

# 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

January, 1910.

## The Month.

**The Church  
and Politics.** THE political situation created by the rejection of the Budget is full of difficult problems for Churchmen. On the one hand, there is the view ably and forcibly stated in our present issue by the Dean of Canterbury in justification of the exercise of the veto by the House of Lords. On the other hand, there is the view stated with equal force and weight by Sir Frederick Pollock in the *Spectator*, that the action of the Lords is "the most audacious attempt to subvert the foundations of Parliamentary Government which has been made since the Revolution of 1688." What, then, are Churchmen to do? The obvious reply is that everybody should be fully persuaded in his own mind. Some, like the Bishops of Lincoln and Bristol and the Dean of Canterbury, favour the action of the House of Lords. Others, like the Archbishop of York, are opposed to it. While still others, like the Archbishop of Canterbury, take up a position of neutrality. What we wish to urge is that each of these attitudes should be regarded as quite consistent with true Churchmanship. It is a fatal mistake, as two or three Bishops have recently pointed out, to identify the Church with any one political party, as has been too often the case in the past. We must insist on absolute freedom for Churchmen to be either Conservative or Liberal, without any reflection on their true loyalty to the Church. Like Sir Frederick Pollock, in referring to the position of Unionist Free Traders, Churchmen must not presume to judge and condemn

other Churchmen who take different views. We must "respect one another's convictions, retaining freedom to act on our own."

One issue at the present moment which is liable to become greatly confused is the question of Socialism. It is probably true to say that many people are opposed to what they call Socialism who do not possess any clear idea of what they mean by that term. Many earnest-minded people are charged with being Socialists, when all that they mean and want is social reform. We commend to all concerned the fine words of the Archbishop of York in his recent speech in the House of Lords :

"It is in an atmosphere of hopelessness and resentment against the social conditions existing, that the extreme and bitter Socialism we all deplore is engendered and flourishes. Give a man a better chance, give him a feeling that the social system is not against him but with him, for him, and on his side, and then his own individual instincts of energy and enterprise will be a more effective check against the development of Socialism than all the arguments that could be urged against it by more fortunate persons."

This strikes the right note. Social reform is one thing, the advocacy of cut-and-dried economic theories is quite another. Social reform will do more than anything else to destroy wild and impossible Socialistic schemes; while Socialism, as it is understood by many to-day, will undoubtedly do much to hinder true humanitarian and social reform. It is the special value of the Christian Social Union that it seeks to bring Churchmen together in the endeavour to consider existing circumstances with a view to social reform. It ought not to be impossible for us to unite in an effort to arrive at the best conclusion and to work with devotion for the true well-being of the people.

*The Deceased  
Wife's Sister's  
Case.*

The decision of the Court of Appeal confirming that of the Court of Arches has reopened this unhappy controversy, and revealed once more the apparently inextricable confusion of the situation. One plain fact is that the Law of the State is at variance with the existing Law of the Church, and yet Church and State remain united.

Another plain fact is that it is impossible to regard Mr. and Mrs. Banister as coming under the category of "notorious evil livers." Yet another plain fact is that Canon Thompson has as much right to his conscientious opinion on the subject of these marriages as anyone else. And so, on the one side, we have the Bishop of Birmingham pleading earnestly for the freedom of the Church, and, on the other, the *Record* deprecating the Bishop's action as detrimental to the continued relations of Church and State. It certainly seems impossible for the Bishop to obtain the freedom he demands without severing the bonds by means of Disestablishment. And thus confusion reigns all round. To those who believe that these marriages are not contrary to Scripture, and who remember that they are legal in other branches of the Anglican Communion, the objection to Mr. and Mrs. Banister's presence at Holy Communion is inconceivable. But there it is, and has to be reckoned with. The Archbishop of York the other day recommended that, while these marriages should not be celebrated in church, those who contracted them should not be refused Communion. We cannot think that this position is really tenable. Churchmen earnestly and anxiously await further developments, and it would not be surprising if the present difficulty led us much nearer to Disestablishment than we have been before.

The new Convocation which will come as the result of the new House of Commons will soon be faced with the thorny problem of Prayer-Book revision. The latest development in this connection will be found in the words of the Bishop of Birmingham at the recent Diocesan Conference. He called attention to a suggestion of Lord Halifax, and gave it his own endorsement. The point is so important that we must have the exact words :

"Any well-considered scheme which, leaving the Prayer-Book untouched, should give us, under the Additional Services Act, the legal right to use Prime and Compline and the Communion Office of the First Prayer-Book of King Edward VI., together with the Office for Anointing the Sick in that book, and which by sanctioning Prime should restore the Athanasian Creed

to its ancient place in Prime—I say any well-considered proposals of this sort I, for one, should welcome, and I am sure you would welcome too.”

Bishop Gore, in accepting this proposal, expressed the opinion that it is not “chimerical to hope that it might be fruitful of results.” He believes that there are a great many people, not all of one school of thought, who would welcome the permission for the use of the older Communion Office, and he also thinks that “there is a greatly increasing number of people within our Church, many of them Evangelicals, who feel that the sick have a right to appeal to the directions of St. James and to claim on Scriptural grounds the ministry of anointing.” We are not convinced that the Bishop of Birmingham has any solid warrant for thus speaking on behalf of Evangelicals, while we are perfectly certain that the anointing of the sick for which Lord Halifax pleads has little, if anything, to do with the Scriptural reference in St. James. Already the relegation of the Athanasian Creed to the Office of Prime, as proposed by Lord Halifax, has met with opposition by members of his own school, while Evangelicals are equally opposed, on very definite grounds, to the permissive use of the Communion Office of 1549. Indeed, it may be said that to the vast majority of Evangelicals it is absolutely “chimerical” to hope that these proposals will be fruitful in results. They will be satisfactory to none, and will be strenuously opposed by many. The sooner this is realized the better. It is certainly not this way that ecclesiastical peace lies.

Considerable attention has been given of late to the state of Evangelicals in the Church of England. By some the Evangelical party is said to be undergoing rapid disintegration, though we incline to think that in the case of those who express the opinion the wish is father to the thought. By others it is contended that Evangelicalism is really more influential to-day than ever. It should certainly never be forgotten that Evangelicalism has always been more of a pervasive influence than a definite

Evangelical  
Churchman-  
ship.

power as a party, and it is probably true to say that the essential principles of Evangelicalism have permeated the Broad Church and High Church schools in a very real way. The *Guardian* thinks that a new Evangelicalism is rising to which such questions as the Eastward Position, Coloured Stoles, Choral Celebrations, and Lighted Candles are matters of practical indifference. We are not so sure as the *Guardian* is that this is the case, because the Eastward Position, at least, is usually associated in the minds of Evangelicals with a doctrine of sacrifice in the Holy Communion which is repugnant to the Evangelical position. But the real question is, What is essential Evangelicalism as distinct from High Churchism? It is along such a line of inquiry that we shall truly discover whether Evangelicalism is a constant force. Here, for instance, are two cardinal questions: (1) Is the ministry properly and essentially described by the term "presbyter" or "priest" (*πρεσβύτερος* or *ιερεύς*)? (2) Does the act of consecration in the Holy Communion associate a presence in, with, or under, the bread and wine which was not there previously? On the answer to such fundamental inquiries the problem of Evangelicalism really turns.

*As Others*  
*See Us.* The question of Evangelicalism has created interest outside the Church of England, and it is useful to see how it is regarded by others. This is what one of the able organs of Methodism, the *Methodist Recorder*, says:

"Speaking as sympathetic outsiders, we feel that the Evangelical party needs leadership—glowing, courageous, inspiring—and statesmanship. The Evangelical thought has vitality in itself, apart from any sacramental setting. Its vitality is being proved abundantly every day in other communions, and we are fully assured that its day has not gone by in the Church of England. Among the members of that Church it is still mightily influential. The Church Missionary Society is the fullest and finest expression of it, and that Society is *facile princeps* among Missionary Societies. It implies an enormous Evangelical backing among members of the Church of England, and those members under adequate leadership can still demonstrate that the Evangelical party is *not* in a state of rapid dissolution. Where are the Evangelical Bishops who combine high courage with real statesmanship, and who at much cost of obloquy (for that is certain) will place themselves at the head of the hosts of Anglican Protestants who wait for the ringing message of a real leader?"

Nothing could be truer than these words. Evangelical thought indeed has "vitality in itself," and this vitality is being proved in a variety of ways. It only requires definite expression, constant emphasis, and true leadership, and with our contemporary, we would inquire where are the leaders, Bishops or others—but of course preferably Bishops—who will place themselves at the head of the hosts of Anglican Protestants? We do indeed "wait for the ringing message of a real leader."

**Evangelicals and Low Churchmen.** One of the commonest errors made by many in the present day is the confusion of Evangelicals with Low Churchmen. Dr. Eugene Stock has recently rendered great service by again calling attention to this serious mistake, and he shows that this strange confusion has led to the popular but erroneous idea that Evangelicalism was dominant in the Church in the first half of the nineteenth century. As a matter of fact, Low Churchmanship was dominant, not Evangelicalism. Readers of that excellent book, "A History of the Evangelical Party," by the Rev. G. R. Balleine, will recall this important point :

"It is necessary to emphasize the fact that the Low Churchmen and the Evangelicals were quite separate bodies. The clergy who only gave their flock a service once a fortnight, the clergy whose churches were falling to pieces through dirt and dampness and decay, the fashionable, card-playing clergy of the towns, the sport-loving, fox-hunting squarsons of the villages, were all Low Churchmen to a man, but some of them would have used very strong language if they had been called Evangelicals. Indeed, the whole Evangelical movement had been a protest and a struggle against the Low Church system, and the Low Churchmen had been the bitterest opponents of the Evangelicals."

However convenient the use of the terms High, Low, and Broad, may be, it would be well if Evangelicals always refused to be called Low Churchmen.

**A Fundamental Distinction.** From time to time we observe definite attempts to identify the Protestantism of the English Church with the rationalistic Protestantism of the Continent. The late Father Tyrrell's opposition to Protestantism is vitiated by this confusion, which was astonishing in so acute a thinker

and so well-informed a theologian. Several leading men of the extreme party in our Church constantly confound the two aspects of Protestantism in this way, and we are sorry to have to confess that the Bishop of Birmingham in his new book has not escaped the snare. But we wish to call special attention to a recent utterance of Bishop Hall of Vermont, U.S.A., who was formerly a Cowley Father. He takes the same line, and actually goes as far as to say that the ethical standard of Protestantism is lower than that of the Anglican Communion, and that it is "the absence of any fixed standard of Christian morals, or the practical failure to bear witness to it, or the substitution of some other to the Christian standard which is so deplorable in modern Protestantism." No wonder that our contemporary, the *New York Churchman* speaks out plainly in the following words :

"Of course Bishop Hall believes this. Nothing short of personal conviction would lead him to make such a reckless statement. It is simply astounding that an American citizen should make a claim so unfortunately exposed to the charge of Phariseism. Even Roman Catholic authorities freely bear witness to the work accomplished by Protestantism in ethical leadership. No Bishop of the American Church should be allowed, without protest, to charge Protestantism with this kind of failure and exalt his own communion as the standard-bearer of public morality. How can such sentiments forward Christian unity? They can only make the position of the American Church more difficult and paralyze its ministry of reconciliation."

Nothing could be more untrue to the facts of experience than the position adopted by Bishop Hall and those who think with him. On the contrary, we believe that the ethical standard in Evangelical Protestantism is decidedly higher and also truer to that of the New Testament than that of Anglo-Catholicism or Roman Catholicism. We have only to look round and test those countries and communities where Catholicism, Roman or Anglican, has chief sway.

Instead of reflecting on the supposed low standards outside our own Communion it would be in every way more salutary and useful to do a little self-examination. In the last number of the *Church Quarterly*

A Frank  
Confession.

*Review*, Professor Newsom of King's College, in an article on the late Father Tyrrell, refers to the way in which Tyrrell, during the last year of his life, felt himself drawn to the Church of England. Then he asks these pertinent questions :

"If he had joined us, what would he have found? Freedom from obscurantism in pulpit, press, and council? Clear solutions of his two great problems, 'What is revelation?' and 'What is Church authority?' Absence of legalism, Medievalist, Protestant, and Erastian? Superiority to shibboleths, a text, an Article, an Act of Parliament, a point of ritual, a dogmatic symbol, the catch-words of the third, or fourth, or sixth century, or of that line across Church history, mythical as the 'line' of the equator, which is called the undivided Church? We trow not."

This is the true way of facing facts and distinguishing things that differ. We believe that the words of Professor Gwatkin in his great work, "The Knowledge of God," are far truer to life when he remarks that "Evangelicals and Nonconformists are still the backbone of serious religion in England." And he goes on to say that "If they will only thank God and take courage they have it in them to represent religion more worthily than any who have gone before them" (vol. ii., p. 246).

The recent correspondence between the Bishop of Massachusetts and the Archbishop of Canterbury, on the proposed Consultative Body for the Anglican Communion, derives much of its value from the fact that it shows with great plainness the determination of the American Church to preserve its own independence in relation to the See of Canterbury. Any primacy which would in any way interfere with that independence will not be tolerated for an instant. This is how the New York *Churchman* characteristically puts it :

"The English Church and the Archbishop of Canterbury have so long assumed primacy over other Churches that it is difficult for English Churchmen and American Churchmen to look at these questions from the same standpoint. American Churchmen have, in their relations with the English Church, allowed themselves to be placed upon a Colonial basis so long that it is surprising to what lengths they allow courtesy and deference to lead them. How many American Churchmen realize and object to a situation so one-sided that while the American Church accepts a clergyman on letters from

a Bishop in England, American clergymen cannot be received in England, except under the terms of the Colonial Clergy Act, which are exceedingly humiliating even to Colonials themselves?"

There is great force in this contention, and it raises the question whether the provisions of the Colonial Clergy Act can much longer remain as they are. It is only on terms of absolute equality that the various branches of the Anglican Communion can live together and make true progress.

**Bishops and the Church.** We are also interested in the above-named correspondence because of the light thrown on the relations of Bishops to the whole Church. The main objection of our New York contemporary to the Consultative Body lies in the fact that the Lambeth Conference as at present organized is limited to Bishops only, instead of including representatives of each Church, Bishops, clergy, and laity, on an equal basis :

"The American Church, it is safe to say, will never accept what was asserted in the letter and in various resolutions and reports of the Lambeth Conference—namely, that the Episcopate represents the whole Church and possesses inherent authority to act for it; nor will it agree that Bishops possess any inherent power to organize the Churches from whom they receive their consecration, and to whom they are responsible."

This expresses New Testament truth on this important subject. The government of the Church was not given even to the Apostles, much less to Bishops or clergy. As St. Paul himself said, "Not that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy." The government of the Church is placed in the Church itself.

---

NOTE.—If any of our readers have copies of the number of the CHURCHMAN for January last which they are willing to spare, we shall be glad to pay for all that may be sent. Address : C Department, 62, Paternoster Row, E.C.

## 1910.

BY THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF CANTERBURY.

WE enter upon the New Year in circumstances of the gravest anxiety. It is not merely that the first two or three weeks will practically decide the result of a General Election, as they did in 1906, but that the issues at stake in that election are of the most vital consequence both to our Church and to our country. It is difficult, indeed, to name any period in our history since the days of the Commonwealth when questions of such import to our national and religious life were at stake. It is the combination of the two issues which carries our thoughts back to that momentous epoch. Now, as then, Church and State are alike menaced by changes which are nothing less than revolutionary. With the purely political issues we are not directly concerned in these pages; and it may be sufficient to observe that, if the present claim of the Liberal party for the supersession of the veto of the House of Lords had been in force in 1893, Home Rule would then have been established in Ireland. As Mr. Redmond has plainly told his supporters, the House of Lords, with its present powers, is the one efficient obstacle to Home Rule. That measure, with its disastrous consequences to the Protestant minority, has now been formally revived by Mr. Asquith as a part of the Liberal programme, and we cannot afford to dispense with a single barrier which may protect us from it.

