

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

March, 1910.

The Month.

The recent Proctorial Elections to the new Convocations have turned very largely on the subject of Prayer-Book revision, with special reference to the Athanasian Creed. We are particularly glad to observe that the London Diocese has elected two Proctors who are in favour of a policy of liberty and progress in the form of wise and careful revision, particularly in regard to the use of the Athanasian Creed. There are many indications throughout the country that this issue has been the dominant one almost everywhere, and in not a few places the successful one also. We are convinced that those who plead for a modification of the present rubric before the Creed represent not only the vast majority of Churchmen, but all that is truest and most enlightened in the Church. The way in which the extreme Anglicans are opposing this change is deplorable, and when one of their representative men can write to the *Spectator* and say that the agitation is "in the interests of those who do not believe," we realize at once that this is the very recklessness of narrow and bitter controversy. Imagine the Bishops of Oxford and Chester, and Canon Johnston of Cuddesdon, to name no others, working "in the interests of those who do not believe"! If it were for a moment to be supposed that the extreme party were the true representatives of the Church, it would be ominous for the best interests of our communion. But it is not so, and we can rightly go on pleading and working for some relaxation of the rubric

which, while conserving the time-honoured document and its doctrine, will not require its popular use as a Creed, when the use is liable to such grave misconception.

The new Convocations will soon be faced with the subject of Prayer-Book revision, and especially with the proposals of the Canterbury Convocation which have been before the Church for several months. On the general question we are in hearty sympathy with those who plead that the time has more than arrived for some changes to be made in the direction of greater elasticity and variety. It is surely impossible to go on as we are with any regard for the best interests of the Church, while using a book which, however, precious, was intended primarily for conditions of life 250 years ago. Here, again, the extreme Anglican party is opposed to all change, and says that it is content with things as they are, though it is not so very long ago that leading men of that section pleaded urgently for the alternative use of the Prayer-Book of 1549. The fear is lest any other Churchmen may be led to unite with the extremists. Canon Cowley-Brown, in an admirable letter to the *Spectator*, puts this with great force :

Prayer-book
Revision.

“The danger is that these extremists may work upon the fears of the more timid among what is called the Evangelical Party, and induce them to join in an unholy alliance. Those who, on whatever grounds, are for keeping things as they are, might remind themselves of Mr. Gladstone’s reply when he was charged with wielding his axe too freely in the woods at Hawarden. ‘In forestry,’ he said, ‘judicious thinning is true conservatism.’ What is true in forestry is true also in Church government and theology. There is no doubt that numbers of the more thoughtful laity have been alienated from the Church by the conduct of extremists like those who are objecting to any revision. And more will be alienated by this *non possumus* attitude of those who, for one reason or another, resist all change.”

Of course, the advocacy of revision does not in any way mean that the present proposals are to be accepted *en bloc*. Evangelical Churchmen will certainly oppose with all their power the legalization of the Vestments and the suggested change in the Ordinal. But these apart, there are many of the proposals which are quite admirable and deserve all possible

attention, and if we cannot obtain sanction for these, or something similar, the outlook for our Church is as serious as it is sad.

It seems impossible for anyone to keep away very long from the great question of Christian reunion. Canon Wilson, in his fine sermon at Cambridge last month, gave renewed expression to what many are thinking, and his treatment of the subject was in every way worthy of the preacher and of the place in which he spoke. After reviewing the situation, and dealing with several great principles, Canon Wilson said :

The Problem
of Unity.

“ Finally, we need a deep and earnest study of our Lord’s mind and will, so far as it can be gathered from His recorded words and deeds, and from the impression that He left on the Apostles and the first generation of the Church. This must be to all Christians the ultimate standard of reference—the mind of Christ. To me it seems summed up in the phrase: ‘ Forbid them not.’ We may think the doctrinal systems of some of our brethren less perfect than our own, and think their security for continuity in the Faith less than ours; but if we faintly realize the vast gulf that divides an imperfect Christianity from entire disbelief, with which the Church of the twentieth, no less than the Church of the first, century is surrounded, we cannot, I think, help acknowledging non-episcopalians as brothers and allies in the great battle, and welcome them, as they would welcome us, to the one Divinely-appointed sacrament of unity.”

If the problem were only faced in this spirit, it would not long be regarded, as it is now by so many, as an insoluble one.

There is no doubt that at the basis of the problem of reunion lies the question of episcopacy, and until this is fully realized no genuine progress will be made. Our contemporary, the *New York Churchman*, has recently called attention to the fact that by reason of certain claims made for episcopacy, which are by no means part of the true idea, the episcopate is often “ a stumbling-block to the unity it was created to conserve.” In support of this the writer remarks :

Episcopacy
and Unity.

“ More than three-fourths of the Christian world believes in Episcopacy, and rightly insists upon it as a part of the historic ministry. But has it

proved a unifying power in those Churches that accept it and insist upon it? No more seemingly hopeless divisions exist than those that separate the Roman, Eastern, and Anglican Churches. Yet all have the Episcopate; all have the three orders of the ministry. Their divisions are high and deep, just because each claims an exclusive and excluding principle based on human definitions which give this part of the Church's order authority not only over the rest of the Church's order, but over the Church itself."

As long, therefore, as these purely human claims are made, all ideas of Christian unity are impossible. The fatal mistake lies in regarding the ministry rather than the Church as the supreme factor and condition of unity. It is the Church as the whole body of Christians and not the ministry within it that must really settle this question, and any attempt to exalt the ministry above the community will only end in emphasizing our divisions still more acutely. The Church existed before the ministry, and to place the ministry above the Church as a whole is the very worst service that can be rendered to the cause of truth and peace. Until this is realized all plans of unity are perfectly vain.

During the January Week of Prayer appointed
A Testimony
 to Union. by the Evangelical Alliance, the Rev. A. P. Cox,
 Vicar of Christ Church, Cheltenham, suggested that
 an occasion might be arranged for the coming together of
 Christians of various denominations by organizing an Annual
 United Missionary Meeting, when two missionaries from the
 Church of England, and two from the Evangelical Free
 Churches should speak from the same platform in the largest
 hall of the town. The suggestion was received with the
 greatest possible heartiness on the part of the audience, and
 the Chairman, a leading Nonconformist minister, assured the
 meeting of the hearty co-operation of those whom he repre-
 sented. This seems to us a fine opportunity for carrying out
 the true spirit of the suggestions of the Lambeth Conference.
 There is already not a little comity in the mission field. The
 World Missionary Conference is soon to meet in Edinburgh.
 And there is not a little united missionary work done in con-

nection with the Bible Society and the Religious Tract Society. There is therefore no valid reason why those who unite on all these occasions should not also unite in the way now suggested and bear testimony to the essential oneness of the Church in all Evangelical missionary enterprise. At any rate, we commend Mr. Cox's admirable suggestion to our readers in various parts of the country. Even if no practical result accrues it is well that such a proposal should have been made. It indicates the true spirit, and if the idea were carried out it would do much amid present strain and stress to bring together the people of God.

The death of the Bishop of Edinburgh is a very
Bishop
Dowden.
 great loss to the whole Church. His profound knowledge and practical use of it were the heritage of us all, and his writings will long abide for our guidance and profit. It is worth while recalling one fact in his notable career. In 1900 the English Church Union issued a Declaration on the subject of the Holy Communion, and had the temerity to quote Ridley as well as a number of Caroline Divines in support of its peculiar views. This was too much for the Bishop of Edinburgh, and in his remarkable series of letters to the *Guardian* he showed that he had no mercy for men who tried to support their position by an unfair use of quotations. Subsequently, in his address to his Diocesan Synod, afterwards published under the title of "Define your Terms," he gave a number of counsels to his clergy in the study of the Eucharistic controversy, and made the following allusion to the English Church Union Declaration :

"My experience has made me familiar with the fact that there are ecclesiastics (and some of them in high station) who talk of the doctrine of the Church as taught by the Fathers, but who labour under the decided disadvantage of not being competent to construe ten consecutive lines of those Fathers whose authority they profess to esteem so highly. It was sought, in notes appended to the Declaration, to support its language by a series of quotations from the Fathers, and also from Anglican writers—and some of them were really eminent, and others wholly insignificant and obscure. It was indiscreet, to say the least, to attempt to claim, in support of the

Declaration, such well-known and easily accessible writings as those of Bishop Andrewes, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Bishop Bull, Bishop Thomas Wilson, and Bishop Horsley. It was only the very ignorant and ill-read among the clergy and laity—forming, it is to be feared, a sufficiently numerous class—who could be long deceived by such scraps, torn from their context, and perverted from their original purport."

These words carry their own plain and significant message. Bishop Dowden's works on the Prayer-Book are also a mine of wealth to students, and some of the papers in his later book "Further Studies in the Prayer Book," are especially illuminating and informing. Nothing could be clearer or more satisfying than his treatment of the Athanasian Creed, and his discussion of such points as "Alms and Oblations," "Into their Hands," and the Prayer of Humble Access. We shall treasure his books and other writings as among our most valuable guides to truth on the subjects of which they treat. Would that our Church had more men of his massive scholarship and balanced judgment!

Gambling.

Wherein lies the sin of gambling? Mr. Arthur C. Benson, in an interesting article in the *Church Family Newspaper*, criticized the utterance of a preacher on this subject, who said that one of the reasons against betting is that it is not honest to take money that has not been earned. Mr. Benson does not think this plea can be sustained for an instant, since it would do away with the possibility of accepting gifts, or legacies, or the increment of investments, to say nothing of life assurance. He urges that if a man who can afford it bets, and does not bet beyond his means, on the ground that it amuses him, it is very difficult to say where the moral guilt comes in. Nor will Mr. Benson admit the truth of the preacher's remark that all gambling vitiated and weakened the moral fibre, for "many worthy men have been known to play cards for small sums during the greater part of their lives without showing any traces of moral deterioration." Mr. Benson thinks that there is one perfectly real argument against the practice, and this is the enormous waste involved. But the one

strong and absolute argument, in his judgment, against the whole thing is that betting and gambling are undoubtedly responsible for a great amount of wretchedness and privation, and even of crime. Under these circumstances it is a practice which "all sensible and conscientious people should set their faces against and give no encouragement to, lest they cause their brethren to offend." We all know that it is particularly difficult to fix precisely the moral guilt of gambling in itself, though, as Mr. Benson rightly says, there is no doubt whatever about the terrible results of betting and gambling in many instances. From all this it would seem clear that the only adequate safeguard is to observe the principle, "Resist beginnings." There is scarcely anything in modern life which so fully and sadly illustrates the truth that "By their fruits ye shall know them," and even Mr. Benson admits that "in any case gambling is not a practice which can be included among normal, natural, and innocent pleasures." Such being the case, it is our bounden duty to strive in every way in our power to prevent people from commencing that which is only too likely to lead to social and moral disaster.

The recent book by Sir Oliver Lodge, advocating the practice of psychical research, has called fresh attention to the question of Spiritualism, and there is no doubt that it is exciting interest among many people. And yet it is a study attended with not a few serious perils. Two recent publications by eminent authorities tend to suggest some mysterious connection of cause and effect between spiritualism and insanity. Dr. G. H. Savage, in the Harveian Oration on "Experimental Psychology and Hypnotism," and Dr. C. Williams in a book on "Spiritualism and Insanity," both call earnest attention to the dangers involved in the popular practice of spiritualism. This is what Dr. Williams says from personal experience :

Psychical
Research.

"I get a very large number of cases of mental and nervous diseases coming under my care in the course of a year, and in going into the history

of the cases I nearly always ask the patients or their friends if they have recently, or at any time, had anything to do with Spiritualism."

Sometimes, he goes on to say, the reply is in the affirmative, and then the first condition he demands is that all such pursuits be given up at once and altogether. Dr. Williams also gives other illustrations from his own professional experience of the connection between spiritualism and insanity. His explanation of the phenomenon is a very simple one, and it certainly seems natural and scientific. As a condition of success at spiritualistic séances, those who take part are urged to force the will into a condition of perfect passivity, and this habit of thus annihilating personality of will for the time being not only weakens the power of will, but in due course injures the whole mental organism. Not even the deservedly weighty authority of Sir Oliver Lodge can set aside the awful perils of spiritualistic inquiry, and those who have read that striking book "The Dangers of Spiritualism," by Mr. Raupert, will readily recognize what we mean. Apart from all else, what practical value has hitherto accrued from such researches? Nothing really scientific, and certainly nothing ethical, has been given to the world as the outcome. Added to all this, there is the undoubted fact that the practice of spiritualism inevitably tends to weaken, and often to destroy, belief in the Gospel of Christ. Nothing is more certain than that the acceptance of spiritualism undermines and destroys belief in the Deity and the Atoning Sacrifice of our Lord.



The Relation of the Ministry to Church and State.¹

BY THE VERY REV. HENRY WACE, D.D.,

Dean of Canterbury.

THE aspect of this subject, which seems specially to require consideration at the present time, is the relation of the Christian Ministry to the State. Its relation to the authorities of the Church would seem plain enough to unprejudiced minds. The direction in the Preface "Concerning the Service of the Church" clearly lays it down that in points of doubt—that is, I suppose, points which cannot be directly determined by law—the Bishop of the diocese is the proper authority to "take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same"; and where the Bishop is in doubt, he may send for the resolution of the doubt to the Archbishop. If this be taken in conjunction with the promise given by the priest at his ordination, "reverently to obey your Ordinary and other chief Ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and chief government over you; following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and submitting yourselves to their godly judgments," it should lead to a generous and liberal interpretation of canonical obedience. The failure to accept this duty of obedience in a generous spirit is, there is reason to fear, in great measure the origin of the disorder in the Church in the present day. Priests have quibbled about the exact definition of godly judgments, and Bishops have set an example of disregard for the opinions of Archbishops, until it has become almost painful to listen to that question and answer in the Ordination Service, from the sense of unreality which it awakens. I will only add, on this point, that Evangelical clergy will be following the examples set them by their best leaders in the past, by showing in their conduct that they, at all events, attach a full and real meaning to that promise.

But a question of still greater urgency has arisen of late respecting the obedience due from the clergy to the courts of

¹ Paper read at the Islington Clerical Meeting, January 11, 1910.

law, by which questions of ritual, and sometimes of doctrinal, controversy are determined. It is boldly asserted in some quarters that the clergy owe no allegiance to what are called secular courts, and that the decision of the Court of Arches and of the Privy Council involve no obligation of obedience. "The State," as the phrase goes, is spoken of as though it were a body to which the Church owes no deference—as a sort of alien authority; and the language of the old declaration against Papal authority is practically applied to it; as though a so-called "Catholic" priest had made a declaration that "no secular prince or potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, pre-eminence, or authority within this Church of England, so help me God!" Just thirty-two years ago the then Bishop of Lincoln, the learned and venerable High Churchman, Bishop Wordsworth, was asked by the then Canon (afterwards Dean) Hole to express his opinion on a resolution, which was brought forward in the English Church Union, that "any sentence of suspension or prohibition pronounced by any court sitting under the Public Worship Regulation Act, is spiritually null and void," and that the Union would give its support to any priest who disregarded it. Bishop Wordsworth gave a very decided opinion against the propriety of such a resolution, and in the course of his answer remarked that "this resolution must, if carried, lead its supporters much farther. They who resist the decisions of the Court of Arches, on the ground alleged by them, must also, by parity of reasoning, proceed also to resist the decisions of the final court of appeal—namely, the Judicial Committee of Privy Council—which has succeeded the Court of Delegates, and has been constituted by legislative enactment, without the advice or assent of the Church. Indeed, this is already avowed by some. And who can foresee what will be the end of such a conflict as this?" What Bishop Wordsworth foresaw has been realized, and no words are now too contemptuous to be used by the organs of the Ritualistic party in repudiating the so-called "State courts."

Now, let us observe, in the first place, that there is some-

thing totally inconsistent with Christian principles in the disrespect thus shown to the authority of "the State." In the first place, "the State" is a Divinely instituted society, second only in its sacredness, to the Divine society of the Church. Even when not united with the Church, as in our own Constitution, it is the part of Christians to assert its Divine origin and functions, and to support its authority. I need do no more than refer to the striking testimony to this view of the State afforded by the admonitions of St. Peter and St. Paul to honour the constituted authorities of the Roman Empire of their day. But this points to a further misunderstanding of the subject. What Christian men and women are chiefly concerned with is not the State, but the governing authorities of the State. Those authorities, even in a non-Christian State, as St. Paul's language shows, are invested by God's ordinance with functions of the highest responsibility, and functions akin to those of the Church. "There is no power but of God: the powers, or authorities, that be are ordained of God." "Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil." The essence of the function of government is the maintenance of truth and justice; and accordingly, it is a striking fact that no Government has ever been set up for the avowed purpose of promoting evil. However perverse and unrighteous in fact, it has always professed the maintenance of justice as its aim. But this is also one of the primary aims of the Church. "The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal. . . . Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity." Here, then, are two societies existing side by side, with coincident objects, as far as this world is concerned. The consequence is that an instinct has always led great rulers and statesmen in the past to promote in every way co-operation and union between the two. The union of Church and State is not a special and peculiar form of policy, but the dictate of common sense to any statesman or Churchman who would combine the forces in human society which make for righteousness. A Churchman, therefore, who speaks disparagingly of the State is as foolish as a statesman who

speaks disparagingly of the Church ; and if a conflict of opinion or influence should unfortunately arise between the two, it should be contemplated with the deepest regret, and every possible sacrifice should be made to obviate it.

But it should next be borne in mind that as ministers of the English Church we are not concerned with "the State" in the abstract, but with the governing authorities of a Christian State. The admission of those who are not Christians into the House of Commons does not alter the fact that the Government of England is a Christian Government ; that the King, who is the supreme governor, must be a Christian, and a Protestant Christian, and that the laws of England are based upon the laws of Christ. Without trespassing upon current political controversy, it may be permissible to observe that the House of Commons does not by itself constitute the Government of our country, and that its constitution may be varied without repudiating the essentially Christian character of the supreme authority in England. The King's courts, accordingly, are Christian courts, and the law which they have to administer is Christian law. Christians and Churchmen are not merely bound to recognize them in this character, but should be forward and thankful to do so, and to maintain their Christian authority in every possible way. To disparage them as merely secular courts is to weaken their highest and most beneficial characteristic, and every true Christian and Churchman will do his best to maintain their authority. Even if we should hold the private opinion that in any particular case they have decided erroneously, it would still be the part of a Christian and a Churchman to obey them, unless the decision involves clear disobedience to the revealed will of God.

But as ministers of an Established Church, we owe a peculiar deference to the King's courts. Whatever else may be involved in establishment, it is certainly by virtue of establishment by law that we all hold our respective places and privileges in the Church. By what authority is it, for instance, that no other body than the Reformed Church of

England can use Canterbury Cathedral for Divine service and for the ministry of God's Word and Sacraments? We may claim to have moral authority for that exclusive use; but the power which renders that moral authority effective is simply the power of the State, the power of the governing authority of the State, the Parliament of England, its laws, and the executive power which enforces those laws. Every parish clergyman holds his exclusive rights in his parish church, his special privileges as the parson of the parish, from the same authority. Does it become those who hold such privileges from "the State" and its courts to say that those courts have no right to a voice in the administration of the Church which they thus support? If the clergy held no rights or privileges from the State legislature or courts, they might claim independence of them. But when they hold positions of immense influence by the establishment of that legislature, and by the aid of those courts, there seems something peculiarly improper and ungrateful in refusing any deference to them.

