

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

October, 1911.

The Month.

**Church
Defence.** WHATEVER our politics—and it is much to be desired that the Church should be tied to no one political party—no Churchman can look upon the present trend of events without serious misgivings, or, at any rate, without serious concern. The convinced Conservative may feel that with the Parliament Bill the fate of Church and schools is sealed. The ardent Radical may believe that if only the Church can be disestablished, and the schools either secularized or rid of denominational influence, true religion would at last have free course. We believe that both are conscientious, but that both are wrong. We stand for religious education; we believe that in a perfectly just system of education there should be room for denominational teaching; we insist that it is good for a nation that it should recognize in its corporate capacity the worship and service of God, and we know of no better method of securing such public recognition than the method of Establishment. So far we are against the Radical; but we are with him in his desire to redress grievances and to secure liberty and justice for all. We think that Churchmen have sometimes failed to see the Nonconformist point of view, just as they have frequently failed to see ours.

The Parliament Act has created a new situation, but we are not inclined to believe that it will lead to hasty and ill-considered legislation. As regards the Church, no sweeping measures of

educational or ecclesiastical disendowment are likely to become law until they have been for some two or three years before the people of the country. We have no sympathy with the Cassandra type of prophet as regards the future of the Church. The British public moves slowly, and it possesses common sense. If, after three years of discussion, a Bill goes through, after all the people must have their way ; and if the Bill be unjust, it will be largely the fault of the Church.

The Church is on its trial ; it has two things to do. First, it must educate and agitate. But education and agitation are not the larger nor the more important part of Church defence. Democracy is utilitarian, and has little respect for old institutions as such. Only so far as their effectiveness commands respect will it retain them. The Church has had fifty years of warning, and its future depends on the hold it has gained on the affections of the people. The best Church defence is concerned with the strengthening of that hold. We must show the people what the Church has done, we must show them what it is doing, and we must rectify our mistakes.

The current number of the *Edinburgh Review* gives the premier place to an article on "The English Church of To-Day." The article has many points of interest. It seems to be written from an external standpoint. It is not merely fair to the Evangelical school, but is warmly appreciative of its excellences. In the condition of the Church at large many weaknesses are pointed out, and some warnings are proffered which we may well take to heart. In the closing paragraph are these words :

"They speak more truly than they know who tell us that for the English Church the time in which we live is critical ; that she has come to the parting of the ways. The call of Empire is in her ears ; she may hear it, and follow ; she may be deaf to it, and refrain. In other words, she may resign herself to the distinctive position of Anglicanism, or she may rise to her higher calling, and take her stand for English Christianity as a whole. In the former case, 'Abide ye here with the ass' will be her programme. It is a poor one. She will rest on her past ; she will appeal to the stationary elements of Society—the uneducated, the unintelligent, those who for one

reason or another stand outside the main stream. She will continue to influence the imagination and sentiment of a section of the nation ; she will probably approximate more and more to mediæval doctrine and ceremonial ; by her claim, disputable as it is, to be (in the sectarian sense of the word) Catholic, she may retain a handful of enthusiasts whose natural gravitation is towards Rome. But this road leads nowhere. A Church which takes it may be long in dying, but is on the road to die. On the other, a great—a very great, destiny awaits her—the furtherance of the religious life of the English people at home and beyond the seas. . . . The ‘least reformed’ of the Reformed Churches, and inheriting the political genius of the nation to which she owes her distinctive features, she may unite for her own people the best elements of the old order and of the new. Should it be so, it is not England only that will be the gainer ; the *vasti luminis oræ* will receive increase. Her past has been great, her future may be greater.”

**Significant
Episodes.**

A few weeks ago, in the city of Brussels, some quarter of a million people gathered in a great demonstration against the Church. The one watch-cry was “À bas la culotte !” (Down with the clergy !). The next step will be disestablishment or revolution. Yes ; but that is in Belgium, a priest-ridden country, feeling the exactions and tyranny of Rome. True ; but, again, at the recent Trade Union Congress a resolution in favour of secular education was passed by an overwhelming majority of those who represent the better type of our artisan population. For several years has this same resolution been passed. What does it mean ? It is fatuous to ignore the fact that somehow organized religion has got out of touch with great masses of our people. We believe that it is as largely true of Nonconformity as of the Church of England. There must be reasons for the fact, and we do not believe for one moment that the main reason is to be found in the growth of godlessness. Suspicion that organized religion is indifferent to the social claims of the struggling masses, belief that the Churches are mainly concerned with questions of their own advantage, and disgust at the divisions of Christendom and the inconsistency of Christians—all these things contribute to the position. Here is the Church’s opportunity. Let us show the warmest and most practical interest in the social problems of the day ; let us claim nothing more than justice for ourselves,

and let us grant, not grudgingly, but gladly, even-handed justice to others; and let us, above all, not only in preaching, but in practice, not only corporately, but individually, maintain the spiritual standard of our Master, and very speedily the underlying antagonism—or, to say the least, indifference—will vanish. The Church is unjust, the Church is unspiritual, so men think, and so they are alienated from her.

The year 1911 promises to become a very distinctive one in the annals of English history. It has witnessed already the Coronation of King George V., a drastic alteration in the constitutional status of the House of Lords, and a labour outbreak of a new and alarming kind. We use the latter terms advisedly, because it is quite a misnomer to call the outbreak a "strike" in the hitherto accepted sense of that term. Formerly a strike meant that a certain body of workmen in some particular trade, finding the remuneration inadequate or the conditions in other ways intolerable, declined to do any more work till their grievances should be remedied. It was a case of collective action on the part of the workmen as against their employers, while the general public took, of necessity, a neutral attitude. The recent outbreak has not been merely against the employers. It has been against the general fabric of society. It has been a desperate attempt on the part of certain bodies of workers, inspired and directed by expert agitators, to deal a blow at the whole social fabric and effectively to paralyze its working. Apart from the general loss and misery it has inflicted, especially on the poorer classes of the country, its most ill-omened feature has been the tyranny and roughness displayed in the so-called "peaceful picketing" by which emissaries of the unions sought to prevent non-union men from rendering any service.

There is no doubt that public opinion has received a shock. We have had a striking object-lesson, showing us what disaster some of the forces already active may produce if allowed to go unchecked. It will

The Labour
Trouble.

The Right
to Work.

be the task not only of statesmen and politicians, but of Society as a whole, to take precautions that such a blow, aimed at the national life, shall not again be possible. With regard to the organized persecution of non-union men, we venture to adopt and endorse most heartily the weighty words of a leader-writer in the *Daily Mail* :

“ We believe no less firmly than any disturber of Society that every labourer should receive in fair measure the fruit of his labour, and that it should be his endeavour to get it. Towards this desirable consummation Society will assist him, as it has assisted him in recent years, both by individual effort and by general sympathy. We believe that nothing better insures the stability of Society than a full recognition of the dignity of labour, and the co-operation of the whole public in fairly distributing its rewards. What we do not believe is that one man should insist on another adopting a particular method of bettering himself. To force a man to strike who does not wish to strike, to bring pressure upon any man to leave work when he desires to work, is tyranny and the negation of liberty. Against those who are convicted of this interference with liberty as stern laws should be enforced as against those who steal or do bodily injury to another. Those who set up a bulwark against a general strike are fighting for freedom as thoroughly as any of their predecessors, who have made England the home of freedom in the eyes of the whole civilized world.”

When sufficient time has elapsed to give the **Our Own Responsibility.** proper historical perspective, future thinkers will be better able rightly to gauge the whole situation. But even at this early stage, certain practical considerations are forced upon us. Perhaps the most obvious is this : How far does the recent outbreak involve grave reflections on English Christianity and its representatives throughout the land ? How far might the darker features of the struggle have been impossible if we, for many years past, had been truer to our vocation and to our Master ? It has been said that much of the violence, during the recent troubles, has been due, not to the strikers, but to a wilder, more lawless section of the populace, who gladly welcomed the opportunity afforded by the disturbed conditions. Are the Churches sufficiently alive to the call that comes from these people and to the need for missionary work at home ? We are greatly occupied with the need of re-union, and we are busy—rightly so—with world-wide schemes of foreign

missionary enterprise. But what of the Lazarus at our own gates? True religious solicitude, like charity, begins at home. Let us beware of incurring the Divine reproach: "These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone."

It is not an unusual thing to spend some moments of our holiday musings in making plans for the oncoming winter season, and when we are thus virtuously employed, we even go so far as to sketch in outline some settled scheme of reading. To those who prefer to study a particular topic, we suggest one, the true apprehension of which means so much for the future welfare of the Church of England—the question of the origins of the Christian ministry. The suggestion may be put in a more practical form if we mention the names of a few books which are likely to be most helpful. Some of them are old friends to many of us, and some of them are quite recent contributions to the subject. The following is the list, to which we afterwards add a word or two of explanatory comment:

A Course
of Reading.

- "Essay on the Christian Ministry," Bishop Lightfoot.
- "The Christian Ecclesia," Dr. Hort.
- "The Ministry of Grace," Bishop Wordsworth.
- "The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries," Professor Lindsay.
- "Studies in Apostolic Christianity," the Rev. A. W. F. Blunt.
- "Early Church History to A.D. 313," Professor Gwatkin.
- "The Origins of Christianity," Professor Bigg.
- "The Church and the Ministry," Bishop Gore.
- "Apostolical Succession," the Rev. Dr. Browne.

Of this list it may be said, in the first place, that it is not quite so formidable as it looks. Two of the books mentioned are not long ones, and in the case of several of the others it is not a matter of reading the whole book, but of excerpting, by means of the index, the relevant portions. Lightfoot's essay is a classic, and should form the basis of all subsequent study. Printed in the first instance as an appendix to his edition of "Philippians," it is

Lightfoot,
Hort, and
Wordsworth.

now published in cheap form as a separate book. The significance of Hort's "Christian Ecclesia" may be estimated when we recall Bishop Gore's outburst contained in Note E at the end of his "Epistle to the Ephesians" (1898): "Not even Dr. Hort's reputation for soundness of judgment could stand against many posthumous publications such as the 'Christian Ecclesia.'" (Those who care to do so can see this proposition discussed by Dean Armitage Robinson in the *Guardian* for March 9, 1898.) In Bishop Wordsworth's "Ministry of Grace," the relevant matter will be found in the first two chapters, amounting to some seventy pages in the larger edition. Professor Lindsay's book is interesting, not merely for its intrinsic excellence, but as indicating the point of view of Presbyterian scholarship.

Mr. Blunt's book, though smaller than the others, ^{The} _{Remainder,} is of first-rate importance. It is written with the objective, historical spirit—the rigid determination to let the facts speak for themselves—which is so characteristic of Hort's "Christian Ecclesia." It does not carry the investigation beyond the limits of the New Testament. Especially valuable is an appendix giving the New Testament passages that bear upon the controverted points. Gwatkin's work may either be read consecutively—which is the better way—or consulted by the index. The same may be said of Bigg's "Origins of Christianity," but in this case the index is not very helpful. The strictly relevant passages are pp. 64-68, 81-82, 107-109, 192, 263-264, 363-365. In this matter, as in all others, the counsel *audi alteram partem* is to be followed. Hence we close our list with two books giving the extremer standpoints on the subject. Bishop Gore's "The Church and the Ministry," should be read as the clearest, fullest exposition of the neo-Catholic point of view. On the other hand, Dr. Browne's Congregational Union Lectures for 1897 enable us to see how the dogma of Apostolical succession appears to a scholarly divine of the Congregational Churches.

We have lost two great Bishops, both of them scholars, both of them High Churchmen, but both of them broad-minded and large-hearted men, Dr. Paget of Oxford and Dr. John Wordsworth of Salisbury. Dr. Paget was successively Dean and Bishop of the University See, and he was worthy of so distinguished a post. Dr. Wordsworth was a scholar of world-wide fame, and his studies in the fields of re-union and of the Christian ministry will bear fruit in days to come. The Bench is poorer, much poorer, for their loss. Dr. Gore's translation to Oxford is natural and appropriate. He returns to the University Diocese after the practical experience of a great city. We may differ from him, as we often do, but we cannot deny him our admiration and respect. One of our greatest social reformers, in the person of Dr. Russell Wakefield, succeeds him at Birmingham, and the appointment may help to bring about that better understanding between the Church and the masses to which we have referred. And now, after many years of splendid service, Dr. Boyd Carpenter is vacating the See of Ripon, and the Prime Minister has the onerous responsibility of sending another Bishop to that great Northern See. We wonder whether Church-people as a whole realize the difficulties which must beset the Prime Minister in matters of this kind, and we wonder how many take the trouble to pray that the right man may be found for each vacant post. It is easy to complain when an appointment is made which does not please us. It is better and much more useful to pray before the appointment is made.



"Anglo-Romanism."

By "DIACONUS ANGLICANUS."

I.

THE other day a fellow-minister of mine in this town pursued a friendship which had begun with mutual opposition to certain measures at half a dozen Chapters, by asking me to breakfast. It smacked so delightfully of the past that I accepted; whereupon he added: "And will you come to Mass beforehand as well?" I am a High Churchman, so I consented and went.

When I got to the church I found that it was the "Festival of the Assumption of our Lady," and that owing to the failure of a regular officer, my friend would be glad if I would serve. He was in a vestry behind the Lady Chapel, vested and waiting—so much the priest that the man had disappeared. As I robed, he asked me colourlessly if I needed the server's book, and I clutched at the straw. We entered the chapel, and my preliminary devotions were interrupted by the somewhat belated transference of his biretta, and my ignorance of what to do with it. I was glad of the Server's Manual, as by means of it I just managed to follow the service. There were no communicants, nor indeed any congregation at all. It may have been a Communion Office in use somewhere, but it was certainly neither Roman nor Anglican; and when we had waded through the intricacies of post-Communion, Ablutions, Last Gospel, the restoration of the biretta, the return to the vestry, and the removal of the vestments, I apologized for myself. "Never mind," said my friend. "One gets a little rusty if one is not often able to enjoy full Catholic privileges."

This little incident may serve as a text for a few remarks on a phase of our church life that is going, I confess (as Wolsey said to Henry), "beyond me." It is not that I write as an enemy, for my sympathies are entirely with what I must call "Catholicism"; it is rather that I write as one who has been

wounded in the house of his friends. The wound will not lead to recriminations. There is no need to scream! The days of *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement* are really over; and the men against whom this criticism is directed are zealous, hard workers, sincere in their own view, and utterly regardless of what I (or anybody else) am likely to say, for a reason which they would give in the words of St. Peter: "We must obey God rather than men." They appear to me in a sense to be gathering weight, and I feel convinced personally that they are the only people in the Church of England able to make a lasting impression on our slum population. In this city, for example, the church which I have described is the only one, apart from the Roman Catholic, which really reaches it. But for all that, there seem to me to be fundamental reasons why this phase, which I shall designate as "Anglo-Romanism," is impossible to an intelligent man who would keep his honesty. And it is with the utmost deliberation that I write that last sentence.

II.

My criticism is a threefold one, removed perhaps from the ordinary run of such criticism, and the first point is that "Anglo-Romanism" fails to comply with the fundamental attitude of Catholicism. Protestantism appears in history as a system based upon the principle of "private judgment," and such a sentence as Luther's: "It belongs to every man to know and to judge of doctrine," exactly sums this up. There is a sense in which the present multiplicity of sects is eminently satisfactory to Protestants, and that is why there is little weeping over it among them. Dr. Aked can move from Congregationalism to the Church of the Baptists without a qualm, and in his view it is precisely this which makes Free-Churchmanship ideal. Based broadly upon "fundamentals," Protestant Christians are at liberty to know and to judge for themselves of doctrine, and to form themselves into congregations for the preservation of certain views. Every man is possessed of this licence, and there is no standardization

of faith and practice. Truth being a diamond with many facets, we are all obliged to see a different side until—well, perhaps until truth ceases to be a diamond!

Catholicism has always maintained that the better gem, if you must have symbolism, is a pearl. But be that as it may, the main principle of that faith is that its adherents are essentially children who require a teacher other than the Voice Within, which, it is asserted, in this matter is not the Divine teacher. The promise of guidance into all the truth was given to the whole Church and not to individuals in the Church, and was meant to be realized corporately. In a word, Catholicism is based upon Authority. It requires authority all round, and not only in "fundamentals." It stands for precisely the opposite of the private judgment principle, which it regards as the shifting sand of Protestantism.

Now it is this supreme axiom of the Catholic faith which is simply ignored by "Anglo-Romanists." The feast that we kept the other day was simply kept because the Vicar liked it. He himself even would not have *blamed* a "brother Catholic" for not keeping it. He is an "anti-Revisionist," but he had conducted a private revision of the Prayer Book without the assistance of Convocation. In "external" matters even he is a pope unto himself. His predecessor, a very staunch supporter of a prominent Ritualistic society, followed the Roman use with regard to lights and incense, and reserved the Blessed Sacrament. The altar at present follows the lines indicated in "The Parson's Handbook" and is "English"; moreover the Vicar regards Reservation, except immediately after Consecration for the use of the sick, as not "Catholic." He has another curate who has even told me that he does not himself regard a daily celebration as "Catholic"—a curate who is enamoured of Bishop Andrewes's "Devotions" because of their literary charm. But the great point is that all and each of these views is based on private judgment.

