

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

January, 1911.

The Month.

Greeting. OUR first words in the first issue of the New Year are a message of hearty greeting to the many friends and supporters of the CHURCHMAN. We hope that to them, both individually and collectively, the year 1911 will bring peace and happiness. We hope that they will find increasing pleasure and profit in the magazine they have so loyally upheld; and we hope that their numbers will be greatly augmented as the year goes on. We have given on a separate sheet our programme for the coming year, and we have indicated there the principles on which the magazine will be conducted. About the distinction and ability of the writers who have promised to help us, we need say nothing here. Our profession of principle will commend itself, we venture to think, to all sober and loyal Churchmen. The year 1911 promises to be a momentous one for us all, both as Churchmen and as citizens. We may well take on our lips the prayer of one who was pre-eminent as a citizen and a patriot: "Remember us, O our God, for good."

Islington Programme. We have received the programme for the forthcoming Islington clerical meeting. We shall hope to touch on some of the subjects to be discussed next month, but we are glad now to express our satisfaction that the programme includes questions concerning which there will be difference of opinion amongst us on matters of detail. Evangelicalism is not a school of shibboleths. We are united on great fundamental principles; but the right of private judgment is duly honoured. It is good, therefore, that such questions as

Biblical criticism and reunion should be frankly and fully discussed amongst us; that this will be done at Islington in the spirit of frankness and of charity we are confident. The Evangelical school must be loyal to principle, but it must set no narrow bounds to its comprehensiveness. Things that do not matter must not be allowed to divide.

Prayer-Book Revision, We expressed last month our profound satisfaction that the debate in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury ended in a decisive victory for Prayer-Book reform. We are not unaware that difficulties lie ahead, but we face them in a spirit of optimism. As the question will probably be before us for some time to come, our present issue may be a seasonable opportunity for giving an account, in brief and general terms, of our point of view. In connection with this, we may refer to the admirable series of pamphlets on Prayer-Book Revision, edited by Canon Beeching, and written by scholars of distinguished eminence and ability. These pamphlets have already been reviewed in our columns, but in view, alike of their authorship and their contents, they may well claim further notice. As we indicate the points on which we agree with Canon Beeching's series, and the points on which we differ, our own attitude on the questions under discussion will clearly emerge.

Points of Agreement. We hasten, then, to say that with a very large part of what is said in these pamphlets we are in entire agreement. If the Lectionary be revised, we should support, in general, the principles laid down by Professor Emery Barnes. We agree heartily with the Bishop of Winchester's careful and guarded proposals for the revision of the Prayer-Book Psalter. We needed no conversion to become upholders of the able and learned plea, by the Dean of Christ Church, for modification in the present usage of the Athanasian Creed. What, then, remains? Simply the vexed question of the Ornaments Rubric. It seems, at first glance, a pity, where there is so much agreement, to lay stress on the solitary point

of difference. It is, however, because we feel this solitary point to be so fundamental that we are compelled to emphasize it, and to justify, if possible, our attitude. It may serve to clear the ground if, in the case of this particular point also, we speak of agreement before we define the points of difference.

Further Agreement. In the first place, we must express our sincere appreciation, not only of the judicial fairness with which the case for permissive use of the Vestments is here stated, but of the large-hearted toleration and the genuine Christian charity which pervades the whole statement. The tone and temper of the whole is entirely admirable. Further, we are convinced that Canon Beeching and those who think with him are as wishful as we are to be loyal to the Reformation. Speaking of the two parties in the Church, he says :

“In both cases there must be a limit to comprehensiveness, and the limit is set by loyalty. In the Church of England the limit set to comprehensiveness must be the definition of the Church as both Catholic and Reformed, a limit expressed in such Articles of Religion as the Sixth which lays it down that the rule of faith is to be found in Holy Scripture.”

He holds that within the limits of proper comprehensiveness, so defined, a permissive use of the Eucharistic Vestments may find a place.

On what grounds does Canon Beeching hold that this permissive use is desirable within a Church that is not only Catholic, but Reformed? He holds, in the first place, that our best Liturgical scholars have shown that the Vestments are not in themselves significant of doctrine. He points to the fact that they were permitted in the Prayer-Books of 1549 and 1559—admitting, of course, that in each case they were subsequently disallowed. He reminds us that other Reformed Churches, such as those of Scandinavia, do still continue to use these Vestments. He recognizes, indeed, the decision of the Privy Council for the present as binding, and to be so regarded by law-abiding citizens. In fact, he has very grave words to say about the present condition of lawlessness. But he still prays that in the interests of charity, of the peace of the Church, of

liberal thought, of toleration, the permissive use of these Vestments may be sanctioned.

The Point of Difference. On what grounds do we justify our inability to support a plea urged with such kindness and moderation? It is not, let us hasten to say, on the ground of the Privy Council judgment. We believe that judgment to be a right one, and we agree heartily with Canon Beeching's view that the decisions of this Court, as long as the Court remains, "are legal and binding, and must be so regarded by law-abiding citizens." But we do not rest our case upon this. We believe that to sanction the use of the Eucharistic Vestments will be a step, and a long step, towards destroying that Reformed character of our Church which Canon Beeching wishes to maintain. We must respectfully differ from him on the point of the doctrinal significance of the Vestments. In spite of the finding of the five Bishops, we believe that the use of Vestments is desired, not on sentimental grounds of historic continuity, but because they are deemed by those who use them to express a particular view of the Holy Communion, and that view is the pre-Reformation one. We believe there is a minority of men in the Church of England—an able and powerful minority—whose ideal is reunion with Rome. They are persistent, far-seeing men, with a definite goal in view. To sanction authoritatively the use of Vestments which are those used by the Roman Church, to familiarize the rising generation with these as an authorized part of the worship of our Church, will be to take a longer step than has ever yet been taken towards destroying entirely the most excellent results of the Reformation.

The Reason. We are at one with Canon Beeching in wishing to maintain the Reformed character of our Church. It is on the question of means that we differ. A step which he thinks would be innocuous we feel would be fraught with disaster. Lest he should think we are unduly alarmist, may we ask him to refer to the *Church Times* for November 4? In replying to a

comment of the CHURCHMAN, the following words were used : " Our contemporary evidently does not realize that the Church of England is not at variance with Rome on the Sacrament of the Altar, but on the papal claims and all that they involve." This is perfectly frank, and reveals the whole situation. The Vestments are wanted by men who hold that "*the Church of England is not at variance with Rome on the Sacrament of the Altar,*" and who find in the use of them a most potent instrument for promulgating that view. Believing this to be the case, we cannot support the plea for a permissive use. In saying so, we are neither scheming for a party triumph, nor relying with Erastian confidence on a Privy Council judgment. We are taking what seems to us the only course of action that is consistent with the maintenance of our Reformation heritage.

We make no apology for returning to this much-discussed subject. The evidence of Dr. Sanday and Dr. Inge exactly takes the line for which we contended last month. The highest scholarship of the land has practically told us that St. Matthew must not be sacrificed. That sacrifice is essential to the campaign which would abolish the existing divorce law. Practical men have regarded that campaign as futile. Now scholarship has robbed it of its intellectual basis. According to the summary of his evidence Professor Denney made a statement which seems to lie at the back of the exception recorded in St. Matthew ; he spoke of cases in which the Divine ideal had evidently been frustrated. Obviously that is so in the cases in which, according to St. Matthew, our Lord did not regard marriage as indissoluble. Does it not seem likely that the frustration of the Divine ideal, in such cases, led our Lord, at least on one occasion, to exempt them from the general law which we are all anxious to maintain ?

Edinburgh. The Reports of the Commissions of the World's Missionary Conference have found their way on to the book-shelves of many of us. They form a small library of nine most important volumes, volumes which it is

impossible to submit to ordinary review. They will provide us for years with subjects for study, and food for thought. They will influence all the missionary effort of the future. After Edinburgh, the world of missionary enterprise can never be the same again. The Reports must not be unread and unstudied as so many reports are. We of the CHURCHMAN desire to help in this matter, and those pages which, under the careful and effective guidance of the Rev. A. J. Santer, have directed our attention to missionary topics will take a somewhat new form from this month onwards. They will be written by an Edinburgh delegate of exceptionally wide experience, and they will aim at making permanent the Edinburgh spirit, the Edinburgh ideals, and the Edinburgh lessons. We sincerely hope that this new feature of the magazine will quicken the missionary interest and arouse the missionary activities of us all.

The Question
of Greek
at Oxford.

On November 22 of last year the Statute abolishing Greek as a compulsory subject in Responsions was promulgated in Convocation. When a vote was taken on the preamble to the Statute, the proposition was defeated by 188 votes to 152. We are the more delighted at this result as we had hardly ventured to hope for so large a majority. The size of the hostile majority was due to the sweeping nature of the proposition, which would have made Greek optional for all. There are many who would be prepared to grant a measure of relief to distressful scientists and mathematicians, but who still uphold Greek as a necessary element in all courses that are concerned with languages, literature, and history. These "moderate" men were compelled to join forces with the out-and-out supporters of Greek, if the language was to be saved at all. The speeches of Professor Murray and Professor Mackail made it clear that they had no wish to take up an attitude of blank negation. Provided that Greek be regarded as essential for all who were going on to study in any faculty of humane letters, they are quite willing to consider proposals for the exemption of other students.

A Suggested
Compromise.

Professor Sonnenschein, of Birmingham—whose devotion to the cause of classical learning none would question—has pointed out in a letter to the *Times* that the case can be largely met by differentiating the Matriculation Examination—by demanding a knowledge of Greek from all who intend to read the older school of “*Literæ Humaniores*” (whether Pass or Honour); from all who take Medieval and Modern Languages and Literature; from all who take Modern History; but from no other students than these. It may be that by some such method as this we shall let go the shadow and save the substance. But, for ourselves, we view the whole process with misgiving. An attack on Latin will certainly follow the attack on Greek. The whole fabric of classical education will be jeopardized. As we said two months ago, the newer Universities may have the fullest scope to experiment in newer theories of education. Oxford can well afford to maintain the older ideal which has been hers for centuries, and which will be hard to recover if once it is lightly discarded.

Tolstoi.

Count Tolstoi is dead! A writer of novels, a preacher of sermons, a leader of democracy, and withal a mystic idealist, always far removed from the commonplace, and often from the practical. He was one of the world’s unique figures: a simple, plain-spoken man, conscientious almost to morbidity; he defied the Church, the Government, and society at large, yet he won for himself an affectionate place in the hearts of the Russian peasantry—a place which he will not speedily lose. He was the Apostle of Love to a world which seemed to him at least to have put all its confidence in force. It was a strange life and a strange death. Futile and chimerical much of his work has seemed to the world; but it will be long before we shall be able to fully realize how much he has really done. On the literary side, “*Anna Karenina*” and “*War and Peace*” probably touched the world most, and will last longest; and, even if he had done nothing else, either would have given him a title to fame.

Christmas and the New Year.

BY THE VEN. ARCHDEACON MOULE, B.D.

“Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.”

THEREFORE the same, Lord Jesus, still with joy,
 The same as in dear Yuletide long ago,
 But with more glad and yet more jubilant tones,
 With waits' old music on late Christmas Eve,
 And bells let loose with earliest Christmas dawn ;
 Then in the church with holly-berries bright,
 And with the gathering smiles and love of home ;
 The same, yet truer as the years grow young,
 For time is passing into endless days ;
 So bend we lowly with our shepherd friends,
 Round Thy dear cradle, with the heavens in song.
 The same ! how sure our hope, how safe our joy !
 Beyond the “no continuance” of earth ;
 Not dying with the leaves and frost-struck flowers,
 Unhurt by fleeting time and vanished homes,
 Nor struck by floods of grief or fire of loss.

Before the angels' song and Bethlehem's dawn,
 Before the steps of Abram's younger days,
 Before time's flow, behind the elder age ;
 Thyself the Framers of each flower and leaf,
 From Thy blest fingers not evolved but made,
 The butterfly's fair damask, emerald-strewn :
 Before the morning stars, before all worlds,
 Lord Jesus, the Prime Lover of mankind,
 We lift our love to Thee, the First, the Last ;
 High on Thy manger-throne, and higher still
 In love and power to save on the dark Cross.

In the far yesterday, on echoing air
 Of young eternity's eternal dawn,

Even then the same, Thy Christmas birthday song
Fell on Thine ear ; and ever and anon
A sudden beam of darkened sunlight struck
A moment o'er the fields of cloudless heaven ;
A sigh in the air of death across Thy life.
So in the far to-morrow, lengthened out
For ever, still the same, yet not the same ;
All sorrow, grief, and sighing, and all death
Lost, yet the Christmas song sounds, and Thy death,
Death's great destroyer, lives in Cross of stars.

Oh, backwards, forwards, evermore the same,
Lord Jesus ! thus the same in later time,
Above the clash of warring factions, lo !
We lift to Thee beneath the Christmas stars
And o'er the winter snows, the same glad song,
Yet louder, of thanksgiving for Thy love.



The Observance of Sunday.

BY THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF SODOR AND MAN.

THE attitude of the Church and of Christian people towards Sunday observance has become one of pressing importance. It is not merely that open attacks are being made by the careless and irreligious upon the old national tradition as to the weekly day of rest and worship, but that many who profess to lead a Christian life are becoming indifferent to this Divine institution, and are unconsciously helping to banish the claims of Sunday upon the conscience and customs of the people. It is to that large class who, without thought or intention, are hastening the end of this law of Divine institution that we must make our earnest appeal. Human nature is only too prone to accept critical theories which release the conscience from uncomfortable qualms as to what God really means us to do with

our Sundays, and the object of this paper is to present a view of our obligations which may reasonably appeal to those who desire to follow God's will, but are uncertain as to the Divine call which Sunday makes upon the Christian.

The relation between the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Lord's Day is one of much difficulty, but is of serious importance when we seek to estimate the position which the Church should adopt towards Sunday observance. According to some, they are the same; according to others, they are not the same. We must avoid the fallacy which underlies either of these broad and unqualified statements, for "short cuts" are generally dangerous. They are not the same as regards the particular day to be observed, for the Jewish law enjoins the observance of the *last* day of the week, while the Christian Church observes the *first*, in memory of our Lord's Resurrection. Moreover, we have now clearer views as to the true meaning of the Sabbath rest through our Lord's own words upon its purpose and sanctions. In the Jewish Church of His day to keep the letter of the Fourth Commandment was thought more important than to fulfil its spirit, and in order to keep their traditions they disregarded the very purpose for which it was ordained. Our Lord taught, not that the Sabbath was abrogated, but that it "was made for man"—that is to say, that it was not to be regarded as an *end* to which man's good was to be at all costs subordinated, but as God's means of teaching, training, and blessing mankind.

And yet the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Lord's Day are the same in that they both represent eternal principles which are independent of all positive enactments, and they both enshrine one of God's greatest gifts to man.

Three facts are of primary importance, and appear to me to give the true lines of guidance through this dilemma, which is causing real difficulty to many anxious consciences :

1. The Sabbath rest is a Divinely appointed ordinance for mankind, not a merely Jewish rule. Like marriage, it was

“instituted of God in the time of man’s innocency,” and was a grant not to the Jewish nation, but to the human race at large. “The Sabbath was made for man.”¹

At a later age this, along with other great moral edicts, was taken up and incorporated into the law of Moses, but it was in itself of earlier and independent origin. This important conclusion follows, that we may be emancipated from the “carnal ordinances” of Judaism, and yet not be free from the obligation to keep the Sabbath day holy.

2. Even in the Jewish dispensation it was placed in a code of *moral precepts*, not of *positive laws*. In other words, it is found alongside of nine other Commandments, all of which (as is universally allowed in the Christian Church) are of Divine and eternal sanction. It might have been placed among such laws as are found in the Civil Code, or in the Ceremonial, which are not of permanent value, but are “positive,” laid down for guidance and control, given for a time, and destined to have their time, and then to pass away when better things were possible. But this was not so. We find the law of the Sabbath side by side with such things as a belief in the one true God, the necessity of spiritual worship, honour to parents, regard for human life, honesty, purity, unselfishness. This is the category of rules to which the principle of Sabbath observance, however expressed, really belongs, and this is the company in which we find it even in the Jewish economy. Its position therein proclaims its sanctions to be not for a time, but for all time. It is not *in pari materia* with any other Jewish ordinances except those which are found in the Ten Commandments. There was in Judaism what was of transitory and what was of permanent value, and the law of Sabbath rest belonged to the latter.

And yet, from its very nature, this Fourth Commandment has a different setting to that of the more distinctly moral rules in which we find it. There is a temporal element through which the spiritual teaching has to be conveyed. A particular day of the week, a specified fraction of our time, has to be laid

¹ St. Mark ii. 27.

down as a positive enactment. Of this there is no need in such a command as "Thou shalt not kill," "Thou shalt not steal." There is of necessity a *positive* as well as a *moral* element in the law of the Sabbath, which is absent from the other parts of the Decalogue. The essence of that law is the separation (or sanctification) of a set time to rest and detachment from secular thoughts and interests—and that is of permanent value. But, as we shall see, this permanent principle had to be expressed in terms of human limitation, which might be modified in a later dispensation without affecting the inner truth which they enshrined. In that sense "the Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath."

3. Accordingly, the Christian Church, while altering the actual day of the week and clearing the Sabbath rest from those mistaken refinements through which Jewish Rabbis had hidden its true value, laid hold of the great permanent principles which gave it its place in the moral law, and embodied them in the Lord's Day, the Christian Sunday.