The Church, of course, as a society owing its origin and its constitution to Christ alone, has an authority quite independent of the state, and must determine certain questions and points of duty by itself. Its ministers derive their privileges of order, and their spiritual duties and powers, solely from Christ; and all points of Christian, as distinct from merely natural, law, must be determined by the voice of the Church alone, in her proper assemblies. But two points have to be borne in mind in applying this principle. The first is that the English legislature has strictly respected it, and that the Prayer-Book and Articles, by which the clergy are bound, were settled, not by Parliament, but by the Church's own Synods, and accepted by Parliament as the basis of the establishment now existing. Disobedience to the Prayer-Book and the Articles is disobedience to the Church of England herself, in her last formal decisions on the subject. The other point to be borne in mind is that a particular Church, like the Church of England, cannot command that indefeasible authority which might be fairly

claimed for the whole Church, when acting as one body in the days of the great councils. The Legislature and the Courts of England have never shown any disrespect to that primary Church authority. But in case of a difference arising on a point of the marriage law between the Convocation of the Church of England and the Legislature, it cannot be expected that the Legislature should assume without question that the existing law of the Church of England is of Divine authority. No particular Church can claim that authority; and when other Churches differ from the Church of England on such a point, the Legislature cannot be expected to recognize an indefeasible claim in the existing Church law. In short, it should be sufficient to remember that neither authority—neither the Church of England nor the Legislature of England—can claim, or does claim, to be infallible, and consequently that neither can fairly claim the right to override the other. What we need to get rid of on this question is the assertion of absolute rights on either side. What the justice of the case requires is mutual deference, mutual patience, and a desire, or rather a determination, to adjust differences by mutual conciliation. The Ritualistic language and action in reference to the authority of the State is not only inconsistent with the principles of the English Church, it is un-Christian. The decisions of the Ecclesiastical Courts, including the Privy Council, may fairly be questioned, but they should be treated with respect, and if possible obeyed. The Legislature may have erred in altering the existing civil law of marriage without any due consultation with the Church, and very difficult questions of duty arise in consequence. But the case is not one in which it can be said to be inconceivable that the existing law of the Church is unalterable, and our difficulties cannot be settled by merely saying that the Church has settled the question for her ministers. Whether, as has been suggested, by dispensation, or by some other mode of mutual deference, the utmost effort should be made to settle the matter by conciliation.

Upon the whole it may be said that what is most needed at the moment on this subject is the enhancement, and not the diminution, of the authority of the Christian ruler in the Church, as well as in the State. If that authority is unduly impaired in Church affairs, it will become similarly impaired in State affairs; and those who are teaching the clergy to disregard it in the sphere of Church law are teaching others to disregard it in the sphere of ordinary life. A very experienced lawyer, the Chancellor of a diocese, when some clergymen were lamenting the illegality of Passive Resisters, observed to them that they had set the example. Another principle of vital importance in our present difficulties is that the promotion of true religion is a primary part of the functions of a Christian ruler. That principle lies at the root of controversies relating to education and the establishment of the Church. But the Royal authority, and the office of a Christian Government, cannot be called in to support religious education and the establishment of religion, if it is to be excluded from a voice in the settlement of religious difficulties. The true English method is to maintain both authorities, that of the State and that of the Church, in due balance and in mutual co-operation. The Papal and the Puritan method is to override the one by the other; and as the constitution of nature renders it impossible for either to be destroyed, such methods always end in a convulsion. Let us, at all events, stand by the methods of the Church of the English Reformation, and strive to preserve the wholesome co-operation and intimate union of Church and State.



Bishop Gore's "Orders and Unity."¹

I.

BY THE REV. CANON H. HENSLEY HENSON, D.D.

BISHOP GORE is, perhaps, the most influential, and in some ways the most attractive, clergyman in the English Church. His influence is conglomerate of many elements, and reflects both a rarely winning character and a strangely various activity. He is interesting to many and widely different sections of the public. His writings—devotional, theological, polemical, political—are numerous, and all, though never of the first rank, are far above the average level. His genuine love of the poor and his strong and increasing sympathy with Socialistic politics have endeared him to multitudes to whom Bishops are not naturally attractive, and brought him into alliance with the Nonconformists, who are content to ignore his sacerdotalism in consideration of his politics. His sacerdotalism in turn makes him the fighting chief of the neo-Tractarians. His zeal for reform, radical and unflinching where sacerdotal principles are untouched, commends him to many who have no love for sacerdotal principles; while at the same time his undeviating loyalty to the last gains him admiration and support from those to whom reform is distasteful. "Lux Mundi" seemed to indicate a zeal for critical liberty; the "Bampton Lectures" demonstrated a passion for orthodoxy; "The Church and the Ministry" gave assurance of unflinching sacerdotalism; the popular expositions of the New Testament disclosed no mean powers of spiritual teaching; the numerous papers and speeches on "Church Reform" revealed a keen perception of practical abuses; "Spiritual Efficiency" presented to view a vigorous autocrat such as the multitude loves, who knows what he wants and means to get it; his evidence before the Royal Commission exhibited for the first time Ritualism and the Episcopate in frankly avowed alliance; his speeches in the House of Lords

¹ "Orders and Unity," by Charles Gore, D.D., Bishop of Birmingham. John Murray, 1909. Price 3s. 6d. net.

have earned for him the gratitude of the extremer sections of the Liberal party ; and his ready acceptance of secular schools and Disestablishment make him a valuable ally of politicians, who have little enough regard for his motives or objects. Thus, he is interesting to many people on many grounds, and has gathered to himself, beyond any of his contemporaries, the hopes and loyalties of many ardent spirits.

For obvious reasons, then, effective criticism of Bishop Gore is extraordinarily difficult. Since so many and commonly conflicting interests meet in him, he is never really held to any one. The Liberal elements are permitted to neutralize the obscurantist, and it is hardly possible to get a clear issue with him. The political Radicalism counteracts in the public mind the ecclesiastical narrowness ; the Socialistic sympathies discount the obscurantist teachings ; the practical reforms make all but incredible the sacerdotalist principles ; the devotional fervour excuses the ritualistic externalism. Of all the individuals now on the stage of public life, Charles Gore is surely the most attractive and the least intelligible, the least reserved and the most enigmatic.

It may go without saying that his latest book has considerable merits. The reader catches the passionate earnestness of the writer, and is carried along by his intense conviction. All that can be done to commend an argument by skilful arrangement, a vigorous though sometimes slipshod style, and illustrations and parallels which, if often misleading, are not rarely felicitous, has been done ; the author's dialectic skill, considerable knowledge, and rare gift of persuasiveness, have all been drawn upon to the full. Yet this book will not add to Bishop Gore's reputation, and, unless we are greatly mistaken, will disappoint many of his friends, for its considerable merits are outweighed by still more considerable faults, and while the merits are most conspicuous in the form and arrangement of the argument, the faults affect the argument itself.

The author is often deceived by his own parallels, and often falls into the fallacy, which might perhaps be called the besetting

sin of copious writers, of shifting the meaning of his words in the course of his argument. Overstatement is frequent, and too often he is the victim of some favourite word or simile. His use of the word "principle" is a good example. His mind is more affluent than profound, more vehement than powerful, and his conclusions have a more apparent relation to his known wishes than to his ostensible premises. He builds too much and too boldly on single points; is far too confident in his assumptions; obscures his real meaning by parade of concession, and takes back in an inconspicuous clause what he has said in a pretentious paragraph. His convictions carry on a running fight with his sympathies, and his concluding chapter seems to belie the more generous language of its predecessors. Illegitimate assumptions and *obiter dicta* which challenge contradiction are scattered freely over his pages, and there are instances of quotation which are in effect, though of course not in conscious purpose, misleading. It would require a long and detailed review, framed on the older polemical model, with large quotations of the controverted argument followed by the criticism, in order to illustrate all these points. Here they can but be mentioned for the student's guidance.

It is not necessary to dwell on Bishop Gore's theory of the ministry, for it has been before the public in fuller form for some years, and he does not pretend to add anything or make any alteration. We may content ourselves with noting the parade of anti-sacerdotal language with which the sacerdotal theory is introduced and partially disguised. The priesthood of the Christian as such is clearly asserted, but the proper inference from the fact is avoided by some verbal juggling with the words "representative" and "corporate." In one place it is plainly stated that the Christian minister is a priest in the old Jewish sense—viz., as the Divinely appointed officer of a priestly community, which apart from him cannot exercise its priestly functions—and that identification really underlies the whole discussion. It is always to be remembered that historically this has been the most potent influence under which

sacerdotalism has prevailed in the Church. It is, indeed, admitted (p. 164) that the notion of a Judaic priesthood in the Christian Church lends itself to easy perversion, and has, in fact, been seriously perverted; but the notion itself is explicitly affirmed, and confused with the quite different conception of the Twenty-sixth Article, which affirms the equitable and necessary doctrine that "the unworthiness of the minister hinders not the effect of Sacraments." This doctrine, of course, has no proper connection with the theory that Orders are indelible, and no apparent relation with what the author calls the "staggering problem" of physical generation. The whole passage (pp. 159-171) is a striking example of confused reasoning and false logic. The fact is that the Bishop is fatally handicapped by his presuppositions. He claims, and doubtless sincerely, to have thought out afresh the whole subject of the ministry, but what he has really done is to attempt a fresh and more plausible statement of the traditional patristic doctrine. "I have done my best to state the ideas of the succession and the ministry with moderation. Certainly for many centuries of the Church Catholic the ideas were held with moderation; the conception of the Christian priest or pastor was neither unspiritual nor autocratic" (p. 167). It would be interesting to know at what point in the history the Bishop would part company with the "Church Catholic," and, indeed, it would be difficult to find a point at which the sacerdotalism of Cyprian, Chrysostom, and Gregory was really left behind by the materializing thought of medieval Christendom.

The most interesting, and from every point of view the most important, part of the book is the final chapter, on "The Present Situation." With dangerous preciseness of statement and an almost reckless dogmatism of tone, the Bishop sums up his argument, and presses its practical requirements. These may be gathered into the single duty of exalting "the Divine authority of the Episcopate," and resisting firmly any weakening of the traditional attitude of exclusiveness towards the non-Episcopal Churches. Incidentally the Reformation is described,

condemned, and repudiated. "Undoubtedly there lay at the root of the whole Reformation movement the denial of the principle of the succession, which we have seen reason to believe to be of Divine authority" (p. 176). The notion cherished by some Presbyterian theologians that the Apostolic succession could be transmitted through presbyters is shortly and sharply disallowed :

"These Scottish divines appeal to Catholic principles and Church law, and on Catholic principles and Church law they have, it must be emphatically said, no case at all. The sixteenth-century presbyters who took part in ordaining the reformed pastors, to do them justice, do not seem to have claimed to do so because they were priests under the old succession; but if they had done so, they would have been claiming a power which, according to the undisputed mind of the Church, they had never received" (p. 183). "I believe that in repudiating this principle the Reformed Churches were—with whatever excuse—repudiating a law of Divine authority in the Church, and also an essential principle of the Church's continuous life" (p. 184).

The Bishop is persuaded that a process of disillusionment, which may quickly pass into repentance, is observable in the Protestant Churches. Experience is teaching them "that there was something fundamentally wrong about the Reformation movement," and we are left in no doubt that the "something wrong" was the abandonment of the Episcopal ministry. "Evangelical divines, historians, and men of letters, are looking back wistfully to the days of the Catholic fellowship, and are asking whether Protestantism was not a passing phase" (p. 187). The Bishop can see no good in "Protestantism"; he carries to its discredit the whole dislocation of social relationship which marks the modern epoch :

"Where Protestantism is the prevailing influence, people pass from one Church to another, as they are attracted by this preacher or that, this service or that, without any constraining sense of obligation to one body. What sense of fellowship in the one family of Jesus Christ binds our artisans to our employers to-day in England or in America? What sense of Catholic fellowship in the worship of fellow-Christians abroad possesses the minds of Englishmen as they collect themselves in a foreign hotel for the English service? What prevailing force in international politics has the name of Christendom to-day? The religious imagination of the world, at its best and deepest moments, is now again haunted by the vision of the ancient unity, by the sense that Christ meant to gather men of all nations and classes

into one family. And as they look back at the period of the Reformation, the old enthusiasm is gone, and they ask whether, after all, when they thought they were destroying the temple of Baal, the Reformers were not really pulling down the walls, however much defaced, of the house of the Lord" (pp. 189, 190).

Biblical criticism, we are assured, has destroyed the very basis of "the old Protestant orthodoxy," for

"You cannot reasonably isolate the New Testament from the Creed or the Episcopal successions, and assert the authority of the one while you repudiate that of the others; or, in particular, assert the authority of the first the while you repudiate that of the third" (p. 192). "It will become increasingly evident that, in attempting to set up the isolated Bible as the infallible standard of religion, Protestantism was attempting the impossible, and violating a fundamental law of the Christian religion which holds Bible and Creed and Episcopate indissolubly together" (p. 194).

This is perilous teaching, and accords ill with the position of an English Bishop. Its fallaciousness is not hard to detect, for it ignores the spiritual principles of the Reformation movement in order to fasten attention on an incidental exaggeration; and it assumes that the witness of experience is exhausted when the mischiefs of sectarianism are disclosed. Inevitably, as we read language which seems like a categorical contradiction of authoritative Anglican teaching, we ask what the author's views of the Church of England must be? The Bishop does not leave us in doubt. He has returned to the insularity of the Tractarians without the vehement anti-Romanism which at first marked them. To him it is "increasingly evident that the Roman Communion is a great and wonderful part of the Christian Church, with a wonderful power of recovery and expansion, and, in moral and administrative matters, a wonderful power of self-reform" (p. 195). While Protestantism has been falling, Romanism has been rising in his esteem. The Anglican Church is the happy mean, and by a singular and almost miraculous providence has "preserved the whole of the ancient Catholic structure, both Creed and Bible, Sacraments and order, beyond the reach of legitimate objection," and with this conservatism has coupled "a repudiation of the supreme authority of the Pope and a whole-hearted acceptance of the principle of the doctrinal

supremacy of Scripture" (p. 199). Of course, the Church of England is sharply distinguished from "the great rebellion against the hierarchy" which created the Protestant Churches. If only it would "recall its unhappy surrender to the State of the necessary functions of spiritual government," it would soon demonstrate its superiority. So we are led to four "elements of this work of internal recovery." We must become severely denominational, narrowly dogmatic, self-governing, and more patient of variety. Thus we shall satisfy the world's need of "a liberal Catholicism." Meanwhile we shall attend the Roman churches abroad, and limit our connection with the Anglican churches to the indispensable duty of "making our communions." "At home we shall make the most of our opportunities of co-operation with Nonconformists for *social and philanthropic objects*," and even go so far as to "join with our fellow-Christians in prayer, wherever we can *on really neutral ground*"; but on no account must we give the least countenance to the cardinal heresy of the age, undenominationalism (pp. 200-208).

The Bishop of Birmingham has a notion of the Church of England which neither its history, nor its constitution, nor its formularies, will authenticate. In his evidence before the Ritual Commission, his lordship offered an interesting sidelight on his mental attitude. "I was what people call a ritualist from the time I was a boy," he said. In this volume he discloses a view of the National Church as ritualists conceive of it, not as it has been, or is, or possibly can be, if in any sense it is to remain what for nearly four centuries it has been—the spiritual organ of a Protestant people.

II.

BY THE REV. CANON HAY AITKEN, M.A.

Amidst the thronging occupations of his strenuous and useful life, the Bishop of Birmingham has managed to find time to write yet another book upon a subject which he has already treated pretty fully, and which seems to exercise a

strange fascination over his mind, and more particularly over his imagination. His latest work, "Orders and Unity," is, more than anything else, one prolonged plea in favour of the dogma of Apostolical Succession; and the strangeness of the thing lies in this, that evidently the bent of the Bishop's mind is critical rather than credulous—he is more disposed towards inquiry and scientific examination than to the submissive acceptance of traditional assumptions, as he showed once for all in his notable essay in "Lux Mundi." Yet here we find him practically sacrificing all real hope of the reunion which he so earnestly desires, at the shrine of a theory of Episcopacy which has been discredited and abandoned by almost all the critical spirits of our time.

In this respect this volume is a most disappointing book. After the heart-stirring utterances of the Pan-Anglican Congress, and not least those that were heard from the pulpit of Westminster Abbey, one naturally opened the volume with the hope that some such reasonable modification of the old traditional view would be indicated in its pages as would open the door for further *rapprochement* between Anglicans and Nonconformists. But no; it is obvious that the object of the treatise is to show the impossibility of any sort of compromise in this respect. Monarchical Episcopacy, according to the Bishop, is not to be regarded as an evolutionary development, deserving respect alike because of its antiquity and because of its practical value; it is part of the original Divine plan concerning the Church, and must therefore take its place among the essentials of Christian religion.

Now, nothing is more obvious, if this is to be the attitude of the Anglican Communion towards this subject, than that all hope of Home Reunion is absolutely illusory, and should in the name of sincerity and truth be finally abandoned. It is no more possible for Nonconformists to admit this claim on behalf of the Episcopate than it is for Anglicans to admit the Roman claim on behalf of the Papacy. Nothing is gained by ignoring the obvious. Better far that we should sorrowfully admit the hope-

lessness of the position, and make the best of things as they are, than that we should both tantalize and stultify ourselves by futile efforts after the impossible.

But is Bishop Gore consistent with himself? On page 196, in dealing with the Papal pretensions, I find him saying: "Our appeal is to the principle, thoroughly recognized and assured in the Church of the Fathers, of the supremacy of Scripture as the testing-ground of doctrine. This means that the substance of the faith was once for all delivered and declared in the first Apostolic preaching of the Gospel; that it is the function of the Church to protect and propagate this faith; but that it has no commission to reveal or enforce new truth."

Now, where was this doctrine of the necessity of mon-episcopal government delivered and declared in the first Apostolic preaching of the Gospel? What indication is there in the New Testament Scriptures (1) of the existence of such an officer as a Bishop in the sense in which we now use the word, and (2) of the institution of the laying-on of hands as the means whereby he was admitted to his office? I venture to say, without fear of contradiction, there is *absolutely none*; and yet the position of such an official in the Christian scheme, as conceived of by the Bishop, is one of such enormous and vital importance that one would have expected the office and all connected with its perpetuation to have been a matter of the most explicit revelation.