Yet the root of the trouble lies deeper still. Pressed upon it, the "Anglo-Romanist" admits that the Bishop is the source.

of authority, and the diocese a miniature of the whole Church. His one quarrel with Rome is that primacy has displaced episcopacy. And yet there is an ever-growing number of men who are absolutely out of touch with their Bishops, even with those Bishops who count themselves High Churchmen.

"The doctrine of purgatory—and the direct accessibility of the saints—can never become a legitimate part of the dogmatic furniture of the Church," writes Bishop Gore.¹ "I deprecate the phrase 'Masses for the dead,' and feel that the doctrine of the Roman Church in that point is misleading and wrong. The intention to communicate is an integral part of the Communion Service," says the Bishop of London.² And yet the Rev. T. A. Lacey maintained at Rome in 1896 that "the one point of difference which made intercommunion impossible was to be found in the Papal claims."³ Mr. Lacey represents the opinion of which I am writing. It is no use arguing upon what the Bishop of the diocese may be like in twenty years, or as to what the Church of England will allow in two hundred. Ignatius wrote, ten years after the death of St. John, as we believe, "Let no man do aught of things pertaining to the Church apart from the Bishop" (Ad Smyr. viii.). "We ought to regard the Bishop as the Lord Himself" (Ad Eph. vi.). Yet this is precisely what these men do not do, although they glory in Ignatius, especially Ad Smyr. vi. ! The Catholic principle is that for continued Church life to go on in opposition to the Bishop is schism. If the Bishop is heretical, then the faithful must appeal to the metropolitan or obtain another Bishop. A delay in such a process was inevitable once: a delay in the first, at least, is not inevitable now. That it is *impossible* in this case one may admit, but there is a solution. The Non-Jurors found it; and that principles are more than life itself is the foundation of heroism. As for the sheep, they are not our concern here: the Lord will provide. It can never be right to do wrong that good may come,

¹ "Orders and Unity," p. 198.

² At Sion College, March 13, 1911.

³ *Church Times*, February 17, 1911; "Memories of 1896"

and, after all, it is for the highest, and for martyrdom, that our age is calling. But be that as it may, the Catholicism of the Ritualist is not the Catholicism of the Catholic Church in respect to the principle of authority.

III.

A second charge that seems to find abundant justification at the present time is that of an attitude of mind towards truth which is identical with what is popularly known as "Jesuitism." I do not personally believe that Ignatius Loyola or his followers ought to be saddled with the term, but there is none other which, in popular language, expresses what I mean. "Anglo-Romanism" in the Church of England is to-day far in advance of the old Oxford Movement, and it takes up a dual attitude which seems to me fundamentally deceitful. What I mean is this: While there is no need to argue about what the Church of England does or does not teach about the Real Presence—although we are divided about that—it is surely clear to any student of the Reformation that she does not teach Transubstantiation. It is incredible that the recusant legislation should have been supported by Bishops who themselves taught a doctrine not to be distinguished appreciably from the Roman. Nor does the Church of England teach that the Sacrament of Penance is the *normal* method of sin's forgiveness, to neglect all controversy as to whether she even recognizes it. Nor does she even suggest Invocation of Saints, even if she encourages Comprecation, and only condemned excesses in the former practice. And she does not even conceive of the Pope's occupying any other position within the Church than that of Bishop of Rome.

Now, the modern school of "Anglo-Romanists" consists of men who, first, themselves believe all these things, and who, secondly, admit frankly that the Church of England, as she stands, does not. I know men personally who use the Rosary habitually; who add the Angelus to their Daily Office; who say

of Transubstantiation that although the philosophy may be faulty, it is the best way of expressing the truth. Such men, in theory, tell you of Confession that "all may, some should, but none must"; but, practically, they consider no lad passing through their hands really satisfactory until he comes to Confession. They point out that the Communion Exhortation says, "if he cannot quiet his own conscience"; and they add, "Now, lads, it is certain that upon some things you can't." They believe in the infallibility of the Church, and when asked privately about the Pope, they tell you he would be infallible if the Church were united.

These men justify their position on two grounds. They say that they do not teach such views openly. They do not, but they are the first to maintain the right of explanation if asked. What does this come to? It means practically that, for example, Confirmation candidates are given teaching publicly which leads them to say at a private interview, "What is the difference, sir, between Paradise and Purgatory?" or, "Then do you think the Roman Catholics are wrong in saying prayers to saints?" and to get the answer, "Well, if you ask me personally, I think there is no difference," or, "I think that they are not." This particular illustration is one that has actually been given me triumphantly. It is the same over Holy Communion. The marvel is, not that Mr. Lacey said at Rome in 1896 that there was no substantial difference between the doctrine of Rome and Canterbury on the Sacrament of the Altar, but that he continues to say it in England. But for the most part it is not said openly, and this is the attitude that is being taken: Publicly, "We do not believe in Transubstantiation"; privately, "Well, it is hard to say what is wrong in it."

Pressed, the "Anglo-Romanist" retreats to a further barricade when he says, as Fr. Waggett once at Cambridge, "We have had one Reformation, and, please God, we will have another." It is this internal undermining which will work that Reformation; to the Ritualist that Reformation will be of God; therefore he may work for it. To him the Catholic Church is

greater than the Church of England. The law of the one displaces and determines the other. He does not see that, in the Church of England, he is only upright if he accepts her modification of the Catholic view.

Now, as I have said before, these men are absolutely sincere and genuinely zealous for souls. They believe it was the Divine plan that the soul of man should be beset by sacraments from the cradle to the grave, but their “ Seven ” are set over against the Church of England “ Two,” which proclaim her belief that sacramental grace is only one of many foods for the soul. As a matter of fact it is here, I believe, that the difference really lies. The “ Anglo-Romanist ” makes the entire Prayer Book take on a sacramental dress. He is the man who, strangely enough, delights in Moody and Sankey’s hymns, and he uses them in a way which is exactly typical of his use of the Prayer Book—

“ What can wash away my stain ?
Nothing but the blood of Jesus.”

He sets a congregation singing, and explains that it means the Chalice.

“ Behold me, Saviour, at Thy feet,
And take me as I am ”

—that is the Confessional. But I maintain that this attitude is not of the Truth. It is inconceivable in the Person of our Lord. It will be the ruin of the Church of England. It means the weakening of our position all round, and makes it possible for such men as the author of “ The Confessions of a Clergyman ” to write, “ I recognize JESUS as my Saviour . . . but I do not recognize Him as my God,”¹ and yet to justify his remaining as a pastor in the fold. The “ Anglo-Romanist ” of to-day is very like him. As he confesses, if he thinks you a friend, he is Roman at heart, and anxious for us all to get there. And although I do not blame him for thinking so, and, indeed, would not commit myself to saying that I regarded him as wrong—my mind is not made up—what I do say is, that his place is in the

¹ “ The Confessions of a Clergyman ” (Bell and Sons), p. 139.

streets among the Savonarolas and Wesleys of history if he will work his Reformation, and not in secret within the sanctuary.

IV.

Lastly, the incredible thing about "Anglo-Romanism" is that it is based upon a theory that is palpably a paper theory. It is a theory which has grown slowly into being. Pusey and Newman edited libraries of the Fathers and based their Catholicism upon the general ground that it was primitive. Newman finally saw clearly, what is logically inevitable, that either the Church is possessed of a Divine guarantee against error, and is, in consequence, as right in this century as in the second, or she is not; and is as likely to be as wrong in the second as in the fifteenth. His followers within the Anglican Church to-day realize this, and further, maintaining as they do that the Church is in such a way the Body of Christ that she is identical with Him, they teach, finally, that the appeal to the past is fundamentally a heresy if its witness is to be set up against the present. The voice of the Church is the voice of Christ, whether yesterday or to-day, and the voice of the Church is the guide of our faith.

Now, it is a little difficult to hear the voice of the Church to-day, because the Church to the Ritualist is Rome-cum-Canterbury-cum-Moscow, in addition to a few other bodies who have lingered precariously since they were convicted of heresy at an early period of Church history; and to escape the inevitable conclusion that Christ is tongue-tied, it is propounded that those things upon which the three consent are the truths which the voice of the Church is ever annunciating. Thus, the Real Presence finds universal support, and is consequently binding upon Christians because it is taught by Christ in the Church to-day. It is for this reason that most controversial books by Low Churchmen make no appeal to a Catholic, because they are always occupied with what is undoubtedly interesting, but, for all that, of antiquarian interest. To show

a Catholic that a dogma is not in the Bible is only to show him that Christ had not then spoken upon it.

But it is this theory of the identity of the Church which is so absolutely impossible. Its impossibility may be put in this way : Whereas it is true that, by this theory, the branches of the Church might quarrel amongst themselves over some question of government or pious belief, they obviously can never differ over dogmas *de fide*, for, if they did, it would be impossible to know what was of faith in any century. Now, the supreme subject of what parts compose the Church (quite apart from the fact of its inclusion in the Apostles' Creed) is obviously a very fundamental of faith to the Catholic, and yet it is precisely this upon which the " Anglo-Romanist's " theoretical Church is most in dispute. There is nobody in the world who maintains his theory of the very identity of the Church but a small section of the Anglican body (itself not so big as the Baptists) which did not even exist a hundred years ago ! It is a paper theory invented to suit a view. Rome and Moscow are not agreed that they, with Canterbury, make up the Church. The Church of the " Anglo-Romanist " denies herself. To maintain his argument, the " Anglo-Romanist " appeals to the past against the present, to the Church uncorrupted in faith from the Church corrupted in faith, when his one and only standard of what corruption is, is that which his Church says to-day is corruption. The " Anglo-Romanist " asks me to use my private judgment to obtain a view of the Church ; then to maintain, by my private judgment, that the Church is in error about herself ; and, finally, to believe a collection of dogmas, not because I privately judge about them, but because they are those which are taught by this Church. His Church is so lunatic that she maintains she does not exist, but she is infallible in everything else.

Credo ut intelligam is Catholicism, and in its daring venture it is at least entitled to respect. But the modern " Anglo-Romanist " has arrived at his faith piece-meal, according as individual dogmas appeal to him. He then builds a house to

lodge them in, indifferent to the fact that the house must have been built before he was born ; and one has to find house first and furniture second. Yet thus he builds—upon the sand. We may well wonder what it is which keeps "Anglo-Romanism" on its feet. One great reason is that it has at last come by a tradition, and entered a fool's paradise. The generality of the junior clergy have never argued out their position, but they are led to believe that it has a great history behind it. It must be right, for otherwise they would all be wrong. Every now and then a vicar (as recently at Brighton) discovers that his Catholicism is private judgment based on a theory of episcopal rule that has no existence in fact, and he goes over. But for the most part we go on with strange festivals, with revised "Masses," with practices not in the Prayer Book, because they are "Catholic," determining our Catholicism by a theory which, if examined, denies itself. We look like Rome, but we wear a painted mask which we have put upon our face with our own hands. And we deceive the passing crowd ; nay, we look in a mirror and deceive ourselves. But God is not deceived. And one day He will move the mailed fist of the world, and the blow will shatter our dream.



The Continental Reformation.

BY THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

I.—HOW TO ESTIMATE THE REFORMATION.

A MODERN historian, who has instructed all of us, and whom many of us have had the happiness of knowing, has justly said that our aim in studying history ought to be "the formation of a right judgment on the great issues of human affairs."¹ Our recent and present political experiences must have shown to those who can take a calm survey of the situation that it is possible to adopt and maintain very strong opinions without the comprehensive knowledge on which strong opinions ought to be based. And if the study of history cannot always give the necessary knowledge, it can at least give us that sobriety of judgment which will show us the dangers of over-statement and over-haste, and keep us from lending a hand in winning apparent successes which prove far more ruinous than failures. History teaches us the extraordinary complexity of the forces which influence human action, and the great, though limited, power which men's wills and characters have in directing the course of affairs. It may be true that history never repeats itself, and therefore never tells us exactly what the present moment requires; but at least it can teach us the temper and spirit in which present problems must be approached.

Ecclesiastical history is no exception. There also there are no exact repetitions. The appeal to the first three centuries, or the first six centuries, is always interesting, and nearly always instructive; but it cannot always teach us what we ought to think or to do at the present time. Present conditions are so different that modifications are almost certain to be necessary. We can learn method, and we can learn temper, and still more surely we can learn what tempers and methods have proved

¹ Creighton, Inaugural Lecture at Cambridge.

disastrous. But perhaps the chief gain is to see the characters of the men who have produced the most valuable and permanent results. It is here that imitation is always safe. What such men actually said and did is of far less value than the spirit in which they worked. It can hardly be summed up better than in the motto which Döllinger chose for his guidance: "Nihil temere, nihil timide, sed omnia consilio et virtute" (No rashness, no cowardice, but in everything forethought and courage). How very different the history of the Reformation would have been had those who took leading parts in it acted on these principles! It is principles rather than hero-worship that we ought to get from this, as from other momentous periods.

It is inevitable that we should commonly regard the Reformation as a religious movement; but it was certainly not exclusively religious, and it is perhaps true to say that it was not primarily or mainly religious. A great crisis in European thought and action would have come in the sixteenth century, not only if there had been no Luther, or Zwingli, or Calvin, but even if there had been no great religious problems which had been clamouring for solution for at least two centuries.¹ The break with the past was quite as much political as religious, and the political break was accentuated by social and economical changes of the greatest magnitude. There were also vast intellectual changes which told in both directions. These perhaps affected the religious side of the movement more than the political side, but they would not have made the movement a religious one if there had been no religious questions to be solved. It was a period of deep and dangerous discontent, and a great upheaval of some kind was inevitable. Men felt that they were living in a new age, which called for a fundamental change in the conditions of life. This feeling may have been confined to the more thoughtful minority; but everyone could feel that evils which had lasted for centuries, and which had been intensified during the last fifty years, had now become intolerable, and must—either by rulers or people—be

¹ J. Mackintosh, "A History of Modern Liberty," ii, pp. 44, 49 *et seq.*

abolished. There were not a few who said that there would be destruction if reformation was denied much longer; and there were some who thought that destruction would be the better of the two. We must look to the eve of the French Revolution to find an era in which bitter criticism of almost all existing institutions was so rife as at the eve of the Reformation, and even in that case the criticism was not nearly so widespread as at the beginning of the sixteenth century; it was national rather than European, or at least was less intense elsewhere than in France.¹ But when the fifteenth century closed, the whole of Western and Central Europe was seething with discontent, and those who might have remedied it were paralyzed, in most cases by selfishness, because the abuses were profitable to them, in other cases by dismay. Those who longed to bring about a reform did not know where to begin; the removal of hopelessly corrupt portions might bring the whole edifice down.

The Reformation was neither the beginning nor the end of a great movement, but the culminating point—reached somewhat swiftly—of a process which had long been going on, and which has continued to our own time. Or, perhaps, it may be nearer the truth to say that it was a great explosion, the materials for which had long been accumulating, and the effects of which are still felt. In any case, it must not be regarded as an isolated phenomenon. It was a crisis in the general progress of society, in its troubled passage from the Middle Ages to modern civilization. It was the crowning episode in which the struggle for freedom of thought developed into a struggle for freedom of action. And in this great transformation a variety of elements were intertwined, acting and reacting on one another. There were not only the political, social, and religious developments which came to a head almost simultaneously; there were advances in art and philosophy, in navigation and weapons of war, in the opening out of new continents, in discoveries and inventions, especially in the discovery of buried

¹ Frederic Harrison, "The Meaning of History," p. 195.

treasures of literature and in the invention of printing. There was a general unfettering and enrichment of the human mind.¹

The Reformation is like the French Revolution in another particular. Hardly any other period of history has been more differently estimated. Both of them have been extravagantly praised and extravagantly abused. They have been regarded as the source, directly or indirectly, of almost everything great or beneficial that has since taken place. They have also been regarded as among the greatest of European calamities, equally distinguished by the portentous blunders and the portentous crimes which were their causes and their effects. Even so lately as May, 1910, the Borromeo Encyclical, which almost immediately produced such a sensation in Germany, declared that "the leaders of the Reformation were proud and rebellious men, enemies of the Cross of Christ, who mind earthly things, whose god is their belly." There is not much sobriety of judgment in criticisms of this kind. Whatever else the leaders may have been, they were neither demigods nor demons.

