There are many strong Protestants who, as we said last month, are in favour of some modification of the present wording of the Declaration, which will obviate the necessity of the King stigmatizing the faith of millions of his subjects in terms which both he and they feel to be unnecessary and unworthy. But it cannot be said that the new Declaration, as framed by the Government, will solve the problem, and it has already met with strong opposition from two very different quarters. Extreme Anglicans object to the Church of England being called "the Protestant Reformed Church." Nonconformists object to the novelty of requiring the King to declare himself a member of the Church "as by Law established." The only people who seem satisfied with the new wording are Roman Catholics, which some would regard as not quite an encouraging and hopeful feature of the situation. It is certainly curious that while the present Declaration calls upon the King to repudiate Roman Catholicism, the new wording should require him to declare himself a member of the Established Church. Before these lines appear in print, the question will have been debated by the House of Commons. Meanwhile we will once again express our hope.
and belief that it will be found possible to agree upon a statement that will enable the King to repudiate membership of, and obedience to, the Roman Church while avoiding the present stigmatizing of Roman doctrine in a way which cannot help being objectionable to Roman Catholics. The suggestions made in the *Times* of July 22 by the Bishop of Chichester seem to us to form a useful basis for a revised Declaration. This country is determined to maintain the Protestant succession to the throne, and whatever changes are made in the Declaration, there must be no weakening of safeguards against Romanism. The letter of the Bishop of Durham in the *Times* of July 18 goes to the heart of the matter:

“In the Declaration, whatever may be altered, the critical word ‘Protestant’ must be jealously retained.”

In the course of the recent discussions on the Divorce Question, several leading scholars seem to have shown a remarkable readiness to set aside the statements of St. Matt. v. 32 and xix. 9 in regard to the one exception to the indissolubility of marriage. According to these words, our Lord expressly allows divorce to be granted for adultery, but both the Bishop of Ely and Professor Paterson of Edinburgh, in their evidence, gave expression to critical views which quite discredit this exception as an authentic part of our Lord’s teaching. As an illustration of the effect of this criticism on ordinary people, we call attention to the reference to this matter in the current *Review of Reviews*, in which the writer points out how easy it is, whenever we are met with a text that is difficult, to describe it as an interpolation. As the note goes on to say, the real question is “whether Matthew or the Church was the culprit who tampered with our Lord’s sayings.” And then this concluding comment is made:

“Who can estimate the extent to which this way of getting out of it will undermine the confidence of the man in the street in the authority of Scripture, which, after all, is the chief foundation of his ethical belief?”
It is always doubtful, and often very dangerous, when our view of an important subject happens to run counter to a passage of Scripture. In such a case nothing but the most overwhelming evidence should lead us to reject a passage on purely subjective grounds. For ages the Church has been faced with these words in the first Gospel as part of the teaching of Christ, and it will require something very much stronger than purely critical reasons for letting them go.

This attitude of certain scholars to the two passages in St. Matthew’s Gospel has called forth an important letter from Archdeacon Allen of Manchester, and in view of his well-known standing in the realm of Biblical scholarship, his words carry special weight. We make no apology for inserting the letter in full:

"Churchmen of prominence are using an argument in connection with the question of the teaching of Christ on divorce which is likely to be turned against themselves in ways which they do not anticipate. They argue that the words in St. Matthew’s Gospel, which permit divorce for adultery, are a Jewish-Christian interpolation into Christ’s teaching. Of course, if they are prepared to accept other critical inferences reached by a similar line of critical argument, well and good; but if not, they are on dangerous ground. They make use in this case of a modern critical inference because it removes from the New Testament, as a basis of faith, a clause which is very inconvenient to their theory of the relation of Christ to the Marriage Question. But the very same critical method which would justify them here would also compel them to come to the conclusion that the Lord’s Prayer has received interpolations in Jewish-Christian circles, and that St. Matt. xvi. 17-19 was in large part a Jewish-Christian interpolation.

"On the same critical method, changing only the alleged motive, it might be argued that the Baptismal formula (St. Matt. xxviii. 19) is not a genuine utterance of Christ, but a formula put into His mouth in accordance with later Church usage. These are only three cases out of a multitude. I know of no greater injury that can be done to the faith of the members of our Church than to lead them to suppose that the Church is prepared to reject words of Scripture on critical grounds only when the words in question are inconvenient to ecclesiastical theory."

As Archdeacon Allen says in another letter on the subject, "The faith of the Church rests on the historical basis of the life of Christ as recorded in the Gospels, and not on anybody’s
attempts to reconstruct that Life." And to quote the Archdeacon yet again:

"I hope that the Church will never attempt to canonize a modern critical reconstruction of Christ's life and teaching. Such reconstructions rest on presuppositions which differ with the individual scholar, and create as many Christs as there are critics. Anyone who is acquainted with modern German 'Lives' of Jesus is aware of this."

If the Church should attempt "to canonize a modern critical reconstruction of Christ's life and teaching," it will lead to results which will make the present controversy about divorce appear a very trivial thing.

Certain Churchmen are fond of pointing out the dangers of Congregationalism by its emphasis on Independency in virtue of the congregational unit.

But it would almost seem as though we Churchmen were in danger of a Diocesan Congregationalism which is fundamentally the same and open to similar objections. We have had some striking illustrations of this danger during the past month. (1) The Bishop of Winchester has vetoed the prosecution of a Vicar in his diocese whose doctrines and practices have been unblushingly Roman, as the letters of Sir Edward Clarke in the Times clearly show. (2) The Bishop of Truro has dealt with admirable firmness in disciplining an Incumbent in his diocese, and refusing him several opportunities and privileges of fellowship pending changes of ritual demanded by the Bishop. (3) The Bishop of Chichester has addressed to the diocese what may be fairly called one of the mildest of communications, in which he links together references to extreme Ritualism and to Evening Communion. Let anyone read the account in the July Church Gazette of a visit to "Three Brighton Churches" by a clergyman of experience who does not belong to any Protestant Society in our Church, and then ask himself whether the Bishop's letter is at all sufficient to meet cases of so absolutely Roman Catholic a character. (4) The Archbishop of Sydney has refused to appoint an
Incumbent to a church in his diocese unless he promises to abstain from the use of Vestments until they are declared legal, and the Archbishop, with statesmanlike courage, preached in the particular church, and told the people frankly, yet kindly, the reasons for his action. We naturally ask why the attitude of these four Bishops to Romanism should be so different. Are the illegalities and extremes such as are found in the Winchester and Chichester Dioceses to continue unchecked? Can they, on any fair and honest interpretation of our formularies, be regarded as coming within the limits of Anglicanism? Is not the action of the Bishop of Truro and of the Archbishop of Sydney much more in keeping with the "drastic action" which the Archbishop of Canterbury years ago declared to be necessary than the attitude of the Bishops of Winchester and Chichester? If only we had Prelates at home with the faithfulness and fearlessness of the Archbishop of Sydney, what a change would soon be brought about! The writer in the Church Gazette concluded his article in the following weighty words:

"Such things as I had seen and heard were entirely foreign to the genius of the English people, and I asked myself, for how much longer would they retain any respect and loyalty for an institution where behaviour of this kind was tolerated—behaviour false to the Scriptures, false to the Church herself, and false to them?

"Not for long! And what then? God only knows!"

We wish that all the echoes of the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh were as hopeful and encouraging as those to which we referred last month. But truth compels us to record other results which are not so cheering. A good deal of attention has been given to the utterances of the Bishops of Southwark and Birmingham and Bishop Montgomery, in which they maintained a view of the Church of England which was definitely exclusive in the High Church direction, and quite plainly sympathetic towards the missionary work of the Roman Catholic Church. Now, it
ought to be said, with all possible respect, that these three well-known Bishops are not to be regarded as speaking for the Church of England as a whole, but only for that section of it with which their views coincide. After all, as Dr. Eugene Stock aptly said, there are such people as Evangelical Churchmen, and that they have done something for missions the letters "C.M.S." abundantly testify. They have as much right to speak as Churchmen as any others, and we cannot think that those responsible for the Conference gave Evangelical Churchmen their proper share in the deliberations. Thus, in the nine important Commissions which prepared material for the Conference the C.M.S. was not given one of the Chairmanships, though we observe the name of Bishop Gore as Chairman of one of them. Where were such Evangelical representatives of missions as the Bishops of Durham, Manchester, and Liverpool, that they should not be appointed to represent the C.M.S.? Then, again, how is it that in the two Committees dealing with the preparation of missionary candidates, two High Church Theological Colleges were represented in the persons of their Principals, while no Evangelical College was given a similar place? Why could not the Principal of St. John's Hall, Highbury, or the Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge, or the Principal of the Church Missionary College, Islington, have been included? Once more, though not referring to Evangelical Churchmanship, it was a surprise to many that the honoured name of Dr. A. T. Pierson, of Brooklyn, U.S.A., was not somewhere included in the membership and work of the Conference. He took so prominent a part in the New York Conference of 1909, and his knowledge and advocacy of missions are of such great importance, that we should have liked to see his name included. We sincerely hope that he was invited; but the absence of his name, together with other features, inevitably suggest that the policy of those responsible for the Conference was to include High Churchmen somewhat at the expense of Evangelicals. We are by no means alone in this surmise, as recent papers show. While we would welcome all who are
willing to join in a movement of this kind on terms of equality and fellowship with their brethren, we cannot help wondering if too high a price was not paid for the presence of those who represented the S.P.G. It is clear that the S.P.G., as such, is not to be represented on the Continuation Committee of the Conference. In view of this, it is difficult to see what practical permanent advantage can accrue from the representation of the Society at Edinburgh. We are not surprised to learn that an American delegate produced a tumult of applause by stating that “American Protestants were not prepared to apologize for the Reformation.”

Some years ago Canon Knox Little wrote a book entitled “The Conflict of Ideals in the English Church.” We have had a number of examples of this conflict during the last two or three years. One of the latest has arisen out of the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury at the Edinburgh Conference, when, as quoted last month, he addressed his audience as “Fellow-workers in the Church Militant, the Society of Christ on earth.” On the same page of the Guardian the following words occur, which for clearness we put in parallel columns:

**Letter of Mr. Athelstan Riley.**

“With all respect to his Grace, I am obliged to say that this is not my view of the Catholic Church; that there are such things as heresy and schism, and that if I thought that the Church of England really taught that the Lutheran, Calvinist, and Baptist bodies, not to mention the infinite variety of sects, were all parts of the Church Militant, the

**Sermon of Dr. Donaldson, Master of Magdalene College, Cambridge.**

“Yesterday I received, with a request for my signature, a remonstrance protesting against the official recognition of the Conference by a well-known Church of England Society. I cannot refrain from expressing my earnest regret that any such document should be issued or any such action contemplated, for if the signatories had their wish, it would be the death-knell of the venerable S.P.G., and would also stay the progress and maim the influence of the Church of England indefinitely. The only possible justification of the action proposed would be the belief that...
Society of Christ on earth, I should very soon cease to belong to her."

all Protestant bodies in England who are outside the Church of England do not belong to the Church of Christ, and are not members of the Body of Christ. Is there any sane man who can maintain so outrageous a proposition? And if we do not hold that, what right have we of the Church of England to claim a monopoly of the Truth, and to assert that we not only cannot co-operate with other Christian bodies in spreading the Gospel, but that we cannot even consult together as to the best methods to be adopted to prevent waste and overlapping, and to achieve what we all desire? Such a spirit seems to me to be entirely alien to the teaching and example of the early Church, and to the spirit of Christ Himself. May God deliver us from this uncharitable, this un-Christlike attitude of mind!

There is no question about the conflict here, and it is quite obvious that both these ideals cannot be right. That Dr. Donaldson’s view is the correct one can be proved by most certain warrants of English Church history up to the time of the Tractarian Movement, and by equally certain warrants of life and experience in the present day. With Dr. Donaldson, we cannot imagine “any sane man” thinking otherwise.

That the presence of High Churchmen at Edinburgh was capable of misunderstanding may be seen from an episode which occurred at the meeting of the Representative Church Council last month. Canon Hensley Henson, in speaking on the Education Question, expressed the belief that there was an underlying agreement among English Christians generally as to the elements of Christian faith and morals, and, on this being challenged by the Bishop of Birmingham, the Canon proceeded to say that the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh was an absolute imposture at every point unless it could rest on the presupposition that all the distinguished and devout men who took part in it were conscious of a fundamental agreement of Christian faith. This brought the Bishop of Birmingham to his feet with the statement that “that assumption was deliberately not made,” and he
went on to explain that “there was no assumption of any kind or sort with regard to that subject made by those who took part in the Conference.” Canon Henson maintained his position, and pointed out how members of the Conference were enabled to join together in Christian worship and to repeat together the Apostles’ Creed. That the Canon was not far wrong we may see by a reference to this episode in the Church Times, which spoke of the Conference as a proof of undenominationalism, which concentrates on a common Christianity and leaves out everything characteristic of particular denominations. As the article went on to say, “the general opinion was that in this round between Prelate and Priest the latter came off easily victorious,” and it also expressed its regret that the Bishop of Birmingham “should have weakened his courageous response to undenominationalism in the schools by the generous error of judgment which took him to Edinburgh.” We turn from this to read, with particular interest, the address of the Bishop of Ossory to his Synod :

“At the World Missionary Conference there was continual reference to the Apostles’ Creed. Never have I experienced anything more moving than when that vast assembly, composed of representatives of so many diverse types of men and of organizations, rose and repeated that ancient symbol with one voice and with one heart. For them there was no thought of that creed as anything but the expression of the faith which united them. When we realize that the faith is to be a bond to unite, and not a fence to divide we shall have gone a long way towards solving the problem of the reconciliation of liberty and unity.”

This is a very different ideal of Churchmanship and Christianity, and it shows quite clearly what the Bishop of Ossory thought was intended by the repetition of the Apostles’ Creed at the Conference. “For them there was no thought of that Creed as anything but the expression of the faith which united them.” This is New Testament Christianity.

It is well known that extreme Anglicans hold in great abhorrence what they call Undenominationalism, and they never tire of quoting Mr. Gladstone’s words which describe it as “a moral monster.” But during the last few years, in connection with
the Student Movement, quite a number of extreme High Churchmen have been found at the Annual Summer Conference, taking part in the meetings and associating themselves with the members of various "denominations." But how has this been found compatible with the characteristic aloofness of High Anglicans to all such communities? It has apparently been made possible by regarding the Student Movement as "interdenominational," instead of "undenominational," and the former phrase is held to be the proper term for such gatherings. It is almost amusing to see the way in which "that blessed word 'interdenominational'" is now being used to explain and justify the action of High Churchmen in taking part in this fellowship. But the question naturally arises whether there is any essential difference between the old undenominationalism (so-called) as understood by Evangelical Churchmen and the interdenominationalism which is in favour to-day. Evangelicals have worked for many years in connection with such Societies as the Bible Society and the Religious Tract Society, and they have never had occasion to compromise their Churchmanship by any supposed undenominationalism. Their attitude has been essentially interdenominational. The same is true of Keswick and Mildmay—always interdenominational, never undenominational. About three years ago an extreme High Churchman addressed a company of Oxford men on the subject of the Summer Conference of the Student Movement, and assured his undergraduate hearers that Churchmen might go to the Conference quite safely without any harm to their Churchmanship! To those Churchmen present who had known, valued, and supported the Student Movement for the last fifteen or twenty years this was highly diverting, but it was received with evident attention as something quite novel by many undergraduates present. Yet this idea of interdenominationalism is only new to High Churchmen themselves, not to anybody else, and if it enables them to provide themselves with reasons for uniting with their fellow-Christians, well and good, for it will prove a spiritual blessing to them. Only we ought not to have it put before people as a brand-new revelation.
THE PERILS OF OPPORTUNISM

The Perils of Opportunism.

By the Right Rev. The Lord Bishop of Newcastle.

"We cannot tell."—Matt. xxii. 27.

I

Let me call your attention in opening to the circumstances under which this answer was given by the Chief Priests and elders of the Jewish Church to a plain question addressed to them by our Lord. His inquiry had concerned a matter of supreme ecclesiastical importance at that time, and I think it may help us not a little, as we seek to examine the situation which confronts us in our own Church to-day, if we try to trace the course of things which led up to this answer, to understand the frame of mind which finds expression in it, and the danger it portended and rendered inevitable.

We know, then, that, in its early history, Israel again and again displayed a fatal tendency to lapse into idolatry and superstition. Though the Lord had delivered their fathers from Egypt and its false gods, though by a mighty hand and outstretched arm He had brought them into the land of promise and established them there, they had perpetually been overcome by a hankering to assimilate their worship to that of the idolatrous nations around them under specious and familiar pretexts of breadth and unity. In the wilderness before their establishment, and in their own land after it, they were constantly found yielding to this tendency, notwithstanding God's solemn warnings as to the consequences of such a course. King after king misled them into it. Prophet after prophet prophesied falsely about it. Priests bore rule through their means, and for centuries this state of things continued, till, as a foretold result, the ten tribes of Israel were led captive by the Assyrian King. It was the same, too, in the case of treacherous Judah, for, as observation proves, history repeats itself. More than a century before the deportation of Israel we read: "They left the house of the Lord God of their fathers, and wrath came upon Judah

1 A sermon preached on behalf of the National Church League at Christ Church, Mayfair, W., July 1, 1910.
and Jerusalem for their trespass; yet He sent prophets to them to bring them again to the Lord, and they testified against them; but they would not give ear.” I cannot refrain from giving you the last words of this quotation as they occur in the Vulgate, and I commend them to your careful notice. “Quos protestantes illi audire nolabant”—that is, “Whom, as they protested, these people were unwilling to hear.” There are those who now tell us that you cannot find the word “Protestant” in the Bible. They might as well add that you cannot find the word “Trinity”; but what we do find most clearly are the truths which both these words express, while, as regards the former word, the criticism is the more unwarrantable, inasmuch as in Jer. xi., written on the eve of the Babylonish captivity, we find Almighty God declaring, “I earnestly protested unto your fathers in the day that I brought them up out of the land of Egypt, even unto this day, rising early and protesting, saying, Obey My voice.”

