

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, 1923

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The Revision Issues. ONE of the drawbacks to a quarterly publication is that in some instances its notes and comments on certain events are apt to appear out-of-date. We fear that this will seem so in regard to the observations we feel bound to make upon the recent discussions in the representative councils of the Church on Prayer Book Revision. But there is really no help for it; the question is far too important to be passed over. Moreover, those discussions were but the prelude to others of a still more important character to take place in November next; and if we are intelligently to appreciate the full significance of the coming debates, we must have a clear grasp of what has preceded them. We venture once again to emphasize what we have so frequently referred to in these pages, viz. the momentous issues which are involved in the proposals for Revision. The greatest of these issues—the one, indeed, which overshadows all others—is whether the Church of England is to retain its present Protestant and Reformed character or whether, in concession to clamour, room is to be found in the Church of England for the teaching of doctrines and the use of practices which were quite deliberately abandoned at the Reformation. The revival of mediævalism, by whatever name it may be called or under whatever pretence it may be urged, means, in practice and effect, the undoing of the work of the Reformation, and when once iconoclastic hands are laid upon that Settlement it is not difficult to see that—unless the attack is promptly stayed—it will be the beginning of the end of the Church of England as a Protestant and Reformed Church. We are convinced that the English people as a whole have not the least desire for a resuscitation of mediævalism and that they will not allow the de-Protestantizing of the English Church.

But if the danger—at present so very urgent and
 so very real—is to be averted it will require the efforts
 and prayers of a compact and united body of loyal
 Churchpeople and in particular of those who hold firmly to the
 Protestant and Evangelical interpretation of the present standards
 of the Church of England. If ever there was a time when Evan-
 gelicals should hold together and pull together it is now, for only
 so can the traditional position of the Church of England be pre-
 served. And yet, obvious as this truth seems to be, there are,
 strange to say, some amongst us who seem to be uncertain of their
 own position, and still more uncertain of the extent to which it
 may be possible for them to yield to the claims put forward by
 those who make no secret of the fact that they desire to go behind
 the Reformation. The proposed changes—so it is speciously
 argued—do not affect the whole Church; they will be forced upon
 no one; they will be included in an alternative book; and will
 only affect those who desire to use that book. How then, it is
 asked, can you be so intolerant and uncharitable as to deny to
 those who wish it a form of service different from that which obtains
 to-day? The answer to such a question is as clear as it is simple.
 The changes proposed in the alternative book indicate a change
 in the doctrinal position of the Church; and if they are adopted
 will give legal sanction to doctrines and practices which are at
 present illegal in the Church of England. It is perfectly true, of
 course, that those strange doctrines and still stranger practices
 are taught and used in a large number of churches to-day, but
 they have no legal status; they have crept in little by little, and
 our episcopal rulers who ought to be the very first to drive away
 strange doctrines, have not rebuked those responsible, with the
 result that members of the Anglo-Catholic party to-day boldly
 claim that they are the true interpreters of the doctrine of the
 Church of England! But their distinctive doctrines and prac-
 tices have no rightful place in the Church of England; and it is
 because of this fact that proposals are made for changes in the
 conduct of Divine Service which will have the effect of giving the
 Anglo-Catholic movement a legalized place in the Church of Eng-
 land. That is the real issue at stake, and not for three hundred
 years or more has the Church had to face a more momentous crisis.
 It is clear, then, that much—very much—depends upon the results

of the debates in the several Houses of the Church Assembly in November next, and it is in no formal or conventional sense that we commend this matter to the earnest prayers of our readers. The Evangelical and Protestant members of those bodies have a very arduous and a very difficult task to perform, and that they may be able to do their duty faithfully and fearlessly they should be upheld by the prayers of the faithful that strength, wisdom and grace may be vouchsafed to them from above.

Let us now review the position and see where we stand. As far as is known the House of Bishops has done no more at present than give "general approval" to N.A. 84, i.e. the Measure embodying the detailed proposals of the Church Assembly's Committee for the Alternative Book. The Bishops, it is assumed, will not begin their work of revision until they have before them the results of the revision of the Measure by the House of Clergy and the House of Laity respectively. In July last these Houses, sitting separately, devoted a week to the work of revision. The House of Clergy did not get very far; the House of Laity made much more rapid progress; but in neither House has the Service of Holy Communion yet come up for consideration, and it is in and around that Service, of course, that the real issue centres. Hence the importance of the forthcoming discussions. It is neither possible nor desirable to review in detail the July discussions, but a few points may be noted. First it should be observed that in both Houses determined attempts were made to secure recognition for "the Green Book," that is to say the volume that contains the scheme of revision proposed by the English Church Union as representing the Anglo-Catholic party; and for "the Grey Book" prepared by an anonymous Committee of clergy of various schools of thought, with a commendatory Foreword by the Bishop of Manchester—a less objectionable volume than the E.C.U. production, but very far from acceptable, in some at least of its doctrinal statements, to Evangelical Churchpeople. But in the main the attempt failed. In the House of Clergy and in the House of Laity motions stood upon the Agenda paper proposing in effect that "the Green Book" should form a Second Schedule of the Measure—in other words that it should become a second Alternative Book. But in both

cases the motion was ruled out of order, although in the House of Laity Lord Parmour did eventually allow a discussion on the question. But the House was decisively against the plan and promptly rejected it. This welcome decision was brought about by hostility to the proposals themselves quite as much as, if not even more than, by opposition to the idea of a Second Alternative Book, which undoubtedly was very strong. No such proposition as the adoption *en bloc* of "the Grey Book" was made, but in the House of Laity more than one attempt was made to incorporate by way of amendment some of its proposals into the new book, only, however, to be very substantially defeated. Further efforts will undoubtedly be made in the same direction when the Communion Office is reached, and the position will have to be watched with the greatest care, for, in the House of Clergy at any rate, "the Grey Book" has many friends. In like manner, when the time comes, the Anglo-Catholics in both Houses will bring forward the proposals of "the Green Book" as amendments to the official scheme. We have not much fear about the result of these movements in the House of Laity, where the determination to uphold the Reformation Settlement is fairly strong; but we feel less confident about the House of Clergy.

The House of Clergy consists of the Lower Houses of the two Convocations—bodies which for many long years past have been notorious for *finesse* in discussion, and it was not to be expected, therefore, that its progress would be very rapid. But we must acknowledge with becoming gratitude that the House by a vote of 106 to 71 passed the clause to be inserted at the end of the Preface "Concerning the Service of the Church," giving the laity the right to be consulted by the Minister before he makes any drastic change in the services. This is a distinct gain. Less satisfactory was the result of the proposal to divide the Measure into two parts, so that the Communion Office could be dealt with separately. It was brought forward by Canon Grose Hodge and supported by other Evangelical leaders. But the House took the not very heroic course of passing, by 156 to 70, to the next business. Much time was spent over Morning and Evening Prayer, and "the Grey book" party succeeded in carrying some small amendments. The House approved in principle an Order of

“Prime,” and added a new rubric about the Athanasian Creed. Up till the Wednesday evening, the discussions, it must be confessed, were fearfully dull, but on Thursday interest was quickened by Canon Grose Hodge’s proposal to add a new sub-section to the Order of Evening Prayer, that “when the Holy Communion is immediately to follow it shall be permissible for the Minister to end Evening Prayer with the Canticles after the Second Lesson,” etc. This proposal raised as a definite issue the question of Evening Communion and there was quite a flutter among Anglo-Catholic members. Dr. Frere, however, supported the proposal, saying that, while he hesitated to use the word approve in connection with Evening Communion, he asked them to give it rubrical sanction. But others of his School were less conciliatory, and in the end all that the House could be persuaded to do was to adopt words which said that where “another service” provided in the book follows “it shall be permissible,” etc. The House of Laity, as we shall see, did much better, but then members of that House are in immeasurably closer touch with modern needs and the realities of life than are those of the House of Clergy. A motion to delete a Prayer for the Dead contained in the Schedule was lost, after the Prolocutor had made a powerful plea for its retention. The Calendar seemed gravely to bother the House and in the end it was postponed. The House afterwards adjourned, having very little to show for its five days’ deliberations. The absence of the Dean of Canterbury, in consequence of a serious accident, was very deeply regretted, and the House passed a resolution of sympathy with him. We are glad to know that the Dean has now recovered and hopes to be able to take part in the debates in November next—a hope in which every friend of Evangelical truth will join most earnestly.

The House of Laity also gave five days to the Revision stage of the Measure, and handled it so effectively that, except for one or two questions which were specially deferred and the Holy Communion Office, it practically finished its work. “The Green book” was the subject of two interesting debates, but in the end the House rejected it by 150 to 74. During the discussions it was made clear by Lord Phillimore and other representatives of the Anglo-Catholic School that if they were granted “the Green book” as an alternative, practically all,

except a few cranks, would come into line ; or, in other words, if they are allowed their own way they will be amenable, but if not—well, the alternative was not stated, but it appeared to be certain that the Anglo-Catholics will not accept N.A. 84 and a pretty position will be created. The House accepted the new sub-section relating to the lay voice in regard to changes in the services ; and agreed to an amendment which provided that instead of deleting verses, when a Psalm was found unsuitable, a suitable Psalm should be substituted. In regard to the Calendar, the House agreed to add the names of Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, Cosin, Butler, Andrewes, Henry Martyn, and others, but by the casting vote of the Chairman refused to add “ The Falling Asleep of the B.V.M.” The proposal to include “ The Commemoration of the Holy Sacrament on the Thursday after Trinity Sunday ” was also lost. The House by 109 to 77 gave recognition to Evening Communion by adopting the proposal that when the Order of Holy Communion follows Evening Prayer it shall be permissible for the Minister to end Evening Prayer with the Canticles after the Second Lesson, and it will be observed with satisfaction that the House of Laity dealt fairly and squarely with the question, whereas the House of Clergy was most ungenerous. These were great gains from the Evangelical point of view ; yet, strangely enough, on the following day, the House, by 104 to 60, accepted “ the Green book ” proposals for the use of “ the holy Chrism ” and other symbols at baptism, but this was practically the only occasion when the E.C.U. secured a triumph, and even then it was due to a generous, if mistaken, appeal from the Evangelical side. For the rest, whilst the discussions were animated, interesting and useful, they do not call for special notice, except to say that “ the Grey book ” Service for Holy Baptism, after a debate in which many of the leading laity showed that they were well instructed in doctrinal questions, was rejected by a large majority. The Burial Service in “ the Grey book ” was also rejected. Reviewing the proceedings as a whole, it must be said that for doctrinal soundness, and for the thoroughness of its grasp of the points at issue, the debates in the House of Laity were vastly superior to those in the House of Clergy, and it is this fact which inspires us with hope that when the Communion Service is under revision in November next the House of Laity may so uphold the existing Order that it will save the Church from the disaster which threatens it.

The increase in these "coloured books" is becoming somewhat confusing, but "the Orange book" does

not profess to contain a new scheme of revision, but sets out to co-ordinate the official proposals, "the Green book" proposals, and also those of "the Grey book." Viewed as a piece of literary work it is possible to admire the skill with which it is compiled, but viewed as a contribution to the solution of the Revision problem it is open to serious objection, for the reason that it has virtually combined "the Green book" and "the Grey book" services, with the result that what, from our point of view, are the faults of both, are sought to be perpetuated. Therein lies the danger: if "Green" and "Grey" join forces, as their proposals are joined in this book, it will be a sorry look out for the Church of England. In the face of this danger we are glad to know that several clergy, more especially in the North of England, are exploring the possibilities of championing, more fully than has yet been done, the cause of the Communion Service as it is in our present book. We believe that in Prayer-Book Revision the way of safety is to leave the Communion Service absolutely untouched; let "the Green book" and "the Grey book" both be scrapped; let the official proposals be withdrawn, and let all loyal Churchmen unite in support of our present Communion Service, without alteration or addition or any such thing.

**Assembly
Activities.**

Although the Church Assembly meets only three times a year, its activities, by means of its Committees, are continuous all the year through. At the last session two very important Committees were appointed whose reports may have very important effects upon the future of the Church of England. The appointment of committees to consider the Reform of Church Courts is a very sharp reminder of the appalling condition of indiscipline into which the Church of England has been allowed to drift. We do not desire to apportion the blame for this lamentable state of things; it is enough to note the fact. If the Courts of the Church are unsatisfactory either in their constitution or in their procedure, by all means let them be reformed in any matter where reform is shown to be needed. But it is important that too much attention should not be paid to the clamour of those who do not hesitate to declare that the only authority they

will recognize is the authority of the whole Catholic Church—whatever that may mean. Moreover, the rights of the laity must be faithfully conserved, and, above all, the right of final appeal to the King in Council must be adequately safeguarded. The other Committee appointed by the Assembly is to consider the appointment of Bishops. The present method of appointment may be open to objection on theoretical grounds, but in practice it works well, and certain it is that no other system has yet been devised which would work out better. The reforming zeal of some of the younger politicians who figure largely in the Assembly needs to be tempered with the wisdom and discretion of men of riper experience ; it is really necessary that the Church should be on its guard against the hustling methods of young men in a hurry, or grave disaster may overtake us. Evangelicals have little to gain from some of the “ reforms ” which are being so persistently pressed.

Losses. It is not our rule in these pages to refer to personal questions, but we cannot refrain from placing our garland of affectionate regret upon the respective tombs of the two good and great men who have lately been taken from us. Dr. Watts-Ditchfield, first Bishop of Chelmsford, was a very remarkable man, with a wide outlook upon life both in the Church and in the State. He was, all his life through, a convinced and attached Evangelical Churchman, loyal-hearted, courageous, fearless and true, and although it was not always easy to appreciate the wisdom of some aspects of his episcopal policy, every one recognized that it was dictated by the one desire to promote the glory of God and the good of the Church. Those who knew him most intimately know well that he was a man of intense spirituality of mind and heart, and his death at the comparatively early age of sixty-one is a grievous loss to the Church, indeed a High Church Bishop of distinction remarked to a friend of the writer that there was no bishop on the bench who would be more greatly missed. Prebendary Webb-Peploe, honoured and beloved by Evangelicals everywhere, has also been called home at the age of eighty-five years, after a life of unstinted devotion to the service of God and man. His long ministry at St. Paul's, Onslow Square, will not soon be forgotten, and for the many years of work and advocacy he gave to the National Church League its members are profoundly grateful. “ God buries

His workmen and carries on His work." May He raise up many such loyal and faithful men as those whose loss we deplore, but for whose ministry we humbly and devoutly give thanks.

Many have desired to possess a clear, succinct and "Ministerial Commission," scholarly statement of the teaching of Holy Scripture and the Church of England on "Ministerial Commission." The material for such a statement is known to all who have followed the Reunion Movement, but we know of no handbook on the subject that gives accurately, comprehensively and in historical perspective the development of the doctrine of the ministry from the earliest times to the present day. For Churchmen the subject is one of primary importance. The barrier between them and orthodox Free Churchmen is built on the character ascribed to the "Commission of Christ" by the protagonists of the Anglo-Catholic movement. In Principal Lindsay's great work on the Reformation, he sees the essential difference between the Roman and the Reformed Churches in their opposing conceptions of the Ministry, and all Conferences on Reunion are brought sooner or later face to face with the conflict of ideals and the consequent disunion in Church life due to the persistence of the sacerdotal and pastoral conceptions of the Ministry of Grace. The Rev. C. Sydney Carter has just published through Messrs. Longmans a half-crown volume *Ministerial Commission* that will be equally valued by scholars and devout Christians for its lucid exposition of Holy Scripture and Primitive Church History on the development of the Ministry and the clear proofs it gives of the unhistoricity of Roman and Anglo-Catholic doctrine on the subject. Its review of the relations of our Church with the Non-Episcopal Churches after the Reformation is especially valuable. His evidence is logically arranged and its cumulative force is convincing. We know of no book that covers the ground with equal concentration on the main points at issue and the documents are quoted fairly—a great matter in a treatise on so controversial a subject. It is the work of an historical student who has given us in an excellent form precisely those facts we wish to know. In the past we had to glean them for ourselves from many sources. The new Bishop of Chelmsford warmly commends the book, and says that in his opinion the conclusions reached are "broadly speaking justified."

The sympathy of the whole nation has gone out to the people of Japan in the disaster which has overtaken them, and it needs no words of ours to commend to the generosity of our readers the Lord Mayor's Fund and every other effort being made to relieve the distress. Happily, the missionaries are safe, but the loss in property is considerable, and C.M.S. has opened a fund to meet the need. The Society had an interesting work in Tokyo, the following account of which is taken from the Annual Report (1921-2) :—

“Of the four Churches in Tokyo connected with the C.M.S., three made advance in 1921 with respect to self-support, while the fourth, St. Paul's Church, has for some years met all its expenses. St. Saviour's Church, at Fukagawa, a poor suburb of the city with a population of 100,000, resolved during the year to take no more money from the Mission; in this district a free dispensary brought relief to many sufferers and opened a number of homes to visits from the Bible women, and the baptisms were more numerous than in any previous year. Emmanuel Church, too, gave notice that it would require no further financial help; work among young people in its neighbourhood was specially encouraging, and several young men who attended a class for university students expressed their desire to embrace Christianity. Zion Church, which has a lay pastor, while unable entirely to meet his salary, increased its contributions materially. Seven young men were baptized who had been brought to a decision and taught at the Whidborne Hall, where during the last twenty-five years about 20,000 people have signified their wish to take Christ as their Saviour. Towards the end of the year there was some revival at Choshi, where the congregation has declined of late years. The Work among Chinese Students was interfered with by the unsettlement caused by the decision of the Chinese Government no longer to provide scholarships for students in Japan, as it had done for fourteen years. A church committee was formed, which, with the pastor, took full charge of the Church and its work, but it is still aided by money grants. The Rev. W. H. Elwin speaks of the year as having been marked by conviction of sin among the men, and mentions one student who was led to repentance by the life of his brother, a member of the church committee. The hostel for girl students was full, with sixteen inmates, but efforts to win them were rather disappointing.”

“CATHOLIC OR PROTESTANT?—THE CONFLICT OF IDEALS.”

BY THE REV. A. H. T. CLARKE, M.A., Rector of Devizes.

PROFESSOR BURY'S recent volumes on *The Later Roman Empire* cover that fatal epoch, the fifth century after Christ, when all the leading nations of modern Europe were born. For it was the German invasions, not the Roman Empire, that made Europe; it was the Gothic tribes, not the Latin race; it was the barbarian chieftains, not the Western emperors. It was the codified customs of the new conquerors that partly assimilated and gradually transformed the old Roman law. Roman law, indeed, provided the framework of the legislation codified by Theodosius and Justinian. But it was Gothic local custom growing up alongside that gave that legislation new life. By this means the great change from Cæsar's Rome to medieval Rome was masked. The forms alone remained. The spirit was new. The old Roman Empire in its old titles and prescriptive privileges survived its downfall under the new name of the Holy Roman Empire.

The old Roman Empire may be said to have closed with the coming of Constantine, when the Capital was shifted to Constantinople, when the barbarians of Germany were officially admitted into the army and given posts of command, and when the Church was imperialized and became a factor in Constantine's policy of ruling the West from the East. This transfer of the Capital (while it saved the Eastern empire from the barbarian invasions) gave the bishops of the West an undue importance, and as early as A.D. 343, played into the hands of the Popes. The bishops became *defensores civitatis*, and the Popes by an inevitable evolution became heirs of the great Cæsarian tradition. The division of the empire into East and West inevitably divided the theology of the Churches into eastern and western. It invited dual control. "Secular" power became gradually severed from "spiritual." And while the Emperors till 1204 buttressed the tottering power of the Cæsars in the East, the West became the prey of the papacy. This divided hegemony of State *v.* Church and Emperor *v.* Pope lasted till the Reformation. And the Reformation was a return,

both in politics and religion, to the Church before Constantine. Let us examine for a moment the nature of that early Church.

I

The ante-Nicene Church was based on a democratic principle. It was a loose confederation of churches. There was unity of a kind but no pretence to uniformity. There was episcopacy of one kind in Asia, which began with Ignatius (A.D. 110), and of a more monarchical kind at Rome which begins historically in the collision between Hippolytus and Pope Calixtus and between Irenæus and Pope Victor. There is episcopacy of a more republican kind in Egypt, where (in some cases at least), the Bishop is co-opted by his presbyters. Not till A.D. 314—the date of the Council of Arles—does episcopacy become universal throughout the Church of the Empire.¹ We have now reached the times of Constantine.

