

We cannot too often remember that no one is more sorry than the man who drops a catch or lets a ball get past him, and a hostile demonstration is not calculated to brace his nerves for the next chance.

If you look at the hands of some of our cricketers, you would be surprised to see how by constantly gripping the bat and straining the hands when catching swift balls, all the fingers are curiously shaped and deformed. Cricket is a keen game, and demands the strained attention and the hearty, fearless action of the whole man. It is every bit as hard and trying as the battle of life; it is only because it is a game that it is not felt to be so.

The fact of the matter is, first-class cricket is really too serious, there is not enough of the 'festival' order about it, and many people think that some slow cricketers deserve 'barracking' when they resort to stone-walling, late starts, and tea intervals. The game tends to ruin through averages and statistics and county championship tables. All these things encourage men to play for their own hands, and the glorification of a century by the papers, even if it has been made at funereal pace, earns too much glory. One glorious hour of Jessop's scientific slogging is more to be desired than many days of tedious and ignoble play. One 'sticker' is enough for any team. What happiness and exhilaration Jessop, Tyldesley, Lord Dalmeny, or A. E. Lawton have given to thousands of people by their skill, daring, and pluck in their seemingly easy display of 'fire-works.' If cricket is to live, there must be more venture, more go, more aggressiveness on the part of the players. If men in business hugged their

opportunities to make money as some players hug their bats and keep on stone-walling, bankruptcy would be the certain end. We want less abnormally cautious play, and cricket will continue to be our great British game in spite of its great winter rival—football. Less of the coldly-calculating spirit, mathematical formula and rules visible to the naked eye of the onlooker, Mr. Cricketer, and we will all like you better and encourage you more. As Mr. Knight puts it, 'Alertness and elasticity of mind no less than of body are the very life of cricket. Without them we get either slackness or boredom.'

Let none of us run down cricket and its crowds. It is infinitely better that men should be out in the sunshine watching cricket, with all its beautiful exhibitions of skill and endurance, than that they should be engaged in card-playing, or domino-playing, or fuddling in a public-house. Cricket is a fine counter attraction to degrading pleasures, and a fine relaxation after a week's monotonous work amidst the perpetual motion of machinery.

Let me give you some words to remember when at cricket—they are taken from the book *On Playing the Game*, by the Rev. Samuel Marriot: 'Guard well your wickets, viz. Truth, Honour, Purity. The batsmen who score well and are reliable, being always near the top of the averages, are recognized by their self-knowledge, self-reverence, and self-control. Dr. Grace says the duty of a batsman is to make runs, so attend diligently to your "scoring sheet," which is your character. Play well, and "funk" nothing. . . . And in the Great Test Match of Life may you have a glorious innings, and Heaven's ovation on entering the Great Pavilion.'

The Doctrine of the Incarnation in the Creeds.

BY THE REV. A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D., PRINCIPAL OF NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

II.

(I) THE Creeds tried from the standpoint of personal faith as the Christian of to-day exercises it are disappointing both as regards what is included and what is excluded. The Apostles' Creed is expressly an individual confession; and the Athanasian Creed declares that 'Whosoever would

be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith. Which Faith except any one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.' The Nicene and Chalcedonian symbols are bishops' creeds, rather than laymen's, and are a declaration of the common

faith of the Church as defined to condemn heresy and exclude heretics. The Apostles' Creed is historical, reciting the facts past, present, and future about Jesus Christ, which the Christian believer must assert over-against the denial of heresy. The third article dealing with the virgin-birth, apart altogether from any critical questions which may be raised about the fact, is one to which the personal faith of many Christians to-day attaches no significance. The descent to the lower world has probably quite fallen out of the effective belief of the modern Christian. And if the belief in the Second Coming is still held, it does not exercise the influence over the Christian life which it had in the Apostolic Age. To me it seems that each of these articles does point to an essential element in Christian truth, the absolute sinlessness of Jesus, the complete efficacy of His sacrifice for the salvation of all the generations of men, whatever be the way that the divine grace is brought within the reach of all, and the final triumph of Christ as the consummation of the present order of human history. But we cannot to-day express these truths just as did the generation of believers who confessed their faith in the Apostle's Creed. The doctrines of the trinity, the divinity and the humanity of Christ, the unity of the person, are all distinctive contents of Christian thought; but it cannot surely be maintained that the exact, elaborate metaphysical formulation of these doctrines in the Athanasian Creed can claim permanent and universal authority for Christian faith. Be the metaphysics good or bad, faith lives and works in another region than that of metaphysical abstractions.

(2) The dominant interest of the Nicene symbol is not merely the divinity of Jesus Christ, but, over-against the inadequate Arian representation of that divinity, the divinity as *oneness in substance* of the Son with the Father. In the third section of this article the suitability of the metaphysical formulæ employed will be discussed. Meanwhile from the standpoint of personal faith it may be contended that, however expressed, the truth that God Himself and no other was in Christ saving mankind is essential. The sufficiency and the finality of the Christian salvation is assured only if the work was not accomplished by any creature, but by the Creator Himself as man for man. A vital interest of the Christian religion was at stake in this controversy.