Well, the end of Judah’s failure to obey this protesting voice was the captivity, to which I have just referred, the seventy years of which appear to have finally destroyed all tendency to lapse into gross idolatry; but what we have chiefly to consider to-day are the evils which took its place. What were they? What was the condition of the Jewish Church at the time of the first Advent? Open idolatry, as I have said, had ceased; but what about opportunism, formalism, externalism, ecclesiasticism, and the substitution of petty rules and ceremonies for the weightier matters of the law and heart religion? No doubt the men who gave the answer to our Lord, which I invite you to consider, were great authorities as to the exact length and breadth of a phylactery, or the precise distance permissible for a Sabbath-day’s journey. They were great, too, in tithing the mint, the anise, and the cummin; but they had so lost sight of great principles that our Lord had constantly to rebuke them, while, on more than one occasion, as they found fault with some act of mercy wrought by Him, He had indignantly recalled to them the teaching of one of their own prophets, “I will have mercy, and not sacrifice.” Such a state
of mind as this led naturally to that frame of time-serving and opportunism which, in the long-run, always manifests itself in those who, having forsaken great principles for close observance of the petty rules of ecclesiasticism, put the latter in the place of the former, and grow blind to matters of really first importance and their own relation to them. Much had they to say about minutiae. But when it came to a question about our Lord’s great forerunner, who had recently stirred the nation to its heart’s core, all they could display or assume was ignorance. John the Baptist had been preaching repentance, baptizing, and pointing the multitudes who flocked to him to Jesus of Nazareth as the long-promised Messiah. What, then, had these accredited leaders of the Jewish Church to say about him? What were their relations to him, and therefore to our Lord Himself, to whom he had borne witness? It was at once plain that their lips were sealed by opportunism. The attitude of Jesus towards their pettiness and their misrepresentations of true religion was a thing unendurable to them. Their firm determination had long been, “We will not have this man to reign over us,” and, knowing that He was now teaching in the Temple courts, they devised a cunning question, which they fondly hoped would discredit Him in the eyes of the people: “By what authority [they ask] doest Thou these things? and who gave Thee this authority?” Then in turn the Saviour put a question to them in regard to their relation to the matter to which I have just referred: “I also will ask you one thing, which if ye tell Me, I in likewise will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, whence was it? from Heaven, or from men?” Now mark to what straits they were reduced: “They reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From Heaven; He will say unto us, Why did ye not then believe him? but if we shall say, Of men, we fear the people; for all hold John as a prophet.” So they answered, and said unto Jesus, “We cannot tell.”

Now pause and consider what was portended by this self-admitted inability (or shall I say unwillingness?) to define their
own relation to a matter of supreme importance which was then exercising the public mind. Who can fail to perceive, as he reads the history of the next forty years, that the time-serving spirit which dictated this miserable answer affords clear evidence of that growing internal rottenness concerning which an inspired writer tells us, "Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away"? Notwithstanding all that the Jewish system had prefigured, and all that they should have known, from their own sacred writings, of Him to whom the Baptist pointed, they refused to recognize as such either our Lord or His forerunner. They dared not to take their stand on what they must have known to be true, and as a consequence the end was sure, no matter by what means it would be brought about. And yet that end was for a time delayed. It is a remarkable circumstance that whereas their ecclesiastical system, which (in God's providence) was only provisional and destined to give place to another, may be said to have had its infancy for forty years in the wilderness, its period of dissolution extended over a like time. Those years were marked by fierce opposition on their part to the extension of Christ's kingdom, and culminated in a complete severance between His followers and the Jewish Church. Judaism and Christianity, however, could never have remained at one, for no man can put a new patch on an old garment. Finally, even the Temple itself, in the courts of which the reply we have considered had been given to our Lord, was demolished, as He had Himself predicted, by a foreign power; insomuch that the ruin which threatened them from within was completed from without, because they had failed to recognize the day of their visitation.

II

I call your attention, secondly, to an inquiry which, however sad and serious, seems imperative in view of the circumstances which surround us. I do not for a moment invite you to ignore the practical work which is being done by our Church at large at the present time. I do not ask you to think of petty diver-
gences in matters of detail which involve no principle. In a great national Church (and especially in one with such a history as ours) we must be tolerant on minor points. I do not shut my eyes to the fact that even fundamental truths may be looked upon from different points of view. One man will ever lay the chief stress on the relation of the individual soul to God, another on the corporate relation of such souls, a third on the relation of the whole body to those outside, and likewise on social questions. Probably he who lays stress on all these views is the best Churchman all round. But when we come to foundation questions—questions which in the past have split up Christendom into bitterly antagonistic camps—questions to which we can hardly doubt that the recent Royal Commission referred when, alluding to "breaches of the law having significance," they said that "these should be promptly made to cease by the exercise of the authority belonging to the Bishop," is it not imperative to inquire whether our Church still adheres to the views as to these matters expressed in her own deliberately drawn Articles and Formularies, or whether she is now hopelessly drifting and indeterminate? If the answer to the latter alternative be in the affirmative, and if, in a spirit of opportunism, such as prevailed in the Jewish Church, this state of things is tolerated and not checked, the questions naturally arise: Whither are we drifting? What prospect lies before us? Can we remain homogeneous? and how long can we escape the operation of the law thus stated by our Lord, "If a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand," or the result implied in the inquiry, "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle"?

I must leave it to you to judge how far the condition of things which now surrounds us in respect of fundamental principles, and the opportunism which ignores them, is analogous to what we have traced as portending the dissolution of the Jewish Church. For my own part, I shall merely submit a few inquiries which seem to me to bear closely on the whole subject. Suppose, for example, we inquire of professed Church-
men at large, Is the Bible a Divinely inspired and authentic record of facts, or are considerable portions of it to be regarded as merely belonging to "Asiatic folklore"? am I right or am I wrong in fearing that the general result of such a referendum would thus be fairly expressed, "We cannot tell"? Again, if we asked, Was the Reformation, which stirred this nation no less deeply than the ministry of John stirred the Jews, a Divinely ordered cleansing of Christ's Church, or an event to be repented of with tears and in ashes?—would the general answer be less indeterminate? Or suppose we inquired, Is our Lord Himself the only Divinely appointed means of access to the Father, through whom a sin-burdened soul may freely approach Him, or should our people be taught to rely upon other mediators, living or dead, in seeking pardon and grace?—do you think that even here we could obtain a more definite reply? Still further, if we questioned, Is the Christian ministry a Divinely appointed agency for the edifying and pastoral care of Christ's Church, or a sacerdotal order of men, ordained to offer sacrifices for the living and the dead, and therefore properly to be vested in the garments which in the Middle Ages symbolized this view of things?—could we get a united answer to this inquiry to-day? Once more, if we asked, Is the Holy Communion a Divinely appointed ordinance for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ and a means whereby the souls of faithful recipients are strengthened and refreshed by a renewed communication of His nature and His life, symbolized by the bread and wine, or is it in any sense a repetition of His great sacrifice once offered by Himself, in which the nature of the elements is changed?—would the replies, again, mean more than this: "We cannot tell"?

So much, then, for inquiries bearing on doctrinal matters—matters on which our Articles and Formularies have already definitely pronounced. But I have two other questions to propound of a different kind, and on the answer to one of these our very existence as an establishment seems to depend. First, what is the reasonable and necessary relation of a Church,
such as ours, established by law, to the decisions of the Sovereign of the State in which it works, and to which it is united, in cases where doubt arises as to the interpretation of its own Rubrics and Formularies? Bear in mind that not only has our Church in her Thirty-seventh Article deliberately assigned to the Sovereign of these realms the chief government in all causes ecclesiastical as well as civil therein, but something more: she has also taught her members, in her own Communion Office, to pray that they, duly considering whose authority the Sovereign hath, may faithfully serve, honour, and humbly obey him. Well, can you think that if this question were now submitted to the Church at large you could get any answer which would better be expressed than in the words of the text? Lastly, if we come back nearer to the form of our Lord's question to the Chief Priests and elders, and inquire, Is the work of other Protestant religious bodies—not in communion with our Episcopal Church—work carried on either at home or in the mission-field, recognized of Heaven, or is it merely of men?—would you expect a unanimous answer? or, on grounds not dissimilar to those which influenced the Jewish authorities, the old evasive reply "We cannot tell"?

May I not, then, well invite you to consider seriously the outlook of our present indeterminate position in the light which the probable answers to these inquiries throw upon it? Contrast it with the almost unanimous feeling which we are told prevailed on most of these points in the English Church in the early part of the last century. Consider it, too, in view of what a Roman Catholic Archbishop in England declared, only a few years ago—namely, that the doctrines of his Church were being preached from a thousand English pulpits. And to this assertion I may add another. I have lately read an utterance of a clergyman who has recently joined the Church of Rome. He was formerly a member of a community which is not only now regarded with favour in high quarters, but is also engaged in training candidates for the ministry of our own Church, and this is what he says about its teaching: "On
practically every point, except the supremacy of the Pope, we believed the teaching of the Catholic Church and taught most of her doctrines, as thousands of Anglican clergy are doing to-day." And if, after careful consideration, you come to the conclusion that this testimony is true, then I ask, Can you entertain much doubt as to what such a condition of affairs portends? Are the contradictions implied in these opposing opinions compatible either with permanence or unity? Optimism may hope to reconcile them. Opportunism may see fit to ignore them. Indifference may very likely smile at them. But, even suppose that no storm from without should burst upon our Church, can you hope to avoid the natural result of such a continued process of internal disintegration—at least, in destroying all esprit de corps? Has not the time come when, to quote a memorable sentence, "Tolerance has reached and even passed its limits, the sands have run out, and stern and drastic action is quite essential"? Should there not be some authoritative reassertion of what is, and what is not, English Churchmanship, and some assurance that our Church adheres to its own foundation principles? The twentieth century is demanding the raison d'être for every institution, and likewise the purport of its existence. But, if the growing dissatisfaction in England, combined with the internal condition we have considered, continues, is it not clear that we are threatened both from within and from without? As I hinted a moment ago, if the choicest fruit decays internally no external force is needed to bring it in time to the ground; but if external and internal forces combine to act upon it, then the end will come more quickly. I quite understand that the opportunist of to-day may shrink, as of old, from dealing with the difficulty, feeling that if he does so it will cause offence to those he fears; but recollect that, though for a moment we may evade the solution of a difficult problem, and thus secure apparent quiet for a brief season, the problem is sure to present itself again, and, when it does so, it will be in a harder and a harsher shape.

It now only remains for me to say that, with these thoughts
in my mind, I heartily congratulate you on the existence and marked progress of the National Church League, to which, I take it, at least the great majority of this congregation belongs. The main object of the League is very simple, and cannot but commend itself to you as of increasing importance every year. It is thus tersely expressed: "The defence and promotion of the Reformed Faith in the Church of England." I have endeavoured to show you the dangers which cannot for long be evaded if, through opportunism or for any other reason, our beloved Church is allowed to drift into an indeterminate position as regards the pressing questions of the day, and the great principles to which it has declared its adherence, to maintain which many of the compilers of our Liturgy laid down their lives. Our object may, of course, be misrepresented, and no doubt it is. It may be said that our League is a mere party organization; but we know that, as a matter of fact, it is nothing of the kind. Its first object is stated thus: "To unite in one association all members of the Church of England who feel the necessity of supporting the principles of the Church as based on Holy Scripture and set forth in the Prayer-Book and Thirty-Nine Articles." I have yet to learn that this object can fairly be described as a party one. If it be so, the position into which we have already drifted is more dangerous than I have allowed myself to suppose. What we desire is, that the Church of England should be kept true to herself, that the views which she has adopted as regards the Sacred Volume, the completeness of the sacrifice offered once for all by our Lord, His sole mediatorship with His Father, the character of the Christian ministry, the nature of the Holy Communion, and her own relation to the State, should be maintained, and that nothing should be tolerated that would symbolize the errors which before the Reformation obscured these views. We must be prepared for misrepresentations; but those who are clear in their own minds as to the supreme importance of these matters will surely not be greatly disturbed by any travesty of their position on the part of those who are opposed to them. Finally,
what we have to do is to ask God's guidance in our efforts to cleanse and defend our Church, to cling manfully and with renewed vigour to the light which, since the Reformation, has made our Church and country so great, so glorious, and so free. For, as we look around us we can hardly fail to see that the dangers which threaten us are real and alarming; and that the heartiest and most widespread support is due from Churchmen to a League which seeks to promote the definite objects I have described, especially at a time when, alas! if we ask, What is the attitude of our Church as regards the great principles on which it is founded? I fear the general answer must be summarized in the words to which I have called your attention this morning: "We cannot tell."

### Spirituality and Social Reform

**By the Rev. Canon H. Hensley Henson, D.D.**

It gives me great pleasure to be here at the courteous invitation of your President. I am not aware of any reason, whether of law or fitness, why I should not express the desire for closer religious fellowship with the non-episcopal Churches which I must needs feel when I observe their zealous and fruitful labours for the cause of Christ. The Baptist Churches have long outlived the heavy suspicions with which they started, and taken a recognized and prominent place among the agencies by which the world is being slowly but surely evangelized. If I am not misinformed, there are now in Great Britain and America some six or seven million Baptists, fully organized for pastoral work at home and for evangelistic work abroad. I observe that in point of numbers the Baptists stand third in the list of Churches in the recent census of the United States, being exceeded only by the Roman Catholics and the Methodists.

---

1 An address delivered at a meeting of Baptist ministers in the Baptist Mission House, Furnival Street, London.
In Westminster Abbey we hope shortly to add to our memorials the window which is to commemorate the name and works of the illustrious Baptist, John Bunyan, one of the greatest figures in the history of English literature, as well as a hero of English Christianity. No Englishman who values his birthright of civil and religious liberty will think without reverence of those obscure and persecuted Baptists who were the pioneers of religious toleration. We have all come round to their way of thinking now; but, none the less, we owe it to them that the tradition of English citizenship contains this precious element of spiritual freedom. The missionary labours of William Carey reflect honour on the whole Christian Church. The sermons of Robert Hall and Charles Spurgeon are widely read by the members of all the English-speaking Churches. In the present day it would be hard to find names more widely known than those of Maclaren, Meyer, and Clifford. You will understand, then, that in coming here I gladly seize the opportunity of offering my homage to the devotion and labour of the Baptist Churches, and claiming my place as a fellow-labourer in the same sacred cause.

The subject which has been announced has an aspect of religious assumption, almost of self-conceit, which distresses and displeases me. Perhaps I have been unfortunate in my phrasing; I am not sure that I have conveyed my meaning. In any case, the very last thing in my mind is any intention of assuming a superior or didactic air in speaking to an assembly of fellow-ministers, some far better fitted than I to address you. My purpose is to set before you some thoughts which have occurred to me, and to confess some anxieties, with respect to our duty as "ambassadors of Christ," and "stewards of the mysteries of God." Let me begin by explaining what I mean by these familiar yet ambiguous expressions "spirituality" and "social service."

The evident reference of the word "spirituality," as it is commonly used among Christian people, is to the usage of St. Paul. The locus classicus is the passage in the First Epistle
to the Corinthians, where, after disclaiming for believers that carnal "wisdom" which had so woefully misled the "rulers of this world," the Apostle proceeds to claim for them a "wisdom not of this world." The passage must be quoted in full, as it illuminates our subject in many of its aspects:

"We received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God: that we might know the things that are freely given to us by God. Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth: comparing spiritual things with spiritual. Now the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto Him; and He cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged. But He that is spiritual judgeth all things, and He Himself is judged of no man. For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that He should instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ." With this passage we must place the exhortation in the Epistle to the Galatians, where the practical obligation and, indeed, the inevitable expression in life of this inward illumination by the Spirit are set forth. "But I say, Walk by the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: for these are contrary the one to the other: that ye may not do the things that ye would. . . . If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk." Such language as this is applied to the Christian as such. The New Testament has very little to say about the Christian ministry. We can see it taking its place naturally in the society in response to the normal necessities which experience disclosed. "Spirituality" is the attribute of discipleship, not the badge of ecclesiastical office. Yet the common trait became very rightly the accepted condition of office, for how could anyone be a Christian minister who was not first a Christian? Naturally, men looked to find an exemplary character in those who stood among the faithful as their leaders and teachers. We, as bearing the solemn and awful burden of the ministry, have no right to resent, but infinite reason to fear, the interpretation of
the religion we represent by the illustration which we ourselves provide. The essential constituents of "spirituality" stand out clearly in the Apostle's language. Before all things it is a communicated grace, communicated from "the Lord the Spirit," but not *ab extra*, as it were a decoration conferred from above. It is a Presence within the Christian, strengthening, purifying, exalting, directing his natural character, making him "a new creature," but preserving every sound element of his nature. The "spiritual man" is in process of being conformed to the "likeness" of Christ, or, to use the phrase of St. Paul, "Christ is being formed in him." When we ask ourselves, what can be the meaning of such words, we can see that certain elements at least are included in the answer. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." We are referred to the Divine Master as the supreme example of Christianity. "Spirituality" implies having "the mind of Christ," looking at this life and the next from Christ's point of view, applying His standard of values to possessions, endorsing His estimate of success and failure, "taking up His Cross" and "following Him in the way." The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews brings his grand series of the heroes of faith to a glorious conclusion by a reference to "Jesus the Author and Perfecter of faith," a most significant description, of which the sense is obscured by the unfortunate insertion of the pronoun "our," which seems to separate Christ's life of faith from that of His followers. Christ's life is offered as the perfect example of the life of faith, which had been illustrated variously by the saints and martyrs of Jewish history. That life is described as involving a detachment of mind, a remoteness of purpose, an other-worldliness, in the sublime sense of the hackneyed phrase. "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them and greeted them from afar, and having confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things make it manifest that they are seeking after a country of their own, and if indeed they had been mindful of that country from which they went out, they
would have had opportunity to return. But now they desire a
type country, that is, a heavenly; wherefore God is not
ashamed of them, to be called their God; for He hath prepared
for them a city." This description is perfectly satisfied only in
Christ, "who for the joy that was set before Him endured the
cross, despising shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of
the throne of God." The sacred writer does not scruple to
encourage his brethren to hold on in their religious course in
spite of all troubles by pointing them to the example of their
Master, who, unlike them, "had resisted unto blood, striving
against sin."