As we look back we see that the Church of the first three centuries (to which Protestantism appeals) was fundamentally democratic, largely adapting itself to the forms of civic life. One has only to read the Ordination rites of the *Διδαχὴ* (first century) or Sarapion's Prayer Book (fourth century), to see how Protestant that Church was. The modern theory of Apostolic Succession was then unknown.² The phrase was there, but it had a different application. Tertullian uses it to vindicate against the perversions of the Gnostics the true interpretation of Scripture. Irenæus uses it to safeguard the original apostolic doctrine. Clement first speaks of it as a *διαδοχή*, by which faithful men were publicly authorized to carry on the Apostle's work. With Cyprian it safeguards the orderliness of ecclesiastical usage against schismatic perversion. Even after Constantine's time, Augustine (in spite of one rhetorical flourish to the seeming contrary) uses it to justify the visible Church in its conflict with the sectarianism of Donatists, of Pelagians, and of Manicheans. The idea of a transmission of grace to a privileged order, which is thereby empowered to act as God's priestly caste, is foreign to his mind. It is the same with the Eucharist. The nature of the elements—so Chrysostom, Facundus, Theodoret, even Pope Gelasius, expressly assert—do not change their properties. What constitutes the change (*μεταβολή, μεταρρυθμός*) is the light in which after sanctification they are regarded. The common

¹ Dr. J. Wordsworth, *Ministry of Grace*, p. 139.

² Dr. Headlam's *Reunion* (Bampton Lectures). Preface to second edition.

bread is to the recipient no longer "common" but a "figure" and "likeness" (*figura* is the language of the Latins even at the time of the primitive Roman mass, *ὁμολογια* is the corresponding phrase of the Greeks from the time of Sarapion) of the Body and Blood of Christ Who once lived among us. By metonymy the elements are called by the names of those things for which they stand. They do not in themselves (as Hooker says) convey grace, but mystically or symbolically they become the outward occasions of conferring the grace which they signify. Those who do not so understand the language of the Fathers misunderstand it. Waterland has, by his illustrations from the investiture of magistrates and the rites of granting bequests or public charters, admirably summarized their meaning. All, says Augustine, are partakers of the sacraments of His grace who may not all be partakers of the grace of His sacraments. St. Jerome has declared himself in the same vein when he speaks of Christians who have been baptized indeed with water, but not with the Spirit Whom the water represents. Any layman whatever (*πᾶς ἰδιωτῆς τις*), adds the too rhetorical Chrysostom, may celebrate the Communion as well as a St. Peter or a St. Paul. This is not the language of Catholicism as we now understand it, that is, of imperial orthodoxy. It is the language of that freer Church, which used few creeds in her public worship, till she was "commandeered" for reasons of *haute politique* by the administrative genius of the Emperor Constantine.

II

Constantine brought in a new factor—politics. He imperialized the Church. Cæsar was to become the head of the new Church as well as of the old State. This meant that the Church was to be no longer democratic, but a factor of Empire, as it had been in old days when the Roman religion was heathen. There was nothing new in all this. Rome, even when republican, had in it from the first the tendency to autocracy. Early Rome had been governed by kings. The Senate, which was the only permanent legislative body in the State, was early likened to, "an assembly of kings." The long conflict with Hannibal called for a sole dictator as head of the army. The collisions in the city between the reactionary and progressive forces brought to light political dictators, whose chief instrument was the army—Marius and Sulla, Pompey and

Cæsar. All republicanism leads indirectly to the tyranny of the single man. It did so in the unique instances of Cæsar, Cromwell, Napoleon. It did so in the case of all the Roman emperors from Augustus to Constantine. The country-side was deserted for the more artificial life of the town (*municipium*). The mob was amused with free games and placated with free doles of food. The army became a body of hired mercenaries. Marriage ceased to be regarded as a religious rite (*confarreatio*). Divorce became rampant. Big farms swallowed up the little farms (*latifundia*). The middle-classes bore the chief incidence of the imperial taxation. Suicide and infanticide had become common. Slavery was the basis of that pyramid of Society which gradually mounted to its apex in the emperor, who held absolutely in his hands the rights of his subjects, even in matters of peace or war, of life and death.

The emperor was also the incarnate genius of the Roman religion, their *praesens divus* or State Providence. And that religion was little more than a State almanac for official notification of holidays and holy days (*dies fasti et nefasti*), a contract (*religio*) binding them to certain observances punctiliously required to feed the watchful vanity of their home-gods.

In Constantine's day the Roman religion, like all other religions, was breaking up. The Emperor left Rome for Constantinople. And the Popes of Rome succeeded to the Latin inheritance. The Pope became the *pontifex maximus*. With very little variation the religion of old Rome—with its Vestal virgins and the Mother of gods and men and the sacerdotal office, even to the "liquefying" miracle at Naples¹—was carried bodily over into the religion of the Popes. Paganism represented not truth but order, not life but antiquity, not liberty but tradition. It was not the worship of God but of political expediency. *Nullum numen abest si sit Prudentia*. And that was the religion of the Popes of the Middle Ages. It was the relic of Roman imperialism, the last bequest of Julius Cæsar who, though an avowed sceptic, was *Pontifex Maximus* in his day. The Pope is still, like the Cæsars of the West, a temporal sovereign claiming more than Cæsar ever claimed, namely, the spiritual and territorial submission of the world!

¹ Horace, S. I. V. 99. Cp. Warde Fowler's *Religious Experience of the Roman People*.

III

The downfall of Rome brought about the rule of the barbarians. It was a blessing in disguise. It brought new conceptions of religion and of politics. The Romans had no sense of individuality, except as members of a corporation. The Goths had an overweening sense of personal freedom, of family life, of individual responsibility. The Roman in marrying a woman married her whole family. The *patria-potestas* placed in the hands of the father absolute power over all the members of the family. On this strange principle the modern Roman Catholic notions of the sacredness of the family and marriage-tie are based. The Goths were more chivalrous. They believed in the soul. They were strict monogamists. They were free men who hated the invasion of family life by State interference. They believed in private property, in selecting as well as electing their kings, in equal rights between man and man. This was the origin of feudalism—a crude arrangement which never worked really well, but it insured chivalry by its securing tenure of land on the rendering of military service. It only required the frame-work of the old Roman law and the teaching of the newly organized Christian Church to tame and tune this barbaric freedom into the gentlemanly instincts of modern Europe.

And this was done by the clergy of the Imperial Church. Her missionaries swarmed over Europe; Boniface went to Germany, St. Martin to France, Augustine to England. The Goths had all been Arians since the fourth century. Under their Romanized kings, especially Clovis of the Franks and Charlemagne of Germany, they all became (nominally) orthodox. Bishops became their chief political advisers. They codified their laws. Thus Alaric's laws were known as the *breviarium Aniani*—the digest of Anianus, bishop of Orleans. The clergy codified the national laws of the Visigoths of Spain. They became also a spiritual nobility. As survivors from old days they carried on the manners and the dress and the language of the old Roman nobles. The imperial description of them was *defensores civitatis*. This included all the duties of educated men in a new country, from the surveying of roads and the building of bridges and the collecting of tithe or toll to the education of the barbarian races in the elements of learning and piety.

Thus the new Gothic races grew up under the nurture of their

old foster-mother, the Church. She represented the static, they the dynamic, force in the new state. Side by side with the old inflexible Roman Law grew up, with all their many local variations, the customs of the barbarians; till first Theodosius, and then Justinian had to codify afresh the whole Roman law transformed in spirit by adaptation to the new requirements. Gradually suicide, infanticide, crucifixion, the gladiatorial games were banished and Sunday observed as the Lord's day. Slowly, by appeals to the mother-city and *Church* of Rome, the barbarians learnt how to govern for themselves. It was this independent Gothic spirit which in time grew to maturity. It made its own laws and, in defiance of popes and emperors, asserted its national rights. It empowered its kings and parliaments to fight the Papacy.' By the sixteenth century it had grown up. In Luther it found a spokesman. He appealed from the Pope to the Councils of Constance and Basle. He appealed to Augustine and to the earlier Church before Constantine. He appealed to the Mass as it was before Gregory the Great had Romanized it and before Charlemagne had Byzantinised it.¹ He appealed to the Bible of Jerome and Ulphilas and Chrysostom, when it was translated into the mother-tongue of every nation. This appeal created the crisis of the Reformation—a political as well as a religious crisis. National kings were now once more to take the place of the universal Emperor and national Prayer Books and universities the place of the autocratic Pope. The Reformation was with Luther as with Augustine—situated as they were in a precisely similar crisis—a trumpet-call of the Church reformed to the Church unreformed, an appeal from the collective witness of tradition to the witness of the individual soul. And the appeal was heard. It is Harnack who says that Augustine and Luther are the two axes round which revolve, as round two poles of opposite but complementary thought, the theological system of Christendom. Constantine and Elizabeth are the true founders of the Catholic-Protestant Church.

To-day that crisis seems about to be repeated. The papacy was an international force asking, like Cæsarism, for sole domination. The national Churches are once more on the eve of a conflict

¹ The Roman Mass seems to have been primitive and Protestant in the fifth century, gorgeous and imperial in the ninth century, Papal and eccentric from all other rites and uses by the thirteenth century (Edmund Bishop, *Paper on the Genius of the Roman rite*, 1899, republished by Provost Staley).

with the central power. The papacy is an imperial force and therefore collectivist in theory, static in principle. The Gothic Churches are fundamentally national and therefore in theory individualist, in principle dynamic. There can be no truce, no compromise between these two conflicting ideals. With the papacy centralization is its one aim. Tradition, authority, order are its watchwords. With the nations of Europe toleration is their aim and liberty, equality, unity (without uniformity) their watchwords.

We can trace these "notes" in the successive revisions of the English Prayer Book, which partakes of Roman order diluted by Gothic liberty. The Prayer Book is fundamentally Catholic, but at the same time vigorously Protestant. Order cannot be separated from life. The international principle must be fitted to the national, if it is to be typically English. We see all this in the very first Prayer Book of 1549. It is for the first time in English. For the first time the Latin term for the Holy Communion, the Mass, occurs only once in a subordinate position in the title. Adoration of the elements, as Bishop Tunstal complained, "is not there." To the fact that 1549 was not a final version but a half-way house to 1552, a hundred contemporaneous facts bear witness. The 1549 Service Book was Catholic in sound but patient of a Protestant interpretation. We can easily test this. The very year it was issued Ridley champions it in public, and Bucer in private; while next year Cranmer expressly refutes Bishop Gardiner's "plain untruth" in finding in it a local Presence. The elements are "not absolutely," but only *to us* who receive them (explains Cranmer), the Body and Blood of Christ. The same year follows an official reprint of Tyndale's New Testament with its provokingly Calvinistic foot-notes; while all over England, by order of the Council or the Bishops, altars, vestments, roods, stoups, rosaries and similar "ornaments" are destroyed. These facts, as Cardinal Gasquet and Mr. W. P. M. Kennedy on the Roman side, and as Mr. Dimock on the Protestant side, truly assert, mark the official interpretation of the 1549 Book.

Yet to this unrevised Prayer Book the Catholic party to-day, *under the name of Revision*, propose to return! And from the Cranmer of 1552 to the Cranmer of 1549—notwithstanding his Book against Gardiner published the next year—they now propose to appeal as the champion of their peculiar doctrines! To

what strangely perverted methods is the new Catholic party now driven, if it so little believes in the ultimate triumph of "that force not ourselves making for righteousness" that, reversing the ordinary processes of reason, it actually proposes to appeal from Philip sober to Philip drunk, from the Church better informed to the Church ill-informed, from Cranmer's finished sketch to his first rough draft! *Solvuntur risu tabulae.*

The situation is a grave one and the conflict of ideals involved cannot much longer be postponed. Dr. Wordsworth in his *Ordination Problems* proved that for a thousand years after Christ till the days of Hildebrand ordinations were of the most irregular kind. Dr. Headlam has since proved that till Augustine's and Chrysostom's day—that is, till the downfall of the Roman civilization—there was no Apostolic Succession in the sense now held by the Tractarians. Ranke has shown that from the earliest beginnings of the Church Protestantism and Catholicism have run in double harness. Harnack has shown that in the first four centuries the Bible and the Bible only was the final arbiter and standard of the teaching authority of the Church. If this be so then the Reformation was, as it professed to be, a republication of the original Christianity as preached by the Apostles and a return to the true Catholic theology as compounded by the Fathers. It was to these first four centuries (including the great names of Augustine and Chrysostom) that the English Church at the Reformation made specific appeal. The Anglo-Roman-Catholic party of to-day shifts the ground of that appeal to include the next two centuries, when the Roman civilization was tottering and the Barbarians were triumphant—a time when the Church of the West took advantage of the general ignorance to assume the prerogatives of the State and to trample on the rights of independent Churches and of national kings. St. Peter and St. Paul teach that Church and State are both in equal degree divine agencies for asserting God's Sovereignty over the conscience of man. Medieval Christianity put asunder that which God had joined together. The Reformation restored the harmony. In the Anglo-Catholic programme (with its appeals to the Pope) original Christianity is once more in jeopardy.

THE OBSCURANTIST.

By THE REV. W. S. HOOTON, B.D.

THE common usage of this term, and of its kindred word "obscurantism," is very familiar. Here is an example taken almost at random—a Church paper quotes a modernist journal as expressing its anticipation of "a hard struggle against the forces of obscurantism and reaction."

Such rash utterances always assume that it is "the other fellow" who is darkening counsel and fighting against intellectual light. It is worth while examining the grounds for the supposition, from more than one point of view. But first let us define our terms.

The monumental *New English Dictionary*, associated with the name of the late Sir James Murray as chief editor, warrants the possibility of other applications. The idea usually conveyed by the group of words is undoubtedly to define opposition to enlightenment and inquiry. This raises, of course, the very fundamental question, What is light and truth? We shall have occasion to return to it. But, altogether apart, the very form of these words is suggestive. The first part of this great Dictionary's definition of "obscurantism" is "the practice or principles of an obscurant." And "obscurant" is defined as "one who obscures," with the added words "one who strives to prevent inquiry, enlightenment or reform." Plainly, the radical idea is obscuration, at any rate. Similarly, the adjectival meaning of this less common variation "obscurant" is applied to anything "that obscures or darkens"; and a significant example for our purpose is quoted from Grosart—"Recondite and obscurant speculation."

It appears, therefore, that we are within our rights in insisting that some attention ought to be paid to the origin of terms like these. It is true that what practically matters, and what must above all things be borne in mind by writers and speakers who do not set out to mislead, is the current and understood meaning of what they say. But when the accusation "obscurantist" is flung, it is obviously intended to convey this very idea that the opponent *does* obscure. We are therefore justified in inquiring whether the accuser himself "obscures" either fact or reason. If so, he is

himself a true obscurantist ; and possibly his beam is much greater than his brother's mote.

i. To this we turn our first attention. And the most practical method will be to give certain common examples from current language and thought. These illustrations may be numbered for clearness.

(i) It is sometimes said that we make claims for the Bible which it never makes on its own behalf. The underlying idea, presumably, is that the Bible itself gives no ground for ascribing to it that inerrancy which so many believers have in fact ascribed to it.

But what do these objectors want ? When a book plentifully besprinkles its pages with phrases like " Thus saith the Lord," it would surely be blasphemous to expect that in contexts of that kind it will pause to assure us that what the Lord says can be exactly relied upon. Or when it repeatedly states, " The Lord spake unto Moses, saying . . ." are we to suppose that the commands represented as the Lord's are not intended to be relied upon as His actual commands to Moses ? In this particular matter, of course, modern criticism raises other fundamental questions : but we are not dealing directly with those on the present occasion. We are just now speaking of what the Bible claims for itself ; and it is the sheerest obscurantism to pretend that phrases of that kind do not involve a clear demand that its statements in those contexts shall be taken as absolutely reliable.

There are other contexts which are not definitely covered by such positive pronouncements. But the prevailing tone of the sacred writings is in the same direction. And our Lord and the Apostles make no distinctions. To them there was but one way of referring to Bible statements. It was all " the Scripture " ; and what the Scripture said was to them the end of controversy. And so it was to their opponents. From the Bible records (which are all that we are just now considering) we should judge that nobody dreamed of suggesting that any part of Scripture was anything but a final and utterly reliable court of appeal, even in matters of detail whose minuteness quite takes away the breath of the modernist thinker. On one occasion, moreover, our Lord Himself definitely said—quite as an aside (and even in human affairs casual references are among the most striking as evidence)—" and the Scripture cannot be broken." Have we grasped the full bearing of that

utterly incidental reference on His lips? Judging from the manner of it, we should certainly conclude that such a reminder might as well have been given with reference to any other passage whatsoever. On another occasion He insisted on fulfilment to the veriest jot and tittle—as it were to “the dot of an *i* or the stroke of a *t*.” When we come to the quotation of Scripture by Apostles and Evangelists, it is mere childishness to pretend that they do not assume inerrancy in passages they quote; and once again I would emphasize that sometimes it is inerrancy down to the veriest details that startle and astound (or, more probably, are coolly repudiated by) the sceptical tendencies of modern thought. And can it seriously be supposed that other passages, not actually quoted by them, would have been treated, if occasion had arisen for their quotation, as on a lower level of authority? Once again “the Holy Ghost saith” is as natural an expression on the pages of the New Testament as is “the Scripture saith.” Both mean exactly the same thing—which is also the thing directly conveyed by that striking expression *διὰ τοῦ προφήτου* (“through the prophet”). The prophet is the mouthpiece of God—there can be no other interpretation of it. And the phrase “the Holy Ghost saith” is itself a claim to inerrancy.

The Bible of our Lord and His Apostles was to all intents and purposes our Old Testament, the whole of which is endorsed by testimony of this uniform character. From such testimony it seems to follow that even when it is not expressly stated, the fact is still the same, “Thus saith the Lord”; and that therefore, as in the cases where some such phrase is definitely employed, it is unreasonable to say we must have explicit assurances of accuracy, or to pretend that inerrancy is not to be assumed, merely because it is not expressed in a definite formula. And what shall be said of the New Testament? It is impossible to use one line of proof which was so convincing in the case of the Old, because New Testament writers were not followed by others who could testify to their writings with the authority possessed by inspired Apostles and by their Lord Himself. But, in any case, the authoritative tone of New Testament writers is in harmony with what we have seen of the tone of the Old. This is illuminating, especially in connexion with the promises of John xiv. 26; xvi. 13. Men who could, almost incidentally and quite as a matter of unchallengeable fact, use such

a phrase as "it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us"—or could employ the tremendous language of Revelation xxii. 18, 19 (or rather, as it seems, could authoritatively pass on such language as the very utterance of the ascended Lord Himself)—men like these leave no really open mind in doubt of their claims. I desire to avoid the least suspicion of exaggeration. I believe that the evidence, reviewed as a whole by a candid mind, justifies a stronger conclusion than I am going to state, when we fairly face the intrinsic characteristics of the whole Bible, and the tremendous implications of the testimony and the whole attitude and bearing of our infallible Lord and His inspired Apostles towards the Old Testament Scriptures. We are dealing now with the suggestion (as we take it) that the Bible contains nothing to warrant any belief that it claims inerrancy. This, at the very least, has surely been shown to be mere obscurantism—and obscurantism, indeed, of the very worst type. To contend that the Bible in no way suggests that its statements are altogether to be relied upon as the Word of God, would certainly be to be guilty of obscuring its most notable feature. And if this is not what is contended by those to whom we refer, it is certain they "obscure" their own meaning. The surest way of avoiding obscurantism is candid examination of the evidence, by methods of the most enlightened inquiry (the definitions quoted at the outset will substantiate this). At any rate it would be unreasonable to demand, as a necessary condition, statements of inerrancy in set terms from a Book whose whole tone and manner may justly be taken to suggest inerrancy; and if no such demands for explicit statements are intended, the proof is of course by so much the more overwhelming, and the conviction of sheer obscurantism all the more crushing in its force.

(ii) Rather akin to what has already been discussed is the suggestion that the inerrancy of Scripture has not been held in other ages of the Church's history, and that it was only definitely formulated at a comparatively late period. But here a different line must be taken in reply.

And first let us clear the ground. We are not discussing the views of Scripture which were held at different times or by different people, but obscurantism in any arguments drawn from those views. During recent discussions, evidence has been produced that well-known leaders in the history of the Church by no means

bound themselves to the inerrancy of Scripture. The subject is difficult, because it is admitted that the statements of such earlier writers and leaders in the Church are often inconsistent, the same writer using at one time words which seem entirely to contradict what he said at another : also because it is not possible to assert that they always used words precisely in the sense which has become attached to them in modern controversy. We need not stay to illustrate these points now. Let it be admitted that statements can be produced suggesting that their authors were far from holding that Scripture is inerrant in detail, however infallible any such may have held it to be in principle.