It is unnecessary to quote at length those passages which prove that the early disciples, while for a time maintaining as devout Jews the observance of the old Jewish Sabbath, made the day of our Lord's Resurrection and of the great gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost their special day of devotion and of public worship.¹ It was to them "the Lord's Day," and, like St. John, they sought to be in a special degree "in the Spirit on the Lord's Day."²

Two main principles in the law of the Sabbath were thus preserved: (1) It is man's Sabbath, his day of rest; (2) it is the Lord's Day, His day of worship.

1. It is man's day of rest. "The Sabbath was made for man." It is hard to see how some can have wrested these words to mean that our Lord abrogated the Sabbath, and thus cancelled

¹ Acts ii. 1, xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. (The same order had been given to the Churches of Galatia.) Rev. i. 10.

² εἶναι ἐν πνεύματι is the normal position of the Christian (Rom. viii. 9). St. John says (Rev. i. 10), ἐγενόμην ἐν πν., denoting a special access of inspiration on that day. "Congruum spirituali visioni tempus." Bede.

God's great gift to man. On the contrary, the words confirm the gift as an institution of permanent value. Doubtless the order had been reversed, and religious teachers had said, "Man was made for the Sabbath," thus subordinating the Divine purpose to their human restrictions; but in reasserting the true order our Lord enriched rather than cancelled the gift, and confirmed the principle enforced by the observance of one day's rest in seven.

The witness of experience confirms the value of the Day of Rest. Lord Beaconsfield and Mr. Gladstone were at opposite poles in many of their opinions, but they were one in their estimate of the need of Sunday rest. Not only did Mr. Gladstone regard the Sunday as "a main prop of the religious character of the country," but "from a moral, social, and physical point of view, as a duty of absolute consequence." We are told by his daughter, Mrs. Drew, that from Saturday night to Monday morning he put away all business of a secular nature, kept to his special Sunday books, never dined out save to visit a friend in sickness or sorrow, and never travelled on Sunday. Writing to the President of the International Congress at Paris for Promoting Sunday Rest (1899), Mr. Gladstone says: "Personally I have always endeavoured . . . to exercise this privilege; and now, nearly at the end of a laborious public career of nearly fifty-seven years, I attribute in great part to that cause the prolongation of my life and the preservation of the faculties I may still possess. As regards the masses, the question is still more important; it is the popular question *par excellence*."

Lord Beaconsfield says: "Of all Divine institutions, I maintain the most Divine is that which secures a day of rest for man"; adding that it is the religious principle which really secures "what I hold to be the most valuable blessing ever conceded to man. It is the corner-stone of all civilization; and it would be very difficult to estimate what might be the deleterious effects, even upon the health of the people, if there was no cessation from that constant tire and brain-work which must

ever characterize a country like this, so advanced in its pursuits and civilization."

Frank Buckland, the distinguished naturalist, put his view of the matter very characteristically. In March, 1886, he said: "I am now working from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m., and then a bit in the evening—fourteen hours a day; but, thank God, it does not hurt me. I should collapse if it were not for Sunday. The machinery has time to cool. The mill-wheel ceases to patter the water; the mill-head is ponded up, and the superfluous water let off by an easy, quiet current, which leads" (but the figure is strange for a man of science) "to things above."

No living man knows more of the needs of the British workman than Mr. John Burns. Addressing the Home Secretary in 1899 on seven-day newspapers, he said that he "believed the Sunday rest was physically good, mentally restful, and morally healthful; and that incidentally it had been commercially advantageous to the British people. He believed that . . . Sunday was the day which had done more than anything else to buttress and maintain that excellent institution called the home. . . . In a word, Sunday, as the day of rest, was from nearly every point of view a national treasure and an industrial advantage."

That is one of the principles asserted and maintained in the Christian Sunday; it is the day of rest divinely claimed for man.

2. It is the Lord's Day—that is, the day specially dedicated to His worship.

All our time belongs to God; all life should be a ceaseless act of worship; and this is the ultimate and eternal principle which underlies the Fourth Commandment. It is the Gospel claim: "Ye are not your own"—"Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God." The Christian ideal is that every place is holy, every time and season is holy, all honest pursuits are holy. The prophet Zechariah draws this ideal picture when he says that "The bells upon the horses"—*i.e.*, the most secular of objects—"shall be HOLY UNTO THE LORD"; and again, "Yea, every pot in Jerusalem and in Judah

shall be holiness to the Lord of Hosts." In other words, the Gospel claims the consecration of the common, the sanctification of what is secular, the hallowing of every time, place, and thing.

But, it may be said, why was not this claim made at once, and embodied, to take our present instance, in the Fourth Commandment? The answer is that mankind has to be educated to higher things. The only way to teach us to dedicate all time to God is to claim certain portions of time for Him, thus forming centres of influence which may become wider spheres of influence, so that all life may become lifted up into a higher plane. We have thus set before us in a great inspiring vision :

" One God, one law, one element,
And one far-off Divine event,
To which the whole creation moves."

In this life we cannot fully realize the vision, but Sunday observance recognizes the principle, and by a wise and healthy discipline helps on the realization of this ideal. We see it again and again in God's dealing with mankind. The Jewish firstborn were holy as an earnest of the service of all God's people. The first-fruits were holy because "the lump" was holy. We have our sacred places to teach us that "every place is holy ground." And in like manner our Sundays and other sacred seasons are an acknowledgment that all our time belongs to God, and that His fear and worship should penetrate and control every moment of our being.

We may recall how Keble takes up this thought in his lines on Easter Day, and extends it to every Sunday :

"Sundays by Thee more glorious break,
An Easter-day in every week.
And week-days, following in their train,
The fulness of Thy blessing gain;
Till all, both resting and employ,
Be one Lord's Day of holy joy."

Such is the wholesome discipline of the Christian Sunday. We refuse it at our peril as Christian people, and as a Christian nation. It is not a Jewish Sabbath, but it rests upon the

same moral claim—a claim which must still be expressed in the terms of a positive command. “The Sabbath was made for man.” The particular Jewish setting of it has been modified; but we still recite the Fourth Commandment, because its inner obligation, like that of the other nine, is an eternal one, and is enshrined for us in the Christian Lord’s Day or Sunday. It claims our time for God, and God knows that this is the best way of enforcing the claim. It speaks to reasonable men who know that, here and now, in this present state of spiritual discipline, we can best give our time to God, not by saying, “All times are holy, and therefore we need have no specially holy days,” but by saying, “All times are holy, and therefore we will keep one day holy, that we may learn, by thus devoting a part of our time to God, to bring the atmosphere of the Sunday into the week-day, into the daily round and common task which all have to fulfil.”

These are the two great principles, once divinely expressed in the Jewish Sabbath, and still binding on man as long as our present limitations last.

We may thus sum up the main grounds on which the claims of the Christian Sunday rest :

1. Upon the Divine appointment of the Sabbath for the good of mankind. “The Sabbath was made for man.”

2. Upon our Lord’s own treatment of the Jewish Sabbath. He said not a word of abrogating it, but He treated it as an institution which men were robbing of its original usefulness, by placing the letter above the spirit, and making the means of more importance than the end.

3. Upon the custom of the Christian Church. From earliest times the first day of the week was kept as the Lord’s Day, and marked by special acts of worship. Moreover, as the Church became emancipated from Judaism, the observance of the Jewish Sabbath fell into disuse, and the spirit of the Fourth Commandment was enshrined in the observance of the Lord’s Day.

4. Upon its intrinsic value as a day of rest, and as a day of special worship,

And this last ground of appeal suggests the answer to the practical question, How shall we ourselves keep the Sunday? I can attempt no answer in detail, and I do not believe that we can exactly catalogue our weekday and Sunday occupations. But we have, at least, gained two principles of action which we should fearlessly apply to our own lives.

I. Sunday should be a *day of rest* for ourselves and for others.

For Ourselves.—"Bishop," said an eminent doctor to one of our English Diocesans who had consulted him about his health—"Bishop, you are breaking one of the Ten Commandments." "What do you mean?" said the astonished divine; "I don't know that I am." "You are breaking the Fourth Commandment," was the reply, "for you don't give yourself one day's rest in seven." We have the assent of almost universal experience that this is true.

For Others.—"That thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou" (Deut. v. 14). As much harm is done by thoughtlessness in this matter as by wilful and deliberate action. We should think seriously about it, for it is affecting character. We are gradually losing our old English Sunday, and largely because many professedly Christian people spend the day without thought for others. For

"Evil is wrought by want of thought,
As well as want of heart."

Our principle should be not to employ any single person unnecessarily on the Day of Rest. For the sake of our servants we should cause as little trouble as possible on Sundays. Social and family gatherings are natural, and cannot be wholly avoided, for it is the only day on which many can meet their relations and friends; but large dinner-parties and elaborate "At Homes" should give place to plain and simple entertainment, such as causes little trouble and does not interfere with either rest or worship. It is an *individual* matter, for though the particular encroachment may seem small it encourages others to follow on, and the aggregate of these thoughtless acts is silently changing one of our best national habits.

Still more is this true of Sunday amusements. "I do not think it is too much to say," writes Archdeacon Sinclair, "that just in proportion as Sunday is made a day of amusement so, as on the Continent, it will become a day of labour." I can remember when, in my own diocese, it was impossible to hire a pleasure-boat on Sunday, or to engage a carriage except for conveyance to a place of worship; but now a vast army of boatmen, drivers, and persons engaged on golf-links and other such places of public amusement, are almost wholly deprived of their day of rest. It is a matter of social as well as of religious moment and concern. The result is a grave national peril. The cause lies in personal selfishness. Self-denial for the sake of others is a primary duty on Sundays.

2. Sunday should be a *day of worship*. The habit of public worship on the Lord's Day was one chief mark of the earliest Christians. It has been handed down to us by our fathers: what are we handing down to our children? At least, let us have clean hands in the matter. One ground on which the Jew was commanded to keep the Sabbath was as a memorial of the redemption from Egypt: "Thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and the Lord thy God brought thee out thence by a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." We have been the objects of a far greater redemption, and have still greater reason to devote our Sundays to the worship of our Redeemer.

Let us also keep our Sundays, as far as possible, free from secular pursuits and pleasures. We should have our Sunday books and occupations, not dull or gloomy, yet such as to mark off the day from other days. I have every sympathy with those whose week is so absorbed in necessary business that Sunday is their only day of rest and refreshment. But I do not believe that it is to this class that we chiefly owe these encroachments on the day of worship and rest. The main body of pleasure-seekers on Sunday is composed of men and women who have no such excuse. Surely we may ask for more serious thought and

for a little self-denial on the part of such as have ample opportunity for secular recreation on other days.

Above all, we should seek to "come to be in the Spirit on the Lord's Day"—that is to say, to form the habit of specially restful and helpful thought and conduct. If we only remember that it is man's day of rest, and the Lord's day of worship, we shall not wish to spend Sunday as other days, but to spend every day in the spirit and atmosphere of the Lord's Day.

"The Sundays of man's life,
Threaded together on one string,
Make bracelets to adorn the wife
Of the eternal glorious King.
On Sundays heaven's gate stands ope,
Blessings are plentiful and rife,
More plentiful than hope.

"Thou art a day of mirth;
And when the week-days trail on ground,
Thy flight is higher as thy birth.
Oh, let me take thee at the bound,
Leaping with thee from seven to seven,
Till that we both, being tossed from earth,
Fly hand in hand to heaven."

GEORGE HERBERT.



Prayer-Book Enrichment: Additional Services.

BY THE REV. C. LISLE CARR, M.A.,
Rector of Woolton.

IT is now 250 years since any Prayer-Book enrichment took place. The developments of national life in the half-century preceding 1662 were met by corresponding liturgical development. The increasing control of Parliament evoked the prayer for God's blessing upon it, the activity of the navy during the Commonwealth produced the forms of prayer for those at sea, and colonial enterprise gave rise to the adult Baptismal Office. Since 1662 the whole aspect of life has changed, and if the Liturgy of the Church is still to voice the needs and worship of the nation, its range must be increased.

A. There is little need to prove laboriously that services additional to those provided in the Book of Common Prayer have become a necessity. It must be the experience of every parish priest to have turned over the pages of his Prayer-Book in search for something that would suit the occasion, and to have felt himself hampered by the want of elasticity in our forms of worship as he now stands by the graveside of the tiny infant of Christian parents, or, again, on New Year's Eve tries to bring home in devotion the message of the dying year.

1. But while it will be almost universally admitted that additional services are required, it will not be so clear that there is any call to enrich the Prayer-Book by their presence. The demand is so pressing that the diocesan Bishops have without exception sanctioned forms of special services, and it may be contended that this local sanction adequately meets the occasion.

This episcopal sanction is, however, legally a very doubtful point. In approving forms of service the Bishops may be presumed to be acting under the Shortened Services Act of 1872. Now, that Act definitely limits the character of the material used in special services. It provides that on any special occasion approved by the Ordinary a special service approved by the Ordinary may be used, provided it contains nothing, except anthems and hymns, which does not form part of the Holy Scriptures or of the Book of Common Prayer. Archbishop Temple placed a most liberal interpretation upon the words of the Act, and refused to admit that it limited these services to the *ipsissima verba* of the Bible or Prayer-Book; but that interpretation is questionable, and is not adopted by the present Archbishop of Canterbury,¹ who has said that he does not believe that many of these services take place without something being done which goes beyond what is sanctioned by the actual words of the Shortened Services Act. Nor is it clear that the clergy are keeping their promise to use in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments the form in the Prayer-Book, and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful

¹ *Vide Report of Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, 13, 222.

authority, when they avail themselves of additional services sanctioned by the Bishop ; for technically the words "ordered by lawful authority" are meant to protect us in the case of services issued by the Privy Council, such as those that were held on the day of the funeral of the late King. No one could be so tied by red tape as to accuse a clergyman of wrongdoing who uses a service sanctioned by his Bishop, but it is a most unsatisfactory state of things that in any point the practice of the clergy should contravene the law.

2. It is, moreover, curious to notice that this sanctioning of miscellaneous services is bringing back one of the unsatisfactory phenomena which the compilation of the Prayer-Book attempted to obviate. So far as additional services are concerned, there is reappearing a great diversity in saying and singing in churches in this realm : some following Salisbury use, some Liverpool use, and some the use of Chester, etc., so that no longer can it be said that the realm has but one use.

B. If it be granted that there should be enrichment by additional services, the next point is the question of the principles on which they should be admitted and should be drawn up.

1. As regards principles controlling admission of fresh services to the Prayer-Book, two are obvious :

(a) Nothing should be admitted to alter its character as a Book of *Common* Prayer, which can be used by all sections of the Church of England, and which does not attempt to minister to the demands of a limited school.

(b) The object of the addition of services is not revolution in the Church. Any addition which could be fairly counted as a party victory would be a general disaster. It is perfectly proper for any school of thought to work for the propagation of its particular views, but it is illegitimate for any party to upset the balance of teaching in that book which at present alone holds together the far-stretched wings of our communion. Therefore the general outline pursued in the various adaptations from 1549 to 1662 should be followed in anything that is to fall short of a revolution in the standard of doctrine which deliberately char-

acterizes our branch of the Catholic Church. Ceremonies, days of observance, services deliberately abandoned during that century should only be reintroduced in response to a demand that is practically unanimous amongst Church-people. It is to that aspect of the Christian faith which is presented by the Prayer-Book as it is to-day that we have declared our allegiance.

2. An entirely different question opens up on consideration of the principles to be observed in drafting new forms of service.

(a) Reverence. We do not wish to bring the tone of our services down to the level of the vulgar. They may be brought down to the level of the ignorant and simple, but they will never raise the vulgar from vulgarity unless they maintain dignity and (as it were) self-respect and a sense of the glorious use to which they are destined before the throne of God.

(b) A second principle will be simplicity. Dignity and simplicity are never far apart, and a good translator of the Latin form can hardly ever fail in both these respects. Nor must simplicity be observed only in the wording; it should be sought also in the form. We do not desire to return to the hardness of the rules called the Pie, and the difficulty of finding the places in the Prayer-Book is already serious enough. If the book is ever revised, it surely would not be too much to ask that the pages in all editions should be similarly numbered.

(c) It is earnestly to be desired that, in drafting new offices, the respect for antiquity, characteristic of Cranmer and his colleagues, should be maintained. There is an abundance of material ready to hand for the liturgiologist who is content to be translator, and not creator.

C. It will be convenient to divide up under the head of the Pre-Reformation Service-Books some suggestions for additional services which are urgently needed.

1. *The Breviary*.—The Bishop of Liverpool, before the last Royal Commission on Discipline, expressed the opinion that many of the poor and of those who have not been brought up to the Church have abstained from attending services because

of the difficulty of finding their way about the Prayer-Book, and most clergy have craved for freedom to use, on perhaps one Sunday evening in the month, a simpler form of mission service in their churches. It is anomalous that they should have to leave the parish church and seek a mission-room when they desire to touch the very people whom they are most anxious to get to church. Limitations within the walls of the church necessitate those Sunday evening mission services, which all too often lead no further, and become little centres of schism, satisfied with a mutilated fragment of church life in a building never hallowed by the Sacraments. And yet, though the Bishop feels the need as acutely as the clergy do, he cannot give to any incumbent permission to substitute a simple mission service for full Evening Prayer on any Sunday. Therefore an alternative simple Sunday evening service should be put forth, to be used at the discretion of the minister, with the express sanction, for that particular parish, of the Bishop of the diocese. Such sanction would safeguard the rights of educated Church-people, and would insure the recollection of the fact that the complete evening prayer is the true ideal of worship. This service would be on strict liturgical lines—confession, absolution, instruction, intercession, and praise. It would admit the possibility of extempore prayer, in addition to the provided form. It would be printed consecutively, and in such a position in the book (possibly at the very end) that access to it would be easy.