The importance of insisting on the example of Christ as
showing the true content of that "spirituality" which is, if
I may so speak, the "hall-mark" of genuine discipleship lies in
the fact that thus the balance of truth is secured; for the record
of Christ's life demonstrates, what might not easily have been
believed apart from that demonstration, that this "spiritual"
life of faith is consistent with—nay, requires—a life of redemp-
tive activity. It is not a life removed from the contacts and
perplexities of secular existence, but a life in the world, realized
and manifested precisely with reference to the world's inevitable
claims and demands. There is a reading of the Revisers which
is extremely suggestive in this connection. When the Lord
was challenged by His disciples to explain the origin of the
blind beggar's calamity, whether it was caused by his own or
his parents' sin, Christ is said to have declined to answer their
main question, limiting Himself to the correction of their error,
and drawing a practical inference. "Jesus answered, Neither
did this man sin, nor his parents: but that the works of God
should be made manifest in him. We must work the works of
Him that sent Me, while it is day: the night cometh when no
man can work." The significant change of pronoun—not "I
must work," as in the Authorized Version, but "we must work"
—will at once arrest your notice. Our Saviour thus binds His
disciples into His own redemptive mission, and makes them
partners with Himself in the world's salvation. It is a Divine
commentary on the commission: "As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." Let me again remind you that in such words there is no limitation of reference to the Apostles and to the clergy as succeeding to their official position in the society of Christians. To disciples as such the words are spoken, and they come home to Christian ministers with special directness, only because they are necessarily assumed to be disciples, and hold a position of representative and publicly responsible character. The law of Christ's example compels us to unite these two factors, which tend ever to drift apart, "spirituality" and "social service."

It hardly needs that I should attempt any formal definition of "social service." Its range and character are determined by the reference to the supreme and always governing precedent of Christ. Such service as is indeed morally redemptive; as really "destroys the works of the devil," and sets up on the earth the "kingdom of God"; as comes under the description of "working righteousness," in that severe and penetrating sense which the words bore on the lips of the Author of the Sermon on the Mount—this, and this alone, can be meant by the "social service" which attaches inseparably to the Christian's, and a fortiori to the Christian minister's, duty. The range of that service, I have said, is fixed by the example of the Lord. If the "Son of man came eating and drinking"—that is, disclaiming the ascetic conception of spirituality, and insisting on correlating the spiritual claim with the secular obligation—then it cannot be otherwise with His followers, if they are perpetuating His mission in the world. If the redemptive process described in the Gospel extended to the physical, as well as to the moral, ills of mankind, so that the Redeemer stood in His generation as the Healer of men's bodies as well as the Saviour of their souls, so it must be now. The assumption of the "Christian Scientists" may be conceded, while the miserable misapplication of the truth which "Christian Science" implies is disallowed. Nothing less than the entire society of Christians is charged with the redemptive mission
which was Christ’s in Palestine nineteen centuries ago, under the
limitations of a personal ministry, and is Christ’s to-day every­
where on earth through His Church. To suppose that Christ’s
ministry, then or since, implied the disturbance and abolition
of the Divine economy of the universe is truly to make the
Redemption a principle of cosmic anarchy, not a power of the
restoration of cosmic order. The healing ministry of the
Incarnate is carried out in the faithful application of medical
science to the ills of men’s bodies, and may not be dwarfed into
the sorry caricature of the historic ministry which the dubious
records of psychotherapy present. The non-Christian physician
is as truly the exponent of that healing ministry as the Christian,
though he differs in this respect, that he owns not the full
majesty of his calling. The quack abates nothing of the
dangerous falseness of his character by insolently disguising
his quackery under sacred names. Part of Christ’s mission as
the Light of the World is the dissipation of ignorance. Will
any maintain that that mission is limited to the didactic efforts
of professed disciples? or that it is not being fulfilled by all
sincere teachers everywhere? or that the inherent nobility and
perpetual value of true teaching are not then only perceived
when that teaching is seen to be part of the process by which
the “light which lighteth every man entering into the world”
is fulfilling His eternal purpose? Apply the crude literalism
of Christian Science to those other beneficent activities by
which the social evils of mankind are slowly being abated. We
say of the economist, the politician, the diplomatist, the governor,
the merchant, that they are contributing to the ultimate victory
of the Redeemer in so far as they are honestly and painfully
fulfilling their respective tasks in society. We say that no
amount of Christian phraseology can change the essentially
anti-Christian character of false economy, dishonest politics,
selfish diplomacy, tyrannous government, unfair trade; and that
only when all social functions are seen in connection with Christ’s
mission of redemptive mercy are they able to take their true
greatness, and discover the whole gravity of their debasement.
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It would be just as reasonable to call on Christians to expect that they might miraculously multiply "loaves and fishes" by the power of faith, because the Master is said to have done as much in the days of His flesh, as to tell them that they can dispense with medical and surgical science, because, forsooth, He is said to have worked miracles of healing. Such crude literalism is precisely the religious error which He emphatically condemned when He declared that "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing."

"Spirituality" and "social service," thus inseparably united in the Gospel, have been found hard to combine in Christian experience. At first the tendency was to magnify "spirituality" at the expense of "social service"; later, the tendency was to exalt "social service" at the expense of "spirituality." In the first days there were many excuses for the ascetic misreading of discipleship which prevailed. The "world"—i.e., the organized system of society—was opposed to the faith. The Church and the State were ranged against one another as confessed enemies. For the clear affirmation of the Christian message, for the satisfaction of the Christian conscience, for the protection of the Christian character, there seemed plain necessity for an attitude of aloofness towards the world. Society was so deeply corrupt that it seemed to need no argument that a Christian's duty was to come out of it. The contemporaries of Nero and Domitian were at no loss to give practical application to the stern language of the Apostle: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the vainglory of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world." When, however, the "world" itself came to profess Christianity with the conversion of Constantine, a dramatic change passed over the scene. A new meaning had to be found for the old language; or, rather, the old meaning had to receive a limited application. From the third century the Church has never been without movements of moral protest against the secularization of Chris-
tianity. The Montanists were but the leaders of a great army of devout persons who claimed heroically, but irrationally, that the old relationship of Church and world, which had existed in the days of the primitive conflict, should be perpetuated. On the side of the Catholic Church there was accepted the truly lamentable notion of two standards of Christian obligation—one for the clergy and another for the laity, one for the "secular" clergy and another for the "regular." Christians were divided into laymen and "religious." The Reformation was a great revolt against this unnatural separation. At all hazards, those whom God had joined together must not by man be put asunder. "Spirituality" and "social service," religion and good citizenship, must be again combined. It was a great movement in the Church "back to Christ." Yet very soon the old situation reappeared, and for the old reasons. The enormous disturbance of traditional beliefs and disciplines implied in the process of Reformation did unquestionably lower for the time the moral temperature of Christendom. While the revolting Churches were fighting for their lives against the forces of the counter-Reformation, all the higher concerns of Christianity were subordinated to the immediate issues of controversy and conflict. Against the extreme and prevailing wickedness of the time, pious men began to use the old language of asceticism, and order themselves as exiles from the main tradition of secular life. Time has rectified the proportions of the faith in many directions. We are perceiving again that the truth lay neither with the Puritans, nor with those who persecuted them; that the ancient problem must not be violently solved by a sacrifice of one or other of the twin essentials, since its essence does precisely consist in the combination of the two. It is easy to separate, and serve the separated factor; easy to be a recluse, easy also to be a philanthropist. The really difficult thing is to take the "spirituality" which the recluse is seeking, and the "social reform" which the philanthropist pursues, and hold them resolutely together in a permanent and harmonious unity.
We have been hearing much lately of the "New Theology." I refer to it now, not for any formal discussion, but in order to illustrate the statement that this separation of elements, which at all hazards must be held in combination, has proceeded far among us, and is a very urgent peril. I have read Mr. Campbell's two books," "The New Theology and "Christianity and the Social Order," several times, and every time I feel more than ever convinced that they are most fairly to be judged as the utterance of reaction against a lopsided conception of "spirituality." Like most such reactionary utterances, they fall into the error of over-statement. As the conventional Puritanism, which the writer repudiates, had dangerously belittled the social obligation of Christianity, so he even more dangerously belittles the "spirituality." Indeed, he has carried his exaggeration to the length of denying that there is any reality in the old problem which has agitated the thought and troubled the conscience of Christian men from the first. Christ's Gospel, we are plainly told, had no other reference than that which is suggested by the phrase "Social Reform." One sentence must suffice:

"The one undeniable and all-important fact about the preaching of this greatest of the sons of men is that it was inspired by the coming of a better day and an ideal human society on earth. He never says a word about going to heaven, for the plain and simple reason that all His hopes were bound up with the realization of heaven here. His illusions were those of the period in which, and the people among whom, He did His work; His ideal is for all time, and is the inspiration of all that is best and noblest in human aspiration and effort to-day" ("Christianity and the Social Order," p. 87).

I make no further comment on these words than that they are the foundation of a frank identification of Christianity and Socialism. For our present purpose they serve to illustrate a tendency which is affecting all the Christian Churches.

I am aware, of course, that I have brought my thesis to a point at which it is probable that we might differ. Be sure that I claim no special wisdom, still less any kind of infallibility, if, in the conclusion of my address, I venture to make a few observations on the duty of the Christian minister with respect to "social reform." First, then, I would insist that our primary
duty is to make sure that "spirituality" is affirmed, and illustrated in our teaching and in our lives. In a true sense, which can never become obsolete, the Christian is "a stranger and pilgrim" on earth; his home is not here; his heart may not be here. He "looks for the city which hath the foundations whose builder and maker is God." His "citizenship is in heaven." Other-worldly he may not pretend to deny that he is. He believes with St. Paul that "the things which are not seen are eternal," that "we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ," that "His life is hid with Christ in God." As a Christian minister his supreme privilege and special duty are, in season and out of season, to insist on these truths. This is his true métier, the contribution to the general life of society which he is charged to make. So doing, he will assist in the ultimate solution of the social problem, and restrain economists and politicians from the sin which so easily besets them—the sin of mere secularism. His message to them is that which Coleridge phrased so happily when he said that "not without celestial observations can even terrestrial charts be accurately constructed." The practical question for him to consider is, whether he will be helped or hindered in his duty by descending into the arena of political conflict, and facing men in the suspected character of a partisan. That question must be finally answered by every Christian minister for himself, but surely we may agree that the guiding principle throughout must be a clear and just perception of the minister's proper business. Every course of action which implies a departure from the line of manifest duty must be rigorously criticized, and only allowed when its rightness has been made clear to the preacher's conscience. Exceptional circumstances may demand in the future, as in the past, that the Christian minister should become the leader of political opinion, or the organizer of social reform; but normally it will not be in those characters that he will fulfil his ministry. He is concerned primarily with men's characters, not with their circumstances; by reforming the first he aspires to make them masters of the last. Any action which
tends to obscure the ultimate purpose of his ministry is doubtful, and may be dangerously wrong. The note of Christian witness is spirituality; and the effect of Christian witness is spiritual-mindedness. The spirituality of the Gospel does not mean its remoteness from common life, but its power to transfigure common life into something enduring and sublime. The spirituality of preaching is not shown by a manifest lack of relevance to the interests and activities of citizenship, but by a subjection of all these to the Spirit of Christ. The spirituality of the preacher does not mean that he moves through life with the helplessness of a recluse and the unconsciousness of a child, but that he lives ever in the great Taskmaster's Eye, and sees his duties, domestic, civic, political, not less than official, as so many interpretations of his Master's claim. The opposite of spirituality is secularity, and it is secularity which has always been, and always will be, the besetting danger of the Christian, and pre-eminently of the Christian minister. The power of his message and the impression made by his example are inseparably linked, for "the world is better able to read the nature of Religion in a man's life than in the Bible," and a fortiori than in sermons. It were no extravagant, or even gravely inadequate, description of Christian preaching to say that it is always directed against secularity, that "mind of the flesh" which is in perpetual conflict with the "mind of the spirit." The Christian life is a gradual and advancing conquest of secularity. I believe it is difficult to overestimate the value to society at the present time of spiritual preaching, and the gravity of the loss which any secularizing of the Christian pulpit will inflict on the course and future of social reform.
Ancient and Modern Christologies.¹

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR JAMES ORR, D.D.,

Glasgow.

Dr. Sanday speaks of this volume as, he hopes, the last of his preliminary studies in view of his long-projected "Life of Christ," and the range and freshness of the studies whet the appetite for the appearance of the book which is to be their outcome. It is to be hoped that nothing will interfere with the completion of this, the writer's life-task. The work, at least, should not be much longer delayed. One may be permitted also to express the wish that so much absorption in the opinions of others about Christ will not unduly withdraw attention from the central figure Himself as depicted in the Gospels, or detract from the originality of a first-hand presentation of His character and claims.

The present work is historical, yet within the limits of a strict regard for the end in view, of furnishing aid in the shaping of a more complete conception. The ancient development culminated in the Chalcedonian doctrine of the two natures, to which so much modern objection has been taken. It is when Dr. Sanday turns to the modern Christologies that the real interest of his work begins. His concluding chapters gather up results, and discuss the presuppositions and possibilities of a satisfactory modern Christology.

What cannot but impress the reader of Dr. Sanday's volume is the irenical spirit that pervades it. This is manifest in the book throughout. Himself persuaded of the truth of the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity and of the full Deity of Christ, Dr. Sanday recognizes the perplexities that inhere in the discussion of these mysteries, and is prepared always to take the most sympathetic view possible of the adversary. Gnostics, Monarchians, Church Fathers, whose doctrine is defective, all

have a kind word said of them. The only exception is Arianism, which is not credited with any saving merit, save, perhaps, in its missionary efforts. It is the same with the teeming modern Christologies. Dr. Sanday believes he has a call to mediate between opposing types of thought, and he does so without stint. His catholicity of spirit enables him to take in all types—Hegelian, Ritschlian, Mystical, Liberal, Orthodox, even an extremist like Schmiedel, whose admission, "It is a very serious question whether we to-day should possess Christianity at all if Jesus had not been interpreted as a Divine being," is justly emphasized. Meanwhile he does not fail to indicate what he takes to be the weak side of the several theories. He is not sure that in Christology Hegel "is not even now some way in advance of many who believe themselves to have got beyond him"; but he thinks "his formula is too predominatingly intellectual," and his method too a priori. Of T. H. Green he speaks with enthusiasm. He is deeply impressed with Ritschl, but contends, "The human mind will not permanently renounce the attempt to find a theory of the universe which shall include all being, even the highest." He takes a most favourable view of mysticism, and insists on the mystical element as of the essence of Christianity.

Dr. Sanday reaches the kernel of his subject in his fourth lecture, where he remarks that "the longer I study the course of contemporary thought, and especially contemporary Christian thought, in relation to religion, the more distinctly does it seem to crystallize in two main types." "I will call the one," he goes on, "'full Christianity,' and the other 'reduced Christianity'; and each of these, as it seems to me, has a Christology of its own." Allowing for shades and degrees, he connects the latter chiefly with the Liberal schools in Germany; the other, he thinks, prevails in England. The "full Christianity" recognizes and upholds the true Deity of Christ, and, as involved in this, the Trinity of the Godhead. The "reduced Christianity" starts from the manhood, and is essentially humanitarian in its estimate of Christ. Among its representatives may be named
ANCIENT AND MODERN CHRISTOLOGIES

Wernle, Bousset, Johannes Weiss, Harnack, Jülicher. Here he finds "the strongest dividing-line between German Liberalism and ourselves," and allows that, "stated boldly, and without regard to the contexts in each case, the gulf will seem impassable." Ritschl, he says, puts the doctrine of the Godhead of Christ in the forefront—in a manner, many will think, which really surrendered it—but he concedes that "not all, but by far the greater part, of his followers, and all the more pronounced Liberals, who are independent of them, would deliberately put it (the Deity of Christ) on one side." Dr. Sanday, however, tries to mediate, and is willing to accept this "reduced Christianity" as far as it will go. We gravely question whether his praiseworthy charity does not carry him here too far. The cleft between the two conceptions of Christ is too deep to be ever successfully bridged over. It is not two "types" of genuine Christianity which are involved, but two Christianities, one of which affirms and the other denies the central article of the Incarnation, without which the whole edifice of the Christianity of the New Testament collapses. If this is not evident on the bare statement of it, it should become evident when brought to the test in one vital point, to which, strangely enough, Dr. Sanday does not, so far as we notice, refer in this connection—viz., the sinlessness of Christ. It is the case that, in agreement with their humanitarian postulate, most of the modern writers of this school—Wernle and the rest—give up this claim of sinlessness for Christ. Is Dr. Sanday prepared to concede that this is compatible with even a "reduced" Christianity? "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid." But this assuredly is not that Apostolic foundation.

Probably the part of the volume to which most attention will be directed is Dr. Sanday's attempt to lay down the lines of a "modern Christology," which shall, as he thinks, conserve the essential Deity of Christ, yet avoid the difficulties usually felt in the doctrine of the two natures. On this doctrine doubt may be expressed in passing whether it is quite just to interpret it as meaning a duality in Christ's consciousness—human and
Divine natures lying side by side—so that He is to be regarded as acting now by His human, now by His Divine, nature only. Language of this kind may have patristic authority, but it is by no means necessarily implied in the Chalcedonian formula. The essential point there is the integrity of the natures, together with the unity of the Person, without dogmatizing too nearly on their relation. Can any true doctrine of the Incarnation avoid this confession, or get rid of the difficulties which it raises? We cannot feel, at least, that the hypothesis which Dr. Sanday advocates sensibly mitigates them.