As a matter of fact, it is open to question whether any single act of ordination is described or referred to in the New Testament. There are only three passages that seem capable of bearing such an interpretation. With regard to the first of these, the laying of Apostolic hands upon "the Seven," it is the fashion now to affirm that Stephen and his colleagues were not ordained deacons at all, and should not be so designated. Certainly they are nowhere called deacons in the Book of Acts, and, if they were not ordained to this office, it would follow that the laying-on of the Apostles' hands was a solemn dedication of them to a particular form of service, and a claiming for them

of the gifts that it required, and not an act of ordination at all. The act would find its parallel in the solemn laying-on of hands that separated Paul and Barnabas for the work to which the Holy Ghost called them.

As for the laying-on of hands referred to in St. Paul's Second Epistle to Timothy, I am much interested in the information which this volume brings me, that so sober and careful a scholar as Bishop Chase of Ely holds that in that passage (2 Tim. i. 6) St. Paul is referring to confirmation, and not to any form of ordination. I have long feared that I was in a minority of one in holding this view very strongly, and am delighted to find that I am now in such good company.

There remains a single passage in the First Epistle to Timothy, where a gift is referred to as given to Timothy by prophecy with the laying-on of the hands of the presbytery; but whether this was an ordination or the communication of some special spiritual capacity, such as the gift of healing, or whether prophecy or the laying-on of hands had most to do with its bestowal, we have literally no means of judging. Where, then, is the revelation of the "Sacrament of Orders" in the New Testament?

And where were the Bishops? Everybody knows that those whom St. Paul addressed by this title were presbyters. Their business was to have oversight over the flock, but where were the officials that were to have oversight over them? Timothy and Titus clearly were not local Bishops, but, as Bishop Gore rightly calls them, Apostolic delegates. They seem to have occupied towards the infant Churches exactly the same position that a white missionary from a Christian land would exercise amongst the new converts of Africa or India to-day. Their authority arose from the fact that they, together with their great leader, were the introducers and exponents of the new faith. It is apparent from the very words of St. Paul that their connection with these Churches was temporary, not permanent, and that it arose from the exigencies of circumstances, not from any plan of Episcopal organization. Where, then, is

the revelation of the Episcopal office? Those who can find it in the fact that St. James, who was probably full brother to our Lord, naturally enough took the chair in the First Council at Jerusalem, must be very easily satisfied.

In considering possible objections to this theory of the transmission of certain special gifts and capacities, essential to the unity, and, indeed, to the continued existence of the Church by the quasi-sacramental act of the laying-on of hands, Bishop Gore refers to the repugnance that some people feel to this theory of the Divine method of action, and quotes words that I wrote some years ago in a pamphlet entitled "The Mechanical *versus* the Spiritual" as illustrating that repugnance. The words which he quotes are these: "The theory assumes that God has been pleased to attach the power of the Holy Ghost to certain mechanical acts, accompanied by the recital of particular formulæ, so as to produce consequences of a distinctly supernatural order, whenever these mechanical conditions are complied with." Therefore, the Bishop goes on to state, it is argued that the theory must be false.

Here is the Bishop's reply: "The theory only assumes this mechanical aspect where it is applied by unspiritual men. The rejection of it implies that we cannot believe that God would have—so to speak—rendered Himself and His gifts liable to be so abused." But this, he proceeds to affirm, is not true. This is a "risk which God wills to run." And he proceeds to enforce this conclusion by an argument which I can only characterize as *most amazing*. "There is no human power," he affirms, "so spiritual as the power to bring into being an immortal soul or spirit. But God has given this power to men by human generation." The argument, when fully stated, would appear to be something of this kind. If God has ordained that the very existence of the human spirit shall depend upon an act that may be described as mechanical, why should He not, with perfect consistency, affect the moral or spiritual interests of that human spirit by means which might also be called mechanical?

To this I reply, the generation of man is a natural process, and no one can think of denying that God has ordained that all such natural processes shall be in some sense mechanical. Nature itself is one huge machine worked by the Divine power, in which that most mysterious force which we call life is quite as prominent as is steam-power in a modern factory. But, when we pass from the natural to what, for want of a better word, we may call the supernatural plane, we are met, not by machinery, but by direct personal action on the part of a personal God, and this action is responsive to moral and spiritual, and not to mechanical, conditions upon the part of man.

Thus, surely, Bishop Gore would admit that the mechanical act of immersing an intelligent and responsible adult in water, along with the equally mechanical act of the recital of a formula, will not produce that spiritual regeneration which St. John describes so impressively, and render the man thus baptized "born not of blood, nor of the will of man, but of God." The relation between the natural and the spiritual process, as depicted in this text, is not one of similarity or analogy, but of contrast. A natural birth may be brought about by the will of man acting in accordance with the laws of Nature, but regeneration can only be brought about by a direct Divine intervention in response to a certain definite moral attitude—the attitude of faith in the name of the Christ (John i. 18). In order for the mechanical act to become the means of bringing this great spiritual change about, it needs to be the expression of a "repentance whereby we forsake sin," and a "faith whereby we steadfastly believe the promises of God made to us in that sacrament."

But if God does not, by His Divine appointment, render spiritual issues dependent upon mere mechanical conditions in the case of the individual, why should He accept this appalling "risk" in the case of His Church? Just let us reflect on what this risk involves. "Thy money perish with thee!" exclaimed the indignant Apostle in addressing Simon Magus; "because thou hast thought that the gift of God can be purchased with

money." But according to this theory Simon Peter was all wrong in repudiating this possibility, and Simon Magus was perfectly correct, in supposing that this might be. In the Dark Ages the purchase of a bishopric was quite a commonplace transaction, and thus the power to administer the gifts of the Holy Ghost must again and again have been purchased for money.

But even this is not the gravest anomaly involved in the Bishop's position. Let us look at the Reformation period, as he himself describes it, and at the action of the Reformers as depicted by him. They found themselves face to face with a state of things "unspeakably shocking" (p. 175). The Church refused to reform itself, and the Reformers "were vigorously and bravely vindicating Divine principles," "especially the principles of the supremacy of Scripture in the Church against the corruption of tradition and the principle of human liberty against spiritual tyranny." "To deny God's presence with them," says the Bishop, "and His co-operation in their work and ministry, would seem to me to approach to blasphemy against the Holy Ghost." And yet these very men were, at this very time, in their work and ministry, "rebels against a Divine law." Apparently, then, God Almighty co-operated with these men in carrying out a rebellion against His own law, or in a work which, under existing conditions, could not have been carried out without rebellion against His own law. I say it with all reverence, this was a risk too great for even God to run. I could not, for my own part, worship a God who had so little prevision as to ordain laws, in rebellion against which He Himself would have to take part, as the result of their obvious and inherent liability to abuse. If this is not the *reductio ad absurdum* of the mechanical theory, I am at a loss to know what can be called absurd.

Of course, if you invest men with absolute autocratic power, whether in Church or State, you will be sure to have tyranny sooner or later. Such is human weakness. Can we believe that God "risked" having to back such tyranny by

Divine sanctions? Can we believe that He "risked" the necessity of having to deprive His own servants of all the benefits that flow from communion with His Church for no other crime save this—that, at the peril of their lives, they co-operated with Him in daring to take their stand for truth and righteousness against "unspeakably shocking" corruption?

If alike our moral sense and our religious instincts constrain us to repudiate so monstrous a conclusion, Bishop Gore's whole theory of Apostolical Succession must perish with it, and along with this all necessary impediment to Home Reunion. There is nothing that need permanently keep us apart from our fellow-Christians, if once we can bring ourselves to regard the authority of the ministry as a delegated authority, inherent in the Church, and thus capable of being transmitted to her executive.

It is to the Church, not to any particular form or type of ministry, that Christ has promised His presence "all the days," and to her He has granted the power of binding and loosing (Matt. xviii. 18). We may believe that the Episcopal form of government has been providentially evolved in the history of the Church, and that it is the wisest and best form of government that can be adopted, and this is my own profound conviction; but it is not a matter of revelation, and therefore any attempt to make it an essential feature of Christian religion is to commit the Pharisees' error of teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.



The Date of the Crucifixion was A.D. 29.

By LIBUT.-COL. G. MACKINLAY (LATE R.A.).

THE subject of Gospel chronology has, until lately, been generally regarded as almost insoluble, and therefore unprofitable; it has consequently been neglected or left to the consideration of only a few specialists.

During recent years, however, historical knowledge has

greatly increased, owing to the discovery of ancient original documents and inscriptions, and fresh methods of investigation have been employed. It is therefore high time that all thoughtful Christians who reverence the Word of God should consider the subject of the chronology of the New Testament with care and attention. If the chief dates can be determined, and if they are accepted as true, the theories of destructive critics and of those who regard the Gospels as mere myths must fall to the ground.

The following are the leading data, in very brief outline, which have been at our disposal for a considerable time :

1. The historical testimony of the Early Latin Fathers that Christ was put to death in the Consulate of the Gemini, which was A.D. 29.

2. The historical references in Luke iii. 1, 2 and John ii. 20 are considered to be consistent with the date A.D. 29 for the Crucifixion.

3. The Crucifixion took place at Passover, which was on the fourteenth day of the first month (Exod. xii. 6). It is generally accepted that this day was a Friday. These conditions are only fulfilled (in the years historically possible) in A.D. 29.

4. The prophecy in Dan. ix. of the "weeks" possibly points to the date of the Crucifixion.

The consideration of the available data has led most of our leading chronologists and scholars to accept this date, A.D. 29, for the Crucifixion. Among them are Prebendary Browne, Dr. H. Grattan Guinness, Professor Sir W. M. Ramsay, Canon Sanday, and Mr. C. H. Turner. It must be allowed that this is only the finding of a majority;—it is not accepted by all. Some of those who advocate this date do so in cautious language—for instance, Mr. Turner¹ summarizes the historical evidence as follows: "It appears, then, not indeed certain, but possible, and even probable, that a trustworthy Christian tradition does point to A.D. 29, and to the Consulate of the Gemini as the

¹ Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible," "New Testament Chronology," p. 414.

year of the Crucifixion;" and Canon Sanday¹ writes of this chronology: "Not as certain, but as on the whole the best of current systems, by placing the Crucifixion in the year A.D. 29."

The following reasons for the date A.D. 29 are newer,² and they give good confirmatory evidence—(A) and (B)—that A.D. 29 really was the date of the Crucifixion:

(A) *The Crucifixion was A.D. 29, because it is attested by Allusions in the Gospels to the Sabbath Year A.D. 26-27.*

The Sabbath year began at the Feast of Tabernacles, near the autumnal equinox (Deut. xxxi. 10-13; Neh. viii. 18). The Hebrews were then forbidden to sow or to prune their vines and olives (Exod. xxiii. 11; Lev. xxv. 3-7), and the land was to rest. Any harvest which grew of itself was not for the owners, but for the poor, the strangers, and the cattle (Lev. xxv. 5-7). Also all debts were to be remitted among the Israelites (Deut. xv. 1-3, 9).

It is generally concluded³ that the years 164-163, 38-37 B.C., and A.D. 68-69, according to 1 Macc. vi. 49, 53, Josephus, "Ant.," Book XIV., chap. xvi. 2, and Jewish tradition about the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus respectively, were all of them Sabbaths. These years are at intervals from each other, which are multiples of seven years, and so each record supports the testimony of the others. It is easily found that an intermediate year A.D. 26-27, which fell in Christ's ministry, if the Crucifixion were in A.D. 29, must also have been a Sabbath year.

Sir Isaac Newton has forcibly reminded us of the habit of Christ to refer to things actually present in His parabolic teaching. Taking into account the graphic living touches

¹ "Outlines of the Life of Christ," p. 33, 1906.

² They were first brought forward in the author's book, "The Magi: how they Recognized Christ's Star," published at the end of 1907. The arguments are there stated in detail, but most of those connected with the Sermon on the Mount mentioned in this article are now published for the first time.

³ Professor G. Schiaparelli, "Astronomy in the Old Testament," p. 144, 1905; Sir Isaac Newton, "Observations upon the Prophecies of Daniel," note on pp. 149, 160; also "St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen," p. 192 (Sir W. M. Ramsay).

which exist in the Gospel narratives, we must judge that the unusual events of the Sabbath year would almost certainly be referred to if it occurred during the Lord's ministry. In other words, if we find consistent chronological references in the Gospels to a Sabbath year ending eighteen months before the Crucifixion, we must accept them as a demonstration that the Crucifixion was A.D. 29.

We shall briefly consider a *few* of these references (there are several more, which we have not space to consider here).

The reading at Nazareth (Luke iv. 18, 19, from Isa. lxi. 1) about the acceptable year of the Lord and the release of captives forms a fitting introduction to the Sabbath year A.D. 26-27, as does also the quotation in Matt. iv. 12-16, from Isa. ix. 1, 2, about the rising of a great Light in Galilee, which refers to the same time.

The Sermon on the Mount was delivered in the following summer, because the lilies of the field (then in bloom) and the bringing forth fruit are both alluded to in it. All the petitions of the Lord's Prayer (which forms a part of this Sermon) refer to some circumstances connected with the teaching of the Sabbath year. The coming kingdom, the will and honour of the Father, and deliverance from evil, are all in harmony with this idea. But there are two petitions which claim special attention. One of them: "Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors" (Matt. vi. 12, R.V.) refers to definite acts which many of His hearers had done in the Sabbath year then present, when, in accordance with Deut. xv. 1-3, each creditor had released his Hebrew debtor from his obligations. An explanation is given just after the prayer, that our trespasses against God and the trespasses of others against us are intended by the word "debts."

The Evangelist Luke, however, conveys the same meaning in fewer words by calling our debts to God "sins" in the prayer itself, thus dropping one of the allusions to the figure of debt, and rendering the subsequent explanation which occurs in Matthew unnecessary: "Forgive us our sins; for we our-

selves also forgive every one that is indebted to us" (Luke xi. 4). The Evangelist Luke wrote for a wide Gentile circle, to whom the reference to the Sabbath year would not come with such force as to the Jews, to whom Matthew seems chiefly to have addressed himself. *Some* reference to the Sabbath year, however, remains in this paragraph of the Lord's Prayer in Luke's Gospel, though very likely it was hardly noticed as such by the first Gentile readers. But *all* reference to the forgiveness of debts is now abandoned by us in the phraseology of the Lord's Prayer with which we ourselves are most familiar: "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us."

Let us endeavour to picture to ourselves the condition of Christ's hearers at the time of the Sermon on the Mount, when the Sabbath year was in progress. They were farmers dependent upon their own produce; the time of harvest had come, but there was no reaping, no gathering into barns, because there had been no sowing. Anxiety must naturally have been in the minds of many. How very appropriate at such a time was the petition, "Give us this day our daily bread" (Matt. vi. 11), because there was practically no corn grown in Palestine in that year, and consequently the supply of bread might run short!

Anxiety is repeatedly referred to in the Sermon on the Mount, and always in terms which refer to the events of the Sabbath year. The safety of stored corn must then have been a special care to those who possessed any; the depredations of hungry insects and men were to be guarded against. So the Lord expressed His warning against anxiety in the following words, as they may be truly translated: "Lay not up for yourselves stores [of corn] upon earth, where moths, even the eating [of moths] doth cause them to vanish away, and where thieves break through and steal"¹ (Matt. vi. 19). Our Lord further continued His exhortations against anxiety by saying: "Behold

¹ The verb *θησαυρίζω* refers to the storing of corn in Luke xii. 21. The word *βρώσις*, translated *rust* in this passage, occurs nine other times in the New Testament, where it is translated *eating* or *food*. The phrase *στῆς καὶ βρώσις* is an example of hendiadys, comparable to Acts xiv. 13, and the word *ἀφανίσει*, translated *doth corrupt* in this passage, is elsewhere translated *vanisheth away* (Jas. iv. 14).

the birds of the heaven, that they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns ; and your Heavenly Father feedeth them " (Matt. vi. 26)—words most appropriate to His hearers during the Sabbath year, because *they* had not sown, and could not, therefore, reap or gather into barns (Lev. xxv. 4, 5). Further still, He taught the same lesson by asking His hearers why they took thought for raiment ; He exhorted them to consider the lilies of the field, which "toil not, neither do they spin" (Matt. vi. 28). In the Sabbath year the fields of flax must have remained untilled, and hence no one had toiled at their cultivation, or spun the produce of that season.

These allusions, as well as several others which we have not space to give, all point to the summer of the Sabbath year A.D. 27. Considerations of Gospel chronology show that the Crucifixion took place a little less than two years afterwards, or in the spring of A.D. 29.

(B) *The Crucifixion was A.D. 29, because it is attested by Allusions to John the Baptist as the Morning Star.*

It is first of all necessary to remember that Christ is spoken of in Scripture as the Sun (Isa. ix. 2 ; Mal. iv. 2 ; Luke i. 78 ; John viii. 12, etc.), and John the Baptist, His forerunner, is likened to the Morning Star,—the planet Venus, which goes before and heralds the rising of the orb of day (*cf.* Mal. iii. 1 and iv. 2 ; Luke i. 76 and 78 ; see also Matt. xi. 10 ; Mark i. 2, etc.). This is a certain, but hitherto little noticed, Scripture simile.

With our own present Western manner of life, when the early morning light of the sun is so strangely wasted, very few indeed notice the appearance of the sky before dawn. It is doubtless a fact that very many may not know that there is any particular celestial object which is pre-eminently the Morning Star. But it is very different in the East, where early rising is usual, and where clocks are few.

Dr. Pinches tells us that the Assyrians named the Morning

Star "Delebet," *she who proclaims*, and modern Persians still allude to it as a well-known type of a forerunner. At the present time the rising of the Morning Star in parts of the world so distant from each other as China, India, Turkey, Syria, and Spain, is the signal for many of the labouring classes to prepare for the work of the day.

Even in England our own poets have sung of "the star that led the dawn."¹

"Now the bright Morning Star, day's harbinger,
Comes dancing from the East."²

"Fairest of stars! last in the train of night,
If better thou belong not to the dawn,
Sure pledge of day, that crown'st the smiling morn."³

"Look! the unfolding star calls up the shepherd."⁴

Alluding to the Duke of Monmouth, Dryden wrote :

"Fame runs before him as the Morning Star."⁵

Others wrote of its fading away :

"As sets the Morning Star, which goes not down
Behind the darkest west, nor hides obscured
Among the tempests of the sky, but melts away
Into the light of heaven."⁶

"For a breeze of morning moves,
And the planet of Love is on high ;
Beginning to faint in the light that she loves
On a bed of daffodil sky.
To faint in the light of the Sun she loves,
To faint in his light, and die."⁷

Little as we may now regard it in England, the Morning Star has attracted universal attention in the past, as it still does in the East. It evidently forms a very beautiful and appropriate simile to John the Baptist.

¹ "Ode composed on May Morning" (Wordsworth).

² "Song on May Morning" (Milton).

³ "Paradise Lost," Book V. (Milton).

⁴ "Measure for Measure," Act iv., Scene 2. "The star that heralds the unfolding of the day calls upon the shepherd to unfold his sheep" (*Contemporary Review*), July, 1908; Museus, "The Astronomy of Shakespear."