There can be no doubt that in limiting the hour services those who drew up the Prayer-Book acted wisely. It may, however, without disloyalty be suggested that they were too stringent in limiting the hours to two—the morning and evening. An additional late evening service would be feasible and congregational, and would succeed in bringing to the church a number of people who are unable to visit it otherwise during the week. The material for such a service lies ready to hand in *Compline*, if this hour office were simplified and shortened in the way in which Cranmer treated those other forms with which he dealt. This would not conflict with the

rule of not reinserting that which has been definitely omitted, for where half a dozen simpler services have been preserved in part there could be no hesitation in making use of a seventh service which is in character entirely in accord with the others.

Amongst occasional services all desire a special form for use to express thanksgiving to Almighty God "for the fruits of the earth and all the other blessings of His merciful providence." These words come from the introduction of the form printed in the American Prayer-Book, and they are important, for to dwellers in industrial centres good trade takes the place occupied in the country by a good harvest. The American form is provided to be used on the first Thursday in November, and if that rubric is generally carried out it is surely a very great gain in preventing that wandering from church to church for the harvest festival which so disturbs congregations. It provides special opening sentences : part of Psalm cxlvii., instead of the *Venite* ; psalms at the discretion of the minister ; proper lessons ; a thanksgiving which includes gratitude for "All the other blessings of Thy merciful providence bestowed upon this nation and people" ; a special Collect, Epistle, and Gospel. On Good Friday a sequence of services, magnificent in the Scriptural fulness with which the Passion is depicted, already stands in our Prayer-Book, but the attendances at three-hour services indicate that something of a more devotional character is a felt need. In such an office large freedom would have to be left to the individual priest.

2. An extension of Litanies, the staple of the old *Processional*, is earnestly to be desired. It is very unfortunate that the draft which Cranmer drew up in 1545, and sent to Henry VIII., and which contained translations of various Litanies, was apparently lost to sight, and that he never fulfilled his intentions of setting forth other Litanies in addition to that of 1544. That Litany was prepared for use in time of war, and its closing portion is devoted to that thought. This fact is rather obscured by the omission of the "Amen" at the end of the prayer "O God, merciful Father," which Collect

was originally entirely separate from the anthem, psalm, and *Gloria* which follow it. Why should not alternative endings stand by the side of these war-time suffrages? The early part of the Litany could remain, while the closing sections expressed the intention of the particular service; or the whole Litany might be varied, as is done in the numerous forms issued by societies and individuals. Amongst those that are most important from our point of view would be Litanies interceding for the deepening of spiritual life, for home and foreign missions, and a Litany of thanksgiving. It would, moreover, be a happy reversion to that early use of a Litany before the Eucharist if a service in Litany form were authorized for the use of communicants' unions, and the general preparation of the people on Saturday evenings.

3. The greatest want in the *Manual* is an alternative office for the burial of very young children. Besides the choice of more fitting sentences, psalms, and lesson, a prayer for the comfort of the parents, such as is provided in the American office, would be welcomed with real gratitude. It always seems a great pity that we leave the graveside without praying more expressly for mourners, particularly in the case of young children.

There is at present no special form for use by a clergyman on the first Sunday on which he appears as incumbent of a parish. The reading of the Thirty-Nine Articles takes the place of the sermon; otherwise the order is unchanged. It may be argued that this is a good thing, as proving the independence of persons in the Church, whose system goes on unhesitatingly, whoever the officiating priest may be. On the other hand, personal interest is strong amongst us all, and an opportunity is lost of drawing attention to the place of an ordained ministry in the Church, its unbroken succession, its high office, and of intercession in view of the particular circumstances of the parish. The Irish Prayer-Book contains such a form, with appropriate psalms, lessons, and suffrages.

4. The last section which calls for additional services is

the *Pontifical*. Every diocese has its particular form for the consecration of churches and churchyards, and for the institution of incumbents. They vary from diocese to diocese, and we have always to discover and either to purchase or to print the service which the Bishop proposes to use on such an occasion. But the variations are very small, and it would not be a difficult task to stereotype one use for the whole Church of England.

Such an attempt was made unsuccessfully some years ago by the late Archbishop Maclagan. In face of a general proposal for enrichment a fresh effort might meet with success.

In addition to this a form for the dedication of gifts to a church would be of the greatest use.

The precise shape which these additional services might take need not detain us long. If every one that has been suggested were printed, the whole total of pages would not be great. Were a general revision of the Prayer-Book carried out, any additional services would be printed in their proper place in it; but if the book is to remain as it has been these 250 years, it would be better to issue a small supplementary book, consisting of the additional services. But whatever their shape, the number should be as limited as possible, in order to save complication.

It is earnestly to be hoped that, when they are taken in hand, they will not be entrusted to a committee, but will be handed over to the most suitable persons, that they may be the products, not of the negative caution of a committee, but of the devotional outpourings of individual hearts familiar by long use with the reverent simplicity of the early offices. In the growing study of liturgiology and the educated feeling for form there is no need to despair of the possibility of finding men who can wear the literary mantle of Cranmer and his fellows.

Prayer-Book enrichment has appeared on the Church Congress programme these forty years. Nothing has been done, because the moment the question is broached attention is concentrated on one or two points of perennial difficulty, and the shout of the controversialist drowns every other sound.

One man fears some alteration of the ornaments rubric which will affect his particular interpretation of its mysteries ; another cannot sacrifice his peculiar fad about the use or disuse of the Athanasian Creed ; a third fears that his opponents may secure some triumph ; others are pining for the moment when reversion to 1549 or 1552 or to the Scotch book may be possible. The time has come when the parish clergy—who do the work, and not the controversy, of the Church—must make their voice heard. They are passionately desirous to be loyal, but they must have greater freedom if their work is to be efficient. Their wants are clear and command general assent. Let them put aside the controversial points and concentrate on their most flagrant needs. Then the great enrichment which God has vouchsafed to our life in Church and State will find its counterpart in the enrichment of our splendid heritage of the Book of Common Prayer.



The Real Difficulty of Preaching.

BY THE REV. C. W. EMMET, M.A.,

Vicar of West Hendred, Berks.

PROBABLY nothing is more criticized than the weekly sermon, and yet in nothing is the criticism more ineffective. The reason lies on the surface : the criticism hardly ever reaches the ears of the one principally concerned. Herein lies one, at least, of the real difficulties of preaching, and a crucial difference between the work of the preacher and that of every other profession. Speakers, writers, and artists of all kinds have abundant opportunity of discovering what their fellow-men really think of their productions. They see reviews of their books or pictures ; friends and even acquaintances have little scruple in offering advice and criticism. The public speaker soon learns from the Press and those around him whether he is a “failure” or not. And again, there is the tangible test of commercial success. Is

the last book selling better than its predecessors? What are the offers for the picture in the Academy? How do this year's briefs compare with last year's?

Of course, no one imagines that either of these tests is infallible or ultimate. Neither contemporary criticism nor commercial success is a sure index to the real value of a man's work; if he is wise he largely discounts them both. None the less, within limits, they offer real guidance and assistance, particularly to the average member of his profession. He learns to avoid mannerisms; he finds out how far he is making himself intelligible to his audience, and how far he is in touch with the thought of his age. He may, of course, deliberately refuse to be so, and prefer to work for posterity or a very limited circle; if so, he has his reasons, sufficient for himself, and he knows what he is doing. But few ordinary writers would deny that they owe much to criticism of one sort or another.

But the preacher—at any rate, in the Anglican Communion! In his first curacy he will receive from his lady friends copious eulogiums on his earliest efforts. If he is fortunate, he will have a Vicar who will give him more discriminating advice and criticism. But as time goes on he finds that all this ceases. Particularly if his lot fall in a country parish, he will go on preaching sermon after sermon without the least idea of their effect or of the impression he has made on his congregation. He will probably try different styles, the written or very carefully prepared, the really *ex tempore*, or even conversational. He will in turn be expository, doctrinal, or practical. He will experiment with literary allusions or popular anecdotes, with courses of lectures on the Bible or Prayer-Book, with up-to-date sermons on current topics.

In all this the preacher may be sincerely anxious simply to find out what helps his people most. He soon gets beyond the stage of hoping to be a Liddon or of looking on sermons as a means of reputation and advancement. His one aim may be the good of his flock, and as a means to that

he knows he must interest them, appeal to their imagination and conscience, and use language which they will understand and remember. But he is quickly pulled up short, because he is left almost entirely without indication as to what has really told. He hears no criticism, favourable or unfavourable, and except in the case of the written sermon, he cannot even recapture the spoken word, so as to give it the benefit of his own criticism later on.

Happy man if he has a candid critic in his wife! It is one of the arguments in favour of the marriage of the clergy that there shall be someone to perform this useful function. And perhaps an occasional visitor or relative will delight the parson's heart with a word of approval or a timid suggestion. But in these cases the personal equation is too strong to make the criticism of much value. The critics move in the clerical entourage; their education and way of looking at things will be much the same as the preacher's; further, it is very hard to give an unbiassed opinion on the work of one whom one knows intimately from within; we read too much between the lines of the sermon. What we need is to know the effect produced on the average member of our congregation, on the man of business, the mother or servant girl, the factory hand or the farm labourer. They only know the preacher from without, and do not move in the ecclesiastical circle. How does the Sunday sermon fit in with their daily life and the normal line of their thought? Do we assume too much knowledge; do we really help them? How very seldom the preacher knows this! He catches, perhaps, an occasional hint in his visiting; he may hear sometimes from a sick parishioner how words of years ago have found their way to his heart or conscience. But generally speaking he remains in the dark Sunday after Sunday, and has not the least indication as to whether his preaching is improving (*i.e.*, helping his people more), or which of the lines on which he has experimented are best worth pursuing.

Perhaps this will be disputed. We are told that we have the obvious test of the growth or diminution of our congregations.

Only very seldom is this test worth much. It applies to the extremes. The very good preacher—the born orator—finds that he is quite evidently filling his church. The very bad preacher is faced and depressed by the sight of visibly emptying pews. And this will particularly be the case in towns where parochial boundaries count for little and there is a choice of churches. But with the average incumbent of a country parish the test is almost valueless. Probably of all the factors which make for good or bad attendance the sermon is the least important, unless it falls under one or other of the extremes. If the preacher is very long, very dull, and very inaudible, his flock may stay away. If he is very acceptable, a few may come more readily than they would otherwise have done. But we are speaking of the average man; in his case, though the sermon may be made the excuse for non-attendance, it is probably very seldom the reason.

Again, there is the further test of which we hear so much—the mysterious *rapport* between speaker and audience. It is said that there is always a certain bond of sympathy, a something in the air, which will tell us whether we are holding our congregation. No doubt this is partly true, and again particularly in the extreme cases. A man of tact and sympathy can perhaps generally tell when he has preached a specially interesting or dull sermon. But probably the temper of mind of the preacher himself has far more to do with this supposed *rapport* than is generally realized. He is deeply moved and interested himself, and attributes the same feelings to his audience. Or he is out of sorts and dispirited, and fancies that no one has listened to a word he has said. In each case he may be quite wrongly transferring his own mood to his congregation. No doubt Horace's recipe for the production of tears may be quoted, and it is perfectly true that the absence of sincerity is fatal to any speaker. But the converse does not hold good, that everyone who does feel sincerely can depend on imparting his feelings to his audience; nor is the preacher's own mood or impression an infallible test of his hearers'. And

is the attitude of the audience always a certain criterion? The man sitting bolt upright, with his eyes glued to your face, may be far away in thought, or may be counting for a bet the number of times you make use of a pet phrase. And the other, never looking at you, and fidgeting aimlessly with his hymn-book, may be taking in every syllable, and unconsciously bearing witness by his unrest to the penetrating power of the two-edged sword of the word of God.

No doubt, when all deductions have been made, the test of sympathy is a true one, and its value grows with experience. But the cry of many preachers is that they want something more definite. We ask that the laity should be ready to speak to us, to praise or to criticize. We do not want enthusiastic eulogiums from those kind-hearted but embarrassing admirers (feminine gender, please) who insist on seeing in the mediocrity of their parish priest the genius of a modern Savonarola; nor are we covetous of the flattery of people with an axe to grind. "Oh, sir, you did give us a *beautiful* sermon last Sunday night!" often means that the speaker hopes to find in the parson a relieving officer who makes no inquiries. This sort of thing we ignore. And there are other types of criticism more valuable in themselves, but too trivial to get to the root of the matter. We are asked for the source of a quotation, or challenged as to a fact or the pronunciation of a word. We want something more. We ask that the laity should cease to think it bad form to discuss the sermon to the parson's face, instead of behind his back.

Readers of Ian Maclaren's "St. Jude's" will remember a most life-like example of the inadequacy of the preacher's own impression of himself, and of the useful part played by the advice of the Elders of the Scotch Church. Might we not look for something of the sort from our own churchwardens and leading workers?

Of course, the custom would have its dangers. We must beware of becoming weathercocks, following the wind of popular taste; nor are we to preach only what our people like

to hear : to prophesy smooth things is to prophesy deceit. The question is not so much of the substance of the sermon as of its form. We ask for the encouragement which would come if we could know that our people had at least thought about what we had said, and considered it worth talking over with us. And we ask for some indications of what really interests and appeals to the varying types of mind with which we have to deal. It is for us to use those indications wisely, and by the light they give to learn more of the mysterious art of "persuasion." We ask for criticism, not that we may win more praise, but that we may do more good.



The Anglican Idea of a True Episcopate.

BY THE REV. M. LINTON SMITH, M.A.,

Vicar of Blundellsands, Liverpool.

THE question of episcopacy is a burning one at the present time, but heat is not always accompanied by light, and controversy is a slow and cumbrous method of arriving at the truth ; for that reason there is need for men to clear their minds upon such a question, and formulate a position which will bear the strictest investigation. Such an attempt is made in this paper, which lays no claim to originality, but simply endeavours to restate the reasonable assertions of the Anglican communion with regard to her ministry.

In the first place, a clear distinction must be drawn between the fact of the episcopate and the various theories which have been held with regard to it. Different theories may be held with regard to the nature of the office, but these theories are but explanations of an already existing fact ; that fact is the same under varying conditions, and whatever explanation we may find of its origin or nature should be applicable to the fact wherever found, and conversely the explanation must take in all the essential features of the fact if it is to be satisfactory.

I take it that we are dealing with the "historic Episcopate," a phrase which has sometimes been scoffed at as meaningless, but one which seems to me to be clear, definite, and convenient, expressing summarily the fact that the office has been and is held in regular and unbroken succession from its first appearance in the Christian society. To this office certain functions are definitely reserved by the practice of the society, and the office is generally exercised in a defined sphere, whether local or social. These three points are the essentials of the office of the Christian Bishop—historic continuity, definite functions, and, with certain unimportant reservations, definite sphere of action. It is important to distinguish between these and the many modifications of the office due to the civil and social conditions in which the Church has existed. The accidental modifications may be for the time the more apparent. There is a marked and obvious contrast between, shall we say, Gregory, Bishop of Rome, with his world-wide interests and highly organized diocese, and David, Bishop of Menevia, with his remote See and loose tribal jurisdiction. But as Bishops of the Christian Church their office and functions were the same; they differ no more in that respect than the Bishop of London differs from the Bishop of Likoma, though the one lives in Fulham Palace and holds a seat in the House of Lords, and the other inhabits a mud-built thatched cottage, and may have to turn his hand to the navigation of a steam-launch on Lake Nyassa. And I think that this suggests, in passing, the importance of a distinction which may legitimately be drawn between episcopacy and prelacy. Prelacy has to do with the accidental prominence, social and civil, which came to be attached to the office of Bishop in the Middle Ages, especially in Western Europe. It is at least questionable whether that prominence has been of real service to the Church, and it is important to keep clear the distinction of social prominence from ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which was so completely obscured by facts at the period of the Reformation. A great deal of prejudice against episcopacy is

due, not to its essential nature, but to its accidental accompaniments.

We come now to the crucial point of origin, on which divide the two main currents of theory as to the nature of the office: Is it specifically revealed from above, according to an explicit command of the Lord to His Apostles, an ordinance of which they were the first exemplars, or has it been evolved from below, in the course of the society's development, by a series of steps which can in some measure be traced in the fragmentary records of primitive Christianity? Before I answer, let me enter a protest against any assumption that either of these theories is more or less inconsistent with the belief in the Divine origin of the office. Whether it be due to the explicit command of the Incarnate Son, or to the hidden guidance of God the Spirit, in either case it comes to us with the evident seal of the Divine approval. But this protest once made, the evidence seems to me to lead unmistakably to one conclusion—the conclusion of such scholars as Bishop Lightfoot and Dr. Hort—"the episcopate was formed, not out of the Apostolic order by localization, but out of the presbyteral by elevation; and the title, which originally was common to all, came at length to be appropriated to the chief among them" (Lightfoot, "Philippians," ed. vi., p. 196). "In the New Testament, the word *ἐπίσκοπος*, as applied to men, mainly, if not always, is *not* a title, but a description of the elder's function" (Hort, "Christian Ecclesia," p. 232).