Where, then, does the obscurantism come in? Not in the production of such statements ; for such production is perfectly fair, and is not to be objected to on the ground that their authors contradicted themselves in other places—which would appear to cast a reflection upon them for confusion of ideas rather than upon those who quote them now ! Yet there is a certain amount of obscurantism even here. It lies in the *obscured sense of proportion*, with reference either to the questions at issue respectively now and in earlier days, or to the main attitude adopted towards Scripture.

Take a concrete example of the former sort of mistake. No illustration is more frequently quoted than that of Luther and St. James. Now it must be remembered—without the least desire to defend Luther's audacious remarks—that he did at any rate resist the canonicity of that Epistle : and a genuine doubt about canonicity is a very different thing from destructive criticism of an indubitably canonical book—such as, for example, the deplorable and open rejection of St. Paul's argument from the Fall. Luther, it appears, had strange ideas on some other parts of Scripture as well ; and it is altogether disastrous that he gave so dangerous a handle to modern critics, which they are not slow to use against him—and against us ! Here let us say boldly that if anything else can be quoted from Luther or from any other writer of any age, which reflects upon the absolute trustworthiness of Scripture, it will make not an atom of difference to the view of those who place all their credence upon what we regard as the indubitable testimony of our Lord and His Apostles. Happily we are not tied to the opinion of Luther or of Origen or of anybody else ; but we are

·tied to the plainly-expressed utterances of Incarnate Truth, and to the Spirit-prompted teaching of His chosen and endowed Apostles and Evangelists. What does it matter what anyone else thought or said about such a subject ?

But, with our main point of *obscurantism* in view, it may be sufficient merely to ask this question : what would the early Fathers have said, and what would the Reformation Fathers have said, to the kind of thing so painfully familiar in our own generation—to denial of the historicity of the Creation of Adam and Eve, and of the reality of the Fall ; to rejection of the narratives which tell the true facts about the Incarnation ; to a theory of the Old Testament involving falsification and direct reversal of facts by its writers ; to disparagement of the authority of the glorious Gospel of St. John, the citadel of our Lord's full Deity ; to refusal to credit plain testimony of our Lord Himself with reference, e.g. to His Return ? It is at any rate legitimate to challenge the production of anything from the early or Reformation Fathers which is comparable to what can be read on such points as these from the pens of the great majority of Biblical writers to-day. And if such sayings cannot be produced, then it is at any rate obscuring *the sense of proportion* in these matters to quote ancient authorities as if they supported such modern ideas of Scripture as these. And while we deplore whatever handle they have given for such quotation, we decline altogether to set their authority over against that of our Lord and His Apostles.

In this connexion one inquiry seems pertinent : Why has there been so much desire to alter that awkward question in the service for the Ordination of Deacons ? We are told that statements of Reformers clearly prove that this question and answer only require acceptance of all Scripture as basis of faith ; and they are evidently supposed by many to allow the modern rejection of Pauline doctrine and even of our Lord's authority, or certain people could never remain in their official positions. Well, if the Reformers really intended them to cover such lapses, it seems to many of us very surprising that they should have used language which appears designedly framed to exclude these. But, apart from this, if it be genuinely believed that their language does cover them, what was good enough for those days is good enough for the modernist ! Is he really only anxious for tender consciences, or is there a bit

of obscurantism about his plea that he is quite justified already in holding the ideas he does?

But not all of those who thus quote the Reformers and others use their words as a basis for such advanced pleas. Indeed, some are no doubt actuated only by a spirit of historical inquiry. But possibly some even of these, and probably many of their readers, make use, though more moderate use of the facts than that already considered. And in such cases I venture to suggest that sufficient recognition is not given by them to a notoriously fundamental feature, at least in the ecclesiastical history of the Reformation period—the deep reverence for the Bible as the final court of appeal. This is certainly the most characteristic feature in the attitude of Reformation divines, as it is also in our own formularies. Some of those divines gave utterance to obviously inconsistent remarks in matters of detail, but the *attitude* even of these was quite different from that prevailing even among moderate critics to-day; e.g. Luther could state clearly his belief in the absolute inerrancy of Scripture. And our formularies at any rate do not betray the slightest inconsistency such as Luther showed! Surely it is somewhat “obscurant” to quote such detailed utterances by individual Reformers (and, by the way, how many of the Reformers were really guilty of them?) as if they covered the idea now prevailing that in matters of doubt the testimony of Scripture must give way before the conclusions of what is alleged to be the best available scholarship and science of our particular day! And this is (is it not?) the prevailing assumption even of those who would style themselves “moderate” critics. How different an *attitude* from that of the Reformation divines! Is not the *sense of proportion* again lacking? And, in particular, is it not sheer obscurantism to suggest that our *formularies* sanction current modes of thought?

We barely note here another possibility, viz. that if such questions as confront us had been raised at that time we might very probably have had much more detailed definitions, in those formularies, of the authority of Scripture. May it not also be “obscurant” to ignore this?

(iii) Another group of illustrations, though supremely important, and involving issues of the most vital character, can be more briefly dealt with. First, the allegation, often made in reply to appeals to our Lord's authority, that He laid aside His omniscience, or that

He limited it in some degree during His earthly Ministry. It is of the utmost importance to point out that this in no way touches the real issue. That issue is not—Was He omniscient when on earth? It is something even more far-reaching, viz.—Can we implicitly trust all He said? The extent of His omniscience in His earthly state (although it is great presumption to assign limitations to it, and as a matter of fact much of the evidence tells quite the other way) is a subject man could never fathom, in any case. Such speculations utterly carry us out of our depth. But His *infallibility*, as Teacher and Guide, is essential to our assurance! And to confuse omniscience with infallibility is unpardonable obscurantism. It obscures the issue by introducing an unfathomable subject which in reality touches a distinct matter. Yet nothing is more common!

It is possible even to derive strong confirmation of His infallibility from the one thing which we are sure, on His own authority, that He did not know. We have not the least idea whether His knowledge was in any other matter limited during His earthly sojourn; and, as we have seen, it is perilous presumption to assume it. But He tells us Himself that He did not know the day and hour of His Return. That fact, so often quoted as if it tended to uncertainty, in reality suggests strong assurance of His supreme trustworthiness. For it irresistibly suggests that if there were anything else He did not know, He certainly would (as in this case) have abstained from making any statement about it. As it has been said, He knew that He did not know. If there were any other such case, He would be equally conscious of it. And surely we repel with horror the thought that He would either have asserted anything, well knowing He had not the knowledge on which to base it, or have imagined He knew what He did not know, and made the least mistaken assertion on such a basis. Bishop Handley Moule pointed out, too, that He knew the angels did not know that fact, and showed how this itself indicates “the vastness of His supernatural knowledge,” and is “an implicit assertion of an immeasurable insight.” No: such a Speaker was not the one to submit to make mistakes of fact in *any* of His statements, or, as the Bishop put it elsewhere, “consented, as a Teacher, *not to know that He did not know.*”¹

¹ *To My Younger Brethren*, p. 58; *Prayers and Promises*, p. 150.

But this is, strictly speaking, a digression. The real point is that to introduce the question of omniscience as if it were identical with that of infallibility is to *obscure the issue*.

(iv) Now as to omniscience by itself. Dr. Gifford and others have conclusively proved that Philippians ii. gives no warrant for a theory of Kenôsis which involves the laying aside of Divine knowledge. The truth is, we have no warrant whatever, except that one clear statement of our Lord Himself, for saying that His knowledge during His Ministry was in any particular limited. And for that, there may well have been special reason. Possibly even, where there are so many tokens in our Lord's life of His altogether superhuman knowledge and insight, the express mention of such a case may suggest that it is of an altogether exceptional character.

The Rev. A. H. Finn brought out the questionable nature of these contentions about our Lord's laying aside of omniscience, when he replied to the Dean of Westminster's addresses in the Abbey at the end of 1920. Speaking of the Dean's contention that "our Divine Lord's true humanity was manifested in the renunciation of His Divine attributes upon earth," he said, "That is very questionable," and gave illustrations of several such attributes as manifested on earth. On the matter immediately before us he commented as follows: "As regards knowledge, He claimed to know, and according to the evangelists did know, the unspoken thoughts of the heart: He claimed to know and foretell the future even to the end of the world: His knowledge of a hidden present and past convinced Nathanael and the Samaritan woman, and was shown in His being aware of Lazarus' death."

Mr. Finn draws lessons from these facts quite in harmony with some of our earlier thoughts. "Yet we are asked to believe," he continues, "that He was ignorant of the truth about the Old Testament Scriptures, sharing in the erroneous belief of His generation." And, a little later, he says, "Even if it were true that the Divine Word on becoming flesh laid aside His Divine omniscience, it would still be difficult to believe that He could acquiesce in, still more that He could share in, actual error"; and pertinently asks: "If he possessed the gift of the Divine Spirit 'without measure,' had that Spirit also renounced His Divine attributes?" But the whole section is worth studying. See *The True Value of the Old Testament*, pp. 31, 32, published by the Bible League, price 6d.

Our chief point at present, however, is that in assuming our Lord thus to have laid aside His Divine omniscience, modern thinkers, so far from seeking full enlightenment by complete and minute inquiry, do not even face the chief part of the evidence. Nothing in Philippians ii. supports them; the narrative of His Ministry is largely against them, and the only real piece of evidence in their favour is a notable utterance by our Lord Himself which possibly bears marks of an exceptional significance, and itself indicates superhuman knowledge! To play tricks with evidence is one of the most glaring forms of obscurantism.

“We must take our Lord as He is represented in the Gospels,” once said a friend to the writer—apparently in apology for these vagaries of modern thought. By all means! But that is *precisely what they do not do*. They take Him to be a very different Christ from that. There, He is majestic, authoritative, wonder-working; supreme over all the forces of nature, the works of hell, the thoughts of men; building His whole Mission, and indeed His own personal spiritual life, upon Scriptures which are to Him as the voice of God. What likeness is there to that picture in the modernist's Christ? In this above all they are “*obscurants*,” for they *obscure the Christ*.

(v) A few words now on infallibility by itself, as we have dealt with omniscience by itself, and with the two in contradistinction. They deny His infallibility in three ways. Not only do they evade by one or more of the modern devices His plain and varied testimony to just those personages and incidents of Old Testament history which are special butts of modern criticism. Not only do they even reject His line of reasoning when it actually depends, as in the case of Psalm cx., upon a fact of that history, or of the literature connected with it, which they see fit to deny. They do something which is more far-reaching than either of these things, though it can scarcely be worse in itself, for He says Himself that He received a commandment, “what I *should say*, and what I *should speak*” (τί εἶπω καὶ τί λαλήσω—how all-inclusive!). Their “correction” of our Lord's alleged “nescience” relates not merely to details—or even to a series of details. It fundamentally affects His whole attitude and teaching. They tell us these are points which do not affect His Mission, or His Office as Teacher—they are merely literary and scientific questions. This argument can be disproved in detail;

as, for instance, by the case just quoted (directly bearing on His Deity), and by His very definite predictions as to His Second Coming, which are now utterly disbelieved by many. All such instances are an essential part of His teaching as to His Mission. But there is something even more destructive of their argument in this matter. If things are as they say, it is no mere question of a few details as to authorship and allegory and so forth; it is a question of our Lord's whole basis for His teaching. It affects His Mission even fundamentally. For if the critics are right, then He was mistaken not merely in details, but in His whole conception of the history of Israel and the composition and authority of their sacred Books. The argument would, in fact, undermine the basis on which He founded His teaching. By representing the matter as one of mere unimportant detail, they *obscure the real issue*. Once more they are convicted of obscurantism.

2. In conclusion, a different line of thought may be suggestive. We are accused of obscurantism because we are taken as opposed to free inquiry, which is presupposed to be the true road to enlightenment. Is this without exception the case? We have already shown cause why a little more completeness in inquiry, a more candid recognition of all the evidence, might lead those who criticize us to different conclusions; and such a line of study could be made yet more complete with fuller space (for there is no great eagerness to embrace the light which conservative scholars have shed on the dark places of modern criticism—here, too, they are “obscurants”!). But we now ask whether it is altogether an unchallengeable position to hold, that mere inquiry, free and unrestrained, is always the path to light.

In one of the Saturday religious articles in *The Times*, some time ago, these words were written, and they seem suggestive in such a connexion: “God in Christ, His love, His righteousness, His grace, His law, are revealed not as hypotheses to be questioned, or as a philosophy to be recommended to our thought, but as facts to be known.” It is true that the article dealt with an altogether different subject from ours, and that the writer was urging that by practical experience, knowledge and certainty could be attained—or something, I think, to that effect. But it is at any rate suggested that some subjects are more fitted for reverent experience as facts, however unfathomable to human understanding, than

for attainment by inquiry. And one scarcely associates these articles in *The Times* with blind obscurantism!

And is it not further true (we add this on our own behalf) that, in the great matters named, so far beyond the depth of human reason, inquiry must needs be speculative? Without revelation, in such a case thought flounders to darkness rather than wins its way to light. At best, it sees dimly through the mist.

And if it be so with matters like God's love and righteousness as revealed in Christ—if here we must "taste and see" rather than speculate and discuss—may not other subjects be more fit for knowledge than for inquiry? When God saw fit to give the world a full revelation in His Son, can it be supposed it would be a revelation which that Son founded upon an entirely mistaken foundation (as we saw in section 1 (v), that it would have been under the critical hypothesis)? A foundation for the testimony of God's only-begotten Son discovered to be mistaken by fallible men in a later generation? *The Times*, as quoted above, was not discouraging free inquiry, perhaps; but it did show the more excellent way of knowledge by experience. And do we not know Christ? Can we not trust Him better than that? And (to follow once more our added reflection) is not this too a case where free inquiry loses itself in a hidden subject (as we saw earlier) unfathomable under any circumstances, and is foredoomed to failure?

An atheist or agnostic might even deny that God's love and grace and righteousness can be known, as *The Times* urged that they can, or might declare them to be subjects for philosophical speculation. Not so the Christian! Humbly and gratefully, taught by the Spirit, he recognizes, and knows, and adores. May we not suggest a parallel in the other case? An infidel might question the inerrancy of the Incarnate Son of God. May the redeemed sinner reverently do so? Surely, to him, this too is an axiom, not a "hypothesis to be questioned"; it is "a fact to be known" (on the authority of the Christ Whom he knows), not "a philosophy to be recommended to our thought." And it *can* be known, by simply recognizing the dazzling brilliance of His Light. A fallible Christ is wellnigh as unthinkable as a sinful Christ. Here *must* we make our stand, and vow that this, indeed, is no fit subject for cool inquiry by sinful mortals—still less by redeemed sinners and "bondslaves" of His!

At the outset we remarked upon one great fundamental question to which we should return. It is a fit question to ask in a discussion on obscurantism. *What is light and truth?* With that majestic authority of His, He sweeps aside all the paltriness of the "free inquiry" of little minds so infinitely beneath Him, as He declares, "I am THE LIGHT of the world": "I am THE TRUTH."

They set up an abstract idol which they dignify by the name of "truth," but which bears no more resemblance to it than other idols bear to the reality; and in worshipping this image of their own creation they reject the direct and unquestionable testimony of Him Who thus majestically declares that He is THE TRUTH.

They extol free inquiry in the pursuit of "light"—all the while, as we have seen, carefully abstaining from following all the paths by which even human inquiry may seek light—and yet they close their eyes to the real implications of the dazzling brilliance of THE LIGHT that once shone upon the world as no other light could ever shine, to convince men not by argument and inquiry so much as by revealed fact, and by humbly trustful experience. And thus spiritual obscurantism is added to intellectual.

Who, then, are the real obscurantists?

This Land I Love. By Robert Bowman Peek. *Selwyn & Blount, Ltd.* Some seventy short poems on all kinds of subjects—some better than others—fill this little book. The author of "*Perceptions*" has on the whole maintained his reputation.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord, and other watchwords of the Faith, resounded by a Humble Ensign in the Great King's Army. *Elliott Stock.* 1s. 6d. net. These brief messages on disconnected passages of Scripture will comfort and guide many. They are suitable for readings to, or by, the sick.

The Mystic Way: Christian Thoughts constrained from a Home of Age and Sickness. By the Principal. *Elliott Stock.* 1s. 6d. net. These nine short messages, appropriate to the great days and seasons of the Christian Year, contain much that will prove helpful to some minds, but they lack "grip" and definiteness.

Coming Events: The Advent, The Signs and The Redemption. By the Rev. J. Crichton-Jack, Minister Emeritus of St. John's Independent Church, Jersey. *Robert Scott.* 3s. net. The author has collected testimony from the Scriptures and from other sources, to the "events" of which he treats, and has presented the case in a compact and interesting form. But there is little that is new in this little book.

SOME MANUSCRIPTS OF THE VULGATE NEW TESTAMENT.

By THE REV. J. M. HARDEN, D.D., LL.D., Chaplain and
Head Master of the King's Hospital, Dublin, and late Vice-
Principal, London College of Divinity.

OWING to the greater importance of the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, considerations of space cause the manuscripts of the Vulgate to be passed over somewhat hastily in works which deal with the textual criticism of the New Testament. My purpose in this paper has been to gather together from various sources those facts which seemed to be of particular interest about some of the most important of these Vulgate MSS. It was natural to select those which form the basis of the revised text which Dr. White has given us in the smaller Oxford edition published in 1911, which is, or ought to be, in the hands of every one interested in Vulgate Latin. These, apart from two MSS. which contain the Gospels only, are seven in number, and have been chosen by the editor as being the best representatives of certain well-recognized types of text found in MSS. of the Vulgate. Of these, the first five are what might be called geographical varieties, two connected with Italy, the others with Spain, Ireland and southern Gaul. These five types of text grew up, so to speak, unconsciously in the course of time; the last two are representatives of the text resulting from two attempts, made about the year 800, to rectify the manifold divergencies found in the Bibles of the time. These revisions are connected with names of Theodulf, bishop of Orleans, and Alcuin, the English scholar who acted as a kind of minister of education for Charlemagne. Naturally it would be quite impossible to give here a full account of the characteristics of these various texts. Some of the more obvious points will arise in the discussion of the MSS. For a fuller account reference may be made to Berger's exhaustive work, which has done much to render less true the words with which it commences, "*L'histoire de la Vulgate est encore presque inconnue.*"

I

First in interest as in importance must always come the famous *Codex Amiatinus* (A), which has been described as "perhaps the finest book in the world" (H. J. White, *Studia Biblica*, ii. p. 273). It is now one of the treasures of the Laurentian Library at Florence. Its very size is sufficiently striking, for it is an enormous manuscript of over 1,000 vellum leaves ($19\frac{1}{4} \times 13\frac{3}{8} \times 7$ in.). These dimensions will convey little to the reader unless by actual measurement he compares them with those of the largest volume which he happens to be acquainted with. The MS. contains the whole Bible still complete, a thing comparatively rare in ancient MSS.

The Codex takes its name from the fact that it belonged at one time to the monastery of Monte Amiata (modern, Delle Fiore) founded about the year 750, at first Benedictine, later Cistercian. It was removed to Florence for safe-keeping when the Cistercian order was suppressed. In the sixteenth century it had been brought to Rome to be used for the Sixtine edition of the Latin Bible. To the Amiatine monastery it had been presented about the year 900 by Peter, the abbot of a Lombard monastery, who, in doing so, coolly altered by the insertion of his own name some dedicatory verses inscribed on its first page. This alteration was afterwards the cause of much perplexity as to the date of the MS.

Fifty years ago the Codex was confidently assigned to the sixth century; Lagarde, writing in 1882, brought its date down to the ninth. It is now known with certainty to come from about the year 700. The various steps in this discovery are full of interest.

Mention has been already made of the Dedication found on the first page. It consists of three elegiac couplets, the first two of which run as follows:

*Cenobium ad eximii merito venerabile Salvatoris,
Quem caput ecclesie dedicat alta fides,
Petrus Langobardorum extremis de finibus abbas
Devoti affectus pignora mitto mei.*

This being interpreted, as it now stands, means that Peter, an abbot from the remote regions of the Lombards, sent the volume as a pledge of affection to the monastery of the Saviour.

Peter the Lombard had no ear for rhythm. The lines as he left them will not scan. The changes which he made are denoted by italics above. To discover the date of the MS. it was obviously

necessary to find out the words which Peter had erased. The first step was made at the end of the eighteenth century, when Bandini published a catalogue of the MSS. of the Laurentian Library. In his description of the *Codex Amiatinus* he endeavoured to restore the original of the four altered words. He saw clearly by the second line that the book had been sent originally to Rome (*caput ecclesie*). He therefore read the first line thus :

Culmen ad eximii merito venerabile Petri.

