

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

# THE CHURCHMAN

July, 1910.

## The Month.

**The World Missionary Conference.** THE great gathering in Edinburgh last month seems to have fully realized, if not more than realized, the hopes and expectations of its promoters, for it called attention to the great work of world-wide evangelization in a way that probably has never been done before. The space devoted to the deliberations of the Conference in the leading daily papers was most encouraging, and the influence of this testimony is sure to be fraught with far-reaching issues at home and abroad. We hope in due course to have an account of the Conference itself from one of the delegates. Meanwhile we desire to call special attention to that point which, as the leader in the *Times* rightly said, "constitutes its chief interest to some, and to others its most unpardonable offence." We refer to the hope expressed by the King that the deliberations of the Conference "may be a means of promoting unity among Christians." We rejoice with unfeigned satisfaction in the presence of the Archbishop of Canterbury at the opening meeting, and in his addressing non-Episcopalian Christians as "fellow-workers in the Church Militant, the Society of Christ on earth." This rings true to the essential character of the Church of England as expressed in our Reformed Prayer-Book, and as illustrated by our history in

the sixteenth century. As the *Times* went on to remark, German missionaries from the Sudan, as well as workers from Korea, China, and India, pointed to the clamant need of many more missionaries to cope with the gigantic task of world-wide evangelization. In opposition to those who have so strenuously objected to this Conference because it did not happen to fall in with their own ecclesiastical narrowness, the *Times* has this significant and important word :

“Neither the Church of Rome, with its endless resources and its unflinching courage, nor the Orthodox Church of the East, nor the revived missionary ardour of the Church of England, are sufficient for these things, or even a tithe of them. Meanwhile, if we are to wait till the one ecclesiastical system which we believe to reflect the exact mind of Christ has gathered enough strength to evangelize the world, we are losing what the World Missionary Conference can do and has done so much to supply—a knowledge of the contribution which the converts of every nation are making to the sum of Christian experience and to the interpretation of the Christian message.”

This is the true spirit in which to face the problems which now confront Christianity all over the world, and it is all the more imperative to do so because there never has been, and there never will be, or can be, “one ecclesiastical system to reflect the exact mind of Christ.” God fulfils Himself in more ways than one, and the Conference at Edinburgh has already shown that Evangelical Christians of the various Churches at home and in other countries are all essentially united in the one great work of extending the knowledge and the authority of our Lord and Saviour. And so we rise from the contemplation of the World Missionary Conference with the renewed hope and prayer of the Apostle, “Grace be with all those that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.”

It will be remembered that the Educational Settlement Committee was formed in consequence of an attempt made to find a way out of the difficulties consequent on the rejection of Mr. Runciman's Bill. The Committee has now published its Report, and we desire to call special attention to the proposals as embodied in the

**Educational  
Peace.**

pamphlet, "Towards Educational Peace" (Longmans and Co. ; 1s. net). The object of the scheme is to "retain religious teaching as an integral part of our national education, while permitting the largest freedom to all forms of conscientious belief." It proposes on the one hand to enlarge and strengthen the existing system of Council Schools so as to place accommodation in a publicly-managed school within reach of every child, and on the other hand to allow alternative schools within the national system in areas where choice of schools is possible, while permitting in Council Schools generally the withdrawal of children to receive religious or moral instruction outside the school buildings where parents desire it. We have studied with some care the opinions of those representative organs of public opinion which were, on the whole, opposed to Mr. Runciman's Bill, as well as, politically, to the present Government, and we would call attention to three utterances which seem to us worthy of special notice. Thus, the *Times*, in an article headed "A Way of Peace," says :

"This careful and, as we firmly believe, hopeful scheme is not only well balanced in its administrative provisions, but it rests upon a belief which its framers have proved to be sound—that it is possible for Churchmen and Nonconformists, denominationalists and anti-denominationalists, to sit round the same table and bring each their several contribution towards the peaceful ending of a long-standing struggle."

The *Morning Post* concluded its article thus :

"It is only when one comes to study the plan closely, and to realize that points have been fought hard on both sides and given away with the greatest reluctance, that it begins to dawn on one that, after all, there may really be in this scheme some prospect of a settlement. The plan of course needs the most careful consideration. On many points objections will be raised, and, it may be, sustained. But here, perhaps, is the germ at least of the long-sought peace. Not until it has been looked at and discussed from all sides and points of view shall we be justified in rejecting it."

And the *Pall Mall Gazette* spoke as follows :

"We welcome it, therefore, as the first practical basis of compromise that has been arrived at, and we hope that it may be the means of uniting educationalists in the serious work, too long neglected, of co-ordinating our elementary schools on a system that will combine the best elements of moral and rational instruction."

These are striking testimonies, and go far to support and confirm the hope that educational peace is possible. The extremists on both sides, as represented by Lord Halifax and Dr. Clifford, have already expressed their disapproval of the scheme, though this tends, in our judgment, to make it all the more worthy of consideration. The Educational Settlement Committee consisted of a number of very representative people, and its findings deserve the most minute and sympathetic consideration. We do not at this juncture plead for the acceptance of the proposals, but we do urge upon all Churchmen the importance of giving the Report every possible attention. Many Churchmen were convinced at the time, and are more convinced than ever now, that the failure to arrive at a compromise in 1908 was a deplorable mistake, and it is well known that our late far-seeing King did his utmost to obtain the passing of the Bill of 1906. In view of all our national educational needs, to say nothing of our religious, moral, and spiritual progress, we ought to be prepared to make sacrifices all round in order to bring about educational peace.

The papers have been full of the discussion of the proposed alteration in the King's Declaration against Roman Catholicism, and it is announced that the Government intend at an early date to bring in a Bill to effect some change. The two articles in the *Times* have created a very deep impression, and have shown many people the difficulties that surround the problem. The question is whether it is possible to obtain an amended Declaration which will at once avoid language painful to Roman Catholics, and also insure, without any possible doubt, the Protestantism of the King. Bishop Welldon's letter to the *Times* seems to us to sum up the matter in the best and, indeed, the only possible way :

“The example of King James II. has not been lost upon Englishmen. It showed how grave a political danger may lie in the accession of a strong Roman Catholic Sovereign to the Throne. Nobody regrets more deeply

than I that the Church of Rome should not accept those principles upon which modern society rests—viz., the right of private judgment, liberty of conscience, religious equality, and the independent authority of the State. But she is entitled to her own opinions—and to the consequences of them. The Declaration of the Sovereign, in its substance as distinguished from its language, is the first line of defence against the possibility of the religious tyranny which England threw off once for ever at the Revolution. Whether the language of the Declaration can be so far modified as to be tolerable to Roman Catholics is a question for the Church of Rome. Lord Llandaff has frankly avowed that their ultimate object is to abolish the Declaration itself. If so, I am afraid the answer will be that, as long as the Church of Rome rejects and condemns those principles which are the axioms of modern society, so long the Declaration must stand.”

In spite of everything that we have read during the last month, we are still of the opinion that it ought to be possible to alter the language in such a way as to provide for the two conditions mentioned above, and we will not abandon hope of a change until the matter has once again run the gauntlet of discussion in Parliament. Meanwhile we have no hesitation in saying that a Declaration against Rome, as Bishop Welldon points out, must undoubtedly stand as long as Rome is what she is.

It is a curious coincidence that, just at the time that the Church of Rome is clamouring for an alteration in the King's Declaration, she is showing her true colours elsewhere. In Germany the Pope's recent Encyclical has given rise to an immense amount of indignation and anger. In praising the work of Cardinal Borromeo, the Encyclical stigmatized the adherents of the Reformation in almost vulgar terms, and we are not surprised that Germany should have risen indignantly in protest against the slight thus put upon some of her noblest men and her proudest national traditions. Denunciation of the Reformation and of the personal character of the Reformers comes with a very bad grace from the descendants of some of the worst Popes that have ever occupied the throne of the Vatican. At the very same time, too, the effort made in Spain to grant a little more religious freedom has been met with a strong protest from the Vatican. The Spanish Royal Decree only authorized some liberty

Religious  
Liberty.

in regard to publicity about the places of worship of those who are not Roman Catholic, and yet Rome at once entered a protest against any such permission. The *Guardian* very ably points the moral of this fact :

“ The latest pronouncement on the part of His Holiness confirms the view of plain men outside its communion, that that Church abhors the idea of religious liberty. Its advocates in this country strenuously labour to show that it desires nothing better than a fair field for all religious denominations, and they point with legitimate pride to the achievements of their Church, both here and in the United States, as evidence that the air of freedom suits it perfectly well. Pius X., however, knows better, and we cannot help thinking he is the more trustworthy exponent of Roman opinion.”

We do not wonder that a very great deal of Protestant opinion is averse to any change in the wording of the Royal Declaration, in view of these outbursts of Roman intolerance. We should have thought that policy alone would have dictated silence just at present ; but, as we said last month, Rome is relentless, and will brook no interference with her designs. But all these protests will do eventual good to the cause of civil and religious liberty, and we know that in those countries where Rome still has the upper hand, as in Belgium, Spain, and South America, the absence of liberty has led to the most deplorable results in individual and national life. The lesson to our own country in regard to Rome is only too patent : “ The price of freedom is eternal vigilance.”

The visit of Mr. Roosevelt to this country, which Mr. Roosevelt was received and welcomed with such heartiness, brought into our midst one of the most striking personalities of modern days. From the moment that he became President of the United States his words and actions have been followed with the greatest interest by friend and foe. No man in high political life ever had more bitter enemies in his own country, and yet no President has approached his popularity with the American people. There is something of the Hebrew prophet about him, and whether he lectured in Cairo, or Paris, or Berlin, or London, or Oxford, he was listened to with respect

and with a good deal of approval, because of his emphasis on the simple virtues of righteousness, truth, and kindness. His Guildhall speech, when he warned the British nation against sentimentality in Egypt, was of course received with mixed feelings, some thinking that it was a timely and useful message, others that it was an unwarrantable interference with our affairs. Certainly, the hypersensitiveness of the people of America would never have allowed one of our leading statesmen to speak against United States policy in the Philippines or elsewhere in the way that Mr. Roosevelt lectured us! But we cannot help thinking that, on the whole, the *Spectator* expressed the feeling of most of us in referring to the speech as follows :

“It is surely the height of tactfulness to recognize that the British people are sane enough and sincere enough to like being told the truth. His speech is one of the greatest compliments ever paid to a people by a statesman of another country. He could not have made such a speech to a touchy, vain-glorious, or self-conscious race. He knew the people to whom he spoke.”

What Mr. Roosevelt says is just the expression of what he is, a strong personality, and there is nothing in this world so interesting and so important as the power of personality in the cause of righteousness and truth. Mr. Roosevelt is well known to be a member of the Dutch Reformed Church of America, and he has never concealed his convictions in regard to Christianity. Nothing could have been finer than his testimony at the Guildhall to Christianity in Uganda. His aims are high, his motives are sincere, and even those who cannot endorse all his ideas and methods are among the readiest to acknowledge the genuineness of the man. For our part, we are thankful that one who is in so high a position in the eyes of the whole world should be numbered among those who believe in the reality of the Christian religion.

“The  
Principal  
Service.”

The Worcester Diocesan Conference on June 14 received two Reports referring to the Service of Holy Communion. A Committee was appointed at the instance of the Bishop of Worcester two years ago to con-



sider "how best the Holy Communion can be made the principal service of the Lord's Day." The Majority Report brought in a number of very remarkable recommendations, urging quite definitely the propriety of non-communicating attendance, and advising that the Holy Communion should be "the service of obligation" on the Lord's Day. The teaching of the Report on the Eucharistic Sacrifice is also very extreme, and as far removed from the Bible and Prayer-Book teaching as truth is from error. The Minority Report was a very different document, and urged with striking force the impossibilities and dangers of the counsel recommended by the majority. We are profoundly thankful to Canon G. S. Streatfeild for his strong note of warning in deprecating the idea that there was any special blessing attached to presence at Communion apart from reception. "It was false to Holy Scripture and the liturgy of the Church to make Holy Communion the be-all and end-all of Christian work." It was evident from the debate that the Majority Report had gone too far, for on the suggestion of the Bishop a resolution was adopted which was confined to a recommendation that the service of Holy Communion should find a place in the principal service of the Lord's Day. The fact is that the Majority Report is, as a clergyman in the Worcester Diocese has rightly said, "a bold and clever advocacy of a return of the Church of England to practices and doctrines rejected at the Reformation." The *Record* considers the Report "a most serious sign of the times," and so far as we know this is the first endeavour to secure official recognition of the un-Scriptural and un-Anglican practice of non-communicating attendance. The one great value of the two Reports is that they serve once again to show the utter impossibility of reconciling the two positions in the Church. If one is right the other is wrong, and no good can accrue from any endeavour to shut our eyes to this patent fact. It behoves all true Churchmen to call attention to this fundamental difference on every available occasion.

In the Bristol Diocesan Magazine for June the Bishop of Bristol is reported to have pointed out that the phrase "The Church of England as by law established" had its origin in a mere blunder, and that the true phrase was "The liturgy of the Church of England as by law established," the phrase "by law established" referring to the liturgy. On this the Bishop's reported contention was that the Church of England is not by law established, for no one has ever found the law. This must have seemed a remarkable statement to many, in view of the Bishop's well-known historical knowledge; but very soon a leading representative of the Liberation Society pointed out that the phrase "established by law," referring to the Church of England, is found in the Third Canon of 1603. And he also quoted a recent letter of Dr. James Gairdner in support of this position. We were glad to read later that the Bishop of Bristol said that the explanation of the phrase in his letter as quoted above was "given in error," but we are none the less sorry that such a handle should have been given in this way to the opponents of our Church. According to Dr. Gairdner, the establishment of the Church of England by law dates from the Reformation which brought the Church under subjection to the Sovereign and his laws. Whether this be true or not, the particular phrase in question is quite clear and unequivocal. The Church of England is an Established Church, and it would seem to be impossible to conceive of it as established except "by law."



## The Criticism of the Pentateuch.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE VERY REV. HENRY WACE, D.D.,  
*Dean of Canterbury.*

IT may well seem surprising that the orthodox Jews have not entered more actively into the discussions relating to the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament. There are differences of opinion on the bearings of the prevalent conclusions of that criticism upon the Christian religion, but it would seem there can be none as to its bearings on the ancient and traditional Jewish religion. It may be a question whether its alleged results are or are not logically compatible with the defence of the Christian faith, but it would seem unquestionable that they are quite incompatible with a belief in the Jewish religion, as exhibited in the time of our Lord Himself, and with the historical Judaism of the last two thousand years. That religion is founded on the conviction that the Pentateuch contains a faithful record of direct revelations made by God to Moses. Much may, perhaps, be allowed for the introduction of later glosses into the text, and for considerable corruption in the text itself; but if, as the current criticism assumes, the narratives of the Pentateuch are, generally speaking, "unhistorical," the ancient religion of the Jews is founded on an illusion. It might, therefore, have been expected that this criticism would have been earnestly attacked by Jewish writers, and that its most zealous opponents would have been Jewish Rabbis. But this has not been the case. Some very learned Jewish criticism has, indeed, been directed against the Wellhausen hypothesis by Jews, as, for instance, by Dr. Hoffmann, the Principal of the Rabbinical Seminary in Berlin, whose work "*Die wichtigsten Instanzen gegen die Graf Wellhausensche Hypothese*," published in 1904, has received no adequate attention. Some Jewish writers, like Mr. Montefiore, have accepted and popular-

<sup>1</sup> "*Essays on Pentateuchal Criticism*," by Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B., of Lincoln's Inn; Barrister-at-Law. London: Elliot Stock. 3s. 6d. net.

ized such criticism; but, for the most part, the great Jewish scholars have seemed to disdain to take much notice of critical attacks on the foundations of their faith. It was not, indeed, unnatural if, secure in the unbroken historical tradition of at least two thousand years, they were content to be silent "until this tyranny were overpast." It may well seem to an orthodox Jew as not less absurd that the historic consciousness of his race should be contradicted, than it would seem to an Englishman that the historic truth of his own Anglo-Saxon records should be denied. Nevertheless, it could not but be hoped that Jewish scholars would some day condescend to come into the critical arena, and join issue with those who maintained that the religion of their race, the religion to which our Lord and His Apostles did homage, was founded on a fiction. The key to many of the critical and legal problems at issue in the Old Testament would seem to lie with them, and their contribution to the discussion has by many been anxiously expected.

For this reason, in particular, the laborious and acute work which has recently been published by Mr. Harold Wiener, entitled "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism," deserves a cordial welcome. Mr. Wiener is a member of Lincoln's Inn, and is thus qualified, not only by his Jewish training, but by legal education, to enter on the discussion of the contentions of the Wellhausen school in Germany, which are represented by a powerful school at Oxford and Cambridge in this country. These questions involve not only literary, but historical and legal issues, and the light of Jewish intelligence and experience, such as Mr. Wiener can furnish, is indispensable. He had previously published a valuable volume, entitled "Studies in Biblical Law," in which he criticized, as it seemed to us with damaging effect, much of the treatment by the Wellhausen school of the laws of the Pentateuch, and showed much cause for distrusting, for example, some of Dr. Driver's arguments on the subject. But the critics in this country have shown an indisposition to take notice of hostile criticism which compares very unfavourably with the spirit of critical circles in

Germany. As we write, for instance, an important work comes into our hands, written at the request of the Saxon Government by Dr. Kittel, the learned Professor of Leipzig, who frankly admits ("Die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft," p. 57) that, though Wellhausen has rendered, as he thinks, greater services to the science of the Old Testament than any living man, yet "his theory of the Pentateuch has not proved tenable in the form represented by him." But in England, to the discredit, as we must think, of our critics, no such fair recognition has been given to the objections of conservative scholars. Dr. Orr has been somewhat better treated, but the neglect of Mr. Wiener's first book is an example of the unfair and uncandid temper of which we complain. It will not, we think, be possible to treat his present work with similar neglect. We regret to observe, indeed, in a review published last month, an article by Mr. W. E. Addis, which briefly dismisses Mr. Wiener's theories as "incredible," and which does not even attempt to meet the main objections which he urges against the prevalent hypothesis. Mr. Wiener's argument is too learned and too effective to be thus disposed of. Whether his own suggestions prove tenable or not, he has adduced objections to the main contentions of the current criticism which seem of great weight. They are to a large extent the arguments of an expert in Jewish literature and law, and, unless distinctly answered, they must seriously invalidate the present critical position.