The causes of this development are obscure: Bishop Lightfoot, while allowing that the "frailty of human pride and love of power" may have been at work, claims that "the pressing needs of the Church were mainly instrumental in bringing about" the growth of its influence, and he notes especially "the confusion of speculative opinion, the distracting effects of persecution, and the growing anarchy of social life," as demanding the development of a strong central authority.

Professor Ramsay ("The Church in the Roman Empire," pp. 361 *et seq.*) makes some illuminating suggestions as to an

important factor in the emergence of the *ἐπίσκοπος* from the college of presbyters. He points out that the man to whom any special function was delegated would naturally be described as the *ἐπίσκοπος* of that particular work; and he goes on to suggest that the presbyter who was put in charge of the external relations of the local Church would acquire prominence in the eyes of other Churches above his fellows, a prominence which would react on his position within his own community: the professor calls attention to the emphasis laid on hospitality in the Pastoral Epistles. His view is borne out by the words of Bishop Lightfoot, that in the first or Ignatian stage in the development of the office the importance of the Bishop lies in the fact that he is regarded as a centre of unity—*i.e.*, that his primary importance is not so much for the internal life of the local Church, as for its external relations with other societies. May I add a further suggestion in the same direction? The Turk has originated nothing, and the organization of the Turkish Empire at the present day is the degenerate descendant of that of the Byzantine rulers, itself a development from the Roman. Now the Turkish Government deals with the various religious communities in a town or district through specially elected delegates—"mukhtars"—who act as the go-betweens in all relations between their own community and the representatives of the Government. It is at least possible that some such practice obtained under the Roman Empire. The objection may be raised that the relations between Church and Empire were not such as to make this arrangement probable; but the first half of the second century, which saw the establishment of the episcopate as a universal order, was precisely the period during which there was an attempt to find a peaceful solution of the difficulties between them. On the part of the Empire there was the relaxation by Trajan and Hadrian of the sterner policy of the Flavii, while from the Church, encouraged to hope for more reasonable treatment, proceeded those writings which have won for the time the title of the "age of the apologists." It does not seem wholly improbable that the official who was charged by the local community with the

supervision of its external relations may have had to deal at such a period, not only with other Churches, but also with the Imperial authorities. So much for the conditions of life which favoured the development of episcopacy in its early stages. One or two other points seem worthy of notice before we pass on from the historical side of the question. We have agreed with the conclusion that the office is not a devolution of the Apostolate, but an evolution from the presbyterate; but if this conclusion be reached on historical grounds, it may on the same grounds be asserted that this evolution took place under Apostolic supervision and with Apostolic sanction. The clearest traces of the monarchical episcopate within the first century are found in the province of Asia, the place where, according to very weighty evidence, the last survivor of the Apostolate spent his old age. In the words of Bishop Lightfoot, "the institution of an episcopate must be placed as far back as the closing years of the first century, and . . . cannot, without violence to historical testimony, be dis severed from the name of St. John" (*op. cit.*, p. 234). The other point to which I wish to call attention is the testimony of the early Syrian Church of Edessa, the importance of which for our subject is due largely to the fact that it developed outside the Roman Empire, and apart from the main currents of Christian life. In it we have the startling fact (if Professor Burkitt's reconstruction of its early history be correct) of a Church which existed for the whole of the second century with no Scriptures but the Old Testament, and which did not officially recognize the four Gospels till the early years of the fifth century, the lack having been supplied by the Diatessaron of Tatian. But this Christian community, which existed so long without those writings which appear to us so essential, seems to have had from the first an episcopal organization, for the names of four, if not five, Bishops of the second century have come down to us. Another point, not without bearing upon the subject, is that at the end of this period the episcopal succession of the Church seems to have been regularized by Palut's acceptance of consecration at the hands of Serapion of Antioch,

a case paralleled in the history of our own Church by Chad's submission to Theodore of Tarsus (Bede, "Hist. Eccl.," iv., c. 2).

From the second century to the sixteenth there was practically no difference of opinion in the Christian world as to the organization of the Church; orthodox and heretic alike recognized the threefold ministry; but the Reformation wrought a great change in Western Europe. The reformed bodies as a whole abandoned episcopacy; the conservatism which, for good and ill, is one of the marked features of the office, rendered the order generally unfavourable to the reception of the new views: the accidents of civil power and social state which had accumulated round the office in the course of ages stood in marked contrast to the Apostolic simplicity of the early Church which the new-found New Testament revealed; the Prelate obscured the Bishop; while the scanty traces of the beginnings of the monarchical episcopate in its pages were not sufficient to convince men who desired a complete break with the past that they were taking a retrograde step in abandoning one of the historic orders of the Church's ministry. But I do not think that any stronger testimony to the practical value of the order can be found than the fact that an equivalent of the episcopate in some form or other was in many cases speedily re-established. The Scandinavian Church has an order of Bishops which possesses some claim to historic succession; in Denmark Bugenhagen's superintendents resumed the title of Bishop before the end of the sixteenth century; while in Prussia, though the title has not been resumed, the superintendent exercises functions which are practically episcopal. In the Reformed Churches, strictly so-called in contrast with the Lutheran, a more rigid Presbyterianism has prevailed.

Bishop Lightfoot distinguishes three stages in the development of the conception of the episcopal office, each of them connected with a great name: there is the Ignatian stage, when the Bishop is regarded as the centre of unity; the Irenæan stage, when he is regarded as the depositary of primitive truth; and the stage of Cyprian, in which he is regarded primarily as

the vicegerent of Christ, and the indispensable channel of Divine grace. I have frankly abandoned as unhistorical the devolution theory on which the last development is based, and if the office has been evolved by the Church under the guidance of the Spirit of God, it must always be open to her to revise her conclusions under the same guidance—that is to say, that the order must always justify its existence by the services which it renders to the society. But it seems to me that such justification can be found along the same lines as those which commended the office at its first development and expansion. It was, in the first place, a centre of unity; the bishops of the several local Churches were the representatives of those Churches to the rest of the body and to the outside world, and so the episcopate welded together in its first days the expanding Church. We are sometimes told now that one of the great hindrances to the reunion of at least English-speaking Christians is the insistence on the part of the Anglican Communion upon an episcopally ordained ministry, in making the historic episcopate the fourth factor in the Lambeth quadrilateral. We may leave out of sight the fact that the Christian Church extends beyond the limits of the Anglo-Saxon races; but are there no signs that, with the growth of the historic sense, and the desire for unity, the episcopate, with its unbroken line of descent and its proved services to the Church, may become the rallying-point round which will gather the broken fragments of the Body of Christ? It may be needful to clear the office of much of its civil eminence, to free it from its connection with exaggerated theories of its mechanical necessity to the life of the Church; but I for one have hopes that in the days to come that which now for a while divides may once again be the centre of attraction in the Christian Church.

In the second place, is there any plainer lesson of history than this, that, with all its faults, episcopacy has been a safeguard of the Divine revelation? It has, indeed, often allowed that truth to be obscured by accretions—such accretions as it was the work of the Reformation to remove; but no Church, as far as I am

aware, with the regular episcopate, has ever suffered from that detrition of the deposit of truth from which the reformed non-episcopal bodies have suffered. Whether you take the declension of English Presbyterianism during the eighteenth century into open Unitarianism, or the development of the down-grade theology in that most dogmatic of all sects, the Baptists, or of the New Theology of the present day, or, again, the tendencies of modern theological thought in Germany or Switzerland, the same phenomena of the wearing away of the fundamental truths of the Christian revelation reveal themselves: in this matter we shall be agreed as to the applicability of the words of Hooker in a parallel case, that "it is better to err by excess than by defect."

At the outset of my paper I used the truism that an explanation or theory must take into account all the facts; the same holds good of our estimates. The divided condition of Anglo-Saxon Christianity is a fact which presses heavily upon us; it was under pressure from a like fact, the corruption of the Western Church, that the reformers of the sixteenth century made their breach with the past by the abandonment of the historic order. It is not easy to see that the Reformed Churches have benefited by their abandonment; it would not be hard to point out weaknesses that have resulted from that step. Sacerdotal pretensions and their corollary in the exaggerated claims as to the organic necessity of this order to the life of the Christian society may raise in hasty minds a prejudice against the office in itself; but our Church corrects this in the sober appeal to history which she makes in the preface to her ordinal: "It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons"—a claim which cannot be denied "without violence to historical testimony." Ardent reformers of abuses, and men for whom God's patient working is too slow, may cry out against the obvious conservatism of the office, and the caution, verging on timidity, which its holders

have often shown towards new movements, a tendency which has sometimes resulted in serious divisions. But the experience of the divided bodies themselves has emphasized, as nothing else could have done, the inestimable services which episcopacy has rendered to the causes of unity and truth.

If I have not misinterpreted the Anglican idea of the order, it does not involve the un-churching of those national Christian societies which have discarded the office or broken with its historic continuity ; we do not dispute their right so to decide, however we may question the wisdom of their decision ; it does not involve the validity of their orders, nor of the orders of those bodies who live side by side with us in separation ; but in the latter case it denies their regularity ; it leaves room for the full recognition of God's working in and through them, though it declares unhesitatingly their unfaithfulness to the ideal of Christian unity.

Such an idea of the office as this, which tries to cover all the facts, which stands with confident appeal to the triple judgment of Scripture, of history, and of experience, is, I believe, in the long run likely to bring men back to that outward and visible unity which is unquestionably involved in the belief in the Lord, not merely as the Saviour of individuals, but as the founder of One Society in which the saved should work out their own salvation.



Restricted Horizons : A Plea for Breadth.

BY THE REV. CHARLES COURTENAY, M.A.,

Vicar of St. Peter's, Tunbridge Wells.

THERE are very few men who are really alike in this world, even though they be brothers. Superficially there may be resemblances, but, when you get below the surface, divergencies begin to crop out in a surprising fashion. There are differences of disposition, of mental texture of angle, of

temper, of tact, of manner, of powers, and a thousand other things. You may have to live with men to find out these idiosyncrasies, but there they are, no matter how twinlike they may seem. It is a bit of life's variety, to prevent undue monotony, and to fill up the world's space even to the odd corners. It takes a good many people to make a world, ordinary and queer. It is hard on the odd man, but very picturesque.

Amidst the distinctions which mark us off from one another there is one which goes to the very depths of the man, and that is the stretch of his horizon. How far can he extend himself, and what distance does his personality carry? Is he a man broad or narrow in his outlook? Is his horizon near or far, restricted or expanded? I have an idea that if we cared to analyze ourselves on these lines, we should make larger discoveries concerning our being than by any other principle of investigation. For the reach of our horizon is not a mere incidental detail, but one which enters into the very essence of our personal build.

Take the ministerial man of the world, and you will still find traces of him more than here and there if you look hard. He is a minister for his own sake, pure and simple. All he wants is a good fat living, and nothing to do that calls for special exertion. He preaches bought sermons, and looks well after the shekels. Now this man has no breadth of horizon at all. He is a point, with no extension outwards. He is just a black speck.

Or take the parochial minister, whose vision stops at that little rivulet which divides his parish from his neighbour's. His sympathies are rigidly confined to his own side of the parochial boundary, and on principle he chops off every stray tendril of concern which wanders over the fence. His parish is his one and only sphere of duty, and he knows no other interests. He and his people agree that no money should go out of the parish, and that there is quite enough there to absorb all their energy and sympathy. This horizon is a wider one certainly than that of his man-of-the-world neighbour, but it is nevertheless rather a contracted one. He is a white speck.

The ministerial Imperialist goes farther afield, and reaches forth to the remotest bounds of the Empire, upon which he reminds us that the sun never sets. His sympathies go to Canada, to Australia, to New Zealand, South Africa, and similar Imperial spots. He is keen on the white man's salvation, and lends a ready hand to forward his advantage. This is decidedly better than mere parochialism, for his horizon is pushed much farther away. His restriction is "No foreigner need apply."

But the larger man, I take it, is the missionary enthusiast who has pushed his horizon out to the edges of the world, and embraces white and black, colonist and stranger, tame and savage. He believes in the greater Imperialism, the Divine Imperialism, for his heart goes out to the world at large. He loves human nature. "Homo sum : humani nihil a me alienum puto."

Partisan restrictions and expansions operate in a similar way. Some horizons stretch to the boundaries of our own party and no farther. Like the old rival factions in the Roman games, we are whites or reds or blues or greens, and while to one of these we stretch out our hearts, to the others we extend our fists. There is nothing but good in our own colour ; nothing but error and evil in the others. All who repeat our party shibboleths we draw to our hearts, and embrace with more or less effusion according as their blue is true blue or fancy blue, genuine or suspect ; the rest we send to Coventry or Botany Bay, or consign them to quarantine for a while. It is quite to be expected that amidst the extremes of party there should be many shades, but, as a rule, most men hang on, as fringes, to one or the other. Oddly enough, the hottest warfare is to be found amongst the closest shades of colour, just as brothers and sisters, when they disagree, are the fiercest fighters. Sometimes they combine, and lay aside their mutual animosities to attack the Broad and Latitudinarian. But the coalition is not prolonged unnecessarily. Fortunately, we are not called upon to decide whose horizon is the most contracted amongst these parties,

except that we may say that where charity is the broadest there is the widest horizon.

Perhaps we ought, in dealing with ecclesiastical horizons, to hint at another limitation and restriction which exists amongst ministers and people when dealing with Dissenting brethren. While one will contend that they are God's true ministers, another will insist that they are ministerial frauds. One would consign them to a bottomless pit; another would lift them to an equal heaven. Now, undoubtedly, ecclesiastical feeling can be very bitter and very unjust, and can, moreover, seal over the eyes to the good work of those who differ from us, and if our love to our own Church makes us unjust to others, love is too contracted, and needs to have its horizon pushed out a little. Religious fences are not made in heaven.

Then there are social restrictions which confine and crib men's sympathies to the special class they fancy, to the exclusion of all besides. Those who dearly love a lord cannot abide the unwashed mob, and those who love the slums and the slummers have but little sympathy for the moneyed and the select. It is all very superficial, and we recall the fact that the Master, while he dined willingly enough with the Pharisees, also ate and drank with publicans and sinners. Classes and masses are not religious divisions. It would be easy to multiply specimens of narrow horizons, for we all stop somewhere and cry, "Halt." At some point, near or far, we freeze up, draw in our tentacles, and cry, "Avaunt!"

Now, there are certain perils connected with restricted horizons which demand careful consideration. There is the peril of self-sufficiency and complacency. The narrow man is always positive. No doubt it is a very comfortable feeling that we have "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," and that we stand almost unique in our completeness; but is it likely? Does anybody know everything without commixture of error? May not our truths be only half-truths? May there not be another hemisphere of which we have no notion? Some people think that they see the whole moon

when it is full, and will not credit the fact that there is another side quite as large which neither they nor anybody else has ever seen.

The peril of conceit is near akin to this self-sufficiency, for pride is indigenous in human nature, and the narrow man always looks down on breadth. The china maniac has a bit of old china which has no rival in the brittle world; the bibliophile possesses the only known copy of a book; and both are consumed with inner delight born of exclusiveness. So when the theologian thinks he has grasped the perfect round of truth, with no piece missing in the puzzle creed, he sits on his blissful height with his two arms encircling his achievement, and smiles serenely on the struggling mortals who, down below, are seeking in vain the missing bits. And all the time, without suspecting it, he is embracing a poor little fragment of truth which even then is being slowly devoured by his poor pride, for conceit kills everything it touches, and whenever it handles truth taps its life-blood.

There is, moreover, the danger of arrested development, for, if we have reached the limits of possibility, why seek farther? Like a man who has made his fortune, nothing remains now but to retire and enjoy it. Only, unfortunately, few retire and live long in their idleness. Peary discovered the North Pole, and declared that one visit was enough, and that he would rest on his laurels. But there is a South Pole yet undiscovered. Now, the Christian who has given over his ambition for new discoveries will most surely drop behind and droop and die. Growth is towards a larger horizon, and to cease extending is to lose what we have gained.

The peril of endless collisions is no fancy one, as we may see for ourselves in life; for if we are satisfied with our attainments, others are not, and nothing is less unlikely than that the busy seekers will wantonly disturb our quietude. They will bid us get up and sally forth to the undiscovered lands of truth, and will disturb our slumbers like the mountaineers in Alpine hotels in the early morning who make the wooden walls

resound with their preparations to ascend some lofty peak. Probably, they will provoke us to say hard things concerning their immoderate zeal. They will be to us wanton disturbers of the peace, by which we mean our own personal peace. Certainly, this is not a world where the complacent and conceited are likely to be left undisturbed.

We shall possibly, like other leisured people whose search for spoils is over, be tempted to criticise unduly. There is no more comfortable chair in the world than that of the critic, none which is softer and grander, and few there be who, once having sat therein, care to vacate it. Feeling like a king, what wonder that the critic deals out his words in royal fashion, and hurries some to gaol and some to instant execution? Now, your critic is always a man of fixed and small horizons, a cocksure man, because he knows everything so well, and has succeeded where the rest of the world confess that they have failed. If he had been a humbler man, straining more after the unattained, he would have tumbled out of his chair in double-quick time. Happily, people do not stop much to listen to an unauthorized critic, and greet his denunciations with a smile. The pity is that he should have set up the shop of the critic with so little to put in the windows.

The fact is that narrow-souled and narrow-minded men and women are in constant danger, and are all the more in danger because they feel so complete. They have blocked up the road to progress, and barred themselves off from their better and stronger fellows; they have thrust themselves into the tightest of corners, where they live as solitaries, and where none but the narrow can squeeze themselves in for company. With their eyes glued closely to themselves and their little circle, they fail to realize how wide the world is, and how gloriously broad is the heaven above them. They live a sort of village life, unbroken by any visit to great cities or contact with greater minds, and therefore untouched by life's larger issues.