But with this single reference to the momentous political issues which will be in a large measure determined during the next month, we pass to the great religious issues which more immediately concern us, and these would seem to be far graver than is generally appreciated. Perhaps one of the worst signs is that the world in general does not seem to realize that the religious problems of the day are really determining our political problems. This is, for instance, the case in Ireland. The ultimate source of our difficulties in that country is that the

Roman Catholic Church is an organized force, which marshals the mass of the population in permanent hostility to the ideals of English government ; and the question of Home Rule is a question whether the English and Protestant ideals of the North of Ireland shall be overridden by the "Irish ideas" which have been fostered by the Roman Church. But if we look abroad, we shall see on a broad scale the religious conflict which is agitating modern society. Similar movements of thought prevail over the whole European world, but are from time to time more clearly exhibited in one country than in another. The most portentous exhibition of the religious conflict of the moment is exhibited in France. In that country a Government is in power which ostentatiously proclaims the overthrow of all supernatural sanctions. One of the Ministers, M. Viviani, boasted that the lights in the heavens had been extinguished, and that men would no longer be distracted by such will-o'-the-wisps from the scientific realities of earth. His speech was, by order of the Chamber of Deputies, placarded throughout France ; and the worst sign of all is that no sense of horror seems to have been roused in the public mind in any country by this great blasphemy. The crucifixes which hallowed and awed every court of justice in France have been removed, and Christian faith is now a mere private opinion, which is not allowed to control the principles of French public life. There is a similar state of things in Italy ; and in Spain, though the Church is still officially supreme, the most anarchical and anti-Christian opinions are widely spread among the people, as was shown in the recent outbreak at Barcelona. There can be no reasonable question that this disastrous revolt against religion in the great Latin countries is due to the perversion of the Christian religion by the Roman Church. Wherever Romanism is held in check—as in Germany—by a strong Protestant influence, and a form of religion is thus maintained which is compatible with reason and conscience, there is, at all events, no such general revolt against Christian faith. But where Christianity is almost wholly represented by Romanism, with

its excessive superstitions and its demoralizing sacerdotalism, it is inevitable that the reason and conscience of thoughtful men should sooner or later revolt against it. Over a large part of Europe public life and national government are thus divorced from Christian, and even from all religious, influences. The inevitable result is a disastrous overthrow of every principle of authority, alike in national government and in the whole moral sphere. "There is no power," and no authority, "but of God"; and, consequently, where God is not recognized, there is no basis but that of force for any human authority. Sooner or later such a state of opinion must lead to anarchy, which, in turn, can only issue in the establishment of a military despotism.

But there is lamentable evidence that, in a less conscious and logical form, the same non-religious view of life has been growing rapidly of late in this country. The widespread neglect of the duty of public worship, and the disregard for the observance of Sunday, are alone sufficiently alarming symptoms. Men and women would not neglect the worship of God if they seriously recognized their allegiance to Him as the "King of kings and Lord of lords"; and they would not turn Sunday into a day of mere secular amusement if they had any sense of the privilege of spiritual communion with Him through prayer and meditation. The result is seen in the purely secular and partisan considerations which prevail in the discussion of all great public questions. Nothing, for instance, has been more lamentable than the disregard in the education controversy of the broad religious consequences which are at issue. If the importance of a true faith in God and Christ to the welfare of the nation had been the main consideration, the chief question in Parliament and the country would have been how children could be best brought up in that faith. But, instead of that, the question has always been how one form of religious teaching could be prevented from maintaining a predominance over others; and provided the quarrels arising out of this question could be appeased, the influence of any settlement on the religious life of the nation has been, for the most part, a secondary

consideration. But, to the mind of a true Christian, the supreme necessity for national welfare is that every child should be brought up in the fear and love of God in Christ, and that this influence should be supreme over all others in his education.

A similar disregard of the main religious interests of the country is apparent in those movements for Disestablishment which become daily more menacing. In the attacks which are made, for instance, on the Church in Wales, what sign is there that a consideration for the maintenance of the Christian faith and of a true Christian life among the people is supreme? To take only the question of Disendowment, can any reasonable man say that the funds which are now available for the maintenance of an effective Christian ministry in Wales are too large for the purpose? Is it not notorious that, especially in the great centres of population, they are far less than is needed, and that distressing appeals are made year by year, and not by the Church of England only, for voluntary additions to them? How, then, if the welfare of religion were really the first consideration, could it possibly be proposed to divert any part of these funds to secular objects? If a statesman really sat down to consider how the glory of God and the faith of Christ could best be promoted among our people, is it conceivable that he would begin by saying that the funds upon which the ministry of God's Word is supported should be reduced? It is very conceivable that he might propose that their application should be modified, and that they should be in some way redistributed with a view to their more effective employment. He might fairly contemplate some modification of existing establishments; but he would not consider simply how the jealousy of one denomination of Christians towards another could be most conveniently appeased, even at the sacrifice of necessary resources of religious influence. In a word, in none of these public problems do we see any other than secular considerations prevalent in the minds of politicians.

If we inquire what is the reason of this lamentable decay

of the religious spirit in the country, we fear we must attribute it in some measure to similar influences to those which in a more flagrant degree have been operative abroad. The Ritualistic movement has no doubt stimulated a certain type of religiousness, but it has not tended to strengthen the hold of the Christian faith among the stronger minds among us. The vehemence with which external matters of ceremonial have been pressed has obscured the weightier matters of faith, and with the inevitable opposition it has provoked on the other side it has led to the subordination in the public mind of the supreme interests of spiritual religion to those of ecclesiastical parties. The prominence given to some sacerdotal practices, and to superstitious views of the Sacraments, have alienated some of the sturdiest members of the English Church. Notwithstanding the example of some great preachers, particularly in London, the average character of preaching has greatly deteriorated, and Churchmen and Churchwomen are in a grievous degree deprived of that "food of God's Word," in which they seek the primary source of their spiritual life.

It is to be feared that not only this failure in Scriptural preaching, but the decay of religious authority of which we have spoken, is in great measure due to the manner in which the practical authority of the Bible has been undermined by the extreme critical teaching which has been prevalent in the two leading Universities. Men in general will never regard as inspired and authoritative a book of which large parts are declared to be "unhistorical" or, in plain words, untrue. Vital parts of the Old Testament are thus disparaged in the eyes of candidates for Holy Orders and of the public in general; and a Professor at the Universities even allows himself to speak of St. Luke having "allowed his own strong social sympathies to tinge his reports of Christ's language." When such suggestions are tolerated, the conception of inspiration is gone, in any sense which would enable us to submit our minds and hearts unreservedly to the authority of Scripture, even of the Gospels. As a further effect, the general authority of the great teachers

of former ages of the Church is destroyed; for, as I think Bishop Stubbs observed, the present treatment of the Old Testament would involve our repudiating the whole course of Scriptural teaching by the ancient Fathers. In our belief, more injury to the Christian faith has been done in this way by the reckless surrender of our Professors to German theories, and by the countenance shown to them in the school of the writers of "Lux Mundi," than by most of the other influences that can be named. It is now proposed by the Committee of the Lower House of Canterbury Convocation to eliminate from the Service for the Ordination of Deacons the question whether they unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament—a proposal which would have shocked every English Churchman from the days of the Reformers to those of Dr. Pusey.

To what does all this point but to the conviction that what we need above all things to hope and pray for in the coming year is such a revival by the Spirit of God of a living faith in Him, by means of a reassertion of the truth of His Holy Word, as will inspire our people in general with a renewed apprehension of the supreme importance of national allegiance to Him, and of national devotion to His service. No minor or secondary reforms will suffice to stay the irreligious infection which is spreading among our people. The Prayer-Book, for instance, no doubt needs, in some respects, a conservative revision in order to adapt it to the altered circumstances of our day. But no mere tinkering with the services, no mere compromises with Romanizing or rationalizing demands, will avail to restore the Prayer-Book and the Bible to the place and occupied in the life of former generations of Englishmen. The Prayer-Book as it stands has been sufficient, and is still sufficient, to sustain the deepest spiritual life in our people; and had better remain as it is, rather than that renewed up embittered strife should be threatened in every parish in the country by such alterations as the legal allowance of the Valuations, or by the proposal of the Bishop of Birmingham a

Lord Halifax for the permissive use of the first Communion Office of Edward VI. What is needed is a steady, though patient and considerate, enforcement of the obligation of obedience to the declared law on disputed points, and a concentration of the energy of clergy of all schools on the revival and deepening of faith in the great realities of the Christian Creed and in Holy Scripture. In political action Christian men ought resolutely to oppose policies and parties which would be injurious to the maintenance of a national religion among us, and which would reduce to a secondary place in our public life the obligations and influences of our faith. We may be quite sure that no social reforms will conduce to the permanent welfare of the poorer classes or of any classes unless faith in God and in Christ is maintained and deepened in the hearts of our people. As Lord Hugh Cecil said well the other day, all such social legislation is, at the best, mere machinery. That upon which the results depend is the spirit which animates those who employ the machinery and those on whom it operates; and if we would save our country from the anarchy and misery which menaces any Godless society, the time has come for subordinating all political and ecclesiastical quarrels to the one supreme necessity of reviving the old God-fearing and Christ-trusting religion which has been the foundation of the best English character and life.



## Jesus or Christ? <sup>1</sup>

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

“**J**ESUS or Christ?” This strange and disconcerting question is often forced on our notice at the present time, and it has a certain importance as summing up shortly a tendency of religious thought and indicating the nature of a

<sup>1</sup> Sermon (on Heb. xiii. 8) preached in Westminster Abbey, November 21, 1909.

religious experiment which is attracting some Christian people. Neither the tendency nor the experiment is really new, for we can produce parallels and equivalents of both from those distant ages when first the Gospel passed under the criticism and into the speculation of non-Christian and semi-Christian thinkers ; but both have taken unprecedented and distinctive forms in our own time. The tendency is towards a repudiation of the unique authority of the Gospel, and its absorption into an eclectic religion hospitable enough to admit into its pantheon every form of deity. This repudiation has perforce taken the form of a severance between the historical and the theological elements of Christianity—the substitution of an ideal for a person. I say this severance has been necessitated, because the truly distinctive factor in Christianity is precisely the combination of the historical and the theological elements ; and if the Gospel is really to be domesticated in the new eclecticism, it can only be by disallowing the history from which it has sprung. The experiment is being made by an application, or misapplication, of historical criticism to the Apostolic testimony enshrined in the New Testament. It is assumed to be possible to go behind the Apostolic testimony, and recover by a critical handling of the Gospels another and a truer version of the history of Jesus than that which the Apostles proclaimed and assumed. The result of this attempt is expressed in the challenge “Jesus or Christ?”—that is, history or faith, the facts certified by historical science, or the ideal built on them by generations of believers. It is taken for granted that the difference between history and faith is of such a character that the traditional unity of both is no longer permissible to thoughtful and well-informed men ; and we are assured that the surrender of the history as incompatible with the faith will really nowise injure the latter, because the faith is now so well entrenched in the respect due to its own merits that nothing can now affect its security. If we give up “Jesus” in deference to the “New Theologians,” we are free to keep “Christ,” and to clothe Him with whatsoever moral excellencies we may imagine to be becoming. I desire to

examine this strange and far-reaching proposal, which is made to us with so great a parade of exact knowledge and high ethical fervour.

Let it be noted that this proposal would not concern us here if it were advanced only by those who made no claim to speak as ministers of Christ. We could have no right, and would not wish to have any, to put shackles on the freedom with which our religion is discussed by men who do not themselves accept it; but the situation is different when, from within the Christian society itself, and from those who hold the chairs of authority in the Churches, teachings are put forward in the name of Christ which seem to undercut and disallow the treasured beliefs and indispensable postulates of Christian men. I do not say that even the acutest alarm may necessarily be well-grounded, nor would I ever make novelty as such the criterion of religious error; but these are circumstances which justify—nay, require—the attention of all Christian teachers, and must explain my present concern with the challenge which is implicit in the formula, “Jesus or Christ?”

1. Let me remind you that the suggested severance is absolutely incompatible with the Apostolic witness. The identification of Jesus and Christ took place at the very beginning of Christianity. It is the obvious assumption of all the New Testament writers, and almost immediately it received its formal expression in the double name which we have in the text, Jesus Christ. If we inquire what originally caused that identification, and what established it so firmly in the acceptance of the Apostles, we find the answer set forth very plainly in the New Testament. They were led to believe in Jesus as the Christ by their own close intimacy with Him during His ministry. There is no reasonable doubt that before the Crucifixion He had claimed to be the Christ, and that they had endorsed His claim. Jesus Himself had challenged them on the point. “Who do men say that I am?” He had asked them, in the way towards “the villages of Cæsarea Philippi”; and when they had replied by stating the various opinions respecting

Him which were current among the people, He had asked again: "But who say ye that I am?" To that question Peter had made answer in the tremendous confession, "Thou art the Christ."<sup>1</sup> That was the first Christian Creed: "I believe that Jesus is the Christ." To separate the two names, and propose a choice between them, is to stultify Apostolic witness from the first.

2. The "Christ idea" in the minds of the Apostles was at first—save in so far as their intimate association with their Master had modified it—quite conventional. They were nowise different from their contemporaries, whose Messianic expectations they shared. Perforce they invested their Master with the attributes of such a Christ as they had been trained to expect, and counted on such achievements by Him as they had been taught to regard as the very demonstrations of Christhood.<sup>2</sup> But the Crucifixion corrected this conventional faith. At first it seemed that their belief in Jesus as the Christ had been wholly destroyed. When the humiliated and terror-stricken disciples fled back from Jerusalem to their native Galilee they carried broken and empty hearts, and lives which were stamped with an intolerable and irrecoverable futility. Then happened the supreme event which restored and exalted their faith. The Crucified returned to them from the grave in which they had laid Him. They saw Him, and heard Him wondrously. He claimed them, rebuked their despondency, commissioned them for a grand ministry of witness, and parted from them with words of benediction. This restored and exalted faith in Jesus as the Christ was the creature of the Resurrection, and it at once dwarfed His earthly ministry into relative unimportance, and invested it with supreme and eternal significance. Let me emphasize the paradox. The living, present Lord, glorious and militant, absorbed all attention. In the fervour of the great assurance they went forth, clothed with

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* St. Mark viii. 27 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> *Cf.* St. Matt. xvi. 22; xvii. 10 *et seq.*; xix. 27; xx. 20 *et seq.*; St. Mark ix. 33 *et seq.*

power from on high, and "preached Christ." They had the demonstration of their message in the central element of their preaching: "Christ is risen." This was the summary of their Gospel: "They preached Jesus and the Resurrection."

3. This concentration of mind on the Lord Himself is naturally most conspicuous in St. Paul, for he had no treasure of holy recollections such as the original Apostles possessed from pre-Resurrection days. His own conversion had been effected by an appearance of the Risen Master, and his continuous labours as a missionary had been always holding him to the central fact that Christ was present in saving power with His Church. The opening words of the Epistle to the Romans exhibit the identification of Jesus and Christ in its full Pauline form, and indicate the manner of the Apostle's thinking on the subject. The passage has something of the aspect of a deliberate confession of faith: "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an Apostle, separated unto the Gospel of God, which He promised afore by His prophets in the Holy Scriptures, concerning His Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead; even Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom we received grace and Apostleship, unto obedience of faith among all the nations, for His Name's sake: among whom are ye also, called to be Jesus Christ's: to all that are in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints: grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." You observe that the identification of Jesus and Christ is conscious, categorical, and complete. A doctrine about His Person emerges inevitably. So much was necessitated by the history and contents of the Christ idea. If Jesus were the Christ, then it followed that He entered into possession of the prophecies which had drawn the picture of the Christ on the canvas of Scripture. If this prophetic ideal realized in Jesus were to be correlated with the fact of the Resurrection, and with the manifest and powerful action which called and

commissioned Apostles, and made their preaching mighty to save, then the prophetic ideal itself must be almost indefinitely enlarged and exalted. The Divine dignity—nay, the true Deity—of the Christ, whom St. Paul confessed in Jesus, emerged naturally in his language. As an evangelist, he was primarily concerned with preaching the Gospel of salvation in and through this Divine and reigning Person; the history of the private life and public teaching of Jesus could not take a principal place in that doctrine of “Jesus Christ and Him crucified,” to which avowedly St. Paul, in proclaiming the message, limited himself, and by which he gathered his converts. The Gospel was essentially contained in those grand acts of the Redemption which he enumerates to the Corinthians, and which bind Christianity fast for ever to the history of Jesus: “I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures: and that He was buried: and that He hath been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures: and that He appeared.”