Mr. Wiener deals with the statement of the critical view as presented in "the Hexateuch . . . arranged in its constituent documents," by Mr. Estlin Carpenter and Mr. Harford Battersby, and discusses in full detail its cardinal arguments. He seems to us to show that the so-called "clue to the documents," in the statement in Exod. vi. 2-8, embodies a far deeper meaning than the critics suppose. They take it to record the mere revelation of a name. With a Jewish writer's deeper appreciation of the meaning of a name in ancient times, he urges that the passage is the record of the establishment of a new relation between God and the people of Israel, and that the use of the

name as a mere mark of documentary origin is to degrade its real meaning. He dwells with great force on the remarkable variations in the texts and versions of the Pentateuch in the use of the names Jehovah and Elohim, and he exposes with a sarcasm which, though sometimes too rough, is often well founded the elaborate divisions of passages between different authors which the critics base on these uncertain readings. We do not think he is at all too severe on the arbitrary manner in which critics appeal to imaginary editors or redactors to explain away phrases which are inconsistent with their theories. But he proceeds to the discussion of matters of historical substance, and he deals in detail with the contradictions alleged by the critics in the narratives of Exodus and Numbers. In this branch of his subject Mr. Wiener's discussion has one valuable characteristic. He is fully sensible of the difficulties presented by the narratives as they at present stand in our Hebrew texts, and he recognizes that some adequate explanation of these difficulties is required. He believes this to consist in the fact that our present text is both corrupt and confused, and the solution he offers is based on some rearrangements of the narrative. He believes that "the secure basis of the inquiry will in the future be the indubitable Mosaic authenticity of the speeches in Deuteronomy (apart from certain well-known glosses)" (p. 171), and that, "while it is undoubtedly the fact that the Pentateuch contains post-Mosaic elements, the possible extent of such elements will be recognized as very much more restricted than is now supposed to be the case, while the wild theories at present current as to documents, schools of writers, forgers of laws, revelation by literary fraud, etc., will be recognized as merely absurd. On the other hand, the duties of the textual critic will be seen to possess far more importance than has been generally allowed."

In addition to this line of argument, Mr. Wiener concludes by attacking directly the first three chapters of Wellhausen's "Prolegomena," and charges that writer with errors and oversights of the gravest character. In particular, he makes out

what seems to us a strong case for showing that grievous confusion has been introduced by Wellhausen and his followers by the careless use of the term "sanctuary." "A place where there is casual mention of a lay altar and a lay sacrifice is regarded as a 'sanctuary,' and when it has been established that a multiplicity of lay altars were in use, the leap is made to a multiplicity of sanctuaries" (p. 187). "The ancient Hebrews had a custom by which any layman could in certain circumstances offer sacrifice," but this was quite consistent with the existence of a central sanctuary, as at Shiloh. This point has more than once been strongly urged by Mr. Wiener, and we are not aware that any adequate notice has been taken of it. We have not space to examine the argument adequately in these pages; but we claim for Mr. Wiener, as a matter of right, that his contention should be patiently and thoroughly examined, and not pushed aside as unworthy of attention merely because it conflicts with the dominant theory.

We could wish that Mr. Wiener had sometimes been less vehement in his denunciations of the critics, but we can make allowance for a Jew who is defending the sacred traditions of his race against what appear to him reckless and unfounded attacks. Wellhausen, at all events, is in no position to complain of contemptuous language in an opponent. But in substance Mr. Wiener's book contains a learned, laborious, and acute argument, covering the more essential parts of the critical position. Whether his own solutions of the difficulties he acknowledges will prove to be tenable is matter for discussion; but at the least he has brought together in this volume a mass of learned observation and argument which cannot be disregarded, and we await with interest the answers which it claims in detail from the representatives of the critical school in this country.



## Church Law and State Law.

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

*Vicar of West Hendred, Berks.*

IN the much-discussed Banister-Thompson case, it has been decided that it is not legal for an incumbent to refuse the Holy Communion to those who have taken advantage of the Act legalizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister. The decision has caused grave searchings of heart among Church-people. The ground of this *sæva indignatio* is the supposed attempt of the State to dictate the terms on which the Church of England is to admit her members to Communion. The situation is not without its grim humour. At the time of the passing of the Act in question, not a few were found to hint darkly that much of the driving force behind the agitation in its favour was supplied by those who foresaw such a development, and for various reasons wished to bring it about. Whether this be a libel or no, the pit has been dug, and, like Gabriel Oak's flock on a famous night, the obedient sheep are tumbling over one another in their eagerness to precipitate themselves therein.

Now, let it be admitted at once that if the protesters' view of the situation were correct, their protest would be almost unanswerable. It would be disastrous tamely to allow the State to override the laws of God or even the real law of the Church, and to compel the admission to Communion of those who had committed a flagrant breach of both. The whole question at issue is : Has this really happened ?

We may lay down one or two general principles which will meet with wide, if not universal, assent.

1. It is impossible to overrate the paramount importance of preserving the purity of marriage and of family life ; the writer would regard this as fundamental. But there may be differences of opinion as to how this end may best be attained.

2. The Church has the right to determine and enforce the law of God ; but, being in fact divided, it can no longer speak



with a united voice, so far as its formal pronouncements are concerned. Besides the great local divisions, there are cross-divisions in the same country. Not only may the Church say one thing in Italy and another in England; but the different religious bodies in England may give varying verdicts on the same question. This fact lessens considerably the authority of the voice of the Church. A clear and authoritative pronouncement of a united Christendom on a question of morals would have tremendous weight; we might fairly claim that a Christian State should accept such a pronouncement. But not only do the "unhappy divisions" of the Church detract from its influence in the eyes of the world; to a less extent they affect the authority with which it can speak to its members. Of course there are in certain Communion some who will hold that their own Communion is the only authentic organ of the Spirit, at any rate in their own country, and they will not be influenced by the fact that the voice of their Church is, in fact, the voice of only a fraction of Christendom. But many who believe quite firmly in the position of their own Church, as being on the whole the soundest, believe also that other Communion are living branches of the Church; they will listen to what the Spirit says to and through these Churches, and will not be inclined to lay too great a stress on any pronouncement, which, though it may express the mind of their own Communion, does not commend itself to the Christian conscience as it expresses itself elsewhere. As loyal members of their Church they will bow to the decision, but they will not be too positive of its correctness; they will claim no sort of infallibility for it. Under these circumstances they may be ready to see in the existence of a Christian State the compensating gift of Providence. They will regard it as focussing the consciences of the various Churches, and speaking, at any rate on some points, with an authority which, singly, they can hardly claim for themselves.

3. At the same time, we must admit that each religious community may fairly claim the right to enforce its own terms of Communion, and lay down for its members its interpretation

of the "law of God." The question will be to what extent it will be wise for it to do so.

4. There are some questions of morals on which the Christian and civilized conscience has arrived at what may be regarded for practical purposes a final and "absolute" decision; there are others on the border-line, where we cannot speak of an absolute right and wrong. On the former class of questions the Church *must* have its law, whether implicit or definitely formulated; on the latter, it *may*, but if it sees fit, it *need not*. It will simply be a question of expediency as to whether it cannot on these border-line matters accept the decision of a Christian State.

Is marriage with a deceased wife's sister contrary to the "law of God"? This question was discussed *ad nauseam* before the passing of the Act which legalized it, and the answer was so decisive that it might seem unnecessary to labour the point further. We need not raise any question as to the "absolute" validity of the Mosaic law, since the old interpretation of the passage in Leviticus which used to be quoted as forbidding the marriages in question is now abandoned by every competent scholar. It simply prohibits a special form of polygamy, the marrying of two sisters at the same time. There is no other passage in Scripture bearing directly on the point—except the story of Jacob! The law of the Church has varied with regard to these marriages, and the general conscience of Christendom gives no decided answer as to their morality. To quote the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury: "There are many good Christian men who believe that these marriages, now sanctioned by the law of the land, are also compatible with what they regard as a true interpretation of the teaching of Scripture, and even of the Early Church, respecting marriage." But perhaps the most decisive answer, from the point of view of many of the objectors, is to be found in the attitude of the Roman Church. There dispensations are freely granted for these marriages, practically, it would seem, as a matter of course, as soon as formal application is made—and, presumably, the proper fee is paid. This implies that they are not considered as contrary to

the "law of God." If they were, no Bishop or Pope could give a dispensation for them, any more than could Parliament. This very awkward fact makes completely untenable the position of those who claim that "the Church" considers these marriages "absolutely" wrong. There are some who in many points are ready to out-Roman the Romans. It is so in this case; it is curious to speculate as to how the extremist would treat Romans married under dispensation who afterwards joined the Anglican Communion. If the marriage is incestuous they must be repelled from the altar, in spite of the fact that a great branch of the Church has sanctioned their action; if they are not repelled, it is admitted that the marriage is not absolutely wrong.

It may be well to state quite clearly that there are prohibited degrees within which marriage should be considered as absolutely and always wrong, and therefore forbidden by the law of any Church. The direct teaching of Scripture, reasonably interpreted, the practically universal consent of the civilized conscience, and the teaching of physiology and sociology, agree in this conclusion. But there is a border-line where the advisability of intermarriage is an open question. The marriages we are considering stand on this border-line. Many people fear that to admit the existence of such a border-line is in the end to sweep away all prohibited degrees, and to deny the ultimate distinction between right and wrong. The fear is groundless. Because you are not sure whether some marine growth should be called animal or vegetable, you are not driven to admit that there is no difference between a horse and a horse-radish; or because you admit a cat into your drawing-room, you are not bound to make a pet of a tiger, merely because it belongs to the same genus. There is, indeed, a good deal to be said for the position that the decision of what marriages on this border-line should be allowed is ultimately a question which should be left to the physiologist and sociologist; the Church should concentrate her attention on preserving the purity of the marriage once it has been formed. Was not this implicitly the attitude of Christ? He was, as we know, questioned on one

occasion about the case of a woman who had successively married seven brothers. No doubt the primary object of the question was to entangle Him in a difficulty as to her position in the Resurrection life. But it is most probable that His critics were also trying to draw from Him some pronouncement as to the advisability of the Levirate law which ordered such marriages. Its validity and application were keenly debated in the Rabbinical schools of His day. At any rate, in His answer He pointedly ignores this side of the problem, though there was an obvious opening for a pronouncement, if He thought that teaching was needed. Nowhere does He discuss the degrees of marriage, nor do His immediate successors, except St. Paul, when in 1 Corinthians he deals with a clear case of incest. Contrast the attitude of Christ on the divorce question. When that is brought before Him He answers unhesitatingly and decisively. Surely, then, we are justified in distinguishing between breaches of the marriage-tie and cases of incest on the one hand, and the debatable ground of the precise degrees within which marriage is to be forbidden on the other. The one class is covered by what have become to us the rules of an absolute right and wrong; in the other we may fairly be guided by experience and expedience.<sup>1</sup>

Many will admit the force of these considerations, but they feel a difficulty as to the "law of the Church." Now, it is well to emphasize the fact that the State has in no way tampered with the rubric governing the refusal of Communion. It has simply decided that certain people do not come within its scope. It has not said, "You are to admit evil livers to Communion," but, "These people are not open and notorious evil livers." But has not Parliament tampered with the marriage-law of the Church, and practically repealed one clause of it without her concurrence? We ask, What is this law of the Church, and where is it to be found? For us of the Church of England it

<sup>1</sup> The Report of the Lambeth Conference (1908) points out that in the United States the Church has no list of prohibited degrees, these being left to be dealt with by each State.

can only be that part of the pre-Reformation Canon Law which has been in some way deliberately adopted by her and enshrined in her formularies. To rest on some arbitrary selection from the vague floating mass of Canon Law, with its out-of-date absurdities, its mediævalisms and contradictions, is unjustifiable both in common sense and in law, and is clean contrary to the principles of the Reformation. Very well, then ; but what about the "Table of Kindred and Affinity," printed on the last page of our Prayer-Book, and exhibited in our churches? The marriages in question are clearly forbidden in that. It is worth while looking closely at its exact wording and authority. It speaks of those "who are forbidden *in Scripture and our laws* to marry together." Marriage with a deceased wife's sister is not, as we have seen, forbidden in Scripture, nor is it *now* forbidden in "our laws." The reference in the last words is clearly not to the Canon Law, but to the selection from it which had been made by Parliament. To quote Professor Maitland :<sup>1</sup> "From 1540 onwards the marriage-law which they [the spiritual courts] administer is in great measure dictated by an Act of Parliament which has at one stroke, and with many opprobrious words, consigned to oblivion vast masses of intricate old Canon Law relating to consanguinity and affinity." Or, in the words of the Lambeth Conference Report : "The law embodied in the Table is *based upon earlier Statute Law* (32 Henry VIII., c. 38)." The Table, then, does not pretend to be an independent pronouncement of the law of the Church ; it may be regarded as simply a summary of the law of the land, which itself purported to be based on Scripture. This view is borne out by the history of its origin. It was, in fact, set forth by Archbishop Parker on his own initiative, in 1560, and afterwards inserted in the Prayer-Book without authority. It does not, as many would naturally presume, represent "the mind of the Church" deliberately and

<sup>1</sup> The passage from which these words are taken is quoted at length by Canon Henson, "The National Church," p. 150. I am indebted to the same source for much else, particularly on the Canon Law, and would refer my readers to the Canon's clear and, to my mind, unanswerable discussion of the whole subject.

formally expressed by its representatives in Convocation or elsewhere. It is true it was adopted by the Canons of 1604, and those who speak of "Church Law" in this connection are ultimately driven to rest their case on them. They are not a strong basis. A discussion of their origin and precise validity would be long and technical; nor does the present writer feel competent to undertake it. But the following points seem clear, and are quite sufficient for our purpose. At the most they are only binding on the clergy: The Lambeth Conference of Bishops (1908 Report, p. 142) admits that Canon 99, which deals with prohibited marriages, "binds the clergy, but does not *proprio vigore* (in law as distinct from conscience) bind the laity." Again, it is pretty generally admitted that the Canons have no validity whatever where they are opposed to Statute Law; and, in fact, many of them are practically obsolete. It is, indeed, ludicrous to see how some of our friends have recourse to their own selection of them in the ecclesiastical squabbles of the day, while they conveniently ignore the rest.

The fact is that much confusion is caused by using such terms as "the law of the Church" or "the law of Christ" in two senses. They sometimes mean the ideal code—the principles of the Christian life; the law of the Sermon on the Mount or the law of love are obvious examples. We may be quite ready to admit that the marriages we are considering are . . . as being possibly inexpedient . . . offences against Christian law as so understood. Law in this sense is a ruling principle for the individual conscience; its observance is a proper subject for the exhortations of the clergy; breaches of it are sins which must be brought home to the conscience of the offender, and be atoned for by confession to God, and, where possible, reparation. But they are not properly questions for external discipline; you cannot excommunicate the man who breaks the law of love.

But law is also used in a narrower sense of a body of rules, sanctioned by a legislative authority, and enforced by courts of some sort, breaches of it being punished by definite external

penalties. The real question is the relation in which Church Law in this sense stands to the law of the State. We may take as our starting-point a paragraph from the annual letter of the secretary of the English Church Union, which has been widely quoted, and has led to much wild language. "The issue<sup>1</sup> can be easily appreciated from a question put to the Attorney-General in the Divisional Court by Mr. Justice Darling, as follows: 'You must admit that your argument involves this, that the moral law alters from time to time according to the will of Parliament. Suppose Parliament declared that murder was not a crime, could the priest refuse to communicate the murderer?' The Attorney-General answered in these words: 'He could not. Some old-fashioned people might be offended, but the murderer must be admitted.'" No doubt this is one of the *obiter dicta* of the trial, to which the Archbishop of Canterbury recently referred;<sup>2</sup> it has not necessarily the force of law. But it raises the issue in an acute form, and, without presuming to suggest what was actually in the minds of the eminent legal authorities concerned, we may analyze the possible implications of the position taken up. If Parliament legalized murder, is the murderer to be admitted to Communion? What does the question really mean? If it supposes the State to sanction all forms of killing, the reply is obvious. A State which did that would put itself outside the pale not merely of Christianity, but of civilization. No Church could have any sort of commerce with such a State; it would be the duty not only of the Christian, but of every civilized man, to work by every legitimate means for its overthrow. The supposition is grotesque enough, but it is of value in helping us to face the real position, which is surely this: If the State were to legalize widely acts condemned, not only by the clear teaching of the Bible, but by the civilized conscience,<sup>3</sup> the question of Establishment and Church Law

<sup>1</sup> The reference, of course, is to the Banister-Thompson case.

<sup>2</sup> Letter to Dr. Inge (*The Times*, February 8, 1910).

<sup>3</sup> Some will be ready to say this has already been done by the divorce laws; the State allows the remarriage of divorced persons. But with regard to the marriage of the innocent party, we are again on admittedly debatable

would enter on a new phase. The State would have become definitely anti-religious and immoral. Needless to say there is no indication of such a thing in England. Matters of debate are all on the dividing-line where Christians themselves differ in opinion. In these things the law of the land must be acquiesced in so far as the "law" and discipline of the Church are concerned. It may try to influence the law of the land, and propound its own higher ideal to the world, and still more to the conscience of its own members, but it cannot treat those who on disputed questions of ethics obey the law of the land as notorious evil-doers, and claim to visit them with external penalties.

It is, however, possible that what is in the minds of those who talk about "the admission of murderers to Communion" is the case where the State may decide by its courts that a certain person does not come within the definition of "murderer." A Cabinet Minister might kill a Suffragette, and a jury bring in a verdict of "justifiable homicide," and yet a not inconsiderable body of opinion might hold him morally guilty. What is the Church to do in such a case? Is it to accept the verdict? Undoubtedly, so far as its official attitude is concerned. The only body which has authority to give a decision has done so. The State has not said, "You are to admit murderers to Communion"; it has merely said, "So-and-so is not a murderer." The verdict may be wrong, but it must be regretfully acquiesced in. In point of fact, unsatisfactory verdicts of this nature are given continually in the case of suicides. The Christian conscience revolts at the use of the Burial Service in many

---

ground; the authority of Christ's words as they stand may be claimed for the permission; only a "Higher Critic" has really any right to take the stricter view. With regard to the guilty, surely the position of the State is this: For the sake of the children, and legal questions affecting property, and so on, it is better to recognize facts, however much we deplore them, and legalize the union which would probably take place in any event. The Church is allowed to treat the parties as evil livers, and the best social opinion of the day agrees with her in doing so. Whether the action of the State is right or wrong, it does not, *in intention*, violate the sanctity of marriage. It merely considers a certain course of action as being, on the whole, the least inconvenient way of dealing with some very regrettable facts.



cases, where a weak-kneed jury has brought in the usual verdict. But so long as the rubrics remain as they are, there can be no alternative but to accept that verdict, unless the Church is to try the case over again. It is obvious that a formal verdict, however wrong-headed, cannot be set aside by the incumbent or the Bishop, acting on hearsay evidence and general impressions. The present position is perfectly clear; the State does not compel the clergy to bury those guilty of *felo de se*, but, by the action of its juries, encouraged by a sentimental public opinion, it removes from that category many who should probably be included in it. The parallel with what has happened in the Banister-Thompson case is obvious; we repeat once more, it has simply been decided that a certain class of persons cannot fairly be included in the category of open and notorious evil livers.<sup>1</sup> Surely, even if the Church were disestablished, and the rubric remained unaltered, they would still have to be admitted to Communion, on pain of an action for libel, or something of the sort.