It is very pathetic that men should suffer so much from what they assume to be superiorities and excellences, but so it is.

Those who live in a narrow world must glean the mischiefs of restriction, and no matter how good their motives may be they cannot escape the penalties of narrowness. So far as they hold the truth, so far will their blessings extend ; but wherein they fall short, therein will their rewards be curtailed.

If all these contentions be true, and narrowness and constriction of mind and heart be so bad, it would be well to try to ascertain how we may extend our horizon. Sandow undertakes to expand our chests ; who will undertake to widen our view and push farther our horizon ? Let us suggest a few common-sense methods.

The first rule, surely, must be, *Get on higher ground.* Some of us have ascended from low valleys, and watched with delight and wonder how the circle has widened around us, disclosing more and more of the distance. The ascent may not be easy, but it was well worth the climb. What is true of the physical world is just as true of the mental and spiritual world ; we must get on higher ground if we would have wider views and larger expanse. But this is exactly what the schoolmaster and the professor are aiming at. Yes, and this is what the Great Master does for us when we take His Word as our standing-ground, and when we ascend the Mount of Prayer and Contemplation. All depends on our height of standing. When the revelation of ourselves takes place we see our spiritual limitations as sinners. When the love comes in we can almost feel the walls of mind and heart pressing outwards and upwards. No man on the heights of Christ can long remain narrow and restricted. We may misread our Bibles, and submit to narrow theological renderings, and be narrowed by the process, but he who takes the whole revelation and leaves nothing out will find his feet in a broad place.

We shall secure a larger vision, and so a larger horizon, by *exercising our eyes.* The mischief comes from fancying that there is nothing to see beyond. This fatally checks the attempt to see farther. The look-out man on board ship has eyes like telescopes for clearness and distance, the fruit of long practice.

Let us try to see farther, believe that there is more to see than we have yet seen, keep a sharp look-out, and the circle will widen quickly and permanently. New truths will rise near the horizon, new constellations, new visitants in the heavens as we look.

It is possible to eke out our natural powers by spiritual ones. The natural soon give out, but the spiritual ones are of a higher and higher character as we work up to them. There is no end to the power of the Spirit objective. It was He who made the narrow-minded Apostles see the right of the Gentile world to the riches of Christ, and sent them through the length and breadth of Asia and Europe declaring the everlasting Gospel. And that same Spirit is at work to-day, giving us what the Church has always possessed, but not always used, the clear vision to see farther and farther afield. Think of the many centuries when the Church in England saw only her own doorsteps. Then the vision came to a few wide-hearted and clear-eyed men, and the Gospel was launched in the foreign field. Surely, we may believe that God's power to confer vision is at least as real in the spiritual as in the astronomical world, and that we may as truly have our horizon extended and revealed as were the heavens by the powers of the telescope. Our children will see farther than we do to-day, because they will possess stronger powers for the eking out of their eyesight.

Most of us find our horizon growing larger by lapse of time and by natural growth. The very young Christian is mostly very intense and very narrow. It is the characteristic of all youth to be complete and sure. He knows more than father or mother together, and he takes care to set them right on many important matters of which he thinks they are ignorant. A little later on he is not so sure, and discovers that even he has his limitations. Then he becomes humble, and sits at his elders' feet as a pupil. And henceforth he is, as a rule, more keen to be taught than to teach. This is the natural order. For experience is a stern master, and knocks a good deal of sawdust out of our heads before it has finished with us, and the

broader the horizon, the more humble it makes us, and the more liberal and broad-minded. We then see that we have not the monopoly of wisdom, that there are a few other clever fellows in the world, that we are not half as good or as wise as we thought, that others are a great deal better than we had ever imagined, that truth has more sides than one, that good doctrine may be expressed in phrases other than we have been accustomed to, and that the trees which at the top wave widely asunder have interlacing roots, and are actually nourished by the same soil. It is such discoveries as these which broaden us out and enlarge our horizon.

Contact with broader minds will often widen the expanse around us. It is for this reason that travelled people are wider-minded. They rub shoulders with many out of their own set who utter other shibboleths and see another aspect of truth. We do not hold our own views of truth with less tenacity, but we find them supplemented by accessory truths which we had not seen before. Insularity narrows, and it is only when we break bounds and cross the Channel or the ocean that we find our creed purified by healthy accretions from without. An ampler charity comes sweeping in, and carries away much rubbish, which, as scaffolding, ought long ago to have disappeared.

Habits of study prevail sometimes to widen our horizon, if we are brave enough to read the other side as well as our own. The danger is lest we keep too strictly to one school of thought, and account it our business to make assurance doubly sure by companying only with books of our own colour. But it is not a very courageous course, and hardly profitable, if our ambition is to gather in fresh truth, and not to remain unduly narrow. If we shrink from mental disturbance, and fear the introduction of a ferment which might unsettle our views, does it not seem as if we held our views unintelligently and lightly? We can have but little confidence in our own side if we fear to be beaten by an opposing team. The fear of inquiry is fatal to all breadth or discovery of truth, or to any extension of our horizon.

The *dismissal of fogs* has much to do with clearing our horizon and widening it. And there is a heat shimmer which is almost as bad as a fog for diminishing distances. Perhaps prejudice is the worst of all mists for cutting off our distant views. There are prejudices of education, prejudices of party, prejudices of nation, which shut us in like the walls of a prison, and keep us in dismal confinement. It is true that we do not call them prejudices, but principles. Nevertheless, if they narrow our horizon unduly, we may call them what we like, but they are hindrances, and not helps. It is of the first importance to break away from fogs, from whatever source they come, and to see things in their right proportion, free from personal distortion. It is not easy, for prejudices cling to us like our own shadows. Still, it can be done if we get high enough and immerse ourselves in God's pure sunshine. We want to see things as they are, and not as we want to see them, or as others tell us that we ought to see them. Astronomers tell us that most of the differences of measurement with skilled seekers in the region of the heavens come from the "personal equation," and that, until this is eliminated or allowed for, no observation can be correct. It is well to remember this "personal equation" in our search for truth.

Obstinacy has to be severely dealt with if our horizon is to be expanded, for it plays no little part in contracting it. We have committed ourselves, we have declared ourselves on this side or that, and we will not break from our past. And while the obstinate fit is on, there is no chance of enlargement. But this stiff obstinacy is a poor spirit when it is set in opposition to the claims of truth. It is more; it is flat rebellion against the guiding Spirit who is seeking to expand our horizon. Besides, to fight against growth is unnatural. A wise man changes his mind; a fool never.

Now, in pressing these considerations of the ways in which we may widen our distances, I am well aware that there is an ultra breadth which is not to be coveted. We may go too far in any direction, and we shall do well to be alive to this danger.

Breadth is hardly earned at the expense of *shallowness*. Your threepenny-bit beaten out to the size of a five-shilling piece is not worth five shillings, is it? Your little lake expanded to twice its original extent will possibly develop islands and inconvenient sandbanks. And if our sympathies seem to be enlarged when they cover a larger area, it may be at the expense of depth and concentration. To love many more is no gain if we love everybody less. Quality must not be sacrificed for the sake of quantity.

There may be *illusions*, too, in our extended views, as when the mariner thinks he sees land, and proclaims it loudly, to discover later on that it is only a fog-bank. Definiteness must not be sacrificed for the doubtful illusion of breadth. Not all that we see is solid. Many a new theology is only new in the sense that the hovering mist is a new territory. New gold-fields in the dim distance do not always pan out quite satisfactorily, and have often been found to be "salted" by some unscrupulous pioneer. Many of the much-vaunted theological "finds" are as real as the travellers' tales with which they regale eager ears when they return home. Green pools seem solid until you step upon them and get well soused for your credulity. We have learned after bitter experience to discount much of what the eager critics tell us of their disintegration of familiar opinions, and have found them to be only the fashion of the hour, caught up by too ready zeal, and then consigned to the theological dust-heap. It is better to be narrow and sound than to be broad and cracked.

There is a danger, too, lest, in the largeness of our ideas, we lose touch with the small ones. An astronomer who to all intents and purposes lives with his head in Mars has no doubt a good and grand time of it. But his feet are on this little earth, and require attention too, to say nothing of his own family circle. The zealous man, who would fain sally forth to convert the heathen, and lets his own neighbourhood lapse into heathenism while he does it, has missed his real vocation. Far sight is good, but near sight has its value too, while normal

sight is better than either. Besides, we may so live in the future as to let the present go to rack and ruin, forgetting the world that lies at our feet.

We must be careful lest, in trying to extend the frontier of truth, we allow human philosophy to displace the revealed truth. Imagination may easily outrun revelation and deny it, and so drop what has been tried and proved. The world is covered with the wreckage of systems which have been found wanting. Do not let us add to them.

We are living in times when no truth, however venerable, is allowed to pass muster without considerable testing in the philosophical crucible. But we need not tremble. Man's mind has not yet produced anything better than the Master's Gospel, and the dignity of man, however much pushed by these original investigators, is not going to throw the need of a fallen man's Saviour out of the field of vision. Truth is all of a piece, and we must take care in the attempt of man to tinker with the everlasting Gospel, lest we be robbed of our most precious inheritance.

The golden rule seems to be—Be as wide as truth, be as broad as God, but go not beyond the Divine heart and mind, lest you fall over the edge into dismal heresy. Truth has its bed like the ocean, and there it lies in all its completeness. We may roam at will over its sunny breadth, but the moment we get out and wade into the bogs and morasses which surround it we are going out of bounds, and had better come back quickly. Error lies hard by truth, and like the quicksands on the sea-beach, may catch and hold and engulf us before we know.



Present-Day Ideas and the Hope of Immortality.

BY THE REV. J. R. DARBYSHIRE,

Vice-Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

SOME months ago I was in conversation with a missionary then at home on furlough. Our talk started from discussion of a missionary exhibition at which we had both been working, and which had been remarkably successful, both in point of the number of visitors and the interest which it had aroused. I was therefore not a little startled at the very gloomy view which he appeared to take of the present missionary outlook in England. Mindful of the Pan-Anglican Congress, of the Day of Opportunity meetings, as well as of the growth of the Student Volunteer Missionary Union, I was not prepared to be told that actual work in the foreign field was not going forward. But my friend seemed only too correct in his declaration that the vastly increased interest in foreign missions of late years was bearing no proportionate fruit in offers for foreign service, or even in subscriptions to the Societies. But he went even further than that; he believed that all personal work of an evangelistic nature was less eagerly pursued than formerly, and he was prepared to support his disquieting assertion by assigning a definite cause for the facts which he had observed. English Christianity has, he held, lost its grasp of the doctrine of a future life, so that Christian people of to-day are unwilling to jeopard their lives for the sake of a visionary hereafter. Neither their own future nor that of those to whom the Word should be preached, is of sufficient interest to them to make it worth their while to risk all in this life with a view to the life to come. Most of us would be ready with arguments to urge against such a view; we might point out many undeniable instances of heroism and self-sacrifice where, as far as we can judge, no thought of bartering the present for the future entered into the case. But even while we argued we should be conscious that, however wrong the conclusions I have

mentioned might be, the main charge is true ; we have allowed the thought of the world to come to drop, if not entirely, yet too often, out of our calculations. Our missionaries do not now go out with the same urgent sense of the need of rescuing the perishing heathen as their predecessors in the work had ; and certainly they do not go with the hope of obtaining a heavenly reward in the place of all that they sacrifice here. We have heard men who almost apologized for those passages in the Gospels which speak of a reward at all ; we are inclined to think all hymns which are full of aspirations of heaven morbid ; we conceive it to be something ignoble to allow our hearts to dwell on, or our lips to speak of, the crown of life which He hath promised to all them that love Him. The situation is not a new one ; as far back as 1870 Ruskin complained of the difficulty of appealing to a belief in eternal life to any "average modern English company," for they "will forthwith tell you that what you say is very beautiful, but it is not practical." This, in a utilitarian age, is sufficient to account for the prevailing silence on the subject, but it becomes necessary to ask what it is that has made such an appeal seem so worthless from a practical point of view. What is it that has robbed the hope of immortality of its value for the man of to-day ?

The first cause which I would suggest is the inevitable focussing of interest upon this present life in a time when the present moment is always too crowded with cares and duties to allow of our thinking much of the future. We look back with envy on the less occupied lives of our forefathers, when the struggle for existence was less keen and the mind had time and sufficient quietude to look forward to a new and completer life hereafter. To-day we suffer, not from a monotony that welcomes the prospect of brighter interests in the world to come, but from a weariness of the day's too-frequent businesses and cares that indulges in the dim hope of an eternal dreamless rest. It would take too long to enumerate all the consequences of this new complexity of daily life ; individually it has meant that nervous irritability which craves for instant relief, making patience and

trust so hard for us. It has brought about that ubiquitous influence of materialistic thought that relegates the idea of unseen things being eternal to the schools of speculative philosophy. Socially it has resulted in a problem of such magnitude and urgency that we are forced to look rather for a solution in this present life than to preach contentment or resignation in the hope of redress in a world to come. So there has come about the undeniable shifting of the emphasis in respect of sin from the offence against the holiness of God, to that against the well-being of man. We think more to-day of the slavery of sin than of its guilt, more of its injury to us and those around us in our daily life than of its power to shut us out for ever from the presence and enjoyment of God.

In the second place, the Church has met this new situation inadequately. She has lost touch with the world because she has continued to preach an old-fashioned and unworthy other-worldliness. She has been too slow to claim the solution of social difficulties as her province. Some of her clergy have appeared to the world to be following blindly and selfishly a policy that made for their own interest and not at all for the interest of the flock committed to their care; others seem to have fled for refuge to an old and outworn theory of priestly rule, offering that as a cure for all evils; while too many of those who made it their boast that they represented the true evangelical tradition have withdrawn themselves from all interest in modern life, and have wasted their time in poring over speculative theories of interpretation of prophecy, or have alienated their flocks by a rigid puritanism which opposed the tendency of the day without satisfying the needs that underlay that tendency. Saddest of all, from too many a pulpit has sounded a message of Divine pardon and atonement, which has been robbed of its power because it began and ended in emotion, and was fortified neither by definite teaching nor by a challenge to Christian consistency and activity. What you say is very beautiful—the world has in very truth answered—but it is not practical.

In the third place, one must mention very briefly the general tendency of modern theology. What the German student has painfully extracted from the Gospels in his patient but continuous search for truth, the doubter or the rationalist in England has seized upon as a verified and complete statement of the facts, with the result that Jesus Christ has been presented to the men of this generation as the last and the greatest of the Prophets, then as the Founder, but not the Finisher, of modern moral teaching. A recent skit on the features of modern England, when gibing at the craving for epitomized literature, suggested that the Bible might be reduced to two words, "Be good"; in very truth, this is all that the Bible means to thousands of men and women; but the fault is at least in part that of the Church, which has not faithfully taught men what the Bible reveals of the secret of goodness. Can we blame men for the very loose thinking that has sprung up in our midst since someone was bold enough to doubt the doctrine of Eternal Punishment? They have lost a superstitious fear, without gaining a saving knowledge of God. Unconsciously they have degraded His Fatherhood into camaraderie, His love into good-nature, and have supposed that a denial of everlasting woe involved the abandonment of any theory of future punishment.

Thus the consideration of the life to come is beset on two sides. We forget the future in the present, and the failure of our efforts to mend the present evils leads us to trust in a beneficent but vague power that is somehow bringing things to rights. Too easily, then, life becomes a game, grim or careless, according to the mood of the player. It is too harassing a game to take seriously. As far as we are concerned, it is generally a losing game, so we play it with a smiling face, believing ourselves the sport of gods who will perhaps step in, as in the old Greek drama, and put things to rights when the situation has become intolerable. And if there are no gods to watch, why, then we must make the best or worst of it according to our temperament.

Now, all this is too obviously opposed to the consensus of

New Testament teaching for it to be necessary to elaborate the point. Perhaps in no case is the difference between the old and new dispensations more distinctly shown than in the change effected in the minds of devout men as to hopes of future bliss and glory. Whereas the Prophets loved to speak of a redeemed Zion and transfigured Judah, with God Himself present, regnant, honoured, and known of all men, with the nations hurrying to Jerusalem to find there the God of the whole earth, the unanimous voice of the writers of the New Testament is that of our citizenship in heaven; and even if a New Jerusalem is spoken of, it is one that is entirely unlike the earthly and historical city of David.

