention to the important speech recently made by the Bishop of St. Asaph. The Board of Education has supplied the Bishop with the following information: Between 1903 and 1908 the number of children in average attendance at Church schools in England and Wales has decreased by over 100,000. The number of Church of England schools closed in that period is 403, and the number transferred to local authorities is 294. Thus we see not only that Church Schools are being closed or transferred, but also that they are being weakened and emptied by the competition of Council Schools. The Bishop

declared his belief in the great loss sustained by the Church in being shut out of Council Schools, and felt convinced that if we could only have had right of entry it would have enabled the Church to obtain solid religious instruction for her children in every elementary school in the kingdom. We are not at all surprised to read that the Bishop's speech made a profound impression, and in view of the resumption of the controversy before many months are over, we commend the careful consideration of these figures to all Churchmen. The facts tell their own sad and significant story, and certainly call for definite, united action.

We have read with great satisfaction the letter  
addressed by the Committee of the Church Pastoral  
Aid Society to all Grantee Vicars on the necessity  
of doing spiritual work in spiritual ways :

**Spiritual  
Methods,**

“ The Committee regret to observe that the practice of raising money for Church purposes by dances, theatricals, bridge, and whist-drives, is rapidly growing, and they regard the fact as a serious menace to the spiritual influence of the Church. In seeking what they can do in the matter, they naturally turn for help to the Grantees of the Society, and they now make an earnest appeal to all their friends to unite with them in discouraging these methods in connection with Church work. The Committee believe that if the parishes aided by the Society's grants take a firm and united stand in these matters, broadly scattered as they are over the whole country, the influence of their example and protest will be widely felt in the Church at large.”

That such an appeal should be needed is itself a serious reflection on a good deal of our Church work. We are glad to learn, however, that the response to the letter has been very gratifying, and we would fain regard this as a token for good in connection with Evangelical Churchmanship. Coming so soon after the strong words of the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Liverpool and Wakefield, recently quoted in these columns, we are particularly thankful for this fresh insistence on the true idea of Church work. It is well for us from time to time to ask ourselves what is the purpose of Christian life, whether in an individual or corporate capacity. Is it not this,

and this only, that God's twofold work of evangelization and edification may be fully and widely accomplished? And in the light of the New Testament as well as of universal experience this work will never be done by worldly methods, but only "By My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

A year ago the Board of Education appointed a **Half-Time Labour** Committee to inquire into the whole subject of half-time labour. The Committee has now issued its Report, and the recommendations are very far-reaching. The most important of all is that, in the opinion of the Committee, all "partial exemption" should be abolished from January, 1911. While the Committee do not accept the wide generalizations made by some of the witnesses as to the universally demoralizing influences on the children by their early commencement of mill-life, yet they are fully convinced that there is a good deal of truth underlying these convictions. It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that half-time employment tends to demoralize the character, affect the health, and lower educational efficiency. It is particularly interesting and significant to have the Committee's proof that the system is no method of relieving poverty. After reviewing all the conditions surrounding half-time, the Committee are unable to recommend its continuance; and it is also urged that all half-time exemption under thirteen shall be abolished, and that children should not be allowed to leave school altogether merely on an attendance certificate. These findings are all the more remarkable when it is realized that the Report is unanimous, and it even recommends the abolition of half-time in rural areas. Every lover of his country—to say nothing of everyone interested in child-life—will rejoice at this Report, and will hope as well as work for the carrying out of its recommendations. The abolition of half-time employment would have many beneficial results—personal, social, and economic; and we shall hail the day when it can be seen that we are determined to do everything in our power to foster the highest and best interests of our children.

Our readers will remember that in our February number Mr. G. G. Coulton commented severely on Dr. James Gairdner's new book, "Lollardy and the Reformation"; and both in our columns and elsewhere he showed that the book contained not a few indications of inaccuracy as well as of bias against Wycliffe and the Reform movement. It is satisfactory to find that Dr. Gairdner now admits the truth of Mr. Coulton's contention in regard to medieval monasticism, for in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* for July he makes some very significant admissions. The great reputation of Dr. Gairdner and the way in which his book has been regarded as an authority must be our apology for quoting at such length from his article :

"I must confess that my treatment of monasticism is exceedingly defective. . . . There are both defects and errors in my treatment of this subject which I very much regret. First, I feel that I should have said something about such a well-known fact as the decline of monasticism before Henry VIII.'s time, shown, among other things, by the almost entire cessation, at the close of the Middle Ages, of those vigorous literary productions which were the glory of former times; and, further, by a number of sporadic suppressions of monasteries which were no longer needed. This ought certainly to have been shown, for it is a matter to be weighed. And a further matter, in which I am sorry to find my remarks have been misleading, calls just for a few words here by way of retractation. My estimate of the general morality of the monasteries, I fear, was rather too high. The St. Albans case I admitted. It was an exceptionally bad one, and though I made a mistake (which I rectified elsewhere) about the particular Abbot whose misrule was so disgraceful, I never attempted to palliate the facts. I have come now to see, however, that the moral decline of St. Albans after Whet- hamstede's day was a gradual one, and had only reached the lowest depths of scandal when Archbishop Morton obtained visitation powers to correct that and some other monasteries which had the privilege, under ordinary circumstances, of exemption from episcopal jurisdiction. . . . But the general laxity of monastic rule was, I fear, rather greater than I supposed on the eve of the Reformation. . . . I certainly did not wish to weigh down the scales on either side, but Mr. Coulton has convinced me that I have misinterpreted some things, and thought too lightly of the real meaning of the findings in certain particular cases. Among other things, at p. 103, where I have said that 'one monk was a dandy,' I ought, I find, to have said, 'One monk dressed in indecorous fashion,' and this indecorous dressing in long hose—not 'long boots,' as I have made it on p. 97—was a thing that would really be a police offence nowadays. So I fear that there is much to be said about the state of matters in a considerable number of monasteries to show that they were no good schools of delicacy or chastity.'

It is important that the widest possible publicity should be given to these admissions ; and we would fain believe that, when Dr. Gairdner has given further consideration to other points, as, for example, his unfair treatment of William Tyndale, we may have further acknowledgments in the same direction. The one great need in all these inquiries into history is to have the facts, all the facts, and nothing but the facts, and then to be allowed to draw our own conclusions from them. Thus alone shall we arrive at the truth and follow whithersoever it leads.

Dean Lefroy. We desire to lay a wreath of affectionate regard on the tomb of our honoured friend the Dean of Norwich. From the days of his strenuous work in Liverpool Dean Lefroy was a well-known figure in Evangelical Church circles, and his influence at Norwich has been real and great for the last twenty years. It is well known that the success of the Church Congress at Yarmouth was largely due to his strong will, boundless energy, and unflinching persistence. His contributions to our pages in years past were always welcomed by our readers, and he had promised us more articles, which now, of course, we shall not be able to enjoy. His Evangelical Churchmanship was of a convinced and robust type, far too little in evidence to-day, and in view of his great powers as a preacher and an organizer, it is impossible not to regret that the opportunity of elevation to the episcopal bench did not come to him before age seemed to prevent his acceptance of it. He was a distinct and definite power for true, spiritual, Evangelical religion, and has left our Church and country much the poorer for his death.



## The Problem of Home Reunion.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR STALKER, D.D.

PRESBYTERIAN readers of the proceedings of the Lambeth Conference must have been interested, not to say gratified, to observe how large a space was devoted to themselves in the reports and resolutions; although they may have been puzzled to know why, when such ample attention was bestowed on them, and on such distant Churches as those of Scandinavia and the Far East, hardly a word was said about such near neighbours of the Church of England as the Baptists, the Congregationalists, and the Methodists. Perhaps, however, these had been dealt with on an earlier occasion, or may be reserved for a later one.

No doubt the reason why the Presbyterians were so pointedly mentioned was because, in the interval between the preceding and the present meetings, a special attempt had been made in Scotland to carry out the recommendation of an earlier date, that Bishops should put themselves into touch with religious bodies in their vicinity, with the view of initiating proposals for union. As might have been expected, so energetic a man as the late Bishop Wilkinson, when he came to Scotland as Bishop of St. Andrews, could not let such a recommendation sleep; and he was ably supported by Bishop Dowden and Bishop Ellis, as well as others. To read, in the biography of the late Bishop Wilkinson, the very detailed account of the proceedings of the Christian Unity Association, which he initiated for the purpose of conference with representative men of the other Scottish Churches, is pathetic, but also very revealing, even to those who, like the present writer, shared in those proceedings. It is evident that he was solicited by a small section of the Church of Scotland, of marked proclivities, who raised round him an impression that there was a movement in the air, and that success might be carried with a rush. As a stranger he had no conception of the real magnitude or weight of this body

of encouragers ; but by degrees the truth dawned upon him, and his disappointment is not concealed by the biographer. While, in the Association, he made a profound impression by his spirituality and evoked a large measure of personal esteem and affection, yet, when he came up—as he did very soon—against convictions as strong and deep-seated as his own, he exhibited no tact or statemanship, in the way of getting round corners and helping things on, but simply stood still, resolving the proceedings into prayer-meetings or religious conferences. In short, as his friend, the Rev. Dr. Donald Macleod, the editor of *Good Words*, remarked, when all was over, “he did not understand Scotland.”

A similar inability to comprehend, for which others must be responsible, occurs in the Lambeth Report itself, where it is suggested that, in the event of union being achieved, the admission of Presbyterians might be effected according to the precedent of 1610. Now, what is the precedent of 1610? In that year King James I., after wearing out the Scottish Church by his importunity, and after prolonged manipulation of the courts of the Church by the arts of statecraft, of which gross bribery, as Dr. Grub, the Episcopalian Scots historian, admits, was one, succeeded in getting Episcopacy so far agreed to that three ministers went up to London and were made Bishops. The formalities on which a rigorous interpretation of Anglican theory might have insisted were in some respects relaxed ; and it is to this concession that the reference in the report points. But the whole transaction was, and is, hateful to Scottish feeling. The incident was repeated at the Restoration, when Archbishop Sharp, known to his fellow-countrymen as “Judas” Sharp, was the ringleader ; and both transactions are associated in the national memory together. Could anything, then, have been more maladroit than such a reference ?

But, indeed, the whole discussion at Lambeth as to how such a union might shape itself was entirely premature. In the Association, at an early stage, it was pointed out that “unity”—the Association’s name and aim—might have at least four

meanings : it might, first, denote merely good feeling and social fellowship ; or, secondly, it might extend to recognition and thankful acknowledgment of one Church by another ; or, thirdly, it might embrace co-operation in work ; or, fourthly, it might at last reach organic unity. The first of these has been attained in a remarkable degree within the Association ; perhaps the second also ; but the third has not. On the only occasion when an opportunity occurred—a united service in connection with the death of Queen Victoria, I think—Bishop Wilkinson himself inhibited his clergy from taking part. For this he was sharply brought to book in the Association ; from which, in consequence, he absented himself for about two years. As for the fourth, it has never had even the most distant appearance of being within the range of practical politics ; and, therefore, suggestions as to the manner of carrying it out are entirely premature, and ought not to have been included in any report.

It may, however, prove an advantage that, in this case, the mark has been overshot ; because the Lambeth documents make it perfectly clear that nothing else is thought of but the swallowing-up of Presbyterianism. Whatever concessions may be made, in imitation of the precedent of 1610, for the purpose of smoothing the path for ordained ministers who might shrink from an admission that their Presbyterian ordination had been invalid, at all events, in the future, all ordinations will be Episcopal. This is not so much plainly stated as everywhere implied, nothing else having so much as suggested itself as possible.

Are Presbyterians so changed that, with impunity, their principles and convictions can be treated in this way ? Certainly there has been a great change since the seventeenth century, when the Scottish Commissioners attending the Westminster Assembly held the same High Church views about their own Church government as the Anglicans of to-day do about theirs. At that time Presbyterianism was believed to be of divine right, and every departure from it, whether towards the right of Episcopacy or towards the left of Independency, was looked upon as sinful. This has now been given up ; and it is not

doubted that God may own and bless those who serve Him conscientiously in the Episcopalian or the Independent way; yet the belief has by no means been modified that Presbyterianism is not only the best but the Scriptural way. In the New Testament "Bishop" and "Presbyter" are identical. The placing of the Bishop above the Presbyters was later; and, while Episcopalians appeal to antiquity and the Fathers, Presbyterians request them to ascend to a higher antiquity and the Scriptures.

Presbyterians value highly the large lay element in their system. When the Bishops from all parts of the world were assembled at Lambeth, why were there not an equal number of laymen associated with them? The Church of England is rich enough in laymen of the very highest type to provide such an element not unworthy of the Bishops; and its presence would greatly have strengthened the decisions, especially as to certain matters. This is Presbyterianism, which has this parity and balance in all its courts. The Presbyterian is, in short, a layman's Church, and therein lies its adaptability to the age. Some weeks ago I heard the Bishop of Kensington declare from the pulpit that the liturgy, while unspeakably dear to Church-people, is not intelligible to working-men—the class which all the Churches are at present anxious to capture—and on the following Sunday I had, in the same place, a striking proof of the truth of the remark. I happened to be worshipping in a cathedral, more thronged than usual at the principal service, on account of the churching of the Judges holding the assizes in the city. In the nave there was, therefore, a large congregation; and there any working-men, attracted by the stir, would certainly be sitting. But the whole proceedings went on in the choir, separated from the nave, of course, by a great screen. Nothing was heard distinctly, even near the front of the nave. After about an hour, a man in front of me said, with relief, to his neighbour, "That's all"; and out they went, along with two-thirds of the nave congregation. A sermon, lasting twenty-five minutes, followed, still in the choir, though even yet there was a larger

congregation in the nave. Only a word or phrase now and then could be heard, such as "And now" at the beginning of a sentence. At last I heard quite distinctly, "The whole creation groaneth," and this seemed conclusive. Of course, to Church-people this will all appear so much a matter of course that they wonder why anyone can carp at it; and the clergy on such occasions are always in the favoured position inside the rails. But what of the working-men, about whom the good Bishop manifested concern? Non-Anglican Churches have not captured the working-classes, either, as they would like; but they are, at all events, far closer to them than this, and they must on no account do anything to make their worship less popular.

The Church of England is strong in the affection of its own people, who are well aware how much it has contributed to create the greatness of the English name. But no less secure is the place which the Presbyterian Church holds in the hearts of its people. The proportion of the population in Scotland that has forsaken Presbyterianism is far less than that of the population in England which has separated from the Episcopal Church; and nowhere has the Scottish Church so lost the population to practical heathenism as the Church of England has done in East and South London. At present the Church of England is experiencing an access of quite justifiable self-consciousness through the assembling of its imperial forces from all the ends of the earth at Lambeth; but, through the Pan-Presbyterian Council, the Scottish Church has also, in recent years, been made conscious of belonging to a larger unity; for in that body nine-and-twenty Churches, in all parts of the world, are represented, some of them being larger than any denomination in Scotland. In short, if there is ever to be any real negotiation for union between Anglicans and Presbyterians, the Churches must meet on a footing of absolute equality, and there must be no foregone conclusions on either side.

The one point of light to which attention is specially drawn in the Lambeth Report is that Presbyterians have always been particular about ordination, the implied suggestion being that

there survives among them some shadow of Apostolic Succession. But, while Presbyterians maintain this rite, surrounding it with strict formalities, the purpose is different: it is efficiency. The ordaining Presbytery thus retains the power of testing the qualifications of those entering the ministry or seeking to be settled in particular congregations. The educational standard, for instance, is far higher than in the Anglican Church, where a single year's study in theology is considered sufficient after the completion of a University course. Three years, on the contrary, are demanded at the same stage by the Church of Scotland, and four years by the United Free Church of Scotland, the two bodies, of nearly equal size, which practically divide between them the population of the country.

The Presbyterian Church, in all its branches, is unanimous in believing three conditions to be requisite to the exercise of the holy ministry—first, personal godliness; secondly, the choice of the congregation; thirdly, ordination, after the testing of qualifications, by the Church. Not only are these the three conditions, but this is the order of their importance. Moral and spiritual character comes before everything else; the right of the congregation to choose its own minister has formed the battle-ground for many a struggle, and now, even in the State Church, the people hold this ground securely; ordination by the organized body is important too, but only in a subordinate degree. To make this the primary condition is the error of what is called Apostolic Succession.

What is it that Apostolic Succession guarantees? It cannot guarantee personal character, as, alas! too many notorious instances prove. I suppose it would be said to guarantee the efficacy of the Sacraments when these are administered by priests in this succession. But what a monstrous doctrine is this! From time to time, in the course of Church history, there have sprung up sects holding that ecclesiastical acts are only effective when administered by holy men. Although, for such a position, there has generally been too much excuse in the moral condition of the Church at the time, it has been easy to

demonstrate how intolerable would be the consequences of such a theory. Venial, however, are these in comparison with the consequences which would follow from the other theory—that ecclesiastical acts, such as Sacraments, are only valid when performed by men in an Apostolic Succession extending over nearly twenty centuries. It might follow, for example, that in a country all Sacraments were without effect for hundreds of years because of some flaw in the succession at a particular point. As is well known, this is no imaginary case, because the Church of England has been recently decreed to be in this very position by the Church of Rome. To many English Churchmen this may occasion no uneasiness; but can this be said with truth of all? The Scottish Church might be able to prove itself to be in the Apostolic Succession, if it were worth while, with at least as much success as the Church of England; but would it not be madness thus to attempt to justify its position to a Church whose own position is denied by the much larger Church which is the true owner of this doctrine? The Scottish Church cannot believe that the Divine procedure is regulated by any such arbitrary rules. “The Sacraments become effectual means of salvation, not from any virtue in them, or in him who doth administer them, but only by the blessing of Christ, and the working of His Spirit in them that through faith receive them.” These are the words of “The Shorter Catechism,” and this is the doctrine of Presbyterianism not only as to Sacraments, but as to ecclesiastical acts in general.