These extravagant estimates of the Reformation, made by subsequent generations, are easily recognized as fallacious by those who will make a serious effort to ascertain and fairly weigh the facts. But, in the generations before the Reformation, there runs a fallacy which is less commonly recognized. Almost from the Apostolic Age Christians have marked a contrast between the Church and the world. When the world was wholly pagan, such a contrast was inevitable. The Head of the Church was Christ, and the prince of this world was the devil. It was equally inevitable that this contrast should lead on to the contrast between "sacred" and "secular." As soon as that distinction was made, there was material for a mischievous fallacy. Secular is opposed to sacred. What is sacred must always be good, therefore what is secular is, of course, evil—it is profane and anti-Christian. Among the great services which the better Humanists rendered to European society was

¹ G. P. Fisher, "The Reformation," p. 10; A. Plummer, "English Church History, 1509-1575," pp. 7 *et seq.*

that of demonstrating that a great deal of what was purely secular was by no means evil.¹

It is with the Reformation as a religious movement that we have to do ; its other aspects will have for the most part to be ignored. And it is with regard to its religious aspect that the widest differences exist in estimating its merits. Everything, of course, depends upon the point of view. Is it a truism or a fallacy to say that a religious movement must be judged from a religious point of view? One remembers Dr. Johnson's trenchant comment on the dictum, "Who rules o'er freemen must himself be free," and one fears to meet with similar criticism. Nevertheless, there may be some reason in the presumption that the non-religious point of view is less likely to bring us to a sound conclusion.² Of course, if there is no God to guide the wills and affections of men, or if the Church is not a Divine institution for affording such guidance, then the non-religious point of view is the right one. We shall then regard the Reformation as a long stride in the march of humanity towards complete emancipation from all restraints, excepting those which each individual imposes upon himself under the guidance of his own reason. Little as they intended it, the Reformers, from this point of view, were leading society onwards towards that Utopia in which each man is to frame his own creed and his own decalogue, without let or hindrance.

Let us grant that such a view has fragments of truth in it. Nevertheless, it is utterly misleading. Can anyone doubt that religion supplied an immense deal of the driving-power of the movement? Can anyone doubt that many of its most important results were religious results? If you could have convinced any one of the leaders that he was working towards the abolition of all religious restraints, he would at once have become an opponent. The restraints which he desired to abolish, and the freedom which he desired to establish, were of a different kind. He aimed at securing freedom for each individual soul to have

¹ R. L. Poole, "History of Medieval Thought," p. 177.

² What follows owes much to "Lectures and Papers on the History of the Reformation," by Aubrey L. Moore.

communion with God in whatever way his personal experience taught him to be best for him. And he believed that in this great struggle God was working surely, if slowly, on his side. Will any Theist, who studies the course of events, condemn such belief as superstition? We do not obtain a more scientific view of history by leaving God out of the account.

If we adopt a religious point of view, the chief question to be decided is, Whether the Reformation was, on the whole, a benefit or a calamity for Christendom. We say "on the whole," because no sane critic would say that it has been a benefit without losses, or a calamity without advantages. The most fanatical Puritan must admit that some things that were harmless, and some even that were of real value, were sacrificed in the vehement desire to purify the Church. And the most bigoted Ultramontane must allow that there was need for purification, and that, if much that was precious was destroyed, some intolerable abuses were abated. No well-read Romanist can maintain that the Reformation was nothing better than the sudden outbreak of a number of false opinions and perilous practices, most of which had appeared before, and had, one after another, been condemned by the Church, and which now appeared simultaneously in order that, in God's providence, all these poisonous elements might be simultaneously cast out.

It is more true to say that, as a religious movement, the Reformation was an effort to get back to the Christianity of the primitive Church, as depicted in the New Testament and in the writings of the early Fathers. This meant getting rid of a number of additions to faith and discipline which had been made without Divine authority in the course of ages, and which had not only obscured, but had utterly disfigured, the teaching of Christ and His Apostles and their immediate followers. The disfigurement had been so complete that even those who were ignorant of what Christ and His Apostles had taught—and this ignorance prevailed widely among both laity and clergy—could not but feel that there was something fatally defective and misleading in the beliefs and practices which were pre-

scribed by authority or sanctioned by general custom. A religion which gave no permanent relief to the troubled conscience, and which often condoned what was plainly immoral, could not be of God. And as soon as the revival of letters caused the contents of the New Testament and the teaching of the Fathers to be known, it was seen that what passed for Christianity at the close of the fifteenth century was scarcely recognizable as such when placed side by side with what we know of Christianity at the close of the Apostolic Age.

That the effort to get back to primitive Christianity was not always well informed, and that in the end it became impatient, improvident, and violent, may be freely conceded. But we must not blame the reforming party for not using knowledge which they had never possessed, and which was still out of their reach. And they would have been more than mortal, and perhaps would have been less effective, if they had not in the end resorted to violent measures. The first Reformers aimed simply at getting rid of abuses, which could not be denied, and were not even concealed, and which were generally admitted to be appalling. They had no wish to interfere with existing authority, whether of Pope, Council, or Bishops. It was only when experience proved that neither Pope, nor Councils, nor Bishops would remedy these intolerable evils that they broke away from ecclesiastical authority, as then constituted, and took in hand the work of reform themselves.

That this view of the Reformation, when regarded as a religious crisis, is nearer to the truth than the Roman view, is shown by several facts.

1. Long before the close of the fifteenth century the desire for a reform of the Church was widespread. Men might differ as to whether the medieval Church was simply to be freed from grievous maladies, while its sacerdotal ministry and elaborate hierarchy were retained, or whether the only sure reform was to sweep away the medieval system altogether; but in almost all classes—monks and friars, clergy and laity—there were many who felt that the existing evils could not con-

tinue much longer, and that a great purifying process, possibly gradual, but probably tempestuous, must soon begin. Charles V. and Erasmus were for the gentler method, Zwingli and Calvin for the more radical. Luther began with the former view, but moved onwards—perhaps on the whole unwillingly—to the other. Yet all were agreed about this: a great reform was necessary, and could not long be delayed. Pope after Pope professed to be about to make reforms, and Adrian VI. tried to begin some. In 1522 he told his Legate at Augsburg to promise reform, but to point out that it would be a slow business; *inveteratus enim morbus, nec simplex*, and the Curia is perhaps the source *unde omne hoc malum processit*.

2. The large amount of agreement which was reached at one or two of the conferences between the opposing parties, and especially at Ratisbon in 1541, is evidence that the Reformers were able to urge a great deal that was fully admitted by the other side.¹

3. When at last a Council did meet at Trent, although the conditions which were imposed did not allow the Lutherans to be present, yet a number of their reforms were discussed, and a few of them were partly carried.

In the face of such facts as these, it is foolish to maintain that the Reformers were simply a gang of heretical mischief-makers. They were revolutionists, because nothing less drastic than a revolution could cure the deep-seated evils. Yet their aim was not (as the Romanist declares) the destruction of religious truth, but its revival. And the movement was also—although the Reformers did not consciously aim at this—a revolution leading to the right of the individual to have his own ideas about religious truth.

It was not at once seen that this necessary revolution might be effected in two ways, and that a choice might have to be made between the two.² It was at least conceivable, however

¹ B. J. Kidd, "Documents illustrative of the Continental Reformation," pp. 341 *et seq.*—an invaluable help to the student of this subject.

² C. Hardwick, "History of the Christian Church during the Reformation," pp. 1-7.

improbable, that the Pope and the hierarchy throughout the whole of the Western Church would make a combined effort and free Christendom from its deadly corruptions. And it was conceivable, and not improbable, that the civil and ecclesiastical rulers of each nation might work in concert, and remove the scandals which existed within their own jurisdiction.

The more general plan might have seemed to be not quite impossible when Pius III. became Pope in 1503 ; but his hopeful Pontificate lasted only twenty-six days. The hope might possibly have revived when Adrian VI. succeeded Leo X., in 1522, but he only lived long enough to learn the insuperable difficulty of the task. In neither case did a general reform become an actual possibility. Only one reason for this need be mentioned. It was impossible to abolish the corruptions which both sides deplored without causing financial ruin to vast numbers of officials, high and low, ecclesiastical and civil. Not only would it have been impossible to induce these officials to co-operate in the work of reform—and without their consent reform was condemned to failure—but good men on the Roman side, who were most anxious to abolish abuses, shrank from inflicting so much suffering as their abolition would involve. When men had sunk their whole fortune in buying a lucrative post which had been put up for auction, would it not be monstrous to abolish all such posts? And there was no money with which to make compensation. When Leo X. died, the Papacy was not only in debt, but bankrupt. A reforming Pope had no chance of success. Every door was barred, and every wheel was jammed.

Nevertheless, when Adrian VI. was elected, hopes of reform were kindled, at any rate outside Italy. In Holland inscriptions were put up : " Utrecht planted ; Louvain watered ; the Emperor gave the increase." To which, however, someone added : " And God had nothing to do with it." In Rome it was quite impossible that any reforming Pope should be popular. The worldly interests and domestic sympathies of multitudes of Romans were bound up with the maintenance of the medieval

traditions respecting the Papacy and the Curia;¹ and the Roman populace was both amused and enriched by the profligate expenditure of the hierarchy. Adrian VI. tried to moderate this, and himself set a severe example of simple living. When he died, the Romans put up *their* inscription. They professed to think that the physician who attended the Pope in his last illness had helped to make the illness fatal. Over the physician's door they hung a wreath, with an inscription "to the liberator of his country" (*Liberatori Patriæ Senatus Populusque Romanus*).

In the end, it was the national system of reformation that was carried out, partially in Germany and Switzerland, and much more completely in Holland, England, and Scotland. In those countries in which the national and political stimulus was absent or was weak, the religious movement failed. In Italy and Spain, where the struggle was chiefly a matter of religion and culture, the struggle was ineffectual. In France, where political support was fitful and uncertain, the religious movement was defeated.

¹ J. A Symonds, "The Renaissance in Italy," ii., pp. 404 *et seq.*



Spade and Bible.

BY THE REV. M. LINTON SMITH,

Vicar of Blundellsands.

IT is evidently destined to provide convincing confirmation of certain phases of Old Testament history which some modern critics have been in the habit of treating as altogether mythical." With these words the *Daily Telegraph* of January 13, 1911, announces the discovery of some inscribed potsherds, by Dr. Reissner, at Sebastiyeh, the ancient Samaria, which from the stratum in which they were found are inferred, and reasonably inferred, to belong to the ninth century B.C. The words have been quoted, not because they draw a legitimate inference from the facts, or because the facts have been accurately and clearly stated in the brief account which preceded them, but because they are a very fair sample of the frame of mind to which "the man in the street" has been reduced by the use which has been made of archæological discovery in relation to the literary and historical criticism of the Bible. It has been dinned into him, on the one hand, that no fragment of Old Testament history has escaped the sacrilegious hands of sceptical students, but that practically the whole is regarded as mythical; and, on the other, that archæological discovery has invariably tended to the discomfiture of the critic, and the confirmation of the accuracy of every part of the Biblical narrative which it has touched. Such is clearly the opinion of the writer of the above notice. But it would be hard to find any responsible scholar who has doubted the general historicity of the stories of Ahab in the books of the Kings, which, therefore, scarcely need confirmation, save in certain details; and, on the other hand, it is hard to see what confirmation for those narratives can be drawn from a number of records of deposits of oil and corn, even if they be quite correctly dated from the period in question; for the existence of a cuneiform tablet in the same

find, bearing the name of Ahab and a contemporary Assyrian King, mentioned in the first report, has not been confirmed.

It is, of course, possible, by a judicious selection of facts, to support both the positions on which the popular view of the case is based. Sciences, like individuals, are apt in their youth to sow their wild oats, and the story of that process is usually more interesting and exciting than is the account of the solid work done when they have settled down ; but it would be as unfair to judge a man's whole life by the sins of his youth as it would be to judge of the literary and historical criticism of the Old Testament by the wilder raids of the B'nê-Jerahmeel, or the extreme assertions of the "Astrallehre" school of Pan-Babylonians. In like manner a very considerable number of the historical statements of the Old Testament have received striking confirmation from the results of the spade ; but it requires a judicious manipulation and selection of these facts to produce the impression that the results of archæology are wholly incompatible with those results of literary criticism which may be conveniently summarized under the term of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. Indeed, it would not be difficult, by the use of similar methods, to produce as strong an argument for that hypothesis from archæology as those which are from time to time triumphantly brought forward by its most stalwart opponents. Yet such means win but a Pyrrhic victory, and one which in the long run is apt to recoil disastrously on the heads of the apparent victors.

The question has sometimes been asked, "Why should we attach such reverence to that which is written with the stylus or chisel upon tablets of clay or stone, and treat with such suspicion documents written, in origin, with ink upon parchment or papyrus ? Why should the results of the spade be given such preference as historical documents over the volumes which have come down to us ?" The question is a very pertinent one, and may be met at once by the reply that the results of the spade are not *necessarily* better material for history than that which has been handed down from generation to generation in written

form. But the documents of stone and clay which the spade has revealed to us have, in a large number of instances, one great advantage over the literary sources in that they may safely be regarded as contemporary with the events which they record, and therefore have escaped one of the great risks to which the latter have been exposed—the risk of alteration, whether from the carelessness of the copyist, or from the deliberate modification of the writers who worked over them for purposes of edification or controversy. The clay cylinders of Sargon or Sennacherib may not, and probably do not, give a perfectly accurate account of the events which they record; but they are contemporary with those events, and were written for men who were eyewitnesses of the events. Such falsification as might be introduced into them would be limited by the fear of incurring incredulity and ridicule; and they have escaped those modifying processes to which the documents of the Old Testament have been demonstrably exposed.

We may say demonstrably, because the careful study of the text of the Septuagint has revealed differences from our existing Hebrew text which cannot in every case be accounted for by the carelessness of copyists alone. To take an extreme example, the Greek text of Jeremiah is shorter by some 2,700 words (or one-eighth) than the Hebrew, and the order of the prophecies is very different. Whatever theory be adopted to account for these differences, the evidence is clear for a period at which the text was in a fluid state, and liable to alteration and modification of a very extensive character. Evidence from another source may be found in the Nash papyrus (second or third century A.D.), now in the University Library at Cambridge. This fragment, some 600 years older than the oldest Hebrew manuscripts known to us, contains in Hebrew the "Shema," or confession of faith, and the Decalogue. Now, the text of this fragment differs, in agreement with the Septuagint, from the Hebrew text of the Decalogue, both in Exodus and Deuteronomy, and differs also, in agreement with the quotations of the Decalogue in the New Testament, in the order of the Command-

ments, transposing Commandments VI. and VII., as do St. Mark, St. Luke, St. Paul, and St. James. Difference on such a crucial point as the text of the Decalogue and the order of the Commandments may surely be taken as fair evidence as to the fluid condition of the text of the Old Testament, and the possibilities of modification, whether by expansion, abbreviation, or alteration, for a considerable period after the material it contains was first committed to writing. The superiority of the evidence of the spade lies in the fact that in so many cases it can be demonstrated to have escaped at least this risk of corruption.

It may not be unprofitable to examine shortly one or two instances of misuses of archæology in this sphere. At times the connection between the archæological facts and the Biblical narrative is too slender to bear the weight of the conclusions. A notable example of this will be found in a most valuable article in a recent number of this periodical, from the pen of that brilliant veteran of archæology, Professor Sayce. He opens by proposing "to give some account of what the latest results of discovery and research have told us about the Hebrew patriarch Abraham." Now, the article shows that the excavations have supplied a background to the patriarchal period, with clear evidence of frequent and easy communication between Babylonia and Palestine. By the adoption of recent theories as to the Semitic origin of the Amorites, it supplies a further connecting link between the two lands. It has shown that on the tablets names occur which may with varying degrees of probability be identified with Abram, Eber, Jacob, and Israel, and also a Divine name which is probably the equivalent of Jahweh, the national God of the Hebrews. Emphasis is laid on the importance of naphtha in Babylonian domestic economy as giving verisimilitude to the objective of Chedorlaomer's expedition in Genesis xiv., since it occurs in the bituminous deposits of the Dead Sea (though it must not be forgotten that like bituminous deposits occur at Hit in the Euphrates Valley itself). It is pointed out that the ἀπαξ λεγόμενον, אֲבִינִי, "his trained

men" (Gen. xiv. 14), finds a parallel in the "hanakuka" (thy men) of a letter to Ishtar-wassur of Taanach (*circa* 1350 B.C.), and that possibly the title given to Abraham by the Hittites of Hebron, (שׂא אֱלֹהִים), "Prince of God" (Gen. xxiii. 6), which bears a perfectly intelligible meaning as a purely Hebrew expression ("great prince") *may* be the equivalent of a Babylonian expression, "Issak ilu" (= Viceroy of the deified King), which was borne by Babylonian Governors. But it is humbly submitted that, with the doubtful exception of the last point, not one of these facts tell us anything "about the Hebrew patriarch Abraham," and the last point, if it be established, only shows how completely the Hebrew tradition had forgotten the not unimportant fact that the man from whom the race traced its descent entered the promised land as a provincial Governor under a foreign power; nor is it easy to see in this case what comfort archæology is administering to distressed conservatives.

Sometimes, again, the conjectures of a single archæologist are assumed as accepted facts (for such assumptions are not confined to the followers of Wellhausen), and are used to upset the generally accepted conclusions of literary and historical criticism. An example of this may be found in the extremely interesting little book, "The Discovery of the Book of the Law," by Professor Naville. In it the learned author connects certain rubrics of chapters in the "Book of the Dead" with the discovery that chapters from that book have been used as foundation deposits in certain Egyptian temples, and claims that the rubrical account of these chapters, that they were inserted in the book because they were discovered "under the feet of the god," is a correct account of their origin; and from this he goes on to argue that the account of the discovery of the Book of the Law under Josiah, which, according to the prevailing critical theory, was the discovery of a recently composed code, was really due to the prevalence of a similar practice of foundation deposits among the Hebrews, the book in question being a redaction of the Mosaic Law, made under Solomon, written in the cuneiform script, and deposited under the founda-

tions of the Temple by its builder. M. Naville is inclined to agree that the discovery was the Book of Deuteronomy only. But, without waiting to inquire how a redaction made in the reign of Solomon is really more in accord with the traditional view than the critical view of a redaction made early in the seventh century, it must be pointed out that Professor Naville himself admits (in a footnote on p. 21) that none of his fellow Egyptologists "have explained the Egyptian texts by reference to the custom of placing writings under the feet of statues or in foundation deposits," and allows that Sir Gaston Maspero quotes the same rubrics in the "Book of the Dead" in support of the ordinarily accepted critical theory of the origin of Deuteronomy. A theory which has not won acceptance in its own sphere can scarcely be used with confidence to overthrow theories which have gained wide acceptance in another sphere.