Here he was on sure ground, as was afterwards proved, but his attempt to restore the third line was not so happy. It had been noticed that at the beginning of Leviticus the name Servandus was written in Greek letters as that of the scribe of some portion of the MS. Bandini accordingly suggested to read in the third line *Servandus Latii*, identifying Servandus with an abbot who was known to have lived in the sixth century. This was ingenious, but not convincing. Latium could hardly be called "remote" from Rome. The writing also was not that of the sixth century, and besides this, the words *Servandus Latii* did not well suit the space of the erasure. The next step was made in 1886 when de Rossi put forward an emendation which has been called "one of the most brilliant perhaps that ever have been made in the history of palæography" (H. J. White, *Studia Biblica*, ii. p. 282). De Rossi had observed that Bede has told us that Ceolfrid, abbot of Wearmouth and Jarrow, set out for Rome in 716 taking with him, amongst other gifts, a Bible (*Pandectes*) according to the translation of St. Jerome. He therefore proposed to read in the third line :

Ceolfridus Britonum extremis de finibus abbas.

This was at once generally accepted, and was made a certainty by the final step, when Dr. Hort showed that in the *Anonymous Life of Ceolfrid*, the very lines of the dedication occur, except that instead of *Britonum* the reading is *Anglorum*, a change which had been suggested before Dr. Hort's article appeared.

It was made quite plain then that the *Codex Amiatinus* was one of three Bibles which Ceolfrid had caused to be written either at Jarrow or Wearmouth. Its date will be about the beginning of the eighth century. Though written in England the text is of

the type current in the south of Italy. The Bible from which it was copied may have been brought from Italy " by Ceolfrid himself or his master, Benedict Biscop, or, perhaps more probably by Theodore of Tarsus when he came to England to be Archbishop of Canterbury in 669 " (Kenyon, *Text. Crit. of the N.T.* p. 225).

The *Codex Amiatinus* may be said to be, on the whole, the best authority for the text of the Latin N.T. The Oxford editors follow it for the most part, particularly in the Gospels. For example in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v.-vii.) there are (apart from mere varieties of spelling) only six places in which their reading differs. This is but a small number if we remember that the Oxford edition differs, in these chapters, from the Clementine in nearly sixty places. It is not suggested that the Oxford edition reproduces the Amiatine text. It does not; but a comparison of any chapter in it with the Clementine text of the same will give a fair idea of how far the latter text has departed from the early text of the Vulgate witnessed to by the Amiatine Bible.

II

As the *Codex Amiatinus* was written in England but has now its resting-place in Italy, so the *Codex Cavensis* (C) is no longer to be found in the country whence it originally came. It is one, perhaps the best, of the manuscripts of the great Spanish family. Its famous sister the *Codex Toletanus* is still in Spain, now in Madrid, formerly one of the treasures of the Chapter Library at Toledo. *Codex Cavensis* has its name from the monastery of La Cava, near Naples, where it is now preserved. Of its history nothing is known, but there seems to be no doubt that it was written in Spain. Apart from the fact of the connexion of its text with that of manuscripts which are certainly Spanish, there are other considerations also to connect it with Spain. Indeed M. Berger goes so far as to say (*Histoire*, p. 14) that it is difficult to understand how the place of its origin has ever been had in doubt. The writing is of the Visigothic type used in Spain. Again, the name of the scribe is found in the inscription "*Danila scriptor*" found between the Books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. This name is quite Visigothic in form. Bishop Wordsworth has shown that the same name is found amongst the signatures of those who attended a council of Toledo in 693. This would not be the signature of the same individual, for the

MS. belongs to about the year 800, but the name connects it with the same country.

Even more important evidence to show the place of its origin is the fact that it contains before the Pauline Epistles the Preface of Peregrinus and the Canons of Priscillian. Priscillian had drawn up an Epitome of the theology of St. Paul in 90 "Canons" or statements. As he was afterwards judged a heretic, these were edited and revised later by an author who has chosen to call himself Peregrinus. His real name is unknown, unless the conjecture that he was Bachiarius be correct. The important thing for our purpose to note is that it is in Spanish MSS. and in those connected with Spain that his Preface and the accompanying Canons are found. *Codex Cavensis* contains the whole Bible. As to its New Testament, two facts of interest may be mentioned. It is the earliest biblical MS. which has interpolated the text of the three heavenly witnesses in 1 John v. 7. This would also connect it with Spain. Again, it contains between Colossians and 1 Thessalonians the spurious Epistle to the Laodiceans. It is remarkable also as containing two Psalters. In the ordinary course of the Old Testament the version of the Psalter is the Gallican, that is, St. Jerome's revision from the LXX which afterwards found its way into the Vulgate. After the Apocalypse occurs the so-called "Hebrew" Psalter, that is, St. Jerome's translation from the Hebrew text. This Hebrew Psalter in our codex is unfortunately incomplete owing to the loss of the concluding leaves.

Codex Cavensis is a much smaller volume than the great Florentine MS. It consists of 303 leaves ($12\frac{1}{4} \times 10\frac{1}{2}$ in.). It is written three columns to the page; Amiatinus has only two.

III

Spain and Ireland were separated from the rest of the Latin world in early times, the former by the Arab invasion, the latter by old traditions of religious independence (cf. Berger, *Histoire*, p. vii). The result in each case was the rise of a special type of biblical text. The manuscript which Dr. White has chosen as the best representative of the Irish type is the famous Book of Armagh (D), now in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. This volume is not, like the two just described, a Bible. It is not even wholly biblical. The main part of the Book is a complete New

Testament (the only one which comes to us from the ancient Church of Ireland), but this is preceded by various documents,¹ some in Irish, but most in Latin, relating to St. Patrick, and is followed by others connected with St. Martin of Tours.

The Book of Armagh was edited in 1913 by Dr. J. Gwynn in a sumptuous volume which reproduces the MS. page by page and line by line, and discusses fully all the problems connected with its text and history. At one time the Book was thought to have been written by St. Patrick himself. This is of course out of the question, since the *Lives* which it contains were not written for generations after the saint's death, but in consequence of this belief the name of the real scribe was erased in several places. On two pages, however, enough was left to enable Dr. Graves to discover not only the century but even the year in which the MS. was written. From one of these pages the name of the scribe was seen to have been Ferdornach. There are but two scribes of this name mentioned in the *Annals*, one of whom died in 727, the other in 845. The problem was to which of these the work was to be attributed. At the end of St. Matthew's Gospel there is a Latin note written in curious Greek characters which runs thus:

. . . ach hunc (librum) dictante . . . bach herede patricii scripsit.

The first letters here are the last syllable of Ferdornach's name. Accordingly Dr. Graves read the inscription as meaning that Ferdornach wrote the Book at the direction of an "heir" of St. Patrick (i.e. a Primate of Armagh) whose name ended in "—bach." The only Primate with any such name contemporary with either Ferdornach was Torbach, and he occupied the position for but one year, 807. Hence the MS. could be dated with precision.

The history of the Book of Armagh is better known than that of most other manuscripts. It was written at Armagh, where it long remained, being known as the Canoin Phadraig (or, Patrick's testament). In it King Brian Boromhe, when he visited Armagh in 1004, had an entry made confirming "to Armagh the ecclesiastical supremacy in Ireland." In the next century we know from St. Bernard's *Life of Malachy* that Niall, the Primate, when he fled from Armagh took the Book with him as one of the insignia of the

¹ The chief of these are the two *Lives* of the Saint by Muirchu and Tirechan respectively, and the *Confessions* of St. Patrick himself.

see. We know also from various allusions in the *Annals* that oaths administered upon this Book were considered as specially binding, and that the members of a particular family were appointed as its custodians and took their name of MacMoyre from this circumstance. This family seem to have been quite ready to permit outsiders to have access to the Book, for we know that both Archbishop Ussher and Sir James Ware made use of it in the seventeenth century.

The last of these hereditary keepers of the Book of Armagh was the infamous Florence MacMoyre, one of the false witnesses who brought about the execution of Oliver Plunket, titular Archbishop of Armagh in 1681. Florence MacMoyre put the Book in pledge for the sum of five pounds, and after some time it came into the possession of the Brownlow family (1707) with whom it remained until in 1846 it was sent to the Library of the Royal Irish Academy in Dublin. It was one of the exhibits at the Dublin Exhibition of 1853 and was there marked for sale. Purchased by Dr. Reeves in that year, it was in 1854 sold by him to Lord John George Beresford, who presented it to Trinity College, Dublin.

The text of the New Testament contained in the Book of Armagh is not a pure Vulgate text. It contains, as do the other Irish MSS., many readings which have been carried over from the Old Latin version. In some passages conflated readings occur, i.e. readings formed by a union of two distinct renderings, as e.g. in Revelation xxii. 19, *de libro vitæ et de ligno vitæ*. Many of the peculiar readings of Irish MSS. are instances of interpolation. Two of these may here be mentioned—(1) in Matthew xxvii. 49 the words which tell of the piercing of our Lord's side are inserted from St. John's Gospel; (2) in John xix. 30 there is an insertion relating the rending of the Temple veil at the time of our Lord's death.

IV

The *Codex Fuldensis* (F) takes its name from Fulda in Germany, "where it has been preserved, perhaps, from the time of Boniface" (Nestle, *Introduction*, p. 122). It is the oldest of all the manuscripts of the New Testament cited by Dr. White in his smaller edition. It comes from the sixth century and its text is of the early Italian type. Written by the direction of Victor, bishop of Capua, who died in 554, it contains in its margin notes made by that bishop's

hand. Evidently he corrected it with considerable care, for there are at the end of the Acts and of the Apocalypse notes to say that he read it through twice, once in 546 and again in 547. It comes to us, then, from the first half of the sixth century. If a conjecture of Nestle's is correct, the MS. was later in the hands of a much more famous man than Victor, namely St. Boniface. Nestle's ground for this conjecture is that in 1 Peter v. 8 the *Codex Fuldensis* reads, *sobrii estote et vigilate et excitamini*, the very form in which the verse is quoted in one of the letters of St. Boniface.

The MS. contains the whole New Testament, including the spurious Epistle to the Laodiceans which, in it, follows Colossians. The book of the Acts is preceded by a preface which professes to give an account of the places of burial of the Apostles. It is strange that though the text of 1 John is free from the interpolation of the "three heavenly witnesses," the MS. contains the preface to the Catholic Epistles purporting to be the work of Jerome, which accuses the Latin translators of having omitted the words in question. One of the most interesting of the glosses which Victor has written in the margin is that in which he gives the interpretation of the number of the Beast as Teitan.

By far the most interesting fact, however, about this MS. is the form in which the Gospels appear in it. They do not occur separately but are given in the form of a harmony. Victor himself supposed, not without some hesitation, that the single composite gospel which he followed was identical with Tatian's *Diatessaron*. It has been only in comparatively recent times that this conjecture of Victor's has been proved true.

With respect to the *Diatessaron*, many questions are still unsolved and are perhaps insoluble, but its general form may be said to be fairly well ascertained. We do not know whether Tatian composed it in Syriac, or whether his Syriac was a translation of a Greek original. The name seems to suggest the latter, but, in any case, the influence of this great Harmony, in a Syriac or Greek form, was felt in the West; and it is not to be doubted but that Victor's harmony in the *Codex Fuldensis*, or rather the Old Latin harmony for which Victor substituted the corresponding passages of the Vulgate, was a translation of Tatian's work. The substantial agreement of both in the order of their sections has been proved. Besides this "there are other remarkable coincidences. For

instance, it would scarcely have occurred to two independent harmonists to make the journey through Samaria (John iv. 4), one from Galilee to Judæa instead of from Judæa to Galilee . . . to place the conversation with Nicodemus after the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, or to insert Herod's threats (Luke xiii. 31) between the Transfiguration and the healing of the demoniac" (*Dict. of Chr. Biog.* iv, 1,125).

The text of the *Codex Fuldensis* is best in the Gospels, where it is very closely allied to that of the Amiatine Bible, but throughout the New Testament it is one of our chief authorities. The Oxford editors rarely reject readings wherein the two codices Amiatinus and Fuldensis agree (cf. Wordsworth-White, *Praefatio in Actus*, p. xiv). The MS. was edited, with facsimiles, by E. Ranke in 1868. The harmony is given in Migne's *Patrol. Latina* lxxviii. 255.

V

Next in order comes the manuscript known by the Oxford editors as G. It is now in the National Library at Paris, but is called *San-Germanensis*, as it originally was in the library of St. Germain des Prés. The MS. is the second volume of a Bible, the first volume of which is now lost, though R. Stephens knew it and made use of it in the first half of the sixteenth century. The second volume begins with various canticles, the Song of Moses, the Prayer of Habakkuk, etc., apparently inserted as an appendix to the Psalter, since the words *Explicit Psalterium* occur at the end of the last of them—the Song of the Three Children. Then follow the remaining books of the Hagiographa, or rather, these once followed, for some are now wanting owing to mutilation of the MS., viz.—Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, 2 Maccabees, and parts of Proverbs, Wisdom and 1 Maccabees. The New Testament is complete. At the end of its last book, in this MS. the Epistle to the Hebrews, came once the Shepherd of Hermas, now represented by a small fragment.

Not much is known of the history of this MS. It has been inferred from two monograms found at the end of the Gospels that the name of its scribe was Rathbold or Rathbod. The scribe, whoever he was, has left an interesting note at the end of the Book of Esther, in which he tells us that his work is the result of considerable study

of various texts found in different MSS. His words are: *Summo studio summaque cura per diversos codices oberrans editiones perquisivi. In unum collexi corpus et scribens transfudi fecique Pandecten.* Bishop Wordsworth thinks that the use of this word *Pandectes* for a complete Bible suggests the time of Alcuin.

The MS. has often been used since the sixteenth century. It was used by Stephens as one of the authorities for his Latin Bible in 1838, by Martianay at the end of the following century, and also by Sabatier when he was publishing his famous edition of the Old Latin Bible. The English scholar Bentley knew of it and had it collated for his proposed edition in 1720.

The chief peculiarity of the *Codex San-Germanensis* is that the Gospel of St. Matthew is not given in it according to the Vulgate text, which the rest of the New Testament follows. The Gospel of St. Matthew is Old Latin, chiefly of the European type. The text of Acts is exceptionally good in this MS. In that book it agrees more nearly than does any other MS. with the text of the Oxford edition (cf. W-W, *Praef. in Actus*, p. vi).

In the smaller Oxford edition it is cited by Dr. White as the best representative of the text of the Vulgate current in Southern Gaul. Berger (*Histoire*, p. 72) supposes that the MS. was written near Lyons.

Two curious, though for critical purposes unimportant, facts may here be mentioned. The first is that here and there are found glosses written in the margin in a kind of shorthand (*notæ tironianæ*). Unfortunately no one has succeeded in deciphering these. It is possible that they are quite worthless, but Berger thinks that the longhand words which accompany them show that they would be of interest. The second fact is that in the margin of the Gospel of St. John are written certain formulæ of divination of the kind known as *sortes sanctorum*. Some of these are also found in the margin of *Codex Bezae* written in Greek in a tenth-century hand. These latter are discussed by Dr. J. R. Harris in his *Study of Codex Bezae* (pp. 7ff.). In connexion with them he has made the suggestion that "a sort of wheel full of numbers" which is found in the *Codex San-Germanensis* before the New Testament, and which Dr. Wordsworth supposed to be connected with the Eusebian Canons was intended rather for use in connexion with these numbered formulæ of divination in St. John's Gospel.

VI

The following is a translation of the description of his sixth MS. given by Dr. White in the *Præfatio ad Lectorem* of his smaller edition: "H = The Hubertian MS. of the Bible, now Add. 24142 of the British Museum (9th or 10th century); its text is good and ancient and agrees for the most part with the Amiatine: but the 'corrector' has frequently written in the margin the readings of the *Theodulfian* recension." The reason for its inclusion, then, by Dr. White seems to be that it gives evidence of Theodulf's work. He was bishop of Orleans at the end of the eighth and the beginning of the ninth century (788-821 according to Dr. White), and was by race a Visigoth. His method of biblical correction may be seen in the famous Bible which bears his name. The Bible of Theodulf is in the National Library of Paris. The text found in it is peculiar. Berger describes it as "a mixed Bible, as a MS. should be which was copied on the frontier between the north and south (of France) by a prelate born in Septimania."

The text is fundamentally Spanish, or rather Visigothic, but in places it is allied (especially in the Gospels) with the Irish texts used in the north of France. Theodulf's own work is to be seen in corrections and variants written in the margin, or between the lines, suggesting the addition of some words, the omission of others, and so on. It is to these notes that Dr. White refers in the words above quoted. This Bible of Theodulf is an indirect ancestor of the *Codex Hubertianus*. The latter was copied, that is to say, not from the Bible of Theodulf, but from some other unknown MS. which had incorporated in its text some of the corrections made by that bishop. This is the opinion of Berger. Dr. White, on the other hand, seems to limit the connexion of G with the Theodulfian recension to the marginal notes.

The Codex takes its name from having belonged at one time to the monastery of St. Hubert in the Ardennes. It is written in a fine minuscule hand, three columns to the page.

Like almost all the early Latin Bibles, especially those connected with Spain, these two great MSS. connected with Theodulf's recension follow in the Psalter not the Gallican Version, but St. Jerome's translation from the Hebrew.

The Codex is unfortunately incomplete in the New Testament

part. Acts and Apocalypse are entirely wanting, and in the Catholic Epistles, the MS. does not go beyond 1 Peter iv. 3.

VII

In the previous section, in speaking of the St. Hubert Bible, we have seen that Theodulf at the end of the eighth century made a serious effort to effect a revision of the Vulgate text. In the course of time innumerable corruptions had crept into the text from various causes, with the result that the Bible was read differently in different places, nor was there any certainty that all the Bibles in one and the same place would have the same text. The "infinite variety" of which St. Augustine wrote in pre-Vulgate days had arisen again. Theodulf attempted to remedy this, but his efforts seem to have had little effect, however useful the records of it are to us now. It was very different in the case of another revision which we have now to consider, the effects of which, as Berger points out (*Histoire*, p. 146), have lasted down to the present time. This revision was inspired in the same century by Charlemagne. Indeed, if we were to take literally some of the writers of the ninth century, we should have to believe that Charlemagne himself took an active part in such revision. This can hardly have been the case, but the tradition is a proof of the interest which the Emperor took in biblical matters. The real agent of the revision was Alcuin, the English scholar whom Charlemagne summoned to help him in this and similar matters. It is clear from Alcuin's own letters that the revision of the Bible-text was one of his chief tasks. This was begun some time before the year 800, and on Christmas Day, 801, Alcuin was able to send to the Emperor the result of his labours. The last of the seven MSS. which are the subject of this paper is a copy, in part at least, of the manuscript which Alcuin then sent to Charlemagne.

This is the *Codex Vallicellianus* or *Vallicellanus* (V), now in the Biblioteca Vittorio-Emmanuele in Rome, which takes its name from the Oratory of S. Maria in Vallicella, where it formerly was. This manuscript belonged at one time to a Portuguese named Staius, and was known sometimes as the *Codex Staiianus*. Staius bequeathed it to the Oratory of S. Maria.

It is a beautiful MS., written with three columns to the page, as are the La Cava and the St. Hubert Bibles. The place where

it was written was probably in or near Tours, for its text in the Gospels is very closely allied with that of the Gospels of St. Martin, a MS. which was written in that city in the ninth century by an Irish scribe. It joins company with another MS., also emanating from the school of Tours, the Bible of Grandval, now in the British Museum, more generally known as the *Codex Carolinus*. Some of the readings in the Gospels connect it with the Amiatine Bible and the Lindisfarne Gospels, both of which were written in Northumbria. Alcuin was from York, and we know that when engaged on his work of revision he asked for, and received, help from his old school. Outside the Gospels the *Codex Vallicellianus* follows the lead of the Fulda MS. rather than that of the Amiatine.

Two of its readings in Acts, mentioned by Berger, are curious enough to deserve notice. One of these (not found in any other MS.) is *inparcenti gregi* for *non parcentes gregi*, in c. 20, 29; the other is in c. 28, 15, *cum audissent fratres Appii occurrerunt nobis usque ad forum et tribus tabernis*. Here the word *Appii*, which should come after *forum*, has been inserted in the wrong place, with a strange result.