Why, then, it may be asked, did Presbyterians join the Association formed by Bishop Wilkinson?

First, because it was a unity association, not a union association. So it was from the first denominated; and many times at the meetings this was emphasized, and by none more frequently than by the Episcopalian members themselves. Their position in Scotland has been one of great isolation; and this new departure was—more, perhaps, than they were themselves aware—an aspiration of nature towards fuller correspondence with their environment.

Secondly, the Association provides a centre where representative men of all the denominations meet. This is an obvious convenience, because there are always arising, in the course of public affairs, questions on which it is desirable for such men to know one another's mind, forming conviction by conference and discussion, even if no joint action is taken by the bodies to which they belong. In point of fact, the meeting in the Unity Association of ministers and elders belonging to the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland has not been without influence on the movement towards union between these two bodies which is at this very moment taking shape; and other unions may follow, even if, unhappily, that with the Episcopal Church prove unattainable.

Thirdly, the Association provides an arena for discussion, where those championing different points of view may convince one another; and it is not in the nature of a Scotsman or a Presbyterian to decline such an opportunity. At the very last meeting which it was my privilege to attend, the subject of discussion was Confirmation, on which an able paper was read by the Bishop of Brechin, now Primus in succession to Bishop Wilkinson, expounding the High Church view and making Confirmation out to be the next thing to a Sacrament. A most interesting discussion followed, in which every phase of opinion received expression; but the feature of the occasion was a perfectly annihilating criticism of the view advanced by the Bishop from Dr. Paterson, Professor of Divinity, and successor of Dr. Flint, in Edinburgh University, who, however, wrapped up the trenchancy of his reasoning in so much geniality and good-humour that even the victim joined in the hilarity of the meeting. If any be of opinion that it is hopeless for those holding such divergent views to convince one another, let them consider how, then, the wider union of all Christendom is to be attained. Unless the Romish Church, for example, is to be convinced by argument that multitudes of its beliefs and practices are false, the union of Christendom can only mean the universal adoption of these errors. The proper temper for union negotia-

tions is not a weak disposition towards concession or a willingness to slur over differences, but a manly faith in the rationality of the human soul and in the power of the Scriptures to convince and convert.

In this paper I have not hesitated to give free expression to my own mind; but I hasten to add that no one has more enjoyed such of the meetings of the Unity Association as I have been able to attend, and that, in particular, I have appreciated the qualities and contributions of the Episcopalian members. Their Church has, indeed, had but a dubious place in the history of Scotland; yet it has enshrined a type of piety little known to the population in general, but refined, and sometimes intense; and its influence in directing the religious sentiment of the country may be larger in the future than it has been in the past. Everyone who loves his own Church, and is in any degree occupied with its affairs, is the better of having some opportunity of seeing, in a favourable light, the character, aspirations and achievements of those connected with other denominations; so that he may not fossilize in his own corner, but maintain a wider outlook, always coveting that between himself and all other Christians there may be in things essential unity, in things non-essential liberty, in all things charity.



### The Cup in Holy Communion.

BY THE RIGHT REV. BISHOP THORNTON, D.D.

**W**HAT did it contain at the Last Supper? Grape-juice, certainly, for Christ spoke of its contents as "the fruit of the vine." But in what condition—fermented or unfermented?

The Lambeth Conference of 1888 virtually laid it down that it was in the former state, for it expressed strong disapproval of the use of unfermented grape-juice in Communion, as a departure

“from Christ’s example” as well as from the practice of the Catholic Church ; and two subsequent Conferences have left the dictum undisturbed. But is it clear that this statement of the case can be substantiated ?

It is safe to say that the use of fermented grape-juice at Communion in the Catholic Church, though doubtless general, has not been invariable. Nor could the practice of the Church be pressed as deciding the question which kind of grape-juice was used at the Last Supper ; and that is the paramount question, on the answer to which it entirely depends whether we have any right to charge users of the unfermented Cup with “departing from Christ’s example.”

What example did He set for certain in this particular ? To that example, in the absence of specific instructions from Him, we should certainly desire to conform in such a matter, as some indication of His will in regard to it.

Not that our Lord, or His Apostle, appears to have laid any stress on ritual details of this kind ; hence we feel justified in departing, as Churchmen, in several respects from literal conformity to Christ’s example. He reclined at the Supper ; we kneel. Beyond reasonable doubt He used unleavened “bread” ; we use leavened, remembering that the word in the original would include both—is used, indeed, of the “manna,” which does not appear to have been “bread” in the strict sense at all. Similarly, in the other Sacrament, though it will hardly be questioned that “baptize” meant “bathe,” and that Baptism as commanded by Christ was originally administered by immersion, social and climatic considerations are held to warrant the Church in sanctioning affusion as an alternative for weakly infants and for all adults.

It is not clear, therefore, that, even if our Lord could be shown to have dispensed fermented grape-juice, we should be justified, in the absence of all command from Him upon the point, in condemning the use, under special circumstances, of the unfermented variety. Still, if we knew for certain that Christ had done so, it would be a strong reason for adhering to

the former. But that is exactly what we do not know for certain. After endless discussion, nothing is certain on the point but its uncertainty.

The probabilities are very variously estimated, and cannot decide the matter. If it be argued that our Lord evidently intended to adopt an ordinary beverage of the time and country as the fittest symbol of that which would refresh man's spirit, and that fermented grape-juice mixed with water was such beverage, it may be argued in reply that the occasion was not an ordinary but a religious meal, in Passover week; that the use of fermented drinks was interdicted by the law in connection with solemn acts of self-consecration; and that all leaven (of which fermentation is the equivalent) was "put away" from every house during the week in question.

One naturally turns to Jewish tradition for guidance as to the probabilities of the case, but the testimony of modern Jews is not decisive. The writer knows places where the "kosher" cup at Passover is rigidly kept from fermentation; in New York a diluted grape-jelly is said to be used, of which it would be difficult to say whether it was fermented or not. Jewish practice seems to have varied; at any rate, it is quite impossible to assert that fermented grape-juice was certain to have been used on the occasion with which we are concerned.

Nor is it possible to infer with confidence from the language of the Scripture record the condition of the liquid which the Cup contained. No arguments from the accepted meaning of the word "wine" are admissible, for the simple reason that this particular term never occurs in Scripture in connection with "the Cup." Our Catechism says that "wine . . . the Lord hath commanded to be received," but no stress can legitimately be laid on the word, for the limits of its connotation have never been authoritatively settled—*e.g.*, in a court of law; it must be taken only as equivalent to "fruit of the vine," which is our Lord's sole designation of the contents of the Cup which He "commanded to be received." That peculiar expression, occurring, we are told, in the ancient Jewish formulary connected

with the Passover Feast, must, in all candour, be allowed not in itself to exclude the idea of unfermented grape-juice.

Is there any other indication in Scripture as to the nature of the contents of "the Cup," as the second element in Communion is persistently (and noticeably) called ?

It has been pleaded that St. Paul refers to communicants who were "drunken," which postulates alcohol ; but no commentator who values his reputation will expound this as proving that the alcohol was in the Sacramental Cup they partook of. It refers to potations in which they had indulged during, or more probably prior to, the love-feast which preceded the Sacrament. No ; it must in all honesty be admitted that there is nothing in Scripture (which our Church recognizes as the ultimate criterion of all essential Christian duty) to make clear to the reader of average intelligence what our Lord's "example" precisely is in regard to the kind or condition of the grape-juice in the Sacramental Cup. How, then, can we condemn any for "departing from" it? Surely the Lambeth Conference of 1888 went too far in so doing!

If the unfermented Cup is to be disapproved, then it must be upon other, and altogether lower and less imperative, grounds. It has been argued that its allowance would sever us from the rest of Catholic Christendom in regard to a Sacramental Ordinance which should unite us all. The argument seems rather belated. Does our adherence to the fermented Cup really do anything towards uniting us in religious fellowship with Rome and the Eastern Churches? Already our faithfulness to Christ's example, as we conceive of it, has unavoidably severed us from them ; for we feel it a duty to administer both elements, and separately (discerning a not unimportant symbolism in that), whereas Rome gives the laity one only, and the Eastern Church both in mixture.

A more pertinent consideration would seem to be whether, by refusing all allowance of the unfermented Cup, we should not be severing ourselves further from the Protestant Communions, which have largely recognized its Scriptural lawfulness. But it

is urged that such allowance would be an innovation upon an almost universal custom, disturbing the conscience of those who might doubt its lawfulness, and creating needless division not only between congregations, but between fellow-parishioners. Separate Cups and separate celebrations for communicants in the same church are utterly to be deprecated. Who, it is asked, will decide, with the acquiescence of all, what the use of each parish or church is to be? And will not a fresh and deplorable classifying of Churches be inaugurated, distinguishing them by objectionable labels, such as "Temperance Churches" and "Drinking Churches"?

Well, the *Leo Compitalis* is a formidable creature—at a distance. But we are of opinion that a withdrawal of the ban on the unfermented Cup would in practice have no such alarming consequences as some persons apprehend, and we speak from personal observation of cases where the experiment has been tried; for it may as well be recognized as a fact that, without authoritative sanction, the unfermented Cup is used in a few of our churches already, and in some cases without any interference by the Diocesan authority. That there is any strong general feeling in favour of the fermented Cup in itself (as there certainly is with many in favour of the unfermented) we do not believe; where it exists it could be entirely removed by some authoritative admission that the latter cannot be pronounced a violation of Christ's command. The Lambeth Conference has not gone out of its way to make such admission, but there is yet room for a pronouncement on this subject by the Archbishop of Canterbury—say, after consultation with some competent committee of special weight and influence. It would be no "decree of the Church," of course; but its counsel would be of enormous value towards what the Prayer-Book calls "avoidance of scruple and doubtfulness," and the ending of a certain measure of confusion in present practice.

There need be no insurmountable difficulty in determining the "use" in each congregation; the Ordinary would direct it in accordance with the circumstances of the case as made known

to him. Granted that neither use was religiously illegitimate, it would be a fair exercise of that "ministry of the laity" of which we hear increasingly to-day, for the communicants to indicate their preference to the Bishop by vote.

Yet another argument against allowance. It is said that pure, unfermented grape-juice is practically unavailable. That which is sold as such, we are told, is sterilized by the admixture of chemicals which artificially prevent fermentation, and our Lord would have used no such concoction. Well, we are not told that He pressed the juice from the grapes into the Cup at the time, but He may have done so. It would not be easy for us, in that case, to follow His "example"; but is it the fact that pure, unfermented grape-juice, hermetically sealed up till used, is really unavailable? The fermented "Communion wine" at present dispensed in not a few churches, it is to be feared, is not pure grape-juice of any kind! Its provision in pure, unfermented condition for our Communion Tables is surely not beyond the resources of modern science and ingenuity.

What other argument (outside that from Scripture, which, as we have seen, breaks down) for the condemnation of the unfermented Cup have we omitted from our survey? Only one; but it has had great influence, and it is plain from the Report of the 1888 Conference that it led to the passing of the Condemnatory Resolution. It is widely believed that the appeal in favour of the unfermented Cup is Manichæan, and that to grant it would seem to endorse the principle that all use of wine is unholy. In short, consciously or unconsciously, an "anti-teetotal" bias repels many minds from any recognition of the unfermented Cup.

The writer, who is entirely convinced that Christ drank fermented wine, and that Scripture nowhere condemns its moderate use; who disapproves of lifelong pledges of abstinence from things not in themselves sinful, and is thoroughly persuaded that the unreasonableness, uncharitableness, and rancour of many abstainers does infinite injury to the cause of true temperance, is surprised to find himself, in the matter before us, bound to espouse the cause of the teetotal communicant, and to condemn

all unfair "anti-teetotal" as strenuously as all unfair "teetotal" bias. A passionate lover of liberty in non-essentials (and he thinks he learnt that from St. Paul), he finds it impossible to say to the communicant teetotaler: "Your prejudice against alcohol debars you from being considered in this matter. We must be rigid beyond the limits of Christ's ascertained example, for fear of showing any favour to your extravagant opinions. You must not communicate except in alcoholic beverage, much as you abhor it. Water it for you we may—dilute it freely—but proof spirit there must be in it; and unfermented juice of the grape, though unadulterated and indubitable 'fruit of the vine,' cannot possibly be allowed, not because Christ used the other—for that is not certain—but because it would seem to be a concession to your extremist views." To me it is unthinkable that Christ would withhold the Sacramental blessing from a penitent believer on such grounds, or that His Church should the Sacramental Cup.

It cannot be denied that many strong teetotalers are among the most devoted and consistent of our Christian people, prepared to comply with "all things which" they are convinced "are, by Christ's ordinance, of necessity requisite" for obedience to Him. Dare we, in face of the facts, assert that fermentation in the Cup is one of these?

Shall we briefly consider a few of the advantages of the unfermented Cup?

To begin with a small matter. Most unwelcome and unpleasant is it for the celebrant, especially at an early hour, to consume the "remainder" of the fermented Cup, if there be a substantial quantity of it, which cannot always be avoided, especially when communicants are many. Of course, he may ask some of them to join him in doing it; but suppose they decline, as they often do? "Reservation" is sometimes the best way to comply with the spirit, as against the letter, of the Church's directions; but the whole difficulty is escaped with the unfermented Cup.

No vicar of a poor parish can be quite a stranger to painful

cases where "gulping" the wine is a temptation to recipients. The writer, when ministering in East London to very humble folks, of small self-control, found it needful to be very vigilant in handing the cup to some easily tempted ones! He knew a case where a neighbour clergyman was not sufficiently careful in the matter, and a poor fellow walked home unsteady from Communion in consequence; and he deems it cruel to ignore such facts. He has heard it publicly denied that a reclaimed drunkard ever relapsed as a result of communicating; but negations are valueless before positive evidence, and there is burnt into the writer's memory the instance of a member of his flock, admitted to Communion after abundant evidence of penitence, to whom that happened, followed by death from delirium tremens a week afterwards! He is chaplain of a large female inebriate asylum, within whose fence no alcohol is ever allowed to pass. Either, then, he must debar the inmates, however hopefully penitent, for three years—and (practically) all the staff—from Communion, or use the unfermented cup. If his doing the latter is allowed to be justifiable under the circumstances, its validity is conceded! If it be suggested that he should apply for a relaxation of the exclusion of alcohol for this particular purpose, the answer is, not only that he feels certain it would be refused, but that he could not ask leave, in the name of Holy Church, after praying that they may not be led into temptation, to tender "drink" to those drink-scarred ones, in the presumptuous confidence that no harm will be allowed to follow!

And be it remembered that there are thousands of men and women in England in such institutions; while there are portions of Africa where, in the physical and moral interest of the natives, the Government interdicts all alcoholic liquors, and great numbers of converts in India to whom introduction to fermented drinks is an abomination and a peril. Bishop Westcott's reverent speculation commends itself to a candid thinker as probable—viz., that if our Blessed Lord had instituted the Holy Communion in China or India, He might not have

appointed bread and wine (or even grape-juice) as its outward and visible sign. But such speculations, of course incapable of verification, cannot count as argument.

To sum up :

Our Articles repudiate all demands of Church Councils in regard to human duty which cannot be supported from Scripture ; and the want of such support for the ban of the unfermented Cup by the 1888 Conference seems to deprive it of any imperative claim on the obedience of Church members.

Pending suggestions for modifying its application, from some quarter to which all would defer, it seems desirable that no change should be made in the ordinary practice of most of our churches.

Where, however, very special circumstances exist—as, for example, in the case of a parish where a greatly preponderating number of the communicants strongly desire the change—it is for the Ordinary to consider whether a congregation adopting the unfermented Cup should in any way be penalized.

It seems exceedingly desirable that it should be ascertained whether it is practicable to supply genuine and unadulterated grape-juice, unfermented, at reasonable cost, in a form suited for convenient use in our churches. Should that prove to be the case, the writer is inclined to think that in course of time the unfermented Cup will slowly survive theoretical objection, and emerge eventually into universal preference and adoption in the Anglican Communion.



## A New View of the Synoptic Problem.

BY THE REV. G. BLADON, M.A.

**I**T has again and again happened that help towards the solution of problems which have puzzled men's minds for long periods has come from some comparatively small matter, which has been overlooked. Like the lion in Æsop's fable, release from the net has come from a mouse.

And it may be that the synoptic problem of undying interest may find—I will not say solution, that is not in the least likely; but light, if only that important factor in early Church life—the work of the catechists—receive fuller consideration.

Before, however, I speak of that work, I would point out that the problem is year by year becoming simplified; on certain matters there is now practical agreement, and even where this is not the case, the points of difference are better defined, and the limitations are better understood.

It is now almost universally admitted that there are three main sources: (1) St. Mark, even if not precisely our present second Gospel, an *Urmarcus* not materially different; (2) a collection, principally of discourses known to, and used by, both St. Matthew and St. Luke, commonly known by the symbol of Q; and (3) certain special sources, collected from different persons and from various places, some known only to one of the three Synoptists, some to two, and a few, perhaps, known to all. These three form what is commonly called the documentary bases; but the theory of an oral transmission of parts at any rate is not dead, though its exponents are quantitatively, though certainly not qualitatively, in a small minority. It once had the weighty name of Bishop Westcott; it still has that of Dr. Arthur Wright, and to some extent that of Sir J. C. Hawkins. And both Dr. Sanday and Harnack admit an element of truth.

Still, however, the problem remains of likeness combined with so much variation — a variation often apparently so purposeless.