Now this has been recognized by a comparatively new school of theologians, who hold what is called the "eschatological" theory of the meaning of the phrase "The Kingdom of Heaven." We are not, it is contended, to interpret this phrase of any earthly state or condition of being; it refers to "a good time coming," but not in this life. It is, in fact, a continuation of the old Messianic hope, but completely metamorphosed. It is that hope purged of its materialism and worldliness and presented anew in a metaphysical and spiritual form. There is, no doubt, a great deal to recommend this view. It presents a reasonable coherence between the Old and New Testaments, while sufficiently exhibiting the difference between the tempers of the two dispensations. It also presents an interpretation of the phrase that would have been exceedingly natural and welcome at the beginning of the Christian era, when men who acknowledged the Name of Christ carried their lives in their hands, and could only look forward to some future time, some new dispensation for the fulfilment of their hopes in Christ. Indeed, we can see in the writings of St. Paul the influence of such a looking forward. The keynote of the Epistles to the Thessalonians is, "So shall we be for ever with the Lord," a thought necessarily of great encouragement to the persecuted Apostle of the Gentiles. The thought recurs in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, "To be present in the body is to be absent from

the Lord ;” and again in Philippians the Apostle declares that “To depart and be with Christ is far better.” If ever any man might be led by sorrow and persecution in this life to look for peace and comfort in the next, it was St. Paul. Does this, then, explain the difference between the language of the New Testament and our indifference to the hope of the world to come? Is the eschatological emphasis of the first century entirely the product of trial and persecution, in much the same way as the Jewish Apocalypses were composed in times of stress and storm? It is clear, indeed, that the Revelation of St. John was written to cheer and encourage men who were face to face with fierce persecution, but does that fact really supply the whole answer to the question, Whence this insistence on the future life in the New Testament? For if it does, we may go on to say: The New Testament necessarily looks forward with eager hope to the world to come, because it was written by men who had suffered, to men who were about to suffer persecution, but with the passing of the fiery trial the need of any urgent presentment of such a hope passes away too.

At any rate, before accepting such an answer, it were well to look at another interpretation given to that phrase, “The Kingdom of Heaven.” The traditional interpretation regards the phrase as expressive of a change not of circumstance but of character; the Kingdom of Heaven is within you; it is alien, not from sorrow, but from sin. It was the strong sense that Christ is the Saviour from sin, not only from its presence in the world to come, but from its power in this present life, that forced this view of the Kingdom to gain support. Men felt themselves already transferred into a new Kingdom that was indeed a Kingdom of God, a Kingdom, however, the privileges of which they were only beginning to realize and enjoy. Nay, the more their experience of its blessings grew, the more they longed for the full enjoyment of them. Still sin hampered them, still they knew that their true selves were unrealized, but they were upheld by the assurance that He who had begun a

good work in them would complete it to the end. Little wonder that they looked eagerly for the day of the Lord, and would "sometimes haply lift tired eyes to heaven; 'Is that His cloud?'"

In this hope, then, lies the reconciliation between the sure belief that the heart of the Gospel is contained in these words: "We know that He was manifested to take away sin," and the equally certain fact that in this life sin never wholly loses its grasp on any one of us. The reconciliation lies in the fact that thus we are promised that which every one of us instinctively desires, yet so few of us can express—viz., the ultimate realization of ourselves, the deliverance from all within us that we feel to be contrary to our best and so most real longings. This self-realization is impossible in the warring of flesh and Spirit within us; we yearn for a new life that will make it actual. Many nowadays, indeed, profess to be offended at our Lord's frank appeal to this instinct of self-realization, but mistakenly. His promises of reward to faithful disciples, His parables of the Kingdom, are all addressed to men who were longing for something denied them in this life, who yearned for satisfaction, but had never found it. To those who have learned the depths of their spiritual poverty, as to those who have endured persecution, is the Kingdom promised. It was St. Paul's heart's desire thus to be delivered from this awful guilt and slavery of sin: "Oh wretched man that I am, who will deliver me from the body of this death?" A world of experience lies behind that phrase: "the sting of death is sin." St. Paul learnt to glory in tribulation; he turned psalms of agonized appeal into pæans of triumphant faith; but ever his cry to the end was still for that satisfaction, that self-realization, which was involved in the consummation of the heavenly citizenship, "whence we look for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body," and again, "I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of—*Righteousness*." The same truth may be gathered from the letters to the Seven Churches. It is for

faithfulness in the face of error and infidelity rather than persecution that final blessedness is promised. Those who overcome as Christ overcame, "shall sit with Him on His throne . . . and they shall walk with Him in white, for they are worthy."

In this presentation of the Christian hope of immortality lies the solution of many difficulties of our own day. It satisfies that need for moral and ethical teaching which has led many to a position of disgust and contempt for an Evangelicalism that seemed to have no message for daily life, but only a too vivid apprehension of the almost physical horrors or joys of the life after death, for it preaches an immortality that takes account of the eternity of character. On the other hand, it avoids the crudities of the theology that explains Jesus as a visionary self-deceived Messiah, expecting almost hourly an immediate Parousia. It leaves room for His ethical teaching, not merely as an "interims ethik," but as the necessary preparation for those who would enter the Kingdom. It reconciles the two apparently contradictory features of the Kingdom, which is presented as at once future and present. On this interpretation we can see how St. John could write the words, "Beloved, now are we the children of God," and then go on to add, "and it is not yet manifest what we shall be." The practical bearing of it is further made clear by the words, "And everyone that hath this hope set on Him purifieth himself, even as He is pure."

Once again this view of the life eternal affords a most necessary corrective to that type of social teaching which, naturally not content for a future life to right the wrong, preaches a kind of earthly paradise. Such an earthly paradise all too easily becomes a garden of Cain, where every man, taught to think first of his own rights and the wrongs inflicted upon him by a regardless society, learns to fight, not for character but for place, not to serve but to tyrannize over, and, it may be, in the end to murder his brother. We must not too harshly blame men whose socialism is a policy of getting rather than giving. The instinct for self-realization is universal; we

do despite to our human nature if we forget or ignore it. Without the recognition of it our preaching of the beauty and the duty of self-sacrifice is an empty waste of high-sounding words. "What you say," once again the world will answer, "is very beautiful, but it is not practical." Even Christ, who pleased not Himself, endured, so we read, the Cross, despising the shame for the joy that was set before Him. The disciple is not above his Master, though to him to live is Christ—yes, though he be made already "to sit at His right hand in the heavenly places," though he joy to be "offered upon the sacrifice and service of" his converts' "faith." Yet for him, too, there remains the hope of the resurrection from the dead, if by any means he may attain unto it, for he is "sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is an earnest of his inheritance unto the redemption of God's own possession, unto the praise of His glory."



"We spend our years as a tale that is told."—PSALM xc. 9.

1910: *Finis.*

ANOTHER volume closed, and every sheet
 Is crowded with the record of a day—
 A strange commingling of the grave and gay :
 Laughter and tears, woes, triumph and defeat,
 Sin's stains and all-sufficient cleansing meet ;
 Traces of guidance sought, but Self's own way,
 Writ large, points out the track which led astray,
 And bruised, ere he returned, the pilgrim's feet.
 A wondrous story shall this tale unfold,
 When edited by Him who can discern
 Self's efforts midst His own most precious gold.¹
 What stands the test of fire we, too, must learn,
 When, in that day, His judgment we uphold
 And joy to let our worthless stubble burn.

¹ I Cor. iii. 13-15.

1911: Foreword.

MOST often is the Foreword written last
 To show the writer's aim—what he doth mean ;
 But here nought but blank pages can be seen ;
 Not e'en a note to show how things are classed.
 Yet what is future now will then be past,
 And stand recorded on the page now clean ;
 Things as they are, not what they might have been
 Had we the right our life's tale to recast.
 And ah! we know that blots and blunders there
 Will mar the Story ere we reach the end.
 Well, if they drive us to our knees in prayer,
 And back to the all-cleansing Fountain send,
 For all the rest—to guard from anxious care,
 His goodness and His mercy shall attend.¹

ARTHUR J. SANTER.



The Missionary World.

THE year 1910 will always stand out in the record of
 Foreign Missions. The World Missionary Conference
 was more than an event. It was "fruit wherein is seed." It
 presented, in a form that had cost long thought and labour, the
 focussed experience of the Missionary past ; it expressed, in
 terms of glowing life, the Missionary consciousness of the
 present ; it held the germ of Missionary developments in the
 future. Great in itself, it was greater still in its relationship to
 what was, what is, and what is to be. At this moment the
 message of Edinburgh is spreading to the Church throughout
 the world. Men and women from the Home Church, on
 whom deep impress was made, have returned to parishes,
 Missionary committees, and the headquarters of Missionary
 societies. Missionaries have gone back to their stations, foreign
 delegates to their own people in Africa and the East. Tokens

¹ Psalm xxiii. 6.

which already reach us indicate that the effect of their dispersion will be great. Now the nine volumes of the Edinburgh Reports and Mr. Gairdner's brilliant "interpretation" of the Conference are following in reinforcement of the witness of the delegates. Truly, as 1910 closes, the whole Christian Church is sown broadcast with the Edinburgh "seed." It fills us with hope that 1911 may be a harvest year. Yet there is need for watchfulness, lest, as in Galilee of old, the good seed sown should fail because of the ground. Fruit an hundredfold there will be. But "the wayside" trodden of passing feet is with us, "the birds of heaven" abound. Life which has "no root" still springs up where is "no deepness of earth"; "thorns" still choke the seed. "Who hath ears to hear, let him hear." The greatness of the opportunity breeds in us a holy fear. The work involved by the Edinburgh Conference is only beginning. It has passed from the Conference committees and commissions to the whole body of delegates, and to the whole Church from which they came, and into which they have been reabsorbed. Responsibility and opportunity are great.

* * * * *

The world-situation, unparalleled in its significance, grows almost too familiar to our minds—the wonder of Japan, new-born amongst the nations; the pathetic possibilities of China—"never was richer freight derelict on the great waters of time"; the mingled unrest and inertia of India, with her seething thousands and slumbering millions; the challenge of extending Islam, changing and yet unchanged; the deep appeal of animistic peoples, so simply childlike and yet so strangely complex and old, lifted at times by Christian tenderness, debased at times by "Christian" lust for gold. We have heard, and in measure we have felt. But impression without resulting action is fatal to the life of the Church. We look at the results of missions and take courage. We hear of "a body of 1,925,205 registered *communicants*" in mission lands, and of the prayerful, self-supporting, self-propagating Church in Korea, with "250,000 followers of the Lord Jesus," where twenty-five

years ago there was no Church at all. But can action be considered adequate when we study, say, the Missionary occupation of the Chinese Empire? In the best manned province (Kiang-su) there are over 28,000 souls for every Missionary ; in the worst manned province (Kwei-chau) there are over 332,000. In Korea the Missionaries estimate that there are still fully 11,800,000 waiting to be Christianized. In round numbers, it may be said that 1,000,000,000 of the human race lack the message with which the Church is "in trust." The dying words of Count Tolstoy come home with power : "*There are millions of suffering people in the world. Why are so many of you round me ?*"

* * * * *

The immediate need for a large reinforcement of the Missionary staff, and a corresponding increase of Missionary income (long asked for by societies engaged in the work), was restated with great emphasis at Edinburgh. Yet few who have followed its inner meaning would say that the main message of the Conference lay in that plane. It has gone behind the supply to the source, behind Missionary organizations to the Home Base of Missions, which is the Church, behind the method to the man, behind man to God. Of late years appeals have been many ; external stimulus has been strongly applied. There is scarcely a justifiable expedient untried, scarcely a plea unurged. The "ditches" of Missionary organization intersect each other in the Home Church—ditches for the most part well planned and deeply dug—but who can say, "The country" is "filled with water"? Professor James Denney spoke some of the strongest, straightest words of the whole Conference when he said : "*Something must happen to the Church at home if it is even going to look at the work that has been put upon it by this Conference.*" It is with that great happening, and what can be done towards it, that the message of Edinburgh is mainly concerned.

* * * * *

A fresh and careful study of the Edinburgh reports and addresses leaves, as the main impression, not the need of the world, but the need in the Home Church for a rediscovery of the limitless sufficiency of God in Christ. This commonplace of Christian belief becomes a great revitalizing power in Christian experience, as it is laid hold of by humble but unflinching faith. When the Home Church rises to apprehend it, there must result an altogether new standard of Christian discipleship and devotion. Expansion will inevitably follow into all the world. Thus, while the Conference brings stores of garnered experience and matured counsel before Missionary experts, its ultimate appeal is to the leaders in the Home Church, to the clergy in the home parishes, to the Christian workers and general supporters of missions in our congregations, to fathers and mothers in our homes, that by "knowing God" they may become strong to do exploits throughout the world.

* * * * *

Month by month in these pages it will be our privilege to further the translation of the Edinburgh message into action by outlook upon problems and advances in the Mission field, by comment upon plans put forward by Missionary Societies, and by suggestion to fellow-workers at the Home Base. From time to time Missionary topics, if of general interest, will be discussed at the desire of our readers. Requests for such may be sent to the office of the CHURCHMAN, marked outside "The Missionary World."

* * * * *

Three forthcoming Conferences may be named, with in each case a plea for prayer: (1) The second General Conference on Missions to Moslems (the first was held at Cairo in 1906) is to meet at Lucknow within a few weeks—from January 23 to 28. To it men and women representing many societies and Mission fields are now gathering, delegates to the great Peace Conference which will discuss the love-conquest of the greatest enemy of the Cross. In view of the Pan-Islamic movement, the

political changes and reform movements in Islam, and the startling Moslem advance among pagan races, a reconsideration of the attitude and equipment of the Christian missionary is requisite. (2) The World Student Christian Federation is proposing during April to hold its Conference, attended by delegates from all the countries co-operating in the Federation, in *Constantinople*. These Conferences have always been big with issues for the students of many nations, but nothing in their past equals the simple fact that it should be possible to plan such a gathering in the political centre of Islam. For this Conference, especially in its preliminary stages, prayer should also be made. (3) The Student Christian Movement of Great Britain, which, besides its annual summer Conference, has held a series of quadrennial Missionary Conferences at Liverpool (1896), London (1900), Edinburgh (1904), and Liverpool (1908), is arranging a Conference to be held at Liverpool in January, 1912. Preparations are actively beginning in the colleges this month. This Conference will deal with Foreign Missions and the home Social Problem as a unity; the attempt is a courageous one, and if successful should have great results. It certainly starts from the central Edinburgh ground. The two problems, if one goes deep enough, are seen to be really one.

* * * * *

The writer has been asked: How can a Vicar get the Edinburgh message worked into his parish? Many parishes have already had a descriptive meeting, addressed by a returned delegate or by someone who studied the Conference from "Edinburgh, 1910." Here and there the record of the Conference has begun to pall; it is an age when we seek "new things." But the meaning and message of Edinburgh is not exhausted in an account of those ten June days. Representatives of many societies are gathering repeatedly for conference; sub-committees of experts are sitting to discuss the "findings" in the Reports. There should be something in every parish parallel to this. The Reports should be in the parochial library; extracts from them should vitalize the parochial magazine; during

the winter members of the congregation should summarize some of their more popular sections and present them at some parochial gatherings. Best of all, the Reports suggest for the Vicar himself subjects fresh and convincing for his sermons, thus making the pulpit, as it should be, the source of inspiration for the pews. For example, the Report (IV.) on *The Missionary Message in Relation to non-Christian Religions* has material of surpassing interest on such topics as the need for a living theology, the sense of sin, the doctrine of the Cross, non-Christian conceptions of God, prayer, immortality, hindrances to the acceptance of Christianity, and the elements in Christianity which make a special appeal to, or present a special difficulty to, the various races of the world. The Index of the Report is admirable; therefore the matter is easy to use. The facts are arresting in their interest, especially to men; but their highest value is in the light they shed upon the essentials of Christianity. This Report lends itself to powerful and much needed apologetic work. The Report (I.) on *Carrying the Gospel to all the World* lends itself equally to simpler work.

* * * * *

In matters of Missionary policy the results of the Edinburgh deliberations must be slow to appear. They must develop in individual minds and in committee-rooms long before they are manifest to the Church. But the "May meetings" will reveal whether the *method* of the World Missionary Conference, the form and order of its meetings, has impressed itself as deeply upon those who organize meetings as upon those who attend them. There is a growing sense that the "May meetings" this year will not—or should not—be as before. The brief, well-ordered business, the absence of "set" reports and technicalities, the careful preparation of the programme, its subjects converging on one single aim, the punctuality and efficient ruling of the Chair, the directness and preparedness of the speeches, and, most of all, the rest and purpose of the great daily "central act"—the best half-hour of the most important meeting given to prayer, and spent for the most part in

“directed silence”—all this was so welcome at Edinburgh that it is desired again. It bears directly upon the prospect of spiritual results.

* * * * *

Next month we propose to consider certain matters which emerged at Edinburgh concerning Educational Missions, and also to discuss the difference in the Home Appeal for Missions between old paths and old ruts.

G.



Literary Notes.

MESSRS. BLACKIE AND SONS have sent us a number of their well printed, beautifully bound and interestingly written books for young people. “The Red Knight,” by G. I. Whitham (price 2s. 6d.), is a story of the days of Edward III. and the Black Prince, full of exciting interest and mysterious happenings. “A New England Maid,” by Eliza F. Pollard (price 3s. 6d.), is the story of a Puritan maid in the days of the War of Independence. Her brother is the Governor of Philadelphia, but Hannah is the real heroine of the story, and her bravery saves her brother. Miss Pollard retains the interest of her readers to the end. “A Middy of the Slave Squadron,” by Harry Collingwood (price 3s. 6d.), is a thrilling story of the slave trade. Dick the Middy, after many exciting adventures, falls into the hands of the slave traders, but soon escapes, and his escape leads to the capture of the slavers. The story will appeal to old and young alike. “Two Dover Boys,” by Gertrude Hollis (price 2s. 6d.), is the story of two boys who fell into the hands of Corsairs, passed through many adventures, and finally escaped. “Maori and Settler,” by G. A. Henty (price 3s. 6d.), is a new edition of one of Mr. Henty’s well-known books, telling the story of a family who emigrated to New Zealand, and after many vicissitudes settled happily in the land of their adoption. “Ronald Bannerman’s Boyhood,” by George Macdonald (price 3s. 6d.), is a beautifully illustrated edition of Mr. Macdonald’s well-known book. “The Great Aeroplane,” by Captain F. S. Brereton (price 6s.), carries the new art of flying into the region of the romantic. An Englishman invents the perfect aeroplane, but finds it difficult to protect it from the malicious. He gathers a curiously assorted crew, proceeds on a long and exciting voyage, and finally brings the aeroplane back to England, where it still lies, so the story tells, ready for use in England’s hour of need. We can cordially commend all these books, and we are grateful to the publishers for maintaining in these difficult days their reputation for clean, wholesome literature, fit to be placed in any hands, and exciting enough for the most exigent, whether schoolboy or maiden, or children of older growth.