Such are the seven MSS. of the New Testament on which the text of the smaller Oxford edition is based. Two others are used for the Gospels, both of the Italian family, viz.—M, the Milan MS. of the Gospels (cent. vi) in the Ambrosian Library; and Z, a MS. of the Gospels belonging to the Harley collection in the British Museum (cent. vii).

It is hoped that the above brief sketches may not be without interest. The Vulgate is being studied now probably more than ever it has been since Latin became a dead language. It is well, then, that those who study it should know something of the old Bibles and Testaments, which are the best authorities for its text. Unfortunately the Clementine Edition is based on very poor MSS. Yet so far we have nothing better for the Old Testament. In the New Testament we have something much better, owing to the labours of Wordsworth and White, something which will in all probability keep its place of pre-eminence even when the revision of the Latin Bible promised by the Church of Rome sees the light of publication.

CLERICAL TRAGEDIES.

BY THE REV. CHARLES COURTENAY, M.A., late Chaplain of
Holy Trinity, Rome.

THAT there is plenty of comedy in a parson's life *Punch* himself is witness, for the oddities of human nature often make rare fun. It is good that it is so, for it helps the parson to bear his lot with a more sprightly air. A good laugh is better than a cry, and the latter is often prevented by some odd specimen of humanity who happens to cross his path.

But there are more tragedies, I think, perhaps more than any of us have ever suspected. How many and how grave they are, perhaps we ourselves shall never know until the curtain rings down and we stand to give our account.

It is to our interest to reduce these tragedies if we can. And in order to reduce them we must get to know them. This is the object of this paper—to point them out.

What a first-class tragedy it is *when a parson dislikes his work!* There are such, and they do not scruple to say that they never did like the work, and that they never will like it. They were, it seems, either forced into it by others, or they entered upon it for a living, or they fancied it was different from what it was. Anyway, they are round men in square holes, and they would like to get out and keep out. It is all collar work, all against the grain, all hateful. Their happiest times are when they are off duty, outside their parishes, and doing something else. Could they change into farmers, or soldiers, or sportsmen, they would do so gladly and at once. But to spin sermons, to visit sick people, and to look after children sickens them. They have indeed no special interest in religion itself, so how in the world are they likely to care to bring others into its fold? I have called this a first-class tragedy, and it is. It is a tragedy for himself, for he is going steadily down hill, and there is no brake on. It is a tragedy for his people, for they are left without a pastor, and have only a wooden figure-head. The hand that should keep them from doing ill is nerveless; the voice that should warn and console and instruct is only a feeble echo. If this is not tragedy, what is?

It is also a tragedy when a Gospel minister has *no Gospel to*

deliver. He is a fireman without his water-bucket, a doctor without his medicines, a coastguard without his rocket apparatus. If he denies that he is a Gospel minister, that is a greater tragedy still, for if he is not that, what is he? If he is not that, why is he there at all? That was his commission, and the Book was delivered to him for that purpose. Without a Gospel of Redemption how is he going to bring men to salvation? Is not that his lever to lift souls to Heaven? No wonder the people pass his church and swarm off to the chapels. They know what they want, even if he does not; and they miss the vital message and resent it. Is it any wonder that they should demand the one comforting message which as sinners they need? And if any are content to have it so, and think as little of the Gospel as their minister, on whose head will their blood rest when the great scrutiny is made? We are not perfect messengers, any of us, but if we omit our Gospel of life and love and forgiveness we are not messengers at all, but simply hirelings, and not true shepherds of the wandering sheep.

And this is a tragedy too when messages of life *pass over cold lips*. I suppose you can light a fire on a glacier, but I imagine that the fire would not be as hot as it should be, and that it would not last. I am always sorry for the man whose heart is chill when he speaks words of warmth and life. I am more sorry still for the Gospel which turns to ice on his lips. In truth it is not the Gospel of the grace and love of God at all. It ceases to be a message, and becomes a mere proposition. With its appeal gone, and with vehemence lacking, it may be well articulated and theologically sound, but God is not in it, and nobody is persuaded. If a man told me in business-like tones, and without a quaver in his voice, or the slightest change of expression, that my house was on fire, I should not believe him. It is not so that great and terrible news is ever told. I expect a note of alarm, a large element of urgency, something of heat and energy. I have a right to expect it, for both good news and bad are generally brought to us steaming hot. And shall the greatest of all dangers, and the best of all good news, be served up in matter-of-fact tones, and with all emotion and concern discharged from them? Surely, this is a real tragedy, for nothing but the most tragic consequences can flow from such coolness, impassiveness, and unconcern. A hot Gospel needs a man on fire to deliver it, unless he would spoil it. That he is not on fire

simply means to ordinary folk that he does not believe it himself.

It is a tragedy also *when a minister of Christ loses heart*. It does happen sometimes, and its gravity cannot be exaggerated. I have known many, and so have my readers. It may be the eye of some depressed soul catches this message. I would not minimize the good record of the past. That stands out, and the Books have it all down. But the pity of it is that the volcano should be now extinct, and all the red fires died down. And the cause of it probably is more tragic still; for no one loses heart, who is in touch with the great Heart of God. Desert winds have been blowing around; the world has been too much with us; the spirit of prayer has been ebbing; the promises and assurances of the Blessed Word have ceased to shine out in their golden glory; faith has paled; from living agents we have turned into automata; conventionalism has replaced freedom and life. And with all this parching and paralysing influence, who can be surprised that difficulties should loom large, and antagonisms look fiercer than ever before? We never lose heart so long as we can trust and feel the Hands of our Lord underneath us. When He ceases to be real we shrivel up, and grow limp, and lose heart. For then we are shut up to ourselves for company and encouragement, and desert fare is extremely emaciating and enfeebling. When a man loses heart he loses the best thing about him and, the spring thus running down, the watch plays sad tricks. A minister is out of the running when he loses heart; or if he runs he is like a spinning-wheel which spins nothing to any purpose. Sad are the prospects of the parish whose minister has lost heart. His people have nothing to gain from him, not a single blessing, until he finds his heart again.

When a man *loses the confidence of his people* he is the actor in a terrible tragedy. I do not ask whose fault this dissension may be. He may be entirely blameless, but, if such schism happens, dire are the consequences. There is bound to be an end of all chances of usefulness. Unacceptable ministrations can scarcely do dissentients good, for they will either refuse to listen or listen with a defiant snort. Every word of his passes over a thick stratum of poison gas which distorts and stifles all he says. Nothing lives in such an atmosphere as that, and nothing can take root. What can such a man do? Live it down if he can, but that takes time

and specially good management. Better still if he can cut and run. In another parish, and amongst another flock, he may meet with a better fate. Unfortunately, we are in such a chaotic condition that our Fathers in God, be their children ever so unfortunate, are obliged to look helplessly on, and be content with idle wishes. And so parishes are at sixes and sevens, and go from bad to worse, while they wring their helpless hands and scatter their ardent wishes. Skilful and powerful hands could place men in the best possible positions for themselves and their people if they had due control of the ecclesiastical chess-board. And so the mischief spreads, and day by day gets worse, and the chasms wider until the newspapers get hold of it. It is a tragedy when these mischiefs begin; it becomes a blacker tragedy when they work to a head and burst. And the beginning? Well, probably it sprang from some bit of change, or some small fit of obstinacy and self-will, or a refusal to give the laity a voice. Whoever managed to get his way has had to pay dearly for it, much more than it was worth.

A woeful tragedy comes in when the *spirit of doubt grips the minister*. Most of us cherish the old truths embalmed in our Prayer Book and handed down from old, old days, even from the beginning. Our heart-strings have got entangled around them. And when they are traversed and scouted by those in the seat of the teacher we do not sit comfortably down under the new régime. It is like pulling up our deepest convictions by the root and laying waste our spiritual fatherland. Were it done less ruthlessly and more gently we might be ready at least to take in the new side which is being set before us. But to cast our dear faith upon the rubbish heap straightway, and to be left without a roof to cover our souls, is a treatment which most of us resent, and rightly. This new botanist wants to pull our sweet flowers to pieces that we may admire the parts and the general construction. We want the flower to yield its fragrance, and we prefer it by its old name and in its old place in our religious garden. It is very dry, barren provender they offer us, and we prefer the old, succulent Gospel of the Grace of God. What is the good of free thought when the old thoughts have become a very part of us, and the old truths have nourished us for many a day and night? But they would unsettle and undermine us, and break up our anchors to make us freer.

And we are certainly more free to run on rocks and get out of our course. The bull in the china shop is nothing to this man of broad views. And when he gets made a Bishop, as broad men often do, we are left as the country-side is left after a storm has passed. It will take us a long time to get back to our old moorings, and the tragedy of it is that some men never do get back.

Tragedy is terribly to the fore when the parson is afflicted with a *love of change*. It may be a small change or a big change, a change in the service, or a change in the officers, a change in what he wears, or in what he leaves off. Some clergymen seem to fancy that any change is a change for the better, and that progress and advance are marked by the number of changes which accompany his revolutions. Now, unfortunately for the parson and his changes, most men are at the bottom conservative and hate change. If our parson is raw he has to find that out; if he is aware of the deep-rooted tenacity of his people for what they have been used to, he ought to know better than to play tricks with them. But many things move a parson from which ordinary folks are exempt. He is often æsthetic, and likes gay garments, and so he alters a little in that direction; or he hates intoning, and he alters that; or he likes symbolic ornaments, and promptly gets some, quite small perhaps. And he does it, all unconscious of the deep hum of disapproval all round. He is engrossed, you see, and only hears what he wants to hear. And all the time the fires of dissension are being stoked, fresh fuel is being heaped up, the slow-match is burning, and by and by there is an alarming flare-up. Then he is surprised.

The mistake our parson has been making is that he made the wrong changes and chose the wrong subjects. What was wanted to make progress was a change in himself, not in his surroundings. If he wanted to appeal to his people in a new and more impressive way, he should heighten his spirituality, put more life into his sermons, get closer to his people's hearts, and gain their confidence by quicker and more loving response to their needs.

It is possible to change for the better, and it is equally possible to change for the worse, but it is hard to believe that that is a change for the better which alienates the parish, empties the church, and brings the parson into grievous unpopularity. It is not worth the candle. Cæsar's wife needed to be above suspicion, and so

should the parson. That a change unsettles a people, breeds suspicion, and limits usefulness is enough to condemn most of the changes made. It is pure tragedy.

There is one kind of tragedy which we may see occasionally and which is always lamentable : it is bitter *conflict between a clergyman and part of his people*. Sometimes it is a political conflict in which party spirit is to the fore. A parson is bound to have his political views, and to know where his vote is to be conferred ; but for him to throw himself into the arena, and fight a political battle, is bound to set a large part of his parish by the ears, for he is not there as a political agent, and to fight elections. If in his heat and violence of statement he sets all the other side against his ministry, the loss is tragical. Suppose he brings his man in at the top of the poll, he himself will be at the bottom of his parochial lists in the opinion of a large proportion of his people. Probably they will never listen to him with the old satisfaction again. He is against their politics ; they are going to set themselves against him and his messages. A parson should, for the sake of his religious influence, keep out of political storms if he wants his people's vote and interest for his Gospel. Why should he imperil them for political propaganda ? Sometimes his standard is raised against Dissent and Dissenters. Here are endless possibilities of tragedy. A free country like England loves to go its own way without let or hindrance. Freedom is an Englishman's birthright, and he prizes it much. And when a parson rises up to denounce them, to consign them to the nethermost hell, and to rain down imprecations upon their devoted heads, the fat is in the fire. A hitherto peaceful parish forms itself into two camps, and war is waged with the utmost bitterness. Not so are men won to better ways. Controversy will confirm those who are convinced already, but it rarely brings over anybody who is wedded to other thoughts. After all, these are still his people, placed under his charge, and for whom he is responsible. Let him not drive them away by reproaches and heat and extreme statements. The way of gentleness and love is infinitely better. Let him be content to see them sometimes at church on great occasions ; let him baptize their babies and marry them if they offer themselves. Let him bury their dead, and do it sympathetically as regards the mourners. They can appreciate kindness, and appreciation will grow into friendliness

in time; and after that anything may happen. And if they do not come over to his side they can be content to differ and show kindness to one another and think the very best.

But a pugnacious parson is sure to be fighting somebody. The best thing is to lose his pugnacity if he can, and be gentle and loving. The man of God must not strive.

The tragedy of *ineffectiveness* is one not sufficiently faced, but it is one of the greatest of all. How many parishes there are with large organizations, busy parsons, and multiplied services, but all apparently in vain. Plenty of sowing, but no harvest; and the parson content to have it so. A gallant array of blossom, where nothing sets, and where there is no fruit.

I know that with apparent failure there may well be deeper success, and that we shall one day be permitted to see much fruit which came without our knowledge. But suppose there is absolutely none. No sower sees all his seed germinate, but if he saw none he would give up his garden or his farm. It cannot be all due to his seed; he must take the blame in part for bad farming. It cannot be all due to the soil, for his neighbour achieves something with no better soil.

The tragedy comes in when our parson does not see his failure, does not even mourn it, takes it even for granted as what he might expect. If he only questioned himself, and ascertained something to guide him better in future sowing, the matter might be mended. But he does not take even this trouble. A more successful brother would gladly have advised him and pointed out where he failed.

Then if he discovered that he was dealing with souls on a wrong method, or that he was not using the right means, or that he was not aiming at results or expecting them, he would probably mend the wrong. And if, too, he found out that he himself was spiritually out of gear, and that the Spirit of God had no footing in his soul, and that even he himself might never have passed under the Hand of the Lord Jesus, he could have it all made right. The blind cannot lead the blind, we all know, but he might receive his sight if he would. And then with a new heart and spirit, labouring for the love of souls, and wielding the potent charm of the Gospel of the Cross and the Risen Christ, he would be gladdened by seeing such a change passing over his parish as would astonish him. All effective work begins in the parson's own soul, and from

thence spreads near and far. There is nothing so catching as Christian life and love.

The final tragedy I want to deal with is the *tragedy of conduct*. The minister preaches two kinds of sermons—the one in the pulpit, and the other, the longer sermon, outside the pulpit and the church. Woe betide the man when they tell different tales. You cannot sever the sacred functions of the parson from his secular ones: they stand or fall together. At the background of every pulpit is the preacher's weekday life; that is his commentary which mingles with every word he says. He may preach an excellent sermon, but his hearers will be recalling the weekday applications, and many a man has preached in vain simply because his way of living has tripped him up. Better that a man should preach a poor, feeble sermon if so be his life helped on to better things.

This tragedy of conduct is fatal. All the time that his lips are pouring out eloquent periods his flock are recalling how hot his temper is, how fond he is of money and how grasping, how he loves tittle-tattle and that not of the most charitable kind, and how close a grip the world and material things have upon his soul. We know, and they know, that a minister is but a man and is bound to have some human frailties. But they expect him to be up to the average of goodness, and a trifle beyond perhaps, seeing that he professes a holy calling. And are they wrong? Neither may a minister resent this view of things. If he be a city set on a hill, as he is, it is surely that the people may look at him and keep looking. Our modes of life may be private matters, but in public men there can be no privacy: we are known and read by every one. Judge then the tragedy when looking up to catch an excellency they discover instead a bad blemish. The shock to religion is inevitable and tragic, and hard to get over.

A melancholy series this list of parish tragedies, neither pleasant to write nor pleasant to read. But they are worth pointing out, if only to bring them to the surface. What is unsuspected or not recognized remains the blot it is. But once in the open they can be dealt with and remedied. May it be so with these tragedies which we have been passing under review! And if the Great Master takes us in hand, the worst of tragedy becomes quickly changed. We may thank God that what is so easy with Him is also His will.

THE THEOLOGICAL AND ETHICAL VALUE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY THE REV. HAROLD SMITH, D.D., Tutor St. John's Hall,
Highbury, N.

MY title excludes much of Old Testament Criticism. The subject is very little affected by questions of date, authorship, or even historical accuracy. The religious value of a Psalm does not depend upon it being written by David; it is just the same if its author lived some centuries later. So the theological or ethical value of a passage in the Book of Isaiah does not depend upon it being written by Isaiah, son of Amoz, contemporary with Hezekiah. In fact, critical hypotheses make much less difference to religion, as distinct from history, than is generally recognized.

No doubt the Old Testament is now very much under a cloud. There is a strong tendency to emphasize the value of Christ's teaching, or the nature of the Christian spirit, by depreciating the Old Testament, its theology and its morals. It is either forgotten that the New Testament is based on the Old and takes up much of it; or else it is held that the Jewish training of the Apostles positively led them to mistake various points of Gospel Christianity, e.g. to misconceive the meaning of Christ's Death. The disregard of the Old Testament is no doubt greatly due to a feeling that it has been largely dethroned by criticism, while the New remains. But on the one hand, much of the criticism of the Old Testament leaves its theological and moral value very slightly affected; on the other, criticism is extremely busy with the New Testament also.

Rejection of the authority of the Old Testament is no new thing. In the early Church (Cent. II), Marcion rejected it altogether. His conception of God was one of pure benevolence, with nothing of justice or of punishment. (This has an extremely modern look about it.) But the God of the Old Testament is clearly a God of judgment, inflicting punishment; hence He can be only an inferior Being, far below the good God, the Father of Christ, Who had hitherto been unknown.

Marcion wrote a book called *Antitheses*, contrasting the Old

and the New Testaments, e.g. he contrasted the behaviour of Elisha towards children with that of our Lord. Tertullian, however, calls this a shameless antithesis, comparing quite different things. Innocent children are not the same as boys old enough to insult and blaspheme. Another answer is that those who came for a blessing received it; the boys did not come to Elisha for his blessing. The Church, in fact, though having to face Old Testament difficulties, yet could not ignore the fact that Christianity is historically built upon it. But just as modern Theosophy is akin to the old Gnosticism, so much of the modern attitude to the Old Testament is a revival of Marcionism, especially in its conception of God as simply kind and beneficent, with nothing in Him to fear. The sentimentalism which poses as the highest Christianity fashions a God in its own likeness.

But the Old Testament has been misused in other directions. The difference between the Old and the New has at times been ignored. Even now we sometimes find appeals to Old Testament isolated texts to establish purely Christian doctrines, which one is reasonably sure were never in the writer's mind. This superficial or forced exegesis appeals only to those who regard any isolated verse or sentence as authoritative as it stands, apart from its context or primary meaning. But it irritates those who regard these points as essential. Apart from such considerations there is no check on the use or misuse of Scripture phrases.

Again, at various times, almost from the Christianizing of the Roman Empire, but most strongly in Reformation and post-Reformation times, various civil laws in the Old Testament have been regarded as morally binding upon Christians. This was, however, never carried through consistently, only eclectically, without any clear principle why some laws and not others should be, not merely adopted as good, but regarded as ordained by God for ever. The Seventh "Article of Religion" puts the whole matter well: "The Law, given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, does not bind Christian men, nor ought its civil precepts to be received of necessity in any commonwealth; yet no Christian man is free from obedience to the commandments which are called moral." This is very sound and sensible; it implies that civil precepts may often with advantage be taken from the Old Testament; but this should be based on the intrinsic merits or suitability

of such precepts, not on the fact that they occur in Scripture. One may hold that it would be good if more of them were so taken over in this country, e.g. if *restitution* were insisted upon in the case of offences against property, or if a false witness were punished by "doing to him as he thought to have done to his brother." But two difficulties remain: (1) The boundary between civil and moral laws is sometimes hard to draw, e.g. in the cases of the prohibited degrees of marriage. This is sometimes the case even between the ceremonial and the moral, e.g. how far do the Biblical laws about the Sabbath apply to the Lord's Day? (2) If a law or regulation is taken over from the Old Testament, or coincides with one found there, is it therefore more binding on the conscience than other laws taken from other sources? Again, if "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil" is regarded as a moral law, how far is it set aside by the principles of democracy, according to which the wish of the majority should be carried out, however unwise or unjust others may think it?

Another tendency has been to make the Old Testament a mere collection of Messianic types and prophecies; or, which is very much but not quite the same, to apply it all allegorically to the Christian life. This last began very early, having indeed pre-Christian precedent; Philo interpreted the Pentateuch allegorically. To Christians the Old Testament was originally "the Scripture"; only later were the New Testament books regarded as canonical in the same sense. Yet clearly there were in the literal history some objectionable things, and much did not give direct spiritual help. The solution was that of allegory. On the one hand, this enabled some of the Fathers to combine very high views on the inspiration of Scripture with abandonment of the literal history where difficult; it was written simply to teach the spiritual lessons. On the other, spiritual lessons could be found in the most unpromising parts, e.g. in genealogies by interpreting the Hebrew names, not always correctly. Often the resultant teaching is very good and true, though divorced from the original meaning of the passage, e.g. Psalm cxxxvii. 9, "Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the rock" was obviously difficult for Christians to use literally. Actually, the most sensible way is to repeat such verses *historically* as expressing the feelings of the *Psalmist*, not necessarily our own; much else in the Psalms

has to be used in this way, e.g. "I will offer bullocks and goats." Or as Bishop Dowden asks, can the ordinary worshipper be speaking of *himself* when he repeats the Magnificat, "All generations shall call *me* blessed"? But the Psalm verse was thus allegorized: "'Babel' means confusion. The children of the daughter of Babel are vain, confused evil thoughts. The rock is Christ. When vain or evil thoughts come to us, destroy them by recourse to Christ the Rock." The result is excellent, though far removed from the Psalmist's thought.