And now, I think, more light comes from that much-neglected quarter—from the influence, that is, of the catechist. Teaching must have occupied an important place in the work of the Church in early days, and the influence of the teacher must therefore have been very great. We know that wherever St. Paul went he established Churches and ordained elders; if Corinth is an exception, as Dr. Charles Bigg thought, it is the only one. And such elders, even if not Jews, as in many cases

they would be, would for all that be largely under Synagogue influence, and we know that in the Synagogue teaching took a high position. Even when such elders were not Jews, the Greek influence would be quite as strong in the same direction. New Testament evidence on the subject is abundant, and is none the less decisive for being in the main indirect. The Beræans are praised as more noble than those in Thessalonica, because they searched the Scriptures—*i.e.*, they studied the writings. In Ephesus we read of St. Paul not disputing but holding argument (*διαλεγόμενος*) daily in the lecture-room of Tyrannus. Strongest of all is St. Luke's preface. Not only is the very word used, but as we read between the lines we see clearly that St. Luke felt that many of the catechists were not so competent as they ought to be, and that there was need of thoroughness. St. Paul also felt this need, as his Epistles clearly show.

The sense of the need of teaching, and the consequent presence of the teacher or catechist, will not, I think, be denied; now comes the question, What did the catechists teach? Oh that the archæologists may dig up for us a first-century equivalent of "Archdeacon Wilson's Notes," or the *Church Sunday School Magazine*. They may do; it is quite possible. In the meantime, until we get so fortunate a "find," we must make the best of such material as we have.

Is it not possible that we are richer than we know, and that we have already got in Q an early copy, not to say the very standard and model, of catechists' notes? No one, I must begin by admitting, has exactly so defined it. Professor Sanday, in his most valuable Oxford Lecture published in the *Expository Times* for December, 1908, regards it as "not a narrative Gospel, but mainly a collection of discourses." Sir William Ramsay ("Luke the Physician, and other Studies") also thinks it was mainly discourses and sayings, but thinks there was narrative, perhaps a good deal. Professor Burkitt, in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, goes farther and holds that there was an account of the Passion; Sir William Ramsay also thinks this quite possible. But Professor Harnack, in his "Sayings of

Jesus," argues for discourses and sayings only, and thinks that it contained neither an account of the Passion, nor even such discourses as necessarily led up thereto.

In support of his theory he makes a thorough examination of the contents of what he believes to have been the original, and the result of such examination is as follows :

Q contained about sixty sections. Seven are narratives—the temptation, the centurion at Capernaum, the embassy of John the Baptist, the man who would follow if he might first bury his father, the Beelzebub controversy, the demand for a sign, and the question how often one ought to forgive. Eleven or twelve are parables and similitudes—blind leaders of the blind, good and corrupt tree, the house on the rock, the querulous children at play, the sheep and the wolves, the light under the bushel, the thief by night and the faithful and unfaithful steward, behaviour towards the adversary, the leaven, the mustard, the strait and narrow gate, and the lost sheep. To these he adds thirteen collections of sayings, such as the Lord's Prayer, the Beatitudes, the great thanksgiving to the Father, the denunciation of the Pharisees and others, and about twenty-nine single sayings, mostly ethical, such as the Golden Rule, "He that findeth his life," etc., and some words of encouragement to the disciples. This, he thinks, was the whole of Q, or at any rate practically the whole ; he allows no more. Q, he says, was not a Gospel ; it was a compilation of discourses and sayings of our Lord, the arrangement of which has no reference to the Passion, with an horizon which is as good as absolutely bounded by Galilee, with no clearly discernible purpose beyond that of imparting catechetical instruction.

And this conclusion agrees in the main with that of Dr. Sanday's, who says : "Q is the picture of the Christian ideal and of the character of Christ." And the opinion of Sir J. C. Hawkins in Section 5 of "Horæ Synopticæ" is *practically* to the same effect.

Both Professor Burkitt and Sir William Ramsay decline to accept Harnack's verdict. The former does indeed grant that

Q was "a single source," but is unpersuaded that Harnack's fragments included all the essential features of the lost document, and thinks Q was a real Gospel, and that it contained a story of the Passion.

Sir William Ramsay maintains that Harnack's verdict is seriously affected by his theological opinions; he thinks that Q contained far more than Harnack allows—probably much narrative, perhaps including that of the Passion, which both St. Luke and St. Matthew may have used.

Now, as each of these very seriously damages my theory of catechists' notes, I must examine them both for a minute or two.

I take Professor Burkitt first, who declares himself "not an impartial critic," and stands to his guns against Harnack. I also, if I may presumptuously compare myself, am "not impartial," and intend to stand to my guns against him.

First, I would say, if Q contained a Passion narrative, it must also have contained a Resurrection narrative. To separate the Resurrection from the Passion in a Gospel seems to me unthinkable. And if it did, why not that very Resurrection narrative, or rather those very evidentials of the fact of the Resurrection, which St. Paul has incorporated in 1 Cor. xv.? I am obstinately sure that the appearances there recorded were those which catechists always gave to their catechumens; the additional appearances given in each of the four Gospels were such supplements as the writer thought suitable for such readers as those for whom his own Gospel was especially designed. But let that pass.

Again, if Q was a Gospel, and so *valuable* a Gospel, and one so early in circulation that both St. Luke and St. Matthew knew it well, how is it that it has not only perished—*that* has been the fate of much early Christian literature—but is completely ignored by the Church historians? Four Gospels, and only four, is the universal tradition; Irenæus even founds an elaborate argument on the number. But here, according to Professor Burkitt, is a *fifth*, so good that both St. Luke and St. Matthew

incorporate large parts into their own Gospels, and that systematically.

Professor Burkitt says, indeed, that Q was "taken to pieces by St. Matthew and St. Luke, and now it has been put together again by Dr. Harnack." But "taken to pieces" is not quite a fair way of putting it, for Harnack shows that both St. Matthew and St. Luke have disturbed the order in Q very little indeed—that in the first thirteen sections they absolutely coincide in order, and that in the later sections they again agree. In other words, they treated Q with great respect. And as regards St. Matthew this is the more noticeable, because he does not scruple to group Christ's discourses and parables. Yet, if Professor Burkitt is right, so long as Q is only concerned with narratives, discourses, and sayings, they treat Q with the utmost deference; but when it comes to the Passion—and I would add the Resurrection—they treat it with no deference at all. Is this probable? I think not. And I venture to go farther, and say that Q was not a Gospel. If it were, then the difficulties of the synoptic problem are almost hopelessly increased; while if Q was catechists' notes—and not impossibly the earliest form of catechists' notes, as I maintain it was—you throw considerable light on the problem.

And now I turn to Sir William Ramsay. He agrees with Professor Burkitt in maintaining that Q contained more, both of narrative, discourses, and sayings, than Harnack puts into his recension. He holds, with Dr. Sanday, that Q was known to St. Mark and St. Paul; and he assigns to it a very early date, and even apostolic origin. "There is," he says, "only one possibility: the lost common source of Luke and Matthew (to which, as [Harnack] says, Luke attached even higher value than he did to Mark) was written while Christ was still living. It gives us the view which one of His disciples entertained of Him and His teaching during His lifetime, and may be regarded as authoritative for the view of the disciples generally. This extremely early date was what gave the lost source the high value that it had in the estimation of Matthew and Luke, and

yet justified the freedom with which they handled it and modified it by addition and explanation (for [Harnack's] comparison of the passages as they appear in Luke and Matthew shows that the lost common source was very freely treated by them). On the one hand, it was a document practically contemporary with the facts, and it registered the impression made on eye-witnesses by the words and acts of Christ; on the other hand, it was written before those words and acts had begun to be properly understood by even the most intelligent eye-witnesses" ("Luke the Physician, and other Studies," p. 89).

Now, I am quite willing to admit that it is not impossible that one, or more than one, of Christ's disciples may have taken notes of His sayings. But Sir William Ramsay seems to be on the horns of a dilemma. If such notes of sayings and discourses were combined after Pentecost with a narrative of the Passion and Resurrection, then Q was a Gospel, like the Synoptists, and all the objections which I have urged against Professor Burkitt apply, with the additional fact that it was the earliest and the most undoubtedly apostolic Gospel, of which no one knows anything, which is unaccountably lost, and to which no ecclesiastical writer even refers. If, on the other hand, there was no such combination of notes with a Passion and Resurrection narrative, then Sir William Ramsay only really differs from Harnack as regards the date and the purpose of such notes.

But the difficulties are very great. Why should Christ's disciples have taken notes, *except of His sayings*, during His lifetime? If they did, they would take them in Aramaic, as Harnack thinks Q originally was written; but Sir William Ramsay holds that Q was in Greek. And during His lifetime Christ's Apostles needed no *narrative*—no record of place and time, that is; but all—Dr. Sanday, Harnack, Professor Burkitt, and Sir William Ramsay himself—allow *some* narrative; Professor Burkitt says very much.

Altogether, I confess that I find Sir William Ramsay very hard to follow. And when he goes on to say (p. 97) that "it is

impossible to regard Q, or the original common source, as a practical catechetical manual drawn up about A.D. 60-70 for the use of teachers and pupils in the Christian doctrine, which is the view taken by esteemed friends, especially Dr. Sanday," I agree as regards the date. Q is *earlier* than A.D. 60—probably much earlier.

Q was catechists' notes, so I maintain, and for these reasons :

First, its original language, as Harnack thinks, though not Sir William Ramsay, was Aramaic. Harnack argues this from the usage and non-usage of certain prepositions, from the constant connection of sentences by *καί*, and from many other traits of style. Now, for catechists' notes Aramaic is exactly what we should expect. Gospels would be composed for ecclesiastical use, or for persons, like Theophilus, sufficiently important to be addressed as *κράτιστε*. They therefore would, generally at any rate, be in Greek. But those *πτωχοὶ* to whom the Gospel was preached, and who, just as much as Theophilus, needed catechetical instruction, had to put up with something less elaborate—with the teaching of some earlier *ιδιώτης*—of a first-century Sunday-school teacher. If such a teacher was one who was most impressed by the works of Christ—the things which Jesus began to *do*—his notes took very much the form of what St. Peter said to Cornelius in Acts x., and which afterwards developed into St. Mark's Gospel. If, on the other hand, he had been most impressed by Christ's discourses—the things which Jesus began to *say*—then he used, not exactly Q, but *λόγια*, which may not have been, but probably were, 'Εβραϊδὶ διαλεκτῶ. Often catechists would learn whole passages by heart : with the oral theory thus held, as it is by Dr. Wright, I quite agree, and it best accounts for the small differences which we find in the common matter of the Synoptists. The catechists, as Dr. Sanday puts it, "would not have the rules or traditions of the professional scribes ; they would be intent on the record of what Jesus said or did, and they would think little of minute exactness in the reproduction of the text as it lay

before them." They would enrich their text, Dr. Sanday thinks, by interesting additions, such as the story of the woman taken in adultery, the anecdote of the man working on the Sabbath, found in Codex D., and such-like.

Secondly, catechists would very largely come from amongst earnest men who had found no spiritual help in the formalities and trivialities of the Scribes, who saw the folly and the hopelessness of the efforts of the Zealots, but who longed all the more eagerly for the redemption of Israel.

For such Q would be exactly applicable. Its teaching is, that the kingdom of Heaven, foretold by the prophets, had been realized in Jesus of Nazareth. It is catechists' notes to that effect.

Again, Harnack points out that Q is "dominated by the belief in the Messiahship of Jesus; the fact of the Messiahship is proved in the introduction—it is presupposed as self-evident from beginning to end of the work—and in the eschatological discourses it is revealed by Jesus Himself" (p. 243). And again he says: "It is evident that Q was composed in Palestine—its Jewish and Palestinian horizon is quite obvious" (p. 248).

This, again, exactly agrees with the theory of catechists' notes. Art thou *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*; was John the Baptist's question; and later it was disputed, This is of a truth the prophet: others said, This is the Christ.

Now, proof of this would go on more lines than one, according to the needs and capacities of both teachers and hearers. On the Day of Pentecost St. Peter argued it from the testimony of Psalmist and Prophet. St. Paul proved to the Jews who dwelt at Damascus that this Jesus is the Christ, but here (Acts ix. 22) we are not told how. Probably the arguments were somewhat elaborate, such as would be suitable for those in the Synagogue. For the "man in the street," for the "plain man," something which appealed a little more to an honest and good heart and a little less to a cultivated intellect—something, in a word, simpler—would be more serviceable. Q, according to Harnack's recension, is exactly the thing.

It is so exactly the thing that, combined with the deeds of the "Strong Son of God, Immortal Love," recorded in the primitive Markan basis, it forms—if the Passion and Resurrection and the Birth narratives be left out—the main part of both St. Luke and St. Matthew; where, as Harnack expresses it, it found its grave. But before such honourable interment it had done immense service. Catechist after catechist had copied it, or learnt it, not feeling it necessary to adhere to any exact phraseology; hence synoptic variations. When St. Luke used it he revised its style, as Harnack often points out, for St. Luke was a cultured man, and did not like vulgar idioms. St. Matthew, on the other hand, has treated the discourses with great respect, and has edited them in a very conservative spirit (p. 37). He has done more; he has adopted its methods and followed along its lines. Like Q, his distinct interest is in our Lord's teaching, which he arranges and groups as Q did, only rather more systematically, as would be more suitable for Church use. In other words, St. Matthew's Gospel is a more scholarly and more ecclesiastical Q. But it was not St. Matthew's Gospel only that Q influenced. It did not, indeed, influence St. Mark, though Dr. Sanday (*Expository Times*, December, 1908, p. 111) thinks St. Mark was acquainted with it. But St. Paul knew of it; "possibly," says Dr. Sanday, I would venture to say, certainly. Dr. Sanday refers to Romans xii. 14-21 as showing the influence of Q; surely so also do the Epistles to the Thessalonians, especially 1 iv., v. And the ethical teaching in Ephesians and Colossians is largely Q, only in an epistolatory style. And I think the same may be said of St. Peter's first Epistle. I do not think Q influenced the *Didaché*: before that was written it had found its grave, to quote a second time Harnack's expression.

Why, however, has it, as a single document, so completely disappeared? One might reply that it has only shared the same fate as unnumbered early Christian documents—that during the Diocletian persecution, when kindly provincial governors accepted any MSS. that Church officials handed

for destruction, and asked no questions, it would be delivered up as being less valuable than the Gospels; and that the spade of that benefactor of the little flock of scholars, the archæologist, may yet unearth a copy. But there may be another reason, and if the reason I am going to suggest is a possible one, it is one that the clergy—Bishops especially—might take note of.

The early Church, doctrinally, had a very high ideal; it wanted the best; it did not think that for teaching anything would do; double honour was to be given to those who ruled well, especially to those who laboured in the word and teaching. Now "in the word and teaching" must mean what is now held up to shame and reproach as "dogma." This Q was not, even though it contained the great passage, "No one knoweth the Son, save the Father," etc., and though, as Dr. Sanday points out, it presupposes the Divinity of our Lord, just as St. Mark's Gospel does. Nevertheless, Q does not rise anywhere near the height of Paulinism, still less of the Johannine teaching. It was "milk for babes," and St. Paul's condemnation of teachers who were content to give, and of congregations who were content to receive nothing more, is emphatic. In other words, Q found honourable interment because the early Church had a very high standard, and did not think Q quite came up to the standard.

So simple an explanation as this would not satisfy a learned German Professor, but it quite satisfies me, the more for that it contains a useful lesson.



### Prayer-Book Revision.

BY THE REV. PREBENDARY EARDLEY-WILMOT, M.A.

IT might be thought unnecessary again to call attention to the subject of Prayer-Book Revision, since so much has already been written and said to show both the need and the demand for it. The position, however, taken up by a section of Churchmen seems to make it imperative to state again what

may be said in favour of it, especially as it appears to present itself to Evangelical Churchmen. And it is the more necessary since, in view of recent events, the subject of the revision of the Book of Common Prayer has become of the gravest importance to the whole Church and people of England and, indeed, to the whole Anglican Communion. For it is stirring not only the Church at home, but throughout Greater Britain. The Synod of the Church in Canada, for example, is debating the subject, and a strong party is demanding revision. Indeed, it would seem as if "revision" there would even anticipate "revision" here if the matter is long delayed by us.

It may be useful to remind ourselves of the steps which have brought the revision of the Prayer-Book into what we may call "the arena of practical politics." The subject, which had often been mooted in assemblies of Churchmen as well as privately, was brought to the front by the issue of the "Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline" in 1906. That Report, which was based upon a large amount of evidence, after recommending that certain specified practices which are "plainly significant of teaching repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England, and certainly illegal, should be promptly made to cease by the exercise of the authority belonging to the Bishops and, if necessary, by proceedings in the Ecclesiastical Courts," went on to recommend that "Letters of Business should be issued to the Convocations with instructions to consider, with a view to enactment by Parliament, (a) the preparation of a new rubric regulating the ornaments of the Ministers of the Church, and (b) to frame such modifications in the existing law relating to the conduct of Divine Service, etc., as may secure the greater elasticity which a reasonable recognition of the comprehensiveness of the Church of England and of its present needs seems to demand." A third recommendation was that the law should be so amended as to give wider scope for the exercise of a regulative authority in the matter of additional and special services, collects, and hymns. It will be seen, therefore, that by an influential commission—for such it was—composed of

Bishops, clergy and laity, representing all schools of thought, as well as ecclesiastical scholarship and legal acumen, revision of the Prayer-Book was not only thought possible, but was recommended; and the process was named by which revision might be carried through.

In November of the same year the Royal Letter of Business was issued, and was read by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the whole Convocation in full Synod assembled. In asking for the appointment of an Advisory Committee upon the procedure to be taken in reply to the Letter, the Archbishop said: "Rules clear in principle and yet elastic in detail we do absolutely require, if the Church in its manifold activities is to be abreast of modern needs and yet loyal to ancient order." The Lambeth Conference of last year appointed a Committee to consider and report upon the subject of "Prayer-Book Adaptation and Enrichment." The report presented was entirely in favour of general revision and adaptation, though it avoided the discussion of what are known as the more "burning questions." At the Church Congress at Manchester a whole session was devoted to the subject, and a strong lead in favour of revision was given by the Bishops of Gloucester and Sodor and Man. During the present year we have had the reports of the Committees appointed by the Houses of Convocation of both Provinces to consider the Royal Letter of Business. Definite proposals are, therefore, before us, and we are able to see in some measure what form revision—if carried through at the present time—might take. It is not our purpose now to consider those proposals in detail, but rather to consider generally what attitude we should adopt as loyal Churchmen, faithful to Evangelical principles and zealous to promote spiritual life in the Church, to the whole question of Prayer-Book revision, though, of course, with special reference to the proposals which are now before the Convocations.