No doubt the retort will be made that, if we were disestablished, we should alter our rubrics freely, and define our terms of discipline so as to exclude explicitly offenders of this type; the members of our Communion would probably be compelled to bind themselves to abide by the decisions of our ecclesiastical courts, so long as they retained their membership. They would, in fact, contract themselves out of certain of their civil rights in order to secure their ecclesiastical privileges. Exactly; this is the issue to which we have been working all along. The claim to have a separate Church Law on social questions, pushed to its logical and necessary conclusion, can only mean this. It means a complete code of Church Law, with an organized system of Church courts. You cannot have a law with external penalties without recognized and impartial tribunals to try each individual case. Let us face this conclusion, and realize what it implies. Has the past history of ecclesiastical

<sup>1</sup> In this case it has probably decided rightly, and this makes the duty of obedience even clearer than it is in the case of the burial of suicides.

courts been such that we would readily revive them? Have not the conflicts between the civil and spiritual courts been a source of endless confusion? Where the two exist side by side there must be a condition of unstable equilibrium. The State could not allow a powerful corporation, such as the Church of England would be, even when disestablished, to ignore the decisions of its courts. Such an *imperium in imperio* would be fatal. Either the Church would be crushed, or the State, and that would mean political power in the hands of ecclesiastics once more, a new "Holy Roman Empire."

Further, it may fairly be asked whether this desire for ecclesiastical courts on social questions (and let it be repeated that a distinct Church Law must in the end imply Church courts) is not contrary to the spirit of the New Testament? It is a commonplace to point out that Christ, St. Paul, and St. Peter all insist on a willing and whole-hearted obedience to the State, whenever it is not directly opposed to the law of God, and that this State was the heathen Roman Empire. *A fortiori*, it is our duty to obey now. It is really difficult to keep one's patience when one reads the language sometimes used about Parliament, as "un-Christian," as largely consisting of Jews, Unitarians, Agnostics, and the rest of it. It is perfectly true that a large proportion of its members are not adherents of the Church of England, but from an ethical point of view Parliament is far from un-Christian. On moral and social questions, it represents as a whole a steadily rising standard. We have no right whatever on such matters implicitly to confine "the Christian conscience" to members of the Church of England! It is represented quite as truly by Nonconformists, as well as by many who would not call themselves Christian at all, simply because the moral atmosphere they breathe is impregnated with centuries of Christian teaching. On a question of ethics, the view of a Henry Sidgwick may be as high and as Christian in spirit as that taken by any Bishop on the bench. And our administration of justice is as a whole the envy of the world; the historian would probably admit that there has never been a

system of ecclesiastical courts which could compare with it for a moment. This side of things needs emphasizing; it is what Dean Church would call one of "the gifts of civilization"; to the Christian it represents the working of the Spirit of God. No doubt there is room for improvement, and it is our duty as citizens to work for that. What we should not do is to sneer at it and despise it as merely "secular." We have no business lightly to cast such a gift aside, and to presume in the face of the teaching of history that the Church could build up something better.

Of course it is, as we have already admitted, quite conceivable that a different state of things might arise; our social and legal system might become, on its ethical side, definitely un-Christian, leaving the Church no choice but to sever its connection with it as far as possible, and to risk the evils attendant on a double system of courts. But there is no sign in England of any such development at present. *Nec deus intersit nisi dignus vindice nodus*. The crisis to-day does not justify any such *deus ex machina* as the establishment of separate Church Law and courts to deal with ethical questions. Parliament has ignored no absolute principle of right and wrong; it has simply taken one side (possibly the wrong side) on a disputed point of morals. If the Church values good citizenship, she must acquiesce so far as her discipline is concerned. She may still discourage the marriages of which she disapproves, by appeals to the conscience, and by insisting on the higher ideal law (principles, not code) of Christ.

It may be well, in conclusion, to say a few words about the Report of the 1908 Lambeth Conference of Bishops, which, to a great extent, bears out the contentions of this paper.

As is pointed out in its "Encyclical Letter" (p. 38), it has made no direct pronouncement on the difficulty created by our recent legislation with regard to marriage with a deceased wife's sister, on the ground that this type of question must be dealt with separately by each Church. But the report of the Committee appointed to consider marriage problems has some

important remarks on the subject (pp. 139 ff). It admits that in England, "as a matter of legal obligation, the unrepealed prohibition now, strictly speaking, binds the clergy only." It proceeds as follows: "In any case, we are of opinion that marriage with a deceased wife's sister, where permitted by the law of the land, and at the same time prohibited by the Canon of the Church, is to be regarded, not as a non-marital union, but as a marriage, ecclesiastically irregular, while not constituting the parties 'open and notorious evil livers.' This is especially the case in countries such as Japan and India, where marriage with a deceased wife's sister is not only permitted, but is, in many cases, a matter of customary obligation. In conclusion, we have to place upon record our opinion that it is within the competence of a local Church to make its own conditions with regard to prohibited degrees, so that they be not repugnant to the law of God. But we earnestly invite all Churches to unite in withstanding the prevailing flood of laxity of practice and thought in all matters affecting marriage. To do so with real effect, our rebuke must be firm and strong; but strong it cannot be unless it is also measured."

No doubt some might have preferred a more definite pronouncement, but the implications of the report are fairly clear. Since the parties to the marriages in question are not "open and notorious evil livers," they are presumably not to be repelled from Communion. Since local Churches may make their own conditions as to prohibited degrees, there must be some degrees which are not matters of absolute right and wrong, but stand, as we have contended, on the border-line; it is clearly implied that marriage with a deceased wife's sister is one of them. And if a local Church is to alter its laws with regard to such degrees, it must obviously do so in such a way as to bring them into line with the law of the State, since we assume that no Church would be so wrong-headed as to introduce conflict and confusion quite gratuitously where no law of God is involved.

At any rate, the remedy for the present difficulty becomes

fairly obvious. Many will contend that, in view of the actual history and wording of the Table of Affinity, the prohibition in question is *ipso facto* repealed by the Act legalizing the marriage, since that marriage is neither "forbidden in Scripture nor by our present laws." But for the sake of the tender conscience, the Church might herself exercise her power of revision, adding, if she will, a note to the effect that she still considers these marriages inexpedient.

There is, of course, an alternative in the revival of the power of dispensation. Bishop Creighton was fond of pointing out that Church Law became, in fact, unworkable when this power was lost. But whether its restoration is much to be desired is a very grave question. It is a comparatively small point that it might become an excuse for the exaction of substantial fees, creating one law for the rich and another for the poor. The serious objection is that it carries within itself the seeds of that continual collision between Church and State, which a Christian country should be able to avoid. It can avoid it if it will remember that the whole of the contents of the "moral law" are not, and never have been, fixed and absolute; no student of ethics or of history can deny that they do, in fact, vary from time to time. We should recognize frankly that the State, expressing its views through its authorized channels, is for practical purposes at once the best index of such variations as have in fact approved themselves to the conscience and also a main factor in producing variations. If we had a single united and really "Catholic" Church, the case might be altered; the State might readily bow to its authority on doubtful points of morals. But we cannot escape the penalty of our disunion. Must we not recognize that on many points the State, at least in England, is the best expression of the collective Christian conscience which existing conditions allow?

To sum up: We have admitted, and we are ready to emphasize the admission, that the Church of England and every other religious community has the *right* to legislate for its members. We repeat that it is quite conceivable that

circumstances might arise which compelled the exercise of this right at the cost of a collision with the State. But no such justification can be found, either in the legalizing of a marriage, forbidden neither in Scripture nor by the unanimous voice of Christendom, or in the interpretation which has been placed by the courts on a rubric of the Prayer-Book. No doubt some will be ready to seize any occasion for a conflict, in order to vindicate the rights of the Church and to hasten the issue which, in their view, cannot long be delayed. They are apocalyptists, and have seen a vision of an impending struggle between Christ and Anti-Christ, in which the State is cast for the less desirable rôle. But others of us are ready, so long as possible, to seek peace and ensue it. We hold that the practical inconveniences of such collisions, whether in an established or disestablished body, are so grave, and that the confusion to which they would lead, if they became at all frequent, would be so intolerable, that they should not be entered upon except under the pressure of absolute necessity. Till such necessity arises we are glad, in England at least, to be able to take a view which is not without good authority, and to believe that the powers that be are, after all, ordained by God.



## Some Chapters in the History of the Early English Church.

BY THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

### III. AUGUSTINE AND AIDAN.

THE conversion of the English to Christianity is an epoch in the history of England; it is the beginning of the Church of England. But it also forms an epoch in the history of Christianity; it is the first distinctly *foreign* mission of the Western Church. Hitherto the Gospel in the West had not spread beyond the limits of the Roman Empire. The Teutonic

tribes in North Germany and Scandinavia, which had never been part of the Empire, and in Britain, which had ceased to be part of it, were heathen. One might almost have said that "outside the *Empire* there was no salvation." By the mission of Augustine this condition of things was broken. Probably those who initiated the movement did not see its significance. To them the attempt to convert the heathen English was much the same as the attempt to convert heathen in Spain and in Gaul. But we can see that the coming of Augustine was the first of a series of missionary enterprises, by means of which the whole of Europe was at last won over to Christianity; it was the first act of one of the most glorious movements in history. And it was not only the first act, it was the most important one, the one which led to most of those which followed. England itself became a missionary centre, and through it Germany and Scandinavia became Christian.

Nor was this all. By the conversion of the English an indissoluble bond was created between this island and European civilization. A bond had been created before by the admission of Britain into the Roman Empire; but this bond had been severed by the withdrawal of the legions, and by the extinction of Christianity by the English in just those parts of the island which could most easily keep in touch with the Continent. Since then Britain had been shut off from Europe. Continental writers of the fifth and sixth centuries know little more of the British Isles than that they exist. Any marvellous tale can be told of Britain, because no one has been there.

With the reintroduction of Christianity into Britain, which had now become largely English, all this isolation came to an end. Intercourse between England and the Continent, and between England and the centre of Western civilization, became common. English people went on pilgrimage to Rome, sometimes more than once in a lifetime. Britain was once more an integral part of European life and culture.

The prejudices of some English people may lead them to regret that it was Roman rather than British or Scottish

Christianity which eventually prevailed in England, and that (however we may divide the credit of converting the English between Augustine and Aidan) it was Christianity in the form in which it was introduced by Augustine which eventually swallowed up the work of Aidan and other missionaries of the Keltic Church. But, as Englishmen, we ought to rejoice at this. The Christianity of the Kelts meant the Christianity of an insular and stunted civilization. The Christianity of Rome meant the Christianity of culture, and perhaps the highest culture then known. Literature and organization, arts and manufactures—all came with Christianity from Rome. We must not confound Rome, the enlightener of the nations in the sixth century, with Rome, the corrupter of the nations in the sixteenth.

Christianity landed in England—we are talking of England now, not of Britain—where almost everything of which we know the history made its first landing, in Kent. That Kent was less shut off from the Continent than the rest of the island is marked by the fact that at the close of the sixth century we find the Kentish King married to a Frankish Princess. She was a Christian, and had at least one Bishop, Liudhard, with her. But we read of no efforts made by either of them to convert the English. It would be interesting to know how many Christians came over with Bertha, how long they had been in Kent when Augustine and his companions arrived, and whether they had tried to make known the Christian faith among the heathen in Kent. Pope Gregory, however, seems to have been aware that neither the Keltic clergy of the island, nor the Frankish clergy of the Continent, had acted as missionaries to the English. His letters to the boyish Kings of the Franks, and to their grandmother, Queen Brunichild, show that.<sup>1</sup>

Thanks to the good offices of Queen Bertha, and to the open-mindedness of King Ethelbert, Augustine and his companions

<sup>1</sup> These, and much valuable material of various kinds, are given in Mason, "The Mission of St. Augustine to England, according to the Original Documents."



had a generous reception, and were allowed to settle and begin their work. After giving details of it, Bede, who is fond of dwelling upon the efficacious preaching that results from a holy life, sums up thus : "What need to say more? Some believed and were baptized, admiring the simplicity of their blameless life and the sweetness of their heavenly doctrine"; till at last, and fairly soon, the King himself, "influenced by the unspotted life of these holy men and by their delightful promises," professed the faith and was baptized.

It was a providential thing that at the time of the mission of Augustine this friendly King of Kent was Bretwalda, and thus had some kind of supremacy over English Kings and chiefs as far as the Humber; and it was under the protection of a safe-conduct granted by Bretwalda that Augustine was able to travel through heathen Wessex, in order to hold his fateful conference with the British clergy on the confines of Wales. Before going, Augustine returned to Gaul and went as far as Arles, where the Archbishop, acting under Gregory's instructions, consecrated Augustine "Archbishop to the English nation"—*Archiepiscopus genti Anglorum*. It is a magnificent title, and we are not surprised to learn that Augustine quickly found that it involved responsibilities to which he hardly felt equal. A number of questions cropped up which he sent to Rome for Gregory's consideration. They are a curious collection. Some are so simple that we wonder how any fairly educated Christian could be in doubt about them. With regard to others, our wonder is given to Gregory's admirable answer. We have space for only one example of the latter. "Seeing that the faith is one, can there be different customs in different Churches? Can there be one custom in the holy Roman Church, and another in the Gallican?" That kind of question is with us still. How does Gregory deal with it? He was an expert in liturgiology, having revised the "Sacramentary" of his predecessor Gelasius, and he might be expected to have a predilection for his own careful work, and to have replied that the Roman use must be followed. But that is not Gregory's way: he is no ritualistic

pedant. He writes to Augustine: "You know, my brother, the custom of the Roman Church, in which you were brought up. But it is my wish, if you have found anything either in the Roman, or the Gallican, or any other Church, which may be more acceptable to Almighty God, that you carefully select, and sedulously impart to the Church of the English, whatever you have been able to collect from various Churches. For things are not to be loved for the sake of places, but places for the sake of good things. Select, therefore, from each Church whatever things are excellent, and when you have arranged them as a whole, give them to the English to be observed."

It is to the credit of both the missionaries and the chiefs whom they influenced that the Gospel was not preached in England by the sword, and was never offered as the only alternative to death. Unlike the spread of Christianity by the fishermen of Galilee, it spread from above rather than from below. The King was won over, then his chiefs, and then the people followed the lead of those whom they were accustomed to obey. They were converted probably less by argument than by example. But there was not much force used to hasten conversion. Ethelbert expressly abstained from putting pressure upon his subjects; for he said that "he had learned from his teachers that the service of Christ must be a voluntary thing, and not a matter of compulsion." He died A.D. 616, after a reign of about fifty-six years.

Augustine's conference with the British Bishop resulted in failure, and it is sometimes said that the fault was his, because he insisted upon their admitting the supremacy of the Pope, which they refused to do. Those who make this statement should produce the evidence for it: it appears to be baseless conjecture. He may have been less conciliatory than was expedient, but even that is conjecture. What we know is that the British were unwilling to take part in the work of evangelizing the English—in other words, they refused to help Augustine. After consecrating three Bishops for the continuation of his work, Augustine died in May, 604, or possibly 605. He had

established the Gospel in a sure position in the kingdom of Kent, and had secured a firm basis for future extensions. Yet he had had only seven years in which to do all this, from which we must deduct some months for his journey to Arles for consecration (see Mason, pp. 95-104).

Oddly enough, it was at the other extremity of England that the next great work was accomplished by missionaries sent by Rome. This was the establishment of the Gospel in Northumbria by Paulinus. He worked there for nearly as long a time as Augustine had worked in Kent. In 627 King Edwin was baptized, influenced, like Ethelbert, by a Christian wife. But five years later Edwin was slain in battle, and Paulinus, who had escorted the Queen from Kent to marry Edwin, thought that he was bound now to escort her home again. He did so, and was forthwith made Bishop of Rochester. He never returned to Northumbria, and the work there suffered. King Eanfrid apostatized, and there was a considerable revival of heathenism. In 634, Oswald, after defeating the treacherous Britons who had murdered his elder brother Eanfrid, sent to Iona for a Bishop. The first who was sent was not a success, and returned to Iona discouraged. "It is no use," he said, "to try to convert such people." One of the Iona monks remonstrated. "Perhaps you forgot the Apostle's maxim about milk for babes. Perhaps you dealt too severely with untrained hearers, gave them teaching that was too high for them, and expected fruit from them too soon." The speaker was Aidan. The other monks, who had been sitting silent, said: "Let Aidan be sent." And at the end of 635 Aidan set out to be a Bishop to the Northumbrians.

Once more we have a happy union between a Christian missionary and a converted King. Oswald himself acted as interpreter when Aidan preached. And Aidan, true to the traditions of Iona, fixed upon an island near the Northumbrian coast as the place for his Church, and became the first Bishop of Lindisfarne. You may walk across to it at low tide, and therefore it was far more accessible than Iona. It is close to

Bamborough, where Oswald had his court, and therefore Aidan and Oswald could keep in constant touch with one another. They made ample use of this advantage, and the beneficent intercourse between the Keltic missionary Bishop and the English King is among the most beautiful episodes in Church history. Each was so bent on living the Christian life and on making the joys of it known to others. What Aidan advised Oswald endeavoured to carry out. Monks from Iona came over to Lindisfarne, churches were built, and the Christianity which had been introduced by the Roman missionary Paulinus was revived and extended. It spread along the Tweed to Melrose, where Boisil founded a monastery, and there became the trainer of St. Cuthbert.

There is little doubt that the main cause of the success of Oswald and Aidan in restoring the Christian faith in Northumbria was the self-denying simplicity of their own lives. Without ostentatious or morose austerity, they showed that they were indifferent to worldly pleasures, and that they cared for wealth only as a means of spreading the Gospel. Aidan seems to have been one of those energetic men to whom idleness is misery, and who find their recreation in a change of work. He divided his time between study, teaching, and the services of the Church. He travelled about his huge diocese on foot, and would never ride unless driven to do so by necessity. He was eager to do good to rich and poor alike, and, if they were believers, to strengthen them in the faith. He would give entertainment, but not gifts, to the rich, and if they made presents to him, he spent these on the poor, or in ransoming slaves. "It was the highest commendation of his doctrine with all men that he taught no otherwise than he and his followers lived."

Oswald's reign ended, as it began, with a great battle. The first battle was against Cadwalla, the Christian King of the Britons. The last battle was against Cadwalla's heathen ally, Penda, King of the Mercians; and here the pagan conquered. "The most Christian King" (*Christianissimus rex*) Oswald was

surrounded by the heathen and slain, A.D. 642. His head was placed in Cuthbert's coffin, and at last found a resting-place, with Cuthbert's body, in Durham Cathedral. The greater part of the coffin may still be seen there in the Chapter library; and what is believed to be King Oswald's skull was seen by many of us a few years ago, when last the tomb of St. Cuthbert was opened. The skull has a cleft in it, showing where the blow that proved fatal fell.