It is also not very satisfactory to value the Old Testament mainly for Messianic Prophecies. Many of these do not appeal to every one; to some of us they often seem far-fetched, only secondary applications of the original meaning. It is without doubt a striking fact that many Old Testament sayings are in a high degree true of Christ. But it is not very satisfactory to take isolated verses of a passage as direct Messianic prophecies, while adjacent verses are not regarded as such; or else to force these other verses into bearing such a sense. Also often in the Psalms there is practical loss in regarding the words as a direct prophecy of Christ. We lose the encouragement derived from the Psalmist's personal experience and feel it difficult to use his words to express our own personal feelings.

The value of the Old Testament is, however, not merely historical. It conveys religious and moral lessons, partly in the history by way of example or warning, partly more directly. Christianity starts from the Old Testament religion, though it modifies or completes it. Some things which lie at the root of Christianity are taken for granted in the New Testament as belonging to its basis, e.g. Christianity rests on Theism—the doctrine not merely of a purely immanent God, but also of a living transcendent God. The doctrine—and the consciousness of the living God—runs through the Old Testament. And this God is a God of righteousness. In the Old Testament, religion and morality are never disconnected, as often comes to be the case in other religions, when we find on the one side popular religions with very little to do with morality or righteousness; on the other, philosophies, sometimes of high tone, but largely agnostic or even atheistic, or at best pantheistic. This could not be asserted of the Old Testament religion or "wisdom." The popular religion was no doubt always in danger of

falling to the level of that of the surrounding nations ; but the prophets prevented this, without losing sight of the Divine Personality and government of the world. Even things below our ideas of morality were in accordance with the accepted ideas of the age and region.

New Testament morality also presupposes that of the Old. The current idea that the Lord's teaching is systematic and complete in itself, and that it contains all Christianity, is a mere assumption without clear evidence. It is, in fact, obvious that much which He said is unrecorded. One whole side of His teaching, brought out by St. John, is very slightly represented in the other Gospels ; hence it is possible that other elements in His teaching are only slightly represented. (The cry " Back to Christ " commonly means " Back to Jesus the Prophet of Nazareth "—ignoring any special value in His Death or His Resurrection, which are prominent in the Apostolic interpretation of the Gospel ; and even then rejects various elements in the teaching ascribed to Him. It is often a plausible pretext for dropping Christian theology.)

He took most of the Old Testament teaching for granted, though modifying and correcting some of it. Again, His teaching was primarily meant for, and suited to, His immediate hearers ; He was familiar with their circumstances, needs and ideas, and said what they needed and could assimilate. Had He told them just the things *we* should like to know, or the things specially suiting *our* needs and conditions, His words would not have taken hold of His hearers, would never have been recorded, and so would never have reached us at all ! *Our* special conditions were not primarily in view.

For instance, Patriotism is clearly not taught by Our Lord, or indeed in the New Testament generally. Hence arise two opposite criticisms of Christianity. (1) " This is one of many signs that its ethics are imperfect ; it encourages only the milder (' feminine ') virtues, having no place for the stronger ones ; or it inculcates a ' slave-morality. ' " (2) " Patriotism is unchristian. " But we have to remember the ideas and position of the people to whom the Lord spoke. The Old Testament is full of patriotism. Jews did not need any teaching of it ; they were inclined to carry it much too far, to make it the supreme virtue. And there was no particular need—or indeed room—for national feeling among the small nation-

alities of the Roman Empire. (See C. W. Emmet in *The Faith and the War*.) Here as elsewhere a completely different result is reached if we regard the New Testament as *setting aside* the Old, or as qualifying and supplementing it, while taking over the bulk of its teaching.

We have, of course, to face the moral difficulties of the Old Testament. These are, however, often unduly exaggerated by forgetfulness of the general condition and ideas of the ancient world. (See Mozley, *Lectures on the Old Testament*.) Unhistorical ideas of the laws of Israel are also to blame; it is often imagined that they were all divinely ordained *de novo*, instead of being largely adaptations or modifications of existing laws and practices. God found Israel on much the same level as their neighbours; He took them to train them gradually to something higher. We must never ignore the progressive character of revelation. Yet the progression is not such as to involve a nearly complete break between the Old Testament and the New. The old idea, that the actions of leading Old Testament characters (except when these actions are clearly condemned in Scripture) furnish a clear precedent of conduct for us, would mean setting aside all knowledge of God and His will subsequently gained. But much current condemnation of such acts is very cheap and unfair; it often puts the worst possible construction upon them. It is a cheap and easy way of displaying the superior moral enlightenment that the speaker or writer enjoys.

I am not afraid for the future of the Old Testament; but I am afraid for the future of those churches or communities which despise or ignore the Old Testament—believing in a God of benevolence but not in one of righteousness; and so regarding all enforcement of law as anti-christian. Either this sentiment which passes for the purest Christianity, while repudiating God's earlier revelation, will ultimately find its true level; or if it so continues to weaken the hands of society that civilization is swept away by a flood of barbarism, then the barbaric Churches which survive will find themselves at home in the roughest parts of the Old Testament.

THE SPECTATOR A SINCERE CHRISTIAN.

[We are glad to have had placed at our disposal two articles on "The 'Spectator' a Sincere Christian," written before his lamented death by the REV. G. S. STREATFIELD, the first of which we print as follows.]

IN an age conspicuous for its scepticism (to use no stronger term), an age of which Bishop Butler could write, "It is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted, by many persons, that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry."¹ Joseph Addison stood forth as a champion of the Christian faith; his faith as a Christian, if we may judge from his writings, growing firmer and more confident with years,² and sealed on his death-bed by the well-known words spoken to his stepson, the young Earl of Warwick, "See in what peace a Christian can die."

It was a frequent, though not invariable, practice with the editors of the *Spectator* to choose a serious subject for their Saturday issue. All the essays on Milton's "Paradise Lost" appeared on Saturday, and there are many papers in the first seven volumes of a still more definitely religious type. The eighth volume, begun two years after the completion of the seventh, contains a remarkable proportion of essays that the devoutest and most scholarly divines of the day might have written—essays of which Lord Macaulay, not perhaps without a grain of exaggeration, could say that they bear comparison with the finest passages in *Marsillon*.³

Next to Addison, and not so very far behind him, Steele was the principal writer for the *Spectator*, and Steele, while less consistent and devout than his co-editor, was also a sincere Christian, lending all his weight both as a writer and a politician to the task of stemming

¹ Bishop Butler is but one of many witnesses to the religious condition of England in the first half of the eighteenth century. Addison himself, writing in *The Freeholder*, No. 37, declared that there was "less appearance of religion in England than in any neighbouring state or kingdom." Bishop Berkeley complains that "a cold indifference for the national religion, indeed for all matters of faith and divine worship, is thought good sense." *Works*, vol. iii, p. 63. It was a stock joke of the early years of the Walpole administration (1723) that "certain statesmen were engaged in cooking up a Bill at a hunting-seat in Norfolk (the county in which Walpole lived) for the purpose of excising the word 'not' from the decalogue, and inserting it in every clause of the creed." Sydney, *England and the English in the Eighteenth Century*, p. 322 ff.

² Addison left unpublished at his death a treatise on the *Evidences of Christianity*, begun in 1713, which was published among his posthumous works.

³ There is good ground for believing that Addison, in early life, seriously contemplated entering holy orders. See *Addisoniana*, vol. i, p. 33.

the tide of infidelity and vice. His papers in the *Spectator* leave no doubt on this point.¹

By far the more important part of the definitely religious element in the *Spectator* is from the pen of Addison, and, in the pages that follow, this feature of the essays will be illustrated chiefly from his contributions.

It almost goes without saying that Addison was no bigot. His moderation is as conspicuous in matters of faith as in those of politics. He was no party man in any sense of the term. Indeed, it may be admitted that, by his lack of zeal, he was a typical representative of the age he adorned. On no subject does he write with more candour and conviction :

No. 201. An enthusiast in religion is like an obstinate clown, a superstitious man like an insipid courtier. Enthusiasm has something in it of madness, superstition or folly. Most of the sects that fall short of the Church of England have in them a strong tincture of enthusiasm, as the Roman Catholic religion is one huge body of childish and idle superstitions.

No. 185. There is nothing in which men more deceive themselves than in what the world calls zeal. There are so many passions which hide themselves under it, and so many mischiefs arising from it, that some have gone so far as to say, it would have been for the benefit of mankind, if it had never been reckoned in the catalogue of virtues.² It is certain, where it is once laudable and prudential,

¹ No essay, so far as is known, was written by Steele for the eighth volume. See above.

It is recorded that during the last three or four years of his life, after the paralytic seizure which enfeebled both mind and body, Steele would have nothing read to him but from the Bible or Prayer Book. See *Addisoniana*, vol. i, p. 57.

² It was later in the century than Addison's time that a well-known and gifted clergyman wrote, "Mankind in general, if left to themselves, have little or no propensity to that most horrible of all vices called zeal."—*A Country Clergyman of the Eighteenth Century*, Thomas Twining, p. 85. It is only fair to add that the words quoted had reference to the Gordon Riots of 1780. In one respect the Roman Catholic religion, in the opinion of Addison, had an advantage over Protestant Churches. In his *Remarks on Italy* he represents conventual life as a safety-valve for the zeal and fanaticism which tend to schism. "I take one great cause why there are so few sects in the Church of Rome, to be the multitude of convents, with which they everywhere abound, that serve as receptacles for all those fiery zealots who would set the church in a flame, were they not got together in these houses of devotion. All men of dark tempers, according to their degree of melancholy or enthusiasm, may find convents fitted to their humours, and meet with companions as gloomy as themselves."—*Works* (Hurd), vol. ii, p. 198. No. 220 of the *Tatler* in the *Church Thermometer* (supposed to have been invented in the reign of Henry the Eighth) should be read as illustrating Addison's thoughts on religious enthusiasm. The following words of Swift might almost have been written by Addison: "Violent zeal for truth has a hundred to one odds to be either petulancy, ambition, or pride."

it is an hundred times criminal and erroneous ; nor can it be otherwise, if we consider that it operates with equal violence in all religions, however opposite they may be to one another, and in all the subdivisions of each religion in particular. . . . I would have every zealous man examine his heart thoroughly, and I believe, he will often find, that what he calls a zeal for his religion is either pride's interest, or ill-nature. . . . It is certain if our zeal were true and genuine, we should be much more angry with a sinner than a heretic ; since there are several cases which may excuse the latter before his great Judge, but none which can excuse the former.

No. 186 may be read as a confession of faith on the part of Addison before the world. It purports to be a letter written by Sir Roger de Coverley's chaplain, who is always presented to us in the most favourable light. The letter, it is clear, expresses Addison's own religious convictions, and is, for that reason, a valuable portion of the *Spectator*. It does not humour or stir the religious sentiments of to-day. There is more egoism than altruism in the confession, and there is a commercial tone of profit and loss, which, however natural and prevalent in Addison's time, jars upon the ear of the twentieth century ; but no one can deny the sincerity and piety of the utterance :

A believer may be excused by the most hardened atheist for endeavouring to make him a convert, because he does it with an eye to both their interests. The atheist is inexcusable who tries to gain over a believer, because he does not propose the doing himself or the believer any good by such a conversion.

The prospect of a future state is the secret comfort and refreshment of my soul ; it is that which makes nature look gay about me ; it doubles all my pleasures, and supports me under all my afflictions. I can look at disappointments and misfortunes, pain and sickness, death itself, and what is worse than death, the loss of those who are dearest to me, with indifference, so long as I keep in view the pleasures of eternity, and the state of being in which there will be no fears nor apprehensions, pains nor sorrows, sickness nor separation. Why will any man be so impertinently officious as to tell me all this is only fancy and delusion ? Is there any merit in being the messenger of ill news ? If it is a dream, let me enjoy it, since it makes me both the happier and better man.

I must confess I do not know how to trust a man who believes neither heaven nor hell, or, in other words, a future state of rewards and punishments.¹ Not only natural self-love, but reason directs us to promote our own interests above all things. . . .

¹ One is reminded here of Voltaire's aphorism : " Si Dieu n'existait pas, il faudrait l'inventer."

Infidelity has been attacked with so good success of late years, that it is driven out of all its outworks. The atheist has not found his post tenable, and is therefore retired into deism, and a disbelief of revealed religion only. But the truth of it is, the greatest number of this set of men are those who, for want of a virtuous education, or examining the grounds of religion, know so very little of the matter in question, that their infidelity is but another term for their ignorance.¹ . . .

The great received articles of the Christian religion have been so clearly proved from the authority of that divine revelation in which they are delivered, that it is impossible for those who have ears to hear, and eyes to see, not to be convinced of them. But were it possible for anything in the Christian faith to be erroneous, I can find no ill consequences in adhering to it. The great points of the incarnation and sufferings of our Saviour produce naturally such habits of virtue in the mind of man, that I say, supposing it were possible for us to be mistaken in them, the infidel himself must at least allow that no other system of religion could so effectually contribute to the heightening of morality. They give us great ideas of the dignity of human nature, and of the love which the Supreme Being bears in His creatures, and consequently engage us in the highest acts of duty towards our Creator, our neighbour, and ourselves. How many noble arguments has Saint Paul raised from the chief articles of our religion, for the advancing of morality in its three great branches! To give a single example in each kind. What can be a stronger motive to a firm trust and reliance on the mercies of our Maker, than the giving us His Son to suffer for us? What can make us love and esteem even the most inconsiderable of mankind more than the thought that Christ died for him? Or what dispose us to set a stricter guard upon the purity of our own hearts, than our being members of Christ, and a part of the society of which that immaculate person is the head? But these are only a specimen of those admirable inforcements of morality, which the apostle has drawn from the history of our blessed Saviour.

If our modern infidels considered these matters with that candour and seriousness which they deserve, we should not see them act with such a spirit of bitterness, arrogance and malice. They would not be raising such insignificant cavils, doubts and scruples, as may be started against everything that is not capable of mathematical demonstration; in order to unsettle the minds of the ignorant, disturb the public peace, subvert morality and throw all things into confusion and disorder. (*Addison.*)

In No. 201 the duty of those entrusted with the upbringing of children to implant early devotion in their hearts is urged:

¹ Addison is hardly altogether consistent in his treatment of the infidelity of his age. Rationalism, teste Bishop Butler and others (see above), was gaining, rather than losing, ground when the *Spectator* papers were written. See also, e.g., Swift's *Argument Against Abolishing Christianity*.

It is of the last importance to season the passions of a child with devotion, which seldom dies in a mind that has received an early tincture of it. Though it may seem extinguished for a while by the cares of the world, the heats of youth, or the allurements of vice, it generally breaks out and discovers itself again as soon as discretion, consideration, age, or misfortunes have brought the man to himself. The fire may be covered and overlaid, but cannot be entirely quenched and smothered.

A state of temperance, sobriety, and justice, without devotion, is a cold, lifeless, insipid condition of virtue, and is rather to be styled philosophy than religion. Devotion opens the mind to great conceptions, and fills it with more sublime ideas than any that are to be met with in the most exalted science; and at the same time warms and agitates the soul more than sensual pleasure. (*Addison.*)

In the following words (No. 293) Addison inculcates belief in Divine Providence and a sense of humble dependence upon the Supreme Being:

It is a great presumption to ascribe our successes to our own management, and not to esteem ourselves upon any blessing, rather as it is the bounty of heaven, than the acquisition of our own prudence. I am very well pleased with a medal which was struck by Queen Elizabeth, a little after the defeat of the invincible armada, to perpetuate the memory of that extraordinary event. It is well known how the King of Spain, and others who were the enemies of that great princess, to derogate from her glory, ascribed the ruin of their fleet to the violence of storms and tempests, rather than to the bravery of the English. Queen Elizabeth, instead of looking upon this as a diminution of her honour, valued herself upon such a signal favour of Providence, and, accordingly, in the reverse of the medal above-mentioned, has represented a fleet beaten by a tempest, and falling foul upon one another, with that religious description, "*Afflavit Deus et dissipantur*" ("He blew with His wind, and they were scattered").

In No. 381 Addison pursues the subject in his beautiful essay on cheerfulness, which the author must have written from his own experience, and in which he describes (perhaps unconsciously) one of the most conspicuous features in his own character. Drawing, surely, from his knowledge of the world and of human nature, he states his belief that guilt and atheism are the most fatal foes to cheerfulness:

There are but two things which, in my opinion, can reasonably deprive us of this cheerfulness of heart. The first of these is the sense of guilt. A man who lives in a state of vice and impenitence, can have no title to that evenness and tranquillity of mind which is the health of the soul, and the natural effect of virtue and

innocence. Cheerfulness in an ill man deserves a harder name than language can furnish us with, and is many degrees beyond what we commonly call folly or madness.

Atheism, by which I mean a disbelief of a Supreme Being, and consequently of a future state, under whatsoever titles it shelters itself, may likewise very reasonably deprive a man of this cheerfulness of temper. There is something so particularly gloomy and offensive in human nature in the prospect of non-existence, that I cannot but wonder, with many excellent writers, how it is possible for a man to outlive the expectation of it. For my own part, I think the being of a God is so little to be doubted, that it is almost the only truth we are sure of, and such a truth as we may meet with in every object, in every occurrence, and in every thought. If we look into the characters of this tribe of infidels, we generally find they are made up of pride, spleen and cavil.¹ It is indeed no wonder, that men who are uneasy to themselves should be so to the rest of the world; and how is it possible for a man to be otherwise than uneasy in himself, who is in danger every moment of losing his entire existence, and dropping into nothing?

The vicious man and atheist have therefore no pretence to cheerfulness and would act very unreasonably should they endeavour after it. It is impossible for anyone to live in good humour, and enjoy his present existence, who is apprehensive either of turmoil or of annihilation; of being miserable, or of not being at all. (*Addison.*)

In No. 458, *Spectator* seriously and forcibly rebukes the moral cowardice of those who fear to confess their faith:

We have in England a particular bashfulness in everything that regards religion. A well-bred man is obliged to conceal any serious sentiment of this nature, and very often to appear a greater libertine than he is, that he may keep himself in countenance among the men of mode. Our excess of modesty makes us shamefaced in all the exercises of piety and devotion. This humour prevails upon us daily; insomuch that at many well-bred tables, the master of the house is so very modest a man, that he has not the confidence to say grace at his own table: a custom which is not only practised by all the nations about us, but was never omitted by the heathens themselves. English gentlemen who travel into Roman-Catholic countries, are not a little surprised to meet with people of the best quality kneeling in their churches, and engaged in their private devotions, though it be not at the hours of public worship. An officer of the army, or a man of wit and pleasure, in those countries, would be afraid of passing not only for an irreligious, but an ill-bred man, should he be seen to go to bed, or sit down at table, without offering up his devotions on such occasions. The same show of religion appears in all the foreign reformed churches, and enters so

¹ Had Addison lived to-day he would have doubtless more than modified this statement.

much into their ordinary conversation, that an Englishman is apt to term them hypocritical and precise.

Perhaps characteristically (for Addison was a loyal Churchman) this reserve is traced to the sanctimonious speech and practices which had been encouraged by Puritans of the more pronounced type :

This little appearance of religious deportment in our nation, may proceed in some measure from that modesty which is natural to us ; but the great occasion of it is certainly this : Those swarms of sectaries¹ that overran the nation in the time of the great rebellion, carried their hypocrisy so high, that they converted our whole language into a jargon of enthusiasm ; insomuch that, upon the Restoration, men thought they could not recede too far from the behaviour and practice of those persons who had made religion a cloak for so many villainies. This led them into the other extreme ; every appearance of devotion was looked upon as puritanical ; and, falling into the hands of the "ridiculers" who flourished in that reign, and attacked everything that was serious, it has ever since been out of countenance among us. By this means we are gradually fallen into that vicious modesty, which has in some measure worn out from among us the appearance of Christianity in ordinary life and conversation, and which distinguishes us from all our neighbours.