There are, then, practically only two ways of meeting the proposal for revision. For a third way, that of swallowing all the proposals as they stand, without objection or alteration, is

clearly unthinkable. Indeed, since Convocation has not yet considered the proposals, there is no final form for acceptance.

1. There is the "non-possumus" attitude—meeting any suggestion for revision with a direct negative. That attitude is well represented by the motion which was moved by Lord Halifax and seconded by Mr. Athelstan Riley in the London Diocesan Conference about three months ago: "That this Conference is of opinion that any alteration in the Book of Common Prayer in the present circumstances of the Church of England, instead of promoting peace, would tend to increase dissension and disunion." A similar resolution stood on the agenda paper of the recent meeting of the Representative Church Council, also in the name of Lord Halifax, who may be regarded as the champion of the party in the Church opposed to all reform. Clearly, therefore, this may be taken as being the present policy of the section of the Church represented by the English Church Union. They are impressed, they tell us, with the growing spirit of unity in the Church. The alleged lax state of discipline in the Church has been tremendously exaggerated. They desire, above all things, peace, and would deprecate anything which would tend to schism. Their "policy is to keep the Evangelical party in the Church, and to prevent a split." It is hardly necessary to say that, as Evangelical Churchmen, we go heart and soul with them in these desires. We, too, would labour for peace, as we must also contend for truth. We have not the least intention of forsaking the Church. But there are one or two things which, I hope it is not uncharitable to say, suggest reflection. When, for example, we are asked whether, if the Prayer-Book is not obeyed now, it is reasonable to suppose that obedience would be given to a revised edition, it rather suggests the idea that the plea for peace is a plea to be let alone, because "we shall never do what we do not like." Or when Mr. Riley, in opposing any revision, says, "We have faith in our own principles, and we know that in the long-run they will prevail"; does it not sound rather like, "We do not want revision, because, if you only give us time to

educate the rising generation and accustom people—as they are being accustomed increasingly every year—to an advanced ritual, revision will not be called for, or will be carried out on lines of our own choosing”? But however this may be, it would seem to be pretty clear that, judging by the evidence given before the Royal Commission, revision on the lines proposed by at any rate the main part of the reports presented to Convocation would disturb what we may call the “equilibrium of laxity and lawlessness” as at present adjusted between the two great schools of thought, and throw the weight of lawlessness very much into the scale which is not occupied by Evangelical Churchmen. May it not be well asked, moreover, whether the “non-possimus” attitude is either politic or possible, at any rate without grave risk to the spiritual life and usefulness of the Church? The need for revision is acknowledged almost without contradiction. The labours of scholars, both Biblical and Liturgical, during the centuries since the Prayer-Book was last revised, have added enormously to the stores of material for the work. The history of the Church and the general progress of civilization and culture during that time have made prominent deficiencies and blemishes in the Prayer-Book which need to be corrected and brought into accordance with modern needs. To quote the words of the Report of the Committee of Convocation of Canterbury, “detailed rules and regulations put forward at a particular period must, in some points, gradually become obsolete. This has happened amongst ourselves to a considerable extent, partly owing to the increase of population, partly owing to changes in ideals of observance, partly owing to the alteration of some of the conditions of family or civic life.” Now here is a fact which must be recognized. And no appeal to the fears of Churchmen, on the ground of alteration in the Book of Common Prayer being certain to promote dissension if undertaken at the present time, should be allowed to prevent its recognition. The point was well put by the Hulsean Professor of Divinity at Cambridge (Dr. Emery Barnes) in a letter to the *Times* on April 30. “If,” he said, “there be danger for the

Church in doing the work at the present time, what time has been without danger? The very first revision of the Latin service books, which gave us the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI., was carried through at a time full of peril. The opposition of parties was at least as vehement then as it is to-day. The last revision, which gave us our present book, was made under similar circumstances of danger. In both cases it was for the general good of the Church that the thing should be done, and so the then rulers of the Church defied their fears and did their duty. If Churchmen shrink to-day because there is 'a lion in the path,' the spiritual life of the Church will suffer, and many will be lost to the Church, and perhaps to Christianity, who might have been saved had the Church risen to her mission and consulted more fully the wants of all her children."

2. This suggests the other and, I venture to think, the better way of dealing with the proposals that are now made for revision. It is to accept generally the principle that revision is desirable and practicable, and would tend to spiritual life in the Church, but at the same time to stand firm against any alteration in the standard of doctrine as laid down in the authorized formularies of our Church; to recognize, in short, the difference between matters of faith and matters of discipline, between credenda and agenda, between changes which involve doctrine and those concerned only with practice. Now, without entering into detail, a study of the various proposals which are before the Church at the present time, and which have yet to be discussed in the Convocations, will show that there are a large number which are expressly designed to "meet the changed conditions of modern life and some of the present needs of the Church; to secure greater elasticity, and thereby to be a help to worship and to spiritual life in the Church." Broadly speaking, the proposals made may be divided into three classes: (a) Changes which simply give sanction to quite unimportant matters which are already in general use; (b) changes involving no point of doctrine or matter of grave controversy which would

afford the elasticity desired by so many, and would tend to edification ; and (c) changes which do involve doctrine, and the effect of which would be to alter the doctrinal position of the Church of England as expressed in her authorized formularies from that agreement with primitive doctrine and practice which was restored to her at the Reformation—which would, in fact, throw her back into those mediæval times from the corruptions and errors of which she was, by the grace of God, set free. And may I be allowed to say here that it is, I think, a matter of regret that while there was evidently a desire on the part of the Committee of Convocation of Canterbury to hold the balance evenly, in most cases, between the leading schools of thought in the Church, and to act up to their expressed wish “to preserve everything closely linked with the history of the Church ; to preserve, also, as much as possible of old ideals of duty, and yet to provide for the changed and changing conditions of Church life,” they should yet, in dealing with burning questions of controversy, have gone so far over to one side as to make recommendations which would legalize “the Eucharistic vestments ;” which would sanction reservation beyond the primitive form in which it was practised in the early Church, and in a way which would leave an opening for the reintroduction of the exaggerations and abuses which had grown round the primitive practice in mediæval times ; and which, by requiring from Deacons at their Ordination only the same affirmation as to Holy Scripture which is required from Priests, would not secure from them any definite expression of belief in the authority of God’s Word, and would, in effect, tend to weaken the authority of Holy Scripture in the Church. Alterations such as these we would heartily join with Lord Halifax in resisting, though possibly upon different grounds.

For while we think that the proposals in question, and others which are not now named, carry us too far in one direction, he and his party may think that they do not carry us far enough ; and if revision is to come at all, would desire that it should be of a far more serious character than even the alterations just

mentioned. We shall, at any rate, be at one in believing that those alterations would not be acceptable to the Church at large, would not promote peace, but would tend to increase dissension and disunion. For how, after all, could it promote peace and unity, and be a satisfactory settlement of a difficult question, to have two standards of doctrine and practice authoritatively permitted, even though it is sought to safeguard them by declaration and regulation? We have abundant evidence that declaration carries no weight, and that regulation would be disregarded. Indeed, there is no indication that any of the recommendations which have been made upon the subject of the Ornaments Rubric would be acceptable to, or accepted by, those represented by the President and officials of the English Church Union. Would it not be wise, therefore, to leave those matters alone, at any rate, until some further authoritative pronouncement is made, or until the desired reform in Convocation is effected, and to concentrate effort, for the present, upon the large number of proposals upon which there is substantial agreement, and which might be acted upon without dissension? The Prayer-Book as it stands is in matters of doctrine, and of practice where it involves doctrine, the expression of the faith of a Church—Primitive, Apostolic, Catholic, and Reformed. On those grounds it meets the needs and satisfies the desires of the great majority of the English people. To alter it in the way proposed would, apparently, please no one, and would most certainly cause grievous pain and offence, and be a “serious and even dismaying shock to multitudes of loyal Churchmen, true sons of the Anglican Reformation, Scriptural and Catholic.”<sup>1</sup>

There is just one other aspect of the question which should be mentioned. It is this. It is, we are told, most undesirable to submit the Prayer-Book, or any alterations thereof, to the present House of Commons. The Prayer-Book, as we have it authorized by Act of Parliament, it is said, was authorized by a House of Commons composed entirely of members of the Church of England. Now, every form of religion is represented in

<sup>1</sup> Report of Upper House of Convocation of York.

Parliament, and there are more Nonconformist members in the House of Commons now than in any previous assembly. Well, that is true. But it is hardly likely, I think, that "the present House of Commons" will be asked to consider any proposals for revision. What the next House of Commons will be it would be rash, perhaps, to speculate. But in any case, for good or for ill, the Prayer-Book is annexed to an Act of Parliament, and would have to be submitted to Parliament for alteration. It would be lamentable indeed were sacred matters of doctrine to be debated across the floor of the House of Commons. We may earnestly hope and pray that such might never be the case; that the dignity of the assembly, and the not yet lost religiousness of the nation, would prevent any such thing. But there would be no irreverence and no Erastianism—only a recognition of the circumstances of the case—in presenting a schedule of the changes I have classed under (*a*) and (*b*), and which form by far the largest part of the proposals for revision, to Parliament to be passed by a short and enabling Act. It would be better, of course, had the Church power to act solely on her own initiative, and we may hope and work for the day when it shall be so. But it is not necessary, surely, to wait until she secures that power to obtain the reasonable alterations referred to.

Where, therefore, we can safely gain liberty, and help in any way the spiritual life of the Church, by wise alteration and addition in non-essential matters of practice, let us, as a living Church, go forward and strive to meet the needs and thought of the present day, undeterred by any fears of dissension and disunion, where all is done for the glory of God and the common weal; recognizing that the blame for dissension and disunion, if it came, would rest with those who opposed such reasonable and desired reform. But where principles of truth are at stake, and where the changes proposed would favour doctrines which the Church of England has distinctly repudiated, let us, for the present, at any rate, hold our hands. Let us, as Evangelical Churchmen, take our stand upon the principle that some changes in the Book of Common Prayer are both expedient and neces-

sary, and will conduce to spiritual life in the Church ; but let us at the same time steadily resist any changes which would destroy the present balance of principle and practice in the Church, take away from its primitive and Scriptural standard of doctrine, and take the Church of England in its authorized formularies back to " the Romeward side of the line of deep cleavage which separates the Anglican from the Roman communion."



### Father Tyrrell and the Jesuits.

By G. G. COULTON, M.A.

MUCH that has been written concerning the late Father Tyrrell's death and burial is plainly beside the mark. For good or evil, the modern Roman Church is, *par excellence*, the Church of rigid discipline. Its ideal cannot be more pithily stated than in the *Catholic Times'* leading article of February 22, 1901: "The Holy See, in its wisdom, ordains the law; the Bishops, scattered over the earth, receive its provisions. The Holy See decides the Faith; the Bishops, each in his respective diocese, guard its purity, and seek to preserve it from admixture of error. Surely this is the true Catholic doctrine." This is the body which Father Tyrrell joined in his rising manhood—on more or less false pretences, as he himself seems to have realized clearly enough afterwards—but on this particular point he must have known fairly well what to expect. Moreover, of his further choice he joined the Society of Jesus, and accepted that "Ignatian ideal of obedience" which "requires in every Jesuit, in all that is not sin, perfect obedience to the Divine will as interpreted to him by the holy constitutions of his Order, and explained to him by the living voice of his superiors, who stand to him in the place of Christ, according to those words of Christ: 'Whoso heareth you heareth Me'" (Father Coupe, S.J., in the *Monitor* for August 9, 1901). We have therefore every reason to believe that he, like Newman, faced at first as

a necessary sacrifice to God the mental coercion to which he must henceforth be subjected. Moreover, we must admit that every true and sincere sacrifice of this kind does in some way bring its own reward, if not in virtue of the object for which it was made, yet at least in virtue of its own honest intentions. George Herbert has described the work of that sincere devotion which is to be found in the Roman, as in all other communions, and which God values (as we must trust that He values ours) not for what it is, but for what it would fain be :

“ She on the hills . . .  
Hath kissed so long her painted shrines,  
That even her face with kissing shines  
For her reward.”

Tyrrell's sacrifice, whatever we may think of the act itself in either case, was as true as David's when he poured forth that cup of priceless water upon the sand. The punishment fell upon the body which tempted him to this moral suicide ; like Newman, he has proved a disintegrating force within the Roman Church. His subsequent career showed clearly how great the wrench must have been. Thousands already, in his place, have yielded gradually to circumstances. There are dozens of prominent Roman Catholics now living of whom their more thoughtful co-religionists frankly confess disappointment ; men who refused at first to become mere machines, but who have lost their individuality as they mounted step by step in the hierarchy, and are now, as prospective Bishops or Cardinals, among the foremost adversaries of those tenets to which they once leaned. Tyrrell was not a man of this stamp ; the attempt to make him such only brought out his native force of character and independence of judgment. He found out long ago that he differed hopelessly from the majority of Roman Catholics ; nothing but his reverence for the Sacraments, and his intense spirit of attachment to everything and everybody that he had once loved, kept him from breaking with the Church of his adoption. But it could not be expected that an organization such as the Roman hierarchy should suffer him to remain thus

in a position that claimed to be of it and against it at the same time. So far from wondering that it refused him Christian burial and "suspended" the friend who spoke and prayed at the dead man's grave in an Anglican churchyard, we must be thankful for the progress of the world which has made any other alternative even seem remotely possible. In the days when Roman Catholicism was supreme, Fathers Tyrrell and Brémond would have gone to the stake; and the mere fact that so wide a public should now wonder at the refusal of burial to an excommunicate, gives force to the complaint once uttered by Cardinal Vaughan, that his Church fought in this generation "with one hand tied behind her back."

But there is one incident in the case which might have been more significant still. We all know the supreme importance attached by Rome to a dying man's last moments. In Sicily there is even a popular cult for the souls of publicly-executed criminals: for the people's mind is often startlingly logical.<sup>1</sup> If, indeed, all eternity depends on the disposition of the dying man at the last moment, when he was hardly living at all—upon his disposition at that moment, and his due reception of certain rites of the Church—then of whose salvation can we be so sure as of a repentant murderer's? The Archbishop of Palermo may die in the odour of sanctity after a long and saintly life; we, the common people of Marsala, know little of that. He died in a darkened room far from us; rumours of his goodness reach us only vaguely; we do not call upon his soul to mediate between us and God. But the man whom we saw ourselves on the scaffold, in full sunlight, amidst the intense and contagious excitement of a great crowd—the man whose repentance and acceptance of the Sacraments was made as public as possible, and was sealed at once under our very eyes with the irrevocable seal of death—of this man's salvation none but a heretic could doubt:

<sup>1</sup> See Th. Trede, "Heidentum i. d. Römischen Kirche," part iii., chap. xix. Gotha (1890).

“ Armuzzi di li corpi decullati . . .  
 Prigati lu Signi  
 Chi li nimici mi vennu 'n favuri.”<sup>1</sup>

In Father Tyrrell's case the interest was still more intense ; at such a moment of physical and mental prostration the dying man might have been induced to make a retraction, or at least some concession which might so be interpreted. Therefore, within a few hours of his death, his intimate friends, Miss Petre and Baron F. von Hügel, hastened “to obviate any danger of false reports.” They published in the *Times* and elsewhere a plain statement that, judging from his last conscious and articulate moments, “he would not wish to receive the Sacraments at the cost of a retraction of what he had said and written in all sincerity, and still considered to be the truth.” Yet even this did not prevent the circulation of a report that the dying man had piteously appealed to a priest with the words : “I thought you would not let me die” (or, according to another version, “be buried”) “like a dog.” This was little enough ; but it might have been exploited to some purpose ; after all, it is less of a jump from that text to the conclusion of the heretic's repentance, than from *Thou art Peter* to the Roman Catholic deduction of Papal supremacy. But Tyrrell's friends also had the courage of their convictions ; and in three letters to the *Times* and the *Tablet* they have not only nipped the nascent falsehood in the bud, but exposed also the rôle played by the French Prior of Storrington, who had posed as Tyrrell's friend, and whose authority was confidently cited for the pretended death-bed speech. The Baron plainly states his own and Miss Petre's reason : “To impede the formation of a legend.”