The quarter to which Dr. Sanday turns for help in his construction of a "tentative modern Christology" is that of recent speculation on the "subliminal consciousness" in man, represented most clearly in the works of Professor W. James and the late Mr. F. W. H. Myers. These depths in human personality which lie beneath our ordinary consciousness, yet from which influences constantly stream up into that consciousness, are thought to furnish the key to what is true in mysticism in religion, and also to indicate the "locus" of the Divine in the Person of Christ. Thus, withdrawn to an inaccessible depth, the Divine in Christ manifests itself only through the medium of the humanity, which develops itself according to purely human laws. It is not necessary here to examine particularly the representations given of the "subliminal consciousness." Much in regard to it is not new. It has always been known that the conscious self is not the total self, that there are stores of experience laid up in memory and character on which hourly drafts are being made, that the greater part of our knowledge at any given moment is "latent," that it is only the smallest portion of what has passed into these recesses of the soul that can ever be consciously recalled. In religion, similarly, there has always been speech of an "inner man" which is the seat of the Divine indwelling and of the Spirit's gracious and sanctifying influences. It is from the "heart," Jesus says, that evil thoughts proceed; out of the heart, an older Scripture declares, are the issues of life. The new psychology—changes nothing in this teaching.
Where it does advance upon it is in its suggestion that these deeper regions of the soul's life are not simply "latencies," but are really under-strata of conscious life; that the contrast is not between conscious and unconscious, but between higher and lower (yet partially interacting) levels of consciousness—the barrier, separating them in certain abnormal states, being broken down.

The present writer does not question the reality of these conditions. He has himself repeatedly drawn attention to them as obviating an objection made to the Incarnation as involving two states of existence of the one Divine Person (cf. "Christian View of God," p. 243; "Revelation and Inspiration," p. 151). What is not obvious is how, even as explained, they make any essential difference in the doctrine of the two natures. The subliminal consciousness in man is, after all, a real part of his human self; it is not affirmed, though Professor James uses language that looks in that direction, that it is identical with the Divine. It is not, again, affirmed that the union of the Divine with the human in Jesus does not differ from the ordinary immanence of God in the soul, or even from the indwelling of the Spirit of Christ in the believer. It is the union of a pre-existent Divine Person with humanity—as also Dr. Sanday teaches—which Person is the basis of the human self-consciousness. It hardly, therefrom, expresses the whole truth to say that the Divine in Christ is His subliminal human consciousness; though it might be true to say that "the subliminal consciousness in Jesus was Godhead itself" ("Revelation and Inspiration," as above). There is room here for all that Dr. Sanday says of the Divine revealing itself only through the human, yet the need of affirming the two natures in one Person appears as great as ever. When, moreover, Dr. Sanday appeals to those indications in Christ's consciousness which prove "that there was in Him a root of being striking down below the strata of consciousness, by virtue of which He was more than human," declaring that to leave these out of account is to leave half of Christ unexplained, does he not admit the partial truth in the
view of those who recognize a distinction of a Divine and a human element in Christ's self-consciousness, and so far qualify his own rather unguarded utterance: "There is nothing to pre­vent us from speaking of this human life of His just as we would speak of one of ourselves?" The difficulty is, on Dr. Sanday's view in which he "shakes hands" with those Continental theologians who see humanity in Christ and nothing else, to prevent his conception from passing over into that simply of a God-filled man, in whom an energetic, subliminal consciousness takes the place of Deity.

---

**The Myth and the Word.**

By the Rev. W. D. Moffat, M.A.,

Edinburgh.

The study of mythology is by no means the fruitless thing that many suppose. The latest results in the shape of comparative mythology warrant the conviction that still greater things are awaiting those who make this study their own.

Doubtless the nature of the subject lends itself, more than most, to speculations that are more mythological than the myths they pretend to interpret, while the indelicacy of many of the myths themselves serves to repel men from a study which seems to reek only with rottenness. And yet, as the scientific study of mythology develops, the greater seems the certainty that certain critical theories must yield to the dominance of wider research and historical evidence.

For the linguist, the historian, the philosopher, the artist, the poet, the man of letters, and the theologian, the study of mythology may be said to be unavoidable.

For each of them it has its own message. The significance of the message will vary, of course, with the object of each thinker, but in every case its value becomes increasingly obvious. History seeks origins; language, universal archaic speech;
philosophy, the reason of things; art, the simplicity of form; poetry, nature; literature, man's earliest efforts to express his highest thoughts; and theology, man's pristine religious ideas and beliefs; and all of these, in their measure, are to be found in polytheistic mythologies.

That theologians should often have been prejudiced against mythological studies can be readily understood, if not condoned. But that they should have frequently failed to grasp its importance is to be regretted. Still more is it to be regretted that the use of mythological lore should have been left very much to scholars of the destructive school, who have applied it in such a way as to give fictitious value to theories and speculations otherwise worthless.

The Conservative theologian, who neglects to acquaint himself at least with the fields covered by mythology, deprives himself of a really valuable weapon in defence of the purity, integrity, and inspiration of the Bible, for, the more we plumb the depths of the myth historical, the myth philosophical, the myth theological, the more do we see that to trace any of them in the Word of God is an impossible undertaking for any man or any school whose reputation for scholarship is worth conserving. For what is a myth? According to our foremost scholars, it is "a pure fiction, without any basis of fact." This at once marks it off from legend, allegory, or parable, all of which may have a substratum of fact. Nay, more, it puts, of necessity, a severe limitation upon the use of the word in relation to Biblical subjects. Retreat into the realm of mythology on the part of advanced Bible critics in order to escape supposed difficulties, or bolster up courageous assumptions and speculations, is a hopeless move in view of this definition. "Fiction without any basis of fact" is surely poor ground for even a "higher critic" to stand upon.

Indeed, it is not ground at all, but a morass that grows more treacherous the longer we traverse it, and, if history means anything, finally engulfs those who trust it. It is, in Biblical speech, "a refuge of lies."
The question is sometimes put, "How comes it that the great civilizations and religions of ancient times all succumbed, one after another, to the touch of decay, and vanished into oblivion?" Historical data can be adduced in favour of the answer that the myth lies at the bottom of it all. Had mythology concerned itself with, or sprung out of, a nation's desire merely for amusement, or self-glorification, or even literary expression as such and of its kind, it would not have been needful to assign it any vital place in the rôle of human history. But when we find it creating vast polytheistic creeds, and, through them, shaping polytheistic religions and polytheistic ethics, we can readily understand its bearing upon national progress or decay, or both.

That a myth can be "a pure fiction," and yet operate on the minds and consciences of men, both by way of moral constraint and restraint, needs no proof. Even the holiest and wisest of men have been betrayed into ethical action by the grossest myths. The mouldy bread and clouted shoes of the men of Gibeon were an acted myth, but the action of Joshua there anent was only too plainly an ethical reality. That is to say, a glaring lie moved him into ethical action and bound him in conscience to a position from which he could not resile. Think of the discussions of statesmen, satirists, poets, philosophers, in the days of mythological decadence in Greece and Rome, and we need no further demonstration of the power of mythology in shaping the social, civic, religious, commercial, and national life of polytheistic peoples. From these we see how patriotism had kindled its fires at mythic altars; national games had found their sanctions in the honours due to mythic deities; law and order based themselves on mythic cosmogonies; commercial integrity had been maintained by mythic maxims; and great religions, with all their paraphernalia of rite and ceremony, and their intrusion into the private and public relations of the people, secured at least outward respect and obedience on the ground of mythic supernaturalism. Up to a point, therefore, mythology was a force to be reckoned with in the history of
these nations. But the famous dictum of Gibbon concerning the religions of the Roman Empire in its palmy days gives us the clue to the decadence that followed: "The various modes of worship which prevailed in the Roman world were all considered by the people as equally true; by the philosopher as equally false; and by the magistrate as equally useful."¹

That is to say, the superstitions of mythology ruled the ignorant multitudes; scepticism made the myths a laughing-stock to the learned; and utilitarianism made the myths valuable to the magistrates in restraining the mob.

It is a strange mixture, but ominous—superstition, scepticism, sham. It was in vain that the best scholarship attempted to find a rational way out from the myth to the allegory, and so to save the nation from the transparent falsities and contradictions of the mythologies that were fast growing into an intolerable mass of monstrosities and impurities.

The mythical bestialities of the gods found their outcome only too surely in the atrocious and growing immorality of the people. No sin could be named that has not its counterpart, and therefore sanction, among the mythological deities. Sodomy, adultery, fornication, lying, murder, theft, perjury, treachery, were all justified by the example of the mythic gods. It needed only that comedy should at last set the people laughing at their own deities, while still imitating their immoralities, to bring about the decadence that ended in oblivion.

No permanent civilization, and certainly no permanent religion, can be built upon lies. The lie may attract and hold the human mind for a time, but the moment of its discovery is also the moment of its doom, for if there be no road out of the lie into the truth, the reaction ends only in self-destruction and ruin. Modern instances of this can be seen in lands where the renouncing of heathen superstitions, when unaccompanied by entrance into the better light of the Gospel, has ended only in the wild reactions of anarchism, despair,

¹ "Roman Empire," cap. ii., § 1.
and suicide. As Dean Church, speaking of the Roman religious decline, so well says: "It (the religion) went, and there was nothing to supply its place but a philosophy, often very noble and true in its language, able, I doubt not, in evil days to elevate and comfort, and often purify its better disciples, but unable to overawe, to heal, to charm a diseased society; which never could breathe life and energy into words for the people; which wanted that voice of power that could quicken the dead letter, and command attention, where the destinies of the world were decided. I know nothing more strange and sorrowful in Roman history than to observe the absolute impotence of what must have been popular conscience on the crimes of statesmen and the bestial infamy of Emperors. There were plenty of men to revile them; there were men to brand them in immortal epigrams; there were men to kill them. But there was no man to make his voice heard and be respected, about righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come." ¹

Just so. The myth contains within itself the principle of its own destruction; and not even civilizations so magnificent as those of Assyria, Egypt, Greece, and Rome could withstand the subtle influence it exerted in finally subverting national life, and perverting the noblest instincts of the human soul. The myth, being a perversion of the pure symbolism of Nature, could have no other development than it had. It must needs graduate downwards from perverted symbolism into polytheism, idolatry, image-worship, fetishism, pantheism, and finally nihilism; and thus it is the distinctive mark of heathenism. It is heathenism. It can be nothing else, even in its earliest and more innocent forms. The puzzle is how any man claiming to be an interpreter of the Bible should fail to see this. To read into the Scriptures mythical allusions, where no historical proof of such allusions is offered, nor indeed possible, may serve the purpose of reducing revelation to the level of paganism, but it can never make clear the stupendous difference between the inspired writings and those of the heathen. The truth is that

¹ "Gifts of Civilization," pp. 148, 149.
the modern craze for detecting myths in the Bible is fast running to seed. It may or may not be a proof of wide mythological knowledge, but it is no proof whatever of a true insight into the Word of God, or of special fitness for interpreting a language which, while often highly poetic and figurative, is never unreal, fictitious, or unhistorical.

It needs only a genuine acquaintance with mythology to end for ever the delusion that any place can be found in the Bible for the myth. The truth cannot masquerade in the fancy dresses of the falsehood. Monotheism cannot maintain its protest in favour of the "one living and true God" by polytheistic forms or formulæ. Inspired revelation can borrow neither form nor substance from uninspired fictions. The concrete faith of the Hebrew and the Christian—one in essence, and with the life behind it that persists and abides for ever, historically and spiritually—dare not, and cannot, identify itself with that which has neither life nor permanency here nor the hope of the hereafter. Really great Biblical scholarship cannot become a possibility as long as we are taught that myth and history are mingled in Scripture, and that we must spend our strength in the vain attempt to disentangle the fact from the fiction, the real from the unreal, the truth from the imposture, or in the still more hopeless task of interpreting the one by the other.

As a modern writer puts it: "We are losing the sense of truth because we treat as poetical exaggeration or figurative language the oath which God swore to His people by His prophets. And thus we have forfeited all interest in, and comprehension of, His dealings with nations and His plan of human history—of prophecy in general, and the great inspiring hope of the supremely glorious and real accomplishment of His promises. Two-thirds of the Word of God lie fallow; we know not what to make of them. Hence, too, it comes that we chatter about a "sinister Hebrew God of vengeance, or ask with infantile ineptitude how it can affect our Christian faith whether Abraham ever lived or not."  

What, for instance, are we to make of statements such as the following by "higher critics"? "Fire and Moloch worship was the ancestral, legal, and orthodox worship of the nation of Israel." Again: "Moses never forbade human sacrifices. On the contrary, these constituted a legal and essential part of the State worship from earliest times down to the destruction of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah." Or again: "Originally Jahveh was a god of light or of the sun, and the heat of the sun and the consuming fire were considered to proceed from Him, and to be ruled by Him. In accordance with this, Jahveh was conceived by those who worshipped Him to be a severe being, inaccessible to mankind, whom it was necessary to propitiate with sacrifices and offerings, and even with human sacrifices." Apart altogether from questions of poetry, metaphor, symbolism, history, and exegesis, we ask ourselves the question, What do these writers suppose they have gained by this attempted association, if not identification, of Jahveh with Moloch? Have they made the Bible more intelligible, more reliable, more authoritative, more spiritual? Or have they made the myth more credible or attractive? Neither the one nor the other.

To trace, for instance, the seraphim of Isaiah to the serpent-myths of extra-Biblical traditions, or to affirm that the personification of Sheol and Death is mythological, may seem conclusive to pedantic minds; but if mythology, as we have seen, has no basis in fact, the attempt to explain the fact by fiction, or to deal with the awful verities of the Unseen and Death on mythological grounds, is neither sound learning nor common sense. Personification of the real is an intelligible and often impressive figure of speech. But to drag in mythology by way of justifying such figurative speech is to make the thing that is not explain the thing that is; it is to exalt the false above the true, and expose Biblical interpretation to something worse than contempt. "O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory?" is personification. "What ailed thee, O Sea, that thou fleddest: thou, Jordan, that thou turnestd
back?" is personification. So is the statement: "Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night teacheth knowledge"; but surely the myths of heathenism need not be ransacked to cast light upon language manifestly dramatic, and used with the one purpose of making the idea at once memorable and impressive.

The one test of these numerous and subtle references in certain commentaries to mythological data is to demand their historical evidence.

When reference after reference of this kind is met, the tendency on the part of untrained readers is to accept them as a proof that the writers of Scripture held these myths for truth, and were willing to avail themselves of their help in recording what only the Spirit of God revealed. The longer we study the Divine record, the more we see that its teaching is coherent, reasonable, and befitting man's need and God's purpose. The more we know of mythology, we see that between it and this revelation there is a great gulf fixed. In the one we are in the realm of reality, purity, light, and hope. In the other we are surrounded with the unreal, the impossible, the false, and the foul, and we decline to have them allied, or to believe that the eternal light needs to be gilded by the glimmerings of myths begotten of the night, and not of the day.

A Plea for the Y.M.C.A.

By CHARLES T. BATEMAN.

ONE of the numerous class of weekly journals depending for its circulation upon sensational articles recently announced on its contents bill, "Exposure of the Y.M.C.A." I bought the paper and read the "Exposure," only to find a rehash of the ancient criticisms against this organization, all of which have been answered by Time or refuted by those com-
petent to speak upon the subject. At the start of the Y.M.C.A., the objects were possibly interpreted on a circumscribed basis. A few of the pioneers might have thought that young men ought first to be prepared for heaven rather than for their life upon earth. Certain results followed from this teaching—Y.M.C.A. workers admit this fact to-day—but in no way commensurate to the criticism and obloquy cast without reason or logic by some speakers and writers.

The fairest way to judge of the Y.M.C.A. is by the men associated with it. Its founder, Sir George Williams, came up to London as a country lad from a West of England farm, and had to carve out his own way in life. At the close of a long and busy life he left behind him a record in the City that has seldom been rivalled. He was honoured and so is his firm. Go to Birmingham, and you find that the men who assisted to build the new Y.M.C.A. premises are respected alike by political friend and foe. They are men who stand high in city council, on the magisterial bench, or in the city’s religious and philanthropic activities. What is true of Birmingham is true of other great provincial centres, whether north or south of the Tweed. Taken generally, the type is good. The character of the men controlling and assisting the Y.M.C.A. movement is an effective reply to much of the criticism now and again levelled against it.

When Sir George Williams commenced the first association in St. Paul’s Churchyard, he had no conception of palatial buildings, not only at home, but in America and the Colonies. He comprehended the need of Christian comradeship, but had not then outlined its contributory channels. No one blames a pioneer that he does not see at the first glance all the beauties of the country he may discover. We honour the memory of Sir George Williams to-day inasmuch as he fostered and encouraged the auxiliaries afterwards associated with the Y.M.C.A. movement. He was no kill-joy. Neither was he obscurantist in respect to education and commercial training. As he became convinced of the necessity for widening the base
of operations, no one was more generous or loyal in providing the supplies or rendering personal service. Like all great movements, the Y.M.C.A. has been a development, each step taken cautiously, but as a rule in a progressive line. This policy has proved its strength.

A vital factor in the growth of the Y.M.C.A. is its cosmopolitan character. Reference has been made to its extension in America and the Colonies. Not only there, however, but in many parts of Europe, in India and the Far East, the Y.M.C.A. has been established. As a part of its development the separate Association was linked up with a federation, and then in time their representatives met for Conference. Here the wealth of experience was reported and sifted until the scattered children of the parent stock were contributing valuable lessons to those at home. This has proved one great source of its strength. The colonist is less trammelled by conventions. He makes short cuts to the heart of things, and by means of his environment grasps problems that the stay-at-home Englishman is oftentimes afraid to tackle. So the Y.M.C.A. movement has grown and expanded because of its world-wide experience.

Two directions in which the Y.M.C.A. has developed with great advantage are along the lines of education and recreation. The ordinary education of the schools may afford a good or a bad foundation for business or professional life. But the average young man requires more than this if he is to succeed. He needs a training on the commercial side. With considerable success the Y.M.C.A. pioneered in this direction. Other agencies have catered for the young artisan. The Y.M.C.A. has provided educational facilities for the young clerk, the assistant in a textile warehouse, and the beginner in a large commercial firm. One branch of the Central Y.M.C.A. in the City of London has, for instance, specialized in classes for bank clerks, and scores of such young men have, as a consequence of proficiency in the technical side of their work gained by attendance there, secured quicker promotion. Many City bankers have testified to the value and importance of such
tuition, and commended the Y.M.C.A. for its excellent results in this direction.