After Oswald's death Northumbria again became two kingdoms, and Aidan threw in his lot with Oswin in the southern portion, called Deira. King Oswin, Bede tells us, was "a man of wonderful piety, and was beloved by all men. . . . He was of graceful aspect, tall of stature, affable in discourse, courteous in behaviour, and most bountiful to all men." But his special grace was his humility, and Aidan predicted that a King so humble would not live long. Not long afterwards Oswin was treacherously murdered, and Aidan, who was greatly afflicted by his death, survived him by only twelve days. Aidan died August 31, 651, in a hut which he had had built for him against the outer wall of Bamborough Church. About the time that he passed away, Cuthbert, who was tending sheep on the Lammermoor hills, saw some shooting stars. After he heard of Aidan's death he said that what he had seen must have been angels carrying Aidan's soul to heaven. He thereupon entered the monastery of Boisil at Melrose.

It has been claimed for Aidan that he was the apostle of England. A pen of great authority has written that "Augustine was the apostle of Kent, but Aidan was the apostle of England." William Bright, late Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford, who made this early period of English Church History peculiarly his own, has said with truth that this "uncritical antithesis" has done great mischief to "historical proportion," and after what he has written in his Appeal to Bede in "Waymarks of Church History," and in the "Letters of William Bright" (p. 219), which have been

published since his death, to discuss the question further may be, as Mr. Maude says in his "Foundations of the English Church" (p. 40), only "slaying the slain." Nevertheless, a few words may here be added as to the services of these two great missionaries to the English.

No one can deny that Augustine was an apostle; the epigram admits that he was the apostle of Kent. He was the first to preach the gospel throughout Kent; and the conversion of the first English King who became a Christian, and of the first English kingdom that became Christian, was his work. But Aidan was not an apostle at all in this sense, not even the apostle of Northumbria. Let us be overflowing in our gratitude for all that he did for the English, whether Christians or pagans, north of the Humber. He was indefatigable as a restorer of what had been laid waste, and as a winner of souls that had hitherto not been won; and apparently he was more successful in his sphere of work than Augustine was in his. His was perhaps a nobler type of the missionary spirit. He had more sweetness and breadth of character; he was less punctilious, less anxious about details, better able to take a wide and sympathetic view. Moreover, he received far more active help from King Oswald than Augustine received from Ethelbert; and he was not at all hampered, as Augustine may sometimes have been, by wondering whether what he was doing would be approved at Rome. He knew how to be trusting, and even adventurous, without sacrificing discretion. "This grace of discretion," says Bede, "marked him out for the Northumbrian mission; but when the time came, he was found to be adorned with every other excellence;" and, in his untiring activity, he was "a strange contrast to the slothfulness of our own age." Bede, though he strongly disapproved of Aidan's Keltic independence as to the Easter cycle and other ecclesiastical usages, is yet full of sympathetic admiration for Aidan's character and work; and we may readily believe that every word of praise which is bestowed by this English writer, who was devoted to Rome, upon the Keltic missionary, who took no account of

Rome, is as justly as it is generously bestowed. Bede was a Northumbrian, and he spent his life in Northumbria, and therefore, when he praises mission work done in Northumbria just before his own day, he is writing about matters that he knows.

But when all has been said about the greater attractiveness of Aidan as compared with Augustine, and about the wider extent of his work, the fact remains that Augustine was an apostle to the English, and Aidan was not. Aidan did nothing for the English beyond the limits of Northumbria, and to the Northumbrians he was not their first evangelist. In that field he entered upon the labours of Paulinus. That he was a better worker than Paulinus we can well believe. But no such disasters disturbed his work as those which overwhelmed the work of Paulinus, and he had an enormous advantage over his predecessor in having Iona to draw upon. From Aidan's old island-home devoted clergy were always to be had. But, however little we may think of the work of Paulinus when compared with that of Aidan, the fact is incontrovertible that in the mission to the Northumbrians he, and not Aidan, was first in the field. Paulinus is the apostle of Northumbria; and in the end the Keltic form of Christianity, as introduced and established by Aidan, passed away, and the Roman form, as preached by Paulinus, prevailed.

Paulinus, like Augustine, Mellitus, Laurentius, and other missionaries to the English, had been sent by Gregory, and Rome had been the centre from which the impulse had come. But who was the source of influence at the other centre in the West, the centre of Keltic Christianity? It was the Abbot of the monastery of Iona. And the remarkable thing is that the Abbot of Iona was not a Bishop. He was only a presbyter, and yet he seems to have had Bishops under his jurisdiction. In the Keltic Church there were, as a rule, no diocesan Bishops. Bishops were attached to tribes rather than to districts or cities, and when (at a much later time) something like dioceses arose, they were simply the districts occupied by the tribes. To the tribal Bishops of the Keltic Church it may not have seemed at all unnatural that they should receive direction from a

presbyter who was the successor of the intensely revered St. Columba.

Keltic Christianity was very independent, but insular, and therefore narrow. Yet the Scots in Iona were free from the race-hatred which disfigured the Christianity of the British in Wales. While the British Christians stood aloof, these generous Scots came over to help, and brought many of our forefathers to the knowledge of Christ. We are thankful for this ; but we may also be thankful that the form of Christianity which they brought was not the one which ultimately prevailed.



“If the Edge be Blunt—”

A STUDY IN EFFECTIVENESS.

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

*Vicar of St. Peter's, Tunbridge Wells.*

THE world is not agreed on many points ; but there is one demand which it makes with one voice—viz., the demand for effectiveness. It measures movements, and it measures men, by the work they turn out—by their output.

And what it insists on for the secular man it insists on, too, for the religious man, for the Church of God.

It is not enough that we move briskly, and that our coat-tails fly, that we have big organizations and large ideas, that our bells are constantly ringing and our organs resounding. It quietly stops us in the midst of all this energy and asks us, when we have got our breath again, “Well, what is coming out of all this ?”

And when we are tempted to reply that our spiritual work is not to be measured, like a carpenter's or a gardener's, we are pulled up short by some memories of the past—when results *did* accrue, when every word seemed to tell, when every visit seemed to lift, and when we waded almost knee-deep in our harvest spoils.



Neither may we fall back with any real satisfaction on the *invisible returns* of our work, for, while it is certainly true that we shall never know upon earth all that we have achieved, we are never told that we must see *none*. Peter and his fellows were directed to let down their nets *for a draught*, and so are we. Christ ordained us that we might "go and bring forth *fruit*." And when we see a Peter in the crowded Jerusalem street netting his thousands, and a Paul sallying forth to plant his living Churches in Asia and Europe, we recognize that what has been should be again—yea, and has been again in this very England of ours.

It is in connection with the Church's failure, and more especially in connection with our own failures, that I have suggested a solution of much of the mystery—"If the edge be blunt——" A bad workman, they say, quarrels with his tools. Our quarrel to-day is only with the blunted edges.

First of all let me point out *what ought to be*. Now, undoubtedly, the merit of a cutting-tool lies in its sharpness, and the wise workman sees carefully to the edge. Whether planing a board, or shaving a chin, or cutting off a leg, the edge is the essential thing.

Its application to our ministerial work is no fanciful one; it is strictly Biblical.

We are sent to drive *a straight furrow* in the fields of the world, to turn the hard clods for the coming seed-time. But the ploughshare must be sharp if the work is to be done well.

We have had deposited in our hands, especially at our ordination, the Word of God which is *the sword of the Spirit*, with its two edges. But preaching the Word involves the man as well as the message, and you cannot secure a clean cut with a blunted man.

*The pruning knife* is part of our equipment to cut off all noxious growths, all unholy pretensions, for are we not under-gardeners to the great Husbandman? But you cannot cut even a thistle with an edgeless knife.

*The sickle*, too, is a Divine instrument in the gathering in of a harvest, but what avails the sweep of a blunted sickle?

The truth is that the tool must be fitted to the work, and, whether it be human or material, the edge must be keen if the work is to be good.

We have now to inquire *what the edge is* in our human ministries.

Not necessarily, I think, *a keen intellect*. In the sphere of mind, the influence of a highly cultured man is unrivalled, but in the sphere of soul and spirit many an unlettered working man will put him to shame.

Neither can we think that the edge is bound up with *dignity and place*. An Archbishop may send a congregation to sleep as effectively as the rawest deacon. Dignity is more likely to blunt than to sharpen, human nature being what it is.

*Orthodoxy* is a precious commodity, but it may as easily tend to dulness as to vivacity. In so far as a tool is well tempered, so far is it a gain; but it need not therefore be well edged.

*Eloquence* is exceedingly attractive and arresting, but it may be as useless as the fireworks to which it is often compared. It may startle and dazzle without inflicting one little cut of conviction.

In truth, edge is something independent of gifts, even the most rare and brilliant, and, as a matter of fact, a man may be the roughest of rough diamonds, as rough-hewn as a bit of quarried granite, and yet possess the edge which will cut clear and deep.

Edge depends on character more than endowments; on spirituality more than standing; and he is the keenest-edged man whose heart beats the truest to the Eternal, and whose warm blood circulates the most rapidly. Let a man's inner being be gripped mightily by the power of God's truths in Christ; let there be a fresh correspondence between his soul and God's Spirit; let his convictions be rooted deep, and his love be all-embracing; let him be immersed in the consciousness of the presence of God, and out of faith and love will come that cutting edge of power which effects so much.

Such a man is a Christian at his earthly best, swayed by Divine power, and sharpened in the Divine workshop. He is of Heaven's tempering, and is qualified best of all to serve the Master's purposes. Self is quiescent, and he seeks only his Saviour's glory and his fellows' good.

Now we are better able to face the query, "If the edge be blunt—what then?"

In the first place, *our work will be poor*, as poor as the mechanic's work after his use of blunted tools. It can hardly be anything else. We shall go on preaching sermons, and our people will be set a-wondering what is wrong, why the right tone is missing, why they cannot keep their attention fixed, and, perhaps, what is the good of listening to sermons at all. We shall visit, too, with much punctiliousness, but we shall not see the grey despair passing and the light breaking in.

In the second place, with our blunted edge *our work will be hard*. It will be all collar-work, no joy or zest in it, but just sheer drudgery. It will be so hard that we shall look forward to it with weariness, and be glad when it is done. The ministry is just galley-slave work when the edge is turned. Physically, too, the labour will be greater, since we never preach so boisterously as when the Spirit is lacking, for, almost unconsciously, we are trying to make up in physical exertion what we lack in spiritual power.

In the third place, *our work will be tactless*. That gentle spirit which touches with just the right pressure on just the right place will be missing, and in its room will come that loveless violence which hurts and wounds. Strong words lovingly spoken cannot exasperate, but lovelessly spoken they rasp and draw blood, like a blunted razor on a sensitive skin.

If the edge be blunt *we shall be tempted to injustice*, blaming the unsympathetic people rather than our unsympathetic selves. We have most of us heard sad tales (perhaps told them) of an unresponsive people, hard and obstinate, resisting the truth. Perhaps we have dubbed them Gospel-hardened. And all the time it has been our own fault, because

we have conveyed our Gospel with chilled fingers, mere frozen chunks of truth, and, failing to be true in love, we have been true in chilliness, which works out in absolute failure.

If the edge be blunt we shall be likely *to drive men away from God's pastures*. I know no more awful fact than this, that we are compelled to stand forth as the exponents of God's character, and that hundreds may be turned out of the way by our unspirituality of tone, or expression, or accent. How many tens of thousands turned Mohammedans from the dryness and deadness of the Christian Church of the seventh century and onwards! An earnest, seeking soul, if he cannot find satisfaction in the Christian Church, will wander into other folds, will embrace New Theology, Christian Science—or, in fact, any “ology” which comes with any warmth in it. Coldness is repulsive to men, and the best of truth, if the chill be on it, will be rejected. It is a terrible responsibility, and we shall do well to face it.

Now, it will not be a vain inquiry if we try to discover *how the edge gets blunted*.

It is not hard to find out. We have only to dip into our own experiences to discover many reasons for it.

*A wrong atmosphere will do it*, collecting the rust upon the edge, and eating its keenness away. This world of men and things is a damp world, which soon takes the shine out of all bright things if they are exposed to its influence. It is difficult to define what worldliness is, but we have a pretty good suspicion when “the world is too much with us.”

*A lack of proper care for the edge will do it*. The truth is that we must wage a perpetual battle for the retention of our spirituality, and it takes our whole attention to keep the edge intact. The moment we let the indolent spirit intrude itself, and relax our vigilance, letting things take their chance and drift, then we find the evil bluntness has come.

*Using our energies and strength for wrong purposes* is as sure a corrosive as to use our razor to cut a stick. Perhaps we find ourselves lending too attentive an ear to man's adulations,

and laying ourselves out for popularity. This is fatal. In a moment the edge is gone, and we are reduced to impotence.

*Failure to renew the edge* will do it. The more we give out of our heart's energies and affections the more renewal they require. The virtue which goes out of us has to be replaced. And if we fail to do this we are useless. Christian work is all edge-work; the wear and tear is there, and the resharpening must of necessity follow.

*False dependencies* will mar the edge of our spirituality. It may be that we have had a glorious time when the sharp edge did its work. And then, almost imperceptibly, we shift our centre, as if the impetus we had received would last on. Veering slowly around, we find ourselves depending on our past experiences, trading on our past successes—in a word, living on our own resources. Of course, we collapse as a balloon when the gas has leaked away, or as a steamboat when the fires have gone out.

Very frequently *success will do it*, generating a disintegrating spirit which dissolves all our keenness. There are few men who are not spoiled by success, for success brings down the soiling breath of men which rusts our edge away. We need a triple armour when praise is falling. It is worse for the soul than cannon-balls for the body.

One other subject remains—*the culture of the edge*.

If our ministerial power be entirely a matter of spirituality, then it is there that the culture is needed.

The grand problem which meets us is how to get self out, how to get God in. The two must go together. We dis-establish self by giving ourselves over to God. The early workers were filled with the Holy Ghost, as the ascending Christ promised, "Ye shall receive power when the Holy Ghost is come upon you." And wherever there has been a fresh infusion of the Holy Ghost, there the spiritual fires have broken out afresh in the hearts of men.

There is no other way. A life of self-surrender, a life of absolute and continuous faith, a receptive spirit which is ever

drawing in of the fulness of God, is all that we need. And this, linked with the Gospel of the grace of God, will make us “able—or sufficient or *efficient*—ministers of the New Testament.”

Then the edge is keen and bright and sharp, and all goes well. “Who is sufficient for these things?” “Our sufficiency is of God.”

A suggestive illustration of all this occurred in the life of Pilkington of Uganda.

There came a time in his missionary career when the edge of his spiritual service was blunted, when he achieved nothing. There were no conversions, and those who had become Christians were slipping back. A blight had fallen upon the Church.

The suspicion that there was something vitally wrong somewhere was brought to a head when one day a convert declared his intention of reverting to heathenism, as Christianity was doing nothing for him. “Your religion does not profit me at all. I have done with it.”

Pilkington’s discouragement was so keen that he felt as if he must retire from the mission-field altogether. Like Thomas, in his despair, he kept away even from the missionaries’ prayer-meeting.

But God led him away into solitude, to an island on the lake, where, with his Bible and a little book by a Tamil evangelist, he fought out the question which so perplexed his soul. And this was his conclusion, that he needed the Holy Ghost’s power for service. He sought and found, receiving the promised gift; and then went back to his work with the edge keen and sharp.

There is nothing more impressive in this world than a soul on fire, and it was this very thing which began to work on missionaries and converts and heathen when he returned. The fire of life and love fell everywhere, and the work leaped forwards, seizing on the most careless, amongst them our friend who had threatened to give up his Christian profession.

And, surely, the time is not lost that we spend in prayer and

communion, any more than the reaper wastes *his* time when he stops so often to whet his scythe. He knows the value of the edge.

"Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts." Not by sturdy arms or moistened brow, but by the cutting edge, the edge *not* blunt.

There is one danger concerning which we do well to be on our guard, *the danger of evading this plain issue* of the blunted edge. And perhaps we ministers are peculiarly exposed to it.

1. We may ignore the question of edge, and *rely upon our holy office*. Are we not ordained ministers, set apart to the work, and raised to a lofty plane by our very Orders? Is not special grace offered to us? Certainly. But it is also true that "the corruption of the best is the worst," that the more privileged we are the larger the responsibility, that the greater the work we are called to the keener and sharper the edge should be. Even the Almighty power of God cannot support and empower a careless, undevotional, pleasure-loving minister. God is faithful, but what if *we* are faithless? And is not this necessary diligence recognized at our very ordination? We recall the question, "Will you be diligent in prayers, and in reading of the holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same, laying aside the study of the world and the flesh?" "I will endeavour myself so to do, the Lord being my helper"—that is, I will keep the edge sharp by God's sharpening power.

2. And just as we may rely without warrant on the grace of the Office, so we may evade the necessity of edge by *quoting the Church's dictum as found in the Twenty-sixth Article*, "Of the Unworthiness of the Ministers, which hinders all the effect of the Sacrament." But if we did fall back on this fact we should be guilty of great meanness, for, in the first place, it was not written for the benefit of an unspiritual minister, but for the perplexed congregation, and, in the second place, it does not meet the distressing fact that the people's spirituality rises or falls with

their ministers' experiences and condition. Our pulse and theirs beat in unison, and as we sink in spirituality so are they likely to do. It is one of the dire penalties of an edgeless ministry that it blunts the congregational edge too. The level of the ministry is the level of the people.

3. Then we are *driven to create substitutes* for the lack of spiritual edge, and the history of the Church is the history of these devices.

We may, for instance, *substitute quantity for quality*, and enlarge our organization in all directions, forgetting that the larger the organization the more need there is of the spiritual content. If we have not life enough for a little body, how can we possibly run a larger body on the same modicum of it?

We may *endeavour to make up for spirit-power by more physical energy*, by more clatter and noise, as in our preaching, when the chill is prominent within, we are apt to shout the louder. But perspiration is not inspiration.

We may be *tempted to attract the masses by appealing to the eye, or the sentiment, or the fancy*, and we may succeed in attracting them. But, having done this, what have we achieved? Spiced religion is not the best of fare, inasmuch as in the process religion itself may vanish. Music is a glorious adjunct to worship, but we have to remember that it is quite possible to drown the voice of God in it.

*There is a delicacy about our Christian faith* which demands gentle handling, and the bloom of it may go if we imitate the loud methods of the world, its exaggerations, its gaudy advertisements, its clamorous touting.

We may be *driven to actual unfaithfulness* by our lack of edge, minimizing the Word of God by preaching on poets or pictures, stooping to low-level subjects, and ignoring the message which we promised to declare.

All this is a plain confession of edgelessness, the effort to make up for lack of life by imitations of life, by graceless contortions.



It is well to be on our guard concerning these powerless substitutes for edge, for, however little *we* may be likely to use them, the spirit of evasion is in the air, and may as easily attack us as others.

The most perfect protection is *to be* what we seem, to rely on God-given weapons, to sharpen the edge of our souls until they cut clean and true, and to be so fully in the hands of our God that He may be able to use us for His own glory.