4. While, however, the identification of Jesus and Christ implied such a concentration of mind on His Person, and on the supreme acts of the Redemption with which His earthly life closed and His risen life began, as to throw into relative obscurity the details of His history, it manifestly follows that those details, so far from being really cast aside as unimportant, were clothed with supreme interest and significance. It is nothing better than a grotesque travesty of the facts to say with a well-known London minister, writing in the recently published *Hibbert Journal Supplement*, that “the Christ of the Apostle Paul bore little or no relation to the actual Jesus of Galilee”; that “for Paul the earthly ministry of Jesus does not exist”; that “all he has to say about Christ could just as well have been said under any other name than that of Jesus.”<sup>1</sup> Such assertions are as mischievous as they are grotesque. They imply the plainly irrational assumption that the entire

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* Rev. R. J. Campbell's article in “Jesus or Christ?” p. 189.

teaching of the Apostle is to be found in the Epistles which the New Testament contains. They omit to allow for the knowledge about Jesus, which St. Paul takes for granted that the readers of those Epistles possess, and which they certainly had received from himself. Let me illustrate the argument from the undoubted Epistles of St. Paul. When, in order to persuade the Corinthians to contribute generously to the fund he was collecting for the poverty-smitten disciples of Palestine, the Apostle says: "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ that, though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor," could the words have been spoken with equal fitness about one who had not been as the Son of Man who was so poor that "He had not where to lay His head"? Is it not plain that the Corinthians knew enough of the history of Jesus to be able to appreciate the reference to His poverty? Again, when in the same Epistle St. Paul "intreats" the Corinthians "by the meekness and gentleness of Christ," could the appeal have been made with any effect if the Corinthians had not known what the Gospel narratives have to tell us about the character of Jesus? Or, in the Epistle to the Romans, when he commends his appeal for charitable self-suppression in the matter of meats by the statement that "Christ also pleased not Himself," does it make no difference whether the Romans could fill out the reference with a knowledge of the history of Jesus or not? Which is the natural supposition—that they could do his, and were intended to do so, or the contrary? When St. Paul bids the Galatians "bear one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ," does not the admonition owe most of its force to the fact that the life of Jesus had provided a supreme example of such service? Generally, does not the exhortation to "imitate" Christ in conduct imply a knowledge, such as our Gospels give us, of His earthly life? Does not St. Paul's practice of quoting specific commandments of the Lord as finally determining practical questions, such as those connected with marriage,<sup>1</sup> and, with the maintenance of the

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. vii. 10.

ministry,<sup>1</sup> imply on his part the highest possible estimate of the history of Jesus, and, on the part of his readers, a recognition of that history as forming, so far as it went, a supremely authoritative revelation of Christ's mind? Finally, if, with some eminent critics of our own time,<sup>2</sup> we may endorse the immemorial belief of Christendom with respect to the authorship of the third Gospel, we can be in no possible doubt that the Synoptic tradition of the Master's life, which St. Paul's "beloved Physician" compiled, was familiar to the Apostle, and underlies his references to Jesus.

5. Having postulated this groundless and quite improbable indifference of St. Paul to the history of Jesus, the writer I have quoted proceeds to describe the history itself as having no religious importance. It does not matter, according to him, whether the narratives of the New Testament are or are not true. He is even indifferent to the verdict they render as to the character of Him whom Christendom has ever worshipped as the Incarnate Son of God. He allows, indeed, that "the being who could inspire others with a faith in God which issued in such a consistent effort to live for the benefit of mankind must have been extraordinary," but immediately adds the terrible and profane assertion that He also was a sinner as the rest. Forgive me for inflicting on you the pain of listening to language so strange and so repulsive on the lips of a Christian minister: "To speak of Him as morally perfect is absurd; to call Him sinless is worse, for it introduces an entirely false emphasis into the relations of God and man." I cannot pretend to understand what is here meant, but there is no ambiguity about the main statement. The so-called "New Theology" is declared by its principal exponent to imply the sinfulness of Jesus.

Be it observed that in this teaching the "New Theology" contradicts the unanimous testimony of the Apostles. Even Schmiedel admits that "as far as Jesus is concerned, it is certain

<sup>1</sup> I Cor. ix. 14; *cf.* I Tim. v. 18; Acts xx. 35.

<sup>2</sup> *E.g.*, Harnack and Ramsay.

that all the writers of the New Testament assumed his sinlessness.”<sup>1</sup> Since Christ, the Object of Christian worship, is thus sharply parted from the Jesus of the Gospels, we perforce inquire what precisely we are to understand that we worship, when we, following the immemorial, continuous, and universal practice of the Church, offer prayers to Jesus Christ. We cannot pray to a fellow-sinner; it seems ridiculous to pray to a personified Ideal which we have fashioned for ourselves. “I maintain,” writes Schmiedel candidly, “a clear distinction between the terms ‘Jesus’ and ‘Christ’ in my own practice, and demand that it shall be maintained in the intercourse of theologians with one another; at the same time, we cannot count on laymen understanding the distinction and themselves observing it.”<sup>2</sup> Laymen will not stand alone in their inability to accept the distinction. “If Jesus was not God,” wrote Bishop Creighton shortly and clearly, “Christianity is not a religion, but a contribution to moral philosophy. But mankind wants a religion, and it is as a religion that Christianity works in the world.”<sup>3</sup> Schmiedel carries his complaisance for the layman so far as to suggest a form of prayer which might be addressed to this Jesus, whom he has severed from Christ.

“As to the special question of prayer to Jesus, it would perhaps be not impracticable that prayers which, to a deeper insight, ought to be addressed only to God, should be laid aside by a process of replacing them with others which no one feels reluctance in addressing to Jesus. Their content might be somewhat as follows: ‘Be Thou my guiding star; let Thy image stand ever before mine eyes; rule my heart; make me Thy disciple.’”

This is a singular formulary, and it is addressed to a singular object of worship. I do not think it is likely to replace the ancient forms of Christian prayer: “O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us; O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, grant us thy peace.”

6. A few days ago there was published the prayer which was actually used on November 4 in the City Temple, and

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* “Jesus or Christ?” p. 68.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 76.

<sup>3</sup> *Vide* “Life and Letters,” vol. ii., p. 256).

addressed to one who is evidently identified with the historic Jesus. In many respects it is a significant prayer, and deserves consideration by thoughtful Christians, who would discover whereto this "New Theology" is tending.<sup>1</sup>

"O Lord Christ, long as it is since Thou didst first speak on earth and in the flesh to humble toilers on the hillsides of Galilee, the toilers have not ceased to think about Thee, and the world can never again be as though Thou hadst not been. Men and women, weak and weary ones, sorrowful and sinful, have somehow learned to invoke Thee, to think Thou canst do great things on their behalf. If they have been mistaken it is a sad mistake, and the world is the poorer for having made it, the richer for having thought that Thou wast throned in heaven. But there has been no mistake; we feel, we know, that what Thou art ought to be enthroned at the heart of things, and we come to Thee, the One who ought to be enthroned, and therefore is; all the best instincts of our nature tell us so, and we ask Thee to help us. We are trying to fight the battle Thou hast fought, we are trying to win the victory Thou hast won. We have not fought so well, and we have not won yet, and we pray to Thee to help us here amid the darkness and the ignorance and the sorrow and the difficulty and the dangers of earth; help us that we may attain as Thou hast attained, and come home to what Thou art. We ask it for the sake of the love of God made manifest in man. Amen."

Now this is mostly a soliloquy, rather than a prayer. The reference to "the hillsides of Galilee" compels us to suppose that it is addressed to the historic Jesus—that is, to the very Person, whom the author of this prayer has told us bluntly it is absurd to regard as either morally perfect or sinless. In that case, what can the prayer mean, and what can it be supposed to effect? On the kindest estimate, is it more than a pietistic rhapsody which does equal credit to the heart, and violence to the reason, of the rhapsodist? If, indeed, our only security for the truth of the Christian revelation of "Our Father, which art in Heaven," is our conviction that what ought to be therefore is, where are we better off than those pre-Christian saints who hoped against hope for the victory of good? Experience is against us. Nature is against us. Our theory compels us to hold that not even in Jesus did the iron empire of evil and death fail of its triumph. Were it not better to face the terrible issue like men, and admit with St. Paul that "if Christ hath not

<sup>1</sup> *Vide the Christian Commonwealth*, November 10, 1909.

been raised, our faith is vain ; we are yet in our sins"? Contrast this prayer of the "New Theologian" with the prayer with which the Epistle to the Hebrews concludes : " Now the God of peace, who brought again from the dead the great Shepherd of the sheep with the blood of the eternal covenant, even our Lord Jesus, make you perfect in every good thing to do His will, working in us that which is well-pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ ; to whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen." There is strength, and Divine assurance, and strong reasonableness in that prayer, and it rises to heaven on the wings of that faith of Apostles and saints which hath overcome the world, even the faith " that Jesus is the Son of God."

7. " Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day, yea and for ever." These are not the words of a bigoted opponent of salutary change. They are not the great formula which is to disguise the little policy of mere obscurantism. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews must have sustained among his brethren the difficult and suspected rôle of a religious innovator. He was the author and advocate of a New Theology. All this adds immensely to the significance of his declaration. He lays hold of the fixed factor in Christianity, that which is the indispensable postulate of every sound theology, and the verifying element in all theologies ; and he offers it as the justification of his novel teaching, and the palladium of Christian faith. The Temple, he tells his Jewish fellow-disciples, will perish ; all that the Temple symbolizes and enables will pass away ; Jerusalem will be desolate, and the religion of national privilege, which has found its centre there, will come to an end ; but this immense demolition of sacred institutions and time-honoured traditions will not touch the core of your faith, nay, it will enable you to realize more truly what that core of your faith really is. You will find that the springs of spiritual life are in no system, but in the Person of the Lord, in whom every system must find meaning, apart from whom all systems are nothing. " Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day, yea and for ever." In Him Judaism has found its meaning, and lost its authority, and

reached its term. You must see Him henceforward in larger connections, and apply His teaching to new conditions.

8. After more than eighteen centuries, the Church of Christ is confronted by another crisis, different and yet similar. The same Christian teacher's words are again on our lips, but richly freighted with the confirmations of Christian experience, and we would find in them the courage to innovate, as well as the obligation to hold fast. We, like the Jewish believers of the second generation, who witnessed the downfall of the Jewish polity, must have a "New Theology" in order that we may gather up into our faith the lessons of experience, and the garnered fruits of human progress. Our clear perception of this necessity, and our frank acknowledgment of it, must not blind us to the essential condition of every change, which shall be progress and not retrogression. May we not still serve ourselves of the language of the New Testament in order to formulate that indispensable condition, which is to be for us, as for every previous generation of believers, the criterion of all theologies which claim our acceptance? "Hereby know ye the spirit of God; every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus is not of God." Does the "New Theology" bring the Saviour more effectively into the thought and life of our time? or does it, with whatever words of calculated compliment, banish Him farther from both? Is the new way of describing Jesus Christ better able to set Him as Saviour and as Judge before the sin-stricken society of our knowledge? Does the new reading of His life, and the new interpretation of His message, help men the better to perceive and to acknowledge His lordship? Does the "New Theology" make more, or less, of Jesus Christ than the old? Nay, the words were ill-chosen; there can be no less or more, for He is supreme, but is His supremacy vindicated and owned over a larger area of human life? As our science grows, and our experience multiplies problems and unfolds opportunities, is "the proportion of the faith" maintained, and Jesus Christ shown in an ever-

changing world to be "the same yesterday, and to-day, yea and for ever"? These are the questions which every theology must answer before it can justify its name, or warrant Christians in accepting it. Pour what new meanings you will, and must, into the disciple's profession, nothing can ever authorize any tampering with the profession itself: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."

But a so-called "New Theology," which proposes the impossible alternative, Jesus or Christ? and calmly accepts the blasphemous postulate of the Saviour's sinfulness, is not Christian theology at all, and needs no other arguments to determine its prompt and indignant repudiation at the hands of Christian men: "We have not so learned Christ."



## The Holy Communion as a Sacrifice.

BY THE REV. ARTHUR J. TAIT, M.A.

### A.

IT is no unwillingness to acknowledge indebtedness for the work as a whole which prompts the writer to criticize Mr. Darwell Stone's exposition of New Testament teaching in his "History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist,"<sup>1</sup> nor is it failure to appreciate the hopes with which that book has been sent forth on its mission; but it is because "the better understanding of the great doctrine," and the promotion of "the cause of peace," require candid statements of points on which men differ.

The method often adopted in an inquiry into the doctrine of the Holy Communion as found in the New Testament is, to start with, an examination of the words of institution and of St. Paul's teaching in the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

<sup>1</sup> "A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist." By Darwell Stone, M.A. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 2 vols. 30s. net.

There is, however, a better way. "No prophecy of Scripture is of private ['special,' R.V., margin—*i.e.*, 'its own'; Greek, *ιδίας ἐπιλίσεως*. Cf. John v. 18, viii. 44] interpretation":<sup>1</sup> no one passage may be interpreted independently of the whole. And in any question of doctrinal importance it is well to recollect the general bearing of Scripture on the subject before building a fabric of doctrine upon one or more isolated passages. Indeed, the only true approach to the interpretation of a particular passage of Scripture is through such recollection.

Mr. Stone reminds us of this principle of interpretation when he says that "in approaching the starting-point [*i.e.*, the institution of the Sacrament by our Lord] there are three preliminary considerations to be borne in mind."<sup>2</sup>

The third of these considerations is "the place which the administrations filled in the earliest Christian life, as shown in the New Testament records," and it is in connection with this statement and its illustration that I first find myself in serious disagreement with the writer. For what we want to know is not merely the place which the "administration" filled in the earliest Christian life, but also what place the whole conception of the Holy Communion occupied in Apostolic teaching. It is not enough to discover the place of the administration in the habitual round of Christian life, as indicated in the direct references to be found in Acts and 1 Corinthians; we must also discover what the general conception of the Holy Communion was, and what place it filled in Apostolic teaching. All Churchmen are agreed as to the importance of regular and frequent administration of the Lord's Supper: it is in our conceptions of its function and significance that we differ.

It might be argued that in respect of the doctrine of the Holy Communion this method is impossible, on account of the scantiness of the dogmatic teaching on the subject.

To that argument I would advance two answers:

1. It is a law of life that a man reveals, at least incidentally,

<sup>1</sup> 2 Pet. i. 20.

<sup>2</sup> P. 2.

the proportions of his mind. I cannot imagine the priest of a parish, where the sacrificial aspect of the Holy Communion is taught and emphasized, writing to the communicants of the congregation about the cultivation of their spiritual life without mentioning the Holy Communion. The phenomena of life forbid me to think of such a priest writing to his people such a general letter of instruction and exhortation, containing reference to faith, prayer, the need of a knowledge of God's Word, alms-giving, etc., and saying nothing about attending the sacrifice or receiving the Holy Communion.

But the Apostles were men, and what is natural for us was natural for them. It matters not that they did not set themselves to write dogmatically about the Lord's Supper, for if "the sacrificial aspect of Christian life has its centre in it,"<sup>1</sup> or if "the Holy Communion is the centre of the earthly life and worship of Christians,"<sup>2</sup> the teaching must have come out, at least incidentally, when the Apostles were writing about the spiritual life. If the Lord's Supper was for them *the* Christian sacrifice, holding a similar position and performing a similar function in the Christian Church to that of the Levitical sacrifice amongst the Israelites, they must have revealed that belief when treating of Christian life and worship.

And consequently an important line of preliminary investigation is the examination of Apostolic teaching on the subject of the spiritual life.

2. There are other ways, in addition to that of direct reference, in which the Apostolic conception of the Lord's Supper has found expression.

For if the Lord's Supper is a propitiatory ordinance, then the minister is a propitiatory priest. What, then, is the general teaching of the New Testament on the subject of the Christian ministry?

Again, if the Lord's Supper is a propitiatory ordinance, it can only be because in it the Church on earth unites herself through the action of the priest with the work of Christ in the

<sup>1</sup> P. 21.

<sup>2</sup> P. 16.

heavenly sanctuary. What, then, is the teaching of the New Testament about the heavenly ministry of Christ?

I may note in passing that Mr. Stone simply passes over these two fundamental points of inquiry. His examination of the teaching of the New Testament takes no account of the teaching on the Christian ministry, and assumes, without discussion, a particular view of the heavenly ministry of Christ as "an abiding heavenly sacrifice."<sup>1</sup>

To sum up this introductory point, I accept Mr. Stone's position that the right approach to the study of the words of institution is the general examination of New Testament teaching, but I refuse to limit that examination to an inquiry as to the place which the *administration* occupied in the primitive worship. I claim that the general conception of the ordinance must be ascertained from the Apostolic writings. For the more vital the function which the Lord's Supper is regarded as fulfilling in the life and worship of Christians, the more certain is it, according to the laws which govern us, that its importance will be revealed, at least incidentally, in any instruction given about spiritual life; and also, seeing that the doctrine of the Holy Communion is bound up with the doctrine of the Christian ministry and of the mediatorial work of Christ, the examination of Apostolic teaching on these cognate subjects forms a natural part of the preliminary investigation.