Messrs. Nelson still continue to issue volume after volume in their two series. In the Sevenpenny Library "The Invisible Man," by Mr. H. G. Wells, "The Call from the Past," by Leonard Merrick, and "Mr. Clutterbuck's Election," provide exciting and light, not to say somewhat gruesome, literature. In the Shilling Series, Mr. Booker T. Washington, the American coloured gentleman, of high intellectual distinction, tells the story of his life in "Up from Slavery."



A new volume of sermons by Canon J. M. Wilson, to be published immediately by Messrs. Macmillan and Co., deals with "The Origins and Aims of the Four Gospels." The book contains two short courses of sermons which were delivered this year in Worcester Cathedral. They do not attempt to describe the method, or to analyze the results of textual criticism, but aim rather at giving the effect of accepting such general results of the critics' way of looking at the Gospels. The sermons were attended by the senior boys of the King's Cathedral School, and the Canon had this section of his congregation specially in mind when planning and writing them.



"The Ascended Christ," by Professor H. B. Swete, will be published by the same firm shortly. The book is a sequel to an earlier work by the same author on the "Appearances of our Lord after the Passion," and, like that volume, it has grown out of a course of lectures given to candidates for Holy Orders. Dr. Swete hopes the book will be of service to the younger clergy, and to Church workers among the laity.



"Douglas Jerrold and *Punch*," by Mr. Walter Jerrold, has just been published by the same house. The book is of considerable literary interest, for Douglas Jerrold was one of the most constant and voluminous of the original band of contributors to *Punch*, and was the first writer whose personality was popularly identified with the paper; he was also the main political force—"Prime Minister in *Punch's* Cabinet"—in those early years when the Fleet Street jester was wont to hit out with the vigorous indignation of youth. "Mrs. Caudle's Curtain Lectures"—one of the most successful works of nineteenth-century humour—and "The Story of a Feather"—Douglas Jerrold's most popular novel—appeared serially in *Punch*, but he was the author of much else in the journal scarcely less notable. In this new book Mr. Walter Jerrold tells the story of his grandfather's connection with *Punch* and the *Punch* men, prefacing it with some account of Douglas Jerrold's earlier *Punch in London*—short-lived prototype of the *Punch*—giving some particulars of his hitherto unidentified contributions, and reproducing some striking fresh material, including "Our Honeymoon," a work full of the humour and observation which made the fortunes of Mrs. Caudle.



We have received from the S.P.C.K. the "Churchman's Almanac" for 1911 in its various forms, adapted for the pocket, the desk, the vestry, and

the Church. The different almanacs are as usual excellently got up, and will continue to meet the need which they have supplied for so many years.



The Rev. G. H. Morrison contributes a preface to a new work by the Rev. W. D. M. Sutherland entitled, "Ideals for the Christian Life." In a number of brisk and stimulating essays, the author sets out ideals which cannot fail to stand the reader in good stead in the making of all that is noble in character and personality. Mr. Robert Scott announces the volume for immediate publication.



The Books of Chronicles.¹

By HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B.,

Of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law.

FIFTEEN years have now elapsed since the appearance of the first instalment of the International Critical Commentary. Three books of the Old Testament have been treated by British writers, and eight by American commentators. If the present rate of progress is maintained, those of us who live till 1945 may hope to see the completion of the British portion of this leisurely undertaking, for seven more works on the Old Testament are assigned in the advertisement to English and Scotch editors.

It is a natural result of this method of publication that a new book in this commentary should appear to those who are abreast of the times as something like an anachronism. The volume on Chronicles has been delayed by causes which every reader must regret, for its principal author, Professor Curtis, has suffered from illness followed by partial loss of vision, and it is probably for this reason that the book seems to represent more truly what was believed in certain circles some years back, than what is generally believed to-day. Or perhaps it might be more accurate to say that the beliefs it mirrors were and are those of certain limited circles, but in the interval that has elapsed since Professor Curtis began his task the views of other circles have been powerfully reinforced by new arguments and facts, and have found fresh and influential support, with the result that current opinion on the Old Testament is taking a direction never contemplated by our author. I do not know that I can illustrate this better than by quoting a few sentences from the volume, and then placing in juxtaposition with them extracts from a recent utterance by a Harvard critic who has also contributed a volume to this series, Professor C. H. Toy. I draw especial attention to the great difference of *tone* between the two writers, which

¹ "The International Critical Commentary": "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles." By Edward Lewis Curtis, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of the Hebrew Language and Literature in the Divinity School of Yale University; and Albert Alonzo Madsen, Ph.D., Pastor of the First Congregational Church at Newburgh, N.Y. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1910.

appears to me even more significant than the actual statements made. Professor Curtis¹ writes :

" This supposition of Keil . . . breaks down completely if the results of recent scholarship in reference to the sources of the canonical books can at all be trusted, since these sources always appear in Chronicles in the same combinations in which they are found in the canonical books, and never, apparently, otherwise. . . . Gleanings from Gen. xxxv., xxxviii., xlvi., representing P, J, and R, appear in 1 Chron. ii. No one, however, has ever seriously argued that the chronicler had access to the sources of the Pentateuch, since, forsooth, to Keil and those of his school the Pentateuch had no sources in the modern sense " (p. 20).

Professor Toy, on the other hand, writes as follows :

" Several writers have recently dwelt on the fact that the Septuagint and other ancient versions differ considerably from the received Hebrew text (the Massoretic) in the use of Divine names. . . . The Septuagint translators, it is commonly supposed, followed their Hebrew text faithfully, and this text is equally authoritative with the Massoretic. . . . It is concluded that the latter is not a trustworthy guide for a division of documents based on Divine names. . . . While this point calls for a more thorough examination than has yet been given it, the conclusion just stated is not out of keeping with the tone of modern criticism. As is well known, critics generally hold that our Hebrew text has suffered greatly from scribes and editors in the process of transmission. It is agreed that Divine names have been changed in Chronicles, Psalms, and elsewhere—why not in the Pentateuch ? . . . I do not pretend to defend all the arguments and conclusions of recent works on the Pentateuch. They sometimes disagree among themselves, and sometimes press analysis too far, and make difficulties where there are none " (*The Christian Register*, April 28, 1910).

These extracts from an article in which Professor Toy was avowedly defending (*not* attacking) what Professor Curtis calls " the results of recent scholarship " must impress every reader. In place of " assured results " we have a " point " that " calls for a more thorough examination than has yet been given it. " In lieu of the " consensus of scholars " we have " arguments and conclusions " that cannot be defended, and works that " disagree among themselves, and sometimes press analysis too far, and make difficulties where there are none. "

The question of the historical character of the patriarchs is similar. Thus, with regard to the existence of Abraham, Professor Curtis writes : " The basis for this belief seems somewhat sentimental " (p. 70). Perhaps if he had read the discussions of Orr and Eerdmans he might have felt more inclined to write that " the basis for the denial seems not even to have the support of sentiment. " Certain it is that throughout his book Professor Curtis is essentially one-sided, attending to the opinions of a particular group of men and to no others. Indeed, an unfortunate bias runs through the commentary, and sometimes leads to the strangest results. Perhaps the following note on 1 Chron. ii. 54 *et. seq.* gives as good an instance as any of the workings of our author's mind : " The mention of the scribes *shows clearly* that we have a post-exilic notice, since it is *doubtful* whether families of them existed earlier. " ² How can a doubtful premiss lead to a certain conclusion ?

While this volume represents a great deal of hard work, it is unfortunate that the space should not have been allotted in such a way as to give more

¹ It appears from the preface that Professor Curtis is " solely responsible for the work, " though some portions have been written by Dr. Madsen under his direction.

² P. 98. My italics.

information. The following is typical of a great many notes: "Another entirely obscure genealogical fragment" (p. 112). Undoubtedly, that is all that any commentator can say of a great many passages in Chronicles, but when we find large numbers of such remarks combined with a refusal of recent archæological information, we feel that our author has misconceived his task. On p. 113 we read: "A very readable exposition of these obscure verses in the light of the discovery of jar handles in South Palestine inscribed with names similar or identical to those here given is presented in the Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement, 1905, by R. A. Stewart Macalister." But surely the material facts ought to have been incorporated in the volume before us, together with some estimate of Mr. Macalister's views and references to subsequent discussions of the subject. If necessary, a conventional sign could have been adopted to denote that verses were hopelessly obscure or corrupt, and the necessary space could have been gained in this way. After all, one goes to a commentary for the information that is available, and notes that add nothing to the reader's knowledge are no consolation for the refusal of such information. It is the business of a commentator himself to provide an exposition of his author in the light of all the available information. Closely connected with this criticism is another—the entire absence of extended notes on special points. Such notes are among the best features of some other volumes of this series; and though it is possible to carry the practice of writing them too far, they are often necessary to the proper exposition of a book. In reading this volume I have missed them sadly, for there are certain matters that require a more systematic treatment than can be given to them by Professor Curtis's system. For instance, the Chronicler's data as to the Levites should have been collected and discussed separately. Some general view of his statements as to the sacerdotal organization should have been provided. His interest is admittedly largely institutional (p. 16), and accordingly an adequate exposition of his work would embrace a good deal more historical and legal matter than is to be found in this commentary. There is, indeed, little in the book that will add much to the general stock of knowledge. It will not rank with the best commentaries of the series of which it forms part. Some of the contributors to that series have held it to be part of a commentator's duty to march ahead of lexicographers, archæologists, etc., but this volume is not informed by any such aspiration. It contributes a little to the textual criticism of the book, but here again it certainly falls below the level of the best work of recent years. There are only two logical positions in this matter: the one is to follow the Massoretic text closely; the other, to use all the available materials systematically and continuously, with a view to getting as near the author's autograph as possible. Professor Curtis does not really occupy either of these two positions, and accordingly his book represents a somewhat unsatisfactory transitional stage.

A considerable amount of attention is necessarily devoted to the sources and historical character of the book. It cannot be said that Professor Curtis has much sympathy with the Chronicler. Here, for instance, are extracts from p. 255 (on 1 Chron. xxii. 2-19): "This chapter is a free composition by the Chronicler, full of general and exaggerated statements, with a number of short quotations from earlier canonical books woven together. No careful,

definite statement suggests a trustworthy historian, or even the use of an earlier source . . . the Chronicler's description must have been drawn by inference from the older canonical books, assisted by a vivid imagination." And, again, on verses 2-5: "Not a studied account of material prepared for the Temple, but rather a careless list of such things as happened to occur to the writer." These particular sentences were probably written by Dr. Madsen, and if so, they show that he, too, shares the Professor's views and feelings towards the Chronicler. It seems to me that men who hold such views would do better to comment on some author with whom they feel more sympathy; for without sympathy there can be no insight.

And this brings me to the principal matter that I desire to discuss.

It is to be observed that the Chronicler himself twice refers to a "midrash" as an authority. The following extract from the article "Midrash" in the "Jewish Encyclopædia" throws some light on the meaning of this expression:

"A term occurring as early as 2 Chron. xiii. 22, xxiv. 27, though perhaps not in the sense in which it came to be used later, and denoting 'exposition,' 'exegesis,' especially that of the Scriptures. In contradistinction to literal interpretation, subsequently called 'peshat, the term 'midrash' designates an exegesis which, going more deeply than the mere literal sense, attempts to penetrate into the spirit of the Scriptures, to examine the text from all sides, and thereby to derive interpretations which are not immediately obvious. . . . The divergence between 'midrash' and 'peshat' increased steadily; and, although the consciousness of this divergence may not have increased in a proportionate degree . . . it was never wholly obscured" (vol. viii., p. 548).

Of the countless millions of Jews who have used this term through the ages, one only has produced work that was deemed worthy of inclusion in the Canon. That one was the Chronicler. It is reasonable to suppose that he knew the meaning that the expression had in his own time, and the only question that can arise is whether that meaning was or was not the same as in later times. If we found such a word as "allegory" employed by a narrator to designate one of his sources, it would be fair to inquire whether he used the word in the sense that appears natural to us, or in some other sense, and the answer would be determined by internal evidence. If it then appeared that the narrative based on that source really was allegorical in character, we should conclude (1) that he had in fact used the word in the sense with which we are familiar, and (2) that his original public would have understood this as well as we do.

Now, any thinking reader of 2 Chron. xiii. will, I imagine, agree that it is not literal history. When, therefore, we find the only authority referred to in this chapter designated by the appropriate term "midrash," it seems impossible to doubt that the expression is used in substantially the same sense as later, and that the Chronicler and his original readers appreciated this as well as could any modern.¹ The real meaning of the chapter must be sought in such phrases as, "But as for us, the Lord is our God, and we have not forsaken Him;" "And, behold, God is with us at our head;" "O children of Israel, fight ye not against the Lord, the God of our fathers." And so it came about that Talmudic authorities did not question the canonicity of Chronicles, but treated it as a book intended for the particular kind of

¹ R. V. "commentary" entirely fails to convey the meaning of "midrash."

spiritual exposition which is designated "midrash." This is really what is meant by the harsh and unsympathetic paragraph of the "Jewish Encyclopædia," which Professor Curtis summarizes in the following sentence :

" While in rabbinical literature Chronicles was regarded with suspicion, its historical accuracy being doubted by Talmudic authorities, and it being held to be a book for homiletical interpretation, yet its canonicity, as some have thought, never seems really to have been questioned " (p. 2).

Failure to grasp this truth has led to the most perverted views of the Chronicler, his work and its historical and religious value. I suppose that, after what has been said, my readers will have no difficulty in appreciating 2 Chron. xiii. Let us glance at another instance: In 1 Chron. xxv. we are told that David instituted certain Levitical musical services. Verse 4 brings us to a list of names. Though there is a good deal of corruption, it is absolutely certain that many of these names are not proper names at all, but Hebrew words including some verbs like "Giddalti" (I have made great). It is generally agreed that originally these words formed a consecutive sentence, but owing to the state of the text the exact details are not clear. The reading favoured by Professor Curtis is rendered by him as follows :

" Be gracious unto me, O Yah, be gracious unto me ;
Thou art my God whom I magnify and exalt.
O my Help (or, Thou art my Help) when in trouble, I say,
He giveth (or, Give) an abundance of visions."

This rendering will do as well as any other for the purpose of my illustration. It will then be followed immediately by verse 5, "All these were the sons of Heman the king's seer in the words of God," etc. Now, I ask, if this were an English book, would any English reader think there were men who were literally called by such names as "I magnify," etc.? Would he proceed to infer that the author of the book believed this to be literal history, or for one moment imagined that his readers could suppose it to be so? Would he, then, charge him with "deliberate invention or distortion of history," or seek to defend him against such a charge by insisting that he has "worked everywhere according to sources"?¹ Or would he inveigh against his "law-crazed fancy"?² Or would he write a note saying, "Why what was possibly an ancient prayer should thus be resolved into proper names cannot be determined"?³ How many readers of the "Odyssey" wonder that *Oδύσσεύς* could have been regarded as a name by Odysseus and the Cyclops—or the Greeks who listened to the Rhapsodists? What would happen if the "Pilgrim's Progress" were edited on such lines? Or is it really supposed that a Hebrew-writing canonical author could be so ineffably stupid as to write words like "I magnify," "I exalt," etc., *in his own language* without understanding what he was writing? Read the lines of the prayer as conjecturally restored, and consider: were not all these in a very deep and spiritual sense the sons of Heman the king's seer in the words of God? Can any Temple service do more than establish such communion between men and God? The chapter may be corrupt, the details are not in all cases clear, but the bed-rock meaning is as plain as could be desired. When the Chronicler is tried for this falsification of history, all who have ever spoken in

¹ See J. Wellhausen, "Prolegomena," Eng. trans., p. 222 (quoting Dillmann).

² *Op. cit.*, p. 195.

³ Curtis and Madsen, p. 278.

parable or allegory will be his companions in the dock. Shall we speak of law-crazed fancy or spiritual insight?

The above represents the most important and far-reaching criticism that can be made on the book—fatal lack of comprehension of the Chronicler's aims, purpose, method. Yet perhaps reference should be made to one or two other matters. Considerable attention is devoted to the question of the Chronicler's sources and the allotment of different passages, and a number of guesses are retailed at some length. The answer to all this has been given by Professor Curtis himself in a criticism of a theory of Winckler's: "In reality no one can decide the exact basis of any unknown work. Many and extensive volumes may lie before an author whose work is restricted and meagre" (p. 23). It is a pity that the Professor did not bear these remarks in mind throughout his volume.

Of more importance is the misconception of the relation of the Chronicles to the Law. The former book does not really represent P in operation, as I have recently shown in an article on "Priests and Levites" in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July, 1910. Unfortunately, Professor Curtis has entirely misunderstood Num. iii. 28-32 (p. 268). This passage relates merely to desert services of transport. His commentary, however, proceeds on a series of assumptions as to the meaning of the provisions of the Law with regard to the priests and Levites which are absolutely untenable, and this, in turn, affects his view of the sources and his historical estimate.