### The Parable of the Unjust Steward.

By PERCY J. HEAWOOD, M.A.,

*Mathematical Lecturer in the University of Durham.*

THE so-called Parable of the Unjust Steward has always seemed one of the most difficult of our Lord's parables. As to many features of the story, commentators have been more than usually emphatic in reminding us that we must not expect to find an application of every detail. But not only are particular points obscure in themselves, as well as in their interpretation, but there is such a strong apparent contrast between the conduct of an unfaithful steward and the lesson of faithfulness which seems to be based upon it, that doubt has been felt even as to the main lesson suggested, and the kind of Divine prudence inculcated has been taken in a very different way from what might at first be supposed.<sup>1</sup> A good deal of uncertainty may arise from our ignorance of the exact powers and responsibilities of a steward (*οἰκονόμος*), and of how much might be left to his discretion in fixing terms and conditions. In default of clearer knowledge, we must follow the leadings of the story as we find it. Perhaps the difficulties are partly of our own making. In trying to shake ourselves free from assumptions, we are not ready to go far enough. Perhaps it is a mistake to suppose that the steward was unjust after all!

<sup>1</sup> *E.g.*, by Latham in "Pastor Pastorum."

To begin at the beginning, the story opens with the master. As to whether he was himself good or bad, just or unjust, there is very slight indication; but the nearness of the other parable, beginning "There was a certain rich man," is at least suggestive, and gives the words a somewhat ominous sound. The kings of the parables, as such, are generally representatives of authority and justice, but in view of other words about riches and rich men, there is nothing in this description to prepossess us in the master's favour. Then, passing to the steward, the first statement about him appears significant: he was "*slandered*" to his master, as making too free with his goods. This at least is the literal and natural meaning of *διεβλήθη*. Of course, it has been explained away, and instances are adduced where the verb is used of a charge which was not in fact untrue, though maliciously brought, as in the LXX of Dan. iii. 8 (where, however, conduct prompted by reverence for God was unfairly put in the light of disloyalty to the king). Sometimes it is used apart from any personal accusation, as in Herodotus viii. 110, 111, of the insincere statement of motives and objects by which Themistocles imposed on the Athenians (*διέβαλλε*); and here falseness seems to be the prominent idea. There seems always to hang about it some suggestion of falseness or unfairness, and it could hardly be applied to a straightforward honest accusation. It does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament; but the noun *διάβολος*, where it does not refer to the arch-slanderer, the devil (thirty-three times), or as applied to Judas (John vi. 70), is, it is needless to say, always used in a bad sense (1 Tim. iii. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 3; Titus ii. 3). Then, as to the charge itself, the word translated "wasting" is far less definite in the original (*διασκορπίζων*, lit. = scattering abroad), and might apply to any kind of lavishness, whether criminal or otherwise. The simple verb *ἐσκορπίσεν* is used in 2 Cor. ix. 9 (quoting Ps. cxii. 9) of the liberal man who distributes to the poor. We start, then, if we start fairly, with the idea of a master whose justice and liberality are doubtful, and of a steward (apparently unfairly) accused of a too free use of his goods. It

would not be at all out of keeping with these indications to suppose a master who thought only of how much he could exact from his dependents, and a steward who, having some latitude allowed him, insisted on treating them in a fairer and more liberal manner than his master would have approved. It has been said that he does not answer the charge; but if it were based on some such grounds as these, there would be no matter for argument. His subsequent conduct may well seem more questionable, but its actual injustice would depend on the kind of control he had over the estimates which he altered in favour of the debtors, and the way in which agreements had been previously made.

The real difficulty in taking quite a favourable view of his conduct is that later he seems to be plainly called the "unjust steward." Yet it is not precisely so. He is really called the "steward of injustice,"<sup>1</sup> which is explained as a Hebraism; but this does not show why the roundabout phrase should be used, if *ἀδικος* would do as well. Even in Hebrew *אהל רשע* is not precisely "wicked tents," nor *לחם רשע* "wicked bread." And instances of such characterizing genitives in the New Testament hardly occur where a simple adjective might have been just as easily used. In Luke iv. 22, the force of *λόγοις τῆς χάριτος* is hardly sufficiently expressed by "gracious words." So in *τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας* (Rom. vi. 6) and *τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου* (Rom. vii. 24) the phrases seem labouring to express ideas which mere adjectives would hardly give. So in *πάθη ἀτιμίας* (Rom. i. 26), *ἐπιθυμία μισμοῦ* (2 Pet. ii. 10), where both substantives are abstract; and again in *τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ* (Col. i. 13) and *τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ* (Heb. i. 3), where something seems due to Hebrew associations as well as to the exigencies of language in expressing Divine attributes and relations. In Jas. i. 25 *ἀκροατῆς ἐπιλησμονῆς* may be merely equivalent to "forgetful hearer" (though *ἀκροατῆς* seems to

<sup>1</sup> Some have taken the genitive as dependent, not on the noun, but on the verb, which is grammatically possible, but very unlikely, in view of the parallel phrases "judge of injustice" in chap. xviii. and "mammon of injustice" here.

require some object). This, in a very Hebraistic epistle, seems the most plausible instance of equivalence to a simple adjective.

It is true that, in the parable with which we are dealing, "the mammon of injustice" and "the unjust mammon" both occur, apparently in much the same sense, representing different versions, perhaps, of an Aramaic original. And here a new question arises as to what precisely is meant by the term "mammon" itself. Here, in fact, lies the secondary difficulty of the parable. If *ἄδικος* be taken in its natural sense, we can hardly think that Christ would apply it to "wealth" except under the name of mammon, and if so, mammon is not merely equivalent to "wealth"; and the history of the term is obscure. There seems no foundation for the idea that it represented a Syrian god of riches, and if derived from מַמּוֹן (= "thing trusted in"), "wealth" must be quite an acquired meaning—as being the ground of worldly confidence<sup>1</sup>; the contrast between God and mammon, in ver. 13 and in Matt. vi. 24, would suggest that the latter stood for the world rather than for money. The words of St. Augustine are often quoted ("De Serm. Dom. in Monte," II., xiv. 47), where (in support of the statement that riches—*divitiæ*—are called mammon among the Hebrews) he says, "Lucrum Punice Mammon dicitur"; but here *lucrum* is not exactly *opes* or *divitiæ*. It is "gain" rather than "wealth" to which the term "mammon" "is applied in Punic." All this may point to its use, not for money in itself, but for resources (large or small) won or used in the service of the world, or in a sphere of personal or business relations whose general principles are limited and selfish, whatever the individual winner may be. Hence it is the "unjust mammon," in contrast to the "true riches"<sup>2</sup>; though the less direct phrase,

<sup>1</sup> It seems that in Ps. xxxvii. (xxxvi.) 3 מַמּוֹן is translated πλοῦτος by the LXX. The language of such passages as Ps. xlix. 6, lii. 7, lxii. 10, Job xxxi. 24, may be noticed, though the word for "trust" is different; also in the New Testament, 1 Tim. vi. 17-19, where the conclusion has striking points of similarity with that of the parable, though involving an entirely different metaphor (θεμέλιον καλὸν εἰς τὸ μέλλον).

<sup>2</sup> Some would give to *ἄδικος* the sense of "false" or "unreal"; but such a use of a simple Greek word seems very improbable here. In many

τῆς ἀδικίας,<sup>1</sup> may have special force as bringing out more clearly that it is the sphere in which the profit is acquired or employed, rather than the thing itself, which is unjust.

And this consideration may help us in other cases. At first sight it might seem that at all events "judge of injustice" (chap. xviii. 6) is practically synonymous with "unjust judge." And yet it is not implied that he was one who would "give wrong judgment, and respect the persons of the wicked."<sup>2</sup> The words which express his indifference to God and man might even suggest a rough sort of impartiality; and, in spite of his want of piety and pity, the persistent widow does not seem to have feared a wrongful verdict, if only he could be roused to action. Is it not the general sphere of feeling and motive, and perhaps the system under which he acted, which are wrong, rather than his decisions as a judge? The phrase τῆς ἀδικίας may rather mark him as one of the unregenerate world than as sullied with definite injustice, in the way the adjective ἄδικος applied to an individual could hardly avoid doing; though, in fact, when St. Paul blames the Corinthian Christians for going to law—ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδικῶν (1 Cor. vi. 1; in contrast to ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγίων)—he seems to apply the adjective in a general way to heathen tribunals as such, whether actually just or unjust.

And so, coming back to the steward of injustice, may not the phrase in his case point rather to the sphere in which he was placed, and the principles on which he was supposed to act, than to the character of the man himself? It would have been

instances of its use by the LXX, for "false" there is no such unnatural divergence of meaning; a "false" witness, *e.g.*, is an "unrighteous" witness. Here the epithet "false" applied to wealth does not even give the right idea; the true advantage of material things is often in inverse ratio to the extent of their possession (Luke xii. 15); but here and elsewhere in the New Testament it is the right use, rather than the disregard of them, which is enforced. Compare ver. 10.

<sup>1</sup> It is said by Charles (and others) that the expression "mammon of unrighteousness" occurs in Enoch lxiii. 10, but this is inferential. He admits, *in a note at the end of his book*, that μαμωνάς is not transliterated in the Ethiopic. Professor Margoliouth suggests that it is a current Jewish phrase arising from the accidental or intentional alteration of מַמְמוֹן הוֹן into מַמְמוֹן אוֹן. If so, the general idea would be as taken above.

<sup>2</sup> Ps. lxxxii. 2.

quite easy to say "the unjust steward," if that had been intended. If only we may take the description as equivalent to "steward of the world," there is no hindrance to supposing that he lost favour by being better, not worse, than his master—less extortionate, perhaps, than his master could have wished; and that, being unjustly dismissed, and having a free hand, he boldly decided, in the time that remained to him, to go further in the same direction.

If this be the true idea of the story, the application is quite easy. The steward, from prudential motives, it is true, found it wise to proceed on better and more liberal principles than those of his position as the servant of a grasping master. So are the children of light, in their worldly dealings, to act on the higher principles which they profess, and so to make to themselves friends, against the time when earthly things shall fail (*ὅταν ἐκλείπη*)—though not in the narrow sense of recipients of personal charity—by their conduct in things too often marred by evil associations, or where they have to take common action with worldly-minded men. Thus do they show themselves not only "prudent," but "faithful"<sup>1</sup> "in the unjust mammon"—*i.e.*, faithful to God in their stewardship of worldly things, where the world would be satisfied with, or even prefer, a lower standard.

And so the parable leads naturally up to the lesson that to be faithful in much involves faithfulness in little, which some have supposed (somewhat harshly) to be introduced by way of contrast. The faithfulness in the unjust mammon, which is a condition of being entrusted with the true riches, answers to the recognition of better principles in the service of the worldly master. And so the next antithesis, even with the at first sight puzzling reading (adopted by Westcott and Hort), "If you do not prove faithful in that which is another's, who will give you that which is *οὐκ οὐκ*?"<sup>2</sup> comes in quite naturally. For if "that

<sup>1</sup> Notice the combination *ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος, ὁ φρόνιμος* in Luke xii. 42.

<sup>2</sup> Of this, on the usual view, it has been said that "it seems to be impossible to make satisfactory sense" (Plummer in the "International Critical Commentary").

which is another's" refers to the things of this world, "that which is *our own*" may well apply to those higher things which belong to disciples in fellowship with Christ Himself. And, indeed, the connection of the two clauses is more intelligible, if faithfulness in another's is not exactly faithfulness *to* that other, but faithfulness to those higher principles of truth and justice which are required in the management of his and ours alike.

On the view that has been taken, it is, of course, Christ, and not the master, who is referred to in ver. 8 as commending the steward for acting prudently. But this is closely parallel to the conclusion of the other parable, where "the Lord said, Hear what the judge of injustice saith" (Luke xviii. 6). The sudden change from the third person to the first (ver. 9) has been thought to tell against this; but the sudden introduction of the master's sentiments, otherwise supposed, comes in quite as harshly; and the change of person may be paralleled by other striking instances in the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles (Luke v. 14; Acts i. 4, xvii. 3, xxiii. 22). Further, the view that it is Christ who commends removes a difficulty; for if it is the master, how did he come to know? or, if he might naturally come to know, where was the wisdom of the steward? The indulgence to the debtors would be defeated, and they would no longer have reason to be grateful.

Finally, this view of the parable might to some extent explain its obscurity. For if it was suggested by the actual case of some exacting rich man who had a steward with more liberal instincts, there might well be reasons for delicately hinting, rather than actually stating, that it was the former who was in the wrong. From this very gospel we know of a steward (*ἐπίτροπος*) whose wife, if not himself, was a follower of our Lord (Luke viii. 3). May not Chuza have been governed by better principles than Herod? May something arising out of their relations have even suggested the story?

But this is by the way. We may notice, in conclusion, that the general trend of the whole passage, and the subsequent scoffing of the Pharisees, "who were avaricious" (*φιλάργυροι*,

ver. 14), do not tell in favour of the rich man. Moreover, the setting of the story, connected in ver. 1 ("He said *also* unto the disciples") with the preceding chapter, where it is shown that the publican and the sinner must be considered, as well as the self-righteous Pharisee, all tells in the same direction.

And whatever may be thought of the interpretation of the phrase *τῆς ἀδικίας*, it is certainly actually applied, in each of the three cases, to something which we are told to use or learn from, not to condemn or despise. Not only worldly resources, but the steward of a worldly régime and the judge of a worldly polity, have their higher aspects and lessons. The worldly steward, if wise, will (as we take it) exemplify better principles than those of his merely worldly master; as the worldly judge, though faulty, will yet embody attributes which have their place in the character of God himself.



## A "Hill Difficulty."

By Miss A. E. WOODCOCK.

A BISHOP, in a recent speech, is reported to have spoken disparagingly of "those district visitors who neglect to use their minds as well as their bodies, and who waste valuable time in rushing about their parishes exchanging greetings and platitudes with their poorer neighbours." There is much food for thought in this view of the district visitor, specially to those of us who, being district visitors, desire to see ourselves as others see us. But though some of us still "rush," and even consider our strength lies in anything but in sitting still, yet surely the old type of district visitor is slowly but surely giving way before a newer and, in some cases, wiser dispensation.

To take an instance. An elderly lady said the other day, "I have been a district visitor for sixty years." Her hearer gazed at her in surprise, which she mistook for admiration, and she added in a gratified voice: "Yes, I had a district in this



town when I was seventeen!" At seventeen girls nowadays, however enthusiastic, would be considered quite unfit to face the awful problems of gross and deadly sin that most town visitors have to face sooner or later. Surely we have improved in the matter of "age limits" at least!

There is, of course, much that can be studied beforehand by the would-be district visitor, even if a special training should be impossible for this difficult work, for difficult it is most certainly. District visiting seems essentially a woman's work (under the clergy of her parish), for only a woman can carry with her that atmosphere of "home," that power of making things look nice, even, if asked, of helping practically sometimes herself.

As we get less enthusiastic, and even worn and wearied with the monotonous round, which takes so much time and labour, seeming to yield little or no return, we sometimes lose sight of the fact that the so-called "cases" are really our brothers and sisters, who are tied and bound with the chains of drunkenness and immorality; that they can only be loosed from them by the grace of God, which we "must learn to call for by diligent prayer," and that no pressing them to join societies or guilds is of any use at all without that grace. "This kind cometh not forth but by prayer and fasting."

As regards the district itself, the difficulties at first seem endless, especially if you have lived in a village most of your life.

A district is given you with a number; you are taken round it once, then you start work. Before you have been at it for many months you are surprised, not at the lack of morals in many of the houses, but at the presence of them in any. For men, women, and children are living, moving, and having their being in dilapidated houses standing in courts into which, in many cases, the sanitary inspector has never been. From bitter experience I know this to be a fact. "My dear," said a disapproving friend, "Aunt Mary used to go to her district with a Bible under one arm and a Prayer-Book under the other; when *you* go it seems to me you take a notebook, and want to know 'how many in family,' and how many rooms in each house, and all sorts of

dreadful things." But, really, it is impossible to go first "with your Bible and Prayer-Book" until you find out the conditions under which your people's lives are lived. It is a farce to speak to them of the love of God, of the brotherhood of the Church, when, for instance, you find a damp stone-floored room downstairs serving as a bedroom, because, "you see, upstairs the ceiling be falling down, and, as I says, you can't watch it when you be asleep, so we sits up there by day with our quilting-frame."

Like Nehemiah's workers of old, we are often compelled to build our wall with a weapon in one hand for attack (not a Prayer-Book!). There are the landlords, their agents, the inspectors—all have to be dealt with, for those most interested are afraid to speak for themselves. The promise is to us, as to Nehemiah: "Be not ye afraid of them: remember the Lord which is great and terrible, and fight for your brethren."

I believe in tracts; people read them who cannot find time for heavier reading. A mother I know always reads one as she is nursing and putting her baby to sleep. She has no time, she says, with her little family of six, all through the day, except these few minutes. But an even greater advantage is that they involve a personal visit each week to each house. Most of us know how immensely difficult it is to gain admission sometimes. A friend of mine told me of a house where she had tried in vain and in vain to get the owner to open the door wide enough for her to go in. But one day she was greeted with smiles, and asked to come in. "I heard, miss, as you'd come from Thorpe," said her hostess eagerly. "Yes; do you know it?" "Well, I do, and I don't," she answered. "My first-cousin cleans the church there. I can't mind her name now, but I'd like to see that place! There were an old lady murdered there—something awful!—years ago. I can mind hearing all about it, and I've had ever such a want to go there since then and see it all!" After this introduction she welcomed my friend regularly.

I have found many flower-lovers among these town-folk. One poor woman, scarred painfully with eczema, is "totally

fond of a fuchsia"; and in one house I was always welcomed if I wore a "real nice pansy." They love little plants. Another difficulty is that grievous one of having to act as relieving officer in the name of Religion. It tends to harden your heart, and make you believe that "all men are liars," when you find that the person on whom most care and money has been spent has either a private banking account or a regular pension, but has never seen fit to mention it to you.

In time, too, you learn to dread Saturday night, when curiously written notes arrive conferring the rank and title of "lady" upon you in the desperate desire for boots, "as my pore children is going bearfoot," or for "an old tail what you've a done with—my tail is in pawn"; a "tail" signifying a skirt that has seen better days.

It is a mistake to live too near your district. Usually those who need help most are by far the most backward in asking for it, and giving money, though the easiest, seems to me the most disastrous way. I wonder if any of my readers remember a picture that came out in an illustrated paper some years ago. An old woman, dirty, ragged, and untidy, is seen sitting by a fireless, unswept grate. A child, also ragged, is sweeping the floor vigorously with the enthusiasm of youth—and such a floor! The expression on the face of the old woman is unforgettable. Underneath are these words: "If you don't give over that sweepin', Sarah Ann, I'll give you such a 'idin'; the district lady 'avent been round yet!"

But there are many and great privileges in this work. First, and most obviously, because the work of a district visitor corresponds with the work of Christ as shown in the Gospel. Even in the petty details of organization it is well to remember that He made the men sit down by companies in order, before any scheme of help in food was carried out. There are still the little ones to seek out and bring to Him that He shall touch them in Holy Baptism. And who amongst us has not felt something of that sense of personal exhaustion after district

work, implied in the mysterious words, He perceived "that virtue had gone out of Him"?