## B.

Turning, then, to an examination of the general bearing of New Testament teaching upon the subject of the Lord's Supper, we note the following points:

1. There is only one out of all the Epistles which contains any explicit reference to the sacred ordinance. The allusions in 1 Corinthians are sufficient in themselves to show that it was "an ordinary and recognized part of Christian life," "an habitual element in the worship of the Corinthians." And when to these we add the references in Acts, we have "suffi-

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 16, 21.

cient indication of its place in the habitual round of Christian life." But how are we to explain the general silence of the Epistles? How came it that St. Paul could write three Epistles, whose central thought was the life in Christ, and never mention the Lord's Supper? and three Epistles on the subject of Church life in general, and the qualifications and duties of Christian ministers in particular, without so much as a reference to the Lord's Supper? And how are we to explain the omission of reference in the writings of St. Peter, St. John, St. James, St. Jude, and the author of Hebrews?

This silence, moreover, becomes the more remarkable when it is contrasted with the mentions which are made of such subjects as faith, prayer, and the necessity of growing in spiritual knowledge.

That the Apostles assumed that discipleship of Christ necessarily involved a faithful use of the ordinance may, in the light of Acts and 1 Corinthians, be regarded as indisputable; and this would explain the omission of any exhortation to use the ordinance. The idea which seems to prevail amongst some people in our own day that the use of the Lord's Supper is for the inner circle, and not for the ordinary churchgoer, was non-existent in the Apostles' days. Absence from the Lord's Table was caused by the exercise of Church discipline, and was not a normal feature of life. There was, therefore, no reason at that time for such exhortation as is often found to be necessary in the present day. But this does not sufficiently explain the silence to which we have referred. If the Lord's Supper was the central thing in Christian life, affording the opportunity for the highest act of worship, securing for the worshippers a special and peculiar presence of the Lord, providing the one opportunity of offering this sacrifice in behalf of living and of dead, would the fact that its necessity was recognized by all have kept the Apostolic writers from making any mention of it? To put the question in another way, Do the clergy who accept this estimate of its importance and significance forbear to mention it at meetings of their com-

municants, because there is no need to exhort them to make a faithful use of the ordinance? Such an idea involves a denial of the phenomena of life. Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. The greater the importance which men attach to a subject, the more certain it is that they will utilize suitable opportunities for expressing their thoughts about it. What, then, are we to say about Apostolic descriptions of the nature of the Christian's conflict, and the ways and means of waging it successfully, which omit all reference to the Lord's Supper?<sup>1</sup> and about similar omissions in instructions on the corporate life of the Church, and on the relation of the new dispensation to the old,<sup>2</sup> and on the attitude of the living towards the blessed dead?

It is hard to believe that such phenomena are compatible with views of the Lord's Supper, which regard it as the central thing in Christian life and worship, and assign to it a place and function which correspond to that of the Levitical sacrifices under the old dispensation.

Experience proves that it is quite possible to regard the sacred ordinance as an habitual element in worship, and to assign to it a place in the habitual round of Christian life, without exalting it to a position which throws into the shade all other means of worship and grace, and brings it into the foreground of instruction and preaching. And this seems to be the only possible explanation of the silence of the Epistles. But it is extremely doubtful whether the emphasis required by the sacrificial view of the Lord's Supper is compatible with such an explanation.

2. Nowhere in the New Testament is the Christian minister distinctively called a priest (*ιερεὺς*). It is difficult enough to explain the omission in the enumeration of the different kinds of ministry given in 1 Cor. xii. 28 and Eph. iv. 11, considering the fact that, according to the sacerdotal view of the ministry, the sacrificial aspect is vital to the conception; but it is to me

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Eph. vi. 10-18.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., Col. iii. 16 *et seq.*; Heb. viii.-x.; 1 Thess. iv. 13 *et seq.*

quite inconceivable that St. Paul should have written three Epistles expressly on the subject of Church life, including directions as to the qualifications and duties of the minister, and should not have even indicated that this most essential aspect of the ministry was included in his conception.

Equally inconceivable is the silence of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

“The writer of the Epistle speaks of Christian sacrifices and of a Christian altar, but the sacrifices are praise and thanksgiving and well-doing, the altar is apparently the Cross of Christ.<sup>1</sup> If the Christian ministry were a sacerdotal office, if the Holy Eucharist were a sacerdotal act in the same sense in which the Jewish priesthood and the Jewish sacrifice were sacerdotal, then his argument is faulty and his language misleading. Though dwelling at great length on the Christian counterparts to the Jewish priests, the Jewish altar, the Jewish sacrifice, he omits to mention the one office, the one place, the one act, which on this showing would be their truest and liveliest counterparts in the everyday worship of the Church of Christ.”<sup>2</sup>

3. The New Testament teaching about the heavenly ministry of our Lord repudiates the idea of the continuance both of His sacrifice and of the offering of it.

Abiding efficacy, eternal validity, of the one sacrifice once offered there assuredly is; but this must be carefully distinguished from abiding sacrifice, continual offering. The dogmatic language of the New Testament invariably uses the metaphor of sitting in describing the ministerial posture of our Lord in heaven, and this metaphor has the definite significance of completed offering. One decisive passage will be sufficient to illustrate the point :

“Every priest, indeed, *standeth* day by day ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifice, the which can never take away sins; but He, when He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, *sat down* on the right hand of God. . . . For by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.<sup>3</sup> . . . Now, where remission of these (*i.e.*, sins and iniquities) is, there is no more offering for sin.”

It would be impossible to find language which could more decisively assert the fact that both the sacrifice and the offering

<sup>1</sup> Both Westcott and Lightfoot repudiate the idea of reference here to the Lord's table.

<sup>2</sup> Lightfoot, “Essays on the Christian Ministry: Epistle to the Philippians,” p. 265.

<sup>3</sup> Heb. x. 11-18.

of it are in themselves things of the past. The pleading of the merits of the completed offering, the using of the virtue of the accomplished work, these are continuous; and "the propitiation itself is something eternally valid";<sup>1</sup> but the idea of a continual offering, a continual representation of the offering, a continual propitiation, is ruled out.

The perpetual intercession of Christ is not that of the Aaronic priesthood. He is a priest after the order of Melchizedek, and that is the order of the King-Priest; it is a royal priesthood. It is as King that Christ is also Priest; it is as seated on the throne that He also intercedes.

In the words of Bishop Westcott:

"The modern conception of Christ, pleading in heaven His Passion, 'offering His blood' on behalf of men, has no foundation in this epistle.<sup>2</sup> His glorified humanity is the eternal pledge of the absolute efficacy of His accomplished work. He pleads, as older writers truly expressed the thought, by His Presence on the Father's throne. Meanwhile, men on earth in union with Him enjoy continually through His Blood what was before the privilege of one man on one day in the year."<sup>3</sup>

It is because of the vital necessity of distinguishing between the continuance of the offering and its eternal validity that the ambiguous phrase, "the abiding heavenly sacrifice," is open to objection.

There is no inherent reason why the continuous pleading of the merits of the one offering should not be done on earth by means of symbol, and the question as to whether the Holy Communion provides the occasion of such *symbolic* pleading depends entirely upon what we are told in Scripture about its nature and purpose.

### C.

We pass on now to consider the passages in the New Testament which refer directly to the Lord's Supper.

(a) "This is My body." Mr. Stone argues that the words signify an identity of the bread and the body of Christ, which

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Westcott, quoted by Stone, p. 17.

<sup>2</sup> *I.e.*, Hebrews.

<sup>3</sup> Westcott, "Hebrews," p. 230.

involved the presence of the glorified Christ in the elements on the night of the institution.<sup>1</sup>

In support of the latter part of the proposition, Mr. Stone refers us to the Transfiguration, when the Lord, "in the days of His humiliation in the course of His ministry, possessed by anticipation in His human nature the glory of His ascended life." The alleged analogy requires some further explanation. Are we to believe that Jesus was not in His natural state on the night of the institution, but was transfigured once again before the eyes of the Apostles? No indications can be found of such a transformation in the records of the institution. And, if it did take place, how could the Gospel narratives which give an account of the institution have failed to relate such a startling experience?

Or are we to suppose that Jesus remained in His natural state before the eyes of the Apostles, but in some unexplained way was also in His spiritual state in the elements? If so, the analogy falls to the ground; for at the Transfiguration Jesus was not present in both the natural and the spiritual states at the same time.

While discussing this question of identity, we may notice that in his explanation of the words, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood," Mr. Stone is content to speak about what "the phrase *implies*"<sup>2</sup>—viz., not identity of the cup and the covenant, but of the contents of the cup and the blood. What, then, we may ask, becomes of the argument that the words, "This is My body," *assert* an identity of the bread and the body? And, further, can we believe that the words, "This cup is the new covenant," would ever have been substituted for the words, "This is My blood," if this conception of identity had been in St. Paul's mind? Bishop Westcott wrote:

"ταῦτο ἐστὶ must be taken in the same sense in 'This is My body' and in 'This cup is the new covenant.' It cannot be used of material identity."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 7, 20.

<sup>2</sup> P. 7.

<sup>3</sup> Westcott's "Life and Letters," ii. 354.

There is one other point in Mr. Stone's treatment of these words which calls for notice. He criticizes the "explanation that bread and wine are means, and only means, by which the faithful communicants may spiritually receive Christ,"<sup>1</sup> on the ground that "the alternatives are only two—'This is in fact My body,' or 'This represents My body'; not three—'This is in fact My body,' 'This represents My body,' 'This is a means by the reception of which My body may be spiritually received.'"

But does anyone interpret the words, "This is My body," in the third sense? The third interpretation is not an explanation of the words "This is My body," but of the whole institution. The bread represents the body, and the bread has to be taken and eaten. The bread is therefore, according to this view, a means (and only a means) by which the faithful communicant receives the body spiritually. But the words "This is My body" in themselves signify nothing more than "This represents My body."

In addition to these detailed criticisms, the position adopted by Mr. Stone in interpreting these words is open to the serious objection that whereas it is made to rest on their alleged obvious meaning, the fact remains that the more literally the words are taken, the more impossible it is to regard them as signifying identity. According to the literal and obvious meaning, the bread is not Christ, nor the blood of Christ, but the "body which is given," as distinguished from the blood, and that alone; and the wine is not Christ, nor the body of Christ, but the "blood which is shed," as distinguished from the body, and that alone. And inasmuch as the "body which is given" and the "blood which is shed" no longer exist either separately or in combination, it follows that the conception of identity is ruled out.

The whole genus of views (of which Transubstantiation is only one species) which seek to identify in any sense the elements with Christ depend upon the theory of concomitance

<sup>1</sup> P. 19.

in order to make them even possible, and involve the abandonment of the plain meaning of the Lord's words. As Bishop Westcott wrote :<sup>1</sup>

“ One grave point I am utterly unable to understand—how ‘ the body broken ’ and ‘ the blood shed ’ can be identified with the Person of the Lord. I find no warrant in our Prayer-Book or ancient authorities for such an identification.”

And again :

“ The circumstances of the institution are, we may say, spiritually reproduced. The Lord Himself offers His body given and His blood shed. But these gifts are not either separately (as the Council of Trent), or in combination, Himself. It seems to me vital to guard against the thought of the Presence of the Lord in or under the form of bread and wine. From this the greatest practical errors follow. The elements represent the human nature as He lived and died for us under the conditions of earthly life.”

(*b*) “ Do this.” Mr. Stone admits that the writers of the early Church and the compilers of the Liturgies understood the words to mean, “ Perform this action.”<sup>2</sup> But whereas he devotes only four lines to the statement of this important evidence, he devotes no less than nineteen lines to an argument that the word “ do ” might mean “ offer ” if the context were sacrificial. No one will care to dispute this, for not only is it self-evident, but also the actual use of the word *ποιεῖν* in the New Testament reveals it to be a colourless word, deriving its significance in all cases from its context, and never giving a significance to its context. Thus, it may mean “ to keep,” if the context relates to a feast (Matt. xxvi. 18); “ to spend,” if it relates to time (Acts xx. 3); “ to bring forth,” if it relates to fruit-bearing (Matt. xiii. 33); etc.

Hence the important matter is not whether *ποιεῖν* may mean “ to offer,” but whether this particular context is sacrificial. And Mr. Stone's reference to this point cannot be regarded as satisfactory. He seems to regard this context as sacrificial because “ in its origin the Passover was a sacrifice in which deliverance was accomplished by means of blood, the symbol

<sup>1</sup> Westcott's “ Life and Letters,” ii. 351.

<sup>2</sup> P. 9.

of life.”<sup>1</sup> If this argument is sound, it might involve us in the assertion that because in its origin the Passover was followed by the Exodus, therefore every subsequent celebration of the Passover must have been accompanied by a similar experience. We can pass by the question as to whether the Passover was even in its origin a sacrificial ordinance; for the Holy Communion is related, not to the original celebration, but only to the annual commemoration of it.

To quote Bishop Westcott again :

“ In the context in which the words occur I have not the least doubt that *τοῦτο ποιᾶτε* can only mean ‘ Do this act ’ (including the whole action of hands and lips), and not ‘ Sacrifice this. ’ ”<sup>2</sup>

(c) “ For My remembrance.” It is true that the word *ἀνάμνησις* in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament is used for that which brings to remembrance a memorial both before God and before man. But of the five occasions on which it is used, only one<sup>3</sup> is connected with the propitiatory offerings, and even there it is probably the trumpets rather than the sacrifices which are spoken of as the means of the memorial. In the other passages the word is used of the memorial before God made by means of the shewbread, of the memorial, or bringing to remembrance, made by means of Psalms, and for the bringing of God's laws to man's remembrance through trouble.<sup>4</sup>

Mr. Stone has, therefore, not underestimated the evidence of the Septuagint when he says: “ While it suggests, it does not necessitate the sense of a sacrificial memorial before God.” The alleged suggestion, however, seems to be silenced by the usage of the New Testament. For, on the one hand, the only other context in which the word occurs in the New Testament requires the sense of remembrance by man;<sup>5</sup> and, on the other hand, the word used for memorial, both in the Gospels and Acts, is not *ἀνάμνησις*, but *μνημόσυνον*.<sup>6</sup> The most natural

<sup>1</sup> P. 9.      <sup>2</sup> Westcott's “ Life and Letters,” ii. 353.      <sup>3</sup> Num. x. 10.

<sup>4</sup> See titles of Ps. xxxviii., lxx.; Wisd. xvi. 6.

<sup>5</sup> Heb. x. 3.      <sup>6</sup> Matt. xxvi. 13; Mark xiv. 9; Acts x. 4.

meaning of the phrase, therefore, seems to be "for My remembrance"—*i.e.*, "to keep Me in remembrance."

(*d*) 1 Cor. x. 16-21. In his explanation of this passage, Mr. Stone says: "St. Paul here treats the Eucharist as having in the Christian religion a position in some respects parallel to the sacrifices to demons in the heathen rites,"<sup>1</sup> but he makes no mention of the change of terms introduced by the Apostle.

Bishop Lightfoot's comment on the passage is as follows:

"Some interpreters, from a comparison of 1 Cor. ix. 13 with x. 18, have inferred that St. Paul recognizes the designation of the Lord's table as an altar. On the contrary, it is a speaking fact that in both passages he avoids using this term of the Lord's table, though the language of the context might readily have suggested it to him, if he had considered it appropriate. Nor does the argument in either case require or encourage such a reference. In 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14, the Apostle writes, 'Know ye not that they which wait at the altar are partakers of the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.' The point of resemblance in the two cases is the holding a sacred office; but the ministering at the altar is predicated only of the former. So also in 1 Cor. x. 18 the *altar* is named as common to Jews and heathens, but the *table* only as common to Christians and heathens—*i.e.*, the holy Eucharist is a banquet, but it is not a sacrifice (in the Jewish or heathen sense of sacrifice)."<sup>2</sup>

(*e*) 1 Cor. xi. 26-30. Mr. Stone allows that the primary meaning of the words "ye do proclaim" appears to be "that the memorial instituted in the Eucharist is a memento set up in the Church as a reminder to Christians";<sup>3</sup> but in view of what he has said about other passages, he finds it difficult to exclude the further idea of a sacrificial memorial and presentation before God.