Yet one other faulty line of reasoning may be noted. In a recent paper the well-known lion seal from Megiddo was described as having the *ankh*, the Egyptian symbol of life, "lightly etched or painted" upon it, and this example of religious syncretism was claimed as a valuable piece of evidence in favour of the Biblical account of the declension of the Israelite religion from that pristine purity, shown in the undoubtedly early Song of Moses. But what critic has ever denied the existence of religious syncretism in the Northern (or, for the matter of that, in the Southern) Kingdom, that archæology should be called in to prove the fact? Critical theories may be inconsistent, but the seal of "Shama', servant of Jerobo'am," only proves that which they have never denied.

Before passing from this negative criticism, there is one point which ought, even at the risk of wandering from the subject, to be noted. Many will have seen the commendations by conservative scholars of Professor Kittel's "Scientific Study of the Old Testament," and possibly on the strength of that recommendation have read the book; not so many will have compared the English translation with the original German, or have seen the review in the *Hibbert Journal* for April, 1911, in

which the work of the translator is seriously criticized; it is shown that in the crucial passage of Professor Kittel's estimate of Wellhausen and his theories (pp. 74, 75) the commendation which the author gives is weakened in the translation alike by the inadequate rendering of the German, and by the complete omission in more than one case of not unimportant words and phrases. *Non tali auxilio!*

(*To be continued.*)



Oxford and Evangelicalism in Relation to the Crisis in the Church.

BY THE REV. E. A. BURROUGHS, M.A.,
Fellow and Lecturer, Hertford College, Oxford.

I.—THE CRISIS IN THE CHURCH.

OF the crisis in the Church of England, readers of THE CHURCHMAN need not to be made aware. Its existence has long been felt; and now its nature is fairly evident. One hopeful feature of the age is the wide public interest taken in religious questions, even by "those that are without," with the result that secular papers deal with our difficulties, and the man in the street has his own opinions on them.

The most striking element in the situation is the growing impatience, in all Christian communities, of sectarian difference, and the kindling passion for Christian Unity. The feeling is, perhaps, largely sentimental and uninstructed as yet; but of its intensity there can be no question, for we see practical steps being taken towards Reunion which would hardly have been dreamed of twenty years ago.

But here at once the central problem rises before us. It is, of course, the old problem of the necessity or otherwise of Episcopacy, called up from more academic surroundings to become a burning question of the hour. The prominence of

the subject at the Cambridge Church Congress of 1910 is but one of a long series of indications showing where we are; and some of the views expressed, however good-temperedly, on that occasion suggest how fierce may be the struggle ahead. Because in the Church the preliminaries of revolution are conducted courteously, we must not blink the fact that here also a revolution is at hand.

Why a revolution? Because two great sections of Church opinion, professing equal devotion to the English Church, stand absolutely committed to two apparently irreconcilable theories, as to the nature of the Church in general and the teaching of the Church of England in particular. The whole structure of the Oxford Movement, with all that has followed from it, is built on the foundation-principle of "Apostolical Succession," so stated as to exclude non-Episcopalian Christians from the Body of Christ. The whole record, doctrinal and practical, of the Evangelical School within the Church of England is one long exposition of that central claim of Evangelical Theology, that "in Christ"—however it may be in ecclesiastical history—"in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek," Catholic nor Protestant, Episcopalian, non-Episcopalian, Established nor Free. And meanwhile people ask, Which is the doctrine of the Anglican Church? and both answers are given, with apparently equal authority and conviction.

Both, it is obvious, cannot be right. If, therefore, a definite solution is to be reached, it must be either by capitulation on one side, or by a painful and humiliating schism. Discussion has been too widely aroused, and tentative *rapprochements* too freely indulged in, to allow of any ultimate compromise. Even if the Churches had a mind for such, the scorn of the world would scarcely tolerate it.

Meanwhile, the leaders of at least one great section are genuinely perplexed, and show their perplexity by self-contradiction. Bishop Gore's contribution to the controversy in "Orders and Unity" is a case in point; and one may also

fruitfully contrast his warm support of the World Missionary Conference with his startling utterance at the last Church Congress, that "the Church of England would be rent in twain" the first time a non-Episcopally ordained minister were formally allowed to celebrate the Eucharist within it. If we of the other wing are less disturbed, let us not congratulate ourselves too quickly; it may be that we are less alive to the situation. In any case, we shall do well to act on the advice which Dr. Gore and others are urging upon Churchmen—viz., that a solid unity may best be reached in the future if each party to it will, meanwhile, emphasize rather than efface its characteristic tenets. Sacrifices, of course, some day there must be; but such a course would insure that the points then surrendered were those that ought to go.

The main question underlying the present paper is just this: Do we Evangelicals consider that we have, in our "characteristic tenets," a real contribution to make to the controversy, and that it is worth making? Are we, then, in a position to make that contribution tellingly and effectually? and, if not, what steps are we taking to prepare for the crisis, in which we stand either to gain or to lose so much, both for ourselves and for English Christianity? In particular, what is our position at the Universities? The present writer is only qualified to speak of Oxford, and ventures, with regret, but without hesitation, to urge that there at least we are largely unprepared.

II.—THE CONTRIBUTION OF EVANGELICALISM.

First, then, let us try and determine what our contribution in the coming crisis is likely to be; and then consider the conditions at Oxford which should affect our chance of making it effectually.

Those leaders of exclusive Anglicanism, who have allowed themselves of late years greater licence in the matter of co-operation with Dissenters, have justified their action on the ground of a so-called "new principle"—the polysyllabic Inter-denominationalism—which they are careful to explain as "taking

all their Churchmanship with them when they go among those who differ from them." But this at once suggests two questions.

First, *do* they really take "all" their Churchmanship—in their sense of the term—to such gatherings as one has in mind? Or do they not rather, as their own more rigid and consistent brethren remind them, leave behind them at the door that very principle of exclusion from which their system starts, while morally supporting a theory of the Church which they exist to condemn?

And, secondly, *is* Interdenominationalism really a new principle at all? Is it not precisely the one upon which true Evangelical Churchmen have uniformly conducted their relations with Nonconformity, ever since the first Evangelicals branched off from Wesleyanism, when it endangered their Churchmanship, without ceasing to regard its leaders as brethren in Christ? Is it not the principle which, for instance, led to the foundation of the C. M. S. by men who could not accept the undenominational basis of the London Missionary Society? For 150 years Evangelical Churchmen have managed, in their dealings with Nonconformity, to combine full spiritual sympathy with clear ecclesiastical distinctness; while at the same time they have set no impassable barrier in their own way towards a more corporate unity, by formulating any other doctrine of the Church than that of the Prayer Book and Articles.

Does not this indicate the importance of Evangelical Churchmanship in the crisis, and the nature of the contribution which it should be able to make? It would seem as if our own traditional standing-ground were intended for the meeting-ground of High Anglicanism and Nonconformity, our central principle for the link to unite the two.

And yet, when this was suggested to an influential, thoughtful, and spiritual Nonconformist leader in the University of Oxford, the notion was met almost with scorn; and, as a matter of fact, both he and his colleagues fraternize more readily with High Churchmen than with others, and seem to hope more from them than from us—a phenomenon with parallels else-

where. Why? Perhaps the most real reason, at least in Oxford at the present time, is the strange ignorance prevailing as to what Evangelicalism really is. "For my own part," cried a high official of the Oxford Intercollegiate Christian Union, himself a Presbyterian, when the altered outlook of the Union was being discussed some time ago, "for my own part, I don't know what Evangelicals *do* stand for." The situation is the more perplexing by reason of the claim now generally advanced by spiritual High Churchmen to be "Evangelicals" also; by which they mean that they lay stress on the Gospel message and the Evangelistic method, without in the least abandoning, say, their distinctive sacramental teaching. So it comes to pass that "Evangelicalism" is viewed by many as merely an outworn antagonism, or at best as an ill-proportioned statement of one aspect of truth, which finds its true adjustment in a higher and richer synthesis known to them as "the Catholic Faith."

Here, however, we may pause for a moment's self-defence. This claim to our distinctive title is significant of a new value attached to part at least of our distinctive teaching; and to that extent it testifies to the success of Evangelical work in the past. That a high value is now placed on spiritual, personal religion, as Evangelicals have always understood it, in quarters where once it seemed to be otherwise, is certainly due to Evangelical influences. If Evangelicals are adopting some practices hitherto known as "High," it is far more obvious that our High Anglican brethren have adopted from us many things they formerly scorned as "Methodistical." But the very advance of our influence has created new difficulties; our part in the present is not to rest on our oars and furl our sails, but to study the chart of the course ahead.

For, in fact, the mission of Evangelicalism is twofold. It has to do with life, but also with doctrine. The religion we stand for is spiritual religion; but it is that because also Scriptural religion. "They that worship Him must worship

in spirit *and* in truth." If "spirituality" be, to some extent, at a premium in the Church of England to-day, it is safe to say that "Scripturalness," alike in thought and worship, is sadly at a discount. True, in theory the test of Scripture is still supreme: the Church of England has never repudiated her Sixth Article, nor re-explained it in Anglo-Catholic terms. But what chance, humanly speaking, has Holy Scripture of really being the deciding voice in the great controversy on the doctrine of the Church, to which we stand committed? If any school of thought in our Church is going to secure the full and loyal recognition of the principle of the Sixth Article in the coming controversy, it will be the Evangelical School.

The contribution, then, which Evangelical Churchmanship might make towards solving the problem ahead of us is two-fold. First, it provides an actual meeting-ground and half-way house between the two extremes of High Anglicanism and Nonconformity, with a principle of *rapprochement* not complicated by any preconceptions about the necessity of Episcopacy. Secondly, it is the natural champion of the Scriptural basis of our Church, as expressed in Article VI.

The real question is, How are Evangelical Churchmen going to make their voice heard? For this we must have leaders and spokesmen who can speak with an authority at least equal to that which is ranged on the other side; and we must also have leaders of the second rank, to interpret the lead given, and make it effectual among the masses of thinking but undecided Churchmen. Quality and quantity are both essential. Never was greater reverence for the specialist than to-day, but also never more wholesale respect for numbers and success. The majority of minds, after all, are not yet made up; but men will often follow the greater volume of sound instead of the sounder argument. However clear the merits of our message, the louder voices do not come from our camp.

Leaders indeed we have of the older generations; though far too few. And for their immediate successors we need not

be anxious. But what of future supplies? What of the natural seed-plots for leaders—the older Universities? The outlook, though hopeful at first sight, is really such as to suggest anxiety. There is a real danger of our losing all effectual hold on the two great strategic points—the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

III.—EVANGELICALISM AT OXFORD.

This alarm-signal will probably come as a surprise to many who have been accustomed, in recent years, to hear more of the religious life of the older Universities than ever before, and to thank God for what they have heard. There is, however, no real contradiction involved. From the point of view of religion generally, things have never, perhaps, been more progressive. New ideals of personal religion and social service, and in particular new interest in missionary work, prevail in much wider circles, and circles socially and ecclesiastically more various. But this is all quite consistent with an outlook for Evangelical principles which is anything but reassuring.

As has been already suggested, the rise of spiritual vitality is, at bottom, the result of Evangelical forces, working beneath the surface. And it may be urged that with this we should be content, and forthwith sink our identity as a "party" in the wider whole of the coming days. In the image used, at the Islington Meeting of 1910, by one to whom the writer owes a special deference, "if the house is already filled with the odour of the ointment, why should we longer care about the alabaster box?" A prompt surrender of what are called our "shibboleths" would undoubtedly be a most popular move at Oxford. Why not confine ourselves to the devotional sphere, and leave the doctrinal alone? In the former our help and leading is really desired; in the latter it is almost resented.

Well, what are we to do? Three arguments seem to be decisive. First is the inevitable connection between doctrine and true devotion, which past experience abundantly proves. The only final guarantee for "worshipping God in spirit" is

that we should also worship Him "in truth." If we believe we stand for a great aspect of His Truth not equally represented elsewhere, we must stand up for it still. Secondly, the house is *not* yet "filled with the odour of the ointment." The Christian atmosphere of modern Oxford is still far from having penetrated into the parochial life of the land; on neither wing, as yet, are devotional enthusiasm and comprehensive charity marked features of the rank and file. Even in Oxford itself, there is ample room for more of both. And thirdly, the distinctive propaganda of the other side, so far from being modified or relaxed in view of the new conditions, is being strengthened and, if anything, stiffened. The practice of the Pusey House may have changed in several respects, but the doctrine it stands for remains the same. "I am Evangelical in spirit, but Tractarian in doctrine": the words were used by another O.I.C.C.U. official of recent date, and they express what a large section of "young Oxford," including some of the very best, would say of themselves. The real inconsistency of it they will learn, and rectify, at Cuddesdon or Wells.

Surely the moral of all this is that we Evangelicals should be up and doing in Oxford on the same lines as the majority of our High Anglican friends; that is, throwing ourselves heartily and thankfully into the interdenominational religious life of the place, but, at the same time, reorganizing and strengthening our doctrinal propaganda, with eyes ever open to the crisis ahead?

The situation is more difficult than might be supposed, in view of the complete change of orientation in the religious life of Oxford in recent years—a change which, as has been said already, is largely the fruit of our fathers' work. The new position can best be explained by a rapid review of the recent history of the O.I.C.C.U., the undoubted focus of our religious life to-day.

Ten years ago this was a small, fairly compact, socially perhaps not very influential, but wholly Evangelical society. There was no restriction of membership, save that implied

in the basis—the profession of personal faith in Jesus Christ ; but in effect hardly any but Evangelical Churchmen and Nonconformists belonged.

By its side, in severe aloofness, stood the small and not very active “Church Union,” founded in 1896 to house such Churchmen as, for one reason or another, were unwilling to join the O.I.C.C.U.

Now, however, a virtual union of the two Societies has taken place, through most of the members of each, who were eligible, joining the other *en masse* a few years ago. A joint “Intercession Service” replaces the old “Sunday Prayer Meeting” of the O.I.C.C.U. ; at this the speakers represent every school of thought, in the Church of England and outside it. The numbers attending regularly are double what they were, and include a good proportion of “influential” men. The College Secretaries are generally men of some position, and College Meetings can be advertised in the Porters’ Lodges without risk.

Whence this change? Without any doubt, through the influence of the Student Christian Movement, which the O.I.C.C.U. has for many years represented in Oxford, but which, so to speak, took the reins into its own hands some few years back. Since then the O.I.C.C.U. has gradually merged its separate identity in the larger organism, and calls itself “The Student Movement in Oxford” ; and, by thus identifying itself with the more catholic schemes and outlook of the S.C.M., it has certainly gained in popularity and opportunity. For this, and for the blessing it has brought to very many lives in Oxford, one cannot be too thankful. At the same time, there is another side to the question which, as Evangelical Churchmen, we are bound to recognize, even if we may not regret it.

It is this : In the transformation of the old O.I.C.C.U., Evangelicalism has lost its one seemingly assured base within the University itself. The new O.I.C.C.U., while scrupulously anxious to give our representatives a fair place on its programmes, stands for no particular school of thought ; its leading spirits are, perhaps, more often High Churchmen than

otherwise, and to distinctive Evangelicalism it is certainly not sympathetic. This is said in no spirit of complaint; there are good reasons for the change. Only, it compels us to recognize that, in the general religious transformation of the last few years, Evangelicalism as such has lost ground in the University, however much the Evangelical spirit may have gained.

And if so, we come back to meet our obligation, which is, to face the facts, review our resources, if need be modify our methods, but at all costs strengthen our organization along the lines which the changed conditions demand.

Our remaining regular resources may be said to be three—viz. :

1. The Evangelical Parish Churches,
2. Wycliffe Hall,
3. The Oxford Pastorate.

To discuss the relative value of these three is outside the scope of this paper; and it would be an impertinence in the writer to suggest in any detail the possible lines of development. But in any estimate of our resources and needs, the following factors should be ignored:

First, there is the growth and better organization of what may be called "College Religion." The Chaplain is generally chosen with a view to real pastoral work, and sermons, extra services, etc., are much more freely provided in chapel. One effect of this is an almost entire cessation of "church-going" on Sundays, except to one or two extreme churches and, of course, to the evening sermons at St. Mary's.

Then, again, there is the growing complication of Oxford life. College and University societies for every conceivable purpose, secular and religious, jostle one another on nearly every night of the week. The man who would be best worth attracting is likely to be the fullest of such counter-attractions to the very best doctrinal lectures you may provide: he will not go out of his way to the latter save under stress of some personal tie.