Hypocrisy cannot indeed be too much detested, but at the same time is to be preferred to open impiety. They are both equally destructive to the person who is possessed with them ; but, in regard to others, hypocrisy is not so pernicious as barefaced irreligion. The due mean to be observed is to be sincerely virtuous, and at the same time to let the world see we are so. I do not know a more dreadful menace in the holy writings, than that which is pronounced against those who have this perverted modesty, to be ashamed before men in a particular of such unspeakable importance. (*Addison.*)

What Addison thought of Puritanism we may judge from No. 494 :

About an age ago it was the fashion in England, for every one that would be thought religious, to throw as much sanctity as possible into his face, and, in particular to abstain from all appearances of mirth and pleasantry, which were looked upon as the masks of a carnal mind. The saint was of a sorrowful countenance, and generally eaten up with spleen and melancholy. . . . Notwithstanding this general form and outside of religion is pretty well worn out among us, there are many persons who, by a natural uncheerfulness of heart, mistaken notions of piety, or weakness of understanding, love to indulge this uncomfortable way of life, and

¹ Cp. *Freeholder*, No. 37.

give up themselves a prey to grief and melancholy. Superstitious fears and groundless scruples cut them off from the pleasures of conversation, and all those social entertainments, which are not only innocent but laudable: as if mirth were made for reprobates, and cheerfulness of heart denied those who are the only persons that have a proper title to it.

Sombrius is one of these sons of sorrow. He thinks himself obliged in duty to be sad and disconsolate. He looks on a sudden fit of laughter as a breach of his baptismal vow. An innocent jest startles him like blasphemy. Tell him of one who is advanced to a title of honour, he lifts up his hands and eyes; describe a public ceremony, he shakes his head; shew him a gay equipage, he blesses himself. All the little ornaments of life are pomps and vanities. Mirth is wanton, and wit profane. He is scandalized at youth for being lively, and at childhood for being playful. He sits at a christening, or a marriage feast, as at a funeral; sighs at the conclusion of a merry story, and grows devout when the rest of the company grow pleasant. After all, Sombrius is a religious man, and would have behaved himself very properly, had he lived when Christianity was under a general persecution.

I would by no means presume to tax such characters with hypocrisy, as is done too frequently; that being a vice, which I think none but He, Who knows the secrets of men's hearts, should pretend to discover in another, where the proofs of it do not amount to a demonstration. On the contrary, as there are many excellent persons, who are weighed down by this habitual sorrow of heart, they rather deserve our compassion than our reproaches. I think, however, they would do well to consider whether such behaviour does not deter men from a religious life, by representing it as an unsociable state, that extinguishes all joy and gladness, darkens the face of nature, and destroys the relish of being itself.

I have in former papers, shewn how great a tendency there is to cheerfulness in religion, and how such a frame of mind is not only the most lovely, but the most commendable in a virtuous person. In short, those who represent religion in so unamiable a light, are like the spies sent by Moses to make a discovery of the land of promise, when by their reports they discouraged the people from entering upon it. Those who shew us the joy, the cheerfulness, the good-humour, that naturally spring up in this happy state, are like the spies bringing along with them the clusters of grapes, and delicious fruits, that might invite their companions into the pleasant country which produced them. . . .

The contemplation of the Divine Being, and the exercise of virtue, are, in their own nature, so far from excluding all gladness of heart, that they are perpetual sources of it. In a word, the true spirit of religion cheers, as well as composes the soul; it banishes indeed all levity of behaviour, all vicious and dissolute mirth, but in exchange fills the mind with a perpetual serenity, uninterrupted cheerfulness, and an habitual inclination to please others, as well as to be pleased in itself.

Addison could look to the pagan as well as the Christian world for his saints. Cato, as we know from his tragedy of that title, claimed his homage. Still deeper was his reverence for the character of Socrates :

No. 213. When I employ myself upon a paper of morality I generally consider how I may recommend the particular virtue which I treat of, by the precepts or examples of the ancient heathens : by that means if possible, to shame those who have greater advantages of knowing their duty, and therefore greater obligations to perform it, into a better course of life : besides that many among us are unreasonably disposed to give a fairer hearing to a pagan philosopher, than to a Christian writer.

I shall therefore produce an instance of this excellent frame of mind in a speech of Socrates, which is quoted by Erasmus. This great philosopher on the day of his execution, a little before the draught of poison was brought to him, entertaining his friends with a discourse on the immortality of the soul, has these words : “ Whether or not God will approve my actions, I know not ; but this I am sure of, that I have at all times made it my endeavour to please Him, and I have a good hope that this my endeavour will be accepted by Him.” We find in these words of that great man the habitual good intention which I would here inculcate, and with which that divine philosopher always acted. I shall only add that Erasmus,¹ who was an unbigoted Roman Catholic, was so much transported with this passage of Socrates, that he could scarce forbear looking upon him as a saint, and desiring him to pray for him ; or as the ingenious and learned writer has expressed himself in a much more lively manner, “ When I reflect on such a speech pronounced by such a person, I can scarce forbear crying out ‘ Sancte Socrates, or a pro nobis ! ’ ”

In few of his papers is Addison’s irony more severe than when he comments on those who interpret misfortunes as judgments :

No. 483. We cannot be guilty of a greater act of uncharitableness than to interpret the afflictions which befall our neighbours as punishments and judgments. . . . The humour of turning every misfortune into a judgment proceeds from wrong notions of religion, which, in its own nature, produces good-will toward men and puts the mildest construction upon every accident that befalls them. In this case, therefore, it is not religion that sours a man’s temper, but it is his temper that sours his religion. . . . An old maiden gentlewoman, whom I shall conceal under the name of Nemesis, is the greatest discoverer of judgments that I have ever met with. She can tell you what sin it was that set such a man’s house on fire, or blew down his barns. Talk to her of an unfortunate young lady that lost her beauty by the smallpox, she fetches a deep sigh,

¹ *A pophthegm*, Book II.

and tells you, that when she had a fine face, she was always looking on it in her glass. Tell her of a piece of good fortune that has befallen one of her acquaintance, and she wishes it may prosper with her, but her mother used one of her nieces very barbarously. Her usual remarks turn upon people who had great estates, but never enjoyed them by reason of some flaw in their own or their father's behaviour. She can give you the reason why such an one died childless; why such an one was cut off in the flower of his youth; why such an one was unhappy in her marriage; why one broke his leg on such a particular spot of ground; and why another was killed with a back-sword,¹ rather than with any other weapon. She has a crime for every misfortune that can befall any of her acquaintance; and when she hears of a robbery that has been made, or a murder that has been committed, enlarges more on the guilt of the suffering person, than on that of the thief or assassin. In short, she is so good a Christian, that whatever happens to herself is a trial, and whatever happens to her neighbours is a judgment. . . . Indeed, most historians, as well Christian as pagan, have fallen into this idle superstition, and spoken of ill success, unforeseen disasters, and terrible events, as if they had been let into the secrets of Providence, and made acquainted with that private conduct by which the world is governed. One would think several of our own historians in particular had many revelations of this kind made to them. Our old English monks seldom let any of their kings depart in peace, who had endeavoured to diminish the power or wealth of which the ecclesiastics were in those times possessed. William the Conqueror's race generally found their judgments in the New Forest, where their father had pulled down churches and monasteries. In short, read one of the chronicles written by an author of this frame of mind, and you would think you were reading the history of the Kings of Israel or Judah, where the historians were actually inspired, and where by a particular scheme of Providence, the Kings were distinguished by judgments or blessings, according as they promoted idolatry or the worship of the true God. (*Addison.*)

¹ *Back-sword*, a sword with only one cutting edge.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

"THE MIND OF THE SPECTATOR."

THE MIND OF THE SPECTATOR UNDER THE EDITORSHIP OF ADDISON AND STEELE. By the Rev. Canon G. S. Streatfeild, M.A. London: *T. Fisher Unwin, Ltd.* 7s. 6d. net.

In the July CHURCHMAN we briefly mentioned this interesting volume, and stated that we would return to it later. We do so in this issue with special appropriateness, as we publish at the same time an article by Canon Streatfeild which, had space permitted, would possibly have found a place in the published volume. We feel sure that readers of the article will have no hesitation in obtaining a copy of the book now under review, and so follow the able and excellent compilation of one, as Dr. David says in his foreword, "whose own warmth of heart, and native taste, and humorous temper are reflected in *The Mind of the Spectator*, which he understood the better because he was in natural accord with the broad human sympathy there revealed." Canon Streatfeild had been a constant contributor to THE CHURCHMAN, and his thoughtful articles were always greatly appreciated; and to those who, like the writer, had the privilege of knowing him personally, the present book, written with all the grace and charm so essentially his, will bring back happy memories of his personality.

The book contains a selection from the papers in the *Spectator*, prepared by Canon Streatfeild before his death, which he proposed to have published under the above title, and his intention in preparing this work was to exhibit the general attitude of the *Spectator* towards various important subjects by collecting from the original eight large volumes the most interesting relevant material which he could discover. Many previous selections have been made from the pages of the *Spectator*, but none have taken this form, as in the present volume we are shown the Mind of the *Spectator* as "Guide, Philosopher and Friend," on "Men," "Women," "Marriage," and on "The Oddities of Life."

The explanatory foot-notes which appear throughout the book render it specially valuable, and display the careful and painstaking methods of the compiler, and the amount of research which he devoted to its compilation. In particular the character sketches of Addison and Steele which appear in the chapter headed "Personal" are of great interest, but the insight which is given into the period, its habits and thought, cannot fail to arrest attention. One particular matter might be mentioned, and that is brought out in a paragraph from a letter of Addison's in which he speaks of "finding out a convenient place where I may build an almshouse, which I intend to endow very handsomely, for a dozen superannuated husbandmen. It will be a great pleasure to say my prayers twice a day with men of my own years, who all of them, as well as myself, may have their thoughts taken up how they shall die, rather than

how they shall live." As Canon Streatfeild puts it in a foot-note, morning and evening prayer through the week in parish churches was evidently no uncommon thing in Queen Anne's reign.

UNCONVENTIONAL PRAYERS FOR BOYS.

UNCONVENTIONAL PRAYERS FOR BOYS. By A. G. Grenfell, M.A., Oxon. *Philip & Tacey, Ltd.* 2s. 6d. net.

These Prayers have been arranged by the author, who is the head master of Mostyn House School, Parkgate, Cheshire, and formerly an assistant master of Westminster School, to provide an occasional and arresting change from the conventional Collect, on week-days in his Preparatory School Chapel. There are fifty sets of prayers arranged for such subjects as the Beginning of Term, End of Term, Being Sincere, God's Justice, Liars, etc. The particular use of the word "unconventional" is that the boys are asked to sit down while a short exposition is read in simple language on the particular subject, which is followed by one or two prayers. Here, although the boys are asked to sit down and to kneel only for the last few moments, the whole treatment of each subject is meant to be a prayer. We like this explanation, summed up as it is by a short prayer, and appreciate the following reference, from a letter by Canon Owen which is inserted as a Preface, "after reading a few of the compositions at House Prayers, I asked an intelligent boy of fifteen how he liked them. He answered, 'Immensely; and so does every one. Will they be used in Chapel?'" We hope and think that the book will be of great service, and will do much to teach boys how to express themselves in prayer.

ST. PAUL AND THE MODERN WORLD.

THE APOSTLE PAUL AND THE MODERN WORLD. By F. G. Peabody. London: *Macmillan & Co.* 10s. 6d.

Professor Peabody informs us that the Theological Library of Harvard University has more than two thousand volumes dealing with the life and letters of St. Paul. Everything connected with him and his thought may seem to have been explored, but the world to-day needs an interpretation of his message. Nothing in recent theology has been more remarkable than the re-discovery of St. Paul as the expositor of the Christian Gospel. Half a century ago he seemed to have passed under a cloud. The cry "Back to Christ" was raised as signifying "we appeal from Paul to his Master," with an implied contradiction between his teaching and that of the Redeemer. To-day Dean Inge truly says: "St. Paul truly understood, what most Christians never realize, namely, that the Gospel of Christ is not a religion, but religion itself, in its most universal and deepest significance." Because he realized this, his message is timeless—it deals with the eternities as brought into touch with human life. He was debtor to all classes of men, his

mind dwelt in the universals of the heavenlies and therefore his teaching was in all its leading ideas and their application that of Him who, when lifted up, draws all men unto Him.

Professor Peabody writes popularly and is much under the influence of contemporary thought. We do not accept his exposition of the Christology of St. Paul as true to the inner convictions of the Apostle. The Saviour was not to him the kind of secondary deity. "The deity of Christ is not a Pauline doctrine. . . . A new title is applied to him; he is the 'Lord' (Kurios). It was a term familiar in mystery worship, applied to the gods of Egypt and Asia Minor, and even assumed by Roman Emperors as indicating their divine rights; yet the title, though it justified divine attributes, did not imply Deity itself. 'The more exalted the idea of supreme deity, the more need was felt of some intermediary between Him and the world of creation and providence. Such divinity did not conflict with monotheism.'" Of course this is the teaching of Bousset and others. Dr. McNeile holds that nowhere in the New Testament is it a theological term for Christ connoting divinity. "We can only say that the fullness and splendour of the title, and the intensity and fervour of their veneration would increase as they realized more profoundly the mystery of His person, until they learned to say 'my Lord and my God.'" Or, as has been well said: "The ease and naturalness with which Paul passes from the thought of God to that of Christ shows that he knows no other God save the God who was one with Christ and Christ with Him, that in turning in faith and prayer to Christ he was conscious of drawing near to God in the truest way, and that in calling on God he was calling on Christ, in whom alone God was accessible to men." Recognizing the stern monotheism of St. Paul it is impossible to read, for example, his Epistle to the Philippians without feeling and knowing that for Him Christ is God. We do not expect to find in letters a theological statement of the implications of the underlying thought. The whole attitude of St. Paul to the Christ in whom he lived is only comprehensible on the acknowledgement that the Redeemer who died and rose is divine.

If we find at times Professor Peabody an untrustworthy theological guide, we are by no means blind to the value of this book. It is thoroughly alive, and the fact that New Testament quotations are taken from Moffatt's version forces the reader to understand their thought. There is much force in the contention of Dr. Caird that "the ethical principle in Paul begat the logical, rather than that the theological begat the ethical." But even this is not the whole truth. St. Paul identified his theology with his ethical teaching. For him, God is righteous and God can only be rightly thought about when His worshippers live the life. "His theology is a thrilling interlude of daring adventure, between the repentance from which he rises and the exhortations with which he concludes." It is more than this. It is the very fibre of his being. For him the very centre of all his faith was God—his morality was a God-inspired morality and the ethical and theological principles were

so closely combined that it is impossible for one to say, "one begets the other." We are in danger of lapsing into the modern conception that men can think rightly about God and be immoral. For St. Paul such an outlook was impossible. He was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and Jehovah demanded right action as much as He demanded reverence to His Name.

Much stress is laid on the saying of Archbishop Temple: "Our theology has been cast into the scholastic mode, i.e. all based on logic. We are in need of and we are gradually being forced into, a theology based on psychology. The transition, I fear, will not be without much pain; but nothing can prevent it." With St. Paul, theology had its roots in the Old Testament and the Christian experience. We are of those who believe that St. Paul presumed among his converts and correspondents knowledge of the details of the Life of Christ. Otherwise he would be preaching or teaching in the air. History can never be cast on one side—otherwise experience simply projects and creates the object of its worship. And here Christianity, as always, supplies the need. We have the records of the Life that give us in outline the Personality; the personality of St. Paul embraced the Personality of Christ and there is no contradiction between his teaching and that of his Master. Such a thought would have been anathema to St. Paul. We can never forget this in our study of the Apostle.

There was development in his thought. As his experience grew richer he learned more of Christ, but fundamentally the revelation of Jesus revealed to him on the way to Damascus remained unchanged. We do not believe that the Mystery religions had anything like the hold on his thought that is attributed to them. He hated their origin and the phrases relied upon as expressive of his acceptance of their ideals are in reality the fruit of his experience. To the end of his life his spiritual environment, as far as external religious teaching was concerned, was the Old Testament. His spiritual religion was derived from communion, not with a Christ projected by himself, but with the Christ of the Gospels, and his influence over the Christian Church is due to his intellectual and practical universalization of the Gospel message. Professor Peabody has said many things worth saying, and he has said them well. His book is suggestive and earnest, as an account of the life and writings of the Apostle, but we part company with his exposition of Pauline theology and Christology. It is well worth reading as the reasoned opinions of one who knows Church History, is widely read, and in many instances is able to correct one-sided presentations of the teaching of St. Paul.

THE PROPHETS OF ISRAEL.

PROPHECY AND THE PROPHETS IN ANCIENT ISRAEL. By T. H. Robinson. London: *Duckworth & Co.* 5s.

Professor Theodore H. Robinson of University College, Cardiff, essays to give a sketch of the development and content of prophecy

in Israel. His standpoint is modern. He holds that "the nomadic Hebrews carried with them portable symbols of stones. These had been received—so their tradition ran, and there is no reason to doubt it—at the mountain, and were a concrete sign of the Covenant." Before Moses we know little of the history of Israel, and there were two religions struggling for victory during the development of her national life. The original system of a pastoral people was corrupted when the nation became agricultural. Syncretism became popular and this continued for many centuries. Efforts had to be made to purify the crude beliefs—which were in reality the result of the impact of the creeds of more civilized people, and the prophets were raised up to do this work. He draws a clear distinction between the Seer and the Prophet. Samuel was the typical seer. "The whole picture is one of a sober, dignified, weighty person standing high in favour with God, and in honour among men." In contrast to him were the prophets, victims of ecstasy. Sometimes the ecstasy was spontaneous—sometimes induced. Lunacy was held in the East to be a divine visitation, and the prophet whose message fired the train of Jehu's revolt was called a raving lunatic. The truth of God comes on the world not as a lightning flash but as the light of dawn which shines brighter and brighter till it reaches the full day. In 1000 B.C. a complete exposition of what God had to tell men would have been incomprehensible. It was better that this imperfect medium should have been employed for the evolution of the world's faith, than that all accepted notions as to the methods of God's dealing with man should be violently overthrown. Israel knew that the Prophet was a man of God, and the prophet could thus be used to show Israel what God was really like. "It was only through centuries of training that the revelation could come, and the unwavering loyalty of Israel to Yahweh, the uncompromising exclusion of all other rites and ideas, and the absolute concentration upon the person of the National God were necessary before the revelation could begin. The Nabi (prophet) was Yahweh's man in a special sense, and better than any other could insist that all Israelites must be Yahweh's men likewise."

From the bands of the prophets he traces the origin of the individual prophet who delivered his own message out of harmony with that of the rest. In the course of generations a small nucleus of oracular matter would gather round it numerous additions and accretions whose source cannot be traced. "Yet we cannot regret this process. We have no reason or right to limit the Divine inspiration to that small number of men whose names appear at the head of the prophetic books, and it may well be that some of the most cherished messages that God has ever bestowed on man have reached us through nameless prophets whose life is utterly unknown to us, and whose work has come down to us only in brief snatches and minute sections." This prepares us for a radical dissection of the work of the Prophets. For example, Isaiah is divided into at least four sections, and other books are assigned to multiple

authorship. But Professor Robinson always writes as a Christian believer. Of Jonah he says: "In a very real sense, then, the book of Jonah is the forerunner in Judaism of Christianity. It was on that very question of the universality of the true monotheistic faith that the Church ultimately broke away from its Jewish tradition. It is not the three days and three nights that make Jonah the sign, it is the universality of the Gospel which the book implies. It is true that Israel never learned that lesson, and that failure made her story perhaps the greatest spiritual tragedy in history. She abandoned her world-mission, but the Church accepted it, and for us who have succeeded to her heritage, it is profoundly true in Christ, that 'there is none other name under heaven whereby men may be saved.'"

We have said sufficient to show the character of the book, which from our point of view is open to many criticisms. There is a great deal of assumption that has no solid basis and the most that can be said for a great many of its theories is, that they are not impossible. We know of no English work that covers the ground occupied by Professor Robinson and it is well that we should have a conspectus of present-day opinions brought before us so clearly by one who has read widely and has written carefully concerning what he calls "that amazing, continuous, and progressive miracle exhibited in the spiritual history of Israel." The book closes with a bibliography by Professor A. S. Peake, which naturally contains a list of works in harmony with the views expounded by the author of this volume.

SERMONS BY ARCHDEACON CHARLES.

THE ADVENTURE INTO THE UNKNOWN. By Archdeacon R. H. Charles, D.D. Edinburgh: *T. & T. Clark.* 7s.