Apart from the question as to whether the other passages admit of the sacrificial interpretation, inclusion of the further idea would be more conceivable if the order could be inverted. If the primary meaning were the making memorial before God, it might be possible to conceive of the making memorial before man as a secondary idea. But it is exceedingly difficult to entertain the idea that the Apostle had the two aspects of the

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot, "Essays on the Christian Ministry: Epistle to the Philippians," p. 265.

<sup>2</sup> P. 13.

<sup>3</sup> P. 14.

memorial in his mind, and made his language refer primarily to the memorial before man.

Moreover, he uses a term which is regularly employed for making an announcement to man. The word *καταγγέλλεω* is of frequent occurrence, and always has that association.

The view which this paper is intended to represent of the teaching of the New Testament on the question as to whether the Holy Communion is a sacrifice may be summarized as follows :

(1) Negatively : (a) There is no indication that the Holy Communion is an ordinance which corresponds to the Jewish sacrifices.

(b) There is nothing in the language of the New Testament which suggests that the Holy Communion was intended to be regarded as a sacrifice.

(2) Positively : (a) The Holy Communion takes the place of the Passover celebration (which was not sacrificial) as a memorial of the completed offering which procured our redemption.

(b) The analogy of the Passover and the language of the New Testament require the conception that the memorial is before man.

(c) The word *ἀνάμνησις* permits (but its use in the New Testament does not favour) the idea that the memorial is also before God, but there is no suggestion that such memorial is in itself sacrificial.

#### D.

Reference must be made in closing to the use of sacrificial language found in subsequent Christian writings.

The Fathers employed sacrificial terms in speaking of the Eucharist, but the use of such terms must be judged in the light of their general teaching.

St. Augustine's definition of a sacrifice is "every act which is performed in order that we may cleave unto God in Holy

Communion, such act being referred to Him as our Sovereign Good, by which alone we can enjoy true felicity.”<sup>1</sup>

Accepting that definition of sacrifice, we should feel no difficulty in using sacrificial language of the Holy Communion; but it illustrates the necessity, before we claim the Fathers as sanctioning such language, of understanding in what sense they use it.

The Fathers, again, speak of Christ being daily offered on the altar. But such language was only used in a certain sense, which is made clear by other expressions in their writings—*e.g.*, St. Chrysostom, in his comments on Heb. x. 9, says: “We do not offer another sacrifice, as the high-priest did formerly, but always the same”; and then, in explanation, he adds, “or, rather, we make a commemoration of a sacrifice.”<sup>2</sup>

St. Augustine writes:

“Christians in the holy oblation and participation of the body and blood of Christ *celebrate a memory* of the same sacrifice which has been accomplished.”<sup>3</sup>

And again:

“Was not Christ offered once in Himself? And yet He is offered in the Sacrament at Easter and every day; nor does anyone say what is false when he affirms Him to be offered. For if Sacraments had not a resemblance to the things of which they are Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments at all. But from this resemblance they derive the names of the things themselves.”<sup>4</sup>

Mr. Stone<sup>5</sup> points out that the use of a sacrificial phraseology by the early Fathers must be considered in the light of their interpretation of Mal. i. 11, “In every place incense is offered unto My name, and a pure offering,” which was generally regarded as “a prophecy of Christian worship, and in particular of the Eucharist.” There can be little doubt that the interpretation is a mistaken one, for the language is not that of prediction, but description, referring in all probability to the

<sup>1</sup> “De Civ. Dei,” x. 6.

<sup>2</sup> μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας.

<sup>3</sup> “Peracti ejusdem sacrificii memoriam celebrant” (C. Faust., xx. 18).

<sup>4</sup> Ep. ad Bonifac., xxiii.

<sup>5</sup> P. 49.

worship in heathen countries of Jews of the dispersion, as being more acceptable to God than the unworthy worship of the more privileged priests of the temple. And even if it be regarded as prediction, the language in which it is expressed is obviously determined by the circumstances of the writer. A literal fulfilment is no more to be expected of those words of Malachi than of the prophecy of Zechariah—that on the bells of the horses there shall be written, “Holiness unto the Lord.”

The use which the early Fathers make of the passage suggests that their sacrificial phraseology is to be traced to their misunderstanding of its import; and then, having once been admitted, it was justified by later writers on the ground that similitude and representation permit the transmission of names. So Augustine in the passage quoted above, and the schoolmen Peter Lombard and Peter of Poitiers.

Peter Lombard writes :<sup>1</sup>

“What is presented and consecrated by the priest is called a sacrifice and an oblation, because it is the memorial and representation of the real sacrifice.”

Similarly, Peter of Poitiers writes :<sup>2</sup>

“Christ is sacrificed in the Sacrament, and this sacrifice is called a sacrifice simply for the reason that it represents the real sacrifice which was once made with extended hands on the cross. As a picture represents that of which it is an image, and as an image is called by the name of the thing which it signifies, so this sacrifice is called by the name of the real sacrifice, which was once made.”

Experience, however, has proved that the use of such language was unwise. It led in time to the doctrine which the Roman Church now holds—that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

The reaction from medieval developments led to the elimination from our services, not merely of everything which suggested the offering of propitiatory sacrifice, but also of all reference to the making memorial before God of the one

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Stone, i. 306.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, i. 307.

sacrifice once offered. And perhaps it was safer and better so, but it strikes the present writer as a loss; it would have been in keeping with very early Christian thought to have preserved the idea of such commemoration.

Mention has not been made of the Holy Communion as the occasion for offering the sacrifices of self, alms, and praise—though in all these subsidiary senses it has sacrificial associations—because the point of dispute is as to its relation to the offering of Christ. Scripture and the Fathers alike limit that relation to one of commemoration and representation.

The pioneers of theological expression used sacrificial language to signify that relationship, but its association with later developments of doctrine has robbed it of the innocent meaning which it once had, and therefore it seems undesirable in the present day to claim the same liberty of expression which the pioneers in theology exercised.



## Home Reunion: A Wesleyan Outlook.

BY THE REV. DINSDALE T. YOUNG.

WITH a willing mind I add a few notes to the discussion of Home Reunion. Let me first of all say that I speak in no representative capacity. No one beyond myself is involved in the opinions I express. As an individual Wesleyan, and only as such, do I contribute to these pen-conversations.

Whilst this is emphatically so, I yet may claim that there is in Wesleyan Methodism a not inconsiderable body of opinion which coincides with my own. And, at the risk of egotism, I will add that I have peculiar opportunity of ascertaining the views of the rank and file of our Wesleyan ministry and laity, seeing that I have probably visited more of our churches than any living minister, and every week of my life I am going in and out among them.

Modern Wesleyanism is ecclesiastically composite. Divers

types are represented among us. Many of us are Dissenters in the strict definition of the term, which I understand to be opposition to the existence of an Established Church. Many of us (but probably a minority) are not in any wise Dissenters. Some do not even allow themselves to be called Nonconformists. They do not habitually or even frequently conform, but they have no inherent objection to conforming to the ways and customs of the Established Church of England. I believe I faithfully reflect the shades of opinion in the Church I have these many years loved and served.

Personally, I always decline to be called a Dissenter. I believe, and increasingly believe, in the principle of an Established Church; and were a conflict to arise on this question, I should not hesitate to defend my convictions. I respond in large degree to the position which Dr. Chalmers assumed on this subject. I feel sure that I am by no means alone among my brethren in subscribing to this position.

Let me frankly say that I am by preference a Nonconformist, but I could, without violating conscience, conform to what is *essential* in the institutionalism of the Church of England. The late Dr. Rigg was accustomed to say that he could conceive of himself accepting the hospitality of the Established Church; and I would follow that great man in such an assertion.

Having thus candidly expressed myself as to my angle of vision, let me with equal candour proceed to contemplate certain considerations which bear not remotely upon Home Reunion.

Assuredly there is a deepening desire among Christians everywhere for real union. We appreciate with reverent gratitude and hope the scope of our Divine Lord's High-Priestly prayer, and we would sacrifice many a personal preference if thereby true Catholicity might be achieved. We do not crave uniformity. Christian union is independent of uniformity. None the less, we see the immense moral advantage of a larger uniformity. "The man in the street"—and he is a man whose soul we must care for—can with difficulty distinguish between unity and uniformity. And, beyond doubt,

a quickened approximation towards uniformity would demonstrate Christian unity much more effectively.

How far, then, may it be supposed the school of Wesleyans to which I belong would be prepared to go in the matter of Home Reunion? If I use great plainness of speech, it is because the solemn importance of the subject forbids all equivocal expressions. First of all, there can be no question of mere absorption by the Church of England. This is axiomatic with us. We cannot reason with those who deny this thesis. We will say in affectionate sincerity, "The Lord be with you," but must also say, "Farewell in the Lord," to all such. Gladly will we co-operate with such in all wherein they desire our co-operation, but of Reunion there can be no possibility.

Reunion must be Reunion, and not absorption. Tremendous difficulties stand in the way, but that those hindrances need be for ever invincible I cannot imagine. Great ideals take long attaining; it is, however, salutary to have the ideals ever in our view. The question of ministerial "orders" is, of course, primary and paramount; no Reunion can be accomplished till the validity of Wesleyan "orders" is acknowledged. On this point I write with intense conviction. We believe that Holy Scripture, Christian "antiquity," and the undeniable experience of the Lord working with us, adequately vindicate our "orders."

Would any of us accept episcopal ordination? Here I use a trepid pen, but I surmise that even this might be if it were clearly understood that such acceptance did not involve the faintest doubt as to the validity of our "orders," and was but a concession to ecclesiastical propriety. In other words, acceptance of re-ordination would mean, *not ordination into the ministry of Christ, but into a new confederation of Christians*. Would many go so far in order to help to achieve Reunion? On such a matter I dare not be a prophet. The subject would need long and loving and patient consideration.

They would, it seems to me, be wise and prudent who did not press such a question as re-ordination. It would be asking much of one side. Would the other side be likely to ask pro-

portionately much? I have gone further in this than many of my dear brethren would go, simply because I feel that all the possibilities of the discussion ought to be faced. But I repeat my complete persuasion, that no Reunion is conceivable except on the mutual recognition of our Wesleyan ministerial "orders."

If this were generally conceded, other considerations, though all grave, would not, I think, be so insuperable. On two points I believe (some will say too optimistically) a large number of Wesleyans would have little objection to offer. I refer to the Episcopacy and to the Liturgy. The episcopal principle is by no means foreign to our Wesleyan system. How could it be, seeing we are the children of John Wesley? But if "the historic episcopate" is construed as meaning the modern type of Episcopacy as essential to the being of a Church, then a difficulty will arise which could never be surmounted. I believe in Episcopacy. I believe it to be for the well-being of the Church. Our Wesleyan organization recognizes this in our Chairmen of Synods. But to make it a *sine qua non* of a Church is to offer a proposition which Wesleyans could never accept. Discussions of Reunion, then, must be upon the basis of the recognition of that fact. Surely it is not fancy's idle dream that this need not bar the door eternally to the possibility of Home Reunion!

As to the Liturgy, I opine there need be little debate. In common with multitudes of Anglicans, Wesleyans would desire to see a judicious revision of some of its phrases, but they have no objection to the use of the Liturgy. Of course many prefer a non-liturgical service, and all claim liberty to pray with or without a liturgy, as occasion may seem to require. But numerous Wesleyans greatly love the Liturgy, and use it regularly at their Sunday morning service. Did the question of Home Reunion come within the near horizon, it is safe to say that there need be little controversy concerning the Liturgy.

I may venture to add that I do not imagine that such a rite as Confirmation would excite acute debate. Certain it is that in

Wesleyanism there is a strong and strengthening "stream of tendency" towards some such ordinance. How to bridge the gulf—a fearful gulf—between the period of Sunday scholarship and adult age is one of the problems that is ever with us, and imperiously clamouring for solution. That it might be destined to find solution in the rite of Confirmation is not a thing utterly incredible to some of my fellow-denominationalists.

Thus, honestly, and, some of my brethren will say, with too much concessiveness, I have looked at certain of the main obstacles to Reunion from the Wesleyan view-point.

Now on the general question. The feasibility of it would require long and prayerful and patient and loving consideration, "Neither is this a work of one day or two." But I for one dare not dismiss the consideration of it. I believe coming days will require every kind of Reunion that is possible among Christian Churches. Much will have to be yielded, in view of this inexorable necessity. Nor need I hesitate to say that there are historical and other affinities between the Church of England and the Wesleyan Church which ought to make Reunion a not impossible ideal. After all, Reunion should not be more unthinkable than Union.

I confess I cherish a dream of Church Union on a large scale in this kingdom. I am convinced "the last tremendous days" will demand it, and the longings of lovers of "the holy Catholic Church" will demand it. And in the interests of such a dream I would spare no effort and no prayer to further the cause of Home Reunion.

Meanwhile, it is obvious that on both sides there must be constant and assiduous approximations one to another. Only in an atmosphere of love can such evolutions ripen; and love can only show itself in generous deeds. There must be genial giving and taking. We must lose no opportunity of social converse; and we must demonstrate our spiritual communion. Nor must we hesitate to act together for the defence of the things of the faith.

Heart and soul I concur in the suggestions made in these

pages some months ago by Chancellor Lias. Let us meet for friendly conference. Specially let us meet for spiritual communion; and I doubt greatly the value, meanwhile, of such projects as the exchange of pulpits. All premature attempts at Reunion are apt to accentuate disunion. "Saving common sense" is a mighty factor in this momentous matter.

Surely it is blessed that men should cherish such a dream as that of Reunion on a greater or a smaller scale. Such visions may be our salvation as Churches.

As an individual Wesleyan, I have touched on but a few items of this great discussion. No one is more conscious of the difficulties than I am, but I believe no one is more sensitively alive to the splendour of the ideal; and I think that I have the Spirit of God when I say no one is more prepared to do all that in him lies towards the accomplishment of the ideal. May the spirit of Christian unity "mix with men and prosper"!



## The Church and the World-Power.

A STUDY IN ACTS XII.

BY THE REV. W. S. HOOTON, B.A.

**T**HIS chapter comes in as a parenthesis in the ordinary course of the history. No doubt its position is chronologically intentional, in order to bring up the general history<sup>1</sup> to the date at which the events occurred at Antioch, which are, at this point in the narrative, the main subject of consideration. But it is just one of those sections which can be taken entirely out of its surroundings and examined by itself. And, at first sight, it even appears to break the thread of the description of the rapidly ripening crisis at Antioch. We are brought back from this digression by the note added in ver. 25, which provides a link with Antioch again, in preparation for the following chapter. But, indeed, closer examination will show

<sup>1</sup> See ver. 1.

that the digression itself is not only chronologically correct, but also most appropriate to the historian's purpose.

Our object is principally to trace this special fitness. But first we will briefly review some of the spiritual lessons of the passage which lie outside the scope of that main inquiry.

1. We are not to be discouraged by the loss of workers, nor to question why such losses are allowed. The providence of God was over James as well as over Peter. His effectual purposes were served as fully by the martyrdom of the one as by the deliverance of the other. James's death, no doubt, brought glory to God in itself, and with equal certainty we may be sure that he was called to a higher sphere of service, having accomplished his earthly witness, and now crowned it by a martyr's death.

2. Another reflection arises as the complement of this. "The Christian is immortal till his work is done." It is a true saying, and Peter's deliverance is the illustration of this fact, as James's martyrdom was of the other. No servant of God has ever been more desperately placed. But such deliverances have been known in the experience of many of God's servants in later ages. They can be read in the records of Church history, and of present-day missionary work. No power can hurt us while there is work for us to do here. God varies His methods of deliverance; but our interests, as also His interests through us, are safe in His hands.

3. Following naturally upon these two thoughts is the lesson that a miraculous deliverance will only be given under two conditions; it must be for God's glory, and it will only be granted so far as is necessary. The first condition appears from the fact that James's martyrdom was allowed; the second is plainly indicated in ver. 10. Peter could not bring himself out of prison, and God sent His angel to strike off iron chains and open iron doors; but when Peter was out in the street the angel left him.<sup>1</sup> He was now free to follow his Master's

<sup>1</sup> A somewhat similar thought has been drawn from an interesting comparison of Mark xvi. 3, 4 with John xi. 39. The angel rolled away the stone,

injunction, which had been left for guidance under such circumstances, and he obeyed it by departing to another place.<sup>1</sup>

May we not somewhat extend the lesson? We are often too much in a hurry. Not only do we seek for miraculous interpositions where none are needed, but sometimes even in opposition to the will of God. Patient endurance of trial must be learned, as well as faith in the possibility of deliverance. Particularly is this the case when the trial has arisen through our own fault, though even here God's deliverances are often wonderful, beyond our deserts.