And, further, there is the subtle effect of atmosphere. Oxford is a past master in the art of disparaging Evangelical institutions by means of a few epithets judiciously used. It is not long before the new arrival learns that "narrowness," "controversy," "proselytism," and the like are prime offences against the spirit of the place; and that it is an unfortunate tendency toward these vices which has prevented Evangelicals from quite ranking with other people in Oxford. The result is that he sees Evangelical institutions under something of a cloud, which does not allure him to investigate them further. And after all, if he *has* himself been Evangelically brought up, is there not a great deal in *audi alteram partem*? There would be certainly if it were adopted all round; but one result of a training to "strict Churchmanship" is that you have no *altera pars* to hear. *Roma locuta est*—it is for the others to revise their position.

Putting these three considerations together, we must recognize that the three regular assets already enumerated represent, under modern conditions, less than they might seem to stand for on paper. It is, perhaps, not too much to say that the influence of Wycliffe and of the Parish Churches must, for the next few years at least, be largely indirect and incidental. The bulk of the work must be done by agencies which can penetrate more easily and directly into the inner life of the University, and adapt themselves to the new conditions obtaining there. In other words, the key to the position is an extended, strengthened, and reorganized Pastorate, with, perhaps, as has been more than once suggested lately, a Pastorate House as its base of operations.

Whatever the steps needed, they will be costly; but the cost is nothing in face of the opportunities and the responsibilities. We must not be afraid of what will, of course, be called "party activity." We are not, and shall not be, fighting for our own hand, but for the widest interest of English Christianity, and for the cause of Catholicism in the one true sense of the word.

Studies in Romans.

BY THE REV. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D.

SUGGESTIONS FOR STUDY.

CHRYSOSTOM had this Epistle read to him once a week. Luther speaks of it as "the chief book of the New Testament." Coleridge calls it "the profoundest book in existence." Melancthon, in order to become thoroughly acquainted, copied it twice with his own hand, and it was the book which he lectured on most frequently. Godet remarks that "in studying the Epistle to the Romans we feel ourselves at every word face to face with the unfathomable." These testimonies indicate at once the importance of the study and the need of all possible guidance.

I.—*Reasons for Study.*

1. The *Intellectual Value* is very great. Romans is concerned with a number of the deepest problems of Christian thought, which are well worthy of all the attention we can bestow upon them. Then, again, the logical arrangement of the Epistle is another reason for intellectual effort. Indeed, it is not too much to say that a study of Romans will provide a mental gymnastic of the finest type. As Dr. Garvie rightly remarks (Introduction, p. 35), "the logical method of the Epistle will repay study," for St. Paul uses various forms of argument that necessarily appeal to the thoughtful mind (see Garvie, pp. 36, 37). Dr. David Brown's fine testimony is well worth quoting :

"Its texture is so firm, its every vein so full, its very fibres and ligatures so fine and yet strong, that it requires not only to be again and again surveyed as a whole, and mastered in its primary ideas, but to be dissected in detail, and with unwearying patience, studied in its minutest features, before we can be said to have done it justice. Not only every sentence teems with thought, but every clause ; while in some places every word may be said either to suggest some weighty thought, or to indicate some deep emotion " ("Romans," p. xviii).

2. The *Historical* Value is equally real. The Epistle is largely occupied with the great thought of Christianity and the world of St. Paul's day, and in many respects it is an expression of Pauline Christianity. Two books of importance, covering the substance of the first eight chapters, have both been entitled the "Gospel according to St. Paul" (Dr. Oswald Dykes and Dr. W. P. Du Bose). Not the least important element of this historical aspect is the witness the Epistle gives to the relation of St. Paul to our Lord, for herein we have depicted the Christ of St. Paul in relation to the Christ of the Gospels. It has often been pointed out that the modern cry "Back to Christ" does not and cannot mean "Away from St. Paul." The Apostle's personal experience of the Christ of heaven, as recorded in this Epistle, amply justifies and vindicates the Evangelists' accounts of Christ on earth. In Romans, too, we have brought before us the one, if not the two, great controversies of the Apostle's life, and as these controversies occupied a large part of his career, we can see at once the historical value of the Epistle. Not least of all we have in Romans what Sir William Ramsay has rightly called St. Paul's "Philosophy of History." The universalism of the Epistle, too, is noteworthy, and its world-wide view naturally and necessarily commends it to the consideration of all serious historical students.

3. The *Theological* Value must not be overlooked. While it does not contain a complete statement of Christian doctrine, since there is no special emphasis on Christology, as in Colossians and Ephesians, and no teaching about eschatology, as in Corinthians and Thessalonians, yet it deals with a number of great theological principles in a thoroughly comprehensive way, and no one can ponder what is here said on such subjects as Sin, Righteousness, Grace, Law, Justice, and Love, without being made conscious of the profound theological importance of the Epistle. There is a remarkable care shown in the presentation of the truth, and an equally remarkable balance of statement, and all this goes to show that the thorough

study of the Epistle is really a theological education in itself. And lest we should be repelled by the thought of theology as something abstract, remote from life, and unpractical, it must be noticed that the theology of Romans is always based on the exegesis of the Apostle's words. Nothing in its way is more striking than the fact that the theology which deals with some of the profoundest truths of the Christian religion comes directly out of the grammatical and accurate interpretation of the Apostle's teaching. The more it is studied from the theological standpoint the more it will be seen that its value for Christian doctrine is of the very highest.

4. The *Spiritual* Value of the Epistle follows as a necessary consequence. In it will be found some of the prime secrets of the spiritual life. Its first great truth is the reality, extent, and awfulness of sin. This leads necessarily to the teaching on Redemption, with its spiritual results in the reconciliation of the soul to God, its deliverance from sin, and its renovation by the Holy Spirit. Holiness is the very centre of the Epistle (chaps. vi.-viii.), and may be described, in a word, as "God dwelling in the heart." But this indwelling presence of God for holiness comes on the one hand from the reception of the Atonement of Christ through faith (chaps. iii.-v.), and, on the other hand, expresses itself in loyalty, love, and obedience (chaps. xii.-xv.). The more the spiritual life is allowed to ponder the Apostle's words, the stronger will be its fibre and force. As Luther rightly said of this Epistle :

"It is the true masterpiece of the New Testament, and the very purest Gospel, which is well worthy and deserving that a Christian man should not only learn it by heart, word for word, but also that he should daily deal with it as the daily bread of men's souls. For it can never be too much or too well read or studied; and the more it is handled the more precious it becomes, and the better it tastes."

And as a modern writer (Dr. Beet) has aptly put it :

"A careful study of the words and arguments of this Epistle will enrich greatly the student's own spiritual life. And this spiritual enrichment will shed important light on the meaning of the Apostle's words. For it will enable us to see the matters about which he writes from his own point of view" ("St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans," p. 27).

5. The *Practical* Value of the Epistle must also be carefully observed. Godet goes as far as to say that "the probability is that every great spiritual revival in the Church will be connected as effect and cause with a deeper understanding of this book" ("Commentary on Romans," vol. i., p. 1). There is much in the past history of the Church which goes to support this statement. Certainly the main factor in the great Reformation movement in the sixteenth century was the teaching of this Epistle and the companion one to the Galatians. While in the Evangelical Revival of the eighteenth century and the various Evangelistic movements of the nineteenth the truths of Romans have been at the very heart of the situation Dr. David Brown truly remarks that :

"While all Scripture has stamped its impress indelibly on the Christian world, perhaps it is scarcely too much to say, that—apart from the Gospels—for all the *precision* and the *strength* which it possesses, and much more of the *spirituality* and the *fire* which characterize it—the faith of Christendom in its best periods has been more indebted to this Epistle than to any other portion of the living oracles" ("Romans," Introduction, p. xviii).

This at least may be said without the slightest qualification and certainly without the faintest fear of contradiction, that a Christian life nourished on the Epistle to the Romans will never lack the three great requisites of clear perception, strong conviction, and definite usefulness.

II.—*The Methods of Study.*

1. The Epistle should be studied *with all possible intellectual attention and concentration*. It is worthy of all the consideration we can give to it. It is important that the whole Epistle should be read right through in the Revised Version at one sitting, and that this should be done, if possible, day by day for a month. It will not take long, and the advantage will soon be seen to be immense. Failing the possibility of this, one of the great sections of the Epistle should certainly be read over and over again, in order that we may become thoroughly habituated to its general lines of thought. At first there is no need to try to study it deeply, but simply to read it through

with care and attention as we would an ordinary article in a newspaper, or a chapter in a book. Gradually the mind will become accustomed to its teaching, and gain a general impression of its contents and meaning.

2. It should be studied with earnest prayer and personal trust. Intellectual attention alone is insufficient. The Epistle should be regarded as a personal letter to ourselves. Its deepest secrets will only be revealed to the heart that is willing to submit to its teaching and translate it into action. "Access to the inmost sanctuary of Holy Scripture is granted only to those who come to worship" ("St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans," by J. A. Beet, p. 27).

3. It should be studied *with an earnest endeavour to grasp its leading ideas*. The early chapters teach the profound truth that man has always failed to manifest righteousness in his life, and the Epistle deals with this universal failure, and brings before us the message of a new Divine righteousness for guilty man. Thus, the leading ideas may perhaps be summarized as Sin, Guilt, Propitiation, Righteousness, Faith, the Holy Spirit, Consecration, and these indicate in turn man's need of righteousness, and his responsibility for it, and then the ground, the means, the effect, and the proof of that Divine righteousness which is provided by God in Christ.

4. It should be studied *with special reference to its great theme*, as stated in chap. i. 16, 17. In these two verses there are seven terms which go through the entire Epistle, and run through every part of it—God, Gospel, Power, Salvation, Righteousness, Faith, Life. So that the theme of Romans is man's reinstatement in righteousness by the provision found in the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Salvation is provided and made possible for sinful man by a righteousness which is not his own. Like the warp and woof of a piece of cloth, these great thoughts are the very substance of the Epistle.

5. It should be studied *with all available helps*. The character of this Epistle is such that the aids of scholarship and of spiritual insight are particularly valuable and welcome. Of the many books written on Romans, it is impossible to refer to

more than a few. For all ordinary purposes, the two books by the Bishop of Durham will be ample. As a foundation, his detailed Commentary in the "Cambridge Bible for Schools" should be used, and side by side with it his larger work in the "Expositor's Bible." The latter book is one of the choicest works of scholarly, intellectual, and spiritual exposition, and if only one volume can be obtained this certainly should be the one adopted. The "Century Bible," by Garvie, is also full of suggestion, and if read with constant discrimination will be found very useful, though it is occasionally too free, in the present writer's judgment, in regard to Apostolic authority and inspiration. The little volume, by Dr. David Brown, in the "Handbooks for Bible Classes," is also extremely valuable, and well merits the testimony of a leading American scholar, who said that it was a "perfect book of its kind."

Larger works, involving for their full appreciation a knowledge of Greek, are the Commentaries by Dr. John Brown, Dean Vaughan, Dr. Beet, Dr. Gifford, Drs. Sanday and Headlam, and Dr. Godet. Each has its own particular excellence, though perhaps for general scholarly use that by Dr. Gifford is the most serviceable. It certainly deserves the fine testimony given to it by Drs. Sanday and Headlam, that it is "on the whole the best, as it is the most judicious of all English Commentaries on the Epistle." A list of books will be found in Garvie's Introduction, and a fuller list is provided in the article on Romans in Hastings' "Bible Dictionary," by the Bishop of Exeter, Dr. Robertson.

The value of several Commentaries to the present writer is that they specially bring out and emphasize particular points. Thus, Dr. John Brown is peculiarly helpful on the meaning of faith in Romans iv. ; Dr. Forbes is illuminating on the word "righteousness"; Haldane on the great truth of "imputed righteousness"; while some other works, like a little book called "*Curæ Romanæ*," by Walford (now out of print), which are almost entirely unknown, frequently shed light on points which other writers fail to elucidate.

In connection with Romans, it is very important to remember that the older Commentaries should not be overlooked or despised. With many of the books of the New Testament the more modern the Commentary, the better, but with Romans this is not necessarily the case; and among the older Commentaries it is safe to say that Calvin, Hodge, Haldane, and Chalmers will never be superseded.

Dr. Alexander Whyte once said that whenever a new book on Romans comes out, and is sent to him for consideration by its publisher, he at once turns to chap. vii. to see the author's treatment, and according to his view of that important section Dr. Whyte decides on the value of the entire work. While this may perhaps be too sweeping and severe a test, it is pretty certain that the treatment of chap. vii. is a good criterion of the value of a Commentary on Romans, and in this connection it is only right to say that, while every commentator endeavours to face the great question involved in that chapter, there are comparatively few that seem to take into consideration all the elements necessary for its complete elucidation. The present writer has found one little work of particular value in shedding light on chap. vii.—“Romans VII. : What does it Teach?” by Laicus (S. W. Partridge and Co.).

Last, but not least, one of the very best helps to the study of Romans will be found in the little volume by the Rev. W. H. T. Gairdner of Cairo, entitled “Helps to the Study of the Epistle to the Romans” (Student Christian Movement). Its small size and its terse comments may perhaps lead some people to overlook the fact that it is based on a close and continuous study of the very best authorities. It will prove one of the truest aids to the interpretation of this great Epistle.

The Epistle is, however, so profound in its thought and so far-reaching in its spiritual experience that, after personal study and side by side with it, it is undoubtedly valuable to consult every available Commentary. There are very few books on Romans that do not help us to enter in some degree, and at some point or another, into the Apostle's mind.

Theology and Pastoral Theology.

BY THE REV. CLEMENT F. ROGERS.

THE question of the preparation of candidates for Holy Orders is to the fore at the present time, but its solution is being made more difficult by what is in itself a help—namely, by the increased opportunities for theological study in the general development of English Higher Education. At present there is a strong swing of opinion in favour of University teaching, and certain Bishops have announced that after a particular date they will only ordain men who have taken a degree. But the fact that its necessity is being so loudly urged shows that there remain considerable doubts as to the efficacy of the University courses to prepare men for their work, especially when, as is often the case, a degree is taken in some school other than that of Theology. Nor will this case grow much less frequent as long as so many laymen continue to believe that for a clergyman to study his own subject properly is “narrowing.” Moreover, the instinct that has led to the founding of so many Theological Colleges and the experience of their very great value, in spite of their defects, form a force sufficiently strong to offer considerable resistance to any hard-and-fast rule on the subject.

And it is not at any rate obvious that, under present circumstances, it would be an advantage to insist on a University degree as an indispensable condition before Ordination. A degree at one of the older Universities, even if taken in Theology, is not enough; nor, in spite of their traditions, are the atmosphere and life such as, by themselves, prepare men for their work. This is duly emphasized in the Report of the Archbishop’s Committee on the Supply and Training of Candidates for Holy Orders. The Theological faculties of the newer Universities are frankly undenominational, though the teaching is given by various religious colleges and institutions, and, granted that this is probably the best solution of the difficulty caused by

our divisions, the influence of the University tends to divorce the teaching from real life and to over-emphasize the study of languages, and especially of Hebrew. In the German Protestant State Churches, where practically all the clergy receive a University training and the teaching is given by the professors, the tension between the University and Church, and the divergence of their points of view, have become very serious.

At the same time, criticism is being directed against both the matter of Bishops' examinations and the methods of special preparation that are adopted. The time spent at Theological Colleges, whether post-graduate or not, is, with very few exceptions, far too short; the thought of examinations dominates it all, and it is very difficult to get any intelligent reading done. The Thirty-nine Articles in themselves do not offer a perfect scheme of doctrine, even if well taught, and there is no time to think out their relation to problems of practical modern religious life. The great majority of students do not see the slightest connection between the theology they are studying and their future work, and the divorce is fatal to both. They regard the one as a difficult obstacle to be got over, and the other remains amateurish and crude, because they have never seriously considered its deeper issues. It would seem as though the causes of these difficulties are two—one theoretical, and the other the practical result of ignoring theory. We have not thought out the relation of Pastoral Theology to Theology as a whole, and, not having distinguished the two clearly in our minds, we are never quite sure which we are studying or teaching. This adds to the confusion of the students; it prevents their work being thorough and increases its difficulty, since by obscuring its purpose it takes away the stimulus which comes from realizing the practical value of what is being studied.

I.

What, then, is Pastoral Theology, and what is its relation to Theology as a whole?

Theology may be defined as the Science of God, and since

by a science we mean an ordered department of human knowledge, Theology may be said to deal with the relationship of man to God as presented to the reason.

Of this science Pastoral Theology is a part. As a social being man has certain relationships to his fellow-man, and some of these meet his or his fellow-man's relationships to God.

Pastoral Theology deals with these as they co-operate or clash ; its subject-matter is, therefore, man's share in the relationships of his fellow-man to God. It deals with all that man can do to minister to, or help, the communion of man with God. Even if it were argued that each man stood absolutely alone, and the possibility of human mediation were denied, a science would be needed to prove this absolute individualism.