⁵ "Absalom and Ahithophel."

⁶ Quoted in "The City of God," p. 190 (A. M. Fairbairn, D.D.).

⁷ "Maud" (Tennyson).

We must remember, however, that the Morning Star does not shine every morning, but only for a period of about eight or nine months; it then disappears from view altogether for a few weeks, and then the same planet appears in the western skies as the Evening Star for some eight or nine months, shortly, however, to reappear in the east as the Morning Star. There are five of these cycles in (very approximately) eight years, and their times can be calculated from astronomical tables. Hence the periods of the shining and of the non-shining of the Morning Star during the times of Christ's ministry have been found.

Bearing in mind the Biblical plan of reference to things actually present, we conclude that John the Baptist is referred to in terms connected with the Morning Star in agreement with the actual visibility or invisibility of the planet before sunrise at the time.

If we assume that the Crucifixion was A.D. 29, and that Christ's ministry lasted for three years and a half, we find that the Morning Star was shining when John the Baptist and Christ each began their ministries. But when John said, "He must increase, but I must decrease" (John iii. 30), shortly before his imprisonment, the Morning Star had withdrawn its shining. When, later on, Christ said of the Baptist, "He was the lamp that burneth and shineth" (John v. 35), and when, shortly afterwards, He again referred to him as "My messenger before Thy face" (Matt. xi. 10), the planet was again glowing in the eastern sky before sunrise. But when, some months later, John was put to death (Matt. xiv. 10, 14-20; John vi. 4-13), the Morning Star no longer shone. Later still, when Christ again referred to this simile by proclaiming Himself the Light of the World (or the Sun) (John viii. 12), and when, a little while afterwards, He visited the scene of John's labours at Bethabara, where the people witnessed "All things whatsoever John spake of this man were true" (John x. 41, 42), the Morning Star again shed its bright beams in the east towards the close of the night. On the other hand, the Morning Star had again ceased to shine on the morning of the Crucifixion.

If, however, any other date (which is historically possible) than A.D. 29 is assumed for the date of the Crucifixion, the harmony of these references is lost, because the Morning Star does not shine at the same seasons every year. We therefore conclude that this method of inference also confirms the previous deductions in pointing to A.D. 29 as the year of the Crucifixion.

These two lines of investigation (A) and (B), connected with the Sabbath year and with the Morning Star, may appear to be unusual, but they are founded on correct principles. As a further test of reliability, they have both been employed to find the date of the Nativity, and both have consistently indicated it to be 8 B.C., which is earlier than the year, until lately, generally thought to be probable. But the historical evidence, when closely examined, is now found to be so strongly in favour of 8 B.C. for the Nativity that Sir W. M. Ramsay wrote: "This date (8 B.C.) may now be accepted provisionally, as the only one which has all the evidence in its favour."¹

If still found to be reliable after fuller investigation by others, these new methods may perhaps be applied with success to the solution of other Biblical problems.

It is impossible within the limits of this article to enter fully into all the arguments in favour of the date A.D. 29 for the Crucifixion. But it is hoped that attention will be drawn to this subject, which reveals so many marks of the consistency and truthfulness of the sacred record. If flaws can be found in the foregoing deductions, or if better evidences can be brought forward in favour of any other date for the Crucifixion, let them be produced. It is believed that, practically, historic certainty has now been obtained, because the available data are now so considerable.

¹ The *Expositor*, December, 1908, and "Luke the Physician," p. 246, 1908.



The Divine Authority of Holy Scripture.

BY THE REV. T. A. GURNEY, M.A., LL.B.,

Vicar of Emmanuel, Clifton.

HOOKER has warned us that "we must . . . take great heed lest in attributing unto Scripture more than it can have, the incredibility of that do cause even those things which indeed it hath most abundantly to be less reverently esteemed."¹ The words of wise counsel were never more urgently needed than at the present time, when men insist on bringing the fullest historic research and scientific criticism to bear upon the great historico-spiritual bases of our faith. For if we are to "guard the deposit"² at all which we hold so precious, we must know how to distinguish between that *depositum fidei* and the mere accessories with which men often come to confound it. There are essentials of faith, to surrender which lightly to the first suitor who demands them, without adequate credentials, would be an act of betrayal of trust as heinous as if in some secular trusteeship we parted as trustees with the securities of our *cestui que trust* to a stranger who only had some mere *prima facie* right to inspect them. But there are non-essentials which are like the wearisome circumlocutions which used to be so dear to legal minds of bygone days—things which we have learnt happily to dispense with, which confirmed nothing which was not already sure, and were not necessary to make the title secure. To stand upon traditions, to keep reaffirming passionately our adhesion to views of Biblical revelation and inspiration which we have not carefully examined and proved, is not only contrary to the true spirit of a living and progressive Protestantism; it is to court defeat, like one who should stake the salvation of his country from invasion upon its martello-towers along the coast; it is to endanger the citadel by dissipating our defence along a line of forts already unmasked by the enemy's fire, instead of concentrating and consolidating

¹ "Ecclesiastical Polity," Book II., c. 8.

² 1 Tim. vi. 20.

our defence at positions which can really be held as impregnable, and which are vital to the citadel itself. We need to make it, above all things, plain just now that the reverence due to the Bible as "the library of revelation" is perfectly reconcilable with the most thoroughgoing investigation of it on its human side and the most scientific analysis of its contents. And, conversely, nothing in that investigation or analysis, when conducted in a reverent spirit, need shake our conviction as to its Divine authority.

What, then, is the authority by which we are led to conclude that the Bible, in a degree different from all other books, and in a way purely its own, contains a revelation from the Most High God? The answer used practically to lie in the assertion of its Divine, at the expense of its human, character. It was Divine—that is, unlike all human books, it was unerring in its scientific accuracy, infallible in its truth—of whatever sort that truth might be—perfect, so that it revealed no process of human growth, no possibility of development from its first page to its last. There are few—even the most conservative—who would take up that extreme position in its entirety to-day. But we do well to remember, with regard to this old line of defence, that it had at least the virtue of thoroughness and consistency; and that those who have abandoned it, without as yet finding a sounder and stronger basis for their faith in the Divine character of Biblical revelation, are in a far less logical, and, therefore, far more dangerous, position than the old supporters of out-and-out verbal inspiration in its boldest form.

The supreme test of the reality of the revelation contained in the Bible does not lie in the infallibility of its dicta upon critical and intellectual issues. It is found in far higher regions of spiritual certainty. It lies in the infallibility of its witness to Christ. It is to be sought in the light which it throws upon the uniqueness of His Person and the confirmation with which it crowns His whole work. An illuminating modern writer has defined Christianity as "the meaning of the fact of Christ."¹

¹ Carnegie Simpson, "The Fact of Christ," p. 172.

That might also stand in the widest sense as the purport of the Bible. It is the unique relation of Holy Scripture to Him, rather than His relation to it, which forms the witness to its truth as revelation. It is through that relationship that we come to perceive that His relationship to it as Author is a special one. "Alone, absolutely alone, amongst leaders of the soul, Jesus absorbs the highest principles into His own personality."¹ Alone, absolutely alone, among the collections of books in the world, the Bible bears a continuous witness to Him as foretold, prepared for, discerned, interpreted, and brought home to the desiring hearts of men.

We are able, therefore, to affirm that there is a Divine revelation contained in the Bible, and that this revelation is common both to Old and New Testaments. The Most High God has actually spoken (*πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*). He has made Himself known in a continuous revelation, of which the Incarnation is the climax and crown. He has unfolded to men, "as they were able to hear it," the true knowledge of His Being, the true knowledge of themselves, the true knowledge of what He has become and will become to them and in them, and of what they may become in Him and unto Him. It is necessary to be very clear, because, as Professor Orr has pointed out,² even when we hear the word "revelation" used we are not quite safe to-day as to its real meaning. It is not enough, as he affirms, to speak, as Andrew Lang does, of Israel's "eminent genius for religion"; or, with Duhm, of a "providential guidance in Israel," in the stages of the development of religion; or, with Gunkel, of Israel as "the people of revelation." For all such statements fall far short of the uniqueness and supremacy of the revelation of Jesus Christ which we actually find in the Jewish Scriptures. By "revelation" we mean far more than a "natural development of religion"; we mean what cannot be otherwise classified than as a supernatural development. We mean, indeed, "providential guidance" in

¹ Carnegie Simpson, "The Fact of Christ," p. 6.

² "Problem of the Old Testament," p. 21.

matters of religion, but we mean providential guidance in which one great Final Cause is ever present, "one far-off Divine event," towards which from the very first we are travelling, giving unity and purpose to the whole. We mean, indeed, an "eminent genius for religion," but a genius which implies not so much pathetic yearnings after God as express directions received from God. We mean, not desires, but fulfilments; not

"lame hands of faith,
Upon the great world's altar-stairs
That slope thro' darkness up to God,"

but that vision to faith, that reward to faith, that message to faith which enabled "holy men of God to speak as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," and led St. John to write: "We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son, Jesus Christ."¹ Within the compass of these sacred books is contained a unique, authoritative, final message from the Living God to the heart and intelligence and conscience of mankind. "Beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, He interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself."² The Highest Authority has thus affirmed the unity of all Scripture in its progressive revelation of Himself. He has affirmed more, we think, in saying this; He has affirmed at least its *general* historicity. The revelation is not contained in myth or legend; it is not derivable from sources common to itself with purely human religions. There is an actual Divine element in it, and it is, in fact, due to that very Divine element, that it is so distinctively and universally human.

That intense humanity is one, at least, of the proofs of its character as revelation. The defender of the Bible as a library of revelation, bearing clear marks of inspiration, does not thereby deny human co-operation and human influence of a genuine kind. There are diversity, progress, influence of

¹ 1 John v. 20, R.V.

² Luke xxiv. 27, R.V.

environment, direct and indirect, constant adaptation, local and temporal colouring, individuality of authorship and standpoint, partiality of knowledge about many things. "The strictest upholder of Inspiration," writes Professor Orr,¹ "will hardly place the Books of Chronicles on the same level with the Gospel of St. John." Indeed, a careful and reverent student of the Bible has written: "The very object of a large portion of the Bible seems to be not so much the disclosure of truth as the embodiment of truth already disclosed."² There is an inspiration of selection rather than an inspiration of creation. Purely human sources are often used. "Inspiration," writes Professor Orr, "does not create the materials of its record; it works upon them." The revelation is progressive "by divers portions and in divers manners." "Revelation proceeds³ by way of development, by a gradual opening of the eyes to higher ranges of truth." The "highest summits of all" are not in Genesis or Exodus, or the Books of Kings, but in Isaiah or Jeremiah, in the doctrine of the Suffering Servant or the prophecy of the New Covenant. Even the prophets had no grant of omniscience or infallibility.⁴

Yet the *witness* borne is infallible. Take away the Divine out of Holy Scripture and the human would fall to pieces. "In Him all things hold together"⁵ is pre-eminently true of the Bible. The unity, the correspondence, the moral consistency, the ever-expanding body of truth, the (still unshaken) supernatural element in the Old Testament as well as the New, the foreshadowing and foretelling of the Christ, the marvellous preparation of the Chosen People to be His witness, the awakening and sustaining of spiritual ideals and longings, which find their only fulfilment in Himself:—all these are unanswerable proofs of revelation.

If this, then, is the substance of revelation, what is the

¹ "Problem of the Old Testament," p. 49.

² Dr. Green, "The Bible Handbook," p. 139.

³ Dr. Sanday, "Inspiration," Bampton Lectures, 1893.

⁴ Girdlestone, "Grammar of Prophecy."

⁵ Col. i. 17, R.V. marg.

connection between revelation and inspiration? A Cambridge thinker, to whose lucid thought and writings the Church owes a memorable debt, Frederick Watson, who passed away on New Year's Day, 1906, has clearly distinguished between the two. He is speaking of the Bible¹ as "the supreme manifestation of Divine Inspiration embodied in human words," and he defines inspiration broadly as "that Divine gift by which all things have their beginning, and also attain their end." Then he goes on (p. 20) to distinguish between inspiration and revelation: "Inspiration is the Divine power within Man which enables him first to appreciate the Divine manifestation, and afterwards to place it on permanent record. Revelation is the removal of the veil which hides Divine things from man's eyes; it is God's manifestation of Himself to man." "The Bible," he adds, "is at once the work of Inspiration and the written record of Revelation. It is a product of one and a chronicle of the other." This corresponds with Westcott's definition, which he goes on to quote: "Inspiration may be regarded in one aspect as the correlative of Revelation. . . . By Inspiration we conceive that (man's) natural powers are quickened so that he contemplates with a Divine intuition the truth as it exists still among the ruins of the moral and physical worlds. By Revelation we see as it were the dark veil removed from the face of things, so that the true springs and issues of life stand disclosed in their eternal nature." Thus, "the one works within man and the other beside him; the one gives him the power of spiritual sight, and the other provides spiritual objects for his spiritual vision. . . . In the light of Inspiration we see the light of Revelation." In the one case God is unveiling to sight; in the other He is opening the eyes to see.²

The Bible, then, contains the actual revelation of God. It was through the inspiration which the writers of both Testaments received that they were able to reveal God. How can we recognize the marks of that inspiration so as to be sure that they were God-directed? The answer would be almost a

¹ Watson, "Inspiration," p. 17,

² *Ibid.*, pp. 20, 21.

recapitulation of the evidences for the truth of Christianity as a Divine revelation. But there are certain features of inspiration which are easily recognized. The first of these is its inspiration of *witness*. It bears the clearest testimony to the fact of Christ. He, the Living Word, not the written word, is the Revelation of the Father,¹ God's first and last message to men. And it is in Holy Scripture that His self-revelation is prepared for, foretold, recorded, and recapitulated in its abiding results and lessons. He is "the very act and the very fact and the very truth of humanity itself,"² and He is at the same time the very image and the very essence and the very Being of God. And the witness of the Bible to this great Revelation is continuous and clear. It takes many forms. It is both direct and indirect. But throughout there is the clearest recognition of "the Lord's Christ." It is an inspiration both of witness and also of *discernment*. That discernment springs from a realization of the Divine Immanence which differentiates the Old Testament prophets and writers from all other wise teachers of men. They "see God everywhere." It is because they have a spiritual gift which brings them into close touch with the unseen.

But with this is another equally noteworthy feature. Through the true vision of God comes the humbling knowledge of self. "I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear: but now mine eye seeth Thee, wherefore I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes."³ There is an inspiration of *conviction* here which stands alone. The sense of sin is direct and personal. It is the sin of Israel herself—not, save indirectly, the sin of other nations—which is dwelt upon. The true spiritual sense of sin is absent from other nations. The desire always with them is to appease the Deity, not to renounce and conquer the sin.

Again, side by side with this is a wholly different characteristic—the marvellous harmony of the Bible. There is in it an inspiration of *self-correspondence*. The Bible is like historic Sion: "A city that is at unity with itself." Though not all of

¹ John xiv. 9.

² Du Bose, "The Gospel in the Gospels," p. 260.

³ Job xlii. 5, 6.

one age or style or workmanship, the hoar and sacred monument of ages of varied needs, of clashing thoughts, of conflicting ideals, yet still, through all these changes, it is one—behind the ramparts of an historic unity never imperilled or lost. “The Old Testament embodies a progressive revelation.”¹ The ideas of God, of His requirements, of His kingdom, of man’s privilege and duty, widen out; but the New Testament is the fulfilment of the Old. It is unintelligible without it. There is living progress. General Gordon once wrote that the difference between the Bible and other books is that “it *is* alive and *makes* alive.”

There is also what Liddon described as “an inspiration of *selection*” in the choice of the facts recorded. They fit into one vast scheme which culminates with the Incarnation of Christ. Specially is this so with the New Testament. Its books were not written at any one time, nor do they bear any one character. They were preceded, in the case of the Gospels at least, by several oral Gospels. Yet we have this marvellous result: At the close of the Apostolic period we find working together the special needs which call forth each distinct letter or writing, the utter unconsciousness of the writers, the absence of any design or common purpose, a complete diversity of standpoint (*e.g.*, St. Paul and St. James), the recognition still of the Old Testament as a complete Bible, the directness with which each letter appears to be directed to special wants, yet the marvel of a New Testament unique in its claim to inspiration, harmonious and self-correspondent, speaking with unity and authority through all ages, and, throughout, bearing clearest witness to Jesus Christ.

There is also, in the most direct way, an inspiration of *morality*. This is far more exceptional and wonderful than it appears at first sight. From other religions morality is divorced. It is never so here. The ethical intensity of the Bible appears not as a subordinate and secondary, but as a supreme and ever-present feature. It completely dominates the Biblical treatment of lives and characters; it forms the background to the whole

¹ Watson, “Inspiration,” p. 75.

plot. Speaking of Ahab's treatment of Naboth the Jezreelite, a leading preacher of to-day says: "It is on this—this great injustice, this great moral failure—that the eyes of the sacred historian are centred. This for him is the crucial interest of Ahab's life, 'The rest of the acts of Ahab and all that he did'; let those read who will."¹ And with this inspiration of morality is that inspiration of *abidingness* which is largely due to it. Eighteen centuries separate the scene of Israel's sin in the Wilderness from the Corinthian life to which St. Paul applies it as a warning.² Nineteen more centuries separate those Corinthians from ourselves. Yet, as we listen year by year to the same warning,³ the same challenge across thirty-seven centuries comes ever with the same living reality.

One might mention with equal force other features of inspiration in the Bible which are equally convincing, though they require more detailed examination and illustration than can be given here in order to bring home that force. Such is its inspiration of *prophecy*. Without at all limiting the word "prophecy" to prediction merely, and whether we regard it from the point of view of its insight or its foresight, it is, in the case of the Bible, equally remarkable. The living insight as to the deepest instincts and needs of man's nature, or as to the trend of national and personal life, its dangers and how they may be averted, its hopes and how they may be realized, is marvellous. So great is that insight, that some have even imagined the gift of foresight which it reveals to be due to the insight, though such a view does not account for all the facts. "In the pagan world," writes Dr. Watson, quoting Mozley, "prophecy founded nothing—it erected no institutions, no framework, no body, no church; it passed away and wandered into space." It "never grew into a practical and directing power." On the other hand, as soon as prophecy found a receptacle in the chosen race, it grew strong, it became an architect and builder, it raised institutions, it enacted ordinances.⁴

¹ Gamble, "Things that Matter," p. 5.

² 1 Cor. x. 6-13.

³ Epistle, Ninth Sunday after Trinity.

⁴ Watson, "Inspiration," p. 135.

It proved itself an instrument of real directing power; it was so living that it made a dying nation live; it was so true that it shadowed forth its own fulfilment; it was so human that it still enshrines the highest hopes of the whole world; it was so Divine that it saw "God manifest in the flesh" afar off. So, in the same way, one might dwell upon that inspiration of *sobriety* and *accuracy* which is such a marked feature of both Testaments. The same providential instinct which made the Early Fathers so careful to discriminate between Apostolic writings and their own marks the whole compilation of the sacred records. In spite of modern critics, to an ordinary reader 1 Kings xviii. bears such a stamp of sobriety and reality that it is simply impossible to accept it as non-historical. What Papias says of St. Mark might be said of each writer: "He wrote accurately all (that Peter mentioned). He made no error, for he took heed to one thing: to omit nothing of what he had heard, and to state nothing falsely in his record." From what source did that sobriety come?