Other matters of which I had wished to say something would take me too far. The type of the book is often inconveniently small, especially in the references to Biblical verses in the small print notes. Misprints are numerous, but harmless. In conclusion, a word of praise must be given to the unusually full English index, which is by far the best feature of the book.



Notices of Books.

THE CHRISTIAN CERTAINTY AMID THE MODERN PERPLEXITY. By Principal A. E. Garvie, D.D. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 7s. 6d. net.

Dr. Garvie has collected in this volume a series of papers which he has contributed from time to time to various magazines. But the book in no way suffers from this fact; it is bound together by a common thought throughout. He writes from amid the *Modern Perplexity*; he has sought to keep himself informed of the many conflicting currents and modern thought. But he remains a convinced Christian; he is able to retain the *Christian Certainty*, and he would have others enjoy the same conviction. The book is one rather to read and ponder over than to pass in review. It will cause difference of opinion from time to time. We shall not always follow exactly Dr. Garvie's lines, but we shall ever be thankful for the bracing tonic which his words will administer to those who are harassed by the doubtings and difficulties of present-day thought. The first section of his book he heads "Constructive," the second "Critical." It is the right order, but it is the more difficult order. The first chapter is headed "The

Restatement of the Gospel for To-day." He tells us that there are three factors in modern thought which make that restatement necessary: criticism, science, philosophy. Of criticism he warns us: "We must not be always revising our creed to bring it into accord with the last book we have read, but may await with patience and confidence the assured results of the new movement." Of science he writes: "We must see to it that we do not mutilate the Gospel in order to lay it as a vain sacrifice on the altar of science." Of philosophy: "No speculative system has or can have the certainty of the religious experience of the grace of God in Christ, and accordingly Christian theology does not need to wait on any philosophy for the terms of its restatement of the Christian Gospel." Dr. Garvie is afraid of none of the three; he is assured of the Christian Certainty. He speaks of conscience and creed, of sin and sacrifice, of atonement and personality; he discusses Reichle and Ritschl, Harnack and Kaftan, Loisy and Tyrrell, Denney and Orr, Forsyth and Sanday; he tells us something of the philosophy of Eucken, something of Modernism, and much of value judgments. But for him Christianity is not at the cross-roads; it is pursuing with calmness and confidence its road, broad in its comprehensiveness, but narrow, if need be, in its exclusion of that which might destroy the faith. For those who are anxious to have a real grasp of the present position, but who have little opportunity for the wide reading that the occasion demands, this book will be both illuminating and reassuring.

THE LIFE OF WILLIAM HAGGER BARLOW. Edited by Margaret Barlow.
London: *George Allen and Sons*. Price 12s. 6d.

The book is a picture, drawn by several friends, of one who for many years toiled incessantly and successfully for the good of the Church which he loved, and the school of thought to which he belonged. Few men have exerted a larger influence, or have played a greater and more unassuming part, in the life of Evangelicalism than William Hagger Barlow. As the Bishop of Liverpool points out in his introduction, he was not a great man as the world estimates greatness; but he was a good man—a man of strong common-sense, of sound judgment and extraordinary powers of work.

"But it was his character even more than his gifts which gave him his great influence over clergy and laity alike, and which made him the confidential friend of two such great Bishops of London as Dr. Temple and Dr. Creighton. . . . None could doubt his unflinching adherence to principle, his devotion to truth, his absolute self-effacement, and his close walk with God."

The story of his life is told with considerable but not tiresome detail by friends and colleagues. Something is always lost when biographies are written by several hands, but it is doubtful if any one man could have dealt satisfactorily with the multifarious interests which Dr. Barlow served. He was the Principal of a theological college, he was the Vicar of one of the most important parishes in the kingdom, he was the chairman of a great municipal authority, he was an educationalist of wide influence and prudent initiative, he had a larger influence in matters of patronage than probably any single man of his day, and, finally, he became the thoroughly efficient Dean of a beautiful cathedral. Small wonder that it needs the labour of many loving hands to describe his many-sided life. This is no

place to tell its story, the interest of that story is sufficient to send us to this book; and those who are anxious that the Evangelicalism of the twentieth century shall be worthy of its glorious traditions, and capable of grasping its splendid opportunity, can learn much from the study of it. In the sermon preached at the College Memorial Service at Highbury, the Rev. E. Grose Hodge puts his ecclesiastical position in a few telling sentences:

"He was a definite, strong, convinced Evangelical. But he always asserted he was not a party man. 'No, I am not a party man,' he said; 'I hold by the whole Church and the whole teaching of the whole Church: I am a Churchman.' He did not want for a moment to gain a reputation for breadth, liberality of view, and for charity, by holding lightly things he knew were true, or by tolerating things he knew to be untrue."

There we must leave him, simply echoing the words with which Bishop Chavasse closes his Introduction: "The Church of England may have had greater men and more brilliant in her day, but it had none who served it and its Lord with greater faithfulness, wisdom, and devotion."

SOME OF GOD'S MINISTRIES. By Rev. W. M. Macgregor, D.D. CHRIST AND CHRIST'S RELIGION. By Rev. F. H. Dudden, D.D. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 4s. 6d. each net.

These are two volumes of a second series of "The Scholar as Preacher." Dr. Macgregor had a volume in the first series on "Jesus Christ the Son of God." The present volume is of a more general character, but it is a worthy successor of the first. His sermons are scholarly and thoughtful, but they are also stimulating and inspiring. He draws his illustrations from many sources; he not infrequently quotes from other men, but the sermons are his own, and there is personality behind them. There is not a weak or uninteresting or unhelpful sermon in the book. The volume justifies the publishers in including a second volume from the same pen in this somewhat carefully guarded series.

Dr. Holmes Dudden's book in some ways runs along similar lines; what Dr. Macgregor calls "Some of God's Ministries," Dr. Dudden sums up as "Christ's Religion." This, too, is a thoughtful and well-illustrated series of sermons, perhaps not quite so simple as Dr. Macgregor's—but it is ill work comparing books that are both excellent. Dr. Dudden is always practical, and he is always devotional. He preaches the Christ who came to minister, and he would have our service the service of real charity, not

"Organized charity scrippied and iced,
In the name of a cautious, statistical Christ."

He preaches the Christ who came to help, and so he bids us, whatever else we do, learn first to pray. For we have at our disposal "the greatest force in all the world," and he bids us use it.

"The Scholar as Preacher" series differs from most of the many sermon series published to-day. The writers are scholars as well as preachers. There is no need to fear that this means that the sermons are dull, unintelligible, and unhelpful. The two volumes before us—indeed, all the volumes of the series—maintain a high level of scholarship; they maintain also a level of spirituality and simple, practical Gospel-preaching which all preachers do well to emulate.

BIBLE-READINGS FOR CLASS AND HOME. By Rev. R. C. Joynt. London : *Nisbet and Co.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

Many of our readers will be glad to possess this little volume of suggestive Bible studies, which appeared from week to week in the columns of the *Record*. Mr. Joynt knows his Bible, and he knows how to help us to study it to profit, without being either fanciful or unscholarly.

PICTURES OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH : ITS LIFE AND TEACHING. By Professor Sir W. M. Ramsay. London : *Hodder and Stoughton.* Price 6s.

Professor Ramsay is so rapid and so voluminous a writer that few of us are able to keep pace with him. We get every year one or more large volumes from his pen, and the reader sometimes wishes that he would practise the art of compression more than he does. But this volume is somewhat different from the rest. It was written to guide Sunday-school teachers through the story of the Infant Church, as they taught from Sunday to Sunday the International Lessons for 1909. The fifty-two studies thus put together by one who knows St. Luke from long study, and the lands of the New Testament from personal travel, will provide the Sunday-school teacher and the ordinary reader with a handbook to the Acts which takes into account the work of modern scholarship, and yet is free from the tiresome details that only serve to puzzle ordinary folk. To those for whom it is written, especially to the Bible-class teacher, the book will be invaluable.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE BIBLE. Edited by Rev. James Hastings, D.D. Edinburgh : *T. and T. Clark.* Price, general, 10s. ; to subscribers, 6s. net.

It is no slur on the many similar aids to sermon-making to say that this new series bids fair to be the best. The danger of most is that they provide the preacher with a ready-made sermon into which he puts little effort and less personality. For those who want ready-made sermons it is useless to apply here, but those who want help in preparation will find it abundantly. In the volume just published, that on the Prophet Isaiah, the great texts of the prophecy are selected for treatment, and each text is dealt with on the same plan. First we find a list of the sermons which great preachers have preached upon the text. Then the text itself is dealt with in relation to its context and the circumstances of its utterance. Then there follows a careful exposition, if it be needed, and the chief topic or topics are indicated. Finally there follows a full exposition, interlarded with apposite illustrations. To the preacher who makes his own sermons, —and all preachers should, or they are not sermons at all—these volumes will provide abundant help. But the preacher who tries to preach these chapters as they stand will be inordinately long, and extraordinarily muddled ; he will deserve to lose his congregation, and will probably do it. This is exactly as it should be. The best book for a preacher is not the book that saves him from working and thinking, but the book which helps him to think out great texts, and enables him to work better and more successfully.

IRISH LAND AND IRISH LIBERTY. By Michael McCarthy. London: *Robert J. F. Scott*. Price 7s. 6d. net.

Mr. McCarthy's studies of Irish life, politics, and religion, are well known. The Land Purchase Scheme has inspired him to write the story of the Irish farmer and the Irish peasant. Only incidentally, but none the less ruthlessly, is it an exposure of the ill effects of the Roman Catholic domination. Mr. McCarthy writes of what he knows, and he gives us a real picture of Irish life as it is among the poorer classes. The book is excellently illustrated, and in these days, when the Irish Question is so prominently before us, it should have a wide circle of readers.

NOVUM TESTAMENTUM GRÆCE. Edited by Alexander Souter. Oxford: *The Clarendon Press*. Price 3s. net.

The Clarendon Press have just issued an edition of the Greek Testament according to the Revisers' text of 1881, with full critical notes at the bottom of each page. A list of manuscripts, uncial and cursive, of versions with their manuscripts, and of Fathers, is placed at the commencement of the volume. The explanatory matter is in Latin. A very useful working Greek Testament.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS. By W. Cunningham, D.D., Archdeacon of Ely. London: *Duckworth and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

We should scarcely expect to find such a book as this in a series the general title of which is "Studies in Theology"; nevertheless, we are grateful indeed for this excellent contribution to the study of Social Problems in the light of Christianity.

Of Archdeacon Cunningham's qualification to deal both with Christianity and social questions there can be no doubt. He is an expert theologian and economist.

The book, which opens with a very full and detailed statement of its contents, is divided into three main parts. Part I. deals with world-wide influences; Part II. with national economic life; and Part III. with personal duty. The field of investigation is broad and comprehensive. Perhaps the most important section of the book, and that which will appeal most forcibly to those who desire to see a true adjustment between Christianity and social problems, is the section which deals with *Personal Duty*.

With Socialism as an economic theory the author has little sympathy. The right of private ownership and free scope for individual enterprise are essential conditions of prosperity.

"For a man to be secured by authority in the enjoyment of the fruits of his enterprise, and of his labour, and to be secured in the possession of that to which he is entitled under the laws of the State, is the corner-stone of all industrial prosperity.' On the other hand, Municipal enterprise which involves interference with the use of the public thoroughfares is advantageous."

With regard, however, to the welfare of society and the means of realizing it, Christianity, says Dr. Cunningham, has no specific teaching to give.

"Its appeal is addressed primarily and directly to individuals. . . . The welfare of society in material prosperity, or in human culture, is secular and mundane, and there is

no special Christian doctrine as to the best means towards this end. This is the business of the State, and not specially that of the Church; the duty of the Church is merely indirect, and consists in using her influence, as far as possible, to secure that the duties of the State shall be done effectively and as in the sight of God by the persons who are responsible for discharging them."

In the following quotation the writer is even more emphatic :

"The primary aim of the State is mundane in ordering the affairs of this world ; and the primary aim of the Church is spiritual in the salvation of souls ; but both powers can co-operate."

We are thankful to have this clear statement of the issues, for there are not lacking evidences of what Dr. Cunningham calls a "Secularized Christianity. This and "The Christianity of Christ" are the titles of the two closing chapters, the contents of which we earnestly commend to the careful perusal of our readers. From so much that is excellent it is difficult to quote. The following, however, will indicate the conclusion of the matter to which the Archdeacon leads his readers :

"The Church, indeed, consists of men each of whom, as a citizen of an earthly kingdom, is called upon to do his political duties, as well as his other duties, in the name of the Lord Jesus. For ordinary purposes, in ordinary life, it may not be important, or even, perhaps, possible, for a man to distinguish that which is incumbent upon him as a citizen of an earthly realm from that which is incumbent upon him as a child in the family of God. But the distinction is of vast importance in regard to those who are called to office and ministry in Christ's Church. The terms of their commission lay down the limits of what they are to do by Christ's authority. They have no commission to put the affairs of society right, or to eradicate the evils in this present naughty world. In the Gospel of the Grace of God they have committed to them the supreme means of touching men personally, and inspiring them with high but practicable ideals. This is the grandest work to which any man can give himself. . . . Christ sent His Apostles on evangelistic work, and bade them administer the Sacraments and exercise pastoral care ; but He did not enjoin them to agitate for social reforms. Since the task which is given us to do is spiritual, it can only be accomplished by spiritual strength and through spiritual means."

In other words, behind all social problems is the problem of the individual, the problem of sin, and it is with these Christianity is chiefly and directly concerned.

This able contribution to a subject of vital interest we heartily commend. The book closes with an excellent bibliography and index, which the reader will find very useful.

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL. By E. H. Askwith, D.D. London : *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 6s.

The old controversy about the Fourth Gospel concerned itself mainly with questions of date and authorship. The newer controversy concerns itself with another question—its value as an historical document. Some modern critics tend to suggest that St. John, or the writer, whoever he was, invented some of the incidents and most of the discourses in the interests of theology. They base their contention mainly on the ground that the story of our Lord's life as told in St. John is irreconcilable with the Synoptic tradition. And so to-day it is internal evidence, almost more than external, that demands our consideration. Dr. Askwith deals with this side of the problem in a series of able and carefully-written papers. He examines first those parts of the Gospel which cover the same ground as the Synoptists. He then turns to the vexed question of the Jerusalem and

Judean ministry in St. John as against the Galilean ministry in the Synoptists. He shows that the Synoptic narratives require such a ministry, and points out that St. Luke's Gospel contains obvious traces of the ministry which St. John records. Dr. Plummer in his Commentary on St. Luke has already shown in detail how the Judean ministry fits into the Synoptic story. Dr. Askwith pursues the same argument to the point at which we must either regard the Synoptic story as unintelligible or the Johannine story as true. The last chapter deals with some of the objections to the historicity of St. John. He notes the significant fact that Professor Birkett on the one hand denies the historicity of the Fourth Gospel, but believes that the writer of it is correct in his dating of the Crucifixion; while Schmiedel, on the other hand, believes that if the author is right on this point the Gospel is to be credited. The real fact is that the critics of the Fourth Gospel have, by their persistent attacks, involved themselves in serious difficulties with regard to the Synoptists, of which the only true solution is to give the Fourth Gospel the position which they deny to it. Dr. Askwith has written a learned and readable defence of the Gospel based on a careful comparison of the Three with the Fourth. We entirely agree with the Editor of the *Expositor*, that the papers were worth issuing in book form as a valuable contribution to the maintenance of the orthodox position.

THE FASCINATED CHILD: Talks with Boys and Girls. Edited by Basil Mathews, M.A. London: *Jarrold and Sons*.

This charming little volume consists of a number of addresses to children given by various people of every sort and denomination. But the best thing in it is the editorial preface, "A Quest for the Child-Spirit," admirable alike in its sympathy and good sense.

THE DOCTRINE OF CREATION. By C. M. Walsh. London: *Fisher Unwin*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

A discussion of various theories and religious doctrines of creation, the main point raised being that of the eternity or non-eternity of matter. The book is mainly useful for the abundant quotations given in it; these are taken from many writers, ancient and modern. But we cannot think that the Doctrine of Creation has had much new light thrown upon it by all these elaborate discussions and quotations. Nevertheless, the volume has a use, if only as a collection of valuable reference passages.

Received: GOD AND THE SINNER. By Canon Denton Thompson. *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net. This is a second edition, revised and rewritten in part, of an excellent volume of sermons on the Parable of the Prodigal Son, published some six years ago. The original edition was widely appreciated, and we venture to prophesy for this a wider circulation still. PORTRAITS OF WOMEN OF THE BIBLE. By Rev. Thomas E. Miller. *Allenson, Ltd.* Price 3s. 6d. A series of character sketches of the women of the Old Testament, ably and suggestively drawn. THE BELIEVER'S TESTAMENT. *Simphin, Marshall and Co.* Price 6d. The Gospel story told in the words of the Bible in harmony form. MOTTO CARDS, ETC. *Morgan and Scott*. A packet of illuminated text-cards with mottoes for the New Year, tasteful and effective as usual. RECOLLECTIONS OF SIR ALGERNON WEST. Nelson's Shilling Library. THE WOMAN IN WHITE. Nelson's Sixpenny Classics. THE GIRL'S OWN PAPER, THE BOY'S OWN PAPER, THE QUIVER. R.T.S. The new numbers of these excellent periodicals, adequately maintaining their long-lived reputation.