Practical Theology, on the other hand, is applied Theology. The term is often used as equivalent to Pastoral Theology, and has been the accepted term in Germany since the time of Schleiermacher, but though its subject-matter is almost coterminous with that of Pastoral Theology, its conception is somewhat different. It emphasizes the results rather than the agent. It is more allied to politics, while Pastoral Theology has greater affinity with psychology. It is the term expressing the attitude more naturally adopted among Protestant bodies which have little conception of corporate life or of the need of an organized ministry, while Pastoral Theology is preferred by Catholic Christians who have a constant sense of their relationship to one another and to the Orders of their Church.

If these are correct definitions of Theology and Pastoral Theology, it will be seen that the two are related, but to be distinguished. Every theological question has its pastoral side, but to confuse the two while studying them is as fatal as to ignore the one or the other. When once they are differentiated, their bearing on one another is realized and the value of each is seen.

Thus, Old Testament study is quite different from Old Testament teaching. Theology studies the origin of the books of which it is composed, the exact meaning of the words of the

Prophets, the development of the Jewish Law, the evolution of the idea of sacrifice, the growth of moral ideas, the relationship of Jewish customs to those of surrounding tribes, the genius of Hebrew poetry, the purification of the conception of God as He gradually revealed Himself to the chosen people. Pastoral Theology, on the other hand, has quite other tasks. It is concerned with the value of the Old Testament, the distinguishing of the transitory and local from the permanent and universal in its teachings, its practical use in education, the problem of recasting our traditional lessons without losing what is essential, the use of its chapters or psalms in public worship.

Again, the study of dogma and of the history of dogma is quite different from Homiletics. The one is part of Theology, the other the counterpart of Pastoral Theology. Theology studies the attempts of man to explain the things of God at the bar of reason; Pastoral Theology is concerned to show why doctrine matters. When the theological student has examined the reasons why men believe in God, the student of Pastoral Theology considers how he may so dress them that they may become useful in Apologetics. Where the one studies the Christological controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries, the other ponders on their bearing on modern life, and in their light sees how

“The acknowledgment of God in Christ,
Accepted by the reason, solves for thee
All questions in the earth and out of it,
And hath so far advanced thee to be wise.”

In the study of dogmatics, to preach is fatal; it is the avowed aim of Homiletics. As a student of Theology, a man studies the meaning and growth of creeds; when he turns to Pastoral Theology he considers their use in public worship. He first studies for truth's sake, clearing his mind from all thought of edification; then he takes what he has studied without bias, and “pastoralizes” it by recasting it into a useful lesson to be taught to others.

It is, perhaps, in the realm of history that it is most essential

to mark the contrast. As long as history was written for a political purpose, to establish or refute a religious creed, or to serve as edifying literature, it was not, properly speaking, history. It is essential for historical truth that the facts of the past should be approached without being coloured by preconceived ideas. But the mere study of the past is a singularly uninteresting and purposeless occupation, unless afterwards the results are to be used for guidance in the present, to vindicate the truth, or to cultivate the intelligence of men. So, to study ecclesiastical history in order to prove a doctrine, or to justify the claims of a Church, is precisely not the way to study it as a part of Theology; but when it has been studied honestly and critically, then the whole ground should be gone over again as part of Pastoral Theology, to discover analogies to present conditions in the past, to profit by the experience of men who, under other conditions, are found to have been extremely like ourselves, from the succession of events to generalize laws which will interpret present conditions, to seek for facts which will illustrate truths, or for examples which will encourage men.

Or, to take an example where the temptation is rather to study only the pastoral aspect of the subject. Numbers of little books are written about the conduct of service in church; verbal discussion of points of ritual assumes still larger proportions in religious circles. Instruction in the rendering of the liturgy appear in the earliest English treatises on the clergyman's duty,¹ and has long been a subject of discussion in society.² Practical suggestions for the management of the voice, handbooks of Church music, have not been wanting. But men have been less ready to realize that behind all this, which is the concern of Pastoral Theology, lies the whole field of liturgical study, with the result that the mass of this literature is superficial and empirical, because it lacks broad principles to guide it. The study of Liturgics, apart from the needs of one particular Church,

¹ Cf. George Herbert, "The Country Parson," chap. vi.; Gilbert Burnet, "Of the Pastoral Care," chap. viii.

² Cf. Dr. Johnson's letter to a young clergyman, August 30, 1780, in Boswell's "Life," and Jane Austen, "Mansfield Park," chap. xxxiv.

reveals certain laws of devotion and worship which must be examined before these details can be elaborated with profit. It is bound up with questions of religious psychology, both of man as an individual and of the crowd. It is necessary, if we are to gain an æsthetic sense of what is fit in architecture, in music, in the structure of religious offices, in ceremonial, in the language of prayer both private and public. All this is part of general Theology.

Once more, the study of conduct has been recognized as a science since the days of Aristotle. The Early Church found itself, from the beginning, face to face with moral problems, which it met as best it could. Theologians have, in later days, set themselves to examine and expound the basis of Christian ethics, while preachers drew up lists of theological and cardinal virtues, or used the Ten Commandments to test the consciences of their flock. In the Roman Church, the whole applied science of moral philosophy has been carefully elaborated from the Pastoral work of the Confessional. But in English Theology, ethics and casuistry have not been brought together. The theological and pastoral aspects have not been confused as in the case of history, nor has one been allowed to obscure the other, as in that of Dogmatics or Liturgics, but the help one might have afforded the other has not been realized. There is not even a term for the Pastoral science; casuistry has a special meaning, and is discredited; moral education is a popular synonym for secular, or anti-Christian, schooling; we have to content ourselves with the vague term "Church work," and the methods and aims of this "Church work" cannot be said to have been studied scientifically.

II.

Such, then, is the relationship of Theology to Pastoral Theology. We are now in a position to consider the right places of study for the one and for the other. Obviously, the University is the chief home of Theology, and the outside world—for the clergy, the parish, or diocese—the main field for

the other. But both are needed in each area. Theology at the University tends to become abstract or one-sided by the neglect of Pastoral Theology; Pastoral Theology isolated from the centres of learning inevitably becomes unscientific. But the chief difficulty occurs when we consider the training of the student of the one and the other. He may be trained in the University, in which case pure Theology will predominate, or in a theological college, where the danger is that the two will be confused, or in the parish, in which case Theology will be in danger of becoming empirical and insufficient for a thorough training. And the whole question is, in practice, still further complicated by the fact that, usually, the general education of the student has, in part at least, to be undertaken by the University or College authorities.

The failure to distinguish clearly between Theology and Pastoral Theology vitiates much in our present attempts to train men for Orders, and adds further confusion to our confused methods. Either a man takes an Arts Degree and then goes to a Theological College, in which case he has to learn his theology there and defer his study of Pastoral Theology till he is in the parish, or he takes his degree in the Theology School and hopes to study its personal application in the Theological College. The tutors have to deal with two quite different aims, with a time and a staff insufficient for either. Naturally the two interfere with one another, and neither is met thoroughly. But at least the difficulty is felt, and some attempt to solve it is made, while the man who merely takes his degree in a non-Theological School and reads privately (or with a crammer) for his Bishop's examination, learns neither Theology nor Pastoral Theology, either confusedly or clearly.

In the Theological Colleges connected with the newer Universities, an attempt is made to study the two systematically and side by side. The University examination gives a guarantee for adequate theological training; the college teaching gives it point by its denominational character. But far more time, as well as a clearer mental differentiation between the two aims, is

needed, especially when, as is often the case, the course has to serve to supply deficiencies or correct faults in general education. At least four years are really needed, with a preliminary year where the ordinary course of education has been diverted or interrupted. If two of these years are spent in reading for an Arts degree, two more are barely sufficient for a grounding in Theology and Pastoral Theology. In the same way in colleges not in connection with a University, or which only send some men in for a University examination, theological teaching should come first, and then its recasting as Pastoral Theology. The two can be studied side by side, but their distinction and logical sequence should be kept clear.

III.

Pastoral Theology makes a great claim on the student. For, since it is a practical science, to be a student in it means ultimately to be a priest. To remain in an attitude of detachment permanently is impossible.

It is true, of course, of all sciences that there is no progress made in them without application. No one makes advance in any knowledge without giving up a great deal, at any rate, in externals. The quest of the Grail inevitably broke up King Arthur's Court. Further, for the understanding of any lore the fit temper is necessary; each pursuit makes its own inner demands. If a man is to be a student and not a mere craftsman, he must be prepared to starve and sacrifice certain sides of his life; his energies get absorbed into one channel and concentrated on one interest. He must not mind becoming eccentric; he need not feel astonished if he finds that, like the Athenian philosophers, "he is not respected in our cities" (Plato, *Rep.*, § 487).

But it is true of the student of Pastoral Theology above all, from the intense interest of his subject, and from the fact that it enters into everything. He cannot be indifferent: he cannot escape the feeling that is described as a disease of modern society—namely, the restless sense of obligation to work that

comes when all round us seems to be moving and working. He can only see to it that this sense of obligation is not forced ; that he does not become affected, unbalanced, a prig. He must learn to husband his resources so as to study and work with energy and concentration ; he must beware of condemning his fellow-students as frivolous for an attitude that is often due to mere reaction or is assumed to unbend the bow. Only if he has an intense purpose can he stand the strain, and it still remains a real sacrifice that is demanded of him, a sacrifice of things often good in themselves, that are destroyed by a sense of seriousness, and by an obsession of the ideas that are necessary to the student of Pastoral Theology.



The Dawn of Coronation Day.

JUNE 22, 1911.

SLOWLY, with no great pomp
 To herald it, in greyness breaks the dawn ;
 And softly 'mid the trees
 The sweet, cool-sounding breeze
 Moves, to the ear proclaiming it is morn.

With far-off sweetness sounds
 The first faint bird-call of the opening day.
 Oh, city vast, awake,
 And in thy millions take
 The King upon thy heart, and for him pray !

Of proven worth and might
 He comes (in love we greet him and his Queen)
 To bear the awful weight
 Of Crown and Empire great,
 And rule in sight of Him Who rules unseen.

And well might mortal shrink
 And tremble at the burden grave and dread ;
 But that the Lord of Lords
 His Spirit's strength affords,
 And with His grace anoints our monarch's head.

So to th' Eternal God
 Humbly the Empire supplication brings ;
 And on this solemn day
 In spirit kneels to pray,
 "Strengthen and bless our King, O King of Kings!"

HELEN SAUMAREZ SMITH.

*(Written between 2.30 and 4.15 a.m.,
 June 22, 1911.)*



The Missionary World.

THE condition of the Home Base of Foreign Missions calls out watchful and sympathetic interest this winter. Last winter, fresh from the great impetus of the Edinburgh Conference, review work of a far-reaching kind was undertaken. On the whole, the great majority of the missionary leaders were of one mind in expressing their concurrence with the general conclusions of the Edinburgh Reports, even when those conclusions differed from the methods actually in use. Now the deliberative stage is emerging into the operative, and it remains to be seen what can be *done*. Several of the Reports remind us that hitherto, in the stress and pressure of work, there has yawned a chasm between what the societies recognized as wise and necessary and the actual practices followed. It would be easy to perpetuate this situation, with heavier responsibility owing to fuller light. Until this danger is over, those who have the best interests of Foreign Missions at heart must watch and pray. "That is what I fear for my Society," remarked an experienced worker the other day, pointing to a house-dog

which, called by his owner to move to another place, had risen to his feet, stretched himself, and lain down contentedly again in the self-same spot, satisfied that he had sufficiently obeyed.

* * * * *

It is generally recognized amongst experts that the significance of the Edinburgh Conference lay not so much in the facts which it stated as in the forces which it released. Convictions which had lain unutilized and uncombined in isolated minds, were brought out into the open and given active play. Now, the release of forces, hitherto more or less latent, in associated work within a society, is invariably an uncomfortable thing. To make use of three pregnant phrases quoted recently in the educational supplement of the *Times*, it involves a passing from "the unanimity of the ignorant" to "the disagreement of the inquiring," if we would attain to "the unanimity of the wise." As long as the work is done merely on paper little difficulty arises, but the attempt to let newly recognized forces play on existing organization does not always easily succeed. It is not a case of one policy *versus* another. There is always a true line of action—frequently a joint one—to be found. It can only be discovered and pursued by loving and loyal fellowship between those of differing views, by large confidence and patient co-operation between the old and the young, whether varying in years or in ideals; by a single-heartedness that keeps large issues rather than personal questions in mind; and by a humble, prayerful, unflinching devotion to the highest apprehended truth. Such "co-operation and unity" within each separate Missionary body will make for a wider co-operation of all. This appears to be the special test before workers in many, if not in all, our home organizations for Foreign Missions this winter. Looking at human nature only, with its tendencies to mutual distrust, things seem difficult indeed. But of all the Edinburgh lessons the greatest, the deepest, the one that works out most surely into life is that of "The Sufficiency of God."

* * * * *

The President of the British Association has been dealing in his opening address at the Portsmouth meeting with the world's supply of energy. He suggests directions in which unsuspected sources of energy may lie, and states that "the whole progress of the human race has indeed been due to individual members discovering means of concentrating energy and transforming one form into another." Science suggests a spiritual parallel for Missionary workers here, though for us there is no fear lest the Source of our energy should fail from over-use. A paragraph further on brings a needed warning to mind. Energy should be converted from one form to another "with as little useless expenditure as possible." "Let me," continues Sir William Ramsay, "illustrate by examples: A good steam-engine converts about one-eighth of the potential energy of the fuel into useful work; seven-eighths are lost as unused heat and useless friction. A good gas-engine utilizes more than one-third of the total energy in the gaseous fuel; two-thirds are uneconomically expended." There are phrases here which stand for conditions not wholly unknown in Missionary service—"unused heat and useless friction," energy "uneconomically expended." Science tells us that this waste is "a universal proposition . . . useless expenditure . . . can never equal zero, but it can be made small." Here, surely, is a challenge for men who work not as machines, but as living agents, energized by the Divine Power of God.

* * * * *

The series of articles on "Northern Nigeria and its Problems," leaves us once more in debt to the *Times* for information of great value, even though the writer does not design his paper, to support and forward Missionary work. Nevertheless, the cause is definitely helped by such vivid presentment of the land and its people. More avowedly favourable to Missionary interests is Sir H. H. Johnson's temperately-written article in the September *Nineteenth Century* on "Alcohol in Africa." He supports outspokenly the statements made as to the evils of the traffic, and deals fearlessly with the

much controverted question of the nature of the spirits supplied to West Africans. Comparing the amount of pure alcohol in trade gin with that in indigenous African fermented drinks, he quotes a trustworthy statement that the former contains 44 per cent. of alcohol to the volume of liquid, and the latter only from 1.5 to 6 per cent. The strongest native African drink has less alcohol than the weakest wines in Europe. Sir H. H. Johnson recognizes that "the manufacture of alcohol or fermented drinks has created . . . vast vested interests which have . . . permeated the Press in parts of the United Kingdom and of the United States." He says, in another place, "to attack alcohol nowadays is a more dangerous emprise than to attack the principles of established religion." He quotes, in a footnote, an extract from a book by Mr. E. D. Morel, who is now such a powerful opponent of the line taken by the Missionaries with regard to the sale of intoxicants to the natives. In his "Affairs of West Africa," published in 1902, Mr. Morel says: "Personally I detest the West Africa liquor traffic. I look upon it in the same light as the opium traffic in the Far East—a blot upon the escutcheon of Christian Europe." Second thoughts are not always best. The whole article is well worth reading, and the facts it gives will be found valuable for use.

* * * * *

In the same number of the *Nineteenth Century* there is an interesting historical article on "Copts and Muslims in Egypt." The present social and political position in Egypt is clearly set forth in an article in the *Fortnightly Review* on "Sir Eldon Gorst and his Successor in Egypt." Students of Missions may gain much from such articles as these.

* * * * *

Before these pages are issued most of the autumn valedictory meetings for outgoing Missionaries will have been held. There is a singularly tender and suggestive "Scripture Message" in the *Mission Field* of the S.P.G. for September, which will strengthen many as they journey forth. A special though somewhat sorrowful interest attaches to the C.M.S.

Farewell Meeting to be held on September 27, inasmuch as only those Missionaries are going whom "the Committee are able to send forth." The published list includes one hundred and thirty-six names, some twenty-seven being new Missionaries, all provided for during their first term of service. But fifty Missionaries, including wives, and thirteen accepted candidates are temporarily detained at home from lack of funds. This in itself is perhaps the most cogent appeal ever made to the Christian Church. It is a fact which adds urgency to every proposal made from headquarters regarding the work of the Home Base this winter, and which stimulates every servant and lover of the C.M.S. to work towards such an adequate advance as shall justify the Committee in a reversal of that policy of retrenchment which they have reluctantly adopted in their present emergent need.

* * * * *

Missionary periodicals are strongly reinforced this month by the annual reports, which teem with interest, and supply endless matter for the use of home workers. It is open to question whether the best plan of reporting the year's foreign work so as to make it an inspiring whole to the subscribers has yet been discovered. But accepting the present plan, which is more or less adopted by all societies, the records are full of stimulating incidents. The *C.M.S. Annual Report* in particular is admirably written, and should be an invaluable handbook for speakers and workers throughout the year. A study of its appendices is of great value—the list of educational institutions and their amazing statistics; the list of Medical Missions, no less striking; the table showing the translational and literary work done by C.M.S. Missionaries during the year; and the list, all too short as yet, of book depots, libraries, reading-rooms, and Mission presses connected with the Society. The Index of special topics, filling eleven pages, carefully classifies all material for ready reference. As to the contribution lists and financial statements, only those who have exploited their

resources thoroughly know their value in deputational work. The book is a monument of painstaking and successful work.