A Good Sermon, But—

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

Vicar of St. Peter's, Tunbridge Wells.

IT may possibly occur to my readers that, in presenting such a subject as preaching, I am appointing myself to a professor's chair and sitting in judgment on my brethren. I may assure them that that chair is quite vacant as far as I am concerned, and that the only parson I am venturing to sit in judgment on is myself.

Now, the phrase "a good sermon," is a very elastic one indeed, and may require a comment or two, because it is so elastic. "One man's meat is another man's poison," and a "good sermon" to one man may be a shockingly bad one to another. Tastes and standards vary. Besides, *moods* count for a good

deal, so that what to-day a man will pronounce excellent, to-morrow he may denounce. Much depends on the nature of his breakfast, the quarter from which the wind blows, or whether the home atmosphere that morning was calm or electric.

Not, however, that "the good sermon" itself is a variable quantity. If it be good it must be good under all conditions, and the judgments themselves are wrong, if adverse. But it is not necessarily good because somebody says it is, or because *we* think it is, or because it is very short, or very long; not even when it is received by a chorus of praise or by such exclamations as "Heavenly!" "Sweet!" or "Entrancing!" A very young man may be deceived by such rhapsodies. The older ones shiver under them, and wonder when such flatterers will be found "sitting under" somebody else.

For the sake of argument, however, let us call a sermon "good" when its matter is good, its arrangement is good, its delivery is good, and its spirit is good. If these elements are present any congregation may be reckoned upon to pronounce the sermon a good one, unless it be a very cantankerous and exceptional congregation.

But, we preachers are bound to be more exacting and critical over our own performances than any congregation can be. We are behind the scenes, among the machinery, and beside the furnace, and it often happens that, as the hearers stream out of the door with praises on their lips, the preacher goes out with a burden of self-accusation pressing heavily upon his heart, and feeling as if he could never preach again.

It is just here that the "*but*" comes in.

I. A GOOD SERMON, BUT— MIGHT IT NOT HAVE BEEN BETTER?

We know, and perhaps nobody else does, how much more time and thought and prayer might have been given to it. Sermons are like some dishes, they require a good deal of simmering to be of the best character; and, it may be, even our good sermons have been less good than they might have been

for want of it. The golden rule for pulpit cookery is a slow fire, long simmering, and then to serve up hot. Our tendency is frequently to look for the fire in the pulpit, and neglect it in the preparation. But we cannot make a sermon digestible if the pulpit fire is all that it has been subjected to.

2. A GOOD SERMON, BUT— WAS IT GOOD FOR SOMETHING?

Any rifle will make an explosion if there be powder in it. But what if the bullet be left out? Perhaps we, too, have been giving blank cartridges in the pulpit. Or, if there was powder and shot, all goes for nothing without an aim and a target. It may be that we, too, "have aimed at nothing and hit it," as Whately says. It is a poor sportsman, too, who "fires into the brown" of the partridge covey, aiming at all in general and at none in particular. Perhaps we have done that, too. I can only speak for myself. It is useless to expect conversions if we do not aim at them. It is the hits that count, not the misses.

3. A GOOD SERMON, BUT— WHERE DID IT COME FROM?

There is a great difference between watering our gardens with rain-water and tap-water. The one has the powers of heaven entangled in it; the other has not, it is flat and earthy. So there is a great deal of difference between sermons which come down and sermons which come up. There are sermons which smell of the depths—the depths of strong minds, if you like, the depths of our energetic selves, but still the depths—and there are sermons which have the smell of heaven in them, the smell of the heights of transfiguration, where we have been with God. We read on the title-pages of some volumes of sermons:—"Sermons by the Rev. So-and-So," and it is quite correct they are by *him*, scores entirely off his own bat, and by him and nobody else, God or man. "*My* sermons" he may call them proudly, but we beg to ask with all innocence, "Had God *nothing* to do with them?" They have come from the wrong place if God had no hand in them.

4. A GOOD SERMON, BUT— WHERE WAS THE GRIP OF IT?

A good sermon is like a good detective; it gets you by the collar, claps the handcuffs on, and hauls you before judge and jury before you know where you are. "Thou art the man," it thunders out all the way through. It is always seeking to get at you, and follows you about, like the eyes of some portraits on the wall. No sermon is really good for much which does not, among other things, grip the conscience, and when it grips, shakes it. You could not possibly sleep under it—no, nor even doze—any more than you could sleep in an earthquake. And the more we think over the grasping power of a good sermon, the more convinced we must be that it is no good at all unless it puts the hearers under arrest, and makes them feel as the fox feels when the hue and cry is after him. Where this grip is, congregations cease to pass on truths to their neighbours, and feel that there is something here for them personally. They, very probably, will not like it, but they cannot deny the truth of it.

5. A GOOD SERMON, BUT— WHY WERE THERE SO MANY DEAD FLIES IN THE OINTMENT?

Sermons, like ointment, are soon corrupted by the touch of dead things, and die through the contact. No sermon ever composed is proof against it. And this is why there are so many dead sermons in the world. Lay the dead hand of self upon the sermon, and the warmth of life goes without giving notice. Speak it with the dead lips of vanity or conceit, and these truths emerge like so many carcasses. Preach for human applause and you thrust a dagger into the very heart of your sermon, and let out all the warm red blood of it. A so-called nice and pretty sermon, full of poetry and decoration, uttered for nothing but to tickle the fancy and catch the crowd, reminds me of a pretty hearse, with its choice white flowers, bearing along a corpse to a cemetery, with the preacher as the undertaker. Probably, the very best of sermons have some self in them, but where it does not merely creep in and hide, but

stalks in with unblushing effrontery, as large as life, there it hacks and slays at its own sweet will.

6. A GOOD SERMON, BUT— CAN THE LORD USE IT?

If He can, He will ; that is quite certain. But if He cannot, then the devil will, and great execution he will do with it. The fact that there are many sermons which have apparently been of no use to anybody is a sufficient commentary on the unusableness of them. There must have been some deadly flaw in them to be fit only for the waste-heap or the fire.

It is vital, therefore, that we should try to discover the sermons God *can* use. What are His conditions?

(a) The first, I think, is that we should “preach the Word” —not *our* words, but His ; not many words, but one, Christ *the* Word. And he who preaches the Word will not give out a text and turn away from it straightway ; neither will he choose a text *after* he has written his sermon, making it a powerless label for his own poor splash.

(b) The second is, I imagine, that we should preach it truly, be in sympathy with it, be bathed in it, be *en rapport* with it. Many a true sermon has been made false by the man behind the message being out of touch with his message. It is hard to keep your fire burning on an iceberg. A noble song may be spoiled by the accompaniment being out of tune most of the time.

(c) The third is that we should divide the word of truth rightly. If a preacher makes no distinctions in his congregations, but treats them all as converted and alive, he is leaving perhaps the larger part of them out, and lulling them into a sleep of security, which is more fatal than an opium slumber. Preaching smooth things is murder pure and simple. Unconverted souls are naturally complacent and satisfied, and need no preacher’s help to press them on in the ways of death. As for the charity of it, it is charity run mad.

(d) There is one other condition which seems to me essential if God is to recognize, own, and use it, and that is

that His Spirit should occupy us. "Ye shall receive power," He has promised. And when the Holy Spirit came on the Day of Pentecost, the power came, too. In a flash thousands were found at the feet of the Lord. Here is where all revivals begin, in the heart of the preacher; and it is useless praying for a revival amongst others until it has come to us ourselves. The inspiration of genius is very well; so is the inspiration of oratory; so is the inspiration of numbers; but the only legitimate inspiration which convinces and converts is that of the Holy Ghost—supernatural power for supernatural results. The energy of action, of voice, of machinery, are no substitutes for the energy of the Spirit of God.

There are, no doubt, other conditions of usability, but these appear to me to be the chief and the indispensable ones. Without these the preacher and his preaching must be outside the Divine zone of effectiveness and power.

7. A GOOD SERMON, BUT— MIGHT NOT THE SHAFT HAVE BEEN SUNK DEEPER?

There is too much surface-sweeping in many sermons, and too little delving. As a rule, I suppose, we never get at the best of a text until we have got to its heart. A text is like an onion, it has many coats; the outer a little familiar and a little browned by handling and the weather. We do not get at the best of it by presenting the outside only, do we? And so nothing makes so much for dryness and dullness as this presentation of the conventional and the commonplace. To take the first that comes, and to suspect nothing better beyond, is to qualify for the professorship of prosaics and dullness. But this demands the brooding mind and the brooding spirit, without which a sermon will be as mute and void as the world was before the Spirit brooded over it. It is astonishing how a commonplace text will break forth into brightness and glow when the warm heart is pressed against it, and the spirit of prayer wraps it all round. It is the Spirit touch which is the real divining-rod to find and reveal the water of life in a text.

8. A GOOD SERMON, BUT— MIGHT IT NOT HAVE BEEN
BETTER CUT AND BETTER SET?

A diamond in the rough is not unlike a common stone, but let an expert cut it and an expert set it, and it flashes brilliantly. What our sermons want is to reach the flashing-point. I am not referring now to the work of the Holy Spirit, who is the real Fashioner and Transmitter, but to that human element which He deigns to use for His own holy purposes. It is well to remind ourselves that a sermon has no more right to be disorderly than the preacher himself has; that we have no more right to discard the best words for our holy work than a numismatist has, when he chooses his specimen of coins, to reject the choicest and best cut; that as the picturesque appeals more to the ordinary mind, so our words should be as graphic as the English tongue will permit. A good sermon is not the worse, but the better, for having an air of distinction in its language, and standing out like a gentleman in an unwashed crowd.

9. A GOOD SERMON, BUT— HOW MUCH EXPECTATION
WAS THERE IN IT?

It makes all the difference in the world to the buoyancy of a sermon whether it be preached hopefully or not. Expectation is the cork which keeps it afloat on the surface of a congregation's interest. Despair is leaden, and depresses sadly. It may be thought that the preacher's inner feelings will be invisible, but they make an atmosphere for weal or woe. There is a lift in a hopefully delivered sermon which, like a pair of vigorous wings, bears it brightly along and aloft. If we had no right to expect fruit, then it would be allowable to despair, but when we are bidden to let down the net "*for a draught,*" and not only to *fish* for men, but "*to catch them,*" the case is different. It is not only impolitic and fatal, but it is irreligious, not to sow in faith and to expect results more or less immediate. At any rate, the fact remains that a sermon loses one of its chief ingredients when expectation is lacking; and the congregation is the first to miss it.

10. A GOOD SERMON, BUT— COULD IT NOT HAVE BEEN IMPROVED BY A DASH OR TWO OF RESERVE?

We cannot preach every aspect of truth in one sermon. Why try? Some truths are surely better kept in reserve for another time. We may allow some of them to peep out just to keep the balance, but to range them all in a row like bottles in a museum is rather too prodigal, and defeats the purpose we are aiming at.

And just as there should be a reserve of truth, so should there be a reserve of exuberance. The passion pitch is not for the whole sermon, or for most of it. Neither a sermon nor an engine should be driven with red-hot boilers the whole journey through. Besides, a man who keeps his heat back and well in hand is a mightier power for good than he who is always letting himself go. The hint of its existence is sometimes better than its expression.

And, just as truly, there should be a reserve of utterance. The voice has many tones and many pitches, and to run a sermon on one note is like playing on one note of a flute only, and that probably the shrillest of all. It is not interesting to a congregation and it is very wearisome to the preacher.

There are, no doubt, other "buts" which will occur to all my readers, but the list is surely long enough and depressing enough. They only emphasize the fact which we are all bitterly conscious of—that a really good sermon, good all through and good all round, is a simple impossibility. Perfection lies not on this side of eternity, and our ideals will never be realized here. All we can hope is that our sermons may be less imperfect, and approach the good a little more closely.

But, thank God, He can use imperfect agents for His great purposes, and only insists on our recognition of the faulty, and our dependence on Himself. "When I am weak, then I am strong," said St. Paul, as he clung to his strong Saviour, and we may surely say in the same strain :—"When my poor words come falteringly out, when my partial thoughts are but lamely

expressed, when I fail to convey the heights and the depths of God's truth, then I cast myself on God's mercy to forgive—on God's Omnipotence to use—on God's wisdom to convert—so that, after all, and in spite of all, hearts may be impressed and won by the living touch of even my poor fragmentary sermon. *My best is bad, but linked with God's best it must prevail.*"



The Temptation of Christ.

BY THE REV. H. M. SANDERS, M.A.,

Vicar of St. John's, Highbury, N.

"ABLE not to sin" (*Posse non peccare*), or "Not able to sin" (*Non posse peccare*). Which of these is correct? What do we mean when we say Christ *could not* sin? The question is no new one. It has been debated from Augustinian, and even from pre-Augustinian, days. It was a classical subject for discussion in the days of the Schoolmen, providing them with a metaphysical and psychological problem after their own heart. Nor was this to be wondered at when we remember that the exegesis of the Temptation then current was that, *e.g.*, of St. Chrysostom (see *THE CHURCHMAN*, March, 1909, p. 202). The problem of making the Temptation *real* to a sinless Christ was, and is, a difficult one if that Temptation is viewed as in any shape, however remote, addressed to His own personal, moral, or religious sense. What we mean will be the better understood if we consider for a moment the case of a Christian man well advanced on the road of holiness (*cf.* 1 John v. 18). Of such a man it is possible to say that "in Christ" he cannot be tempted with sin. So long as he is "in Christ," in *living, conscious union* with the Lord, he cannot, strictly speaking, be induced to evil at all. All his shortcomings are due to the victory, for the time being, of the old Adam over the new,

because he has relaxed his love and faith and obedience. And actually—though, alas! the best so often fall or “revert”¹ in this fashion—it is true to say that the life of union with Christ renders *impossible* such gross sins as blasphemy, filthy speech, and filthy action. The true saint has no taste for such. They do not attract; they only repel. He is conscious, however, that even against these he still has a warfare to wage. They lie, for the present, right beyond the farthest outwork of his security, and he believes that Christ can and will keep them there, but only so long as he allows evil in *no* shape to make a truce with him. He must hate it even in its “mild” forms. He must remember that spiritual declension can come so gradually as to be almost unnoticed at first, but that, like the “hole in the dyke,” the little unrepented failure may lead to the ultimate bursting of all his defences. But the fact remains that “in Christ” there are certain evils into which he cannot fall, and ideally he is immune from all. From this it is lawful to conclude that the life of Christ, which, as imparted to the believer by the Holy Spirit, is the Source of this immunity, is itself, and if *is*, then also *was* similarly immune; in short, that He had no “taste for” sin. With the believer this immunity is not a negative but a positive excellence. “He doth not commit sin,” not because he cannot, but because he will not. What rejoices God in him is that he does not, in the face of the possibility that he could. Is it a negative thing with Christ? If we answer “Yes,” then we seem to make the believer’s derivative excellence greater than that of its Source. If we answer “No,” then we seem to admit a possibility of sinning in the case of Christ. Either supposition is impossible. There must be some *via media*. We cannot be left on the horns of this dilemma. The origin of the dilemma arises from confusion of thought between a moral and a physical necessity. If we

¹ Cf. Bishop Moule, “Romans,” p. 195. “He fails,” he “reverts,” when being a sinner by nature still and in the body still, he meets the law and meets temptation in any strength short of the definitely sought power of the Holy Ghost, making Christ all to him for peace and victory.” Cf. Bishop Gore, “Romans,” i., p. 267.

say "God cannot lie," we mean God *will* not—wills not to lie. Anselm's famous answer will bear quoting in full :¹

"All power depends on will. When I say, for instance, that I can speak or walk, it is implied, if I will. But if freedom of will be not implied, it is not power, but necessity. For when I say that I can be betrayed or conquered against my will, this is no capacity of mine, but my necessity and power on the part of another. For that I can be betrayed or conquered is nothing else but that another can betray or conquer me. Thus we may say of Christ that He could lie, if we imply 'if He willed it,' and since He could not lie against His will, nor could will to lie, no less exact is it to say that he could not lie."

Or, later on, in the same chapter:

"That is improperly called *necessity*, which is neither compulsion or prohibition."

The first Adam and the Second Adam each met the tempter in a state of innocence. The will of each was free. They both possessed the *liberum arbitrium*.² The former fell because he had not, in addition, the *beata necessitas boni* (Augustine). The Second Adam overcame the tempter because His free will was inflexibly fixed upon righteousness.

But this question "could never have been so much as started," as Archbishop Trench says,³ "except in a Nestorian severance of the Lord into two persons, and thus in the contemplation of a human person in Him, as at some moment existent apart from the Divine. When we acknowledge in Him two natures, but these at no time other than united in the one person of the Son of God, the whole question at once falls to the ground. And such is the Church's faith. Christ was perfect man in the sense of having everything belonging to the completeness of the human nature; but there is not, and there never at any moment has been, any other *person* but the Son of God. His human body and soul, at the very moment of their union with one another, were also united with the Eternal Word.

¹ "Cur Deus Homo," ii., x.

² Cf. "Greg. Nyssa Contra Eunom., Migne," ii."545. ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ (= the natural life of man) ἀμαρτία οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀλλὰ δεκτικὴ ἀμαρτίας ἐξ ἀβουλίας ἐγένετο.

³ "Studies in the Gospels," p. 28.

so that there is not, nor ever has been, any human person to contemplate, or in regard to whom to put this question."¹

In short, of the two questions asked at the head of this paper, it is the second, Not able to sin (*Non posse peccare*), which fits the case. Nor is there in this answer anything which subtracts from the victory of Christ its moral virtue and positive excellence.

How strongly does the view of the Temptation which makes it addressed to the sense of Messiahship in Jesus support this contention! How really does it take out of our path some of the difficulties which a false exegesis had placed there! The tempter recognizes that his opponent has the *beata necessitas*, of which we spoke above. It is hopeless to attack Him with moral or religious evil. He will see if his subtlety is equal to the task of subverting that very "necessity," of using it to his own ends. He made the attempt. He failed. He departed to return again after a season (*ἄχρι καιροῦ*, Luke iv. 13), only, however, under the same *free* necessity, to be foiled again!

¹ Cf. "Athanasius Contra Arios," iii. 35. "It was necessary, then, first of all to examine these points, that whenever we find our Lord either doing or saying anything by the action of His body, which at the same time proves His Divine power, we should ascribe all such actions and words to Him as God; and that, when the manner of His acting or speaking is represented as human, and when any infirmity seems to encompass Him, we should understand that He bore our flesh and became man, and that, as such, He did and said and suffered these things. We cannot fail to have a right notion and belief concerning the person of Christ if we distinguish, as we should, between the two natures; and if, at the same time, that we attribute to each nature its proper faculties and functions, *we look upon both as the powers and acts of one person.*"



The Annunciation.