Whether they will wholly succeed is another question. If the legend is felt to be necessary to the Roman Church, or even to the Jesuit Order, then it will certainly be formed ; and the

<sup>1</sup> “Poor souls of the decapitated corpses . . . pray the Lord that the enemies may be reconciled to me.” Pitré has collected several other prayers to the same effect from the popular mouth. Monday is the special day for this worship.

very men who try to show themselves abreast of modern ideas by repudiating the Loretto legend, or the liquefaction of the Holy Blood at Naples, or the equally gross figments about St. Edmund's bones at Arundel, will help, little by little, almost unconsciously to themselves, in the fabrication of no less glaring falsehoods about Father Tyrrell's recantation. Here, again, the Jesuit Father Coupe rightly indicates that controlling necessity which makes it impossible for an ultramontane Catholic to live on the same mental plane with the rest of mankind. He explains, in a Catholic Truth Society pamphlet, that, if one Pope can be proved to have taught error *ex cathedrâ*, "the Catholic Church collapses like a house of cards, and Christianity collapses with it." "If there be no such teacher [as an infallible Pope] to enlighten us, then Christianity is a delusion and a dream, and there is nothing for us but, like the Pagans of old, to cry out in anguish and desolation of heart: 'God there is none! Future life there is none. Let us drink and make merry, for to-morrow we die!'"<sup>1</sup> This is, of course, on all fours with Cardinal Manning's celebrated protest that the appeal to history against "the living voice of the Church" is a treason and a heresy. Only by carefully weighing pronouncements of this kind can we understand the irresistible growth of legends in the Roman Church. They are not merely accretions to that Church under its present constitution, they are bone of its bone and flesh of its flesh. It is true of any priest, and doubly true of a Jesuit, that he is almost compelled, both by conscience and by lower motives, to close his eyes against everything that is not of priesthood or of Jesuitism. On the one hand, to admit common sense, to face historical facts, is to feel the whole fabric of religion reeling about his ears; to see the gulf of Atheism yawning at his feet. On the other hand, he is so used to transmitting infallible and unquestionable truth from the Pope to the people that his prestige cannot afford the admission of any serious error. With all its severity against such errors as Tyrrell's, the Jesuit Order is startlingly lenient in the matter of

<sup>1</sup> "The Alleged Failures of Infallibility," pp. 2, 3.

false witness brought against fellow-Christians. Perhaps the three most prominent English Jesuits are Fathers Rickaby, Gerard, and Thurston, each of whom I have convicted of publishing plain misstatements for "the cause," which they neither could justify nor would retract. To plead that these men are in other respects typical English gentlemen, incapable of prevarication in the ordinary concerns of daily life, is simply to emphasize the mischief done by a system which assumes infallibility at its source, and strives to reduce the priest from a sentient being to a mere connecting-rod in the huge machine. The only infallible truth about such a system is this : that when anything goes wrong at the source of propulsion, the rods must either break or suffer strange distortion. The modern invidious connotation of the word *Jesuitical* is not due, as a charitable reviewer recently hinted, to the genius of Pascal. It comes out with renewed clearness in every generation ; it is incarnate in that spirit against which Tyrrell protested by his life and death.



### A Living Church.

A STUDY IN ACTS XI. 19-30 ; XIII. 1-3.

BY THE REV. W. S. HOOTON, B.A.

THE above grouping of passages may be the subject of some surprise, but it is made deliberately, with a purpose which will be manifest before the close of the paper. It is true that the call of Barnabas and Saul to foreign missionary work is intimately connected with the account of their first missionary journey in Acts xiii. and xiv., but it is scarcely less closely linked with their relation to the Church in Antioch as described at the close of chap. xi. Chap. xii. comes in as a parenthesis which in no way affects the course of the narrative. And while it is undoubtedly instructive to examine xiii. 1-3 from the

standpoint of the Divine call, it is none the less so if we consider the response made to that call, and the resulting growth and expansion which, no less than its vigorous internal life, marked the infant Church that is here pictured for us. At any rate, we are bound by no arbitrary theory of a distinct division of the Acts at the close of chap. xii. A new era does certainly begin with chap. xiii., and Paul is, equally certainly, the prominent character from that point onwards, as Peter had been before it; but the book is a comprehensive whole, and, if it may in any way tend to illuminate some of its purposes to make the division of the subject which is now proposed, we are quite free to do so.

Our purpose, then, is to examine the state of Church life at Antioch, which is the most prominent example given us of an infant Church outside Jerusalem. There are several indications of Antioch's special eminence as a centre of early Church life, particularly from the point of view adopted by St. Luke in this history. It was the first main outpost from Jerusalem—a strategic point of great importance, at a distance of about three hundred miles from headquarters. From Antioch, “the uttermost part of the earth” seems more within reach than at Jerusalem, and that not only in the matter of distance, but in consideration of the prevailing spiritual atmosphere. Viewed merely as a strategic outpost, it became the starting-point of the three missionary journeys which are shortly to be described. This in itself gives a lasting distinction to the city. But, also, the circumstances of the foundation of the Church there make it plain that the prevailing tone of thought was admirably adapted to the extension which was soon to take place from this centre. Some of the scattered preachers, whose movements after the death of Stephen may be traced also in chaps. viii. and ix., were the first to sow the seed in this fruitful field,<sup>1</sup> and among them were some of sufficient breadth of view to preach to the

<sup>1</sup> The fact of the first step towards the foundation of this important Church having been taken by unnamed individuals is an example of the point that obscure disciples are often used for especially honourable service. Cf. ix. 10-19.

heathen.<sup>1</sup> Great success marked their efforts. It is uncertain whether these conversions were parallel to, and independent of, the reception of Cornelius, the work advancing in two directions simultaneously, or whether the direct work among the "Greeks" at Antioch followed the sanction given by the case of Cornelius.<sup>2</sup> Whichever be the fact, the coming advance is foreshadowed by both cases, and we may, at any rate, say that in Cornelius and his friends we have the first recorded Gentile conversions, and in Antioch the first largely Gentile Church.

The atmosphere that would prevail at Antioch, then, was especially fitted for the coming forward movement, which would not be so liable to be thwarted by the narrow prejudices common in more conservative Jerusalem. The geographical position of the city, and its intimate connection with Rome, gave it further advantages as a starting-point for the evangelization of the Empire, and, finally, of the outside world, while the terribly debasing heathen rites, which made it infamous as a stronghold of Satan, mark with special significance the triumphs of the Cross, which are recorded as emblems of the ultimate victory of the King of kings in all lands.

There are also other distinctive features of unique interest in this Church. It was the first main sphere of the work of Barnabas and Paul, and the circumstances under which they came there are instructive. Barnabas came on a mission of inspection from the central Church.<sup>3</sup> With broad-minded fervour, he commended all he had seen, and his faithful attitude was rewarded by further triumphs of the Gospel (xi. 24). His experience probably led him to feel that the circumstances were exactly suitable to an advance on the lines which, we may be

<sup>1</sup> The R.V. adopts the preferable reading in xi. 20. Even if they were of the same class as Cornelius, the point remains the same. They would be numbered among the uncircumcised.

<sup>2</sup> Probabilities favour the latter view, as the tone of the history marks Cornelius' baptism with such special prominence, and both St. Peter and the Jewish party seem to have regarded it as the first case; but there is no insuperable objection to the former theory. At the most, however, it is only possible.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the similar mission in viii. 14.

sure,<sup>1</sup> he knew were favoured by St. Paul (still hitherto called Saul); and he determined to seek his aid. Their early association is to be observed in ix. 27. The helping hand which he then extended to the great Apostle was now given, through him, to the Church at Antioch, and the two laboured happily and fruitfully there for a whole year, their long stay again proclaiming the importance of the work.

Barnabas is a singularly attractive character as presented to us here, and in iv. 36, 37 and ix. 27. Whole-hearted, single-eyed, and without the least desire for a solitary triumph in the work, he is one of those most favourably described in the history; and he, too, like others, was "full of the Holy Ghost." Is the lack of fulness which we often deplore sometimes due to the absence of qualities such as Barnabas possessed? Jealousy of other workers, and self-seeking in spiritual work, are fatal obstacles to the power of the Spirit.

So the two faithful leaders laboured on, and there is added a remarkable touch: "The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." Whatever the exact reason for the statement of the fact, it imparts one more distinctive feature to the Church there. If, as seems agreed, the title was first given with some scorn, it may testify unconsciously to the lives of marked consistency lived by the believers; and so, as is often the case, a name of derision becomes a name of honour. Further, a singular fitness in the introduction of the name at this particular point in the history is noted by the Rev. Harrington C. Lees,<sup>2</sup> who says: "The name Christian, Hebrew in conception, Greek in form, Latin in termination, is coined and applied just when Jew, Greek, and Roman are beginning to flow as one stream in Christ."

Such variety of statement about the course of events in an infant Church will not seem disjointed if considered with the main object in view. It is evident, as we have seen, that the position of affairs at Antioch was a very remarkable one, with

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Dean Plumptre in Bishop Ellicott's "Commentary," ver. 25.

<sup>2</sup> "The Joy of Bible Study," p. 90.

regard to what is to follow. Already we have seen abundant evidence that it was, as it is above described, "a living Church." But the greatest proof in this direction is to come. There remain two notable paragraphs which we have not yet touched. These, again, are not simply disjointed statements, but present to us from two points of view the feature of Church life which made it so vigorous and so fruitful. One word sums up the lesson of both. It is the word *unselfishness*. This quality was manifested by the whole Church (as we have already seen it displayed in another way by Barnabas, its principal founder) in two directions. There was consideration for the needs of others, both bodily and spiritual.

1. They sent famine relief to their brethren in Judæa. Here is an instructive picture. We may believe that the prophecy about the famine (which otherwise might seem to have a less distinct connection here)<sup>1</sup> is recorded partly with the direct purpose of bringing out this bright feature in their life. This young Church—itsself an offshoot—does not think that help is only due to it from the Churches of Jerusalem and Judæa, as from older and more firmly established branches, but takes the initiative in sending help to them. Surely we may find here not only a proof of unselfishness of spirit and a tender regard for the bodily needs of others, but an evidence also of gratitude for spiritual blessings received, and an indication of solid belief in the Communion of Saints. The spirit of the Church at Antioch is not yet dead. The boys in a Mission institution at Cawnpore, who sent their Lenten savings to the English waifs and strays, and the Christians of Tinnevely, who made a collection for their brethren in Uganda, were moved by the same Spirit of God in our own day as those who were first of all called Christians of old.

Various other points of great interest which have been

<sup>1</sup> Even if the presence of the prophets from Jerusalem is to be taken as a further sanction to the work (see Dean Plumtre in Bishop Ellicott's "Commentary"), the insertion of this particular prophecy demands some explanation. Other reasons are suggested in the following paragraph.

observed in connection with the collection at Antioch and the poverty in Judæa can only be noted briefly here. There is the suggestive theory (it cannot be called more)<sup>1</sup> that the chronic poverty in the older Church—afterwards frequently mentioned in the New Testament—was the result of the exhaustion of its resources by the liberality of the common fund—a theory which, if true, both illustrates the difficulties in the way of a permanent communism, and extols the true devotion of the primitive Church, and the generous recognition of it by the Churches of the Gentiles. There is also the fact that implicit reliance was placed on the inspired word of prophecy, as the collection was evidently made before the famine came, and the relief was thus despatched in time<sup>2</sup>—a further proof, too, of God's care for the needs of His people. And there is the much more important point that this is the first mention of the collection for the poor saints, which was afterwards so fully organized by St. Paul, and used by him as a bond of union between the Jewish and Gentile Churches.<sup>3</sup> There could scarcely be a more fruitful bond than the active exercise of unselfish charity such as we find in the Church at Antioch.

2. Even more impressive is the account of their concern for the spiritual needs of others, as given us in xiii. 1-3. The lessons under this head may be grouped round the Divine call, and their response to it.

(i.) The call came to those who were already quietly doing their appointed duty. As when Philip was sent to the desert, and Peter to Cæsarea, so were Barnabas and Saul called to a wider sphere while they were faithfully doing their allotted

<sup>1</sup> Especially as there is evidence that *all* the people of Jerusalem (not the Christians only) were greatly distressed and in need of relief, during this particular famine at any rate. Besides, the relief was not limited to Jerusalem (ver. 29), and there is no evidence that the other Judæan Churches had ever adopted the plan of a common fund.

<sup>2</sup> See Ramsay, "St. Paul the Traveller," p. 50, etc.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. frequent allusions in the Epistles. See Rom. xv. 25, 26; 1 Cor. xvi. 1-3; 2 Cor. viii. and ix.; Gal. ii. 10.

work ; and so was the Church called to give them to God while it was truly and devotedly serving Him.<sup>1</sup>

(ii.) The call is from the Holy Ghost.<sup>2</sup> It is not to be thought a light thing when a new worker is called to the Mission Field, at home or abroad, nor is the movement to be checked.

(iii.) The call of God is confirmed by the true Church. This is our special point here. What was it that this struggling infant Church was asked to do? Let it be remembered how much they had already done by a contribution of their means. And now they were called to send forth two out of five chief leaders of their number to the regions beyond ; moreover, the very two whom they could probably least easily spare. It is not, of course, to be assumed that there were no other workers to whom they looked up, except these five ; nor is it to be taken for granted that three of the five were comparatively insignificant because the names of Paul and Barnabas alone meet the eye in the subsequent record. We have not a full Church history of this period in the Acts ; and these two were the leaders in the line of work specially chosen for description—in fact, Barnabas himself drops out of the narrative later on. But, at any rate, these were the two to whom the Church at Antioch owed the most, under God. That is distinctly written. Consequently it might have been said that these were the very two they most needed at home. Yet there was no hesitation in confirming the call. They were “sent forth” by God the Holy Ghost, it is true ; but the Church “let them go.”<sup>3</sup>

The lesson is obvious, and the point need not be greatly

<sup>1</sup> The language of the first clause of xiii. 2 suggests that the call came at a special time of worship, just as Peter also was at prayer when he saw the vision (x. 9).

<sup>2</sup> Of special importance is the evidence of xiii. 2, 4 to the *personality* and *Deity* of the Holy Spirit—“separate *Me* Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto *I* have called them. . . . They, being *sent forth* by the Holy Ghost . . .” Such terms are only applicable to sovereign, personal Deity.

<sup>3</sup> In v. 4, ἐκπεμφθέντες . . . ; in v. 3, ἀπέλυσαν. . . . The latter word is the one used for *giving permission to depart* ; or it might be rendered “dismiss,” in the sense of our missionary dismissals. It occurs, *e.g.*, in iv. 21, 23 ; xvi. 35 ; xix. 40. In noting the faithful response made by the Church to the call to this surrender, we should not fail to observe also the faithfulness of those who were sent—Barnabas and Saul.

laboured; it speaks much too plainly for itself. What is, too often, the attitude of the home Church now towards the work abroad? Leaving out of account the critics and opponents of the work, what is the attitude of the Church? Do we always confirm the Divine call, or do we resist it? Have we approached anything like the proportion in giving, either of men or means, which was reached by this struggling infant Church in the midst of rampant heathenism? Whatever our difficulties, we are not in such a position as that! Yet how infinitely, how absurdly short we fall of giving two-fifths of our best workers, or, indeed, of giving anything which we really feel; and, whether the gift be of persons or of offerings, whether it be the surrender of ourselves or of our nearest relatives or most valued friends, the giving of what we feel is all that marks a genuine gift. Antioch had "heathen at home" with a vengeance! But the Church there was wiser than we, for it realized that it is only an unselfish Church that is either fruitful or even alive, and that the main object of the spiritual life is not the nurture of our own souls, but the glory of God in the salvation of others—and that the former end can only be accomplished by the attainment of the latter. For it is indeed true that concern for the souls of others brings a reflex blessing, and that a vigorous internal Church life depends upon a large-hearted external charity. No wonder Antioch was used as a mighty strategic centre! So might we also be used, if we would.

But encouragement is not altogether lacking in the present attitude of the Church. At Antioch we see "the uttermost part of the earth" in full view, and the armies of the King mobilizing for immediate advance and conquest. There is some ground for hope that those uttermost parts are coming at least within the vision of our later Church, and that the time of real advance and triumph will not long be delayed. To this end we must pray without fainting and work without ceasing.



## The Value of Training for Women.

By MILDRED RANSOM.

ONE of the greatest obstacles in the path of women who are obliged to earn their own living is their lack of adequate preparation. Parents do not realize how important a proper training is, nor what a splendid advantage they bestow on those daughters who receive it. Women who will eventually be dependent on their own exertions ought to be trained to the idea from childhood exactly as a boy is trained. While a home is still one of their most valuable assets, and while they still have their parents to back them up with sound advice and financial help, they should be trained, and no parent ought to delay till these great advantages are perhaps things of the past, and the daughter is handicapped by having forgotten valuable habits inculcated in girlhood. Some of the saddest cases of helpless destitution are exhibited among the daughters of professional men, and, above all, of the clergy. Such women have been brought up in comfort and sometimes in luxury; their bread has been buttered for them by no effort of their own, and, in common parlance, they "have lived at home." Their occupation has usually been to undertake all the small duties of the household that nobody else finds it convenient to do, to fill their time with as much parish and social work as they can manage, and, above all, to see to the comfort of their relations, especially of their male relations. They have usually received a fair general education, which has partially fallen into the limbo of forgetfulness, or has atrophied for want of use; but they have rarely received any training by which they are able to earn a penny. Complaints of enforced inaction are usually met by the remark that "there is no need *now* for you to go out of your home." Such a reply is unconsciously tyrannical. It implies a future necessity to go out and work, but forbids an adequate preparation. It also is a bad policy, for talents are smothered, habits of promptness are lost, and a desultory routine

of inconsequent snippets of work is substituted for a definite purpose in life. All the lazy people of a household find unmarried women most useful; everyone who dislikes darning their own socks and stockings, taking care of their own children, writing their own letters, doing the parochial work for which they are paid, praise this sacrificial system, and hold it up to admiration.

Surely it is a terrible waste of good material to bring daughters up so aimlessly. No parents who spend their capital in starting their children in life can blame themselves if fortune does not shine perpetually on their efforts, but no relatives have any right to appropriate the best years of a woman's life, if they know that that appropriation means a hard future for the daughter who gives so willingly and freely.

It is far from my purpose to decry the good unselfish woman whose place is in a home where she is needed to perform specific duties. Such women give up liberty, they sacrifice their tastes, they sometimes forego marriage and love, all at the call of duty. Such unselfishness is a valuable asset to the nation, and I do not tilt against it, but rather against the selfishness of parents who prefer to keep their daughters at home, waiting upon the family, in entire disregard of the future. There ought to be more individual freedom, a greater liberty to choose, and with it would come less friction, less crying out over injustice. For when the mainstay of the family dies, the outlook is black indeed for the delicately nurtured daughters who are faced with the necessity of earning their own living. They believe—and it is sad to think how futile is the belief—that, in spite of their lack of training, pluck and perseverance will eventually bring them a post which will support them, and their disillusionment is tragic. Their energy is unsurpassed, their courage nothing can destroy, and their hopefulness is an object-lesson to those who growl and grumble because the responsibility of their post is too much or the pay is inadequate. They have not the faintest idea of social economy or what they are worth, and they believe that in the same way that the Jane Eyre type of young woman earned her living as a governess, they can become

secretaries, or fall back upon that refuge for the incapable, a companionship. But day by day they discover that the only education they have been given is thoroughly unmarketable, and that they are repeatedly eclipsed by properly trained workers.