Twenty sermons preached by the erudite and plain-spoken Archdeacon Charles in Westminster Abbey are the last addition to the series "The Scholar as Preacher." Their author deserves attention, for he has attained in his own branch of sacred study a pre-eminent position and has his pulse upon the time. He is in some respects a man in a class by himself. He holds by Reformation teaching and yet in some respects he rejects some of its most characteristic aspects. He is a stern foe of all that is pinchbeck and dishonest. He is fearless in the expression of his views, and years after the war he is not ashamed to publish the emotions he felt during the war. He has stern words on the labour demagogues and the propagandists of class warfare. "These doctrines are being taught in England to-day. Their authors are criminals of a worse type than those imprisoned in Dartmoor; but the Government has been blind to the propaganda of these irrational fanatics, and fostered this revolutionary movement by the cowardice, the opportunism and the ignorance of economic questions it has exhibited in several great crises through which the country has passed from

the date of the Trade Disputes Act in 1906 down to the present day. Should the Governments of the future yield to such hare-brained theories, the hour of England's doom is not far off, and the great avenger of all wrong-doing will speedily take away both our place and nation."

It would be unfair to judge the preacher by paragraphs such as we have quoted or even by the following: "In modern times the Roman Church prescribes its infallible dogmas as ultimate and necessary to salvation, while in a somewhat lesser degree the Romanizing party in our own Church, and the ultra-Evangelicals in all Churches, issue their indispensable terms of fellowship; nay, more, the most benighted members of these two opposing parties declare that these terms are essential to salvation itself. The Pharisees are strongly entrenched in all the Christian Churches of the present day.' The ultramontane members of these Churches should beware lest to them be applicable Christ's words of execration: 'Ye serpents, ye brood of vipers, ye sons of hell.'" The main objective of these sermons is to lead people to God through Christ and to build them up in their faith. They are of the religious liberal type and may not be acceptable to many readers, but all who wish to have a thoughtful setting forth of the fundamental positions of the best liberal—we do not say modernist—theology should make acquaintance with these addresses which are at once stimulating and thought provoking. They have a breezy manliness about them, a downright honesty of conviction and a sense of personal religion that make them well worth careful study. The concluding sermon on Neutrality is as earnest as it is heart searching.

A HELP TO COMMUNICANTS.

HELPS TO THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. A MANUAL FOR COMMUNICANTS.

By the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D. London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 1s. 6d.

There has been for many years an unfortunate dearth of Manuals that Evangelical clergy could usefully place in the hands of their Confirmation candidates and younger communicants; and even the needs of older communicants have been very sparingly provided for. It has been a real loss, which has been felt the more acutely when we have seen the large number and variety of Manuals issued by "the other side," with teaching and exposition as dangerous as it is unsound.

In the Manual before us Dr. Gilbert has endeavoured to meet this need, and we hasten to say that he has met it admirably. As we turned over its pages and read his loving counsel and exhortation, and saw the prayers suggested for use morning and evening and at midday, the special passages of Holy Scripture to which attention is invited, and the devotions provided for use at the service of Holy Communion, we could not help thinking how many young lives might have been saved from spiritual shipwreck if

only such a Manual as this had been put into their hands at the very outset of their Christian career. It cannot but be a very real help to the spiritual life of all, whether young or old or whatever be the stage of their spiritual experience, who accept its simple Scriptural teaching and follow its wise directions.

In an introductory address it is pointed out that one of the greatest things which those just confirmed will soon realize is the vital importance of their inner life, if they are really going to be faithful followers of Christ. For the help of that inner life God has given us certain aids—Prayer, the Bible and the Holy Communion. To help those who have pledged themselves to Christ to use those aids to the best advantage is the purpose of Dr. Gilbert's valuable Manual.

The section on Prayer is fittingly based upon the well-known passage, "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength" (Isa. xl. 31), and Dr. Gilbert points out various aspects of prayer, laying stress upon the fact that prayer is spiritual intercourse with Christ and that it is through prayer we can gain from Christ the help we need in our daily lives. A passage from Bishop J. C. Ryle's *Knots Untied* (how sincerely we wish that the works of that great prince of religious writers were more often referred to) is quoted to emphasize the omnipresence of God—"There is no place in heaven or earth where He is not. Enter your closet and lock the door, and God is there." But what strikes us as the most precious part of this section is the collection of prayers for daily use; they are, of course, only suggestions, for the young Christian is encouraged to pray his own prayers, but those provided will be found to meet some of the deepest needs of the human soul.

The section on Bible Reading is shorter but it is clear and direct upon the importance of daily reading of the Bible: "It is the daily food for the nourishment of our spiritual life, and our spiritual life will inevitably become weaker if we do not partake of the spiritual food offered us by the reading of God's Word." For help and guidance at special times a series of readings is usefully set out.

The third section deals with Holy Communion, and we are most thankful for the faithfulness of its teaching. No aid to devotional life is more misunderstood or more misrepresented in many "popular" Manuals than Holy Communion, and it is a real refreshment to come upon one which is true to New Testament teaching and loyal to the Church of England position. Dr. Gilbert points out that it is a service to be observed in obedience to our Lord's command, and that it has spiritual benefits associated with it. The Holy Communion is "a visible pledge of our redemption by Christ," and when "we kneel in faith and eat the Bread and drink the Wine in obedience to our Lord's command, we are by faith appropriating all the blessings which Christ's death has procured for us." Another very important point is stressed: participation "is not to be a mere casual or haphazard thing, but a participation for which some preparation should be made." We cannot help feeling that with many the duty of "preparation" is not fulfilled

so adequately as it should be or as it used to be a generation ago ; and we are grateful to Dr. Gilbert for giving us such valuable helps to "preparation" as may be found in these pages. The hints to communicants as to their actions in church will be found useful ; there is nothing fussy or forced about these suggestions : they are quite simple and natural and will be found a real aid to devotion. Then as to the Service itself, the Order is set out in full, and to each part of it counsel and suggestions are appended which will not only make for reverence and reality at the Service, but will help the reader also to receive from it the highest spiritual advantage.

Parochial clergy will find that in Dr. Gilbert's *Helps to the Christian Life* they have just the book they have long been waiting for to place in the hands of their confirmees and communicants, and we are sure they will thank us for drawing their attention to it.

MR. DYSON HAGUE'S NEW BOOK.

THE HOLY COMMUNION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the Rev. Dyson Hague. With a Preface by the Right Rev. E. A. Knox, D.D. *The Church Book Room, 82, Victoria Street, S.W. 1s. 6d.*

There is need to-day for clear thinking. Churchmen have been confused by such remarks as "the Holy Communion in our Church is identical with the Roman Mass." Historically and contemporaneously "It is the Mass that matters," and the great need of all who follow Prayer-Book Revision is to keep their minds free from half-truths, and to see truth steadily and whole. The Holy Communion has been defaced and overlaid in the course of centuries by ceremonies and doctrine that are foreign to the Institution and the New Testament teaching on the Supper of the Lord. Until the growth of the Tractarian movement in its new phases, it was the commonplace of all Anglican Theology that there are vital differences between the Communion and the Mass. To-day, clergymen of our Church do not hesitate to affirm that they believe the Roman doctrine of the Mass, and by their celebration of the Holy Communion with its ceremonial assimilation to the Roman Mass they make their convictions clear. As Bishop Knox says, "Tractarian tenets never made any way in England until they were translated into ritualistic imitations of Rome. It is in this fact that the great importance of Prayer-Book Revision is to be found to-day. If the Church officially sanctions forms of worship which convey to the ordinary layman doctrines which he cannot distinguish from the Mass, if these doctrines come to him, not as extravagances of individual cranks, but as official Church teaching, it will be useless to say that Prayer-Book Revision did not affect doctrine." Mr. Dyson Hague shows clearly and irrefutably the conflict between Roman and Anglican teaching on the Mass, and we hope that every churchman interested in Prayer-Book Revision and the doctrine of our Church will read this well-written, popularly-phrased and

illuminating book. Its appeal is to the average churchman, who will find it free from theological subtleties, and can understand every line. We have long wished for a clear statement that is intelligible to the ordinary lay mind. *The Holy Communion in the Church of England* supplies what is required, and we urge all our readers to buy and circulate the volume.

LIFE IS GROWTH.

THOUGHTS ON THE PROBLEM AND PURPOSE OF THE INDIVIDUAL LIFE. By Charles Godfrey Balk. London: *Robert Scott*.

This is a singularly thoughtful book, written in a lucid style, by an earnest, cultured Christian of independent thinking and broad sympathies. The author asks himself, "Why am I living?" He examines successively the answers which biologists, zoologists, and sociologists have given to his question. He appreciates what is true in these answers and points out what is lacking. His own solution is:—"To take full advantage of the opportunities offered to grow ourselves and to help others to grow to beings to whom physical death will be only the beginning of a fuller and better existence beyond" (p. 30).

The full conception of the purpose of individual life, he says, has been revealed by Christ:—"A higher conception than that of becoming sons of God, brothers and friends of Jesus Christ, fellow-workers with God and His Christ, is inconceivable" (p. xvii).

There are chapters also on physical, mental, and spiritual continuity, Scriptures, Churches, sin, prayer, love, and the future. Teachers and leaders of thought would do well to read and inwardly digest this book.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTICES.

Modernism and the Person of Christ (Robert Scott, 3s. 6d.) is a criticism by Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson of some of the theories put forward at the Girton Conference. He defines Modernism as "an attempt to harmonize traditional doctrine with theories of the century. It is a tendency rather than a formulated result. It is therefore distinctly individual." The book considers Modernist Presuppositions, the sense in which Jesus called Himself God, the character and value of the Apostolic Interpretation of Christ and the Christology of the Gospels. Dr. Sparrow Simpson makes acute criticisms and expounds the traditional doctrine with considerable point and skill. The most valuable part of the book is the abstract of the criticisms of Dr. Tennant of the view that Christ's uniqueness is the result of the Divine power on the human person! The last chapter on the theories of Loofs and Sieberg is provokingly brief, as most readers would be glad to know how they reconcile their theories with the dogmatic conclusions they reach. The closer we hold to New Testament teaching the nearer we come to truth concerning the Person of our Lord, always realizing that that teaching must be taken as a whole and not as a series of disjointed conceptions.

The writers never thought that their sentences would be looked upon as in themselves, taken separately, a full portrayal of their thought concerning the Person of the Redeemer.

Christian Auto-Suggestion (S.P.C.K., 2s.) is a small book by the Rev. R. E. Roberts on what we may call Christian Couéism. He is convinced that much that is now proclaimed to be modern psychology is in reality a rediscovery by scientists of the teaching. In five chapters he discusses God, Man, Faith, Prayer and Joy, and gives a number of daily thoughts for auto-suggestion. The fundamental truth of the book lies in the recognition of the objectivity of God and His revelation in our Lord. Faith in Him and His Presence will carry us through. When we have that Faith and live in Christ we can be assured "that all things work together for good to those who love God"—without it, self-projection is doomed to result in failure and a great deal of auto-suggestion depends for its success on the reality of what we imagine to be true. We know Christ to be true and real and with Him we can go forward. Self-hypnotism must be distinguished from a real living faith in Christ as the inspiration of higher living and true optimism. If we think we can make real progress by mere self-suggestion and permanently benefit, we are in danger of failure. For the self we know to be weak, no matter how earnestly we may strive to make it strong by suggestion. Mr. Roberts is not blind to the truth of these remarks.

We have before us St. Luke (Vol. 1) of the *Speaker's Bible* (T. & T. Clark, 12s. 6d.), edited by the late James Hastings, D.D. We can most heartily recommend the book to all who have to prepare addresses. It has one fault, as far as we can see. From the pulpit point of view it covers so thoroughly the entire ground, by suggestion, illustration and arrangement, that it will tend to make preachers lazy. They have before them such a wealth of material that they will be led to think that their own reading cannot possibly add to the treasure house in their possession. We suggest that the book should be used after the preacher has worked through his ordinary store and has formed his own idea of the line he will take. Then let him apply himself to the consideration of what Dr. Hastings has provided and he will indeed be a well-read man and one of great fertility of thought, if he does not find something new in the rich supply of extracts and exposition given by the Prince of Biblical Lexicographers and collectors of the best work of famous preachers.

The Riddle of Life after Death (S.P.C.K., 2s.) is a book by Mr. F. Attfield Fawkes, who brings together in an unconventional form a number of arguments in support of immortality. Dr. David, Bishop of Liverpool, supplies a Preface, and no one reading the paragraphs can fail to see that the writer is very much in earnest. Immortality cannot be proven—apart from Christ the arguments for and

against are nicely balanced—and Mr. Fawkes shows that the light shed by the teaching of the New Testament is decisive for Christians. He truly says: "It is only when we get a proper perspective of our earth, in relation to the universe, that we can begin to realize the overwhelming, overpowering condescension of the Sovereign Lord of all this, in sending His only Son to our tiny insignificant earth, to redeem its miserable and suffering inhabitants."

The *Forty-two Shillings Dictionary of the Sacred Language of all Scriptures and Myths* (George Allen & Unwin) is a monument to Mr. G. A. Gaskell's industry. It contains many striking quotations, but unless its attractions are valued by Theosophists, we do not see how it can have a large circulation. Frankly, we do not understand a great part of its contents.

The Christian Hypothesis, by the late Edward Campbell Tainsh (London: Longmans, Green & Co. 3s. 6d. net), is a posthumous publication of manuscript in part revised and prepared by the author. The contents are Book i, "What is Faith?"; Book ii, "The Objectives of Faith"; Book iii, "Grave Hindrances"; Book iv, "The Grounds upon which the Christian Faith may be Received"; Book v, "The Divine Provision for the Fulfilment of the Christian Ethic." The editor, in his short preface, is assured that the book is one which will prove a help to persons of good average education who have failed to find those grounds for belief in the Christian Religion which are essential if they are to accept the Christian ideal as their aim in life. There are, however, sentiments expressed in this volume which startle the reader, and the sacramental teaching is such as could be expected from a writer of this "school": but, on the whole, the book will help many.

In *Great Hymns and their Stories* (R.T.S., 3s. 6d. net) the Rev. W. J. Limmer Sheppard has given us a book of quite absorbing interest. The number of Hymns of which some story is told is 134. All the old favourites are included and a good many that are less well known—certainly on this side of the Atlantic. The plan of the volume is somewhat novel. The stories are grouped in chapters and relate to hymns (1) based upon Scripture; (2) inspired by spiritual experience; (3) occasioned by incidents; (4) arising from circumstances; (5) suggested by surroundings; (6) expressing personal feelings; and (7) proceeding from sudden inspiration. There are further chapters, also, on points of interest in the language of hymns, striking incidents connected with hymns, and spiritual blessing resulting from hymns.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 Victoria Street, S.W. 1.

Catalogues.—New lists of the publications of the Church Book Room and of books recommended for Sunday School prizes have just been issued and will be sent on receipt of a postcard. The prize list has been compiled as a guide to those who are unable to call at the Book Room and select books from the shelves.

Prayer Book Teaching.—A new series of booklets is now being issued in the hope that they will provide a means for the instruction of Churchpeople in what the Prayer Book really teaches, as distinct from the misrepresentations being widely propagated in the publications issued under the auspices of the "Anglo-Catholic" School. One of these, *Church Teaching*, by the Rev. F. G. Llewellyn, B.D., particularly deals with Anglo-Catholicism as compared with the teaching of the Prayer Book and Holy Scripture. It is issued at 3d. Of the others, *The Atonement and the Sacrament of Remembrance*, by the Rev. H. R. Anderson, lately Vicar of St. Luke's, Redcliffe Square, emphasizes the completeness, sufficiency and finality of our Lord's work on the Cross; *The Prayer Book and the Mediatorship of Christ*, by the Rev. H. Drown, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Scarborough, treats of the intercession of Christ, His merciful readiness to hear, His invitation to direct approach, and His power to aid; *Repentance and Pardon*, by the Rev. C. F. Ayerst, Vicar of Watford, dwells on the nature of Repentance, its necessity as a condition, though not a ground, of forgiveness; *The Resurrection and the Christian Life*, by the Rev. R. M. Mayes, Vicar of St. Alban's, Streatham Park, particularly deals with the new life, its source of power and the way of holiness; *Reservation*, by Mr. Albert Mitchell, is a valuable exposition of its history and practice, the Author taking first the historical aspect of his subject, then pointing out the law of the Church of England as it is to-day, and ending by a reference to the proposals now before the National Assembly; *Fasting Communion and Non-Communicating Attendance* and "*This is My Body*," by Canon A. P. Cox, Vicar of Emmanuel, Clifton, Bristol; *The Creeds*, by the Rev. Dr. Harold Smith, Tutor of St. John's Hall, Highbury, and *The Godward Aspect of the Holy Communion*, by the Rev. A. R. Wood, Vicar of Thorpe-le-Soken, are particularly clear, useful expositions of the subjects with which they deal. The last eight are issued at 2d. each. Also included in this series are *The XXXIX Articles*, by the Rev. B. C. Jackson, Vicar of St. Luke's, Hampstead (3d.); *Holy Communion*, by the Rev. Dr. T. W. Gilbert (1d.), and a revised reprint of *Why I am a Churchman*, by Canon Odom (3d.). The last-named pamphlet has gone through several editions and has been in very great demand. It has been found of considerable service not only in the instruction of Churchpeople, but for circulation amongst those not definitely attached to the Church, who have been making inquiries as to what it actually stands for. Canon Odom knows how to write, and he is able to put his points clearly and concisely.

A complete set of the booklets will be sent post free on receipt of 2s. 6d.

Anglo-Catholicism.—In view of the activity of the "Anglo-Catholics" and the fact that they are openly proclaiming a religion of the Church not consistent with the letter and spirit of our Reformed Church of England, attention is once more drawn to the Rev. J. R. Cohn's very able little book

No Bishop, No Church; or, Anglo-Catholic Claims Examined (6d.). Mr. Cohu examines some of the utterances of the "Anglo-Catholics" in the light of the best available English theological thought. Nothing is more valuable to confute these claims than a wider knowledge of Church History of the first three centuries on the part of the laity, and, as Mr. Cohu says, this will do more than anything else to brace the nation to stand by their now threatened Reformation Settlement. In addition we would also mention three pamphlets by the Archdeacon of Macclesfield, the Ven. J. H. Thorpe: *Prayers to the Blessed Virgin Mary* (2d.), which is particularly valuable in view of the prominence given to the teaching of Mariolatry in the handbooks of the "Anglo-Catholic" Congresses, and specially in that of the recent Congress held in London; and *Auricular Confession in the Church of England* (2d.), which we hope will have a wide circulation in view of the pressure which is being brought to bear to induce people to come to Confession in not a few parishes. As Archdeacon Thorpe says, "Confirmation candidates are being strongly urged to make confession before their first Communion, and as a regular preparation for subsequent Communion." Indeed in many cases candidates are being refused Confirmation unless they make Auricular Confession. This pamphlet gives a clear account of the teaching of the Church of England on the matter, the ecclesiastical history of the subject, and its results as it affects both the laity and the clergy. The third pamphlet is entitled *Mass or Communion: What is the Difference? Which is True?* (3d.), and is of special importance in view of the discussion of the revision of the Holy Communion Service which will be before the National Assembly in November.

Prayer Book Revision.—This matter will be before the National Assembly in November, particularly the question of the Revision of the Holy Communion Service, and attention is again drawn to the publications of the League on this subject. The booklets which have already been mentioned on the teaching of the Prayer Book are specially valuable, particularly that on Reservation, but those who have not yet studied the question would do well to obtain Bishop E. A. Knox's *Open Letter concerning the Provision of an alternative Prayer Book* (3d.), which shows clearly the objections to an alternative Holy Communion Service. Also in connection with this subject it is hoped to issue two books this month: one by the Rev. Canon Dyson Hague on *The Holy Communion in the Church of England* (1s. 6d. net; paper cover, 2s. net, cloth), and one on *The Ministerial Commission*, by the Rev. C. Sydney Carter. These books are popularly written and will, we are sure, do much to inform Churchpeople generally upon these important matters.

The Holy Communion in the Church of England.—This book by Canon Dyson Hague is of special value at this critical moment in the history of our Church, and we hope will be widely read. Bishop E. A. Knox contributes a valuable preface in which he says, "The great value of this book is due to the force with which the author expounds the doctrinal significance of our Service of Holy Communion as contrasted with the Roman Catholic Mass. The importance of insisting on this difference at the present time cannot be exaggerated. Canon Hague's book will be found to be no dry bones of metaphysical doctrine, but a book which comes from the heart and speaks to the heart. It is in fact a popular work."