4. The most fruitful lessons of all which can arise from our present detached consideration of the incident are connected with prayer. Most evidently prayer is the resource of the Church at all times.<sup>2</sup> It is the weapon which prevailed here. Never let us lose sight of the power that individual Christians, and the Church at large, *can* use if they *will*.

“That power is prayer, which soars on high  
Through Jesus to the throne,  
And moves the hand, which moves the world,  
To bring salvation down.”

How extraordinary is the slowness of believers to use so real a power!

A good deal has been made of the strange unbelief which seems to have been exhibited by the group of praying disciples when their prayer was answered. Certainly it is true to human nature, if such a lesson is really intended to be drawn without limitation. Only too often, nothing is a greater surprise to the Christian than the answer to his own prayer; and there can be no stronger rebuke to our unbelief, and no clearer explanation of at least one hindrance to the answer. The marvel is that we receive so much. Yet it is only fair to observe that they

---

which had been so great a cause of depression to the women, just *because* it was too great for them to move (ver. 4), and when they looked up (R.V.) they saw their fears were needless. But in the other case the hindrance, which could be removed by human agency, had to be taken away before the deliverance could be wrought.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. ver. 17 with Matt. x. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. iv. 24-31.

are not said to have been praying for Peter's deliverance, but only for Peter.<sup>1</sup> Comparing the tone of the prayer in Acts iv. 24-30, we might even think it likely that they chiefly sought on his behalf a faithful witness—perhaps unto death, as in the case of James—but at any rate the grace to be faithful. The deliverance may thus have come in the light of a glad surprise to those who had already surrendered their leading Apostle into God's hands. But, even so, we may fairly say that they were strangely dull of faith not to accept his actual deliverance as a possibility in answer to their prayers;<sup>2</sup> and at any rate there is no doubt about our own dulness and unbelief.

Is it lawful to go a step further? It may savour somewhat of speculation with regard to things not written if we do so; but is it possible that if they had prayed for James as they prayed for Peter (though we do not know that they did not), a like deliverance might have been granted? Or, may it be that after James's martyrdom they had already given up Peter too much for lost? Such matters are too deep for us; but the former possibility at least opens the way for solemn searchings of heart as to our use of this all-prevailing weapon. How far can our unfaithfulness, either in prayer or effort, hinder God's cause? We dare not say; but we know enough to realize the tremendous responsibility which rests upon us, and the sobering fact that *it makes a difference* whether we pray earnestly and obey fully.

It is interesting to observe the informal character of the gathering for prayer which is here described (ver. 12). Few ought now to need to be persuaded of the lawfulness or of the helpfulness of prayer-meetings. Yet it is good to have the direct Scriptural sanction, of which this is one instance. In such a case of dire distress, it may be said, it was only natural. But is the exercise of prayer to be limited to periods of distress and peril? And is not the Master's assurance of His special

<sup>1</sup> Ver. 5: *περὶ αὐτοῦ*. Even the reading *ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ* need imply no more.

<sup>2</sup> Ver. 15. They thought it was the guardian angel which Jewish belief assigned to every man. Possibly some allowance should be made for their distracted sorrow.

presence with groups of praying believers<sup>1</sup> a pledge of the efficacy of united prayer at all seasons? And does not the Church of our day stand in need of the power required and used by the Church of old?

But let us turn now from these detailed reflections upon the lessons of the incident, and examine its *typical significance*, which is full of instruction with regard to its position in the history.

It may be said with confidence that the Herods stand in Scripture as representatives of the world-power. As it was their policy to court the favour of Rome, to which they owed all their authority, this symbolical reference is most appropriate. At any rate, in the case of the three members of the line who are actually called by the name in Scripture,<sup>2</sup> the deadly opposition of the world to Christ is plainly seen. It is impossible to mistake the significance with which we meet, at the very outset of the Gospel story, with the attempt of Herod the Great to destroy the infant Saviour in the massacre of the Innocents. The relations, again, between Herod Antipas and John the Baptist are those of open conflict between the good and the evil, and that conflict is further illustrated by the share which the same king afterwards had in the condemnation of the Lord Himself. And now we have Agrippa I. brought before us under this name, which bears with it such terrible associations, and the evidences of the same eternal conflict are as clearly marked as ever. May it not, then, be said, without any fantastic distortion of Scripture, that the name "Herod" stands for the world in its pride of power, and in its relentless opposition to Christ and His Church and His truth?<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xviii. 19, 20. It is by no means certain that the meeting of Acts xii. 12 was only held privately because public services were dangerous. Indeed, the expression in ver. 5 has been taken to imply that the Church continued to meet as usual (as in ver. 12), in spite of persecution.

<sup>2</sup> Agrippa II., the last of the line, though mentioned, is not actually called "Herod" in Acts xxv. and xxvi.

<sup>3</sup> It is, further, remarkable how close a resemblance is to be found between the three leading Jewish parties named by the Evangelists and some of those in the Christian Church now. With some limitations, the Pharisees represent the exclusive spirit of ceremonialism and formality; the Sadducees

With all this in view, how exactly does this episode fit into its position in the narrative! At the juncture when all is ready for the great advance which is planned at Antioch, it is but natural that we should read of a great effort on the part of the power of the world to assert itself.<sup>1</sup> It is, in fact, quite likely that this new persecution was stirred up by the Jews on the ground of what they had heard concerning the action taken by leaders of the Church about this time in the reception of Gentile converts without Jewish rites. If so, the free opening of the door to all the world would have an even closer connection with this ferocious attempt to put special hindrances in the way of the proposed advance. And the futility of the outbreak of enmity is made plain in preparation for the coming records of progress.

The special encouragement which such a narrative gives to the Church of all ages will appear when we consider closely the result of this crisis. Could anything be apparently more hopeless than the position of Peter at the outset of the story? The prison doors, the iron chains, the relays of guards—above all, the relentless king upon the throne—were seemingly insuperable obstacles to deliverance. The tyrant had been allowed to work his will upon another Apostle. What reason was there to think it would be otherwise now? It would appear that the prisoner was sleeping his last earthly sleep,<sup>2</sup> the relief being delayed almost till the last moment, as is so frequently the case in God's good providence, for His greater glory and our purer faith and truer thankfulness and joy. To Peter in the prison, or to the believers in Mary's house, what hope of deliverance, humanly speaking, could there now be? Yet see how things

---

are those who, under a cloke of broad-mindedness, cover practical unbelief in spiritual verities and an irreverent criticism of Holy Scripture; and the Herodians correspond to such as would compromise between the Church and the world, and rely upon worldly influence to support spiritual work.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the special outburst of demoniacal energy which seems to have coincided with our Lord's earthly ministry.

<sup>2</sup> Ver. 6. Peter's calmness is an example of Christian restfulness in the face of danger, if, as is possible, he knew the end seemed so near. Cf. Dean Plumptre in Bishop Ellicott's "Commentary."

stand after a few more vivid sentences. Herod is not upon the throne at the end of the chapter. He dies a loathsome death, smitten for his blasphemous pride and self-sufficiency. It is the prisoner who goes free; the king is bound in the chains of a miserable disease, and, above all, the work prospers. That is the main consideration—not Peter's deliverance, but God's glory. "Immediately an angel of the Lord smote him . . . and he . . . gave up the ghost. But the word of God grew and multiplied" (vers. 23, 24, R.V.). This collocation of contrasted ideas must be intentional,<sup>1</sup> and the intention of so vivid a contrast, especially in view of the complete turning of the tables from the position as related in vers. 1-3, must be to represent the victory of God over all seemingly successful combinations against His cause.<sup>2</sup>

It is instructive to note the same kind of ultimate result in the case of the other Herods. Herod the Great slays the Innocents, but his own end speedily follows,<sup>3</sup> and the infant Saviour (by a similar contrast) grows and prospers all the while. Herod Antipas slays John the Baptist, but cannot quiet his own conscience<sup>4</sup>; he enjoys the seeming triumph of having the King of kings at his bar, but the positions will be reversed one day. All history and all prophecy confirm the lessons which are so strikingly presented in the vivid contrasts of Acts xii. The world often seems to triumph—momentarily and partially<sup>5</sup>—but God gives His Church in His Word sufficient ground of assurance that He rules over all, and that the ultimate destruction of the powers of evil and the firm establishment of His own kingdom are beyond doubt. He cheers them, by the recorded experiences of His servants in past ages, with the

<sup>1</sup> Another remarkable contrast is provided by the language of vers. 7 and 23. An angel, in each case, "smote" Peter for deliverance, and Herod for death. May not this also be intentional?

<sup>2</sup> The repetition of the lesson so manifest in Acts iii.-v. is very plain. No power avails to hurt or hinder when God's finger is stretched forth to work and to deliver.

<sup>3</sup> Matt. ii. 19, 20.

<sup>4</sup> Mark vi. 14, 16.

<sup>5</sup> As at Calvary itself, where its devices were even made subservient to the destruction of its own power.

certainty that, though they may have to pass through afflictions and death, it will only be so if His glory may be the better secured thereby; while He inspires them with the confidence that no power in earth or hell can restrain His working here and now, if it be His will to deliver. With this present assurance, and certain future triumph, nothing remains but to go forward in the conflict with a good hope, a thankful courage, and an ever-ready use of the weapon of prayer which we have seen He provides for the special relief of His Church militant here in earth.



### New Year's Hymn.

"I will not fail thee."—*Joshua* i. 5.

BY THE REV. A. J. SANTER.

I.

THE love of God can never fail,  
 As ocean's depths it doth abound;  
 Unwearied on the wand'rer's trail  
 It seeks till erring souls are found.<sup>1</sup>

2.

The strength of God can never fail,  
 To Him all power and might belong;  
 We know ourselves as weaklings frail,<sup>2</sup>  
 Then in Omnipotence are strong.

3.

The truth of God can never fail,  
 His word, unchanging, never dies;<sup>3</sup>  
 "The Lord hath spoken" shall prevail  
 O'er man's conceits and Satan's lies.

<sup>1</sup> Luke xv. 2.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Cor. xii. 10.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Pet. i. 23.

4.

The peace of God can never fail,—  
 Terrors may come in any form,—  
 Hope's anchor fixed within the veil,<sup>1</sup>  
 We calmly face the fiercest storm.

5.

The life of God can never fail,  
 'Tis stored and given in His Son ;<sup>2</sup>  
 We tread triumphant death's dark vale,  
 Led by the Ever-living One.<sup>3</sup>

6.

The rest of God can never fail ;<sup>4</sup>  
 How sweet to lay the burden down,  
 Ungird the warrior's coat of mail,  
 And take instead th' eternal crown !<sup>5</sup>



## The Life of Principal Rainy.<sup>6</sup>

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR JAMES ORR, D.D.

**I**T is not always that ecclesiastical biographies, even though the subjects of them are men of distinction, are really interesting, or establish their right to rank as literature. Either the men were not great and many-sided enough to make their lives important, or the events in which they took part were not of historical magnitude, or the treatment is trivial and gossipy, or there is a confined, partisan spirit in the writer's outlook and treatment. This biography of the late Principal Rainy by the Rev. P. Carnegie Simpson may confidently be cited as an exception to the too common rule. It is not chargeable with any of the above weaknesses, deals with a very remarkable man, who was identified with the most remarkable movements in the Scottish Church history of the last half-century, and is written in a style and spirit, with a breadth of view, and sagacity of insight, which will, without doubt, secure for it a place among the best works of the kind in the language.

Although a biography of Principal Rainy, the man, the scholar, the teacher,

<sup>1</sup> Heb. vi. 19.

<sup>2</sup> 1 John v. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Ps. xxiii. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Matt. xi. 28.

<sup>5</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 8.

<sup>6</sup> "The Life of Principal Rainy." By Patrick Carnegie Simpson, M.A. With portraits. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1909. 2 vols., 21s. net.

the citizen, the two volumes of the book are even more a narrative of the succession of great crises through which ecclesiastical life in Scotland has passed since the days of the Disruption of the Church of Scotland in 1843. This arises from the fact that Dr. Rainy's career was so completely merged in these public movements and conflicts that the story of the one is in large part of necessity the story of the other. There is another reason for the predominatingly objective style of treatment. While a man of rare intellectual gifts and many-sided sympathies—warm and tender in his home attachments, and keenly alive to friendships—there was in Dr. Rainy's nature a certain impersonality and aloofness, an elevation and universality, which raised him above most of the lesser interests that furnish biographers with piquant details of family, social, and day-by-day personal incident, and threw his public life into proportionately stronger relief. This gives its peculiar character to the biography, and at the same time imparts to it an exceptional value. Church politics in Scotland are, it is to be feared, but imperfectly understood south of the Tweed, and even by many whose home is north of that boundary. For educative purposes in ecclesiastical matters, reaching to the most recent date, no better or more readable guide can be found than this work of Mr. Simpson's. It is written, naturally, not from the point of view of a State Churchman, but from the standpoint of a Free—now a *United* Free—Churchman; but, as all who know the field will heartily acknowledge, this is done with a statesman-like grasp of the meaning and progress of events, and an impartiality and skill of presentation, which give the work a thoroughly trustworthy character.

Thus it comes about that in Mr. Simpson's volumes these two things are combined—a finely-drawn picture of Dr. Rainy's personal history and character, from his boyhood in the home of his father, Professor Harry Rainy of Glasgow University (with sketches of an ancestry which, on the mother's side a few generations back, joined that of Mr. Gladstone), through his College career, his early ministry at Huntly, his transference to Edinburgh, his Professoriate in New College, his Principalship in succession to Dr. Candlish, his rise to Church leadership, his successive conflicts, the sore trials resulting from the House of Lords' decision against his Church in 1904, till his pathetic death in Australia, whither he had gone for rest and health, and the later funeral at home—then a history of the Church movements, all of them of decisive historical importance, with which his personal biography is intertwined. The Disruption itself was before Dr. Rainy's time of influence—though he was in the midst of the excitement of it in his father's house—but the event belongs so closely to the succeeding narrative that a full chapter is devoted to it—a chapter which everyone who desires to understand the "Ten Years' Conflict" should read, mark, and inwardly digest. In 1863 began the first negotiations for union with the United Presbyterian Church—negotiations which looked at first so promising, but after ten years had, for internal reasons, with profound sorrow of the leaders, to be temporarily abandoned. It was a time when Disestablishment was being keenly discussed, and various circumstances drew Dr. Rainy into the vortex of that controversy in association with the late Principal John Cairns, of the United Presbyterian Church. This movement sustained a severe back-set through the emergence of the Home Rule Controversy and Mr. Gladstone's desire for the

unity of his party. The disappointment was keen among the Dissenters at Mr. Gladstone's postponement of their cause in 1885, and their alienation was not without effect on the defeat of his party in 1886. Meanwhile a new and momentous controversy had, in the late seventies, sprung up within the Free Church itself, in the case of Professor Robertson Smith ending, after many vicissitudes, in the removal of that scholar from his Chair in Aberdeen College, on account of his advanced critical views. The history of this unhappy controversy can be nowhere better studied than in the faithful pages of Mr. Simpson's biography. Dr. Rainy's prestige suffered heavily for the time with many in his Church, on account of the line of policy he pursued in this case—a policy which his biographer seeks, we think successfully, to show, was really the only possible one in the circumstances. The calmness and courage of Dr. Rainy in this crisis, and in public affairs generally, soon regained for him his position of unchallenged supremacy in the Church courts.

At length, in 1896, the Union negotiations with the sister Church were, through pressure of the situation, revived, and, the opposition having dwindled into numerical insignificance, the Union was happily consummated in 1900. The handful of dissentients carried the case into the civil courts, with the result which everyone knows. The Scottish judges gave clear verdicts for the United Church, but on appeal being made to the House of Lords, the judgment was reversed, and the whole accumulated property of the Free Church for sixty years was declared to belong, on the ground of their adherence to the principle of Establishment, to the small fraction that had resisted the Union. The blow was a stunning one, but Dr. Rainy and his Church never wavered in their adherence to the ground they had taken up in carrying through the Union. The effect of the judgment, in truth, was to consolidate the Union as it had not been consolidated before, and to impart new vitality to the United Church. The money loss was extremely heavy, even with the partial restitution which has since been made by the Parliamentary Commission; but this in large part was made up by an astonishing outflow of voluntary liberality. The strain of this last crisis proved too much for Dr. Rainy's strength, and the end came not long after.