* * * * *

An article on "Precursors of the Bible Society" (in the September issue of *The Bible in the World*) reminds one of the extraordinary value of the history of Bible translation and circulation in the region of Christian apologetics. The evidence is easily accessible, flowing in from every land, and is comparatively little known or used. It is a weapon we cannot afford to forego. What the Book does, testifies to what it is. Here, for example, are two incidents recently told by an American Presbyterian Missionary in Korea:

"I remember that there was trouble some time ago down in the Hoang Hai Province, and the soldiers went to one place and started looking for rebels. One picked up a New Testament. His comrades said: 'Put it down; there is some witchcraft in it. You will have to be a Christian if you touch it.'

"Sitting in my room once with an old Korean, I offered him a copy of the Scriptures. He said, 'Thank you; you are so kind to give me a book. I cannot take it myself; just lay it on the table. I will take it away next time.' Next time he came I got out the book and gave it to him again. He said, 'I cannot tell you how happy I feel that you should have remembered me again. I will take it away next time.' On inquiring the reason of this politely disguised unwillingness to take the book, I was told that the story had gone north, south, east, and west through Korea that a peculiar spirit or deity resided in the Bible. If a man once read it, he became possessed of that spirit, and had to become a Christian.

"There is an element of truth right there, though they did not know what it meant. They were preaching the truth in ignorance. There is a power in God's Word—a power which compels men to believe. That power is God's own Holy Spirit in it."

The British and Foreign Bible Society have issued a farthing edition of St. Mark in Korean; more than 500,000 copies have been bought by Korean Christians and distributed amongst their heathen neighbours.

* * * * *

Those who desire a succinct account of the "Present Position of the Anti-Opium Crusade" will find it in a paper under that title in the Wesleyan *Foreign Field* for September, by Mr. Marshall

Broomhall. The record speaks better for China than for ourselves. It is important that prayer and interest in this great question should still be well maintained.

* * * * *

The two leading C.M.S. magazines again compel one's attention from cover to cover this month. The *Gleaner* is an excellent number, and the new series, called "At the Translator's Desk," promises to be of fresh interest. The picture of the interior of Ispahan Church, with the late Bishop Stuart conducting the service, and the little flock of converts from Islam bowed in prayer, is deeply moving, and adds point to the urgent pleas for reinforcement for the Persia Mission printed elsewhere. The *C.M. Review* is also at its best. The two outstanding articles are one on "The Mind of an African," by Archdeacon Willis of Uganda, which will materially aid members of study-circles working on "The Future of Africa," and another on "Linked Schools: A Proposal," by Mr. T. R. W. Lunt, which leads off sanely and ably in a new direction, and is sure to carry conviction to men. Besides the usual notes, the C.M.S. editorial secretary contributes an admirable article on "A Distinguished Indian Civilian," being a somewhat belated review of Sir Andrew Fraser's book, "Among Indian Rajahs and Ryots." The *C.M. Gazette* is as usual full of stimulating record and suggestion. The paper on "Missionary Candidates: The Present Position and Future Hopes" has great practical value at this juncture.

G.



Discussions.

[*The contributions contained under this heading are comments on articles in the previous number of the CHURCHMAN. The writer of the article criticized may reply in the next issue of the magazine; then the discussion in each case terminates. Contributions to the "Discussions" must reach the Editors before the 15th of the month.*]

"THE ETHICS OF DISENDOWMENT."

(*"The Churchman," September, p. 651.*)

I AM glad to accept much of what Chancellor Smith says in this article as supplementary to mine on the same subject in the CHURCHMAN for July. His statement of the principles which govern all interference by the State with the property of religious and charitable institutions cannot be other than helpful at the present time, as well to those who are in agreement with me on the main point as to those who are not. At the same time, his article contains so much criticism that I am bound to offer a reply, lest any reader should suppose, as Chancellor Smith evidently supposes, that there is no more to be said for my case.

The Chancellor agrees with me in holding that "Disendowment is not necessarily wrong . . . because it would cripple the Church"; but he adds that I am "mistaken in assuming that those who ground their opposition to it on its baneful consequences regard those consequences as determining its ethical complexion." As a matter of fact, I need appeal no further than to the correspondence columns and leading articles of the newspapers of the last six months to find my justification. Over and over again one has read that it behoves all loyal Churchmen to fight against Disendowment because the Church would suffer by it; over and over again one has read of the imperative need for instructing Church-people as to what its effects would be; and as no slightest hint has been given in the context which would suggest that any further investigation is called for, one cannot avoid the conclusion that most of the writers are unaware that the necessity for it exists. Dr. Smith thinks that the attitude is correctly described by the colourless word "non-moral." I cannot agree with him; to my mind "immoral" is not one whit too strong.

But I did not pretend that this form of apology has no rivals, and I offered an alternative one for consideration. Yet even this alternative argument (I fear I cannot follow Chancellor Smith in calling it a syllogism!) was offered only as the one "usually" adopted. By what right, then, does he say that I put it forward as "exhausting all that can be said on the subject"? Another instance of misrepresentation occurs three pages later, where I read: "Mr. Russell actually compares the Disendowment of the Church to the compulsory acquisition of private land for a public purpose" (p. 655). Anyone who should take

the trouble to refer to my article would be surprised to find how completely I am innocent of such iniquity. I quoted compulsory sale (p. 534) to illustrate the principle that "in no case are rights of property absolutely and eternally independent of State revision," and I claimed that the same *principle* must be admitted in connection with ecclesiastical endowments. Can this fairly be called a comparison? But perhaps I need make no further comment on such details as these.

The fact is that Chancellor Smith deals with the question which I raised as if it was simply a legal matter, and as if nothing more was needed than the decision of a court of law. I did my utmost to put it on a different and, as I conceive, a higher footing. I said that it was a matter of conscience; and I pointed out that, to take refuge from the ruling of conscience behind a decision of the law courts, was precisely the offence for which Archdeacon Grantly, in *The Warden*, merits and receives the contempt of all upright men.¹ I admitted that I was not competent to pronounce an opinion on the legal aspect of the question; but this, as I regard the controversy, is of small moment, since the legal aspect is of secondary importance. This difference of treatment is so great as to render much of Chancellor Smith's criticism ineffective.

Thus, after asserting that, in refuting the argument which I quoted, I have merely knocked down a ninepin of my own setting up, and have ignored the existence of other and more stable ones, he proceeds to state in what respects the argument should be altered. The endowments, he says, belong to the Church of England, not because they were given to it in the past (and so, it is implied, my consideration of the original purpose of the benefactors was beside the mark), but because it "can show a title to them of many centuries"—a title which, by the second principle quoted (pp. 653, 654), is "indefeasible, however irregular or unlawful the origin of the possession may have been." This alteration is, of course, an important one to a lawyer; but my proposal is not intended to appeal to the mere lawyer, nor yet to the man who has put his conscience into the lawyer's custody. It is no affront to the lawyer to be reminded that legal and moral codes cannot be equivalent; and I do not hesitate to say that, when the matter is considered in the realm of conscience, the alteration of the argument has slight effect. An example will make my meaning clear. A man, we will suppose, has for a long time possessed a property, but for some reason he becomes convinced that a part of it ought all the while to have belonged to someone else. His lawyer, however, says to him: "Never mind; whatever may have been intended at first, your ownership has been recognized for so long that it cannot now be legally disputed." I will ask Chancellor Smith this question: Does he suppose that a man with a Christian conscience would be satisfied with advice of that sort? For my part, I am sure that he would say:

¹ Need I say that this, and not any comparison of a sinecure warden with "our hard-worked Bishops and clergy" as Dr. Smith thinks, was the point of my allusion to the book?

"It is not my legal title that I am anxious about; that may be as secure as you please; but something more is needed to set my mind at rest"; and I have no doubt that the Chancellor will agree with me. That is sufficient for my argument; for it means this—that if there is really any question in our consciences as to the original intention of the Church's benefactors, it is nothing to the purpose to say that our legal right to their gifts is by this time secure.

This leads to another point in dispute. Is there really any such question in our consciences? Chancellor Smith observes that no one but myself has ever heard of any Nonconformists putting forward the demand which I attributed to them, and he is shrewd enough to suspect that those who do so exist only in my imagination. Let us see. A few months ago one of the best-known Nonconformists in the country wrote the following words about himself and other Free Churchmen: "We find serious fault also with her monopoly of those ancient cathedrals which seem to us part of our national inheritance."¹ If my critic will take the trouble to understand what these words mean—I do not say, if he will grant their claim, but only, if he will understand their meaning and examine what is implied—he will find that they rest upon the very theory which I tried to make explicit, namely, that "the various Nonconforming bodies are co-heirs with the Church of England of the earlier Church, and hence they are entitled to some share in those gifts which the devotion of our Christian forefathers bestowed." The Chancellor's tribute to my imaginative powers was hardly warranted!

The third and fourth principles which Dr. Smith discusses are more relevant to the subject as I presented it. It is obviously reasonable to ask under which subsection of (3) any State action of the kind that I contemplate will be justified. And the answer is easy: It will come under (d). If the action is taken for the reasons which I set forth, and in order to follow the dictates of conscience, it will certainly promote the general good of the community. This possibility receives scant consideration from Dr. Smith; he tells us, without a word of explanation, that no loyal Churchman would admit it. But this, it scarcely needs to be said, depends entirely upon the attitude adopted towards what I called the Nonconformist claim. And the use of the word "loyal," brought in as a catchword where it can only prejudice the investigation, comes very near to being a prostitution.

The important principle (4) remains. Not merely does Dr. Smith find this claim to exist in my vivid imagination only; he also hurls at me the statement that (with certain exceptions) seceders have no right to demand anything at all. But, before asserting that "Mr. Russell seriously propounds the exact contrary," he should have faced the question whether we can regard Nonconformists as seceders *in this connection*. That they have seceded from the Established Church no one will deny; but if my proposal is to be considered fairly, it must be

¹ Rev. F. B. Meyer. See "Church Unity," p. 54.

recognized as involving this—that we must regard the early endowments as devoted, not so much to the Established Church, as to the religious life of the nation. The Established Church happened to be the sole representative of that life then; the Free Churches share with it the representation now; and unless Nonconformists can be shown to have no place in the national religious life, it is impossible to quote this principle (4) as, in any way relevant to the discussion without assuming the very point at issue—namely, that the early endowments were intended for the Church of England *as such*. Yet the application of principle (4) (which, to anyone but the legalist relying on “title,” simply begs the whole question) is the only argument offered by Chancellor Smith against the claim which I advanced.

A short reference must be made to two other matters. I added the footnote with regard to tithes, because without it the statement of my opinion on secularization would have been incomplete. But I could not then enter upon the discussion of such an intricate question, nor can I do so now; I need only say that Dr. Smith’s conjecture as to my view is incorrect. At the same time, I beg readers of the *CHURCHMAN* to remember that whatever theory we may hold about tithes cannot in any way affect our decision on the main issue before us.

Lastly, Chancellor Smith has shown that I was wrong in saying that a policy of concurrent endowment has never been urged by Churchmen. I am by no means sure that the offer which was made in 1869 would be regarded by Nonconformists as evidencing a desire to understand their point of view in its entirety; and, in any case, our beliefs as to tithes are such that the Chancellor is hardly likely to agree with me as to what was or was not “an equitable readjustment.” But rather than confuse the main issue by examining such points at length, I will gladly withdraw this part of my paper. It must not, however, be supposed, because a scheme of concurrent endowment was rejected more than forty years ago, that Free Churchmen are necessarily opposed to such a revision of early endowments as would give full consideration to their principles. I have shown that the desire for such a revision is felt; and some steps, at any rate, could be taken at once towards meeting it. After all, if we support this policy, it will not be in the last resort because we hope thereby to purchase peace, but because we are persuaded that it is just.

C. F. RUSSELL.

“AUTHORITY IN RELIGIOUS BELIEF.”

(“*The Churchman*,” *September*, p. 673.)

In this article the writer questions the claim of the “average Englishman” to decide for himself what he shall believe. This claim, he says, “arises in theory from the inferences that religion is human in its origin, and that revelation has not taken place”; moreover, it is

contrary to the teaching of St. Paul, "that we are not sufficient to think anything out for ourselves."

Now, the average Englishman may accept the statement of St. Paul as we find it in his Epistle relating to his own ministry—that he was not sufficient of himself to account anything as from himself, but his sufficiency was from God. Thus, he will admit the "historical fact of revelation" while at the same time he claims the right "to think out for himself" even "authoritative" declarations emanating from God. Indeed, he is bound so to do if he wishes to find out their particular bearing on himself and his life, without which they can be of no value to him. Much more, then, has he need to think out the doctrines presented to him in formularies emanating from men, such as the doctrines of "Sin and Atonement, of Baptism and Communion," each having various interpretations even within the Church. He may at least claim the choice from among them of those which satisfy most fully all his faculties and aspirations.

The general consideration of the question ends, and must end, in the conclusion that our final assent to or rejection of such doctrines lies with our free will. At the same time, in particular cases the influences which lead to this decision differ widely from one another—whether, *e.g.*, these doctrines are presented to a grown man for the first time, or have been learned in his youth, and his belief in them has been shaken or destroyed.

In the latter case, any "authority" which he deems to have misled him will certainly no longer have any weight with him. But his doubts must be met in the full understanding of the sphere in which they have arisen, and in full sympathy with him in his inquiries.

In either case the most that can be brought about by force of argument or authority is the mere intellectual assent, which cannot by itself bring Christ into his heart, and, indeed, is liable to become an obstacle in the way of reaching that end.

Questions, then, arise and seem worthy of the utmost and unbiased consideration :

1. Whether it is advisable, or not rather futile, to bring in "authority" as an inducement to a grown man to accept any particular interpretation of God's Word or deduction from it, except the one authority of its fruits shown in the life of the believer.

2. Whether it is not dangerous to teach the young doctrines which admit of dispute, since, receiving them as absolute truth and afterwards discovering their fallibility, they run the risk of giving up with them their entire faith in Christianity. Or whether it is not safer, and more conducive to their spiritual life and its maintenance in the world which they are entering, to confine their religious teaching to the acts and words of our Lord and the fact of His dwelling within them as their ever-present Friend and Helper if they do but obey His voice within

them, and to the natural—*i.e.*, the spiritual—development of this fact in themselves and their relations to others.

F. A. LE MESURIER.

“AUTHORITY IN RELIGIOUS BELIEF.”

(“*The Churchman*,” September, 1911, p. 673.)

I should like to be permitted to traverse some statements in the paper by the Rev. C. Lisle-Carr, which appears in your current number. His objection to the Bible as a supreme authority is, that so many communities appeal to the Bible, and yet so many of them differ. But this is a mistake. These conflicting communities differ about matters upon which the Bible gives them little or no authority. They differ about forms and forms of service, and Church order and government, about which the Bible says but little. Hence their differences are not owing to the Bible, but to their own conceptions.

On the other hand, when we turn to the matters upon which the Bible speaks freely and clearly, namely, the Christian verities, we have solid and substantial agreement between the leading denominations, as witnessed at the Keswick and the hundred and one Conventions the world over. Yea, more. When we turn to the genuine Roman Catholic saints and mark their authentic utterances, we find ourselves one with them. And in a memorable instance, to which I wish to draw attention, Joan of Arc, in her last hours, was asked if she would appeal to the Church, and she replied: “I appeal to the Scriptures!” And so she died, as many a Protestant has died.

WM. WOODS SMYTH.



Notices of Books.

INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By James Moffatt, B.D., D.D. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 12s.

A book of this kind defies review. It is easy to lightly commend. For massive learning, for patient research, for careful arrangement, for completeness of detail, the highest commendation is deserved. The writer has certainly succeeded in his effort to know something of what others are thinking. His catena of names is overwhelming. But he makes it clear that his bibliography is not gathered from a library catalogue. The books have been taken down from the shelves and read. But the book is no mere conspectus of authorities; there is a vast amount of independent thinking and independent arrival at conclusions. To some extent, at least, it demands an answer. It often raises serious problems in single sentences: it dismisses them as briefly; no discussion of them can be as brief. The book has already become the text of a series of trenchant articles in the *Expositor* from the pen of Sir William.

Ramsay, and many particular issues will have to be separately dealt with. Perhaps here we can do best if we briefly describe the book, venturing a comment or a question here and there.

The book begins with several chapters of prolegomena. It discusses the collection of the New Testament writings into a canon; their arrangement, sources, and structure; matters concerning their circulation and literary characteristics. The discussion is full, detailed, and illuminating, but somehow it seems to lack the touch of sympathy. We have been reading the newly published Oxford Essays, and Dr. Sanday's opening contribution covers some of the same ground as Dr. Moffatt's Introduction. But with Dr. Sanday there is the critical faculty and sympathy. Here—and it somewhat applies to the whole book—we have criticism, brilliant, able, learned, but cold, calculating, almost unsympathetic. Somehow the book reads as the detailed story of a post-mortem examination, and for us and for Dr. Moffatt we know the subject lives.