On the recreative side the Y.M.C.A. is equally strong. "Namby-pambyism," of which at one time we heard so much, has no meaning to-day as a criticism against the Association. There is, in fact, some danger of the pendulum swinging too much the other way, and of the Association members forgetting that recreation is not the end, but simply the means to an end. A healthy body is but an increased opportunity for useful service. With its cricket and football clubs, its harriers, its tennis, cycling, swimming, and other organizations, it provides recreative facilities second to no other similar institution for young men run on secular lines. This, too, with the approval and co-operation of the older men in the Association.

Some idea of the want the Y.M.C.A. has supplied is obtainable from its present strength. It is but a truism to say that numbers are not everything, but at least they convey the idea of solidarity as well as some measure of influence. To-day there are, roughly speaking, Associations in all parts of the world, with an aggregate membership of 841,498. Tested in this way, no other organization for young men has progressed to the same extent.

From the first the Association has endeavoured to maintain a high standard. Its start was the result of Evangelical impulses, and this fact has never been forgotten. Its basis and its programme are both alike coloured by its origin. We sometimes see its limitations, but these are due to its upbringing. It cannot with readiness adapt itself to a policy of opportunism. From the first it was a testimony to the Evangelical faith, and if we may judge the spirit of its leaders to-day, they have no desire to deflect it into other channels. On its business and philanthropic side it is strong, and if there is any weakness it is in the supply of cultured Evangelicals who will give its religious aims intelligent expression. Both in the Church of England and the Free Churches there are men well qualified for the task, and in the future the Y.M.C.A. will have need of them.
At the present time the Metropolis lacks adequate premises for central Y.M.C.A. headquarters. True, a suite of rooms in the Strand has been requisitioned since Exeter Hall was demolished. But not until 1911 will London possess a building commensurate to its size and world-wide importance, and to the varied opportunities open to the Association in such a city. When complete, however, the new home of the Y.M.C.A. will at least compare favourably with the palatial places in the provinces and the Colonies. On the island site in the Tottenham Court Road will be found club accommodation for at least 10,000 young men. Nearly the whole of seven large floors are to be devoted to the purposes of religious training, education, social and recreative amenities, and as club and hostel. Probably in no other centre in the United Kingdom will such complete Y.M.C.A. quarters be found. But utility and influence are the dominant notes of the Committee's programme. They desire to help the young Christian fellow to become a more efficient trader, banker, insurance broker, or textile assistant. For the sake of his faith they want him not to be content to play the part of an indifferent second to the foreigner, but, like the latter, to study to show himself proficient in the daily task. There is nothing derogatory to Christian ethics in such an endeavour. It is but casting the net on the right side of the ship.

Apart from the educational policy is an attempt to provide a residential department for at least 200 young men who come up from the country to earn a living in the Metropolis. A large proportion are but youths who have to subsist upon their earnings. How they face this problem is one of the mysteries of a young man's life. If readers of the CHURCHMAN were set down in London with £1 a week as the sole income, from which they had not only to pay for board and lodging, but clothes and all the little etceteras that are almost indispensable, then they might realize something of the struggle. Given health and strength it is a fight, but if these fail it becomes a tragedy. What is the kind of lodgings and fare offered to him? He must cut his suit according to his cloth. Even where the landlady is respectable,
the accommodation is limited. She does not want him home before bedtime, and on Sundays he is often made to feel that his room would be preferable to his company. Supposing he has to pay 13s. or 14s. for board and lodging, he must purchase lunch or midday dinner for six days of the week. Sixpence a day is a modest sum for a midday meal, and such a meal is limited. Three or four shillings then remain out of the weekly wage as an unexpended balance. He must dress decently. He ought to pay into a sick club. He will require some recreation. Economize as best he can, the margin is small.

But the financial aspect is not the most depressing feature. In too many instances London lodgings possess no resemblance to home. The young fellow without relatives and friends is lonely amidst London's teeming thousands, and the very spirit of loneliness often tends to his undoing. To go in and out of the City, knowing only those in one's house of business, with no sitting-room but the public library, and its obtruding notices requesting "Silence!" is not an exhilarating experience. "The dreary loneliness of a great city" is a subject for the philosopher, but more than we imagine it enters into the very soul of the youngster straight from the cheery home life—if humble and circumscribed—of the provincial town and village. Just here is the sphere of the Y.M.C.A., and this new building in the Tottenham Court Road will stand with open doors inviting the home-sick and lonely young men to enter and find companionship, recreation, and inspiration. In its spacious entrance-lobby he will see the Academy bust of Sir George Williams, and in course of time may appreciate the significance and value of the Y.M.C.A. movement.

I may add one or two sentences to this eulogy of Y.M.C.A. work. The cost of the building will amount to between £160,000 and £170,000. There is still £63,000 to raise in order that it may be opened free of debt, and if any generous reader of the CHURCHMAN is prepared to help, the Secretary, Mr. Clarence Hooper, 346, Strand, London, will gladly receive his contribution.
SPIRITUALISTIC manifestations, among the most obstinately recurring phenomena of our time, have wrought a subtle and profound revolution in contemporary thought. The more thoughtful journalism accurately reflects the change from a mocking scepticism to sympathetic inquiry. "Though no verdict of 'proven,'" says the Spectator (December 4, 1909), "can yet be given, there is very considerable ground or believing that if investigations are pursued in the future as bravely and as patiently as in the past, proof may be achieved."

The Contemporary Review goes farther: "There is reason to believe that through this investigation we are about to gain knowledge of extreme importance."¹ No critic of Spiritualism is better informed, or more acutely critical, than Mr. Podmore; yet it is Mr. Podmore who says: "It is certain that no critic has yet succeeded in demonstrating the inadequacy of the evidence upon which the Spiritualists rely."² Sir Oliver Lodge is one more worker in the front rank of science to discover that the phenomena are real. "The time for suspicion," he says, "is over with most of us investigators. It is a judgment which I hold, for my own part, to be fully justified: intelligent co-operation between other than embodied human minds and our own has become possible."³ Fresh evidence is ever accumulating.

The Hon. Everard Fielding, who confesses to "a fairly complete education at the hands of fraudulent mediums, my unbroken experience of whom had led me into an attitude of entire scepticism," yet now acknowledges, after careful and exhaustive investigation, that "we have obtained evidence of unimpeachable validity."⁴ "It has been found," says Sir Oliver Lodge, "that

⁴ Nineteenth Century, November, 1909.
whenever a scientific man has thought proper to devote his mind to a thorough examination of occult or unaccepted or twilight phenomena, he has, I believe, historically without exception, become convinced of the occurrence of some of them, and has allowed the evidence to assure him of the reality of phenomena worthy of further investigation." The solid work in the past accomplished by such investigators as Professor de Morgan, Sir William Crookes, and Sir Alfred Russell Wallace—"the facts," Sir Alfred says, "beat me"—is supplemented by evidence ever freshly recurring. "The old foundations of Spiritualist belief," Mr. Podmore acknowledges, "have been undermined by recent additions to our knowledge. But just as the faith might have seemed to be tottering to its final fall, it has been buttressed anew out of its ruins, and now stands to the eye more firmly established than before."¹

But to a Christian judgment evidence less overwhelming than the mass of literature which the last half-century has produced would be sufficient. For we approach Spiritualism, not as Agnostics, but as Christians—that is, as those who hold in their hand an infallible revelation from, and concerning, the unseen; and a revelation, unlike an induction, requires no elaborate accumulation of experimental data, although it corresponds, with perfect exactitude, with all data that can be accumulated. The Bible has always asserted the existence and intervening power of unseen intelligences. To deny the actuality of witchcraft, says John Wesley, is to abandon the Bible. It is not the manifestations, therefore, but their origin, which challenges our alert inquiry and arouses our acutest interest. Who are they—in the words of Defoe—who do come? It must be obvious to all that the problem of identity is vital. It involves issues of quite incalculable importance. Now, we are at once confronted by the curious fact that, throughout the history of Spiritualism, the evidence for the return of the dead has proved the most acutely baffling problem of all. So inextricable is the mental confusion in the revelations forthcoming,

¹ "Modern Spiritualism," vol. ii., p. 357.
so conflicting and baffling the proofs of identity offered by the
spirits, that Dr. Hodgson is driven to suppose that "the aptitude
for communicating clearly [from the unseen] may be as rare as
the gifts that make a great artist, or a great mathematician, or
a great philosopher." An hypothesis so amazing in its admission
of the rarity of anything like adequate evidence on identity is
not less violent than the facts need if the spirits be the dead.
"Surely," says Mr. Andrew Lang, "I must know something
about the characters and tastes of my own deceased friends.
Either their tastes have altered, or the communications are not
what they profess to be. I cannot be more serious than I am
on this topic." Investigators everywhere are baffled on identity.
"Up to this day," says M. Camille Flammarion, "I have sought
in vain for certain proof of personal identity through mediumistic
communications." Even Mr. F. W. H. Myers, to whom the
problem in life was a passion, returns unrecognizable. "His
messages," says Mr. A. C. Benson, "were to me more like
a superficial parody of the attributes of his mind." Crucial tests
steadily fail. "Several persons," Mr. Podmore says, "have
within the last few years left behind them sealed letters, con­
taining some statement known only to themselves, in order that
revelation of the contents through the medium might furnish
proof of the writer's survival. In no case has the test been
complied with. The limitations of the knowledge displayed,
and the occasional disingenuousness, forbid us to accept these
communications as authentic and unembarrassed messages from
the dead." The pressure of these constantly recurrent dis­
crepancies extorts a remarkable admission from the chief
Spiritualistic organ. "It may be necessary," says Light
(December 23, 1893), "to acknowledge that recent experiments
may effect a weakening of one wing of the faith which has
supported the average Spiritualist in his most cherished hope.
The doctrine that only spirits of the dead manifest their

2 Journal of the Society for Psychical Research, April, 1900.
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presence may have to be given up—indeed, is given up by many.”

But the problem cannot end negatively. Mr. Myers, who declares that “the only invaders of the organism who have yet made good their title have been human, and have been friendly,” also bravely asserts that “these phenomena of possession are the most amply attested in our whole repertory.”¹ But “possession” is a grave word, and possession of the organism by any but God must involve incalculable peril. Why is Mr. J. N. Maskelyne compelled to say: “I have good reason to know that professional mediums, both men and women, are immoral and blasphemous in the extreme”? “It is this apparent demoralization of the medium,” says Professor Barrett, “which renders the whole inquiry so perplexing and doubtful, from an ethical as well as from a scientific point of view. As a rule I have observed the steady downward course of mediums who sit regularly; moral obliquity is the first symptom, then they become wrecks.”² mediums themselves acknowledge the peril. “Cheating mediums,” a healing medium wrote recently in the Daily Telegraph, “are often made so from necessity. Their spirit guides leave them for a time; they want means to carry on, and their reputation enables them to impose on their clients. A medium is forced to go, sooner or later, through every experience of Hell. Sorrow, grief, and despair have all to be gone through.” The intercourse implants the stamp of Hell. “I could not divest myself of the feeling,” says Dr. Furness of the medium Slade, “that his expression was that of a hunted animal or of a haunted man.”³ Mr. T. L. Harris, himself a lifelong Occultist, writes: “The tenor of private communications to me has been, not ‘How shall we get into communication with spirits?’ but, ‘How shall we find salvation from the direful tortures with which they assail us?’ So far as I am able to judge, the majority of such instances are traceable to the habit of attending séances.” Facts, even apart from Revelation, compel

¹ “Human Personality,” pp. 298, 310.
² Moses’ “Spiritualism at the Church Congress,” p. 17.
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us to the conclusion that Spiritualism is attempted necromancy, and actual sorcery. "A peep into the cavern of the witch," in the words of the British Quarterly Review, October, 1875, "or the circle of the necromancer, as they existed between two and three thousand years ago, reveals a scene indistinguishable, in its essential features, from the darkened chamber of the medium of to-day."

The consequences that flow from these facts are tremendous. Behind and beyond all the momentous movements of a momentous age stands this ominous shadow of Spiritualism. It is the silent inrush and unparalleled aggression of an unseen world. On the incidental importance of Spiritualism as an ocular and indisputable demonstration of Biblical teaching concerning wizardry and the supernatural; on its decisive overthrow of all materialism, and the light it casts upon methods of inspiration, both Satanic and Divine; on the critical revelation it affords (1 Tim. iv. 1-3) of the approaching consummation of our Age—on these, and other equally momentous consequences of the demonstrated truth of Spiritualism, we do not now dwell. It is enough to emphasize, in conclusion, the motive that underlies the spiritual onset. "Ever since I became intimately acquainted with the subject," says Mr. Stainton Moses, "I have been deeply impressed with some serious questions concerning it. One is, that there is an organized plan on the part of spirits who govern these manifestations to act on us, and on the religious thought of the age."1 The religious teaching given has a curious and significant general identity. "There is a general consistency"—in the words of Sir Oliver Lodge—"in the doctrines that have thus been taught through various sensitives."2 "Almost all these automatic utterances"—in the words of Mr. Myers—"appear to me analogous to Swedenborg, the father of all modern Occultism."3 The intelligences, organized and acting together in some measure, betray a specific design. "The central dogmas of the Christian Faith,"

3 Proceedings of Society for Psychical Research, vol. xii., p. 612.
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says Mr. Moses, once an Anglican clergyman, "seemed especially attacked: and it was this that startled me." 1 It might well startle him. "It has been one of our chiefest difficulties," the spirits informed him, with whom he consorted daily for thirty years, "to uproot false dogmas from your mind: so long as you reply to our arguments with a text, we cannot teach you." 2 Says a medium of long standing: "I learn from spirits that a vast spiritual movement is working out a great religious scheme, having for its basis universal Deism and brotherhood." The conclusion is inevitable. Our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but, in a manner now appallingly real, against the world-rulers of this darkness. "It may be," as Canon Wilberforce assured the Church Congress in 1881, "that the manifestations are part of the dark clouds which have to appear and be dispersed before the promised advent of the Lord with His saints." The sunset of the world is the sunrise of the Christ of God.

The Father of Topography.

By Miss M. ADELINE COOKE.

Among the vast store of modern guide-books and their compilers, we run a risk of forgetting that picturesque figure in the reign of King Hal who assuredly may be considered the first of antiquaries, the father of topography, and the forerunner of the horde of folk who perambulate Merrie England and set down much knowledge concerning her.

John Leland stands forth as a vivid personality the moment we really begin to think about him, a man with marked individuality, which probably bordered on the eccentric, blessed with the gift of observation sometimes streaked with a grain of genius, and positively overflowing with industry. If he were a trifle conceited concerning himself and his doings, who can find it in their hearts to blame him! The very title given to that

2 Ibid., p. 198.
“Newe Yeare’s Gifte,” describing his aims and achievements, quite disarms one at the outset. “The Laboriouse Journey and Serche of J. Leland for England’s Antiquities” cannot fail to conjure up a picture of this sixteenth-century priest who cared next to nothing about parish work, and ardently adored ancient manuscripts, setting forth to travel all over England, despite the difficulties and dangers which a journey meant at that time. So we feel inclined to pardon the conceit which makes him declare that he spared neither cost nor labour, and that he had performed the incredible task of visiting almost—he justifies his statement by that little word which forms such a convenient loophole—almost every bay, river, lake, mountain, abbey, moor, heath, wood, city, castle, manor-house, monastery, and college in the land. Truly a stupendous claim! The story of his life affords some insight into the different ideas and ways of the men who lived in the reign of King Henry VIII.

There is an uncertainty about the exact date of his birth, and oddly enough his parents bestowed upon him the same Christian name as their elder son, whether from inability to think of another or from a desire to make sure of perpetuating it in the family it is impossible to determine. He was born in London, and received an excellent education. First of all he went to St. Paul’s School, London, and afterwards to Christ’s College, Cambridge, where he took his B.A. in 1522. Subsequently he studied at All Souls’ College, Oxford, where he made the acquaintance of Thomas Caius, and completed his education in Paris. He appears to have been particularly learned in Latin and Greek, to have gained considerable knowledge of French, Italian, and Spanish, and early acquired that remarkable industry which proved such a feature of, and assisted him so much in, his later life. It would be interesting to know what were the reasons which led him to take Holy Orders. Leland always seems to have had what is slangily termed “an eye to the main chance,” and we should hardly have considered that this step would have been likely to commend him at the Court of Henry VIII., unless, indeed, he had a vision of glorious
Wolsey before his mind, and hoped to rise in like manner. Perhaps, however, he thought of taking the scholastic side, for which at that time Orders would have been a sine qua non. Undoubtedly he acted as tutor to a son of Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk. The interval was employed in writing Latin panegyrics on the King, which so recommended him at Court that at Christmas, 1528, Henry bestowed upon him a small annual income, and not long afterwards he was made Keeper of the Library and Royal Chaplain. In June, 1530, he was presented to the rectory of Pepeling, and Pope Clement VII granted him a dispensation to hold four benefices, provided their yearly value did not exceed 1,000 ducats. He does not appear to have taken the responsibilities of a parish very seriously, but at least he employed someone else to do his work, for two years later we find him returned as an absentee from his rectory, and mention made that he was specially relieved from all obligation of residence, and allowed to keep a curate. The Papal dispensation is rendered decidedly amusing by the fact that as a personal adherent of the King, who possessed the power to make or mar his career, Leland actively championed the "new religion." What a pity we cannot know his true opinions, for certainly he seems somewhat of a time-server, or perhaps a king-server would be more appropriate. That Leland was now high in favour with Henry is quite apparent, for in 1533 he was made King's Antiquary, an office, by the way, which must have been specially created for him, as he had neither predecessor nor successor, and that very year he attained his great desire. A commission was granted him under the broad seal which permitted and directed him to search for "English antiquities in the libraries of all cathedrals, abbeys, priories, and colleges, and all places where records, writings, and secrets of antiquity were deposited." But he intended to gather material concerning the history of England, with a description of its towns and villages, beside monastical manuscripts and records. No doubt he fondly dreamed that his "History and Antiquities of the Nation" would win him wide prominence. Six years were
spent upon this gigantic task; at least, so Leland avers, though it would appear that he was really occupied from 1534 to 1543; and we cannot help wondering in what style he travelled the length and breadth of all England, and how he was received. Abbots would look upon him with suspicion until, perchance, their visitor's genuine delight in ancient documents and love of learning lulled their doubts. It is probable that Leland's Protestant opinions were coloured by the company of violent partisans, for it is expressly stated that he "did not disdain social intercourse with abbots and priors"; and we can fancy that this was the kind of society in which he most delighted, and in which his conceits, eccentricities, and time-serving opinions dropped from him. And then, what tales he must have had to tell his hosts of the places he had seen and the archives he had perused! There must have been eager faces round the abbot's table, and it ended most likely in his being a welcome guest. Whatever Leland may have thought about the dissolution of the monasteries, he was horrified at the destruction of valuable manuscripts which occurred, and he entreated Cromwell to so extend his commission as to enable him to collect such documents for the King's library. His wish was partly fulfilled.