It is the story of this chequered life which is told with so much skill, insight, and literary power in the volumes before us, and no student of the age will act wisely who neglects the information they convey. It is more difficult to speak of the final results of the movements in which Principal Rainy in his day bore so manful a part. The movement for Union, on which perhaps his heart was most deeply set of all, has been carried to a successful issue. The Union is a fact accomplished which nothing can now disturb. It has not been carried through without tremendous sacrifice, but this, like the sacrifice at the Disruption itself, has been overruled for the higher good of the Churches concerned. The question of Disestablishment remains, and it is certain that it cannot die so long as ecclesiastical parties in Scotland remain on their present unequal footing. Nor can a solution be looked for by a return of the Churches outside the State connection to a reconstructed Establishment. Yet a spirit of union is in the air. Negotiations are proceeding in which the question of Establishment itself is being treated as open, and a hope is entertained in many quarters that friendly conference may ere long

hit upon, by mutual agreement, some practical line of action. 'Tis a consummation devoutly to be wished. The alternative of renewed political struggle, with increasing bitterness on both sides, is one from which everyone who desires the highest good of Christ's Kingdom must shrink. The critical controversy initiated by Professor Robertson Smith is still in process, and must work itself through till clearness is attained. Those who read the narrative of the case will probably feel with Mr. Simpson, that it was forced upon a Church unprepared for it with altogether unwarrantable aggressiveness, and that, in self-protection, the Assembly, in the final stages, could hardly have acted other than it did. It was really a revolution that was being "rushed"—a revolution to which the Church then, and till the present hour, has refused to be committed. There were mistakes undoubtedly, and much, as in all such cases, was done and said by extreme men, which had better have been left unsaid; yet probably, with all their extremeness, those who opposed the new doctrines had a truer instinct of their real bearings and issues than many who took them to their bosom. Still, it is by calm and fair discussion, rather than by Church action against individuals, which always has a savour of persecution, and often involves real injustice, that genuinely critical questions must at length be settled.



## The Missionary World.

BY THE REV. A. J. SANTER.

AS we stand on the threshold of a New Year, there comes to us a message of cheerful encouragement as regards the Missionary work of the Church. The latest available reports from the great Mission Field tell us plainly how wonderfully "God is working His purpose out." It is painful indeed to hear of deficiency of funds in nearly every organization engaged in the work, of threatened retrenchments where extension was hoped for. But, if for a while we mount up higher beyond these mists, and "view the landscape o'er" from the Pisgah peak of *God's* doings, rather than from the low level of man's shortcomings, our faith may be strengthened to go forward still more fearlessly, and attempt again to do some greater things for Him Who has called us to this glorious work of taking possession of the Promised Land—"from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth"—in the Name of His dear Son.



The Jubilee of Protestant Missions in Japan, recently celebrated in the capital of that Empire (October 5 to 10, 1909), stands out not only as an occasion for a special Thanksgiving for fifty years of guidance, help, and blessing on the work and workers of that Mission, but, above all, it proclaims to the Churches the wondrous way of working of the Almighty One. The meeting held in Tokyo was itself impressive, as we gather from the account given by the Rev. Basil Wood, who gives an account of the celebration in the *C.M.S. Review* for December last.

“It was impressive in the perfect and natural harmony with which Europeans and Japanese gathered together with one heart and one soul in the one Name.” There were present “recognized authorities—whether Japanese or European—on education, on literature, on philanthropy, on philosophy, and, last but not least, on the multiform work of the pastor and evangelist. Nor must we omit to mention the tributes of congratulation from those in high station outside the Christian fold—namely, from the Prime Minister, and the Ministers of Education and Home Affairs—nor again, the speech from so leading an educationist as Count Okuma, who, though not himself a Christian, is deeply in sympathy with Christian thought.”



But the true significance of that Jubilee Celebration is revealed in an address given on the occasion by the Rev. W. Imbrie, D.D., portions only of which are quoted from the same source. After briefly mentioning some of the wonderful events of a material or social or political nature crowded into the short period of half a century of Japan's history, he continues: “Fifty years ago notice-boards were standing on the highway declaring Christianity a forbidden religion; to-day those same notice-boards are seen standing in the museum in Tokyo as things of historical interest. Fifty years ago religious liberty was a phrase not yet minted in Japan; to-day it is written in the Constitution of the Nation. Less than fifty years ago the Christian Scriptures could be printed only in secret; to-day Bible Societies scatter them far and wide without let or hindrance. Fifty years ago there was not a Protestant Christian in Japan; to-day they are to be found among the members of the Imperial Diet, the judges of the courts, the professors in the Imperial University, the editors of influential newspapers, the officers of the army and navy. Even forty years ago there was not an organized Church in all Japan; to-day there are synods, and conferences, and associations, with congregations dotting the Empire from the Hokkaido to Formosa. . . .” Dr. Imbrie is careful to point out that after a period of advance towards Christianity a reaction came. But now has come the time of recovery. Space forbids anything but a bare mention of the varied organizations now at work. “There are Christian schools, some of them now long-established, doing a constant work year in and year out, and exerting an influence that cannot be told in figures. There is the Young Men's Christian Association going in and out among young men, delivering them from evil, giving them new interests and new ideals, lifting them to a higher life. The Young Women's Christian Association is here, so, too, are the Bible Society, the Tract Society, the Temperance Society, and other societies for reform. There are homes for the fatherless and motherless, rescue homes and homes for the leper, hospitals and dispensaries. All these are forces for the extension, for the illustration, for the commendation of Christianity that can be counted on.” The important fact to be noted—too often, alas! overlooked—is “that *all* these forces are the product of Christianity.” It is refreshing, also, to note that the Churches, whilst increasing in numbers at a steady rate, are awakening to their responsibilities as Churches, and as Churches of Japan. The Lord Himself has gone before, and by various means, and in marvellous

ways, has brought that great "Land of the Rising Sun" to its present transition state. This fact in itself constitutes a clear call to God's people to enter upon and develop still more fully the grand work which lies before them.



To continue the same subject of God's tokens of encouragement given to us at this season, we may refer to an incident mentioned in the *C.M. Gleaner* for December last. It is on a much smaller scale as regards size only, not of importance. In a letter from Canton, South China, Miss A. M. Jones writes: "About two months ago I visited a new village in the Tsang-sheng district, and the whole of the inhabitants are asking for baptism. They have put away their idols and ancestral tablets." This is God's encouragement to us. What is our response? Miss Jones continues: "They require naturally much teaching preparatory to baptism, and, alas! I have not yet been able to send them a Bible woman to instruct the women and children. Other villages are begging for Chinese teachers."



*India's Women*, quoting from the *North India Gleaner*, says: "We have at Mankar (Burdwan, Bengal) a most interesting case of a woman taught through the Word of God. . . . She was a high caste Brahmin's wife in Benares. From the Zenana where she was, some children attended one of the Mission Schools, and used to repeat the hymn and texts they learnt at school when they returned home. She had never heard anything so satisfying, and eventually, without ever having seen either a Mission lady or worker, she left her home and everything it means to a Hindu wife, convinced of the truth as it is in Jesus."



## Literary Notes.

NOW that the holiday season—*i.e.*, the Christmas season—with its rush and turmoil in the book-world, is over, publishers are likely to take stock and count their successes, or losses, during the past year. Having done that, they begin to look forward once again to the prospects for the New Year. There is evidence that 1910 is likely to be better for business generally, and when trade is good books sell, and so the author, the publisher, and the bookseller are all radiant with happy anticipations. The Cambridge Press have already made announcement of one 1910 book. It is a monograph of a man who always proves of interest to the student. This is a life of John Lyly. Professor Feuillerat has given a considerable amount of study to Lyly and his times; in fact, so close has been his contemplation that he has been successful in discovering a number of new facts concerning his life; so we may expect that the volume will be a very interesting one. In addition to the new discoveries, Professor Feuillerat discusses in much

detail the story of the plays, and the reader may expect to find a number of new opinions based upon fresh aspects concerning the "Euphues" and the importance of its portents.



Quite recently Messrs. Methuen and Co. issued Mr. H. N. Asman's "Introduction to the History of Rome." The idea of this volume is to give to pupils learning Latin some knowledge of the history of the great people whose language they are studying. It has been rightly insisted on by educational authorities, that some knowledge of the history of Rome is essential, not only for a proper appreciation of Roman literature, but also as a necessary part of a complete education. This book aims at occupying a place between the primer and the larger works on the subject. It gives a brief survey of the history of Rome to the death of Augustus. It is likely, also, to appeal to the general reader who is anxious to have some knowledge of the subject.



Among Mr. Stock's newest books is to be found "The Seven Nights," by Marian Fox. It is a story narrating the adventures of a young Breton knight on a journey in England during the early years of King Richard's reign, and shows something of the medieval life in town and country under the memorial system. Another book is "Songs of Our Pilgrimage," poems on the Christian Year, by Miss Grace Farthing. Lessons of help and comfort are derived from the Epistles or Gospels appointed for the Sundays throughout the year and on the meaning of the chief festivals. A third book is "The Christ in Holy Communion," by the Rev. T. A. Gurney, a work which deals with the devotional aspect of Holy Communion, and bears upon present-day questions; while another new work is the Rev. J. B. Oldroyd's "The Doctrine of the Atonement, chiefly as set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews."



There has just been completed a very valuable annotation. It is that great work, Crowe and Cavalcaselles's "History of Italian Painting." There is undoubtedly room for an annotated edition of this important book. It has been carried out by Mr. Edward Hutton with a thoroughness which suggests an energy in the work of preparation that is entitled to the highest praise. The last volume—the third—came out the other day. We understand that the editing of this undertaking actually caused a reference to something like five thousand books, essays, and other literary matter. Indeed, the whole task has been stupendous. Messrs. Dent are the publishers, so we may be sure it has been excellently produced.



A timely work entitled "A Project of Empire," by Dr. J. Shield-Nicholson, Professor of Political Economy in the University of Edinburgh, is to be found in Messrs. Macmillan's new list. The author goes over his ground pretty extensively, and sets before the reader a basis of argument which may be accepted as a broad attitude capable of being adjusted to the various minds of his readers. The author also deals at some length with the Imperial Conference on National Defence. The whole attitude of the learned author is calm and judicious.

The Rev. H. Montague Dale, B.D., Vicar of Christ Church, Summerfield, Birmingham, has written a treatise entitled "Religion: Its Peace and Power." The book will serve as a useful introduction to the study of comparative religion, and is published by Messrs. Allenson.



Mr. Murray is publishing "In the Torrid Sudan," by Mr. Lincoln Tangye. Such a volume as this may be properly expected to devote some space to the more sporting side of the Sudan, and while sport as well as travel is given a due measure of attention, the more serious side of the country, the descriptive side, so to speak, such as geography, history, internal conditions, administration, as well as the future of the Sudan, is very fully and very ably considered. There is a very happy account of a pretty long shooting trip which the author took in a district of the Sudan which is very little frequented.



It is now more than two years since the publication of the first number of *The International: a Review of the World's Progress*, together with the French *Les Documents du Progrès* and the German *Dokumente des Fortschritts*. The main object of the editor—Dr. Rodolphe Broda—was to place the experience of each country at the service of others by means of articles and reports on the social problems of the various nations, written by experts on the spot. Dr. Broda was successful in organizing a staff of over two hundred correspondents in every quarter of the globe, and has been able to publish many important contributions. A further development of this idea is taking place in the foundation of an International Institute for Lectures and Reviews. Its official organs will be: In England, *Progress* (with which is incorporated *The International*); in France, *Les Documents du Progrès*; in Germany, *Dokumente des Fortschritts*. It will issue monographs dealing with the social problems of special importance; it will organize lectures by leading authorities on special questions from many parts of the world; an inquiry bureau for information respecting social reform in foreign countries; and a series of international inquiries on concrete points of social reform. The subscription fee is one guinea, and the English agent is Mr. T. Fisher Unwin.



Lord Ronald Gower, whose reminiscences, it will be remembered, were published many years ago under the title of "My Reminiscences," and who a few years ago issued another volume of memories entitled "Records and Reminiscences," has in hand a volume dealing with the art treasures in that wonderful collection at Stafford House. Such a volume is bound to be intensely interesting—first, because of the subject-matter itself and the many illustrations which no doubt will accompany it; and second, because Lord Ronald Gower writes so attractively.



It is of interest to learn that Mr. Murray has issued a cheap half-crown edition of the Bishop of Birmingham's Bampton Lectures, delivered in

1891, on the subject of "The Incarnation of the Son of God." This volume has had a large sale in the past, and no doubt in its new dress will soon increase its circle of readers.



Mr. Hugh Thomson has just illustrated a volume entitled "Highways and Byways in Middlesex." Mr. Walter Jerrold, who is the author of this volume, says: "There are yet many people who do not allow the fascination of the far to destroy their interest in the near, and others who have not entirely lost the art of walking, who may like to be reminded that they can find much to please them, even within a few miles of their own doors." The talented artist of this book contributes over 120 drawings, and it is needless to say that he adds greatly to its attractiveness. There is also a good map in the volume. This series of "Highways and Byways," which Messrs. Macmillan projected so long ago, is one of the most delightful and most readable collection of books that we know. We can *always* find something in any of the volumes to interest us.



Messrs. Williams and Norgate have brought out one of the finest catalogues that have ever been issued. It is the "Catalogue of the London Library," which has been edited by Mr. Hagberg Wright, who has been working at it for quite a long time. Mr. Wright has fortunately had the help of a number of expert assistants, so that the catalogue is a valuable work of reference. It has been said that next to the great Oxford Dictionary it is the biggest piece of bookmaking that has ever before been undertaken. For those who have to deal with the bibliography of literature it will be absolutely essential.



Messrs. Constable and Co. will have ready this year several more volumes in "The Memorial Edition" of George Meredith's Works. This uniform edition is being printed from new type and on paper specially manufactured for it. There will be altogether some fifty or sixty illustrations in photogravure, as well as, among other things, certain facsimiles of manuscripts. This edition, which is sold in sets only, is limited to 1,500 sets.



Messrs. T. and T. Clark published in the latter part of December the second volume of their great "Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics," edited by Dr. James Hastings. The period covered is from "Arthur" to "Bunyan." Among its many articles, several of which are equivalent to concise books on their subjects, the most generally interesting to our readers will be that on the "Bible" by Dr. Sanday. In this he returns once again to those studies in Holy Scripture of which his "Bampton Lectures on "Inspiration" are the most widely known.



## Notices of Books.

INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Theodor Zahn. 3 vols. Large octavo. Pp. 1740. London: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 36s. net.

No Introduction to the New Testament merits more careful consideration than this; not merely because it is the work of one of the foremost German scholars of to-day, Professor Zahn of Erlangen—that would alone entitle it to consideration—but because he has given to it so many years of toil and ever-ripening experience that it is true to say of it, as Dr. Stalker has said: “No book on the great theme with which it deals has been based on broader or deeper preliminary studies.” The mass of detailed knowledge exhibited in the main sections of the book, and with even greater exuberance in the appended notes, is overwhelming. It was another book that drew forth the note of admiration, “How those Germans do work!” but this book at least deserves it. Nor is this detailed learning a mere exhibition of knowledge. It is the basis of Zahn’s conclusions. Men will differ as to those conclusions. But all, whether they accept or reject them, will be disposed to agree with Dr. Sanday’s criticism: “Every shred and scrap of the evidence is at his command, and he handles it in a masterly fashion.” And at least this much must be universally conceded: no one has a right to differ from Zahn unless he has carefully viewed his conclusions in the light of the evidence which he presents for them. The book is not altogether an easy one to read; it was probably a difficult one to translate. The difficulty of translation has been overcome by others, and with exceptional success. If we are willing to overcome the difficulty of reading, a rich reward awaits us.

What are his conclusions? It is impossible to do more than summarize them. They are generally frankly conservative; they are never bizarre or fanciful. The books of the New Testament are dealt with mainly in the order of their writing, as Zahn conceives it. St. James’s Epistle comes first, and James of Jerusalem wrote it almost immediately after the famous Council. It was intended as a corrective, not to mere libertinism, but to the “moral indolence which went along with the consciousness of faith and of orthodox profession.” Quite probably St. Paul knew it, and “a letter which left St. Paul unsatisfied with his own conclusion about Abraham’s justification, and which influenced him to take up the passage Gen. xv. 6, and discuss the subject with far greater thoroughness (Rom. iv. 3-24), than he had done heretofore (Gal. iii. 5-7), must have made a deep impression upon him.” The idea embodied here is suggestive food for thought.