Besides, there are few things that take you out of yourself as a district does. Many years ago we had a lovely Persian kitten; in spite of all our care he seemed to pine, and his blue eyes grew languid. Then we showed him to someone who "understood" cats. He looked carefully at the kitten; then he said: "There is nothing wrong with him really; catch a mouse for him, that will take him out of himself best." I think a district would prove "a mouse" to most of us.

There is so much variety when you once know your people. It is like a magazine of serial tales. I know a dreary court with ten houses on each side, once whitewashed, now green and grey with age and dirt. It is decorated on washing-days with strings of flapping clothes, about fifteen feet across, and there is a perpetual smell of hot soapsuds and steam rising from the washhouses attached. On a November day it is almost impossible to imagine anything more dreary; but the dreariness is outside.

An old man lives in one house (I am afraid he never has a washing-day), and he is always glad of what he calls "godly conversation." He is most hospitable, offering an old hollow deal box for a seat, in the courtliest manner. Being very deaf, the conversation is one-sided, but very learned. He talks of "the Hebrew ego" and "the human entity." I am left far behind, and I listen in respectful silence as he quotes pages of Milton, his favourite poet. Next door is Mrs. Jones, a widow; she is out, but her next-door neighbour calls me seriously in, and says (in what she fondly believes to be an aside) that she has had to speak straight to Mrs. Jones. "She's always talking about the men-folk, and she be up eighty, miss, and wore out both her last husbands by what I can hear. So I says to her plain: 'Mrs. Jones,' I says, 'at your age you'd a deal better be thinkin' about the next world, not about the next man!'" Farther on is an old soldier; he has been in India and abroad

more than twenty years, and he loves to talk of "them furrin' parts, and the 'boa constructors' you meets out there!"

A keen sense of humour is like the much-advertised rubber heels—"it prevents jar." I do not know if humour can be cultivated. I have my doubts; but to those who possess it, it is an inestimable boon, saving them sometimes from making mountains out of molehills, and themselves ridiculous. I heard of a clergyman the other day who was preaching to a village morning congregation of four grown-up people and about twenty school-children. After giving out his text, he began: "This historical situation was not an absolutely unknown phenomenon." So it is not only district visitors who are deficient in this gift.

Browning says the object of our lives is "just our chance o' the prize of learning love." I have been young, and now am old, and yet only once amongst the poor have I heard "giving" justified by the remark, "Never mind, miss; of course, we can't afford to lose it" (with an eye on my bag); "but it wasn't a large sum, only a trumpery shilling, and there—the Lord will provide, we know"—the suggestion being quite clear that "the trumpery shilling" would be easy to restore, but a larger sum would take some raising.

There are two suggestions I would like to make. First, that those we visit really look upon it as a politeness and compliment to them if we take pains to dress nicely. I know the criticism this remark will receive, but I maintain it is so. Some people think "any old clothes do for a district." "Oh, miss," said an old man wistfully to a friend of mine, "I wish I'd seen you last time you come to our place; 'twas in the evenin', and mother said, 'Miss looked beautiful; she be goin' courtin' for sure.'" Then my friend remembered she had put on her best hat to go out to tea, and called in on the way. The second suggestion may seem even more unnecessary; it is a plea for courtesy. One lady I know visits her district at 12 noon on Monday, and walks in without knocking, bidding her unhappy companion follow her. Another used to go and look at the beds to see if they were properly made! Another—a man this time

—walked into a house at 10 a.m. without knocking, to find a poor old woman rocking her wailing grandchild, and trying to tidy up at the same time. The breakfast cups were still on the table, and he was much incensed. “I’d got a shilling for you,” he announced, “but I shan’t leave it with you until you’ve got a tidy place to put it down in!”

There is a beautiful old collect for the Transfiguration, which parish workers would do well to ponder. “O God, who on the Mount didst reveal to chosen witnesses Thine only-begotten Son wonderfully transfigured in raiment white and glistening, mercifully grant that we, being delivered from the disquietude of this world, may be permitted to behold the King in His beauty.” And the Hill Difficulty lies on the road to the Celestial City.



## The Missionary World.

BY THE REV. A. J. SANTER,

*Formerly C.M.S. Missionary in Bengal.*

IT is not often that missionary work obtains such a public recognition as was given to it on May 31 by Mr. Roosevelt in the course of his famous speech at the Guildhall. It is worth while to quote what the speaker said about Uganda, which place he visited in the course of his travels: “Uganda has been the scene of an extraordinary development of Christianity; nowhere else of recent times has missionary effort met with such success; the inhabitants stand far above most of the races of the Dark Continent in their capacity for progress towards civilization. They have made great strides, and the English officials have shown equal judgment and disinterestedness in the work they have done; and they have been specially wise in trying to develop the natives along their own lines instead of seeking to turn them into imitation Englishmen. In Uganda all that is necessary is to go forward on the paths you have already marked out.”

Many who read these words will also think of much that was not said on that occasion. Many will remember how that great kingdom was first *evangelized* by heroes of the mission-field long before the State took hold of things there; and that the blood of martyrs, European and native, has again proved to be the seed of both Church and Empire. Moreover, “the paths already marked out” point not only to the civilizing course of a settled government, but also to the building up of the great and growing Church in the ways of righteousness. Worldliness has perils quite as deadly as heathenism.

Following on the remarks of the great ex-President may be presented some refreshing news from that same neighbourhood. Dr. A. R. Cook, who accompanied Bishop Tucker on a Confirmation tour in January, writes as follows in the *C.M.S. Gazette* of May: "It was with the greatest interest that I looked round and contrasted in my own mind the state of affairs as we saw it in December, 1899, on my last visit, and as it appears now. Both King and Katikiro were heathen, believing in charms and witchcraft, and all the other paraphernalia of the devil. Ten years have passed away. The day after our arrival I had the privilege of preaching in a large, substantially-built brick church, densely packed with people, estimated at 1,200, and of afterwards joining with nearly 200 at the Lord's Table. . . . On every hand were signs of a material prosperity which showed the enormous increase in civilization. Nor is there wanting evidence of a real and true work of the Spirit in the hearts of the people, not only in baptisms and confirmations, which are the outward and visible signs, but in Christlike deeds and words."



In a letter from Miss Underhill of Nasik, evangelist in the hospital there, quoted in *The Zenana* for June, we are given an insight into the tremendous difficulties met with in dealing with the Indian mind. Speaking of Anant Kanhere, the young fanatic who recently assassinated Mr. Jackson, Collector of Nasik, the writer says: "Anant Kanhere has been kept, during the trial, in the guard-room just beyond our compound. . . . We often passed within a few yards of him, and always received a shock anew to see his air of jaunty irresponsibility. One of the most awful things about the whole affair is the apparent lack of moral sense in these—mostly juvenile—criminals . . . they seem to be sincerely unable to see that they have committed any crime! It is not easy to deal with such a spirit. Another significant fact is that Hinduism permits a man to retain his religious status when he has committed a crime like this; but if Anant were to receive a cup of water from the hands of one of his Marathi guards he would be abhorred of all as a great sinner. Think of the anomaly!"



From the *C.M.S. Gazette* of June we learn something of the aggressive tactics of the Romish Church: "In 1885 the first Gônd was baptized, and now there are more than 600 baptized Christians. Quite recently, and for the first time, the Roman Catholic priests have invaded the Mission. Mr. F. D. O. Roberts wrote from Diwari on February 10: "At Parsitola, a Christian colony on the opposite side of the river, we have twenty-eight members of our Church—many of them weak and erring, and very ignorant of Satan's devices. . . . Two Roman Catholic priests have spent a time among them; they have settled a catechist there, and have opened a school. . . . We are facing a crisis. Earnest, incessant prayer and a strong force of men and women are wanted immediately to hold the fort. In the villages I meet with wonderful encouragement. People are happy to listen to the Gospel. . . . Inquirers and would-be scholars abound in these parts, but we feel that we shall soon see many of them in the hands of the Roman Catholics."

From the *C.M.S. Review* of June, under the heading of Far-Eastern Notes, we glean one item which should lead to careful consideration and to earnest prayer: "Loose thinking and teaching about the main doctrines of Christianity is another frequent cause of lack of progress in the Churches. The ready tolerance of the average Japanese mind, the constant desire to be 'up to date' in religious thought as in other things, the tendency to give a Japanese turn and twist to all that has been received from the West—all this makes many of the Japanese Christians, and even whole churches, fall an easy prey to the insidious attacks of the New Theology."



Christian action speaks, we learn from *The Awake*: "A missionary at Onipe, a village in the Ibadan District, West Africa, was dressing the wounds of a girl who was suffering from severe scalds and burns. An old man from the crowd of onlookers remarked, 'Only a Christian could do that,' implying that no one else would take so much trouble over a black girl."



### Literary Notes.

A REMARKABLE phenomenon in America has been the recent growth of the "Emmanuel Movement"—a spiritual healing movement entirely distinct from so-called "Christian Science" in that it works on Church lines, and makes no claim to have a new revelation. A defence and exposition of the movement will be found in a book entitled "The Christian Religion as a Healing Power," which Mr. Unwin published a little while since. Its authors are Dr. Elwood Worcester and Dr. Samuel McComb of Emmanuel Church, Boston, the two chief leaders of the School. The Emmanuel Movement, it may be said, has no therapeutic procedure except such as is common to all scientific workers; no theology, except the theology of the New Testament as modern critical scholarship has interpreted it. It seeks to bring into effective co-operation the physician, the psychologically trained clergyman, and the trained social worker, in the alleviation and arrest of certain disorders of the nervous system which it is held are now generally regarded as involving some weakness or defect of character. In America this movement, which is certainly worth while looking into, has been remarkably successful in its results, and this new book on the subject, which attempts an exposition of its principles, is likely to be very interesting to English people who, mayhap, appreciate certain elements in Christian Science while they are unable to accept its metaphysics and its more extreme claims. Readers of the *CHURCHMAN* who may wish to inform themselves concerning the history of this Emmanuel Movement might turn to the Rev. Lyman P. Powell's systematic account of experiments and reflections designed to determine the proper relationship between minister and doctor in the light of modern needs. It is a very useful book indeed. There is also "Health and Happiness; or, Religious Therapeutics and Right Living," by the Rev. Samuel Fallows, D.D., LL.D. It is a most interesting volume, and well worth perusal.



Mr. A. Hamilton Thompson has, through Messrs. Methuen, brought out a new edition, entirely rewritten and made up to date, of his "Cambridge and its Colleges." An introductory chapter deals with the growth of the University in relation to the town of Cambridge, its subsequent history, and the development of the collegiate system. The second chapter, containing the history of the Schools, Library, and other University buildings, is followed by a short architectural and historical account of each College in order of foundation. The book concludes with a brief description of the various churches in the town.



Speaking of Cambridge reminds the writer that the Principal of Ridley Hall, the Rev. A. J. Tait, is publishing, through Mr. Elliot Stock, a very important work entitled "Lecture Outlines on the Thirty-Nine Articles." The book provides an outline basis either for lectures on the Articles or for private study. It supplies the teacher with points for discussion and expansion, and furnishes the student with a guide for study. The outline is based upon the Thirty-Nine Articles, but it is not limited to them in contents. Readers of the *CHURCHMAN* will be interested in the information which it is now permissible to give that Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas is also engaged on a two-volume work on the "Articles," which Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co. will publish. This same firm has recently issued the third edition of the same author's *Anglican Church Handbook: "Christianity is Christ."* Early volumes to be published in this excellent series are "The English Church in the Eighteenth Century," by the Rev. C. Sydney Carter, and "The English Church in the Nineteenth Century," by Dr. Eugene Stock.



In a volume entitled "Gothic Architecture: Its Christian Origin and Inspiration," by the Rev. Dr. Butler, who, it will be recalled by some, is the author of "A History of the Tron Kirk and Parish of Edinburgh," effort has been made to correlate Gothic architecture with the great religious forces of its creative period, and with the Christianity of which it was an interpretation. This new work of Dr. Butler's is to be issued by that well-known publishing firm of Edinburgh and London, Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson, and Ferrier.



Dr. Samuel McComb, who is referred to in the first paragraph of these notes, attempts in a volume entitled "The Making of the English Bible" to indicate the sources of the English Bible, and to estimate the literary influences that have conspired to make it the most venerable of our classics. The volume shows in the light of investigations the immense debt our latest revision owes to its predecessors, and how men of every type of religious conviction—Reformer and Humanist, Roman Catholic and Protestant, Prelatist and Puritan, Calvinist and Armenian, Trinitarian and Unitarian, Orthodox and Liberal—have directly or indirectly, willingly or unwillingly, left their mark upon its pages. It only proves once more the simple fact—the fact which was taught us in early life: that it is the Book of Books.



From Messrs. Longmans we may expect shortly "Heroes of Indian History and Stories of their Times" by J. C. Allen, with several maps and many other illustrations.



The same house have in the press "Life as Reality: a Philosophical Essay," by Arthur Stone Dewing, of Harvard University. This book is a plea for the voluntaristic interpretation of idealism. Dr. Dewing searches for reality in the native sense experience, in the laws of science, in the objective principles of individual and social morality, and in the religious consciousness. He finds that the underlying reality everywhere lies in the self-expressive impulse of life which each one of these spheres of human values reveals. At least this is what one gathers the scope of the book is going to be. It is an interesting idea, and we shall look forward to the publication of the work with a good deal of anticipation. The title is a good one, and Mr. Dewing has a fine opportunity of developing a deeply interesting idea. Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co. are also expecting to publish the Rev. W. Sparrow-Simpson's "St. Augustine and African Church Divisions." The author is chaplain of St. Mary's Hospital, Ilford. In "The Epochs of Philosophy," a series of books edited by John Grier Hibben, Ph.D., LL.D., Stuart Professor of Logic in Princeton University, which are also issued by Longmans, there will shortly appear the following: "Stoic and Epicurean," by R. D. Hicks, Fellow and late Lecturer, Trinity College, Cambridge; "The Philosophy of the Enlightenment," by the editor, Dr. Hibben.



A great deal is heard nowadays about this being an age of religious doubt and unbelief, yet discussion of religious problems is more general and more widespread than it ever was. "Modernism" is a spirit that is associated in the popular mind with the recent Papal Encyclical, but its manifestations are rife among non-Catholics as well. There is in the press a scholarly contribution to this field of thought—"Protestant Modernism," by David C. Torrey. There will be much in the work to attract the thinking man and woman. The author shows familiarity with the best that has been said and thought on the great questions with which it concerns itself. He applies to religion the underlying principle of modern thinking—candour and freedom. He endeavours to show how the application of a scientific method to the problems of theology may lead to a deep religious faith, deeper because of its basis of logical conviction. "Protestant Modernism" certainly promises to be an instructive work, and should find many readers.



Felice Ferrero, brother of Guglielmo Ferrero, author of "The Greatness and Decline of Rome," and that other valuable book, "Characters and Events of Roman History," has written a volume entitled "The Valley of Aosta." There are few spots in the world which offer such a diversity of interesting features as the Valley of Aosta. The solid masonry which the Romans constructed during their occupancy of the valley still fills the spectator with wonder, as do the ruins of the medieval castles with their sinister stories of feudal days. The setting in which these historic monuments

appear is most majestic, made up as it is of towering Alpine heights. As a result, the valley is the resort not only of the historian, but of the Nature-lover and the mountain-climber. In his volume, Felice Ferrero has gathered together authoritative information regarding this valley in ancient, medieval, and modern times, and has described the scenic beauty that it holds enshrined.



Two important new books have just come from Messrs. Clark of Edinburgh: "Chronicles," by Professor Curtis of Yale; and "Genesis," by Professor J. Skinner of Cambridge. The volumes are appearing in the series known as the "International Critical Commentary," and will be reviewed in our pages in due course.



Mr. Charles F. Parsons has written a volume entitled "Some Thoughts at Eventide," illustrated by Maurice Griffenhagen. In this work, which will appeal to all lovers of poetry, the author touches upon Love, Friendship, Joy, Sorrow, Faith, and Devotion.



"Facts and Fallacies Regarding the Bible" is a new work which has been written by Dr. William Woods Smyth. Mr. Stock is the publisher, who will also issue the Rev. D. Macfadyen's study of the Prophet Malachi, which he has called "The Messenger of God."



## Notices of Books.

A CRITICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. By A. S. Peake, D.D. PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION. By Hastings Rashdall. FAITH AND ITS PSYCHOLOGY. By W. R. Inge. REASON AND REVELATION. By James Orr, D.D. Studies in Theology. London: *Duckworth and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. each net.

A new series, described as "Aids to Interpretation and Biblical Criticism for Students, the Clergy, and Laymen." The editorial preface seems to come from the pen of Dr. Fairbairn, and the books are said to be written "by men who have lived in the full blaze of modern life, though without having either their eyes burned out or their souls scorched into insensibility." As we shall see, the authors speak with different and differing voices, and this, while perhaps all the better for the serious and discriminating student, will be somewhat perplexing for the layman, for whom also this series is intended. It is difficult to realize three books in the same series with such divergent standpoints as those by Drs. Inge, Rashdall, and Orr.

Professor Peake's book quite literally fulfils its title. It is a critical introduction, neither more nor less. In view of the author's restricted space and the complexity of the problem, attention is concentrated exclusively on critical questions, and no account is given of the subject-matter or authors. Eleven chapters, covering 100 pages, are devoted to the Epistles (with

the exception of those of St. John). One chapter each is given to the Synoptic Gospels and the Acts. Then follow four chapters dealing with the Johannine writings. These take up fifty pages. Professor Peake claims to have written from a scientific standpoint, avoiding as far as possible all bias, and endeavouring to be loyal to the facts. He says that he is conscious of no wish to be in the critical fashion or out of it. His view of the Pastoral Epistles, the Apocalypse, and the Fourth Gospel is particularly interesting, even when it does not carry conviction to more conservative minds. For those who would know the latest information on the purely critical questions connected with the New Testament, there is nothing to compare with this little handbook, and it will also prove a valuable introduction to lengthier works.

Dr. Rashdall's book consists of six lectures delivered at Cambridge. The first three deal with subjects purely philosophical, and are entitled "Mind and Matter," "The Universal Cause," and "God and the Moral Consciousness." They are a clear, strong, and remarkable presentation of Idealism as Dr. Rashdall conceives of it. Lecture IV. discusses "Difficulties and Objections," and is equally acute and forcible. For an introduction to the Philosophy of Idealism in its bearing on religion we do not know of anything to equal these four chapters in clearness and interest. Lectures V. and VI. treat respectively of "Revelation" and "Christianity," and here Dr. Rashdall gives his view of the relation of Idealism to the Christian Religion. If only these two chapters were on a level with the former this would be a remarkable book, but we are compelled to say that in our judgment Dr. Rashdall's view of Christianity is altogether inadequate to the teaching of the New Testament, to say nothing of the Nicene Creed. Both mind and heart crave for something more than is here found, but on the philosophical side the book is strikingly clear and fresh, and is well worth reading for these chapters alone.