Although manuscripts attracted him more than architecture, Leland conscientiously describes with some minuteness the diverse buildings and cities visited during his "Itinerary." He takes a good deal of trouble to search out the history of abbeys and their precincts, and to discover the origin of alterations; and though it has been said that his style is disjointed and rough, more like a mass of undigested notes—which was probably the case—than a carefully written and revised work, there is yet a certain picturesqueness about his descriptions and explanations. How quaintly he narrates the dissensions between the monks of Sherborne Priory and the townsfolk: "The body of the abbay church, dedicated to our Lady, servid ontil a hundred yeres syne, or more, for the chife paroche churche of the town." He then explains the cause of "variaunce," the
acts of the "stoute butcher," and how "a prest of Alhalowis shot a shaft with fier onto the topp of that part of St. Marye chirch that divided the Est part that the monks usid from that the tounes-men usid; and this partition chauncing at that tyme to be thakkid yn the rose was sette a fire and consequently al the hole chirch, the lede and belles melting, was defacid."

This is delightful, and although Leland's very conscientiousness sometimes renders his descriptions tame, a certain quaintness is rarely absent. His usual method seems to have been to describe the town as he approached it, and afterwards the objects of interest. He can hardly be said to possess the artistic soul, and his conceptions of nature or architecture are scarcely gilded by imagination. "A praty uplandish town" is a favourite epithet when phrases or ideas fell short. Sometimes a local custom is commented upon, or Roman or Saxon remains. Nor is such a trifling matter omitted as that the passage over the Wey to Melcombe Regis was "by a bote and a rope bent over the haven, so yt in the fery bote they use no ores." Like all seekers after information, he was occasionally misled. Hemp was largely grown at Bridport, and during Leland's time the town supplied most of the cordage used in the navy. The local phrase for a man being hanged, "He was stabbed with a Bridport dagger," was taken literally by him, and he therefore gravely remarks, "At Bridport be made good daggers." But now and again a golden gleam transfigures the solidity of his descriptions. "A praty market town set in the rootes of an high rokky hille down to the hard shore. There cummith a shalow broke from the hilles about a three miles by north, and cummith fleting on great stones through a stone bridge in the bottom—Marchaunts of Morleys in Britaine haunt this town."

Such was Lyme Regis as Leland saw it, and the trade was in serges and linens. No doubt he watched the wild sea breaking over the Cobb, and trod the bridle track, just a path wide enough for pack-horses, leading past the old Church of St. Michael high on the cliff overlooking the ocean. Leland bestows few words on the places which he considered un-
important. "The townlette is no great thing, and the building of it is mene," he says upon one occasion; another is "a good fishar town." Manufactures were also noted. Bradford-on-Avon is described as "standing by cloth-making," and "the beauty of the town of Vies is all in one strete—it standeth on a ground somewhat clyvinge, most occupied by clothiers." Of course he visited Old Sarum, of which he reports: "There is not one house, neither within or without Old Saresbyri, inhabited. Much notable ruinus building of the castell yet ther remaynith."

On the conclusion of his tour of England, Leland presented an account of his researches to the King under the title of "A Newe Yeare's Gifte." But he hoped to prepare a full description of the topography of England, together with a map engraved in silver or brass, a civil history of the British Isles in fifty books, a survey of the islands adjoining Britain and the Isle of Wight, Anglesey, and Isle of Man in six books, and an account of the nobility in three volumes, all in one year. He also wrote about early English writers, designed an account of Henry's palaces, and prepared a treatise which defended the King's supreme dignity in Church matters. Honours were not slow in showering themselves upon this redoubtable scholar. Archbishop Cranmer presented him to the rectory of Haseley, Oxford, in 1542. Three years later he was made Canon of King's College, Oxford, and Prebendary of East and West Knoyle in the county of Salisbury. But he chiefly resided in the parish of St. Michael-le-Querne in London, occupying himself with the numerous works he had projected. Such arduous labour enfeebled his constitution, and probably it was on account of his failing health that he wrote to a friend living at Louvain to find him an assistant, or, as we should call it, a secretary, who was required to be "a forward young man about the age of twenty years, learned in the Latin tongue, and could sine cortice nare in Greek." His reason became clouded, and in 1550 the Privy Council gave him into his brother's custody, together with the revenues derived from Haseley and Pepeling, which were to serve for his maintenance. Two years later John
Leland died without recovering sanity. He was buried in the Church of St. Michael-le-Querne, which stood at the west end of Cheapside, and laudatory tributes inscribed on his tomb. The church was destroyed in the Great Fire, and never rebuilt, and so perished all outward memorial of the father of topography and first of antiquaries. It was a sad ending, and perhaps is a silent commentary on the truth that no man can achieve the impossible, and that Leland certainly aimed at doing when he set himself such stupendous tasks. Very little was published during his life, and at his death his manuscripts were made over by Edward VI. to the custody of Sir John Cheke, and were dispersed when that gentleman left England in Queen Mary's reign. The original of his "Itinerary" passed into many hands, and was ultimately presented with five volumes of the "Collectanea" to the Bodleian Library. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries numerous antiquaries gained access to his manuscripts, and borrowed largely from them. Indeed, Leland may be truly said to have conferred enormous benefits on all succeeding historians.

Most people own to a vague knowledge concerning the name they frequently see beneath some bit of information. But it stops there.

Do we ever really think of John Leland as a living man who set himself to do a great work, and succeeded? Do we picture him as a vivid personality, a seeker after learning, who loved and revelled in it for itself alone? Do we care about the daily effort to keep at his self-appointed task as his mental faculties failed and his reason became clouded? And the two years before his death, when all that made the man was dead, though the body lived! It is a piteous portrait, though he attained honours with ease and did not live long enough to taste the bitterness of disillusion. Was his pursuit of knowledge all he cared about, we wonder? Was there no softening influence, no love in his life? Perhaps he never felt the need or the lack.

But at least a sense of mystery, a vague fascination, invests the picturesque personality of King Henry's antiquary, the Father of Topography.
OUR Lord's words, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me," are being fulfilled to-day more than ever. Men cannot get away from the attraction. They cannot, apparently, turn their eyes away from the Crucified: and, if they do not gaze at Him with faith and love, at least they join in the taunt "He saved others; Himself He cannot save." This book is a good illustration of the fact. The writer and most of those whom he quotes with approval hardly disguise the fact that they are haters of Christ. Herr Schweitzer tells us that there are two ways of writing a "Life of Jesus"—with love or with hatred for Him; and he adds that the most successful modern "lives" of Him have been written "with hate" (pp. 4 and 15). Among these he instances those of Reimarus and Strauss. From the former's arguments Herr Schweitzer informs us that he himself differs in only one single point of any consequence (p. 23), while he can hardly find words strong enough to express his admiration for Reimarus himself and his work, published by Lessing after the writer's death.

Herr Schweitzer expresses the greatest contempt for all attempts made on the Christian, and even on the Rationalistic, side to counteract the effect of Strauss's "Leben Jesu." Strauss himself comes in for reproof only once, and then it is for having, in the third edition of his book, recanted some of his extreme theories in consequence of De Wette's and Neander's arguments. However, as the author joyfully points out, these admissions of error were retracted in the fourth edition (pp. 119, 120).

Herr Schweitzer has devoted an immense amount of toil to the task of condensing into his work all the infidel attacks on the Jesus of the Evangelists "from Reimarus to Wrede." The result is a book which will prove a perfect armoury of shallow arguments for the use of half-educated unbelievers in this country and wherever English and German are read. Yet this work is warmly commended by our Cambridge Norrisian Professor of Divinity! It is of little consequence that its arguments have been refuted over and over again, for those likely to be affected by the book are precisely the people who are quite unaware that such answers have been given.

In a brief review of the book it is, of course, impossible to refer to the voluminous mistatements of Scriptural facts to be found in the books which Herr Schweitzer quotes. We must content ourselves with pointing out that the author and most of those whom he praises are throughout complacently guilty of petitio principii in case after case. E.g., he is himself well aware that every attempt to disprove the possibility of the miraculous has failed, as even J. S. Mill proved from the logical point of view. His book shows that he knows how completely all the anti-Christian writers whom he quotes have failed to convince one another, or perhaps even themselves, of the plausibility

---

1 "The Quest of the Historical Jesus," by Albert Schweitzer, Privatdozent; with Preface by Professor Burkitt. London: A. and C. Black. 1os. 6d. net.
of their efforts to explain away the resurrection of our Lord, or even a single one of the minor New Testament miracles. Yet he coolly denies the occurrence of these miracles (p. 51), though compelled to admit the bona fides of the Gospel writers and the fact that it has proved impossible to eliminate the miraculous element from the narrative. Regarding our Lord, he tells us that "there are few characters of antiquity about whom we possess so much indubitable historical information" (p. 6). Yet a careful study of Herr Schweitzer's work leaves us absolutely unable to say what facts regarding Him he holds to be historical, and by what criteria he professes to distinguish the "historical" from the "mythical" elements in the Gospel narratives. Herr Schweitzer would evidently like to regard our Lord as merely a great Jew of the first century, though more enlightened in some respects than most Jews of that time; yet his studies show him that this is absolutely impossible. Such a man would never have been heard of by the world at large, and would assuredly have been unable to change the world as Christ has undoubtedly done. The cause of this change must be adequate to the effect, but no adequate explanation of it has even yet been given except the Christian one—that Divine power was and is at work, that our Lord was what He claimed to be, and that the Gospel narrative is true. From this dilemma Strauss, Renan, Reimarus, and even Herr Schweitzer, have all failed to find an escape.

Our author quotes the attempts made by Seydel, Ghillany and Robertson, to trace certain elements in the Gospels back to Buddhistic, Mithraic, and Krishnaic influence respectively, but he lets it be seen that he rightly regards these efforts as unsuccessful (p. 290). Some not inconsiderable study of this question has convinced us of the absolute absurdity of such theories, regarded merely from the standpoint of scholarship. Not only these but all the other hypotheses quoted in the book smack of the professorial—or Privatdozentic—chair, and show an almost complete ignorance of real life and of things Eastern, as well as of man's spiritual needs and of the limits of human credulity. Renan had spent some time in Palestine, yet his description of the "docile" Eastern mule (p. 184), and, indeed, the whole of his romance, manifests a total inability to represent to himself the facts of the case and the circumstances of our Lord's life on earth. The want of reality is as conspicuous in his book as is its lack of moral earnestness.

The effect of Herr Schweitzer's book on the thoughtful and earnest reader is twofold. In the first place it fills him with sorrow that such an effort should be made to influence for evil those who are not really determined to find the truth in order to do God's will (John vii. 17). In the second it shows him how completely the efforts of unbelief during the last century and a half have failed to account for the Gospel portraiture of our Lord except on the supposition that it is historically correct. When we consider the author's admission that all the authors on the anti-Christian side in their "Quest of the Historical Jesus" (so called because it has really been an attempt to avoid being found by Him) have reached merely "negative" results (p. 396), and that, when He is found, "the historical Jesus will be to our time a stranger and an enigma," we are not surprised that he should say this. Men who start with the assumption that it is axiomatic that those who
knew the Lord Jesus best and loved Him most have given an entirely erroneous and unhistorical view of Him can hardly be expected to be successful in their "Quest," or at least in finding out the truth. Hence the rational (?) conclusion of our author that "the real, unmovable, historical foundation" of the kind of Christianity which he is trying to establish "is independent of any historical confirmation or justification" (p. 397). In the much-abused name of criticism, therefore, we are expected to accept as historical certain theories and assertions which their own latest advocate admits to be devoid of any historical justification! And yet this blind credulity is by some thought to be more intellectual than a living Christian faith.

We must speak out plainly on the subject dealt with in this book. This "Liberal Theology," or whatever it may be miscalled, is only a repetition of the old inquiry addressed to the world by those who write "with an eloquent hate" (p. 15): "What will ye give us, and we will deliver Him unto you?" Something more than thirty pieces of silver is now offered, and the scholar's fame too often takes the place of the traitor's shame. Yet still to-day, as before the Resurrection, the words of the betrayed, the Crucified, are true: "Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world." From the day these words were uttered to this, there has never been any real doubt as to the winning side in this great war.

The Missionary World.

By the Rev. A. J. Santer.

From the private circular letter of a lady missionary at Mankar, Bengal, we are able to give a short account of the funeral service in memory of our late King, Edward VII., held in the small, mud-built church of that station, which is both interesting and significant. Miss Harding writes: "It was a most impressive sight—a sea of earnest faces, deeply reverent. The Bengali Padre gave an address in the compound, so that all might have a chance of hearing. As I stood close to the Pastor and saw that huge assembly, Mohammedans, Hindus, Brahmins, and low-caste, all standing shoulder to shoulder, I thought how marvellous the power that can draw men together whatever be their caste. And strangely enough, too, instead of having their own demonstration separately, as they might have done, the Christian place of worship was chosen as a centre to show their last respect to our King. ... I recalled a similar crowd, only not so large, which gathered in the month of May, thirteen years ago, a hostile crowd, bent on doing me harm, because I had fed a famine-child, and because the effects of Christians living in the place were being felt. How different now, on May 20, 1910—a friendly crowd come to join with Christians to show respect to England's King and their Emperor! In that crowd I recognized some who were armed that memorable day with clubs, and now they stood side by side with me in the precincts of God's house. We can only say, What hath God wrought?
From *The Foreign Field* we learn that "fetishism is fast losing its hold of the people in West Africa, and they are losing faith in the gods of their fathers." But this encouraging fact is accompanied by a very serious problem which tempers the warmth of our rejoicing. The question is asked, "Is Christianity or Mohammedanism to take its place?" Our great hope for the future is in gaining and training the young people. For the most part our schools are well attended, but what can one solitary missionary do to supervise a huge tract of country nearly forty miles across? The loneliness and absence of that spiritual help which comes from Christian companionship makes the task wellnigh intolerable.

The subject of the aggressiveness of Islam is brought before us now every month in the magazines of nearly every section of the Church. Miss Deimler, giving a report of her work in Bombay, writes in *The Zenana* for July: "In closing this report I want to remind friends again that we want earnest prayer in this Mohammedan work, for in Islam we have to face a mighty foe, a religion with missionary aim, ever ready to spread its belief by fire and sword and preaching. An Arab lady told me that she was praying daily that not only I but all of us should be converted to Mohammedanism. As one passes through the streets of this city and hears the cry for prayer from many a minaret, one's heart's cry is: "How long, O Lord, how long? When wilt Thou give us the heathen for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession?"

In an article on idol-worship in Japan in *The C.M.S. Gleaner* for July, the sad fact is impressed upon us that the adoption of Western civilization may yet leave undisturbed the most deplorable superstitions. "The most degrading worship in Osaka is that of the foxes. To the great fox-temple, which is only fifteen minutes' walk from here, come the lowest class of criminals, both men and women, to invoke aid to carry out their base desires. The great foxes look the personification of evil, with their grinning stone faces, and in the faces of many of the worshippers wrong-doing is only too apparent. The power of the Adversary is plain and unveiled, and yet, even in the five minutes we are here, at least twenty people have come in to worship. These are the forces which are holding back millions of the lower classes, and the Church of Christ has hardly begun to touch these people."

Kabarega, ex-King of Bunyoro, now residing as an exile in the Seychelles, has found entrance into another kingdom, the joys of which are more durable and satisfying than those of any earthly realm. The Rev. R. H. Pickwood, incumbent of St. Matthew’s, Praslin, writing to Bishop Tucker, as quoted in *The C.M.S. Gleaner*, says: "My old friend, ex-King Kabarega, looks to me always for spiritual help since I was used of the Master to help him. . . . I was pleased to find him trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ. I began to teach him more about His love to sinners, when his son came in. Then I spoke in English, and the son acted as interpreter. Let me say that
Kabarega has been well taught. I prayed with him, and it was most pleasing to hear him repeat ‘Our Father.’ He then asked me to give him a Bible in his own language.”

The following from *The Bible in the World* gives us a glimpse of the ever-fresh power of the Old, Old Story: “A lady missionary travelling in the hills near Mussoorie stopped to speak with a gang of coolie women working on the road. Among them was a woman of considerable intelligence who spoke Urdu fairly well. Her husband was a Tibetan, who had in some way obtained a Gospel in the Tibetan language. The woman was familiar with the story of our Lord, but she refused to mention His crucifixion and death. “It was too awful,” she said; “I cannot bring myself to read it.” The lady asked, “Did you think His death was the end of all? Did you not see that He died for your sins and mine, and then arose from the dead and ascended to heaven, where He now lives to intercede for us?” A wave of delight swept over her face, as she replied, “I am so glad you have told me. I see it all. It must be true. He lives to save.”

From the same source we learn that the present demand for the Scriptures in Tinnevelly is unprecedented. The missionary itinerating bands, which a year or two ago were selling a hundred copies a month in the course of their tours, are now selling a thousand copies a month. And they find that the best recommendation of the books is to read passages aloud. One villager, who listened attentively to the preaching, promised to study a Gospel if a copy were given to him free, but he was not willing to pay for it. A schoolboy was thereupon called up and asked to read aloud the fifth chapter of St. Matthew. He had not read a dozen verses before the man stopped him and said to the preacher, “That is a good book. Here is the money.” Following his example, twenty others made similar purchases.