BY THE REV H. A. BIRKS, M.A.,
Vicar of Kingsbridge, Devon.

O THOU to whom the angel came
 One early dawn at Nazareth,
 His wings aglow with morning flame,
 Heaven's incense in his trembling breath.
 He found thee—so my spirit saith—
 New wakened from thy guileless sleep,
 That oft-recurring little death
 That creeps upon us when stars peep.
 And on that Resurrection morn
 He told thee of a Wondrous Birth,
 The age-long hope of man forlorn,
 God's new creation of His earth.
 "Hail, highly favoured one," he said ;
 "The Lord is with thee, do not dread !"

Mute wonder in her waking eyes,
 Pure freshness in her virgin thought,
 With tender infinite surmise
 She mused what God, her God, had wrought,
 And doubted not, but simply asked,
 "How shall it be?" and still confessed
 Omnipotence not overtaken
 In giving God to man as guest.
 But can her tender strength avail
 Such mighty purpose to fulfil?
 Empty of self, she could but hail
 The Brooding of the Heavenly will :
 "Behold the handmaid of the Lord,
 Be it according to Thy Word."

Professor Gwatkin's "Early Church History."¹

BY THE EDITOR.

AT last we have what has been so long expected—the ripe fruit of Professor Gwatkin's labours in the study and teaching of Early Church History. In these two fine volumes he has given a record of the Church up to the Edict of Milan, A.D. 313, a record which it is bare truth to say takes its place at once in the front ranks of our authorities. We have been taught what to expect by the Professor's masterly "Studies in Arianism," while his great work, "The Knowledge of God," revealed to the world a thinker and a philosopher as well as an able annalist. The growth of Christianity is here traced "in its connection with the general history of the time, indicating the lines of thought, and noting the forces that made for change, but without any attempt to give an exhaustive account" (Preface). But though not exhaustive, the book is remarkably full of detail, and it is difficult to believe that any ordinary student of Church History can need much more than is here given. To review such a work is obviously out of the question, whether we have regard to the reviewer's knowledge or the space at his disposal. Professor Gwatkin is a master, and it is our wisdom to follow his guidance and to learn from him the deep lessons of Christian history. The three opening chapters are on "Church History in General," "The Decay of Ancient Religion," and "The Roman Empire," and at once reveal the writer in the character of a philosophical historian. In the course of these pages the reader is guided safely along many avenues that would otherwise be dark and intricate. Thus, how informing is the statement descriptive of the three great periods of Church History, "The Early, the Mediæval, and the Modern" (p. 3 f.). Then the chapter on "The Decay of Ancient Religion" is another illustration of the writer's insight into the fundamental principles of life in that day. The ancient world is shown to be a failure, and yet a preparation for Christ and Christianity. Greek philosophy, Roman jurisprudence, political and economic changes were all part of the great *præparatio evangelica*.

The treatment is roughly chronological, and so we have in the first volume the various stages from the Apostolic age through the Neronian Persecution to the time of Commodus. The last three chapters discuss "The Apologists," "Christian Life," and "The Churches and the Church." Proofs of Professor Gwatkin's knowledge and insight abound on almost every page. The *Didaché* is "Petrine Christianity diluted." The contrast between the books of the New Testament and those of the subsequent age is described as one between "creative energy" and "imitative poverty" (vol. i., p. 98). Dealing with the Apologists we have the acute remark that "Christian life has never reached a high level without a widespread knowledge of the Bible." Senten-

¹ "Early Church History to A.D. 313." By H. M. Gwatkin. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd. Two volumes. Price 17s. net.

tious sayings abound which take us right into the heart of great questions. Thus, on the opposition of Celsus to Christianity, we are taught that—

"The ultimate offence of the Gospel has always been its lofty tone of authority. Such a claim cannot be ignored, but must either strongly attract or strongly repel" (vol. i., p. 186).

On the question of the Resurrection it is truly said that—

"Granted the fact of our Lord's Resurrection, it cannot be an idle story. If in very truth He broke the never-broken spell of death, few will venture now to dispute His claim to reveal the secrets of another world" (vol. i., p. 192).

And as to the Old Testament, we are told that—

"The early Christians had a very real sense of the historical continuity of revelation, and a fixed persuasion that even the Old Testament must somehow speak of Christ throughout. And were they not right?" (vol. i., p. 195).

The chapter on "The Christian Life" is full of good things, of which we have only space for one:

"Just because the Gospel was personal, it never stopped at the individual. It was a social power from the very first, for the power which claimed the whole man had to cleanse all the relations of life" (vol. i., p. 226).

The keen penetration into fundamental principles is particularly evident in the treatment of Baptism, than which nothing could be clearer or, as a whole, more convincing.

Professor Gwatkin quite frankly says that "no attempt has been made to conceal personal opinions," and we are particularly glad that it is so, for it adds to the interest and value of a book like this to see the bearings of the facts of early Christian life on subsequent problems. It is well known that the author's view of Church history is frankly Protestant, and those who have read his "Knowledge of God" are well aware that he has a good account to give of himself in this connection. So, also, in this work it is a scholar and a thinker who writes, and his arguments will only be set aside by a superior scholarship and a deeper thought. The last chapter in Volume I. on "The Churches and the Church," is of the very first importance, and must be studied by all who would know the facts of the case. We have therein Professor Gwatkin's treatment of that disputed question—the origin of episcopacy. His general view is that "the theory of an apostolic command is needless as well as unhistorical" (vol. i., p. 294). Also that the theory of a development downward from the Apostles is "quite untenable" (vol. i., p. 295), for the very obvious reason that the Apostle's work differed entirely from that of a Bishop, and because there is no evidence that he ever gave up his calling to become a Bishop. In view of some recent writing, it is truly valuable to have the careful, weighty, and confirmed convictions of so profound a student and so great a historian. It need hardly be said that Professor Gwatkin is, in all essential respects, at one with Bishop Lightfoot's epoch-making Essay on the Ministry.

The chapter on Gnosticism is particularly valuable for its perception of principles, and for the clearness of its treatment of the main facts of this intricate story. No one need lose his way in the maze of Gnosticism if he follows Professor Gwatkin's guidance. The chapter on Montanism is

equally illuminating and discriminating. Of its importance and significance we can gain a good idea by the concluding comment :

"The entire medieval system, from the Papacy downwards, is no more than a natural development of the unbelief which knows no working of the Spirit, but one transmitted by outward ordinances from a distant past ; and to this development the failure of Montanism gave a greater impulse than the defeat of the Gnostics or the conversion of Constantine " (vol. ii., p. 95).

Chapters of equal interest and value are those on Irenæus, The School of Alexandria, and Origen, from which we are tempted to quote, but must not. At every step we feel that we are being led by the hand of a master, and his guidance is almost self-evident in its clearness and cogency. What could be finer and more suggestive than the remarks which open by saying that—

"Four times in four distant ages the truth of Christ has had to be defended from a great and deadly enemy inside His Church " (vol. ii., p. 156).

We must leave our readers to discover for themselves what these ages are. Clement of Alexandria and Origen are evidently favourites of Professor Gwatkin, and his treatment is full and sympathetic, albeit discriminating. Not the least valuable is the clear knowledge and firm grasp of essential Christian doctrine here displayed for the student's help and guidance. Thus :

"The Gospel is neither a religion nor a philosophy, but a revelation ; and the revelation is Christ—in His Person, not simply through His teaching " (vol. ii., p. 180).

Again :

"The dilemma of the Person of Christ was growing sharper in the third century. If He is God, we have two Gods ; and if He is not God, we worship a creature " (vol. ii., p. 314).

The life and teaching of Cyprian afford another characteristic illustration of the writer's powers. This is how the great Bishop is introduced :

"We are on the eve of changes. The first great contribution of Latin thought to Christian history was a new theory of the ministry and of the Church in general, which forms the greatest break between the Apostolic age and the Reformation " (vol. ii., p. 274).

Professor Gwatkin shows, as Lightfoot did years ago, that it is to Cyprian we owe the introduction of the conception of a sacerdotal ministry :

"Cyprian claims for the Bishop a sacrificing (no longer a purely eucharistic) priesthood, and a *jus divinum* essentially different from the Divine sanction given to the 'powers that be' of every orderly government. Both claims were new. The New Testament gives no hint of any such priesthood to be held by Christian men, though there was no other worship in the world without it. . . . As regards the *jus divinum*, it will be enough to repeat that even Ignatius never claims it for him " (vol. ii., pp. 275, 276).

So also with the Lord's Supper. As Westcott points out in his "Commentary on Hebrews," Cyprian is the first to supply the term "altar " to the Communion-table. So Professor Gwatkin says :

"If it was not easy to turn the Bishop into a sacrificing priest, it was even harder to provide him with the something material which a priest must have to offer. Scripture admits no sacrifice that Christian men can bring but that of thanksgiving ; and this is the deliberate language of all Christian writers before the Nicene age—Cyprian excepted—whenever they speak of sacrifice " (vol. ii., p. 276).

There is, however, one very important point which certainly deserves to be better known than it is: the fact that sacerdotal language is used by Cyprian of the Bishop only, not of the Presbyter.

"He is careful to use sacerdotal words only of the Bishop, Levitical of the Presbyter. Cyprian would have been as shocked as any Quaker at the idea of turning the Presbyter into a priest" (vol. ii., p. 278, note 3).

But we must close, though we had marked several other passages of great importance to show the profound interest and permanent value of this book. It must suffice to say that it will be absolutely indispensable to all serious students of Church history. In spite of the welcome additions during recent months from Bigg, Duchesne, and Westcott, Professor Gwatkin's book stands at the head of all for its fulness of learning, deep insight, firm grasp on essential principles, and the truly marvellous epigrammatic way in which he can express some of the profoundest principles of the Gospel of Christ. We called attention last month to the *Times*' review of this work, in which the reviewer spoke regretfully of "the pained surprise" with which the High Church school has greeted it. And yet perhaps this is not to be wondered at, for High Churchmen of the extreme school could hardly be expected to accept without question the remarkable array of facts, with all that they imply, which may be found herein. It is worth while calling renewed attention to the words of the *Times*' reviewer when he says that—

"It might seem well to acknowledge frankly that the results of the historical knowledge stated by its most eminent exponents within and without the English Church to be taken by themselves are not favourable to the High Church theory."

And the reviewer very aptly and forcibly goes on to remark that "it can hardly inspire confidence in anyone's ability to read the first century aright if he takes an obstinately conventional view of the twentieth."

It is the barest duty to express our most cordial and grateful thanks to Professor Gwatkin for one of the most refreshing and convincing treatments of ante-Nicene Church history which it has ever been our privilege to read. Armed with weapons such as are here provided in the historical facts of these early centuries, the true Anglican Churchman in sympathy with the Reformation has no need to fear in regard to his position.



The Missionary World.

BY THE REV. A. J. SANTER,

Formerly C.M.S. Missionary in India.

FROM all parts of the Mission-field come reports of the intense struggle which has to be maintained against the forces of evil. The conflict is against the same foe under many different forms. From Hoima, the capital of Bunyoro, Central Africa, the Rev. A. B. Lloyd writes, as quoted in the *C.M. Gleaner* for February: "The fight here is a fierce one; we have got to the parting of the ways, and the little band of Christians stands for a moment

as if hesitating, and some, alas! have turned aside, while some have their faces set towards the dawn. The real testing-time has come, Christ or the World, and the choice must be made. Religion is no longer fashionable here; rather it is more in keeping with the spirit abroad to fling it aside and go back to the things of the earth. The congregations are thinning down; the numbers reading for baptism, etc., are decreasing; sin in its grossest forms is rearing its ugly head once more, and the weak ones are fascinated, and the cry goes up, 'I can't.' Now, as never before, is the time to sound out the battle-cry, 'God can; He is able,' and this is what we want to do. I don't mind the smaller congregations and the fewer baptism candidates, if it means that the little band is absolutely faithful. . . . Education for the young is the cry to-day for Uganda, and by God's help this will be the salvation of the country. . . . We want to get hold of the young boys who will become the chiefs in a future time, to make them strong in knowledge and firm as a rock in the fear of God. This can be done now if only we are wide awake to the opportunity."



A most interesting illustration of the slow but sure decay of caste prejudice is given in the *C.M. Gleaner* for February, quoted from an article in the *Nineteenth Century* for December by the Bishop of Madras. This was the experience of the Bishop at Ellore, the headquarters of one of the five districts of the C.M.S. Telugu Mission:

"During my visit I distributed the prizes to the Hindu girls of the Mission Girls' Schools in the town. The schools are attended largely by the daughters of the leading Brahmans, merchants, and high-caste families of Ellore; but I found that every single teacher in all the schools was a Christian woman of out-caste origin. It is only a few years ago that the Mission High School in the same town was four times emptied of all its Hindu scholars because a single Christian boy from the out-caste classes was admitted as a pupil; yet here were the out-castes actually teaching the Brahmans! And this is by no means an isolated case. In many of our Mission schools and colleges Brahman students are taught by out-caste masters. The hereditary custodians of learning are actually sitting at the feet of the despised out-castes!"



Difficulties are made to be overcome. This is how Dr. Druitt, of Onitsha Hospital, set about the task, as given in his "Journal" in *Mercy and Truth* for February. Of a patient from Hausaland he says: "I found, in speaking to him, that our Hausa friend knew but little Igarra; but fortunately we have an Ibo patient who speaks well. I therefore, in view of the seriousness of the case, gave him as straight a message as was possible—speaking first to our evangelist in English, while the latter addressed the Ibo patient in his own language, and he in his turn interpreted to the Igarra. The reply came, therefore, in the reverse order, so that at least six speeches had to be made before one could find out the condition of that man's heart. He, however, was open and fairly plain-spoken, and, although at first he said he was not a murderer, thief, etc., he acknowledged that in his case his own sin was the cause of his present sickness, and he was willing to accept God's way of salvation."

Some of the forces of evil opposed to Mission work are not indigenous, but none the less deadly in their assaults for all that. In the February number of *Awake* we are told by Mr. C. W. F. Jebb, of Ibadan, West Africa: "Mahommedanism is spreading fast in West Africa. Its teachers pander to the African's love of charms, polygamy, etc. In some parts they have greater freedom than Christian workers to teach the people. For example, in Northern Nigeria the Governor has prohibited Christian missionary work in a few of the provinces whose Emirs object to it, while at the same time he gives unlimited liberty to Mahommedan teachers everywhere, and they are now able, with the help of the British rule, to build mosques in many pagan towns which formerly they did not dare to enter. We ask prayer for Ilorin and other places with closed doors, that when they are opened we may find a people prepared to receive the Lord's message."



Again, from British Columbia comes a note: "The workers in those parts of North-West Canada where civilization (so-called) has penetrated are hard put to it to protect the Indians from temptations to indulge in strong drink. For example, Archdeacon W. H. Collison, of Kincolith, British Columbia, says that the Japanese and Chinese there are permitted to procure liquor in any quantity, and that they sell it in the summer to the Indians at the establishments where the salmon are cured. He adds: "Two of our young men were drowned when intoxicated during the summer; a white man who supplied them with liquor is serving a term of nine months' imprisonment."



From the *Missionary Herald* we gather some encouragement for those who engage, or take an interest, in educational work in the Mission field. In describing the wonderful results attending a Revival held lately at Shensi, China, the Rev. J. C. Keyte, M.A., says: "To one accustomed to 'Special Missions' in the West, it has been remarkable to see the quick and complete grasp of essentials shown by the Chinese converts. This is accounted for by the patient years of instruction given to them previously. They had been drilled in the Scripture. Often taught by dispirited missionaries and native evangelists, who felt that the ground they sought to cultivate was very rock, these people had received the Word of the Truth, here a little and there a little, but without living interest or obligation. But now the Spirit fell on them, and what had been meaningless lived, and they knew Him, of Whom before they had but heard, as the One in Whom they believed unto salvation."



Gratitude is a word very little known in the East. Dr. J. H. Lechler, in an account of his work among the opium slaves, realizes this when he says: "I have heard that opium patients who have been saved from death are always unsatisfactory, because the patient bears you ill-will for having saved him, and the family are so ashamed that afterwards they will not even recognize you in the street." Nevertheless, the need of constant strenuous exertion in the crusade against the opium evil is called for, as witnessed by the noble speech of the Hon. Tong Kai-Son at a Breakfast Meeting held in

his honour on December 20 last. "Therefore," he concluded, "for the sake of your national righteousness, for the sake of your national fame, for the sake of humanity at large and of the Chinese in particular, and for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ, in Whose sight we are all His children, and Who has taught us to love others as ourselves, we invoke your continued co-operation in this opium question until the last shipment of Indian opium has been landed in China, until the last opium-pipe has been burnt, and until the last acre of poppy shall have been uprooted, and the opium evil has disappeared not only in China, but throughout all the world."



It is a matter for rejoicing when we find a body of laymen recognizing their responsibility as regards the work of the Lord among the mass of unevangelized peoples around them. The *Mission Field* for January tells of "A Laymen's Missionary Movement in Ceylon." This had been suggested by the laymen's missionary movement in Canada. At a public meeting held in Colombo on October 14 the matter was considered, and the following resolution was proposed: "That in view of the large number of districts and villages in this island that are still unevangelized, and recognizing the fact that the laymen of all the Churches are equally responsible with the ordained ministers to pray and work for the coming of the kingdom of God upon earth, and that every Christian should recognize the world as his field, and to the measure of his ability work for its evangelization, the time has come, in the opinion of this meeting, when a forward movement should be made on the part of the lay members of the Christian Churches of Ceylon, with a view to enlisting the intelligent and practical interest of others in the evangelization of the island." Our readers will doubtless agree with those of the *Mission Field* that "we shall look with interest for further accounts of this new organization, and invite prayers for its success."



Literary Notes.

MR. ELLIOT STOCK has in hand for immediate publication quite a number of excellent books. The Rev. Dr. Harold Ford has prepared a volume entitled "Sermons, with Analyses, for Extemporaneous Preaching." This work is intended to be a companion volume to "The Art of Extempore Speaking," applying the principles embodied in that work specifically to the practical work in the pulpit. The same publisher is also sending out "The Awakening," a volume of sermons for Lenten reading, by Archdeacon Wilberforce. Another book on Mr. Stock's list, down for early publication, is Mr. Harold M. Wiener's "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism." This is a critical study of the original text of the Pentateuch based upon a wide range of evidence, with copious parallel references.



One of Mr. Stock's most important issues is a cheap edition, at 2s. 6d. net—the original publication price was 5s. net—of "The Oxford Reformers and English Church Principles; their Rise, Trial, and Triumph," by the

late G. F. Bridges. The work has been prepared, and to some extent rewritten, by the author's nephew, the Rev. W. G. Bridges. The first part of the book gives an historical account of the Oxford Reformers during the fifty years' struggle for an open Bible. The second part gives quotations from their writings, illustrating English Church principles. Romance and realism are skilfully blended, with facts of history graphically described, and no one can study this work without being deeply impressed by the Reformers' firm hold of scriptural truths and their ability to expound them.