Dr. Inge tells us that his object is threefold—to vindicate for religious Faith its true dignity as a normal and healthy part of human nature; to insist that Faith demands the actual reality of its objects, and can never be content with a God who is only an ideal; to show in detail how most of the errors and defects in religious belief have been due to a tendency to arrest the development of Faith prematurely, by annexing it to some one faculty to the exclusion of others, or by resting on given authority. According to Dr. Inge the true goal of Faith is "a unified experience which will make authority no longer external." In the first two chapters Faith is discussed "as a religious term," in which the Old and New Testaments and Church History are rapidly but sufficiently reviewed, and the various views of faith indicated. Chapter III. discusses the "Primary Ground of Faith," which is said to be "a deep-seated religious instinct or impulse," by which we assign value to our experience (p. 42). This native propensity to assign values is associated especially with three attributes of "things which have an absolute intrinsic value" (p. 45), the True, the Good, and the Beautiful. Faith is then shown to be more than the pure feeling of Schleiermacher and his school (Chapter IV.). And then "Authority as a Ground of Faith" is discussed in relation to the Church and the Bible, the authority of both in

this respect being rejected. Even the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ is only allowed when regarded as internal and continuous rather than external and historical. Faith is then treated in relation to the Will, to Practical Needs, to Reason, and Æstheticism, and the lectures close with a fine treatment of "Faith as Harmonious Spiritual Development." Dr. Inge is strongest on the negative and critical side of his subject, and his examination of Ritschlianism and Modernism is penetrating and convincing. But on the positive and constructive side he is less satisfying. His criticism of the authority of Jesus Christ is concerned almost wholly with the Ritschlian view of our Lord. He does not take into account the Evangelical view of an historical Christ as recorded in the Word of God, together with the Christ of experience as mediated through the Holy Spirit. Against this position his argument has little or no force. His view of the Bible is unsatisfactory and really impossible, and his treatment of inspiration would not be accepted as either true or conclusive by many of those whose opinions he thinks he has combated. But quite apart from these serious difficulties Dr. Inge is one of those modern writers who must be read, and this manual contains so much of his characteristic work that it will be read with interest and often with profit even by those who cannot agree with him.

For a long time we have been waiting for a book on the Bible and its Inspiration which would be at once scholarly, modern, conservative, and spiritual. The Higher Critical School has been allowed to have its own way too long, and Dr. Orr's works, published during recent years, show what can be done to state the conservative view of the Bible with adequate scholarship and ability. Dr. Orr tells us that this volume has been written under the conviction that three things mutually implied are at the basis of all true thought about the Bible. "A positive view of the structure of the Bible," "the recognition of a true supernatural revelation in its history," and "a belief, in accordance with the teaching of Christ and His Apostles, in the Inspiration of the record." And he believes that the evidence for each of these three—Unity, Supernaturalness, and Inspiration—yields support to faith in the other two. Starting with the consideration of the ideas of "Revelation and Inspiration in Current Thought," naturalistic schemes of Revelation are discussed, and the need of a special and supernatural Revelation emphasized. Forms of this special revelation, as seen in history, prophecy, and miracle, are then considered, leading up to their culmination in the Person of Christ as "the Supreme Revealer and Supreme Miracle." The last three chapters discuss the problem of Inspiration. Thus, in the course of ten chapters Dr. Orr covers most of the ground connected with modern problems of the Bible as the divinely inspired record of the will of God. Dr. Orr's position on Revelation will of course not be acceptable to the Higher Critical School, and on Inspiration it is possible that some of his conservative friends would be prepared to go a step farther. But he has given us a book that appeals in a very satisfactory way to the mind and heart of everyone who loves the Bible. It is written with all Dr. Orr's clearness of thought, firmness of grasp, fulness of knowledge, and spirituality of tone. If anyone would know what is the true conservative view of the Bible, here is the answer, and we warmly recommend it as one of the most timely and valuable of manuals.

**THE HIGH CALLING.** By the Rev. J. H. Jowett. London: *Andrew Melrose*.  
Price 3s. 6d. net.

Dr. Jowett is always welcome, and here, in his devotional treatment of St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, he is seen at his best. This contains some of his ripest work, and is a delightful blend of adequate scholarship, spiritual insight, felicitous expression, and searching application. With Lightfoot's great Commentary, Bishop Moule's "Philippian Studies," and Dr. Jowett's present work, every student, preacher, and teacher will be fully equipped for work on one of St. Paul's most characteristic Epistles. We have greatly enjoyed this truly inspiring book, and we heartily commend it to our readers.

**BROKEN EARTHENWARE.** By Harold Begbie. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*.  
Price 6s.

The title alone might suggest a novel, but those who have read the book will know that it is much more important and in many ways more fascinating than a work of fiction, for it tells the story of several pieces of living "earthenware," "broken" by sin but renewed by the grace of God. In a series of sketches we have the life-stories of nine trophies of grace brought to Christ by the Salvation Army in one slum district of London; and no one who begins the work will find it easy to put it down without reading it to the very end. Mr. Begbie calls his book "A Footnote in Narrative to Professor William James's Study in Human Nature, 'The Varieties of Religious Experience,'" and the one point which he emphasizes again and again is that nothing but religion could have effected these wonderful changes. Psychology may adduce the hypothesis of suggestion, but no suggestion is adequate to account for all that can be read here. Cotter Morison once said that there was no remedy for a bad heart. Here is the answer, and that from one district only. We commend the book to the careful and earnest attention of all readers. That clergymen should read it goes without saying; but it should be pondered by all Christian workers, and, indeed, by all who would know the way out of Darkest England—the way of Divine grace. It is one of the finest pieces of Christian evidence, one that appeals to all. Read and studied side by side with Mr. George Jackson's "Fact of Conversion" it will prove an inspiration and a guide to all soul-winners. So long as the Gospel of Christ can produce such conversions as those of "The Puncher" and "Old Born-Drunk," we need not despair of the hardest heart.

**THE LIBERTY OF PROPHECYING.** By H. Hensley Henson, D.D. London: *Macmillan and Co., Ltd.* Price 6s.

In this volume we have the Lyman Beecher Lectures for 1909, delivered at Yale University, together with three sermons on allied topics. Canon Henson's subtitle explains and justifies his reason for using Jeremy Taylor's classical title for his book. He pleads for freedom in preaching, "with its just limits and temper considered with reference to the circumstances of the modern Church." There are eight lectures, commencing with "The Functions and Claims of the Preacher," and passing to such subjects as "Denominational Subscriptions," "Evidences of Personal Belief," "Inter-

pretation of Scripture in Sermons," "Reserve," "Social and Political Preaching," "Proportion in Religious Teaching," and then closing with a lecture on "Objections and Conclusions." The sermons are on "Divine Vocation," "Authority in Religion," and "Christian Teaching." From this summary the wide scope and intense interest of the treatment will readily be seen. With Canon Henson's general plea for liberty we have nothing but the warmest sympathy, though in the application of the principle we do not find ourselves in anything like full agreement. His protest against demanding fuller tests from the minister than from other Christian disciples (p. 66) is a little difficult to follow, especially as he allows the necessity for taking precautions against professional inefficiency (p. 67). Then, supposing we abolish the test of the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Church would still have a right to apply some criterion to those who wish to be her recognized exponents. We are only afraid lest in pleading for liberty Canon Henson should be understood to be claiming licence by many who have not his grip of truth, as seen in his recent opposition to the New Theology. We observe with interest one point of very great importance. While Canon Henson's sympathies are evidently with the Critical School, he is able to see what many conservative writers have hitherto been pressing in vain, that the real difficulty is the ministerial and spiritual use of the Old Testament narratives (p. 104). Canon Henson may well doubt whether the critical scholars have really grasped the situation as it applies to the ordinary clergyman of the parish. It is only too true that the work of the critics is "far more revolutionary than they perceive," and yet we are not told, even in this book, how we are to use these revolutionary ideas in our preaching. Again, is it not far too easy to set aside the difficulties of the barren fig-tree and the Gadarene swine by saying that they are unhistorical? What real proof is there for this contention apart from subjective preference? There are other points, as to which Canon Henson raises problems without in any way solving them. So we repeat that we find ourselves in hearty agreement with his general plea for liberty, and yet in equally hearty disagreement on several of the fundamental illustrations used in support of his plea. Before we could go farther with him we should need a much clearer doctrine of Scripture as the basis of liberty, and the absence of this from the present work tends to make it less useful to preachers of the conservative school than the author evidently desires it to be. Apart, however, from its main contentions, there is much that is fresh, illuminating, and suggestive, and whether we agree with Canon Henson or not, his passionate earnestness commands our deep respect and admiration. Nothing could be finer than his sermon on the Divine Vocation and its protest against the mechanical view of Vocation held by a certain School in our Church. We observe that "Denny" appears two or three times for "Denney."

MODERN SUBSTITUTES FOR CHRISTIANITY. By P. M. Muir, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Price 6s.

The Baird Lectures for 1909, consisting of six lectures, dealing respectively with "Popular Impeachments of Christianity," "Morality without Religion," "The Religion of the Universe," "The Religion of Humanity," "Theism

without Christ," and "The Tribute of Criticism to Christ." The first considers certain aspects of popular opposition to Christianity, and calls attention to the widespread alienation from the Faith, though at the same time showing that the systems and tendencies abroad to-day "owe their vitality to the Faith which they attempt to supersede." Four prevalent tendencies are then discussed, and on each of these the author writes wisely and well. At times the treatment seems somewhat slight, but difficulties are not shirked, and the true methods of reply are suggested. The closing lecture shows that there is, and can be, no satisfying alternative to Christ. The book ends, as it should, on a note of hope as the future is contemplated in relation to Christ. The author is fully abreast of the latest, best (and worst) that is now being spoken and written against Christianity. For a popular well-written summary of modern unbelief, the book is likely to be very useful. It contains an outline of a Christian apologetic which can be confidently recommended. There are several valuable appendixes and an admirable list of "authorities consulted."

ISRAEL'S IDEAL. By the Rev. J. Adams. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 4s. 6d. net.

We are always glad to welcome a book by the author of two such suggestive and valuable volumes as we have recently had from him in "Sermons in Syntax" and "Sermons in Accents." Mr. Adams here attempts a higher flight than before, into the realm of Old Testament theology. He wishes us to regard as his keynote "the endeavour to connect the Hebrew usages everywhere with general Shemitic practice and ideas," and this specially under the guidance of Robertson Smith, who, he says, revolutionized his view of Old Testament subjects. But we are bound to confess that Mr. Adams is much more satisfying when he is not under the influence of Robertson Smith, for he is truer to the Old Testament as it is, and truer to those Hebrew verities which are quite evidently the life of his life. The attempt to read the Old Testament in the light of the great Scottish scholar is not very successful, and, indeed, is often a distinct failure; but wherever Mr. Adams sets out to interpret the Scripture for himself he is at once successful, convincing, and delightful. It is curious that he has not given heed to the view of Curtiss on Sacrifice, for it would have provided a salutary corrective to Robertson Smith, while proving truer to Old Testament ideas. But the careful and discriminating reader will find here not a little to refresh his mind and satisfy his heart. Apart from its critical inconsistencies, as we cannot but regard them, it is one of the freshest treatments of Old Testament theology that we possess.

THE LORD FROM HEAVEN. By Sir Robert Anderson. London: *Nisbet and Co., Ltd.* Price 3s. 6d.

"Chapters on the Deity of Christ," eleven in number, and all of them containing food for thought and heart. Sir Robert Anderson has written a truly valuable book, small in size, but great in usefulness. In these days of hesitation, vagueness, and doubt, it is refreshing to read an author who knows his own mind, and can give weighty reasons for the hope that is in him. The book well merits the appreciative words of the Bishop of



Durham, and we endorse this commendation with all possible heartiness. The two chapters on "The Son of Man" and "The Son of God" are particularly good, and should do much to clarify thought and deepen conviction on topics of great present-day interest and discussion.

**SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS IN THE LIGHT OF CHRISTIANITY.** By the Rev. W. E. Chadwick, D.D., B.Sc. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 5s. net.

This book contains the Hulsean lectures given by Dr. Chadwick, in 1909 and 1910, before the University of Cambridge. They have been enlarged since they were first delivered, and a great number of notes and excursuses have been added; but the substance of the lectures remains unchanged. The book is a fine and generous plea for the "supremacy of the ethical"—that is, of righteousness—in our social life. As the writer takes care to point out, this plea for the moralization of our social relations is the supreme call of Christianity. In days when, from so many sides, ideal substitutes for the Gospel are being put forward, as if they held the solution of the problems that beset us, we do well to be reminded of the truth of Dr. Chadwick's contention. The author's knowledge is wide, his experience many-sided, and his sympathies true and deep. Hence his book is sure to make an appeal among all who really have the greatest of interests at heart. Let all social reformers master the contention of the book, and they will begin to perceive the supreme need of Christian teaching to-day. They will learn how the regulative principles of the Divine kingdom were promulgated by Jesus Himself—briefly, with the decisiveness of a great teacher, authoritatively, with the directness of spiritual genius. Those principles of action He *laid down*; he did not (hereby revealing a heavenly wisdom) *explain*. The whole life of the Christian Church since then has been the application to human life, and its conditions, of those ideal standards of government; the working out of the "implicit" of Christ's doctrine in the "explicit" of history. Something of all this will be learned from the book before us. We trust the lesson will not be unheeded, for the spiritual well-being of the future depends entirely (so far as we can see) on our realizing, throughout the complex of humanity, the vital significance of the words of Jesus Christ. Apart from Him, there is little chance of the world making any real progress. Parliaments will not solve the difficulties, the increasing difficulties, of modern existence. Christ can.

**THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.** By Alfred Plummer, D.D. London: *Methuen and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

This is the last in order of the series of Handbooks of English Church History, edited by Mr. Burn; and the ripe scholarship of the author is a sufficient guarantee of a careful and able treatment of his subject. Dr. Plummer states that his aim has been to give "a correct impression of the leading characteristics of the century," and in the main he has certainly succeeded. We are inclined to think that he has given too little space to the actual Church history of the period, and it would have been helpful to have had a short account of the Trinitarian Controversy, and a little more detail on the Methodist and Evangelical movements; but the very full

sketch given of contemporary political history enables the reader to form a right perspective of the religious life of the day. Although Dr. Plummer takes an unusually optimistic view of the moral and religious life of the eighteenth century, his introductory chapter furnishes a good résumé of the light and dark sides of its life, from the point of view of politics, literature, and art, as well as of religion. He is, we think, rather too severe in his strictures on the emotional and fanatical character of the early Methodist movement, but he aptly sums up the inevitable tendency of Wesley's principles, when he says: "He implored Church-people to abide in the English Church, but he smoothed the way for their departure" (p. 213). We must, however, take exception to his statement that the strong conservative attitude the Evangelicals took to Holy Scripture, and their lack of interest in scientific developments, "not only discouraged the search for truth, but weakened men's love of it and their power of appreciating it" (p. 158). We do not believe this is warranted by facts. Neither is it quite fair to lay the responsibility for the long delay in repealing the penal laws against Romanists at the door of the Evangelicals. Granted that they adopted an unjustly intolerant attitude towards Roman Catholics, this was, as Dr. Plummer himself well points out, then common to all classes and sections, from Dissenters to Non-Jurors, and was the unfortunate legacy of an age which had suffered much from the dangerous political and persecuting policy of the Romish Church. The book throughout, however, shows abundant evidence of wide reading, and much research amongst contemporary writings, and also a judicious and, on the whole, impartial discrimination in arriving at conclusions. It should therefore be welcomed as a useful and valuable guide for all students of this somewhat unpopular period of Church history.

THOUGHTS ON MODERN CHURCH LIFE AND WORK. By J. C. Wright, D.D.  
*Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2s. 6d.

The Archbishop of Sydney writes on the duties of the clergy in municipal life—the use of wealth, revival, the Lord's Supper, reunion, and some functions of churchwardens, etc. He attracts us by his robust common sense, his loyalty to the Church of England, and his strong grasp of essential truth. We are sure his many friends will be glad to have this permanent record of his wise and illuminating counsels.

HOW TO TEACH and CATECHIZE. By the Rev. J. A. Rivington. London:  
*Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

•This is an invaluable little book. As a plea for the employment of sound educational methods in the religious instruction of children, it might well be put into the hands of every Sunday-school teacher. Heaven knows, our Sunday-schools need reform. Mr. Rivington's book ought to go far to initiate the reformation we look for. The Church of England's extremity is apt to be the Dissenter's opportunity; but, if that Church will really rouse herself, she may yet keep a large majority of the young within her fold. The Sunday-school will be the key of the Church's position in the near future. What is imperative to-day are better methods, better teachers, better standards of efficiency. At present things are in a sorry condition in the bulk of the Church's Sunday-schools—antiquated methods, inefficient (though generally

well-meaning) teachers, lack of plan and discipline. We would very strongly urge upon the clergy to procure Mr. Rivington's book, which is full of excellent advice, always practical, always vigorously phrased, and not without touches of humour. We have read every word of it with uncommon satisfaction.

STUDIES IN THE MAKING OF CHARACTER. By the Rev. H. W. Clark.  
London: *Robert Scott*. Price 2s. net.

Mr. Clark is already known as a thoughtful writer. His "Laws of the Inner Kingdom" was a book at once original and sane. If we mistake not, the present volume will confirm the high opinion passed upon his former work. One cannot but be struck with the *suggestiveness* of these brief but illuminating little "studies." They are worth reading several times over, for they do not disclose their full meaning at a first perusal. Mr. Clark's new book is just the sort of volume to have at one's bedside, to be taken up in the early morning, or when the work-day is over, as a means for solemnizing or tranquillizing thought.

THE PROBLEM OF THEOLOGY IN MODERN LIFE AND THOUGHT. By Andrew Miller, M.A. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 5s.

Like so many recent volumes of "Apologetics," the present book comes from a Scotch source. Mr. Miller writes with considerable force; he has evidently read deeply in contemporary philosophy, and has meditated long on the problems with which he essays to deal. He has a happy knack of putting his finger on the weak spots in an opponent's arguments, and his power of effective criticism is considerable. Perhaps the best chapter in the book is the last—"The Church in Modern Life." Altogether an able, timely, and suggestive book.

CHURCH AND NATION: OR, WEALTH WITH HONOUR. By Elliot E. Mills.  
Bath: *National Unity Press*. Price 10s. 6d. net.

This is a rather irritating book. It is not without good points—indeed, many good points—but the style is disconcerting, and the presentation of Mr. Mills' case still more so. The writer is evidently sincere in his generalizations, as in his criticisms; but the book as a whole is somewhat tedious. It would have been a good deal more readable if reduced from about 400 pages to between 80 and 100. The book is dedicated to politicians of all parties; and the object aimed at by the writer is to secure for his country a bold constitutional advance, as the alternative to an artificial constitutional crisis. The means advocated to secure this end is "a corporate, disciplinary, neo-Catholic Church."

THE CHURCH AND LIFE OF TO-DAY. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*.  
Price 6s.