**Literary Notes.**

One or two interesting volumes may be expected shortly from Mr. Robert Scott. The Rev. Harrington C. Lees has written a new work entitled “St. Paul and his Converts.” This earnest book is now ready, and consists of Bible studies on the missionary principles of the New Testament, as illustrated in the Seven Churches to which St. Paul wrote epistles.

Mr. Edric Bayley has prepared for publication a volume which will undoubtedly prove of considerable interest to those who are concerned, in some way or another, with technical education and its administration. The work deals with that well-known South London institution, “The Borough Polytechnic Institute,” and so the book will be called. Very few people are aware, perhaps, of what tremendous value this particular institution is to this crowded district south of the Thames. A little while since the writer of these notes, in connection with some investigations which were being prepared concerning the Polytechnics of London, had the privilege of being shown the inner workings of
the place, and he was literally astonished at the activity which was to be found there, an activity, too, which was producing definite results. These London Polytechnics are a power for good, and we hope that they will continue to wield a great influence. We were sorry, however, to note the other day a falling off in the matter of students; but perhaps with the coming autumn sessions the old numbers may be reached, and passed too. Mr. Sidney Webb contributes an introduction to Mr. Bayley's readable book, in the course of which he says, "The story of the Borough Polytechnic affords a more than usually interesting example of the happy co-operation of endowment and municipal aid, of voluntary initiative and collective control." The volume is published by Mr. Elliot Stock.

Lady F. M. Macrae has written a book which should not fail to find a large circle of readers. It is a fascinating account, told in the form of a story, of a trip to the West Indies and back, and it is being published by Mr. Elliot Stock. The title of the volume is "Under the Burning Sun," and in the course of the work Lady Macrae gives a very succinct, although brief, description of the islands visited, and she does it in an attractive and chatty style.

Another little work to come from Mr. Stock is "Our Heavenly Home; Love Hereafter," by W. N. Griffin. As the title indicates, it is a consideration of the future life. One is always astonished, as each new book is announced about this subject, that the public interest is so definitely maintained, and how eagerly new works dealing with it are read and talked about. There is scope still for a really profound and earnest study of the whole question, so far as there is evidence at hand. When writers begin to speculate, then the difficulties commence; and there has really been no volume which has added anything to our knowledge of the future life beyond what is to be found in the New Testament. It is probable that we know and feel as much of the matter instinctively as can be found in all the scholarly books which deal with the question. But it is astonishing—and we speak with knowledge—how these kinds of books—good, bad, and indifferent—find purchasers. As soon as the volumes are announced, orders begin to come for them. We wonder why? Is it earnest effort to get nearer the truth, or is it but idle curiosity?

Mr. Fuller Maitland has completed the laborious task of editing the new edition of Grove's "Dictionary of Music," which he has certainly conducted with so much success. The fifth volume will be published by Messrs. Macmillan and Co. It contains a great deal of new matter, as well as a thorough revision of the articles which are retained from the first edition. It covers the letters T to Z, and includes an appendix. In this fifth volume will be found corrections and additions to the other four volumes, as well as a large number of biographies of the young English composers whose work has recently come prominently before the public.

Messrs. Sampson Low are the publishers of a life of Miss Alcott, the author of that wonderful book, entitled "Little Women," which still continues
to have a popularity of which many more modern authors would be proud. This life is chiefly based upon her journals, in one of which, it is of interest to note, she mentions that she went to Boston and saw the late King Edward when he was staying there as a young man. The work should certainly be worth reading.

Some few months back we had the pleasure of directing attention to that very charming novel, which is so clever and original, as well as so wholesome and witty, entitled "The Rosary." It is good news that another little story, called "The Wheels of Time," is being published. We understand that there are many characters in it in whom the admirer of "The Rosary" would be deeply interested, seeing that they attracted the reader so much in the latter book.

The Macmillans are bringing out a series of books, especially for young people, to be called "Readable Books in Natural Knowledge." These volumes have been especially prepared for boys and girls who have commenced the formal study of science in the school laboratory, but, though expressed in very simple language—and this, indeed, will be a distinct advantage—it is anticipated they will appeal equally to mature readers who are interested in the achievements of science. The first three volumes are "Wonders of Physical Science," by G. E. Fournier, B.Sc.; "Tillers of the Ground," by Marion I. Newbiggin, D.Sc.; and "Threads in the Web of Life," by Professor J. Arthur Thomson, M.A., and Margaret R. Thomson. The price of the books is 1s. 6d. each.

Last month we made reference to the Emmanuel Movement in America, calling attention to certain recent volumes appertaining to the subject. We see Messrs. Kegan Paul and Co. are bringing out a work entitled "Medicine and the Church," which deals very thoroughly with the relationship of medicine and the Church's ministry to the sick. Among those who have contributed essays to the book are Dr. A. W. Robinson, the Bishop of Bloemfontein, Prebendary Fausset, the Hon. Sidney Holland, and Dr. Jane Walker. An introduction has been written by the Bishop of Winchester.

Among the recent publications of the National Church League, valuable pamphlets, in every sense of the word, are "Rome's False Dogma" and "Great Britain's Mission," price one penny each, both sermons which were preached before the University of Oxford by Bishop Samuel Wilberforce. We should also like to draw attention to the earnest "Church Leaflets," published by the same Society. There are five on our table at the moment: "Incense," by W. Guy Johnson; "Hyperdulia: The Worship of Mary," by G. C. Parkhurst Baxter; "Children's Eucharists," by W. Guy Johnson; "Altar Lights," by the Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft, and "Prayers for the Dead," by Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas. These excellent little works, so full of sound reasoning, written in careful language, and without bitterness, are issued at one halfpenny each, or three shillings per hundred. They ought
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to be widely distributed. We note a valuable article by Mr. Parkhurst Baxter in the last number of the Church Gazette, entitled "Pater Dei: The Worship of Joseph." Perhaps this will be extended and eventually form a Church Leaflet.

Volumes V. and VI. of the Memorial Edition of the Rev. N. Dimock's works, which have introductory notes by the Bishop of Durham, have been brought out by the National Church League through Messrs. Longmans. They are "The History of the Book of Common Prayer," and "The Christian Doctrine of Sacerdotium." They are published at two shillings net each. The first four volumes in this new reprint, and already issued (1s. 6d. net each), are respectively entitled "The Doctrine of the Sacraments in Relation to the Doctrines of Grace," "The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper," "Christian Unity," and "Our One Priest on High." It is expected that one or two additional volumes will be published in September, of which "The Sacerdotium of Christ as taught in the Holy Scriptures," will be one. The importance of these new issues cannot be overestimated, and we sincerely hope they will have a wide sale.

Notices of Books.


The author considers that "the study of the Person and work of the Holy Spirit has been strangely neglected by the Church throughout her history." Not only so, but "even the Holy Scriptures do not deal with the doctrine of the Holy Ghost as with the nature and mediatorial work of Christ." Nevertheless, the Preface can refer to a list of upwards of twelve hundred books, or parts of books, of all ages dealing with the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. Dr. Downer rightly points out the serious spiritual dangers which have always accrued from neglect of the Person and doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and he sends forth his book as a contribution to that continuous need of thought of and prayer for the grace of the Holy Spirit which alone will enable the Church to realize to the full its great privileges and discharge its important responsibilities. Dr. Downer's plan has been "comprehensiveness rather than detailed fulness of treatment," and he has sought to deal with as many aspects of the doctrine as he could include in the space at his disposal. He calls attention to the need and purpose of the Pentecostal gift, as distinguished from the earlier work of the Spirit, as "the most characteristic part" of the work. He believes that there has been only one outpouring of the Spirit, "though given on two complementary occasions—first upon the Jews at Pentecost and later upon the Gentiles at Cæsarea." This is an important point, and has some far-reaching consequences. In the first chapter "The Theology of the Holy Spirit" is discussed, and the history of the doctrine is traced up to the time of St. John of Damascus. Probably
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space compelled Dr. Downer to stop at this point, though we do not see any reason why the theology of the Spirit should be arrested just there. He still abides in and guides the Church. In the second chapter the work of the Holy Spirit as recorded in the Old Testament is usefully and clearly delineated, while in Chapter III. we have the important subject of the Spirit in relation to our Lord Himself, followed by a brief supplementary chapter on "The Promise of the Father." A long important chapter follows on "The Nature of the Pentecostal Gift," and the various points recorded in Acts ii. are considered with care and fulness. Dr. Downer agrees with that school of theologians which believes that the effusion of Pentecost was final and never repeated, and that therefore there is now no further need of waiting for the Spirit. Chapter VI. is another long and important section dealing with "The Holy Spirit in the Church." This summarizes the teaching of the Acts and the Epistles. Two supplementary chapters discuss respectively "The Further Work of the Holy Spirit in the Church" and "The Perpetual Presence of Christ with His Church through the Vicariate of the Holy Ghost." Chapters IX. and X. are concerned with the work of the Spirit in the soul, while three more chapters discuss "The Missionary Outcome of the Holy Spirit's Work," "The Holy Spirit in the History of the Church and of the World," and "The Completion of the Holy Spirit's Work." It will be seen from this outline how thoroughly justified is Dr. Downer's claim to comprehensiveness. Indeed, there are some chapters in which too much is attempted in the space. Chapter VI., which summarizes the Acts and the Epistles, could easily have been elaborated into a volume or into a very much larger section. On the other hand, some of the discussions do not seem to have any more distinctive connection with the Spirit than with the second Person of the Trinity, and the space thus occupied might well have been utilized for the consideration of points specifically associated with the Spirit. Thus, we should have liked to see a careful treatment of the difference between the Old Testament and the New Testament doctrine of the Spirit in relation to the world. The cosmic element of the Spirit's work found in the Old Testament is singularly absent from the New, and it may be questioned whether the Holy Spirit is ever referred to in the New Testament apart from the Church and the individual Christian. We have one serious difference with Dr. Downer on a point of doctrine. In view of his belief that the effusion of Pentecost was unique, and no further outpouring is to be expected, he is naturally faced with the problem of the transmission of the gift of the Spirit to subsequent ages. He explains this by what he calls "the Apostolic rite of Confirmation." "The Fathers of the Church lay hands on the children of the Church, with prayer for the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit is still given" (p. 111). He accounts for the perpetuation of the ministry in the same way. Now, we take leave to question this altogether. In the first place, there is no proof that this work of laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Spirit was "a work reserved to Apostles" (p. 134). The case of Ananias and Saul ought to have prevented Dr. Downer from making such an assertion. In the next place, there is no proof that the Apostles could transmit this power, even if they alone possessed it themselves; while, in the third place, there is no trace either in the New Testament or in the Apostolic history of a connection between the Apostles
and the Bishops of the Church. Lightfoot and others have shown that the Episcopate came as a development of the Presbyterate and not by devolution from the Apostolate. Thus, we see that Dr. Downer’s view of the transmitted gift depends upon three important and vital conditions, not one of which is capable of proof. For our part, we contend that what is here called the Apostolic rite of Confirmation cannot be associated with our modern Confirmation in the way Dr. Downer endeavours to make out. The one and only point of connection is that which is indicated in our Prayer-Book when it speaks of the laying on of hands after the example of the Apostles, “to certify them by this sign of Thy Fatherly goodness.” It would be very serious—indeed, fatal—for all non-episcopal Churches if Dr. Downer’s view were right, for his doctrine goes clean contrary to some of the most evident facts of the Holy Spirit’s presence in other Churches than those where Bishops are to be found. We are entirely at one with Dr. Downer in believing in the uniqueness of the Pentecostal effusion, but we are also perfectly certain that the transmission of the gift was not brought about in so purely mechanical a way. But notwithstanding this, to us, seriously erroneous feature of doctrine, Dr. Downer’s book contains a vast amount of teaching and suggestion which all who love Christ and desire to honour the Spirit will be thankful to have and ponder. The book will prove a useful contribution to the study of the special topic of which it treats.


Readers of “The Life and Letters of Dr. Hort” will remember that in the scheme arranged between him, Lightfoot, and Westcott, for a Commentary on the New Testament, the Epistle of St. James was to fall to Hort. Throughout the “Life” there are references to it as in progress, and, indeed, the fulness and frequency of these allusions gave hope that the work would be found practically complete. But this, unfortunately, was not the case, for the present volume has only a Commentary up to chap. iv. 7, with Introduction and Additional Notes. All who know and value Dr. Hort’s great powers will feel the keenest regret at this incompleteness, especially as other works of his on Peter and Revelation have been published in the same fragmentary form. But they will also feel profoundly thankful for what is found here, for, like everything Dr. Hort wrote, it is “dust of gold.” No one will ever think of studying the Epistle of St. James without consulting this precious fragment of the great Cambridge scholar. Dr. Murray of Selwyn College contributes an introduction which goes beyond any mere explanation of the circumstances connected with the publication of this volume. His words deserve attention for their illuminating contribution to the question of the place of Commentaries, and also for their appreciation of the value of the work of the great Cambridge trio. Well may he say that “it is impossible to overestimate the debt which English Christianity has owed” to Lightfoot, Westcott, and Hort. The present Commentary is marked by all that patient minuteness which we have learnt to expect and value in Dr. Hort’s work. We do not pretend to discuss
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particular points of exegesis; it is at once a duty and a pleasure to call attention to it, and to thank those who are responsible for giving us yet one more fragment of the work of this profound scholar.


We offer our hearty congratulations to Dr. Courthope on having brought to a conclusion his really great contribution to the history of English Poetry. In fulness and clearness of presentation, this work can challenge comparison with any work on the national literature, and we do not think it is likely to be superseded. We regret, indeed, that the author has thought fit to bring his work to a conclusion with the death of Scott, instead of with the death of Swinburne; and we can but express a hope that, some time, a seventh volume will be added in order to round off the history. It seems a great pity that such a work as this should be left incomplete, and incomplete any history must be which does not include criticism and discussion of such poets as Tennyson, Rossetti, William Morris, Browning, and Swinburne. Between 1832 and 1900 a veritable epoch is contained, an epoch a great deal more important and far-influencing than that which began in, say, 1730, and closed with the beginnings of the French Revolution. Mr. Courthope has given us, with a fulness that is unnecessary, many pages on Rogers, Campbell, Moore, Southey, and the rest—men whose work is not of any first-rate importance; these pages we could have, in a large measure, spared, if by their excision room could have been found for some adequate treatment of the Victorian era. However, we are thankful for what Mr. Courthope has done; he will add to our sense of satisfaction if he can bring himself to essay the task—no doubt an exacting one—of dealing with the later romanticists. The time has assuredly come for estimating the place and formative influences of those poets, in the light of whose presence we of this age still live.

OLD CRITICISM AND NEW PRAGMATISM. By J. M. O’Sullivan. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Co.

The essays which make up this stout octavo are “an attempt to exhibit the Kantian system as an immanent philosophical criticism of first principles.” Students who are interested in such problems as the new “Pragmatism” of Professor James forces us once more to confront, will be interested in reading this book. But it supposes a fairly considerable first-hand acquaintance with the metaphysics of the later schools, and will hardly find readers save among professed students of philosophy. But Pragmatism, with its insistence on the instrumental character of conceptions, and its denial, within the realm of human experience, of the existence of necessary laws and categories, is bulking so largely on the philosophical horizon just now that an acquaintance both with what it sets out to show and with its real implications is (in some sort) needful. Pragmatism is radically empirical, and almost naturally follows from the prevailing empirical trend of latter-day thought. The exact incidence of its doctrine, when regarded in connection with the critical philosophy, must be fairly taken into account.
This Dr. Sullivan endeavours to do, his conclusion being that Pragmatism, unable to supply a canon for deciding the relative value that man ought to attach to the satisfaction of different desires, fails as a rational explanation of the riddle of things; it is (to use the words of the writer) "a confession of the futility of all logic."

**The Gospel of the Kingdom.** By H. E. Savage, D.D. London: Longmans and Co. Price 10s. 6d. net.

This most painstaking work sets forth the Sermon on the Mount in the light of contemporary Jewish thought and ideals. Dean Savage made a great hit, when he was in the North of England, by his lectures to the clergy; the present volume is the considered result of those lectures. Its special value lies in its ample footnotes and its discussions on separate points of interest — e.g., the note on ἀγαπέον (pp. 136-140). Very carefully does the Dean make use of the Talmud, and other sources of information, in order to illustrate the religious attitude of the Jews during the time of Jesus, and thus to arrive at the original force of the message of the "sermon" as the formal statement of the Gospel of the Kingdom. The word "kingdom" was continually on the lips of our Lord, and it is of the utmost importance to understand precisely what significance our Lord attached to the word. If the Dean of Lichfield has not added much to our knowledge, he has rendered valuable service by carefully summing up, and illustrating, the teachings of Jesus on this momentous theme, and we feel grateful to him for his book. One of the best sections is that in which the Lord's Prayer is discussed. The Dean is convinced that this prayer forms an integral part of the sermon, and is no mere apt insertion of the Evangelist, intended to illustrate principles already formulated by Jesus. The Dean makes out a very good case for his contention, and the cumulative force of his argument cannot be overlooked.


It is altogether unnecessary to do more than call attention to this "Second Edition, Revised and Supplemented," of a work that has taken its place among the most important of the absolutely indispensable books dealing with the Synoptic Problem. Sir John Hawkins modestly describes his work as "Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem," but, though "mainly a collection of materials," it is of such a kind that every student of the Gospels is now indebted to it for much that both saves his time and introduces him to some of the most important questions connected with the study of the Gospels. The present edition is marked by an entire revision, and also by the addition of numerous small supplements made to many lists of words. The book is the fruit of years of close, patient study, and will be needed constantly by all serious students. It is a credit to English and, let us add, Oxford scholarship.