It is of some interest to note that that delightful story, "The Rosary," by Florence L. Barclay, is achieving a conspicuous success both here and in America. The author is the wife of the Rev. Charles W. Barclay, Vicar of Hertford Heath. Mrs. Barclay, who is a sister of Mrs. Ballington Booth, has been sojourning at St. Moritz, working upon her new story, which is expected to be in readiness some time in the autumn of this year. It is something, nowadays, to capture the fiction-reading public with a clever novel which also avoids anything of a sordid character. Mrs. Barclay has accomplished this combination of virtues. And it certainly suggests that sufficient common-sense still remains in the mind of the modern novel-reader to enable him (or her) to recognize a good story when such is placed upon the market. It speaks even more for the genius of the author. We anticipate the new story with the liveliest of interest. At the time of writing "The Rosary" is in its fourth impression.



Sierra Leone for a long time has borne a very bad name, but its character has at length been thoroughly vindicated. "A Transformed Colony" is the title of an entrancing book shortly to be issued by Messrs. Seeley and Co. The author, Mr. T. J. Alldridge, was for many years Commissioner in the Upper Mendi Country and also in the Sherbro, and from his intimate knowledge of the country the author is well qualified to give a vivid description of the customs of the people, the health and beauty of the Hinterland, and the enormous undeveloped wealth of the land. The book is profusely illustrated with photographs taken by the author himself.



Mr. Unwin has lately published, in his "Half-Crown Library of History and Biography" a revised edition of Mr. William Howie Wylie's "Thomas Carlyle: The Man and His Books." Mr. Wylie was on intimate terms with Carlyle, and his biography is full of personal reminiscences, table-talk, and anecdotes of the philosopher. There is an Introduction by Mr. William Robertson, the newly-elected M.P. for Ayr Burghs. Mr. Unwin has also had to go to press with another impression of the Rev. Augustus Jessopp's historical studies, "Before the Great Pillage." Dr. Jessopp has a delightful style, and all his books are very readable.



"The Church of England in the Eighteenth Century," by Dr. Alfred Plummer, is an addition to the "Handbooks of English Church History" series issued by Messrs. Methuen. The aim of this volume, the sixth of the series, is to vindicate the character of the eighteenth century, not by question-

ing the existence of many dark features, but by showing that there are many bright features in it which are ignored. The progress of religion is traced, and eight leaders of thought are taken as illustrating the contradictory estimates of the century.



In Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton's spring list are to be found a number of good items. There are, for instance, "Aspects of Christ," by Principal Selbie, Dr. Fairbairn's successor at Mansfield College, Oxford, and "Light from the Ancient East," by Professor Deissmann. It was to be expected that the interesting "Life of Mary Baker Eddy," which has been running serially through *McClure's Magazine*, should find an English publisher. Whatever we may think of Mrs. Eddy's dogmas, she is undoubtedly an interesting individual, and we note that Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton will issue the book in England. Of course, in its book-form the biography has been much revised. There is also in the same publisher's list that very important work (the completing portion of it) on the "Reformation in Scotland," upon which Dr. Hay Fleming has been so closely engaged for some time.



We are promised what is likely to prove an attractive book by Messrs. Bell and Sons. It deals with a trip, part hunting and part exploration, through Uganda, Victoria Nyanza, the Kelmanyaro region, and British East Africa. A good book, written in a readable style, not too ponderous, and yet not too inconsequent, about these parts, is sure to have a welcome; for we do not know too much about the places visited. Mr. Peter MacQueen is the author, while Mr. Dutkewich, who accompanied him upon the trip, took a number of capital photographs which illustrate the volume.



The bound volume of *THE CHURCHMAN* for 1909 was issued a little while ago. It is published by Mr. Stock at 7s. 6d. Those of our readers, however, who desire to have their own numbers bound up will no doubt be glad to know that a handsome cloth binding-case, gilt-lettered, is issued at 1s. net, and can be obtained direct from the publisher post free for 1s. 2d.



The same publisher announces "A Three-Hours Service for Good Friday; Devotions on the Seven Last Words of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," by the Rev. J. Eckersley, M.A. The work consists of readings from Scripture, with prayers from the Book of Common Prayer, and also continuous suggestions for private devotions.



We understand that the Trustees of the British Museum are arranging for the publication, compiled by Mr. Lionel Giles, of an Alphabetical Index to the "Ku Chin T'u Shu Chi Ch'êng," or "Illustrated Encyclopædia of Chinese Literature, Ancient and Modern." Mr. Giles is in the Department of Oriental Printed Books and MSS.



It is not out of place to follow the previous paragraph with the information that Messrs. Nisbet are shortly issuing an important work by Lord William

Cecil, entitled "Changing China." It will be remembered that the author visited Shanghai a year or two since in connection with the Centenary Conference in that town, afterwards making a tour of the many missionary stations scattered up and down the country. Then, again, on a later occasion, he went to China on behalf of some Oxford men who are contemplating an educational scheme. The book is the outcome of his impressions, and is likely to be one of the most important books of the spring season. Lord Hugh Cecil has prepared for publication a volume entitled "Liberty and Authority." It was originally an address delivered at Edinburgh University.



Messrs. Nisbet, who, by the way, are issuing some very good books this season, are bringing out a life of Lord Morley. This has been written by Miss E. E. Major. We doubt, always, the policy of issuing a biography of a prominent person during his lifetime, and we sincerely trust that many years may pass before it is necessary to set down the official biography of Lord Morley. But the life of so eminent a public man is bound to be interesting. It would be worth reading and contemplating even for the literary side alone; while his service to the State, and his association with most of the great intellects of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, should prove exceedingly attractive. There is also, of course, his long association with the stalwarts of the old Liberal school, few of whom are now living. His friendship with Mr. Gladstone alone would make a discreet biography of Lord Morley a valuable book. We shall look forward to the work with considerable interest.



Mr. Arnold expects to have ready this spring several volumes which are likely to come into demand. There is "Across the Sahara: From Tripoli to Bornu," by Hanns Vischer, M.A.; "Neighbours and Friends," by Miss Loane, who will be remembered as the author of a much-talked-of book published last year; and "The Clergy and Social Service," being the Cambridge Lectures on Pastoral Theology, by Dr. W. Moore Ede, Dean of Worcester.



An illustrated book in colours, dealing with Pompeii, is to be issued by Messrs. A. and C. Black, who are so widely known for their beautiful books. The artist is Signor Alberto Pisa, and the text has been carefully done by Mr. W. M. Mackenzie. Not a single important part of this ancient city has been forgotten, and it promises to be an excellent piece of book-making.



This month—on the 12th, to be exact—will appear the first number of a new penny weekly newspaper, to be called *The Literary Post*. Its size will be a little different from what one would expect of such a paper. It will be as large as *The Westminster Gazette*, and we also hope it will become as successful. The object of *The Literary Post* is to provide the general reader with a complete guide to current literature, and to cover the whole field of literary activity in a thoroughly comprehensive way. A strong effort will be made to avoid the more ponderous quantities of the weekly reviews, and to cultivate in the headings of the articles and the treatment of books the

attractive elements of a popular newspaper. But although this end is to be aimed at, the value and weight of the criticism will not be impaired in the least. Readers will also have the opportunity of reading special articles about authors and their work, as well as about special phases of literature; while there will be published from time to time interesting character sketches, brightened by portraits and other illustrations. An important feature will be a condensed survey of the world's literary output—English, American, and Continental. Mr. Edwin Oliver, a well-known man in the world of letters, will edit *The Literary Post*. Mr. Oliver has a wide experience of most sides of literature, and his personality and knowledge are likely to make the new journal a successful venture.



Notices of Books.

THE TEMPLE DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. Written and edited by Rev. W. Ewing, M.A., formerly of Tiberias, Palestine, and Rev. J. E. H. Thomson, D.D., formerly of Safed, Palestine, and other Scholars and Divines. With 500 illustrations. London: *J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd.* 1910. Price 10s. 6d.

Messrs. Dent have produced a Dictionary of the Bible which is certain to take a highly honourable place among the numerous helps of the kind at present being published. It is a massive one-volume work of 1,012 pages, profusely and finely illustrated with photographs, engravings, and maps, is well planned, skilfully executed, comprehensive, and altogether is fitted to prove a most useful aid to the Bible student. Not the least of its recommendations is that it is produced at the extremely moderate price of 10s. 6d. The editors—Rev. William Ewing, M.A., formerly of Tiberias, Palestine, and Rev. J. E. H. Thomson, D.D., formerly of Safed, Palestine—deserve congratulation on the successful completion of their important task. The need of compression has led to the use of what is perhaps, for literary effect, an excess of abbreviations in such words as from (“fr.”), which (“wh.”), could (“cd.”), etc. It is a feature of the Dictionary that the Apocrypha is treated by itself as a separate part of the work, following the Biblical part. There is an advantage in this.

The subject-matter of the Dictionary deserves high praise. The articles are evidently written by excellent scholars, though only the principal articles are signed. It is understood that much of the unsigned work is by the two editors, and it is ably done. Admirable work is done in the articles on Palestine and Jerusalem, and on all geographical, topographical, and archaeological subjects, on “customs,” etc. Many of the topographical articles are done by Dr. Dalman. Professor Sayce writes valuable articles on the “Exodus,” “Hittites,” etc. Professor James Robertson writes on the “Pentateuch,” on “Deuteronomy,” and on “Psalms,” with other subjects. Professor James Stalker does the important article on “Jesus.” The position taken up in the articles on the Christian facts is entirely positive. Professor James Iverach writes on the “Gospels,” on “Mark,” on “John,” etc. These are fair examples of the high quality of the work.

In a critical respect the Dictionary is in the main reasonably conservative in standpoint—in the New Testament entirely so. In the Old Testament articles the positions are more varied. On the whole, the attitude is one of reserve to extremer opinions, while the modern critical views are fairly stated. Thus the articles on "Leviticus" and "Judges" are on Wellhausen lines, while the articles on "Levites" and "Numbers" are fairly conservative. This also is the case with Professor Robertson's article on "Deuteronomy." The article "Pentateuch" is a full and fair discussion in a moderate spirit. Professor Margoliouth, on the other hand, writes in a free spirit on "Religion of Israel" and "Sacrifice."

Details need not be gone into, but the book, as a whole, may again be recommended as a valuable and up-to-date piece of work.

JAMES ORR.

FOUR BIOGRAPHIES.

ARCHBISHOP MACHRAY. By R. Machray. London: *Macmillan*. Price 21s. net.

FRANCIS W. NEWMAN. By Giberne Sieveking. London: *Kegan Paul*. Price 10s. 6d. net.

BEVAN BRAITHWAITE. By his Children. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 7s. 6d. net.

J. HARRISON RIGG, D.D. By John Telford, B.A. London: *R. Culley*. Price 5s. net.

Most modern biographies have two faults: (1) They are too long; (2) they are too expensive. We fear that all the four volumes above named suffer from the former fault, and two at least suffer from the latter. Admirable (in some ways) and interesting as is Canon Machray's picture of his fine old uncle, sometime Archbishop of Rupert's Land and Primate of All Canada, we feel that there is in it a large mass of detail that, though well enough in its place, detracts from the effect of that picture as a whole. What we look for in a biography is that the main figure should stand out bold and distinct; that the impression made upon us should be personal and vivid. If we miss some of these features in Canon Machray's book—a book which otherwise we cordially commend—still more do we miss them in Miss Sieveking's "Life and Letters of Francis Newman." The book is a failure from the literary point of view, and somehow we get from it no really satisfactory portrait of the once-famous brother of Cardinal Newman. Frankly, the book is not interesting, and the letters of the Professor are not illuminating. From a man of his eminence we might have expected letters of no ordinary interest; but the fact was, Francis Newman, despite his encyclopædic learning, lacked the true letter-writer's charm. We are rather surprised to learn that in extreme old age Newman reverted to the Christian faith. It was the last of the many "phases" he had passed through. Curiously enough, Miss Sieveking makes no mention of J. N. Darby, that strange enigmatical genius under whose influence Newman once fell—Darby, who was ultimately to become the founder and prime oracle of the Plymouth Brethren.

In Mr. Braithwaite's Memoir we have the record of one of those quiet scholarly men—he was a Quaker—who, making no great stir in the world,

nevertheless contrived to influence all he met in the best and finest way. His varied intellectual gifts, his sanity of judgment, his large wisdom, and his tolerance, were things that must have impressed all who knew him. The *Memoir* brings this before us in an unostentatious fashion, and we feel the better for having been brought into the company of so good and true a man. The same may be said of *Dr. Rigg's Life*. No Nonconformist of our time (with the possible exception of Dale of Birmingham) was more truly respected by Churchmen than this Methodist divine. Dr. Rigg was so many-sided in his activities that it was impossible for him to remain out of touch with all that is best and fruitfulest in the Christian life of our time. English Churchmen have, or should have, every reason to be grateful that Dr. Rigg was able, despite his eighty years, to issue (in 1895) what is in some ways his most valuable work, "Oxford High Anglicanism." "The book" (said the *Record*, in a long notice) "stands for a witness and a warning." Had Dr. Rigg written nothing else, this work would entitle him to a very high place among students of religious movements.

SEVENTEEN YEARS IN PARIS. A Chaplain's Story. By H. E. Noyes, D.D.
London: *Baines and Scarsbrook*. Price 3s. 6d.

This unpretending narrative of Dr. Noyes' work as Hon. Chaplain to His Majesty's Embassy and incumbent of the Embassy Church in Paris deserves a cordial welcome. It is full of interesting things, and not a chapter in it seems too long; indeed, we could have gladly borne with a much larger volume. Those who wish to get a bird's-eye view of the present conditions of religious life in France could not do better than read Chapter X. in this book (it was originally read as a paper at the Church Congress of 1907); though brief, it is singularly lucid, temperate, and (we believe) absolutely sound.

THE REVOLUTION IN CONSTANTINOPLE AND TURKEY. A Diary. By Sir William Ramsay, D.C.L. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 10s. 6d. net.

The object of this book is simple: it is to exhibit a record of what the author saw and heard during the momentous days of the revolution last year in Turkey. It is a plain statement of facts, so far as could be ascertained, and of the opinions expressed by others on what was passing from day to day in the storm-centre of the Near East.

It is a somewhat discursive book; perhaps the picture presented is (as the author frankly allows) a trifle confused; but it is a real transcript from life, and gives a singularly interesting account of the progress of the revolutionary movement. We take it that this book ought to prove a very effective antidote to the partial and oftentimes misinformed telegrams published in the daily Press of England. The Germans appear to have been far better instructed as to the true trend of events; and the result, or one of the results, has been that German influence in Turkey to-day considerably outweighs that of England.

Professor Ramsay has his limitations, we suppose; he sees nothing but what is ill in the old régime under Abdul Hamid (doubtless he is right here), and little save what is good in the "Young Turks" and their propaganda (wherein he may, perhaps, be less implicitly believed). But he has been a

witness of what he describes; he knows Turkey and the Turks; he is a brilliant scholar and an acute and observant critic. Hence, even when we feel something is amiss with his judgments, we find it difficult to rebut them. Naturally his opinions colour the narrative. One is noteworthy. It is this: he strongly holds that the most serious difficulties which face the Young Turks proceed from the divergent aims of England and Germany, but that the true interests of all three parties are identical. Hence his conclusion that an agreement between Germany and England could and should be made. Unfortunately, or fortunately, England regards German policy with deep-rooted distrust. One thing, however, is certain: we have much to learn from German methods, in the East as elsewhere.

The latter part of Professor Ramsay's volume is devoted to a record of travel in Asia Minor, subsequent to the revolution. This record is generally illuminating, and sometimes amusing; it is always true to life. *Quid multa?* The distinguished scholar has written a book which we are glad to have read; we hope it will have a wide circulation, and perhaps make its way to the British Foreign Office. Our diplomatic officials are not always wise, but even they might glean from Sir William's pages some valuable information, and, possibly, some equally valuable hints.

OUR SUNDAY-SCHOOLS. By J. Gunn, M.A., D.Sc. *Nelson and Sons*. Price 2s. 6d.

"In nothing," says Dr. Gunn (on p. 267 of this book), "does the Church show less wisdom and foresight than in dealing with the children." Yet the possibilities of the Sunday-school, that nursery of the Church, are very great; indeed, incalculable. If the religious idea is to flourish in the next generation among the working-class populations (of our towns, especially), something must be done to remedy the dulness of Sunday-school teaching, to eliminate the marks of "barrenness" from it, and to make the Sunday-school really efficient. It is a great work, hardly so much as appreciated by the nation at large. The Church is half-hearted in the matter, naturally, because her Sunday-school methods are antiquated. Dr. Gunn shows us how best to remedy this very grave defect, and his book is a valuable and timely contribution to the problem that faces the Church to-day. Every parish clergyman should make a point of studying it.

THE CITY WITH FOUNDATIONS. By John Edgar McFadyen, M.A. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 5s.

An earnestness of tone prevails throughout the pages of this thoughtful and helpful book. There is scarcely a chapter that one does not linger over with a sort of tender gratitude that disarms criticism; but, if one may be selected for special mark, we should choose the little essay entitled "The Failure of Success." It carries with it a lesson sorely needed in these days when the mammon-worship of worldly success threatens to engulf the purer ideal of Divine "failure."

THE ETHICS OF JEWISH APOCRYPHAL LITERATURE. By Maldwyn Hughes, D.D. London: *R. Culley*. Pp. xii + 340.

Those who wish to get a general idea of Jewish Apocryphal literature could hardly do better than procure the present volume, which has been

approved for the degree of Doctor of Divinity by the University of London. Dr. Hughes marshals his facts with care and skill; his account of the literature is perspicuous; and he provides us with a full and carefully arranged index. The book will certainly do what its author intended—viz., assist earnest students to read the New Testament in its historical connections with intelligence and profit.

[COMMUNICATED.]

THE INCARNATION. By the Rev. G. S. Streatfeild, M.A. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s.

This is the tenth of the series of Anglican Church handbooks, edited by Dr. Griffith Thomas, other volumes of which are in preparation. Eleven chapters, stretching to 124 easily-read pages, confront us. Chapter I. deals with Jesus Christ in history, and within his limits the writer has no difficulty in showing that it was the realized presence of a personal Christ which endowed the Church with her power to control and guide the course of history. Chapters II. and III. are devoted respectively to the preparation for the Incarnation in Gentile and Jewish world. Mithraism and philosophy alike are shown to make their contribution and confess their failure before Christianity. The value and importance of Judaism as preparatory to Christ is discussed with ability, and the citadel of the Old Testament is sturdily guarded. Chapter IV. is concerned in suggestive fashion with Christ the revelation of Godhead and manhood. Chapter V. dwells on the union of God and man. Christ is the medium of this, and before there can be union there must be reunion—i.e., there must be an atonement. Chapters VI., VII., VIII., and IX. deal respectively with the Incarnation in the Gospels, the Infant Church, the Epistles, and the Fathers. Chapter X. the "Mode of the Incarnation," deals with the Virgin-birth of our Lord. Chapter XI. emphasizes the fact that with thoughtful men it is Christianity or nothing. It will be seen that the writer has made a great, and we think successful, attempt to deal with a tremendous subject within a small compass. We are indebted to his learning and his grasp of his subject, and warmly commend the volume to our readers.