It does not seem fair or just—let the advocates of a high birth-rate say what they will—to bring up a family with absolutely no means of support in case of that most usual of all catastrophes—death. I do not mean that each child need have a provision allotted to it from birth, but ordinary probability should be considered. A man whose income has never exceeded £400 from all sources, and who has no prospect of increasing it, or of saving a reasonable sum, has no right to keep any child, son or daughter, in idleness merely for the selfish comfort of the household and to the future detriment of the child.

Men of the middle, especially of the professional, classes appear to entertain the most lively faith concerning the future of their daughters, while they have none concerning their sons. Here they leave nothing to chance. The boys are carefully educated, and the parents and daughters are pinched for years to provide the wherewithal; but for the daughters anything is good enough. And certainly, if a woman is going to spend her entire life “doing flowers,” darning stockings, and paying calls, there seems some justification for this theory; but, in point of fact, women are rarely able to spend their whole lives in these amiable pursuits. Most daughters expect to outlive their parents, and if they do and are not married, they will find it very difficult to keep the wolf from the door. A professional man who has educated two or three sons and launched them in the world can rarely do more than provide for the future of his wife, and the daughters—well, the daughters have to eat the bread of charitable relations.

It will probably be suggested that in many cases the sons alone are educated because the parents cannot afford to do more, and “the boys have to earn their own living.” This argument

is a survival of the time when women were supported by their relations as a matter of course, and when the domestic arts had not been removed forcibly to factories and workshops, but it is sadly out of date now. Brothers of the present day would be much surprised if told that because the bulk of available capital had been concentrated on their advancement, they were now bound to support their sisters, and the modern view that each unit ought to be self-supporting is a far healthier one. It is infinitely better for all the sons and daughters of a family to be financially independent, if possible, and it tends greatly to family respect and peace.

The line of least resistance is a favourite path to tread, and it is far easier to spend money on a boy than on a girl. The profit is more obvious. All professions are open to them, and the number of scholarships, exhibitions, and various other plums are legion compared to the small amount attainable by their sisters. Therefore most parents prefer to push the boy and hope for the best with the girl. But this ease of attainment, these scholastic plums, this width of choice for the boy, ought to weigh down the scale in favour of the girl if there is not enough for both. Sex is no bar to the boy; it is a legal handicap to the girl. A boy has, *ceteris paribus*, merely to choose his profession; the girl finds her choice limited to very few. Morally, the girl has the greater claim, for the difficulties in her path are far greater, and, moreover, they are absolutely beyond her control. Brains, capacity, and admirable courage have hitherto failed to unbar for her the gate of the legal profession; the executive ranks of the Civil Service are closed to her; she can fill no office of State; she is obviously unfitted for the fighting professions; she cannot become a parson, a sailor, an architect, or an engineer; and public opinion keeps her out of many places wherein she could fitly employ herself.

But the greatest obstacle to equal education and opportunities for sons and daughters is the attitude of the average man or woman to marriage. Byron's lines are still quoted, and love is still regarded as "woman's whole existence." This Oriental

point of view colours the plans of thousands of parents. But our race seems to be ever reluctant to carry out its beliefs; and while many parents assert that woman's vocation is marriage—and nothing but marriage—it is the rarest possible event to find daughters systematically trained for matrimony and motherhood; in fact, it is considered highly indelicate even to suggest such a thing. What is the result? Women undertake marriage without the slightest training in the care and nurture of infants, without the smallest idea of modern (or ancient) skill in housewifely qualities, and with no knowledge of the science and economy of food—with, in fact, no preparation whatever for what is declared to be their special vocation. We know more about prevention of disease and evil and the science of food supply than ever before, but of what use is this to the modern bride, who appears to be densely ignorant of everything appertaining to marriage except her trousseau? Parents allege that marriage is woman's true profession; then let them give their daughters adequate training and preparation. If a man has a vocation for Holy Orders or the Bar, his parents take good care that he shall be properly instructed and developed, but women are allowed to undertake the responsible and complicated duties of matrimony with no more preparation than they give to the various odd jobs with which their life has been filled.

We have been overdosed with advice on the birth-rate. It would be well if the women of the nation considered the infant death-rate. One of its direct causes is admittedly the lack of training of young mothers both as to the care of their own health and that of their children. In 1906, 16,385 infants died under one year old, and of these 2,130 died of wasting diseases, under which heading is included atrophy and lack of their natural food. Of these 16,385, nearly 5,000 died in the first month of their lives; and the mortality of all ages is greatly aided by the inappropriate food upon which many young children are fed. It is quite erroneous to state that this improper treatment and feeding is found only among the uneducated classes, for mothers and grandmothers of a higher class are equally

deficient in common-sense. They give infants "comforters" to suck, regardless of the fact that it is not possible to cleanse them, and that these "comforters" are undoubtedly the cause of many fatal diseases to children. A baby of my acquaintance sits and chews his father's briar pipe, imbibing nicotine amid the admiration of a delighted family. A rag dipped in hot water, with sugar tied up in it, is considered excellent nutriment in many homes, and the rag never appears to be washed or changed. Any worker among the poor will agree that the use of gin and pickles as infants' food is so common as hardly to call for comment. I once travelled in the same compartment with a well-to-do family consisting of father, mother, and four children, one of whom was a baby at the breast. Halfway to London all the children pulled mugs out of their pockets, and one child produced a doll's wooden pail, about two inches high. Beer was served round over and over again, and when we reached town all the children, including the baby, were intoxicated.

The infant mortality has now become so serious that our Health Authorities have taken up the matter, and Health Visitors are sent by the London County Council to homes of newborn infants to visit the mothers and improve the conditions affecting infant life. Several districts in London supplement these efforts by a supply of modified milk, and the results seem to have been excellent.

Ignorance of the science of food-supply is by no means the only cause of infant mortality. Carelessness and a remarkable want of common sense is responsible for much. The above instances illustrate this, and I may add that measles is a case in point. It is still regarded as a trifle, from which all children must suffer, and even among the educated classes children are still put to sleep in the room with an infected brother or sister, "so that they may all have it at once, and get it over." Tradition dies hard, and it will be long before parents realize that certain infectious diseases successfully attack children, not by ordinary course of nature, but because children are less able

than adults to resist them. The longer a child can be preserved from infectious disease, the better chance it has of escaping altogether, and of building up a good constitution. No grown person would deliberately try their system and upset their health by inducing measles or chicken-pox "to get it over," but would prefer to keep well. Why, then, should such a strain be put on delicate young children? If the lives now sacrificed to the great Moloch of ignorance could be saved, no one would need to trouble about the birth-rate. But in order to save those valuable little lives, in order to strengthen the sickly weaklings who owe their bad start to their parents' mistakes, it is necessary that fathers and mothers should have been taught the modern laws of health, and that they should not delay acquiring the knowledge till their marriage. Knowledge does not come by instinct, whatever our grandmothers may have believed, and the training of women in matters of infant nurture should begin in earliest childhood. If marriage is considered to be woman's vocation, it is high time that the advocates of this theory took active steps to train their daughters for the state. So common-sense a step would materially improve the physique of the next generation.

We belong to a highly organized civilization, and if we fall behind modern progress the consequences to ourselves and to posterity will be serious. Haphazard, untrained methods may have produced excellent results in past years, but they are useless now. It is no good to protest that what was good enough for our grandmothers is good enough for us. Our grandmothers did not enter the labour market; they were almost unknown in the learned professions; according to one of Jane Austen's heroines, "marriage was their only honourable provision," and the immensely increased sphere of action of their descendants was a blank to them. Other times, other manners; and it is futile to apply the maxims of bygone days to the twentieth century when social problems are concerned. Having lost control of the domestic arts, women have definitely demanded the larger life, the more extended sphere, and there

is no doubt that they will obtain eventually far more than they now possess. But in order to make the most of modern opportunities, and to insure a reasonable prospect of success to the worker, the economic conditions of to-day must be studied and proper systematic training must be given to fit the back to the burden.



## Studies in Texts.

### SUGGESTIONS FOR SERMONS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.

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

Suggestive book : Ramsay's " Luke the Physician " (= R.). Others quoted : Hastings' " Dictionary " (= H.) ; " Dictionary of Christ and Gospels " (= C.G.) ; Mackinlay's " Magi " (= M.) ; " Expositor's Greek Testament " (= E.) ; M. G. Pearse's " Short Talks " (= P.).

TEXT : " Rest unto your souls. "—MATT. xi. 29.

" **M**OST characteristic, most exquisite, most perfectly adapted to needs of man. There was no second Christ to speak those words " (R., 95). Three conditions of Christian restfulness.

I. PROXIMITY. " Come unto ME, and I will rest you. " " The words are as wide as the burden of every trial, and every sorrow men know " (R., 96). They have a real application to burdened sinners, but spoken primarily to tired workers. He thinks of them as draught-oxen (κοπιῶντες) wearied out under the yoke, and as baggage-animals overweighted (πεφορτισμένοι) with loads, to whom their master calls that they may have their weights removed. The words specially significant if spoken in Sabbatical year, when men were resting physically, and beasts found burden light and yoke easy (M., 113).

II. HUMILITY. " Take MY yoke, for I am meek and lowly in heart. " It implies stooping (Lev. xxvi. 13). This is not easy (Rom. x. 3). But He bent also (cf. Eph. iv. 1, 2 ; Col. iii. 12, implying Paul knew Matt. xi. 29 R., 94 n.). It implies servitude (1 Kings xii. 4). But what a contrast to Jewish hard labour ! (Acts xv. 10, 28 ; Matt. xxiii. 4 ; see R., 95). " Jesus discovered a nation under the yokes of law, of Rome, of sin " (C.G., ii. 843).

III. DOCILITY. " Learn of ME, and ye shall find rest unto your souls, for My yoke is easy, and My burden is light. " " Intense yearning for receptive scholars at a time when painfully conscious of prevalent unreceptivity " (E., i. 179). Christ the Carpenter must have made many yokes " easy "—i.e., kindly to wear. " A gentle device to make hard labour light " (Drummond). So here rest *discovered* as we progress *with Him*. " Yoke " implies a pair " (cf. Luke ii. 24, Greek). " Father's yokes always made heavier one side : then the light end would come on the weak bullock, because the stronger one had

the heavy part on his shoulder. The Lord's yoke is made after the same pattern" (P., 208).

Each command implies distinct crisis to be faced. Are we stationary? *Start*. Are we proud? *Stoop*. Are we dull? *Study*. Each of the three acts is effective only as it brings us into relation to Christ,—“ Me,” “ My,” “ Me ” (vers. 28, 29).



## The Missionary World.

BY THE REV. C. D. SNELL, M.A.

THAT there are two sides to most pictures is made clear by a comparison of articles dealing with the revival in the Far East. On the one hand, Dr. Harold Balme, writing to the *Missionary Herald* from Shan-Si, speaks thankfully of what has been accomplished, and dwells upon the changed lives of some of the Christians and upon their quickened zeal in the matter of winning others. He tells of a hospital assistant who exclaimed, “ This year I must win two or three men,” and of a doctor's wife who, confessing her inability to give any deep teaching to other women, said, “ I thought I could just show them that ‘ Jesus loves me,’ and tell them what that means and how He can save us, and then just teach them to pray.” On the other hand, a missionary of the United Free Church of Scotland in Manchuria narrates many sad cases of failure, and affirms that the real spiritual results were “ in inverse proportion to the violence of the excitement.” It is important that it should be recognized that the picture has the two sides.



From time to time gods are invented in India to account for grave evils, which, it is believed, are due to the malevolence of some beings. Thus about twelve years ago, so the *Chronicle* of the L.M.S. says, the occurrence of the plague led to a goddess of that disease being postulated, and there is now a temple in a village in the Mysore province of which the deity is called “ Plaguamma,” or the goddess of the plague. She is worshipped by all classes, and at the request of the temple authorities, Brahmans have recourse to the shrine so as to give dignity to the deity.



The workers of the Baptist Missionary Society have been gladdened by a great harvest of souls in Orissa, North India. Three hundred persons were baptized on one Sunday in April last, forty-six a week later, and eighteen more within another seven days. There were a number of others who asked for baptism but whom it was felt wiser to defer. The converts, who are from the lower classes, were won largely through the instrumentality of the Rev. Bhikari Santra, the Indian assistant-missionary in charge of the Patna district.



Temperance workers will be interested in a remarkable movement which is in progress among the Khonds, one of the aboriginal tribes of India. Their

leaders lately realized that their property, which they have possessed from time immemorial, was gradually falling into the hands of the vendors of drink. Accordingly a great assembly of the headmen was held, at which an oath was taken, attended by most solemn ritual. A large vessel of drink was brought and poured out to the earth goddess, as representative of the deity. The pot was then broken in pieces while all took an oath to abstain from taking liquor. Whoever should fail to keep his promise, his life was to become like the vessel which had been shattered into a hundred pieces. The vendors of drink, alarmed at their decreasing trade, made grave charges to the Government, and a special inquiry was accordingly held to ascertain whether the movement was spontaneous. At the inquiry the same headmen, representing some 46,000 Khonds, solemnly renewed their vows to the earth goddess. The people are now asking that the drink shops may be removed from their villages.—*Missionary Herald*.



The China Inland Mission is able to report steady progress during the seven years which have elapsed since the Boxer crisis. The number of stations has not materially increased, but that of out-stations and of chapels has more than doubled; there are now 1,157 paid Chinese helpers and 560 voluntary helpers, instead of 541 and 200 respectively in 1902; and the number of living communicants has risen from 7,774 to 20,993. The growth of the native agency is a matter for special thankfulness, as indicating that Chinese Christians are beginning seriously to undertake the evangelization of their fellow-countrymen.



There has been a certain recrudescence of the Boxer movement in the Province of Si-Chuan, specially directed against Christians and foreigners. The mission-premises and church at one of the C.M.S. out-stations of Mien-cheo and the houses of some of the Christians were set on fire, but escaped total destruction, and the wife of a mission-school-master was severely wounded. A few days later, at the beginning of April, similar troubles occurred at Chong-pa. Two of the school-children and a man sleeping on the mission-premises were killed and the house was burnt down.



The Bishop of Rangoon, dealing in *East and West* with current criticisms as to the character of native Christian servants, urges with great force that servants are much what their masters make them. But few of the latter encourage and aid those in their employ to be good Christians. Moreover, the example which is set before the native convert is often prejudicial to his faith. He sees that his master makes light of the duties of prayer, the observance of the Lord's Day, etc., and on the strength of that, he in his turn makes light of other duties—of truthfulness, temperance and the like. There is great need that prayer should be offered for our countrymen in heathen lands who profess and call themselves Christians, that "they may hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in *righteousness of life.*"

## The Bible at Work.

BY THE REV. W. FISHER, M.A.

FOR the Book there is no word as explicit as that which commissions the man. The circulation of the Scriptures has no counterpart to "Go ye therefore and preach;" and some point out that Christ gave no authority for such a work. In defence and answer it may be urged: (1) The Apostolic appeal was always to the Book, and for authority the Apostolic Gospel was founded upon it. While not world-wide, there was even then, through the Jew and perhaps beyond the Jew, a very wide distribution of the Scriptures. The knowledge, presence, or possession of the Book is involved in St. Paul's statement that "the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began . . . is made manifest, and by (*διά*) the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the Everlasting God *made known to all nations* for the obedience of faith." What is being done to-day had incidentally already been largely done. (2) A century's work with three to four hundred million copies must unanswerably demonstrate its rightness or wrongness.



Mr. John R. Kilburn, following in the steps of Dr. Baedeker, has been visiting prisons and hospitals in Russia, distributing the Scriptures. He gives a remarkable illustration of the power of the Word. Dostoevsky was banished to Siberia for ten years for complicity in a plot. Four were spent among felons; but while he went out a revolutionary he returned a great Christian leader. The cause of his conversion is given in a quotation from George Brandes, an atheist and a Danish critic. "A great change had taken place with him. During the four years spent as a convict he had only one book, namely, the New Testament, and he read it over and over. All exasperation died down in his soul . . . and he returned as the philanthropist among Russian authors, as the author of the helpless and the fallen."



Colportage is not instinctively suggestive of romance or heroism, yet it is constantly associated with much quiet bravery. A colporteur in Lower Egypt was advised by a schoolteacher not to go into a certain part of the village. "Why?" "Because they will beat you." "I am going there immediately." He went and was quickly surrounded by a crowd of Moslems. "What is your object in coming among us, who are of the Faithful?" "I come that you may buy these books, and read, and become Christians." "Are you not afraid to speak such words to us?" "No; even if you should seek to kill me." "Truly your religion is a true religion. God will give you no small reward for being willing to labour, and to be insulted, and even to die for your faith; come and dine with us." "No; I must go round the village." He sold fifty-five books in that village. The British flag must perhaps be recognized, but such work and such a worker cannot be without fruit, and certainly not without honour.