(3) The reality of the manhood of Jesus Christ is an essential truth for Christian faith; but so is the unity of the person of Christ. (i.) The Christian thinker of to-day would treat more tolerantly and even appreciatively the attempt of Apollinaris to make that unity more real than the orthodox doctrine did. His psychology is not ours to-day; we do not distinguish a rational and an animal soul as he did; and our conception of personality allows of an immanence of God as personal in man, which does not suppress the human personality or destroy the unity of the personal experience and character. For us, therefore, the assertion of 'a rational soul' in Christ has lost much of its significance. (ii.) In discussing the metaphysical formulæ of the Chalcedonian symbol, we shall consider the question whether Nestorius was really guilty of the heresy for which he was condemned. At the present stage of our discussion all we are concerned to show is that Christian faith does demand the personal unity of Christ; and that in asserting that unity in opposition to its alleged denial this Creed was safeguarding a vital interest. It must be added, however, that the Creed did nothing to make that unity more concretely real, and so more intelligible to the mind, but rather in its underlying assumption of an essential opposition of divine and human nature, and of the absolute impassibility and immobility of the divine nature, implicitly excluded even the possibility of any such unity. Nestorianism was more logical, given the common assumption, than the Creed. The four 'famous adverbs' employed to describe the distinction of the natures in the unity of the person posit rather than resolve the problem. (iii.) Eutychianism was a greater danger to the Christian faith than Nestorianism; it would have cut off the metaphysical creed altogether from its historical basis in the actual life of Jesus on earth. And yet Eutychianism only carried to its logical conclusion the dominant tendency of the Christian thought of that age. Athanasius spoke of a *ἕνωσις φυσικῆ*. The term *θεολόκος* applied to Mary the mother of Jesus, which Cyril so vehemently defended against Nestorius, indicates that in the current conception the divinity absorbed the humanity. Many of the Fathers present the same conception. The Creed of Chalcedon did render an invaluable service in insisting, as it did, that the human nature was real, complete, unabsorbed into the divine. An inadequate conception of person-

ality in God and man made the framers of the symbol incapable of thinking the personal unity of both God and man in Christ. It is in the very factors which the creeds ignore in the earthly life of Jesus that the solution of the problem lies; in His moral character and religious consciousness, His

revealing truth and redeeming grace we can discover divine-human personality. It is these moral and religious facts which the creeds pass over on which personal faith to-day lays hold, and to which it closely clings. Both negatively and positively the creeds fail to meet the demand of personal faith.

Literature.

PRINCIPAL SIMON.

THE Rev. Frederick J. Powicke, Ph.D., has written the biography of the late Principal Simon of the United College, Bradford. The title is *David Worthington Simon* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d.). It cannot have been an easy thing to do, for Dr. Simon lived a life of the utmost simplicity and quietness. His strength was in his character; but character is the most difficult thing on earth to turn into language. Character, however, has influence; and what Dr. Powicke has done is to gather together the men who came under the influence of Dr. Simon's character and get them to tell what he was to them. These tributes are certainly not all the book. Dr. Powicke himself has written a considerable part of it, and there are many letters, for Dr. Simon was a delightful letter-writer. But the tributes of friends and students are an important element in it. We cannot think of any recent biography in which that element bulks so largely or produces so memorable an impression.

Dr. Massie was Dr. Simon's colleague at Spring Hill College for fifteen years—up to the time of Dr. Simon's appointment to the Principalship of the Theological Hall in Edinburgh. After speaking of the inspiration of saintliness in his character, Dr. Massie says: 'With all this he was a man, and, in the best sense, a natural man; if he had been otherwise he would have belied himself. His nature abhorred cant, that is, according to Hazlitt's definition, not hypocrisy, the pretending to feel what you don't feel at all—that is out of the reckoning—but what truly religious men are often guilty of, overwrought presentation of a feeling which at its root is genuine. "Treacle," as he used often to call it, made him sick, and even inclined him, as he extravagantly put it, to profanity. A luscious spiritual phraseology, or what he termed

"slush," provoked him (in my company, at any rate) to an unrestrained mockery which bubbled out of a keen sense of humour and which would undoubtedly have made a matter-of-fact piety stand with its bristles erect and its mouth wide open. Like our common friend Dale, he shrank from, as unmanly, such ways of speaking of our Lord and Master and Judge as "Dear Jesus," "Sweet Jesus." The truth was that he saw how sentimentality tended to kill true reverence, and to nourish a mawkish and (not womanly but) womanish attitude towards the Son of Man. And that was his and Dale's criticism of the Faber style of hymnology.'

THE MAFULU.

The Mafulu are a mountain people in British New Guinea. They have had a Roman Catholic Mission among them for five years. They have also seen an occasional trader or scientific investigator. But they are really in as uncivilized a state as it is possible now to find a race in any part of the world. And that was the very attraction which drew Mr. Robert W. Williamson to visit them in the year 1910. He went not out of mere curiosity, but out of a desire to increase our knowledge of the mind and manners of the untutored savage; and he went well furnished with those questions which Dr. Frazer has been the chief instrument in preparing for the use of anthropological inquirers. He confesses that the natives did not understand his questions, and when they did, often refused to answer them. And he is very fair in enabling us to distinguish between information and inference. The book which he has written, and to which he has given the simple title of *The Mafulu* (Macmillan; 14s. net), is plentifully illustrated from photographs, many of which were supplied by the Roman Catholic missionaries, who did everything