THE PRE-EMINENT LORD. By the Rev. J. Stuart Holden. London: *Hodder and Stoughton.* Price 3s. 6d.

The first gives the title to this book of twenty-five sermons, and the glorification of the Christ is the unvarying theme. Mr. Holden has considerable beauty of style, looks at a text from his own point of view, and impresses us with a strong grasp of Evangelical truth. He is sparing in quotation and illustration, but uses both with appositeness. He needs them less than others because of a cultivated, aphoristic style. We have enjoyed reading the sermons, and left them with thanksgiving and prayer to the pre-eminent Lord.

UNDER THREE TSARS. By R. S. Latimer. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 3s. 6d net.

The three Tsars are Alexander II., Alexander III., and Nicolas II., and the book is an account of the growth of spiritual religion and liberty of conscience during their reigns. We get vivid glimpses of the ecclesiastical

character of the State and the common life of the people. The Stundists and Molokans are fully described, and sufferings and devotion to Christ are to be found on many a page. Despite the narrations of horrible cruelty under a Pobiedonostzeff, and the tragedy of a Red Sunday, the book is temperately written, and is a call to prayer for Evangelical Christians of that land. What magnificent Christians these Russians will make when they get absolute liberty of conscience!

W. G. LAWES. By the Rev. J. King. London: *Religious Tract Society*. Price 5s.

This great pioneer missionary of the London Missionary Society, who did so much in translational and evangelistic work in Savage Island and New Guinea, has here his record written by a skilful biographer, who rises worthily to his subject. The biography covers a missionary experience from 1860-1907. Magnificent optimism, determination, love of souls, and incessant toil marked those years. Lawes never looked back from his work, and great transformations took place in the scenes of his labours. His like-minded wife contributed in no small measure to the splendid results achieved. When the British annexed Papua, it was Dr. Lawes who was the main instrument, because of the people's confidence in him, in securing a peaceable settlement. We congratulate the biographer on this piece of work, especially as we gather that the modesty of the great missionary and his extreme reticence about his trials and difficulties make a chronicle of his life no easy matter. We look round and ask, Where are the men who will step into the position of such a great Christian soldier as this? There are excellent illustrations and a map.

THOMAS SCOTT, THE COMMENTATOR. A Memoir. By the Rev. A. C. Downer, D.D. London: *C. J. Thynne*. Price 3s. 6d.

In this book we have, in the compass of 112 octavo pages, well printed, in large type, a most appreciative, yet not indiscriminately laudatory, memoir of one of those men raised up for the revival of God's work in the Church of England in "a day of murk and gloom." Among the distinctive features of these fathers of the "Evangelical Revival," two were these: their manliness and their common-sense. In both these qualities Thomas Scott, for one, excelled. In the present work we find, gathered from sundry sources, a vivid summary of the experiences, the struggles, the sufferings, of those "of whom the world was not worthy." We have, moreover, not only some account of his chief literary works, but also a judicious appraisal of the value of his now all but forgotten "Commentary." If it be asked, "Had Dr. Downer any special object in view, any special point to emphasize in this volume?" an answer to that question shall be suggested. Jealous for the purity of Evangelical doctrine, he is equally jealous for the maintenance of Evangelical conduct. And one main cause of his admiration for Scott is that he finds the same twofold jealousy in Scott himself. This insistence on the inseparable connection between justification and sanctification appears to be the cardinal virtue which he discerns in Scott's teaching and life.

THE ARISTOCRACY OF GRACE. By Rev. R. Ballantine, M.A. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 3s. net.

The author has achieved a fine piece of work. He has managed to invest the most obvious Evangelical truth with a singular freshness and force. Assuming that the human soul is an organism with marvellous powers of development, he rightly asserts that there is an ideal condition for the soul, and the man who has reached this condition is the truly aristocratic man. The writer shows wide knowledge of religious and philosophic thought. He neither despises what is good in other ideals nor does he attempt to minimize their deficiencies in comparison with the Christian. The style is easy, and the illustrations are abundant, apt, and drawn from many quarters. No better book could be put into the hands of thoughtful men whose faith in the supremacy and uniqueness of Christianity has been shaken by advancing knowledge in other directions.

THE STORY OF ISLAM. By T. R. W. Lunt. London: *Church Missionary Society*. Price 1s. 6d. net.

This is the Intermediate Study Text-Book for 1909-10, designed for a younger class of readers, for whom Mr. Gairdner's "Reproach of Islam" is too advanced. It is "dedicated to the public schoolboys of Great Britain, who have a big part yet to play in shaping the future story of Islam," and the Preface is written by the Headmaster of Eton. The book falls into two well-marked divisions. The first six chapters deal with the stages of the Prophet's own life, his early training, his "revelation," the days of quiet propagation of the new faith, and the unsheathing of the sword. Then comes a splendid analysis of the reasons for the success and failure of Islam, showing implicitly, in the latter case, the contrast with Christianity. The rest of the book handles the problem of Islam, its widespread existence as a menacing challenge, and the Church's reply. Mr. Lunt has his readers in mind when he gives them examples of heroic missionaries like Raymund Lull and Henry Martyn. The book is admirably fitted for its special purpose; but it will also be read with enjoyment and profit by senior study circles. When it reaches a second edition a few slips in the latter half might be corrected.

THE LIFE THAT IS LIFE INDEED. By George F. Trench. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* Price 3s. 6d.

"An attempt to set forth the Scriptural doctrine of holiness," and on the whole a successful attempt. There are of course gaps in the treatment, and Churchmen will naturally desire a discussion of several points not found here, but within its own limits it is a clear, useful, and satisfying book. Part I. consists of five sections, mainly introductory, giving certain definitions of the subject, and a statement of what holiness is and is not. Then in Part II. the author discusses the "Channels of Holiness," five in number: Holiness by Truth, by Faith, by Hope, by Love, and by means of the regenerated soul. Part III. treats of the "Destination of Holiness," and shows how it touches and dominates all the elements of our nature. Mr. Trench writes in full view of New Testament teaching and out of a true spiritual experience of the truths discussed. It is this twofold appeal to Scripture and human

life that gives the book its chief value. There are many suggestive bits of exposition by the way, and altogether it is a most helpful book, calling for and well worthy of thoughtful study.

QUIET TALKS ABOUT JESUS. By S. D. Gordon. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

The third edition, revised, of one of the works of this now well-known and welcome author. When it first came out we were not able to give it our unhesitating assent, owing to certain features of the treatment, some of which seemed to us untrue to Scripture, and others which were not quite in keeping with our English ideas of reverence. But we observe that these points have all been dealt with in this edition, and we can therefore call attention to it as well worthy of consideration. We are not sure that Mr. Gordon has quite rightly read the spiritual and theological development of the Bible as here portrayed. Nor are we satisfied that his view of the Atonement is adequate to New Testament teaching. Indeed, we still feel that it is in the region of experimental and practical religion rather than in theology that Mr. Gordon shines. But the book is well worth studying for its true suggestiveness and for the novelty to many of its theological outlook. The author's powers of description are as remarkable and fresh as ever.

THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF THE BIBLE. Edited by S. E. Keeble. London: *Robert Culley*. Price 2s. net.

A book prepared under the auspices of "The Council of the Wesleyan Methodist Union for Social Service." Fourteen writers have co-operated in it. They regard social problems from different points of view, but agree as to the importance of studying them, and the utter impossibility of solving them apart from the teaching of Holy Scripture. The editor believes that the work of the future in the Christian Churches will be the more detailed and thorough study of the sociology of the Bible, and this manual is intended to be a first and preliminary step in that attempt. Part I. takes up the Old Testament and Apocrypha, and in seven chapters, by so many different authors, gives the social teaching of the Hebrew writings under various divisions. Part II. discusses the New Testament, and similarly gives an outline of the social teaching of its component parts. Six chapters cover this aspect, which extends from the Synoptic Gospels to the Apocalypse, with a chapter on the early Christian Fathers. It is useful to have concentrated in a brief form the social teaching of Scripture, though it is impossible to avoid observing the differences of outlook on Scripture illustrated by the various writers. Then, too, there is the constant danger of thinking that social teaching is everything. After all, as Gwatkin has recently pointed out, the social element of the Bible naturally depends upon the individual and redemptive aspects of the Christian religion. He who receives into his life the love of God in Christ will be ready to lay down his life for his brethren. For its particular purpose the book has a useful mission and should accomplish it.

PREACHING. By the Rev. F. E. Carter. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

"A series of handbooks for the clergy would certainly be incomplete without a volume on preaching." So says the writer in his opening words,

and if we might omit the introductory chapter, we would add that this little volume gives an admirable completeness to the series of which it is apparently the concluding contribution. But why, someone may ask, except the first chapter? Dean Carter himself shall answer. He tells us that while preaching is important, it is not the highest or most important duty of the ministry. "The altar is a more sacred place than the pulpit." "The function of the priest—using the word in its broadest sense—is greater than that of the preacher" (p. 3), and he goes on to say that "our Lord's earthly life offers the most complete illustration of the relation between the pulpit and the altar" (p. 5). By this we are to understand that while His active ministry was one of preaching, it led up to His high-priestly work in His passion. We can only open our eyes in astonishment and ask for the proof of these statements, for they are the very reverse of New Testament teaching. When we consider that what Dean Carter calls "the altar" (New Testament, Lord's Table) is only mentioned in one Epistle, and yet that preaching and teaching are found everywhere, we can see at once the impossibility of his position. Again, we observe how small a part of the record of the thirty years in the Acts is concerned with the Lord's Supper, as compared with the preaching and teaching. It is also impossible to say that preaching is subordinate to pastoral work, for it involves a false antithesis. Preaching is part of the pastorate. Yet, although these impossible statements do not prepossess readers in favour of the rest of the book, the treatment of preaching is well worthy of attention. Among the topics included are "The Preacher," "The Preparation," "The Message," "The Appeal," together with considerations of varied style and belief, on each of which Dean Carter has much to say that is true, pointed, and telling. Of course, in the comparatively small space, it was impossible to deal with all the aspects of the great work, but on its own lines the book constitutes a fresh and forcible plea for the best possible teaching, and no one who heeds the counsels here given will fail in improving the quality of his sermons.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW. By the Rev. J. R. Miller, D.D.
London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 5s.

Dr. Miller has planned a series of eight volumes—of which this is the third—entitled "Devotional Hours with the Bible," his aim being to suggest some of the spiritual and practical lessons to be gathered from the leading passages. This volume can be cordially commended to those who are looking for a devotional commentary which will bring the truths of the Gospel face to face with the facts of everyday life. Dr. Miller writes with welcome insight into spiritual realities.

MINIATURE SERMONS FOR BUSY PEOPLE. By the Rev. H. C. Mackey. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

A series of short sermons, eighteen in number, useful for private meditation, as well as a help to the busy cleric who desires some suggestive sermon sketches. They include "Paul the Transformed," "The Real Real Presence," and other helpful topics.

MUTUAL RECOGNITION IN THE LIFE BEYOND. By the Rev. H. H. T. Cleife. Preface by the Ven. Archdeacon Sinclair. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 2s. net.

A collection of extracts from the Bible, with appropriate comments culled from many writers and arranged for daily meditation.

THE BIBLE AND THE BRITISH MUSEUM. By Ada R. Habershon. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* Price 3s. 6d.

The authoress has taken eight different sections of the British Museum, ranging from the Roman Gallery to the Manuscript Saloon, and shown the bearing of their contents upon Bible history. This is the very book to take with one on a visit to the Museum. It is full of interesting and suggestive sidelights on Holy Writ.

CLUBS AND CLUB WORK. By the Rev. C. W. Steffens. With Introduction by the Ven. Archdeacon Sinclair. London: *Elliot Stock.* Price 1s. net.

A very useful little book for those interested in clubs for men or boys. It contains the results of the writer's own experience in this branch of work.

SCENES FROM THE LIFE OF ST. PAUL. By the Very Rev. J. S. Howson, D.D. Illustrated by Harold Copping. London: *R.T.S.* Price 3s. 6d.

This is a new edition of Dean Howson's well-known work, which will always be found stimulating. The value of the book is now greatly enhanced by the eight admirable coloured illustrations drawn by Mr. Harold Copping after his visit to the Holy Land.

PERIODICALS, REPRINTS, AND PAMPHLETS.

THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW. January, 1910. London: *Spottiswoode and Co., Ltd.* Price 3s.

Eight articles, with the usual short notices, comprise this number. The editor opens with a brief discussion of a timely topic, "The Christ of History." Dr. Ayles discusses "The Date of Deuteronomy," assigning it to the reign of Jotham; Dr. Oesterley writes on "Jerusalem," reviewing Principal G. A. Smith's great book; and Mr. Frere of Mirfield has an interesting article on "Lollardy and the Reformation," in which he does not follow Dr. Gairdner. The short notices seem almost more belated than ever, and it is surprising that so important a publication should not be able to keep its reviews more thoroughly up to date. This apart, however, the number is a decidedly useful one.

THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES. January, 1910. London: *Henry Frowde.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

The first three articles are of real interest and importance, and go far to make this number of special value. Dr. Sanday reviews "The Cambridge Biblical Essays" in his own characteristic style, full of informing and illuminating points for all students. Mr. Turner continues his valuable "Historical Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," and deals in the course of the article with the work of Tischendorf, Hort, and later authorities. The Rev. E. F. Morrison writes on "The Relation of Priest and Prophet in the History of Israel before the Exile," taking a pretty definite critical view. The usual sections dealing with documents, notes and studies, and reviews completes a truly interesting and valuable number.

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA. January, 1910. Oberlin: *Bibliotheca Sacra Company.* Price 75 cents.

Of the nine articles which constitute this number our readers will naturally turn first to the two which are by authors familiar to our pages. Chancellor Lias writes very effectively on "Is the So-called 'Priestly Code' Post-Exilic?" and Mr. H. M. Wiener provides another of his striking and searching criticisms of the dominant Wellhausen school in "The Answer of Textual Criticism to Higher Criticism of the Story of Joseph." Dr. Magoun continues his valuable articles on "The Glacial Epoch and the Noachian Deluge." Dr. McKim has a fine and timely article on "Our Lord's Teaching on Marriage and Divorce." Dr. Swing writes informingly of "The Theological Situation in Germany." Other articles are, "Difficulties in Faith," "Philosophical Tests of Socialism," and "The Romantic Element in Elizabethan Letters." The book notices are fresh, up to date, but all too brief. A valuable number of an always welcome Quarterly.

THE REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR. January, 1910. Edited by the Faculty of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Kentucky: *The Seminary Press.* Price 60 cents.

As this Quarterly Theological Magazine comes from the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, the present number is appropriately occupied with a series of fifteen addresses delivered at the recent Jubilee Celebration of the Seminary. The subjects cover a wide field, and touch upon almost every topic of present-day interest. The speakers come from various denominations, and, of course, the papers differ both in quality and in standpoint. The one we like least discusses "Fifty Years of Old Testament Research," which is far too

sympathetic to the Higher Criticism than we believe is warranted by the facts of the case. The regular features of the Quarterly are necessarily omitted from this number, which will warrant careful attention from all who are interested in the progress of theological thought as viewed through American eyes.

NISBET'S CHURCH DIRECTORY AND ALMANACK. 1910. London: *James Nisbet and Co., Ltd.*
Price 2s. net.

This always welcome volume reached us too late for notice in our last issue. It is our cheapest and most convenient clerical directory, and is adequate for all ordinary purposes. We have it in constant use, and find it indispensable.

LONDON DIOCESE BOOK. 1910. Edited by the Rev. Prebendary Glendenning Nash.
London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

Full of information on every conceivable subject connected with the Diocese of London.

THE REMINISCENCES OF LADY DOROTHY NEVILL. Edited by her Son, Ralph Nevill. **THE LIFE OF CANON AINGER.** By Edith Sichel. Nelson's Shilling Library. **A SON OF HAGAR.** By Hall Caine. **THE PRINCESS SOPHIA.** By E. F. Benson. Nelson's Sevenpenny Library. **TOM CRINGLE'S LOG.** By Michael Scott. Nelson's Sixpenny Classics. London: *Thomas Nelson and Sons.*

The current issues of these three admirable series, affording pleasure and profit to a great variety of readers. Messrs. Nelson's enterprise calls for ever-increasing support.

REDEMPTION TRUTHS. By Sir Robert Anderson, K.C.B. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.*
Price 2s. 6d. net.

A re-issue of a book formerly published under the title of "For Us Men." It treats of the doctrines of the Gospel, and is intended specially for those who are seeking peace with God, or who desire to lead others into the way of life. While we cannot always accept the author's interpretations of Scripture, his clear insight into essential Evangelical verities and his firm grip on these realities are most refreshing in these days of vagueness and hesitation. Even when we cannot agree with him, Sir Robert Anderson makes us think.

THE CHURCH CATECHISM. By the Right Rev. Rowley Hill. London: *James Nisbet and Co., Ltd.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

We give a very hearty welcome to this reprint of fifty-two lessons for Bible-class and Sunday-school. The Bishop was a clear thinker, and an able preacher and teacher. For Evangelical Churchmen there is nothing quite like this manual, and it is heartily commended to all clergy and others who are engaged in the work of teaching the Church Catechism.

THE REVISION OF THE PRAYER-BOOK. By the Rev. H. C. Beeching. London: *Hodder and Stoughton.* Price 1s.

A plea for the revision of the Prayer-Book dealing with the actual proposals now before Convocation. The writer is in favour of liberty in the use of the vestments; he supports the proposed alteration of the question in the Ordinal, and speaks strongly on the need of some modification of the rubric dealing with the Athanasian Creed. It will be seen from this that he is not likely to please either party in the Church. Certainly, the position taken up on the first two of these three subjects will prevent him from obtaining the sympathy of Evangelical Churchmen.

ROMANISM IN ENGLAND: THE PROTESTANT ATTITUDE. By the Rev. Professor J. Radford Thomson. London: *Evangelical Alliance.* Price 1d.

An admirable pamphlet, full of telling facts and points well put and clearly enforced. It deserves wide circulation.

FOR THE TRUTH. By the Rev. J. Vicars Foote. London: *James Nisbet and Co., Ltd.*
Price 6d. net.

The first of a series of pamphlets dealing with evidences of Christianity. This is concerned with the importance of moral evidence. It will be easier to appreciate the writer's position when we see more of his work.

Received: **HANDBOOK OF THE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN SCOTLAND.** 1910. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 6d. net. **THE BUDDHIST REVIEW.** January, February, March, 1910. London: *Probsthain and Co.* Price 1s. net. **MATRICULATION DIRECTORY.** January, 1910. Cambridge: *Burlington House.* Price 1s. net.