After the Introduction we come to the detailed consideration of the books of the New Testament, dealt with under five headings—the Correspondence of Paul, the Historical Literature, Homilies and Pastorals, the Apocalypse of John, the Fourth Gospel, etc. The Correspondence of Paul has no place for Ephesians or the Pastorals which are dealt with in Chapter III. 1 and 2 Thessalonians stand first in order and date, are both by St. Paul, the rather curious theory that because 2 Thessalonians is so like the first epistle in style and language it cannot be Pauline being dealt with as it deserves. A useful paragraph deals with the development of St. Paul's doctrinal teaching, and sums the position up as follows:

Behind him lay the struggle with Jewish Christian traditionalism at Antioch and Jerusalem, which had already compelled him to define his principles and think out the deeper aspects of his gospel. It is therefore historically and psychologically impossible to read the Thessalonian epistles as if they represented a primitive stage in the Apostle's thought, when he had not yet developed dogmatic Paulinism. If his gospel centres here round the Coming rather than the Cross of Christ, and it seems to argue that men were to be sanctified by hope rather than justified by faith, the explanation must be sought in the special circumstances which determined the composition of the letter. There was apparently nothing to call out any discussion of the Law or any theorizing on forgiveness.

This is excellent, and just now particularly useful. Galatians comes next, and Dr. Moffatt is evidently a thoroughgoing apologist for the Northern theory. He marshals the arguments on both sides, but with a strong leaning to the old view. He finds no difficulty at all in the vexed phrase *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*. It can only mean Phrygia and the region of Galatia. He compares it with other phrases where we have the collocation of two countries without the article; but they are not really similar, as *Γαλατικὴν χώραν* is not the name of a country, and if we are to translate with Dr. Moffatt, we need the article. He is not at all sure of the historicity of Acts xv. He regards the Western form of the decree (containing three members only) as secondary, but not later than A.D. 150. He finds serious, almost insoluble, difficulty in the relationship of the epistle to the Acts.

St. Paul's correspondence with Corinth included four letters from him. (a) The earliest, referred to in 1 Cor. v. 9 and 2 Cor. vi. 14 to vii. 7 is probably part of it. (b) 1 Cor. (c) After a visit to Corinth, a short, sharp letter, pre-

served in part in 2 Cor. x. 1 to xiii. 10. (*d*) 2 Cor. i. to ix., omitting vi. 14 to vii. 1. It will be seen from this summary that he believes the second visit (almost certainly accomplished and not merely prospective) was paid after 1 Corinthians, and that he denies the integrity of 2 Corinthians, though regarding it all as Pauline. In the former contention he is surely right, but he hardly seems to have dealt fairly with the arguments against the latter.

Romans i. to xv. represents the original epistle, xvi. being, at least in part, added to a copy of the epistle sent to Ephesus. Here, as elsewhere, Dr. Moffatt demands a considerable amount of editing (perhaps even textual) when the epistle came to be incorporated in the Pauline canon. He regards the epistle as doctrinal rather than as controversial or apologetic. Colossians is genuine, and its integrity is clear. Holtzmann held that an epistle was originally written to the Colossians, worked up by some unknown author, first into Ephesians, and then afterwards into the canonical Colossians. Moffatt calls this "filigree" criticism. Has he provided us with a long-needed name for criticism of its kind? Philemon and Philippians need little consideration. In reference to the phrase *σὺν ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνοις* in Phil. i. 1, Dr. Moffatt receives very sympathetically the suggestion that the words are a second-century gloss in the interests of catholicizing. He says, if such glosses are to be admitted anywhere in the New Testament, this is as obvious a place as any. Yes, but where is the evidence? The fact that the words do not accommodate themselves to a particular point of view, does not prove them a gloss, or we shall lose half the New Testament.

The second section deals with the historical literature. Ur-Markus (not our Mark) is one of the two great original sources. The other is Q, which our St. Mark knew. Our St. Mark is earlier than either St. Matthew or St. Luke. St. Matthew's Gospel bears his name because it makes the most systematic use of the Matthæan Logia of Papias; it was not composed by an Apostle nor in Aramaic. St. Matthew used our St. Mark rather than the Ur-Markus. As to dates, Moffatt does not follow Harnack's recently set forth early dating. Our St. Mark is a final version of the Ur-Markus, composed shortly after the events of A.D. 60 to 70. St. Matthew must be later than 70 and earlier than 110. St. Luke does not depend upon Josephus, and may therefore be earlier than 94, but must be later than 70; 75 to 100 roughly represents the period of production. The Diarist in the Acts was also the Historian, and therefore almost certainly St. Luke.

The third section deals with Homilies and Pastorals. It is daringly critical, and calls loudly for lengthy criticism itself. Here we can but summarize decisions. 1 Peter is accepted, though its date is left doubtful. Jude is dated in the early decades of the second century, and it did not borrow from 2 Peter, but *vice versa*. Of course it is by no Jude known to the New Testament. 2 Peter must, perforce, come after it and is dated in the middle of the second century. The author of Ephesians knew 1 Peter, and, obviously, Colossians. If *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* is authentic, it cannot have been written by St. Paul. But *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* is not authentic. Even then it can hardly be Pauline, and must date between A.D. 75 and 85. Of the Pastorals, 2 Timothy is the earliest, but all are tendency writings, and all from the same pen, but it was not St. Paul's. They are later than 1 Peter—later, of course, than

St. Paul's death. Between 90, or perhaps a little earlier, and 115 they must have been written. Hebrews was written by a "highly trained Hellenistic Jewish Christian, a διδάσκαλος of high repute, with speculative gifts and literary culture; but to us he is a voice and no more." He was not a person of commanding genius, and we could have done without his epistle; still, it is good to have "this unique specimen of Alexandrine thought playing upon the primitive gospel." James was written early in the second century, and yet James of Jerusalem may have had something to do with its authorship. Is not this perilously near to "filigree" criticism?

With regard to the Johannine literature, of course, the existence of the Presbyter John is to be taken as historical fact. 2 and 3 John were written by him. The Apocalypse was not written by John the Apostle; that is ruled out by the acceptance of the tradition of his early martyrdom. (Why do we accept some traditions, and reject others, better authenticated, with equal readiness?) Perhaps the book is pseudonymous; perhaps John Mark wrote it, more probably John the Presbyter. The fourth gospel is by an absolutely unknown author—or by John the Presbyter. The beloved disciple was either John, the son of Zebedee, or John a Jerusalemite, or is he simply the picture of the ideal Christian? We should like to ask: If he was John a Jerusalemite, did he perchance come to be later on John the Presbyter, and was his father's name Zebedee? Or is that "filigree"? The gospel was written before 130, probably before 110, and after the other three. The first epistle was written by one who lived in the same circle as the writer of the gospel, but he was not the same person. The book ends with a discussion of the Johannine tradition, and John the Presbyter is clothed with reality.

Such is the book and its critical standpoint. It needs an answer; but much of the answer has already been given. Lightfoot, Sanday, Zahn, Ramsay, and a host of others, have dealt with its positions, and demolished some of them. It is the work of a good scholar, but much of it is, to use his own word, "filigree" work. "Filigree" work is not easily manufactured; this kind has come by patient toil, arduous research, and keen exercise of mind.

But it is not an Introduction to the New Testament we know: it is subversive of well-won positions; it rejects well-substantiated traditions for speculative and ill-based theories. It is "filigree" work, beautiful, but brittle. In the pages of the *Expositor*, Sir William Ramsay has been dealing some vigorous blows, and the delicate fabric has been damaged. It will suffer more damage yet.

F. S. GUY WARMAN.

DIVINE TRANSCENDENCE AND ITS REFLECTION IN RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY.
An Essay by the Rev. J. R. Illingworth, M.A., D.D. Price 4s. 6d. net.
Macmillan and Co.

This essay is a worthy successor of the one dealing with Divine Immanence by the same author, and should be read in connection with it. A book on this subject has been needed—and none is so competent to write it as Dr. Illingworth. In the preface he truly says that the omnipresence of God "has been frequently employed as though it were an exclusive alternative" to His supremacy, whereas, to the Christian, Divine Transcendence is "presupposed, not precluded," by Divine Immanence.

The main thought of the book is that the Transcendence of God is the ultimate source of all authority: and its chief practical teaching is an exhortation—much needed to-day—to practise the virtues of “humility” and “obedience.” The book is carefully written. The argument is close—sometimes almost too close: it must be carefully read to be appreciated. It is marked by the deep learning and thought characteristic of the author, and its felicity of Biblical quotation calls for mention.

The confidence with which the author faces “hostile criticism” should be of value to many unstable in the faith; for it is not the blind enthusiasm of those whose zeal outruns their knowledge, and causes them to shut their eyes to all modern thought and movement, but the assured conviction of one who has studied all sides of the question and finds in the Christian solution the only satisfactory one.

Coming to the work itself, the first part deals with the philosophical aspect of the question. Psychology may explain our mental processes, but “the object” lies beyond. Religion must be rooted in personal spiritual experience if it is to live; but it must also have an absolute objective basis, independent of the feelings of the individuals who from generation to generation successively come under its sway. Men have continually—and with increasing difficulty—tried to locate this ultimate basis of authority. “The authority of reason, the authority of conscience, the authority of the Bible, the authority of the Church, are all phrases which at once raise complex difficulties of thought. They have lost something of the clear-cut character and definite outline which they once possessed. But this need not mean that they have lost their reality” (p. 7). On reflection, this difficulty of location is inevitable, for a living thing is ever changing. Yet “it” is there, even if we cannot exactly reach or define it. There is an absolute element in religion which finally is seen in the Infinite Fact of the Transcendence of God—“the absolute and transcendent ground of all existence.”

The writer then turns to Plato and Aristotle. The perfect is implied in our knowledge of the imperfect, as our knowledge of relative existence presupposes the existence of absolute being. He shows how both thinkers recognize the fact that moral affinity is necessary for knowledge of a person, and of God. What the Greek philosophers thus reasoned over, the Old Testament writers “knew,” and later Christian writers developed. Phrases, such as “impersonal reason,” “unconscious purpose,” or “unconscious will” are meaningless. The doctrine of the Trinity is of the “esse” of the Christian Faith, for “complete in Himself, God transcends the Universe, though He expresses Himself in and through it.”

Thus Divine Immanence and Transcendence are correlative conceptions in Christian Theology. They are seen for all time in the Incarnation, and God’s supremacy is reflected in the authoritative tone of Christianity, first given by its Founder. All authority is thus ultimately based and appeals in the last resort to conscience with its absolute dictation; for God—be it ever borne in mind—is the infinite “Good,” as well as the infinite “Great.”

In what can be called the second part, the author proceeds to show these principles in action. Christ Himself spoke “with authority.” He left no “book,” but trusted Himself and His meaning to men. He founded His

Church to be His witness to the world and delegated authority to it. By reason of human sinfulness and fallibility, divisions that seem to be permanent have arisen, and men ask: "Where is the true Church?" The question of the difficulty of location again arises. But His Church—as a visible fact, and not only as an eclectic society of men with a common spiritual experience—exists. For the law of spirit is that it acts through matter. "Visibility is the Church's keynote." Dr. Illingworth links up this thought essentially with the fact of the episcopate—"the symbol of Christ's authoritative hold upon the world." Here we are on old familiar disputed ground. Can we thus "essentially" link the two *as a theory*—even if we can as a fact—which, with our present knowledge of the state of things in sub-apostolic times, cannot be regarded as *conclusively* proved—though most probable? That the Church, as a Visible Society, was a Divine Idea in the mind of the Christ is accepted as an essential fact and theory by all Churchmen, and is obvious to any careful student, but *the exact form* that it took in episcopal organization is inevitably of the secondary rank, for it is a "method"—albeit divine—rather than a principle. The fact may exist, and probably does, in spite of gaps; but it is a different thing to take it as an exclusive and essential theory, though we hold it as such in practice, and the onus of justifying themselves lies on those who forsake it, not on us who keep it. Even our writer admits that "sacramental ordinances may be normal instruments, but can never be limiting conditions of the Spirit's action" (p. 205).

He writes next on Creeds and Sacraments. Creeds guard apostolic tradition: their dogmatic element is necessary and good. Sacraments are in accordance with the laws of our being, for again "spirit acts through matter." If shadows of them and of an authoritative priesthood are found in the most primitive religious systems, it is what should be expected from human instinct unconsciously obeying the laws of being. They find their substance and reality in Christianity. He goes on to show that Biblical authority in both Testaments has not been, and cannot be, altered in their essential spiritual aspects by external criticism. A good chapter on the Christian life under authority follows. He writes well and truly on the fact of sin and of the Atonement, which meets man on the threshold of all life in touch with God. The need of the practice of the virtues of "humility" and "obedience" is impressively set before us—especially are they needed in an age with "insubordination existing as a prominent evil."

A recapitulatory chapter closes this essay, which we confidently commend, for its stimulating and helpful thoughts, to our readers.

F. G. GODDARD.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE. Westminster New Testament. By A. E. Garvie, D.D. London: *Melrose*. Price 2s. net.

The General Editor of the series has made himself personally responsible for this volume, and it bears the marks of his ripe scholarship. The Introduction deals with Authorship, Date, Sources, and Characteristics, and owes much to Harnack's latest studies. Dr. Garvie has no hesitation in assigning the Third Gospel to St. Luke, and prefers to date it about A.D. 80. The examination of the sources is compressed, but clear, and the now

prevalent two-document theory is adopted. Much is made of the points of contact with the Fourth Gospel, and the author hazards the conjecture that "the Third and Fourth Evangelists had personal intercourse together, and even came to some common understanding as to the way in which each would supplement the existing sources." In the Commentary the text of the A.V. is printed in short sections, and reference is made at the head of each to the parallel or similar sections of the other Synoptics. Dr. Garvie tells us he has tried to give special attention to the difficulties which the life and teaching of Jesus present to a modern reader. Questions of theology are necessarily ruled out by considerations of space, but it is useful to have cross references to discussions of them in the author's "Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus."

THE PROBLEM OF DEUTERONOMY. By the Rev. J. S. Griffiths. London: S.P.C.K. Price 2s.

We have no hesitation in thoroughly commending this little book. It claims to be written from a scientific standpoint, and to avoid *a priori* arguments; and examination of its contents justifies the claim. The author has read widely in the literature on both sides of the question: he has fairly marshalled and stated the opposing arguments, and his conclusion is a temperate expression of his belief that Deuteronomy, as we have it, is "a contemporary record written by Moses himself, or by some person or persons acting under his direction." There is a very full analysis at the beginning, and a careful list of Scripture passages at the end, both of which add to the usefulness of the book. We noticed one misprint on page 16—"cilivized" for "civilized."

WESTMINSTER ABBEY AND THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE CORONATION. By W. R. Lethaby. London: Duckworth. Price 2s. 6d. net.

This very careful and interesting work deserves to be read, and kept, as an historical memorial of a great ceremony. The illustrations are good, the plans useful, and the letterpress most helpful to a right understanding of the complete ritual of the Coronation Service.

Received: THE CONSECRATED LIFE and THE PATHWAY OF VICTORY. By Rev. T. W. Riddle. London: Marshall Brothers. Price 1s. net each. Two useful little devotional books, of which the output is now so happily large. FADS. By Rev. I. W. Charlton. London: Marshall Brothers. The fads are such things as faith-healing and re-baptism, and this little book is, on the whole, a common-sense warning against them. THE JESUIT. By Joseph Hocking. London: Cassell and Co. Price 3s. 6d. A very exciting novel, the plot of which concerns itself with attempts to win perverts to Rome. HELBECK OF BANNISDALE. By Mrs. Humphry Ward. Price 7d. net. EIGHTEENTH CENTURY VIGNETTES. By Austin Dobson. Price 1s. net. THE PICKWICK PAPERS. By Charles Dickens. Price 6d. net. London: T. Nelson and Sons. THE RIGHT WAY. By Sir Gilbert Parker. London: T. Nelson and Sons. Price 7d. net. THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW. Edited by Dr. HEADLAM. Price 12s. per annum. THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES. Price 3s. 6d. net. Annual Subscription 12s. net. EPISCOPACY. By Lieut.-Colonel F. S. Terry. Price 2d. PROCEEDINGS OF THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY FOR AFRICA AND THE EAST. Price 2s. net. COMFORTABLE WORDS FOR CHRIST'S LOVERS. By Dundas Harford. London: H. R. Allenson. Price 1s. 6d. net. NICHOLAS NICKLEBY and THE PICKWICK PAPERS. By Charles Dickens. London: T. Nelson and Sons. Price 2s. net each. THE CHRISTIAN PRACTICE OF PRAYER. By K. E. Kirk. THE MISSIONARY PROBLEM AND THE DENIAL OF CHRIST IN CHRISTENDOM. By Malcolm Spencer. THE STUDY OF THE WILL OF GOD FOR MODERN LIFE. By Malcolm Spencer. THE VOCATION OF SCOTLAND. By D. S. Cairns. Price 6d. net. London: Student Christian Movement.