The Holy Land with all its "changelessness" is not stereotyped in its impressions. Probably few visit it who know nothing of Nehemiah's feelings and are not oppressed with a sense not only of spiritual desolation but also of a set, almost fatalistic insensibility. In few places, if in any, have missionaries more of those difficulties that depress and dishearten. A special interest, therefore, attaches to a colportage experiment made this year by the Bible Society. Up to the day of the New Constitution the distribution of Scriptures in Palestine had been confined to Christians or Europeans. An experienced colporteur, named Vartan, commenced work in January. Among other places he visited Jaffa, Bethlehem, Bethsaida, Hebron, Samaria, Nazareth, Cana, and Lydda. As well as opposition he met with great kindness and much encouragement. Hebron is notoriously fanatical. "If they buy your books," said one, "it will be a miracle." "During my few days here," Vartan reports, "I have succeeded in selling seventy-two volumes, and the Moslems have proved more ready to buy than the Christians in other towns. One old Moslem, who used to be the governor of a town, helped me by writing out the names of forty-seven villages and explaining to me about them." Altogether 1,771 volumes were sold, in thirteen different languages. It was an experiment, and while illustrating ready enterprise, it probably marks the beginning of a new and welcome development.



Siberia is a land almost as vast in its possibilities as its area. Since the war with Japan emigration from Russia to Siberia has been rapidly increasing. In 1907 there were 700,000 immigrants, and in 1908 there were 760,000. Cheljabinsk is practically the door into Siberia from the West. Here the trains are met by colporteurs, and last year 2,500 Testaments and Gospels were given to immigrants too poor to purchase.



New conditions are quietly, and if at present not extensively, yet steadily transpiring in the heathen world. An aggressive Christianity has provoked aggressive heathenism; and philanthropic and tactical models are being copied. A *Sannyasi* who has spent some years in the United States has returned to Calcutta to found an Indo-American Mission which will provide *zenana* teachers for Hindu homes. The instruction will include lessons in reading and writing in Bengali, elementary arithmetic, dressmaking, etc. But the special object of the Mission is to keep up the Hindu religious spirit in the married women, by associating with American lady converts to Hinduism. Such an effort means more than imitation and confession; it means more than the evidence of Christian influence. It forebodes new problems in the future; for a heathenism fortified in any way with Christian characteristics will not be the more subject to conversion. Rather, perhaps, will it become the more confirmed, because, by comparison, the more contented with itself. Such a condition should but mean greater call and greater opportunity for the Bible, because of the greater challenge involved; for the Gospel and its preachers would be cast not upon contrast and not upon superlatives, but upon the sovereignties, the great solitaries that allow no comparison because Christianity shares them with no other. Both for religion at home and Christian warfare abroad the Bible has vast resources.

## Literary Notes.

IT is an interesting announcement that Miss E. S. Haldane and Mr. G. R. T. Ross are doing a translation of the complete philosophical works of Descartes. Miss Haldane is, of course, the sister of the Secretary of State for War. She has been a student of philosophy for many years, and possesses, in addition to an extensive knowledge of the subject, considerable acumen as to the relative merits of the various systems. Miss Haldane has already published acceptable translations of Hegel's "History of Philosophy," besides a very capable study of "The Life and Times of Descartes." Mr. Ross is a member of the staff of Hartley College, Southampton.



This month publishing begins to revive. The "flat" summer season and its lighter literature is passed and gone and the real serious publication will soon make its appearance. It seems a pity that publishers should crowd practically into four months the publication of all their most important books. As the next few weeks come and go, congestion in book-publication arrives at a stage when almost an *impasse* will have been reached. But somehow the publisher and his assistants come out of the hurly-burly all right. Yet the fact remains that a good many likely books are choked in the race for a life. In America there are not such hard and fast rules as to seasons. Good books come out when they are ready; although, of course, even there, the tendency is to keep the summer months entirely to fiction. Even the spring in England is never so brisk as of old. Naturally, people read more in the winter; but there are many books of the lighter kind, not necessarily novels, which would sell in the other months of the year as much as during the last few months.



From Messrs. Nisbet we may expect shortly some very attractive volumes of reminiscences of more than usual interest, at least to the religious world. These books will come from the pens of Miss Agnes Weston and Dr. Eugene Stock. It is obvious that whatever Miss Weston or Dr. Stock puts down on paper is bound to be attractive from many points of view. The work of both has been, during the many years they have been engaged in it, of the utmost importance, and in different ways has had a profound influence. Dr. Stock's contributions to our pages will make his book doubly welcome to our readers.



Yet again I have to record the approaching publication of a new magazine. In this case it is to be welcomed. Any new effort to spread culture and artistic influence must be always encouraged. We are shortly to have a new monthly review which Mr. T. P. O'Connor is to edit. Now there are not very many distinctively literary reviews—I mean solely and absolutely devoted to books—other than the trade organs, such as the "Publishers' Circular" and "The Bookseller," both excellent papers, well edited, well written, and up-to-date. There is, of course, "The Bookman," published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton, a valuable and interesting monthly, and "The Book

Monthly," edited by that indefatigable literary man, Mr. James Milne. His monthly is probably more quoted than any other journal of its kind, while his "Personal and Particular" notes betray the personality and style of their writer. But a real, live, popular monthly literary review there is not, and it will have a hard fight to bring itself to be accepted, although, seeing that its editor is Mr. T. P. O'Connor, more than half the battle has been fought and won. We wish it a long life and great success. It will contain critical sketches of notable authors, book-reviews, and gossip about all that relates to the world of letters.



The bicentenary of the birth of Dr. Johnson occurs this month, and there is to be an exhibition of Johnsonian books, manuscripts, portraits, relics, etc., at Lichfield. Efforts have been made to secure as many mementoes as possible, and the commemoration has been advertised widely, so that it is expected the exhibition will be a thoroughly representative one; at least it will be highly interesting. The "affair" has had an almost "official" ring about it, seeing that the Mayor of Lichfield made the appeals for the mementoes, while the Town Clerk received them. Messrs. Bell published an excellent little monograph the other day in their charming "Miniature Series of Great Writers," in which was reproduced the painting by Eyre Crowe, giving a capital representation, a literary study really, of three great men of the time: Dr. Johnson, James Boswell and Oliver Goldsmith. The author of this little book is Mr. Lang Buckland.



It is certainly good news that we are to have this autumn what was probably the late Dr. Richard Garnett's last book, "The Life of W. J. Fox," who was a famous preacher and a fervent politician. There is a good deal of original matter in the book. Mr. Fox was one of Robert Browning's friends.



We have long been expecting the "Life of Christ" by Professor Sanday. But Dr. Nicoll, who always seems to get hold of early information about new and important books, says that it will not appear for some time, but that Professor Sanday will issue two other works before it—*i.e.*, a short volume on the "Doctrine of the Person of Christ," and then "Prolegomena."



Mr. Arthur Rackham, whose success and importance seem to make a great advance on each occasion when he illustrates a new standard work, has been preparing for some time now a set of illustrations for Fouqué's "Undine." There will be, in addition to fifteen plates in colour, quite a large number of pictures in the text. Mr. W. L. Courtney, the able editor of the *Fortnightly Review*, has made the adaptation of the book. There is probably no more original book-illustrator to-day than Mr. Rackham, and his yearly volumes are looked forward to with more interest each year.



"Fifty Years of New Japan" is a title likely to be used for a work promised for publication early this autumn by Messrs. Smith, Elder and Co. The volume has been compiled by Count Okuma, late Prime Minister of

Japan, and he has received considerable and valuable assistance in its preparation by a number of specialists. Their co-operation has been of the most useful kind, and as a result it is said that the work will be the most authoritative issued in recent times. It surveys thoroughly the modern and remarkable growth of the country. Mr. Marcus B. Huish, who is Vice-Chairman of the Japanese Society, has edited the book.



In a few weeks Messrs. Macmillan will publish a most important book by that intrepid explorer, Dr. Sven Hedin. It is, in every sense of the word, a full, descriptive, and picturesque account of his last adventurous journey. Altogether, there will be something like 400 illustrations. The title will probably be "Trans-Himalayas: Discoveries and Adventures in Tibet," and will be in two octavo volumes. Another important book of exploration will, of course, be Lieutenant Shackleton's.



Two "Tudor" books are appearing shortly through the Oxford University Press. One is a volume composed of several lectures dealing with Tudor England's literary relations with France in the sixteenth century. These lectures were given at Oxford by Mr. Sidney Lee in the summer. The title of the book is to be "The French Renaissance in England." The other volume is an addition to the "Tudor and Stuart Library." This is Sir Thomas Browne's "Religio Medici," together with the "Observations" by Sir Kenelm Digby, which followed the surreptitious publication of Browne's work in 1648.



The "History of English Poetry" is, undoubtedly, a very great and important work, and Professor Courthope has expended upon the production much skilled labour and considerable learning. Five volumes have so far been published by Messrs. Macmillan, and quite recently Professor Courthope completed the sixth, which is to come out some time this autumn. It is of interest to note that the first volume of this monumental work appeared fourteen years ago, and it is a real pleasure to know that it is about to be completed. It was no light task and responsibility which Professor Courthope took upon himself when he decided to commence such a work. Very few scholars would have thought it worth while to give so much time and labour to such an undertaking, and one is, therefore, all the more deeply grateful to the author for having so courageously stuck to it. It is probably the only exhaustive history of poetry published since that of Wharton's which was issued as far back as the eighteenth century.



To the *Hibbert Journal* for next month there will be added a supplement, price 6s. net, entitled "Jesus or Christ?" The volume will comprise contributions from many writers of prominence. Each of the articles have been, it is almost unnecessary to say, written entirely from an independent standpoint. Here are the writers and the titles of their papers: "Who say ye that I am?" by the Bishop of Southwark; "The Jesus of History and the Christ of Religion," by Canon Scott Holland; "One Lord Jesus Christ," by Father Rickaby; "The Point at Issue," by the late Rev. George Tyrrell;

“Faith and Fact,” by Principal Garvie; “Jesus or Christ?” by Rev. R. J. Campbell; “The Jesus of History and the Christ of Religion: the Approach toward Consistency,” by Professor Bacon; “Jesus Christ and His Teaching,” by Dr. Drummond; “Jesus or Christ?” by Principal Carpenter; “A Divine Incarnation,” by Sir Oliver Lodge; “The Idealism of Jesus,” by Professor Henry Jones; “Jesus or Christ? a Pragmatist View,” by Professor Percy Gardner; “The Christian Cult as Christ Worship,” by Mr. James Collier; “Jesus our Saviour,” by Professor Weinel; “The Christ of Theology and the Jesus of Religion,” by Professor P. Schmiedel; and “Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: their Changed Relationships in Modern Thought,” by Professor Nathan Soderblöm of Upsala. We shall look forward with a good deal of interest to this volume, and it should prove to be one of the most noteworthy symposiums of modern times. The writers obviously represent many points of view, though we should have liked even one more, that of the strong Evangelicalism of Principal Forsyth. Messrs. Williams and Norgate are the publishers.



One of the best weekly journals in America, and one which is conducted on a plan more akin to our own understanding in matters journalistic, is the *New York Nation*. There occurred the other day the death—the regrettable death, for he was indeed a high-minded man—of its editor, Mr. Hammond Lamont. The paper had always a high tone, but under Mr. Lamont’s able—one might almost say remarkable—direction, it had become a great force in the land. The character of the journal reminds one very forcibly of such a great English institution as the *Spectator*; and really this is distinctive praise which those of any political creed will admit. Mr. Lamont had been editor for three short years, but in that time he had accomplished much. Then came the end—sudden and swift. He succumbed under an operation. It was a fortuitous circumstance which enabled the directors of the journal to have at hand such an able successor as Mr. Paul Elmer More. He was the associate-editor, and now he takes sole charge of the fortunes of the paper. He has been making for himself of late an international reputation, through the medium of his learned and incisive volumes of Essays, entitled “Shelburne Essays.” These have undoubtedly stamped him as a definite and distinctive critic of letters in the Twentieth Century. His last volume, the “Sixth Series,” dealt with “Studies of Religious Dualism,” which included such papers as “The Bhagavad Gîtâ,” “Saint Augustine,” “Pascal,” and “Bunyan.” Mr. More has also written several poems, as well as a life of Benjamin Franklin. He is also a classical scholar, and was for some time a professor of Sanskrit at Harvard.



“Europe in Renaissance and Reformation,” by Miss M. A. Hollings, M.A., is a volume in Messrs. Methuen’s “Six Ages of European History.” This work is intended as an introduction to the study of medieval history.



A volume entitled “The Gospel of Rightness: A Study in Pauline Philosophy,” by C. E. Woods, is announced by Messrs. Williams and Norgate.

## Notices of Books.

THE CITY OF JERUSALEM. By Colonel C. R. Conder. London: *John Murray*. 1909. Price 10s. 6d.

[BY THE REV. PROFESSOR SAYCE, D.D., LL.D.]

Books on Jerusalem are multiplying, and whoever wishes to know something about the topography and history of the Holy City has an almost bewildering choice of authors before him. Unfortunately, the authorities on the subject do not always agree together, and the unlearned reader is apt to be puzzled by the confident assurance with which the most contradictory views are put forward. As a matter of fact, the materials are not at hand for settling most of the disputed points; more excavation of a scientific character is needed before the topographical problems of Jerusalem can be solved and its earlier history cleared up.

Colonel Conder's book challenges comparison with the learned and practically exhaustive work of Professor G. A. Smith which was reviewed in these columns a few months ago. In many respects it stands the ordeal. There is no one better qualified than its author for writing about the ancient capital of Judah; he was one of the pioneers of topographical exploration in Palestine, and he knows Jerusalem well. The work he accomplished for the Palestine Exploration Fund is a guarantee that, as might be expected from an officer in the Royal Engineers, his survey work was scientifically conducted, and is thoroughly trustworthy. Colonel Conder, moreover, has the gift of writing attractively, especially when dealing with history, and his book will therefore be probably found more generally interesting than Professor Smith's.

But we miss the cautiousness in expression which characterizes the latter. Colonel Conder has no misgivings as to the correctness of his own opinions—even though they are shared by no one else—and the absolute untenability of the opinions of those who differ from him. It is clear that he would have made a model Inquisitor in the old days. The topographical limits of Jerusalem in the pre-Exilic period, for example, are as certain for him as if he had accompanied Nehemiah in his famous examination of the city-walls. And yet on this particular point it looks as if he were likely soon to be an Athanasius against the world of scholars, though with less chance than Athanasius of impressing his own views upon it.

Here and there, moreover, there are slips or statements which make us feel doubtful as to whether Colonel Conder's scholarship is such as to enable him to pronounce dogmatically on matters of archæology and philology. Archæologists, I am afraid, who have not given special attention to Palestine, will close the book when they read that "the frescoes and tablets of the palace of Knossos, in Crete, are probably not older than about 500 B.C.," or that "Hellenic" influence was felt in Canaan in the Mosaic age, and will conclude that the writer's statements about Palestinian archæology must be of the same nature; while Semitic scholars will ask what business an author who writes "*elah* (or *elohi*) *hash-shemim*" has to discuss questions of Semitic philology. A knowledge of the Semitic languages, however, is not Colonel

Conder's strong point, as may be seen from his assertion that Uru-Salim (not Salimu, as he writes it), the Tel el-Amarna name of Jerusalem, is an Amorite word signifying "safe city," and is therefore equivalent to "strong abode." More philological errors than would seem possible have been crowded together in this single remark. *Uru*, "city," is Babylonian; whether it was also Amorite we do not know, and if the Amorite dialect resembled the Aramaic or Canaanite, it would not have been so. The word for "city," furthermore, is feminine, and Salim could not mean "safe," much less "safe" in the sense of "strong." Uru-Salim can only be "city of Salim." Uru-Salimi would be "city of grace"; "the safe city" would be Uru-shalimtu. As for Colonel Conder's further statement that the name of Jerusalem "has been read with certainty by Dr. Winckler," that also is a mistake. It was first read in the Tel el-Amarna tablets by myself, and then by Zimmern, with full acknowledgment of his obligation. I need not refer to Colonel Conder's "Hittite" etymologies of Palestinian names. His "Hittite" words prove to be "Akkadian"—that is, what is now usually termed Sumerian, but they are not likely to be accepted by the Sumerologist. Where, for instance, did he learn that *api* meant "waves" or "depth"? *Apsi*, written ZU-AB, signified "the deep," but *api* "waves" is as much an invention or misconception of Colonel Conder as his belief that *sar* "king" was "Akkadian." And once more I must protest against the assertion that the Khabiri of the Tel el-Amarna letters were Hebrews. Here, indeed, Colonel Conder is supported by several Assyriologists, but, beyond the philological possibility of identifying the two names (and in this case the Assyrian form ought to be Khabirâ), there is nothing to connect the two peoples together, unless we are prepared to dismiss as fictitious the Old Testament account of the Exodus and conquest of Canaan.

I am sorry to have to write thus about Colonel Conder's work, for on the topography and history of Palestine there is no one who has a better right to be heard, even where we may hold a different view from that which he advocates. And his attitude towards Old Testament history is one with which personally I cordially sympathize. It is all the more to be regretted, therefore, that he should give occasion "to the enemy to blaspheme" by adventuring into subjects with which he has not a first-hand acquaintance, and so weakening his case as against the "higher critics," who, whatever else they may be, are good Semitic scholars. As regards the question of Hittite influence in Canaan I am, moreover, at one with him, and feel convinced that when we have deciphered the cuneiform records of Boghaz Keui we shall find that many names and words hitherto regarded as Canaanite are really borrowed from the Hittites. But we must wait until the records have been deciphered before attempting to prove this, and not try to supply the place of evidence with imaginary "Hittite" words.

The larger part of Colonel Conder's book, however, is not occupied by such disputable matter, and can be thoroughly recommended to the student. The arrangement is clear, the facts are well chosen, and the work is interesting and well written. And it has been supplied with excellent maps. For a history of Jerusalem from the age of the Kings down to the close of the Crusades I know of no better book.

A. H. SAYCE.

THE EDUCATIONAL IDEAL IN THE MINISTRY. By H. W. P. Faunce.  
London: *Macmillan and Co.* Price 5s. net.