The recent death of the venerable author has been a fresh reminder of the profound debt we all owe to him for his marvellous gifts as a preacher
and teacher. In our judgment he has not been surpassed by any one of the
great names of our day. His knowledge of Scripture, his genuine scholar­
ship, his homiletical genius, his profound experience, and his literary gifts,
are a constant delight and inspiration. We are thankful beyond measure
for the work he did and for the legacy he has left behind. His books will
long abide as the very best guides to preachers and a source of spiritual
profit to all Christian people. The present volume contains some of his
most characteristic work. It is a satisfaction to learn that, although this is
the last volume of the series which the author saw in its completed form,
all his manuscripts are already in the printers' hands, and that many of the
proof-sheets of the three remaining volumes have been corrected.

Westminster Sermons. By the Rev. H. Hensley Henson, D.D. London :
James Clarke and Co. Price 3s. 6d. net.

Twenty-four sermons in three series of eight each. The first is headed
“Anglicanism,” and includes such subjects as “The Historic Episcopate
and Inter-Communion,” “Anglicanism and Reunion,” “Cyprian,” and
“Baxter.” In this section are several subjects which Canon Henson has
made peculiarly his own, and they will provide food for thought, and facts
for argument which in our judgment are conclusive against the extreme
Anglicanism of to-day. The second section is headed “Theological and
Ecclesiastical,” and includes sermons on “Jesus or Christ?” “The Failure of
Tradition,” “The Unity of the Church,” “The Bible,” “The Christian
Ministry.” On these subjects we do not find the preacher quite so con­
vincing, though our readers will be glad to know that the first sermon in
this section is that which appeared in our columns for January last. It is
on the subject of the Bible that we find ourselves unable to follow the
preacher; on the contrary, we are decidedly opposed to his view of the
character, authority, and uniqueness of Holy Scripture, especially the Old
Testament. The third section includes subjects “Social and National,”
and here again the Canon has much to say that is thoughtful, robust, and
truly valuable for these times. The book as a whole is marked by all the
manly vigour which we value in Canon Henson, and the sermons are well
worthy of attention whether we agree with them or not.


A series of studies in eight divisions, covering the salient points now at
issue in regard to the Old Testament. Our readers have already been
made aware of Mr. Robinson's power by two or three articles which are
here reproduced. We are glad to have them again in this more permanent
form, together with a number of similar studies. For clearness and cogency
the treatment leaves little or nothing to be desired, and the book forms a
contribution of real value for the study of the Old Testament. Mr. Robinson
is a thorough student, knows his ground well, and is able to give a good
account of himself. We commend this volume to the attention of all who are
interested in and concerned about present-day problems of the Old Testament.
There are nearly seventy illustrations, well reproduced, drawn from various
sources.
THE EXPANSION OF CHRISTENDOM: A STUDY IN RELIGIOUS HISTORY. By Mrs. Ashley Carus-Wilson, B.A. Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. 338. 6s.

Readers of Mrs. Ashley Carus-Wilson's admirable books on the Bible and on Missions know well that she has a genius for systematic and logical arrangement, and the present work is especially conspicuous for that characteristic. The best thing that a reviewer can do is to mention her divisions and subdivisions, and indicate their scope and purpose. The book is in three parts, headed "Ecclesiae Finis: The Case for Missions"; "Ecclesiae Acta: The Course of Missions"; "Ecclesiae Agenda: The Crisis of Missions." Part I. contains six short chapters, dealing with six Motives for Missions—the Philanthropic, the Eschatological, the Theological, the Loyal, the Fraternal, the Filial. The first four explain themselves. The Fraternal Motive is "Concern for the Church's Welfare," no Church prospering without a missionary spirit; and the Filial Motive is "Conformity to the Will of God." The first three were the motives of our grandfathers, and the Philanthropic is still the one that appeals to the man of the world; but the last three are the irresistible motives to the Christian. Part II. has fourteen chapters. The first shows how the idea of national religions has given way to the larger idea of international religions, of which there are three—Buddhism, Islam, and Christianity. Then eight chapters give a historical summary of the rise and progress of those three; and the remaining five can best be exhibited by their titles: The Seven Empires of the World, A.D. 1910; The Ebb and Flow of Peoples; The Seven Religions of the World; The Decadence of Buddhism and Mohammedanism; Christianity Conquering and to Conquer. The way is thus prepared for Part III., with its seven stirring chapters: The Opportunity and the Aim; The Changed Pagan Field; The Changing East; Many Adversaries; Missionary Strategy and Comity; The Call; The Outlook. The moral of Part I. is "It must be done"; of Part II., "It can be done"; of Part III., "It shall be done." The book is full of illustrative facts and incidents gathered from all parts of the world; its quotations from other writers, and the mottoes of its chapters, are most happy, and give evidence of wide reading; the historical chapters are the outflow of a genuine historic instinct; the style is clear, crisp, strong. Its design is to appeal especially to "the intelligent Church-goer, who regards Christian Missions as uninteresting and unimportant, and gives carnal aid and yet more carnal thought to them." For such a purpose the book is admirably planned, and its plan admirably executed; yet it will be read with interest and profit by the best-instructed enthusiast, just because it will systematize his mass of undigested information, and give him a correct general view of the subject. Mrs. Ashley Carus-Wilson has rendered the whole Church of Christ real service by this book, and we would say to all our readers: Buy it, read it, put it on a near shelf for frequent reference, and recommend it to all your friends.

E. S.

PRESENT-DAY PREACHING. By C. L. Slattery. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Price 3s. 6d. net.

Books on preaching abound; and this is not surprising, for every age, and indeed almost every decade, has its own needs which preachers must face and supply. Dr. Slattery is an honoured clergyman of the Protestant
Episcopal Church of America, and here gives what he calls "the frank account of what a reasonably varied experience shows to be the practical requirements of preaching at this particular time." The book is the outcome of personal ministerial life, and we can well believe that the lectures were as enjoyable to hear as they are to read. In the course of four lectures Dr. Slattery discusses "The Form of a Sermon," "Acquiring Material," "Subjects of Sermons," and "The Preacher's Attitude towards His Congregation." He thus covers the essential ground of preaching, gives abundant counsel from his store of spiritual, intellectual, and pastoral experience. We are not able to agree with him on the superiority of the written sermon; indeed, his own admissions go far to destroy the case he endeavours to make out. But in the lecture on "Acquiring Materials," he is at his best, and we could wish that the admirable advice were pondered and followed by every preacher, old and young. It has been a hobby with the present writer to collect all available books on preaching published during the last twenty-five years, and the volume is gladly added to the list, and will be given an honoured place. We have greatly enjoyed its breeziness, its common sense, its insight into essential needs, and its masculine tone and bearing. Even those who most desire a little more definite Evangelicalism in teaching and spirit will easily be able to add this to the admirable materials here provided.


Another book for clergy and ministers, and, though written from the standpoint of a Scottish Presbyterian, it can be read with profit by English Churchmen. In a series of nineteen chapters, the writer ranges over practically the entire ground of ministerial life, and does it well. Starting with the minister himself as the point of primary and fundamental emphasis, the writer gives us wise counsel based on experience as to Sermons, Visitation, Work among the Young, Home, Books, Missions, Monday, and other aspects of ministerial work. It is said to be "written for beginners," and certainly nothing could be better than that beginners should ponder these wise and suggestive hints. But older ministers would also profit by the many earnest reminders of what their life might and should be. The writer's modest preface expresses the hope that "there might be a place for a book treating in simple fashion of the daily necessities of ministerial duty." We can assure him that there is such a place, and that this book will do much to fill it.

The Road to Happiness. By Yvonne Sarcey. London: Andrew Melrose. Price 3s. 6d. net.

The book consists of three parts—the Girl, the Woman, the Child. As it is a translation from the French, we find in it much of the French atmosphere and standpoint. It abounds in good common sense, and its chapters deal with all those ordinary matters which are supposed to make or mar the happiness of life. Shrewd remarks abound on the present-day excess in exercise, on the mad speed-rushes of the motor in the pursuit of pleasure, and on the superficialities of modern fashionable life. While the book is elevating in its tone and aims, it has nothing in it of religion. To those of us who believe that Christianity, which means Christ in the heart
as the only source of true happiness, is indispensable, the work is inadequate, and its title claims too much. But within its limits it can be heartily commended.


A series of "Thoughts on the Holy Spirit in the Epistle to the Ephesians," with two introductory chapters on Devotional Life. Dr. Murray is at his best in work of this kind, and those who have learnt to value and profit by his former books will gladly welcome this little volume. It is full of rich and ripe spirituality, and will prove a precious companion for the quiet hour.


Biffel of the Wise Eyes, and the most intelligent of all oxen, is the central figure of this book. Around him are the Kaffirs, the white men, and the outdoor life of South Africa. The illustrations constitute a large part of this very clever delineation of animal life and characteristics. Probably it is a book which will appeal to the few, as it is distinctly a work for animal lovers. Doubtless, too, those who know something of life on the African veldt will most appreciate the story of Biffel.


It is somewhat doubtful whether a new book on Marcus Aurelius, unless of the purely scholastic kind, was called for, after Bigg's admirable introduction to the new Oxford translation of the "Thoughts," or Professor Davidson's equally admirable monograph on the Stoics, published not long since. Of course Dr. Bussell's book is valuable, as we should expect, but it seems to fall between two stools. As a treatise for scholars pure and simple it is, perhaps, not altogether what was required; as a volume in a series, professedly of the "popular" kind, it is altogether out of place, being loaded with Greek quotations and matter that the average educated reader will have no patience to read. By far the best part of the book is contained in the first fifty pages, and this might well be issued separately. The rest of the work cannot make anything but a limited appeal to everyday folk; they will probably content themselves with Matthew Arnold's Essay, the Introductions prefixed to Long's translation, or Bigg's Preface (already referred to). The book is provided with no index—a great defect, we think, in a work of this kind.


We are heartily glad to receive another book from the Bishop of Bristol. A diocesan Bishop in these days is apt to lose touch with the world of letters—owing to a multiplication of duties (many of them of a harassing nature)—unless he be unusually vigorous both in mind and body. As for Bishop Browne, despite his seventy-five years, it is difficult to imagine him other than vigorous, physically and mentally, and this book is proof enough—were such needed—that his old fire and enthusiasm are unabated. Like all
the Bishop's books, this monograph on Boniface is somewhat overweighted with names, and the style is heavy. In other words, it is not a book to be skimmed for the sake of the story; it is a genuine historical work, written by a student for students, not by a dexterous penman for an omnivorous public. Its publication just about the time of the World's Missionary Conference was singularly opportune; for in the noble army of missionary-pioneers few hold a higher place than Winfried of Crediton, the great Apostle of Germany—traveller, monk, archbishop, evangelist, and martyr.


This book professes to discuss, in certain important aspects, "the journey of a soul," with its trio of duties, or offices—(1) self-preservation; (2) the soul's attitude towards another soul; (3) its attitude towards God. Along with some things that are fanciful, others of doubtful value, and some few statements which appear thoroughly unfounded, the book is valuable as a reminder to us, in days of mammon-worship and growing materialism, that our true citizenship is in heaven; that, apart from God, the world itself is but one vast orphanage; and that all our "moralties" and ethical systems are but "vain dust that builds on dust," destined, not to regenerate, but to puzzle mankind.


We fully recognize the good intention of the writer of this little book, but we cannot honestly praise the performance as a whole. It is founded largely on an unscholarly and discredited view of certain prophetic writings in the Old and New Testament, and, though we admit that the writer, following hard after the late Dr. Grattan Guinness, makes some good "points" in his impeachment of Papalism, we do not think the cause of a really sound Protestantism is likely to be furthered by books of this sort, however vigorously worded or ingeniously set forth.


This suggestive little work accepts the modern ascertained facts regarding Matter, Life, and Mind, and their genesis as interpreted by scientists; and exhibits them, in relation to the Bible, as the natural bases of its own revealed facts and doctrines. This is accomplished, not by accommodating both systems of knowledge to each other, but by accepting both in their simplest sense. In evidence of this, the author finds that the plain and obvious interpretation of the Scriptures is the one most congruous with those natural principles revealed by science. Thus the supreme authority of the Bible is vindicated.


It is a great satisfaction to observe that this cheaper edition has been so soon demanded. John Wilkinson was one of the noblest spirits whom we ever met, and this record of his saintly and energetic life affords an admirable idea of the man and his work. His zeal on behalf of Jewish Missions was intense, thorough, and Scriptural. We hope that this new and cheap edition will have an ever-widening sphere of usefulness.
NOTICES OF BOOKS

ARJUN: THE LIFE-STORY OF AN INDIAN BOY. By S. E. Stokes. Westminster: S.P.G. Price is. 6d. net.
This is a story culled from life by Mr. Stokes, the well-known American missionary, who has formed the Brotherhood of the Imitation of Jesus. It relates the process of the conversion of an Indian boy, showing incidentally the influence of mission-schools, the power of example in the case of a convert of high caste, as well as what “conversion” actually involves for many Indians. The story is charming in simplicity and telling in directness, and will be read with profit by all interested in missionary work.

REPRINTS AND PAMPHLETS.

This is an admirable number. All the papers are interesting, and some of them quite valuable. The first, by Dr. M. G. Kyle, is on “Recent Testimony of Archaeology to the Scriptures,” and is full of good things well put, which should be read by all lovers of the Old Testament. Other articles scarcely less important are “Paul on the Resurrection of Christ,” by Dr. C. M. Mead; “An Attested or a Self-Developed Saviour—Which?” by Dr. G. N. Boardman; and a very clever “skit” on certain aspects of modern criticism entitled “The Two Lord Lyttons”; while Mr. H. M. Wiener discusses with his accustomed ability and acuteness the fourth chapter of Wellhausen’s “Prolegomena,” which deals with “Priests and Levites.” Altogether an extremely useful number.

This quarterly is always welcome, and is sure to contain some papers of permanent value. We would call special attention to four of the six papers. “The First Conflict on the Divinity of Christ,” “The New Evangelistic Movement in the German Church,” “The Place of the Resurrection in History,” and “The Value of Christ’s Death.” The other two articles are of special interest to Baptists—“The Seven Churches” and “The Panlickian Churches.” The book reviews are as usual fresh, strong, and well up to date.

Another instalment of this admirable series of modern fiction. Dainty in appearance, convenient to handle, and thoroughly representative of modern writers, these volumes will necessarily be in great demand. For holiday reading nothing could be better.

With unfailing regularity and with singular timeliness of choice, Messrs. Nelson pursue their pathway as pioneers of cheap literature. These two, the latest in their series, are too well known to require more than bare notice at our hands.


The North London Christian Evidence League has been doing good service during the last year or two in giving lectures with opportunities for questions and discussions, and then publishing the results in cheap pamphlet form. These represent the first twelve lectures. For the most part they are admirable in clearness, force and cogency, but we cannot agree with the general line taken on the subject of Old Testament criticism. Indeed, in connection with two of these lectures the opponents seem to us to have made some unanswerable points, and we are not surprised, because the modern view of the Old
Testament is peculiarly vulnerable to the attacks of scepticism. On New Testament
subjects and on theological topics generally there is much that is useful in these pamphlets
and worthy of wide distribution. We would call special attention to the pamphlet on
"Pagan Christs," by Dr. Tisdall, as particularly able and timely.

**TALKS ON THE RACES TO BE Won.** London: *Church Missionary Society.* Price 6d. net.

Another of the textbooks for Junior Missionary Study Bands and for missionary
speakers to children. There are six "Talks," well stated and admirably illustrated. Just
the very book for providing material for children's missionary lessons and addresses.

**THE STORY OF THE LOCOMOTIVE.** Price 5s. **DOGS: THEIR BREEDS AND CHARACTERISTICS.**
Price 7s. 6d. London: *Funk and Wagnalls Company.*

These two large pamphlets, in stiff covers, are reprinted from the Standard Dictionary,
and provide an immense amount of valuable information on the subjects dealt with. The
full illustrations and "dissectible models" add materially to the value and afford ample
opportunities for thorough study.

**THE FACULTY OF READING.** By George Radford. Cambridge: *University Press.* Price
1s. net.

An interesting and valuable account of the varied work of the National Home-Reading
Union, which celebrates its coming of age this year. All who are concerned for the
intellectual improvement of our country should make a point of reading this pamphlet,
and then of helping forward the work of the Union in every possible way.


A sketch of English literature from the earliest days to the present, published in
connection with that admirable organization, the National Home-Reading Union. As a
brief introduction to the study of English literature nothing could be more appropriate and
helpful.

Price 1d.

A striking testimony from one who knows the Roman Church from the inside.

**THE LAW OF LOVE IN THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.** By Rev. G. Friedlander.

Written by the minister of a London synagogue. It will be interesting to Christians
to see what a Jew thinks of his own and of their religions, but the teaching will not carry
conviction to those who are aware of the spiritual sterility of modern Judaism.

Price 1s.

Selected from the sermons of the Rev. A. H. Stanton, of St. Albans, Holborn.

**A BRIEF HISTORY OF MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE.** London: *Burroughs Wellcome and Co.*

A little volume drawn up for the members of the World Missionary Conference at
Edinburgh, and intended to introduce the various medical equipments suited for mis­
sionaries which are provided by the well-known firm of Burroughs Wellcome and Co.

We have received from the Oxford University Press the new edition of the Prayer-
Book necessitated by the creation of the Duke of Cornwall as Prince of Wales. This
edition renders the George V. Prayer-Book complete, and we may confidently hope that
there will be no further changes in the Prayer-Book for a long time to come. The editions
vary in size and price, and can be obtained with or without hymns. They are sent out
with all the finish and attractiveness for which the Oxford Press is famous.

We have also received an edition called "The Commemoration Prayer-Book," which
includes the various Forms of Prayer and Services relating to King Edward from the time
of his birth to the Services in commemoration of his death. There are also several
illustrations of persons, places, and scenes connected with our late King's life. A most
attractive volume, which can be obtained in various forms and sizes, and with or without
hymns. Many will be glad to possess themselves of this unique edition.

**Messrs. Funk and Wagnalls** have sent us a supplementary list of about five hundred
recent words which have been added to the vocabulary of their Standard Dictionary.
The sheet can be readily edged with paste and inserted at the end of the existing addenda.
Possessors of that valuable dictionary will be only too glad to obtain this supplementary
list, which apparently has every modern word of importance, except "aviation," though
even here there are illustrations of monoplanes and biplanes.