It is impossible to notice a book like this, to which no less than twenty-three Church dignitaries have contributed; for an adequate notice would occupy many pages. It must suffice to say that the papers contributed by the twenty-three, despite an extraordinary variety of topics, are generally worth reading—some of them (like the Bishop of Durham's on "National Courage," or Canon Barnett's on "The Housing of the Poor") particularly so. The papers are uniformly short, and are quite of the "popular" order.

RELIGION : ITS PLACE AND POWER. By the Rev. H. M. Dale, B.D.

London : *H. R. Allenson*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

The author contends that the place of religion is pre-eminent, and its power universal. He has written eight clear and cogent chapters on the definition of religion—its prevalence, origin, evolution, rationale, influence upon Art, Law, etc., and upon Character and Conduct. He has read a good deal, and quotes authorities with freedom and insight. We think his book a distinct contribution to the study of religion, and would place it in the hands of any whose minds have been disturbed or who have lost their sense of perspective. He proves to us that religion has played the most prominent part in the education and development of the human race, and we advise our readers to test his logic and examine his proofs.

LENTEN SHADOWS AND EASTER LIGHTS. By the late Rev. Studholme

Wilson, M.A. London : *James Nisbet and Co., Ltd.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

This is a book of sermons preached by the late Rev. Studholme Wilson, and includes one sermon for each Sunday in Lent, and until the fifth Sunday after Easter, with short addresses on the "Seven Sayings." The treatment varies somewhat, but there is a strong Evangelistic appeal running throughout the whole, and the practical way in which the topics are applied should, as its editor hopes, make the little book of service both to clergy and laity. The price, however, seems a little excessive for a book of 183 pages.

FROM COAL-MINE UPWARDS. By James Dunn. London : *W. Green*. Price 2s.

An autobiography of the life and work of Mr. James Dunn, who for very many years has been connected with the London City Mission as Missioner, and latterly as District Secretary to the City and Central Auxiliary. The work is as thrilling as any novel, and certainly more satisfying. At work in a coal-mine at the age of eight, episodes at the Crimea and in Sebastopol, as one of Sir Joseph Paxton's "Army Works Corps," lead up to the story of the writer's conversion. His work as a London City Missionary is then described, Bethnal Green of the old days being unfolded in character stories, which by their simple eloquence speak forcibly their story of the Cross, which is "the power of God unto salvation." In the later portion of the book there are many interesting reminiscences of Sir George Williams, Mr. J. G. Barclay, Mr. R. C. L. Bevan, Lady Ashburton, and others, who have been keen supporters of the Mission.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE SYNOPTISTS. By F. W. Worsley. Edinburgh : *T. and T. Clark*. Price 3s. net.

The purpose of the present work is to show that the author of the fourth Gospel wrote with the three synoptists full in view, and therefore omits everything which he regards as satisfactorily detailed by them, and only repeats when he wishes to correct or supplement their narratives. The fourth Gospel is also able to lay special stress on our Lord's manifestation to His disciples as opposed to the manifestation to the world. Such being the case, it is contended that the author of that Gospel must have written with the highest possible authority, and that it cannot possibly be the work of a second-century editor. Unfortunately, however, in support of this admirable contention, the writer has to surrender a great deal of the

synoptic tradition which he thinks the fourth Gospel quietly but definitely corrects, because the writer believes it is erroneous. We should hardly have thought that it was necessary nowadays to argue that the call of St. Peter in St. John i. is the same as that recorded in St. Mark i. and St. Luke v. Apart from the author's unwarrantable theory, as we believe, that the synoptic writers are wrong and need correction, the essay is an able and scholarly piece of work, and provides not a few valuable points for the thorough study of the fourth Gospel.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF PHILOSOPHY. By Miss Alice Oldham.

Dublin: *Hodges, Figgis and Co.* Price 5s. net.

A series of lectures, delivered during the years 1904-06 at Alexandra College, Dublin, and published posthumously from lecture-notes. The book will serve a very useful purpose. It covers metaphysics, ethics, and psychology. The first section gives a succinct account of the leading thinkers on the eternal problem of "The One and the Many" from Thales to Lotze, and might form an excellent thesis on the subject—"Can man, by searching, find out God?" In the second section there is some good criticism of the Hedonistic and Utilitarian theories of ethics, and an appreciation of the strength of the Intuitionist position. The chapters on Psychology reveal a thorough if unobtrusive knowledge of modern writers. The chief defects of the book—inevitable under the circumstances—are some omissions and an excessive condensation, which leads occasionally to obscurity. The metaphysical standpoint of the writer is Hegelian, and is therefore open to criticism for making an unjustifiable separation between consciousness and the conscious self, and relegating our instinctive belief in the "transcendental ego" to the land of dreams. Similarly, in ethics the final precept is—"Realize thyself as an infinite whole. That vast whole is our true self. Thyself is all-that-is." There is a frank appreciation of the debt ethics owes to Christianity, which would be "all-perfect if realized," and yet a view of sin which seems to be related to the conception of it as mere appearance, not reality. A considerable use of Christian language in a non-Christian sense perhaps constitutes a danger for the unwary reader. We would suggest that any Christian who may use this book as a first introduction to philosophy should read as a sequel either D'Arcy's "Idealism and Theology" or Illingworth's "Personality, Human and Divine."

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE CHARACTER OF CHRIST TO NON-CHRISTIAN RACES. By C. H. Robinson, M.A. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

A very interesting series of studies on rather diverse topics, whose link of connection is best indicated by the subtitle of the book, "An Apology for Christian Missions." Two valuable chapters state typical objections to missions, especially missions among Moslems, and answer them with force and freshness, by the aid of Bishop Lightfoot's cordial for drooping spirits—the study of Church history. But the main portion of the book is taken up with an inquiry into the ideals of Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, and Islamism. Canon Robinson's idea is that the Christian missionary should start with a sympathetic appreciation of what is best in the native religion, and

use it as a stepping-stone to the still higher ideal of Christianity. Where this method is practicable, the comparisons drawn in these chapters will be found very suggestive. The unfortunate thing is that the knowledge of their own religion, possessed, for example, by the majority of professing Hindus, is so scanty that the stepping-stones are not very reliable. Similarly, the English student of comparative religion must remember that, though it is legitimate and necessary to test rival religions by the height of their respective ideals, yet, as Canon Robinson himself confesses, the stricter test is by practice, by the extent to which men are enabled to attain to their ideal. It is significant that San Chi'-u is reported to have said to Confucius: "It is not that I do not delight in your doctrines, but my strength is inadequate." In the light of this admission, when we are told that "the goal of Christianity is the attainment of character," and that the means to this end is the "presentation of character" (pp. 6, 8), we cannot help wondering whether it would not have been well to say more clearly that the unique feature of Christianity is the presence of a living Spirit, who presents the character, and aids men in the imitation of Christ.

THE SHEPHERD OF ISRAEL. By David Baron. London: *Morgan and Scott*. Price 2s. 6d.

The title is taken from Psalm lxxx., which is the text for a summary of Jewish history. The past and present state of Israel is graphically and pathetically told, and their future is not forgotten. How truly the Word of God has been fulfilled with regard to this unique people these pages clearly show. In these days of unsettlement and uncertainty, and consequent dissipation of energy, it is excellent to study the Jew as an eloquent monument to God's faithfulness, and to the truth of the Inspired Writings.

LIFE AS SERVICE. By Canon H. Lewis. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2s.

Fifty-two short chapters, covering 157 pages, full of excellent quotation and concise utterances on this great subject. The devoted life of the writer, his convincing style and direct appeal, will serve to draw to him many readers. This book on the subject of the highest service cannot be read without fresh longings and purposes springing and fructifying in the soul.

THE HEROES AND MARTYRS OF FAITH. By Dr. A. S. Peake. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 5s.

These studies on the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews attract us by their style and spirituality. We may find it difficult to walk in critical agreement with Dr. Peake, but we gladly sit at his feet as he unfolds evangelical truths to our soul. He is unquestionably a teacher, seer, and student of human nature. His view of the history of the Jews is different from that of the writer of the Epistle; but we are bound to add that, in this instance at any rate, the spiritual interpretation suffers no loss at his hands. His finest chapters seemed to us to be those on Moses and the great renunciation, but profit and pleasure have been derived from all. When the scholarly is steeped in the spiritual, and, forgetting preconceived theories, settles down to teach us spiritual truths from historical facts, we gladly open heart and ears.

**NEW CHINA.** By Rev. W. Y. Fullerton and C. E. Wilson, B.A. London: *Morgan and Scott*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

Twenty-four fascinating chapters about this fascinating land. We go on tour with our two friends, and learn the present outlook of the work, its claims and calls, and we get into touch with all classes—missionaries, native Christians, mandarins, etc. Dr. Glover, in the Preface, speaks warmly of the book, which constitutes a call to penitence for our coldness, to sympathy for our overtaxed brethren, and to response to the cry from the Farthest East—"Come over and help us." If the West does not respond to the East, the East will repudiate the West.

**SERMONS WITH ANALYSES.** By Rev. H. Ford, D.D., D.C.L. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

Excellent sermons and analyses, and excellent hints for extemporaneous preaching, by one who knows, and has a right to speak. To follow these would be to ease the burden of the long-suffering laity of both sexes to no inconsiderable extent.

**THE MASTER'S TREASURES.** By E. Gilling Cherry. London: *Morgan and Scott*. Price 1s. 6d.

This small book of poems is edited by Isabella Bishop, and Dr. Moule; in his introduction, speaks of the writer's "presentation in verse of clear Christian truth, of her gifts of insight, reflection, and genuine poetic faculty."

**MISSIONS AND THE MINOR PROPHETS.** By Rev. F. S. G. Warman, B.D. London: *C.M.S.* Price 1s.

The writer is a good guide from the missionary standpoint. His one aim is to discover the light which the life and work of the Minor Prophets shed on the missionary problems of to-day. A brief note is given at the beginning of each chapter upon the book and its author. Questions and a programme for study-bands will be found, and we warmly commend the book as an excellent starting-point and basis of operation for private and public use.

**RECORD OF A YEAR'S READING.** By L. H. M. Soulsby. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 6d.

What we read during the day affects us for good or ill. This is a diary for recording the list of books read, their authors, and the reason for their perusal. Miss Soulsby's method will make us careful of what we read and what we remember.

**MESSAGES OF FAITH, HOPE, AND LOVE.** By W. J. Sears. London: *Morgan and Scott*. Price 1s. 6d.

These messages are true to their title, and the writer has poetic gift as well as spiritual insight. As the Rev. F. B. Meyer says in a foreword, "they will help to make the tainted atmosphere of the world more fragrant."

**BOKWALA.** By a Congo Resident. London: *R.T.S.* Price 1s. net.

Dr. H. G. Guinness writes a preface to this terrible, true story. It is a most loathsome piece of reading when we realize that the Congo victims were far happier under the domination of cannibals than that of so-called "Christian" traders. It is impossible to read this bit of autobiography, put into the mouth of one of the victims, without feelings of bitter indignation. We do not wonder that a common native proverb says that "rubber is death," and that, while salvation from sin is essential, salvation from rubber is equally so. We hope the book will be read by all, and that Englishmen will still play the part of champion to the oppressed.

**WHERE MOSES WENT TO SCHOOL. WHERE MOSES LEARNT TO RULE. ESTHER THE QUEEN.** By Mildred Duff and Noel Hope. London: *Marshall Bros.* Price 1s. each. 3 vols.

We warmly commend these volumes for the use of intelligent children. Sketches of the original monuments and stone pictures are given, and the Old Testament scenes stand out in vivid clearness. We consider them invaluable for parents and the teachers of junior classes.

## REPRINTS, PAMPHLETS, AND PERIODICALS.

LIFE OF GORDON. By D. C. Boulger. THE MAKING OF A FRONTIER. By Colonel Durand. COLLECTED POEMS OF HENRY NEWBOLT. Nelson's Shilling Library. SHINING FERRY. By Q. THE RIDDLE OF THE SANDS. By Erskine Childers. THE HOUSE OF LYNCH. By Leonard Merrick, Nelson's Sevenpenny Library. THE ROMANY RYE. By George Borrow. HANS ANDERSEN'S FAIRY TALES. Nelson's Sixpenny Classics. London: *Thomas Nelson and Sons*.

The latest results of Messrs. Nelson's three notable enterprises. Each series is quite admirable by itself, but all three together are particularly interesting, valuable, and attractive. These excellently-produced volumes of the best literature, ancient and recent, deserve the widest circulation.

MAMMA. By Rhoda Broughton. MRS. LORIMER. By Lucas Malet. A BELEAGUERED CITY. By Mrs. Oliphant. DR. CLAUDIUS. By F. Marion Crawford. THE SOLITARY SUMMER. By the Author of "Elizabeth and her German Garden." London: *Macmillan and Co., Ltd.* Price 7d. net each.

The latest instalment of Messrs. Macmillan's sevenpenny series, consisting of works of fiction by well-known and representative modern authors. There is one volume, however (we will not further particularize), which, both in its original and in this cheaper form, strikes us as not in keeping with the publishers' very high standard. These little volumes are beautifully printed, attractively bound, and a joy to handle and read. They will doubtless be in great request during the forthcoming holiday season.

THE GOLDEN TREASURY. By C. H. Bogatzky. CHRIST AND THE SCRIPTURES. By the Rev. Adolph Saphir. DAVID: SHEPHERD, PSALMIST, KING. By the Rev. F. B. Meyer. JOHN, WHOM JESUS LOVED. By the Rev. James Culross. JOSEPH: BELOVED, HATED, EXALTED. By the Rev. F. B. Meyer. PAUL, A SERVANT OF JESUS CHRIST. By the Rev. F. B. Meyer. THE CATACOMBS AT ROME. By Benjamin Scott. "Golden Treasury" Series. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* Price 1s. net each.

The first seven volumes of a new series of special cheap reprints of well-known works, convenient and attractive in form. Clearly printed and well bound, they will have the fresh lease of life which they deserve in this new and cheap form. We hope Messrs. Morgan and Scott's enterprise will be abundantly rewarded, and that we shall soon see further editions of the series. The volumes can be warmly recommended, both for reading and distribution.

ALPINE PROFILE ROAD BOOK. Compiled and Edited by R. H. U. Ellis. London: *Thomas Nelson and Sons*.

Issued by the Cyclists' Touring Club, and intended for use by cyclists in Switzerland, the Tyrol, and the Italian Lake District. It gives the profiles of the roads, with gradients, tables of distances and elevations, and notes on the passes. An admirable compendium, indispensable to all cyclists in the districts comprised.

ROOSEVELT: THE MAN. By W. Holt-White. London: *Andrew Melrose*. Price 1s. net.

A bright, interesting, well-informed, and well-illustrated sketch of the life of one who has been bulking very largely before the eyes of all men during the last few weeks.

THE GOSPEL IN HADES. By the Rev. R. W. Harden. Dublin: *Combridge and Co.* Price 1s. net.

The author's theme is that our Lord's death wrought a great change in the spiritual position of Old Testament saints. In the course of the discussion, the well-known passages in 1 Pet. iii. and iv. are considered with clearness and force. This little work bears evident marks of close study and of complete loyalty to the Word of God. It deserves careful attention, whether we agree with it or not. It will provoke thought and lead to study.

THE NEW TESTAMENT NAMES AND TITLES OF THE LORD OF GLORY. Arranged by A. R. Habershon. London: *James Nisbet and Co., Ltd.* Price 1s. net.

The name indicates the subject of this valuable little compendium. Our Lord's titles are shown to "teach us many things as to what He was, what He is, and what He will be." All Bible students should make a note of this book.



**POLITICAL PRIESTS AND IRISH RUIN.** By F. H. O'Donnell. London: *P. S. King and Son*. Price 1s. net.

Another of this author's trenchant criticisms of the political influence of the Roman priesthood in Ireland, which is shown to pauperize as well as demoralize the people. Written, as it is, by a Roman Catholic, it will carry weight with many with whom a Protestant writer would have no influence.

**TOWARDS EDUCATIONAL PEACE.** A Plan of Resettlement in English Elementary Education, issued by the Executive Committee of the Educational Settlement Committee. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. net.

Whatever may be our view of the education problem, the proposals found in this pamphlet deserve the most careful and close study on the part of all those who are interested in educational peace and progress. It should be in the hands of all Churchmen.

**THE COONEYITES, OR "DIPPERS."** By the Rev. Canon Armstrong. Dublin: *Church of Ireland Printing and Publishing Company, Ltd.* Price 7d. net.

Very few outside Ireland will know much, if anything, of the "Cooneyites," but our brethren across the Irish Channel are well aware of the trouble that these people have been causing during the last two or three years, by their wild, and yet specious, attacks on some of the deepest convictions of members of the Church of Ireland. This pamphlet will do capital service in refuting the absurd contentions of this sect, and we commend it to all who have been troubled by attempts at proselytism. It is sane, balanced, and thoroughly Scriptural.

**TALKS ON THE BOOK OF JUDGES.** By Rev. S. Levermore. London: *Morgan and Scott*. Price 6d. net.

A series of addresses on some of the more prominent Judges of Israel. An endeavour is made to apply the lessons of their lives to modern needs. There is a good deal of spiritualizing, but not a little helpful application.

**THE CHURCH'S GAIN FROM MODERN THOUGHT.** By the Rev. R. H. Kennett. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 6d. net.

We have seldom read anything which so clearly reveals the great gulf fixed between the Old Testament as it is and as it is being taught by leading exponents of the Higher Criticism. We cannot help saying that, if the views here set forth are true, we must speak, not of "the Church's gain," but of her very serious loss.

**THE ATHANASIAN CREED.** By the Rev. R. H. Malden. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2d.

A scholarly, able, and convincing plea for a modification of the present use of the Athanasian Creed.

**CHURCH PROPERTY.** By Sir Charles E. H. C. Healey. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2d.

Full of useful information about tithes and, generally, in support of the Establishment.

**ADVICE TO CHURCHMEN ABOUT TO EMIGRATE.** By Bishop Montgomery. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1d.

A number of practical hints, though here and there a little too definitely High Church for our liking.

**"SCALES WITHOUT WEIGHTS."** By Alex. Devine. London: *W. H. Smith and Son*. Price 2d.

A contribution to the all-important question of the religious training of preparatory-school and public-school boys. This should be pondered by all parents and teachers. It is full of wise thoughts well and ably put. It only needs a little more emphasis on the Holy Spirit of God to make it almost perfect in its way.

**OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE CONGO REFORM ASSOCIATION.** May, 1910. London: *Congo Reform Association*. Price 2s. 6d.

Full of valuable and important material for all those who are interested (as we all ought to be) in the grave question of Congo reform.

**THE CHURCH GAZETTE.** June, 1910. London: *National Church League*. Price 2d.

This truly admirable organ of the National Church League continues to provide month by month papers of permanent importance, which should be read and preserved by all who are interested in the defence and promotion of the Reformed Faith. Dean Wace's recent sermon at Cambridge, an article on the Coronation Oath, and a review of the recent edition of the Revised Version with Fuller References, constitute the leading articles of this number.