The Lyman Beecher Lectures at Yale, have always received great attention since the days when the series was so ably commenced by Henry Ward Beecher and Phillips Brooks. This, the latest, is concerned with the ministry from one point of view only—that of the teacher—with special reference to the educational ideal required to-day. The first lecture discusses “The Place of the Minister in Modern Life,” and is an able and earnest plea for the educational conception of the ministry as distinct from conceptions of former days, represented by what the author calls the liturgical, magisterial, and oratorical conceptions. We should, however, have liked to hear a little about the evangelistic ministry. Then comes a lecture on “The Attitude of Religious Leaders toward New Truth,” which emphasizes ministerial duty in the face of the enormous advances in knowledge which characterize the present age. The work of the ministry is said to be that of a mediator in coupling the generations, uniting past and present, and keeping alive man’s faith in an ever-present God. Lecture III. discusses “Modern Uses of Ancient Scripture,” and points out the bearing of criticism on ministerial work. This is the least satisfactory of all the lectures, because of its inadequacy. We ought to have had a much more thorough treatment of the question of criticism in relation to the ministry. Dr. Faunce is sympathetic towards modern criticism, but seems to be timid in stating its bearings on pastoral work. Holy Scripture is something infinitely fuller and richer in ministerial life than is here indicated. We can only describe the next four lectures by their titles: “The Demand for Ethical Leadership,” “The Service of Psychology,” “The Direction of Religious Education,” “The Relation of the Church and the College.” They are full of good things, ably and well stated, and are marked by real thought and suggestiveness. The last lecture is on “The Education of the Minister by his Task,” and is decidedly the best and most helpful of them all, because it comes nearer to the heart of an ideal ministry. The influence of the congregation, the spiritual demands of the work, the dangers of the homiletic habit, the prominence of women in Church work, and the intellectual stimulus which comes from prolonged ministry in one place, are specially emphasized in relation to ministerial education. These counsels will find an echo in every true shepherd-heart, and so, while our educational ideal is not quite that of the author, we have read his book with interest and profit, even where we have been unable to agree, or where we have thought his counsels needed supplementing, especially on questions of fundamental doctrine. We cannot conceive of any clergyman giving the book careful though discriminating study without his own ministry profiting and being enriched thereby.

THE REPROACH OF ISLAM. By W. H. T. Gairdner. London: *Church Missionary Society.* Price 2s. net.

This is to be the textbook of missionary study for use by several missionary organizations this winter. It is a fine testimony to the unity and comity of missionary work, that no less than seven Societies have combined to issue and use it, including the C.M.S., the L.M.S., the Baptist Society,

two Scottish Presbyterian Societies, the Student Volunteer Missionary Union, and the Young People's Missionary Union. We rejoice in this fresh evidence of missionary fellowship, and we rejoice also in the book itself. Mr. Gairdner knows his subject, and knows how to write. These two qualities in combination have produced a fine textbook. It is full of knowledge, scrupulously fair and yet definitely Christian, and, above all, instinct with a faith in the power of the Spirit of Christ, and an assurance of the ultimate triumph of the Cross over the Crescent. If this book is only used as it deserves to be, the results to missionary work must be great and far-reaching. We commend it especially to clergy for their own use and for the guidance of their people. Here is a first-rate opportunity for missionary study and work this winter.

COMPARATIVE RELIGION. By W. St. Clair Tisdall, D.D. London : Longmans, Green and Co. Price 1s.

[COMMUNICATED.]

This is the sixth of the Anglican Church handbooks edited by Dr. Griffith Thomas. To say that it maintains the high standard of the other five, is to tell the barest truth. The writer devotes Chapter I. to the "Origin of Religion"; Chapter II. dwells on belief in a Divine Incarnation; Chapter III. deals with Sacrifice and Sacrament; Chapter IV. compares Christianity with the Ethnic faiths; Chapter V. shows the universal idea of an after-life; while Chapter VI. is an illuminating summary. The writer speaks with authority on Comparative Religion, and has no difficulty in showing that Christianity is not *a* but *the* religion. Other religions are guesses at the truth; Christ knows it and tells us. Dr. Tisdall says that two great facts stand out in the comparative study of religions—viz., Christ's uniqueness, and the world's deep need of Him. A book written with such learning, temperateness, and power, is a great weapon in the Christian armoury.

FOXES'S BOOK OF MARTYRS. Popular Edition. Illustrated. Prepared by W. Grinton Berry. London : Religious Tract Society. Price 2s. 6d.

A bright and attractive edition of a book which ought to be in every home in England. We are deeply grateful to the Religious Tract Society for their perennial stream of soul-saving and nation-saving books.

THE CHURCH PULPIT COMMENTARY: ACTS XI. TO ROMANS; I COR. TO EPHESIANS. 2 vols. London : J. Nisbet and Co. Price 7s. 6d. each.

Again we have pleasure in speaking well of the above. The names of contributors and the matter contributed give an outward as well as an inward value to the outlines and comments on great texts and passages.

THE GLORY OF THE BODY OF CHRIST. By E. F. Ströter. London : Morgan and Scott. Price 2s. 6d. net.

The author describes this book as "The Opening-up of the Epistle to the Ephesians." It consists of a commentary verse by verse, and its main theme is the Church as the Body of Christ. The author argues that this and not the universality of the Gospel, is the theme of St. Paul's "mystery." Marks of scholarship and spirituality abound on every page, and even though we may not accept the author's main position, or his detailed exposition at all

points, it is impossible to study the Epistle under his guidance without obtaining intellectual and spiritual profit. It is a distinct addition to our knowledge of an important part of the Apostle's writings.

HAVE MIRACLES HAPPENED? By the Rev. H. T. Dixon. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

The author aims at controverting the naturalistic tendency of present-day criticism of the Bible. He takes up the miracles of the Old Testament, which he regards as outposts of the citadel, and he believes that if we surrender these outposts, the citadel itself will soon be in danger. The first chapter discusses the general question whether miracles have happened, and Hume's position is effectively controverted. Then follow six chapters dealing with certain Old Testament miracles, including the ascension of Elijah, the sun standing still, Jonah's preservation, Balaam's ass, the crossing of the Red Sea, and the three Hebrews in the fiery furnace. While we may not be able to accept all the author's conclusions, he has certainly provided us with a useful contribution, and it is particularly refreshing to have so definite a championship of miracles in these days of vagueness, hesitation, and doubt. He argues that as our religion is certainly supernatural, any attempt to set aside those events of the Old Testament which are undoubtedly miraculous, must, in the long-run, weaken the support of Christianity itself.

ADVENT TO WHITSUN-DAY. By Rev. C. Rhodes Hall, B.D. London: *J. Nisbet and Co.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

Brief addresses on the main teaching of each Sunday. Mainly practical, but somewhat sacramental in tone and aim.

THE CHURCH YEAR. By the Ven. W. J. Armitage. Oxford: *Henry Frowde*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

A key-thought is selected for each Sunday and holy day, and this is pointed by apt quotations, most poetical. The Bishop of Ripon writes a commendatory note. Evangelical and spiritual, though a little too summary in parts.

MOUNTAIN PATHWAYS: A STUDY IN THE ETHICS OF THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT. By Hector Waylen. With Introductory Note by Professor Burkitt. London: *Sherratt and Hughes*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

It is not to be expected that a new study of the Sermon on the Mount will contain much that is novel. Enough if the mode of presentation appears fresh and helpful. Mr. Waylen's book is certainly interesting, though his "revised translation" appears somewhat unnecessary; but the notes he has appended to his version are useful throughout. We see no advantage in writing Ieshua instead of Jesus; Galila for Galilee; or Mamuna for Mammon; and the practice of writing Greek in English characters is (we are convinced) absurd. People who read Greek resent it; and those who do not read Greek are no whit enlightened by the fact that they can *spell* the original, thanks to its English dress. In the introduction, Mr. Waylen gives us an interpretation of certain vital sayings of Jesus, which will be read with a good deal of sympathy by those who are untrammelled by conventional exegesis. In this introductory matter he follows—very closely in parts—the masterly little exposition of the Sermon on the Mount, printed (many years

ago) by the Rev. R. Govett, sometime Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford. But Mr. Waylen nowhere mentions Mr. Govett, so it is possible that the coincidences are accidental. Govett's books are difficult to get now; we commend, however, to Mr. Waylen's notice, his closely-reasoned "Reward according to Works," published about fifty years ago.

THE FUTURE LEADERSHIP OF THE CHURCH. By John R. Mott. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 3s. 6d.

A series of lectures on the Christian Ministry, addressed to "the leaders of the Church, both ministers and laymen, and to all others who are deeply interested in the progress of Christianity." They are largely the result of inquiries made in different parts of the world during the last few years, and formed the substance of lectures delivered recently in Oxford and Cambridge. With keen insight and statesmanlike grasp, Mr. Mott realizes the serious problem of the decrease of candidates for ordination, and he sets himself to discover the causes and to suggest remedies. We are not quite sure whether we should have laid such strong emphasis on ability as he has done in pleading for "able" men for the Christian ministry. We should have been quite content—and, indeed, we should have thought it on the whole wiser and better—to have emphasized simply the need of spiritual men; for, after all, we need men of all sorts, so long as they are spiritual, since only a few can be leaders. But Mr. Mott's forcible plea can be considered quite apart from this particular point, and we heartily commend the book to all who are concerned (and who is not?) with the future of the Christian ministry in our land. Clergymen and parents in particular should make a special note of this valuable discussion.

FAITH: ITS NATURE AND ITS WORK. By the Right Rev. H. C. G. Moule, D.D. London: *Cassell and Co., Ltd.* Price 3s. 6d.

A welcome addition to the list of works by our honoured contributor. Although the preface speaks of the aim of the book as "modest," and as making no pretension to deal with the subject scientifically or exhaustively, it is in reality a truly valuable introduction to the study of Faith. In the course of thirteen chapters various aspects are treated, and on each of them Bishop Moule has something to say which is marked by all his great scholarship and true spiritual insight. We could wish for nothing better for our students than that they should make a thorough study of the Biblical doctrine of Faith under the guidance of this book. If we mistake not, it will prove one of the most definitely useful of all the Bishop's valuable and welcome works.

SUGGESTIONS FOR BIBLE STUDY. By Rev. F. R. M. Hitchcock. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 2s. net.

This little book well fulfils its title, and in the course of its fourteen chapters thoughtful Bible students will find many fruitful suggestions. It is too sympathetic to certain dangerous forms of the Higher Criticism for our liking, and it does not carefully distinguish between a criticism that is legitimate and a criticism that is not. Nor are we satisfied with its treatment of inspiration, which is, in our judgment, inadequate and inaccurate. But these apart, the book as a whole will prove decidedly useful to discriminating students.

## PERIODICALS, REPRINTS, AND PAMPHLETS.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY FOR AFRICA AND THE EAST: ONE HUNDREDTH AND TENTH YEAR, 1908-1909. London: *Church Missionary Society*. Price 2s. net.

It is difficult to make people believe that a Report is anything else than a dry and uninteresting tabulation of facts and statistics, and yet the C.M.S. Report for the current year ought to disprove this idea. The almost world-wide mission-field covered by the Society is here reviewed; and to add to the interest there is "An Index of Special Topics," calling attention to the salient points of missionary information suitable for those who are called upon to advocate the Society's claims. Not the least valuable part of the Report are the excellent maps included. We commend this bulky but truly valuable volume to the prayerful interest of all who love missionary work.

THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES. July, 1909. London: *Henry Frowde*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

The two leading articles are "The Influence of St. Jerome on the Canon of the Western Church," by Sir Henry Howorth, and "Common Prayer," by the Rev. Prebendary Brightman. The "Notes and Studies" and the "Review" sections are particularly interesting and valuable, both to the general student and also to the scholar.

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA. July, 1909. Oberlin: *Bibliotheca Sacra Company*. Price 75 cents.

The first article on "Gifts of Healing" discusses various aspects of the modern mind-healing movement, as to which the writer's conclusion is that it is to be feared it does not wholly rest on such sure spiritual foundations as will enable it to withstand the shocks and storms of life. The fifth section of the "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism," by Mr. H. M. Wiener, brings to an end a truly valuable discussion, which we hope will appear in book form, for it will provide some striking and, we believe, convincing materials in favour of the conservative view of the Old Testament. Among the other six articles included in this number are the second of a series on "The Glacial Epoch and the Noachian Deluge," by H. W. Magoun; "The Atonement and the Time Spirit," by S. G. Barnes; and a particularly interesting discussion of the American Revised Version, by H. M. Whitney. There are also some valuable Biblical notes, with the usual reviews, constituting this an excellent number.

CHURCH SOCIALIST QUARTERLY. July, 1909. London: *The New Age Press, Ltd.* Price 6d. net.

This is the *Optimist* under a new name. It is now the official magazine of the Church Socialist League—an organization which takes a much more extreme line in the direction of Socialism than the Christian Social Union is able to do.

THE SEVEN WISE MEN. By S. R. Crockett. London: *The Religious Tract Society*. Price 1s. net.

A new and cheap edition of one of this well-known author's Scottish stories. Many will be delighted to have it in this very inexpensive form.

CHRIST OR SOCIALISM. By H. Musgrave Reade. London: *Marshall Bros.* Price 1s

The autobiography of the author, who was formerly a prominent atheist and socialist, and is now a keen Christian worker. The alternative suggested by the title, of course, refers to the Atheistic Socialism of which the author was formerly an exponent, and which, both on the Continent and in our country, is, we fear, the dominant idea of Socialism in the minds of many.

VISITOR'S GUIDE TO WESTMINSTER ABBEY. By Francis Bond. London: *Henry Frowde*. Price 1s. net.

This Guide consists of the seventeenth, and part of the eighteenth chapters of the writer's larger work on Westminster Abbey. It deals principally with the various objects of interest in the Church and Cloisters. It is well and clearly written, and has at the end no less than thirty-two admirably-executed plates. Ordinary visitors to the Abbey will need nothing more.

COMPARATIVE MYTHOLOGY. By Professor Max Müller. London: *George Routledge and Sons, Ltd.* Price 1s. net.

A new edition, with an introductory preface by the Editor. Even those who are unable to accept Professor Max Müller's position will be glad to read him again in this new and attractive dress. Dr. Littledale's skit is also a welcome part of this little volume.

COLLECTIONS AND RECOLLECTIONS. By G. W. E. Russell. CULTURE AND ANARCHY. By Matthew Arnold. Nelson's Shilling Library. ROMANCE. By Joseph Conrad and F. M. Hueffer. THE WAR OF THE CAROLINAS. By Meredith Nicholson, Nelson's Sevenpenny Library. ROMOLA. By George Eliot. Nelson's Sixpenny Classics. London: *Thomas Nelson and Sons*.

The latest issues of Mr. Nelson's three enterprises. The volumes by Matthew Arnold, George Eliot, and Mr. G. W. E. Russell are so well known as to need no commendation at our hands; and although the two volumes of fiction are not quite so familiar, they will soon introduce themselves to the reader's notice. Each series is as attractive as it is cheap.

HOW TO ATTAIN FELLOWSHIP WITH GOD. By the Rev. J. A. Clapperton. London: *The Religious Tract Society*. Price 6d. net.

A dainty edition of one of the most helpful of modern helps to the spiritual life. Our private prayer life often lacks point and force from the absence of method. If only the suggestions here made were followed, the result would be truly blessed.

THE EARNEST COMMUNICANT. By the Right Rev. Ashton Oxenden, D.D. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 6d. net.

When a book is circulated to the extent of nearly three-quarters of a million it would hardly need further comment beyond attention to a new and cheaper edition. Many a communicant has found his spiritual life helped by Bishop Oxenden's simple but spiritual suggestions.

TALKS ON EGYPT. London: *Church Missionary Society*. Price 6d. net.

An outline of six missionary instructions, with illustrations and recitations for young people. This follows closely in outline and plan the three predecessors on Africa, China, and India, and all who are called upon to work among children on behalf of missions should make a special note of these helps. They provide a wealth of suggestion and illustration, and ought to be in great demand during the coming winter.

SCIENCE AND HEALTH. Critically examined by Rev. E. A. Tindall. London: *The Religious Tract Society*. Price 1d.

A searching and welcome examination of Mrs. Eddy's well-known work on Christian Science.

THE DEVIL'S MISSION OF AMUSEMENT. A Protest by Archibald G. Brown. London: *Robert Banks and Son*. Price 1d.

A new issue of a much-needed protest about worldly methods in Church work. The title is forcible, but not essentially untrue.

COURTESY AS A MATTER OF RELIGION. By L. H. M. Soulsby. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2d. net.

A delightful talk, originally intended for members of the authoress's own sex, but equally suitable for those of the sterner persuasion. A little more reference to the Holy Spirit would make it a perfect statement about Christian courtesy.

IS MAN WISER THAN GOD? London: *C. J. Thynne*. Price 1d.

An argument against crosses and other ornaments in churches, including a good deal of historical information.

CHRISTIANITY AND ITS OPPONENTS. NO. 1. WHAT IS THE OLD TESTAMENT? By the Rev. C. L. Drawbridge. NO. 8. PAGAN CHRISTS. By Rev. W. St. Clair Tisdall, D.D. NO. 10. CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL REFORM. By Rev. A. J. Waldron. NO. 12. PRAYER. By Ven. Archdeacon H. E. J. Bevan. London: *The North London Christian Evidence League*. Price 3d. net each.

Four pamphlets issued by a very active London Branch of the Christian Evidence Society. The first on the Old Testament is not at all satisfactory, as may be gathered from the following statement of the author: "The Old Testament is not the Word of God, but a collection of the literary efforts on the part of the ancient Jews to express God's revelation of Himself to them. The spiritual experience (the revelation) is one thing; its literary expression is another." We are not at all surprised to find that in the discussion following this lecture the lecturer came in for some very serious handling on the part of secularists. Dr. Tisdall's pamphlet is like everything he writes, clear, thorough, and convincing. The other two are useful, but not particularly strong presentations. Each lecture was followed by discussion and questions and answers. Christian workers in the line of evidences will find some useful material here, but three of the four pamphlets need to be read with discrimination.