St. Paul’s Epistles are next dealt with, and Galatians is deemed to be the first. The churches are the churches of Ramsay’s view, but the date is much earlier, so dated on internal historical grounds. The argument for the early date (A.D. 52-54) is attractively put, and he forestalls criticism, on the ground that it does not accord with Paul’s doctrinal development, by pointing out (vol. i., pp. 200, 201) that that development was brought about by long preparation and longer missionary experience before he wrote one of the letters which have come down to us. He thus makes a point too frequently lost sight of in discussions on Pauline theology.

The remaining Epistles are assigned to the dates and circumstances usually assigned to them in conservative circles, each position being carefully examined and made good, with minuteness of research and not infrequent originality of argument. The problems of 2 Corinthians are discussed with illuminating definiteness; the second visit to Corinth was paid before either Epistle was written, and the letter of 2 Cor. vii. 8 was not 1 Corinthians, but an earlier letter, which produced a reply from Corinth, which reply, we know, produced the first extant Epistle. The integrity of Romans is maintained after a full discussion, the names in the last chapter being very carefully investigated. The Epistles of the first captivity were written from Rome, but, as against Lightfoot, Philippians was written last, not first. The Pastorals are styled "the last three Epistles of Paul," and their authenticity is defended with some vehemence; but whilst Zahn is sometimes impatient with those with whom he disagrees, he never allows himself to do otherwise than subject their arguments to the most thorough and impartial examination.

The Epistles of Peter and Jude next claim attention. Both Epistles of Peter are deemed authentic, but they are not addressed to the same churches, and 2 Peter is the earlier. 2 Peter iii. 1, therefore, does not refer to 1 Peter, but to some other letter in St. Peter's perhaps voluminous correspondence. 2 Peter iii. 15 cannot refer to Ephesians, written much later, nor to Hebrews (which is, in Zahn's view, not Pauline, nor capable of being thought to be so by Peter), but to some unknown letter of St. Paul. The problem of the authorship of the Hebrews is then examined, and left unsolved, none of the many suggestions quite satisfying the writer.

The Gospels and the books of the New Testament written by the Evangelists are discussed in the remainder—almost half—of the book. Zahn searches the early centuries for material. He carefully distinguishes between tradition of the right kind and learned conjectures. "The tradition associated with the four Gospels from the time when they began to circulate, which was not once attacked during the entire period from 70 to 170, even by hostile critics, of whom these books had no lack, even at this early date, is based, not upon learned conjectures, but upon facts which at the time were incontrovertible." In this spirit he criticizes the various solutions of the synoptic problem which have been presented to us. He pours mild scorn on the imaginary "sources" which the different theories postulate, and on the extent to which these unknown works have been elaborated. "In our time we have commentaries on works the existence of which, to express the matter mildly, can be proved only by means of conjecture." His own solution is that of mutual dependence. Ur-Markus and Q, upon which most modern theories are built, are unnecessary to Zahn. "So long as the impossibility of a relation of direct dependence between two extant documents remains undemonstrated, it is arbitrary or unscientific to explain the agreements between them by supposing that both are dependent upon documents no longer extant and without witnesses." "Direct dependence" means this: St. Matthew wrote his Gospel first in Aramaic; St. Mark knew the Aramaic Matthew, and used it. His Gospel is a mosaic, partly due to St. Matthew, partly to what he heard from St. Peter. Then St. Matthew

was translated into Greek. St. Luke wrote his Gospel to win Theophilus, an interested heathen. It is a Gospel with a definite evangelistic purpose. "Most excellent" would never have been addressed to a Christian. Luke used sources, almost certainly used St. Mark, almost equally certainly did not use St. Matthew, nor the "original apostolic document, or the logia, if these books ever existed." Thus Zahn boldly—perhaps too boldly—traverses the usually accepted positions of to-day. Space forbids any attempt to summarize his attempt to justify his daring. The book must be read, and it will be worth the effort.

The Johannine writings are finally dealt with. The "Elder John" goes the way of the "imaginary" writings, and John the Apostle is responsible for all. The conservative position is carefully and fully defended. Perhaps the most interesting suggestion is that 2 and 3 John are Epistles written at the same time, one to the church of which Gaius and Diotrephes were members, the other to Gaius himself. Here we must leave it. The book teems with interest. It is replete with learning. No student of the New Testament can afford to neglect it; but, as toil has been spent on the making, so happy toil must be given to the reading. F. S. GUY WARMAN.

CHRISTIAN IDEAS AND IDEALS: AN OUTLINE OF CHRISTIAN ETHICAL THEORY. By R. L. Ottley, D.D. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* 1909. Price 7s. 6d.

Most of those who, twenty years ago, read Canon Ottley's excellent essay on "Christian Ethics" in "*Lux Mundi*," which was certainly one of the most valuable contributions to that volume, have lived in hope that he would some day write a book upon the subject. That hope is now fulfilled. We have waited a long time, but our patience is rewarded. We confess we opened the present volume with high expectations: we have not been disappointed. We have very few satisfactory treatises on Christian ethics, especially by English Churchmen. The present work will certainly take a front place among those we do possess. But it is more than a work on Christian ethics, for it deals, as every adequate treatment of that subject must deal, with the Christian philosophy of God, man, and the world; and it deals satisfactorily with each. At the same time, while Canon Ottley is quite clear that though Christianity *implies* a philosophy of life, it is far more than a philosophy; it is *itself* a life—a life "which depends upon the power and grace of God, and consists in spiritual fellowship or union with Him. Here, it will be seen, the right point of view is at once taken. But Christianity is not only such a life; it is the life which in Jesus Christ was once for all manifested. In His life were manifested "the inherent capacities of human nature, its true destiny, and the conditions of its perfection." Also by Christ there was manifested the hindrance to the realization of man's possibilities—the mystery and the power of sin. Further, it was "seen once for all in Christ that victory over sin was to be the law of human perfection." How different all this from certain ethical theories and ethical systems which are being taught to-day! Again, Canon Ottley teaches us that we learn by revelation that "life realizes itself and finds its appropriate nurture and discipline in fulness of personal relationships": the

young ruler who "would enter into life" was pointed to the commandments of the second table. "The Christian law embraces all possible relationships in which men stand to each other, while, conversely, social or corporate life is the condition necessary for the complete development of personality." Such, this book teaches us, are the fundamental ideas of Christian ethics. In its various chapters its author explains and develops these, and shows their application to the various problems which meet the Christian to-day. How this is done we most strongly advise our readers to discover by a patient study of the book itself. The following is sometimes a difficult question to answer: "Is this a book I ought to have?" In regard to this volume the answer is clear. It is not only a book to have, but a book to study—one from which both to learn and to teach. It reveals the great want in all "the Churches" to-day—namely, *power*. It is power for which we need to seek and to pray. As the author says: "[The Gospel] is a principle of life, of energy, of movement. It heightens vitality; it makes for efficiency in work and for greatness of character." But the book does more than reveal the need; it points to the source of the supply—namely, the Spirit of God—"the indwelling of God in humanity: the might of the Spirit working in human hearts and strengthening them to receive, to know, to act, and to endure." We most cordially recommend this very valuable book.

W. EDWARD CHADWICK.

AN EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW.

By the Rev. Alfred Plummer, D.D. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 12s.

For years past a gap has been seen and a great need has been felt in regard to a first-class modern commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel. While the other three Gospels have been amply provided for by Swete, Plummer, Godet, Westcott, and Reynolds, there has been nothing available of the same order on the first Gospel. It was therefore welcome news that Dr. Plummer was engaged on such a work, and the actual appearance of the book three months ago was still more welcome. We are not unmindful of Mr. Allen's scholarly but necessarily technical commentary on this Gospel in the International Critical Commentary Series. Nevertheless, Dr. Plummer's book will fill a void which all ordinary students have felt for years past. Personal experience of "Plummer on St. Luke" has naturally increased our expectations concerning this volume, for that truly great book on the third Gospel is a perfect education in minute exegesis and spiritual insight to all who use it. And now we shall be able to put side by side with it "Plummer on St. Matthew," and read it with equal pleasure and profit. The book opens with about forty pages of Introduction, in which the various questions of authorship, date, etc., are briefly but adequately discussed. Dr. Plummer thinks the tradition which ascribes the first Gospel to the Apostle Matthew is incorrect, though he believes that the association of some sort of Gospel to Matthew cannot be unfounded. Like most scholars, he holds the priority of Mark, and believes that Matthew and Luke used our second Gospel. We are not yet as fully convinced as Dr. Plummer that this is an "assured result," and early tradition has often a curious way of reasserting itself. Not until present discussions about Q are brought nearer to

completion will the problem of the relation of the Gospels be helped forward. But quite apart from these critical questions, Dr. Plummer's sections dealing with the plan of the Gospel and its Christology will be read with interest and pleasure, while his treatment of Dr. Charles's work on "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" is an able and noteworthy contribution to an important question of modern scholarship. We have tested the Commentary at various points, and never without obtaining definite information and not a few suggestions. The rendering of the Greek text, the exegetical notes, the minute attention to grammatical forms, and the constant reference to spiritual teaching, are all delightful in their helpfulness, and usually convincing in their treatment. A good example of Dr. Plummer's power as an exegete is seen in his treatment of the thorny question whether the Mother of our Lord had any other children. As ever, his knowledge and use of other writers, and his width of reading are as astonishing as his openness of mind and frankness of discussion in regard to controverted points. Critical questions naturally and necessarily occupy a great space, and Dr. Plummer doubtless finds it essential to take note of this or that theory; but, while we fully understand and appreciate this, we are bound to add that we would gladly have spared the space for still more of his own truly helpful and inspiring exegesis. He has laid us all under a deep debt of gratitude for this masterly work, which will now become as much a standard work as his equally valuable book on the third Gospel. More than this it is unnecessary and, indeed, impossible to say.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

INTRODUCTION TO THE ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the Rev. G. F. Maclear, D.D., and Rev. W. W. Williams. London: *Macmillan and Co., Ltd.* Price 10s. 6d.

A third and a revised edition of a book originally published in 1895, and well known to students of the Articles. The surviving editor has added an appendix of nearly forty pages, with the purpose of showing how the theological topics of the Articles are related to the wider aspects of thought which obtain in the present day. The treatment is valuable and suggestive as far as it goes, though it is necessarily brief and fragmentary. The general outlook is that of a pronounced High Anglican, as may be seen, for example, by the statement that "the distinction between mortal and venial sin is recognized by the English Church in the Litany." For our part, we prefer the much more natural and convincing discussion of this subject found in Bishop Drury's valuable work, "Confession and Absolution." The *Spectator*, in its notice of this new edition, called attention to the difference between the wording of Article XXVIII. and the comments of the editors in regard to reservation and adoration. After quoting the language of the Article which tells us that the Lord's Supper "was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped," the reviewer quoted the comments in this book. As to reservation, "each independent Church may adopt or allow the practice as it may be judged expedient." As to adoration, "worship due to our Lord present in the Sacrament under the form of Bread and Wine." Well may the *Spectator* add, *O mirificas theologorum ambages!* Students will be glad of this new edition for reference and for much useful teaching on

non-controversial points, but on the salient questions at issue in the sixteenth century, and still with us to-day, the book will have to be balanced by a fuller and more accurate knowledge of those historical facts by which alone the true interpretation of our formularies becomes possible.

EPOCHS IN THE LIFE OF ST. PAUL. By A. T. Robertson, D.D. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 5s.

Those who have made the acquaintance of the author's companion volume reviewed in these pages some months ago, "Epochs in the Life of Jesus," will give a hearty welcome to the present work. Although necessarily brief, extending to just over 500 pages, it covers the ground in a remarkably clear way, providing the reader with all that he will need for an introduction to the life and work of the great Apostle. It is written in the full light of the latest and best works on the subject, and its almost constant footnotes with its remarkably full bibliography will prove of especial value to students. We know nothing like it as a thorough introduction to the study of St. Paul's career, and if used together with the well-known and valuable little works of Stalker and Findlay, the student will be finely equipped. It is a marvel of compression, clearness, and ability. It reveals a thorough mastery of the subject in all its bearings, and is a first-rate example of able, open-eyed, conservative scholarship.

THE DOCTRINE OF IMMORTALITY. By the Rev. J. D. Thompson. London: *Edward Dalton*. Price 3s. 6d.

The aim of this book is to show that "the great simple seminal intuitions of religion, in relation in especial to Immortality, have been held everywhere, always and by all, and that these take form and body according to the intellectual climate of any given time; the core abiding, the covering ever changing." The writer seeks to know what is the essential element of immortality under all the multifarious forms which belief in it has assumed. The first chapter remarks on the slackening of belief in immortality in the present day, and endeavours to show the causes. The "essence of the belief" in immortality is shown to be a personal consciousness of personal communion with God, and the consciousness of such fellowship is said to be the firmest proof and warrant of immortality. The belief is then traced through the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, and the New Testament, and the author evidently accepts in full the modern critical position on the Old Testament, regarding "Hebrewism" as no exception to the historical order of development whose steps are Animism, Polytheism, Henotheism, and Monotheism (p. 17). Then the problem is discussed in connection with other religions, and several witnesses are brought forward in support of the belief in immortality as fellowship with God. Two more chapters discuss "The Relativity of the Belief," by which is meant its relation to racial characteristics, geographical conditions, general conditions of culture and civilization, and crises in national and ecclesiastical history. Then we are introduced to "Present-Day Forms of the Belief," in which various aspects of eschatology are discussed and criticized. And two concluding chapters treat of belief in immortality in the light of evolution and in view of practical everyday needs. The method of treatment, and, indeed, the substance of the

book, read somewhat strangely coming from a Primitive Methodist minister, and we are not surprised at the stir caused by the lecture of which this book is the substance. It is difficult to see what difference, except in degree, the author makes between the Bible and other books in regard to a belief in immortality. Certainly, so far as we have been able to follow the discussion, there is no such antithesis as that of Revelation *versus* Evolution. The book is able, and shows great width of reading, but we fear that it will be only convincing to those who are prepared to adopt the author's critical standpoint. For the rest of us—and we should include also the vast majority of people in the author's own communion—the book will remain almost entirely unconvincing in regard to its salient features.

HANDBOOKS OF ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY.—I. "Foundations of the English Church" (to 800 A.D.). By the Rev. J. H. Maude.—II. "The Saxon Church and the Norman Conquest" (800-1135 A.D.). By the Rev. Canon Cruttwell. General Editor: Rev. John Henry Burn. *Methuen and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. each, net.

These attractive handbooks, wisely used, will do much to meet an educational need to-day. The General Editor, who was first moved to undertake his task some dozen years ago by the late Bishop Creighton, believes that the names of the several contributors "are a sufficient guarantee that the work is conceived in no narrow spirit of partisanship," and therefore has allowed "to each writer the utmost freedom of treatment." Consequently, it is inevitable that many, who will cordially welcome the general idea of the series and appreciate the merits of the various volumes, will be unable either to sympathize with all the views expressed, or entirely to endorse every presentation of facts. For instance, there seems to be too great a tendency to regard the enforcement of monasticism as a "reform," and to excuse the encroachments of the Papacy as, after all, a blessing in disguise to barbarous and turbulent ages. Mr. Maude tells us that the period with which he has to deal has been "exploited by ignorant or unscrupulous controversial writers in the interests of their own theories," and rebukes as "the offspring of ignorance or prejudice," "such statements as that the early Scotch Church was Presbyterian, or that the mission of Augustine did little towards the conversion of the English, or that the British Church refused to accept the claims of the Church of Rome, or that it preserved a purer type of Christianity than the rest of the Western Church" (p. 11). One can heartily agree with the measure of truth underlying these words, and yet bear in mind that the school indicated by Mr. Maude is neither the most ignorant nor the least scrupulous that exploits Early Church History. Despite his pleasant style, his good acquaintance with his subject, and his obvious intention to be fair, Mr. Maude seems unduly possessed of a conviction that history should be written with an attentive eye to the requirements of Anglo-Catholicism.

We are able to speak in higher praise of Canon Cruttwell's performance. Sharing the best characteristics of its predecessor, it is marked by a wider reading and a more balanced judgment. Especially pleasant it is to note the writer's frank patriotism, his just appreciation of such national heroes as Alfred the Great, and Harold Godwinsson, and his discriminating vindication of misjudged men like Ethelwolf, Godwin, and Stigand. He brings out most

orcibly the fact that the Tudor Sovereigns and Parliaments in their interference with Church affairs only resumed powers anciently exercised by the Anglo-Saxon Kings and their Witans (pp. 40, 160-2, 252), though he seems to hold higher views of clerical authority than are warranted by the constitution of our Church (pp. 204-232).

A few points, however, require amendment. We do not believe that the Forged Decretals "supplied a force imperatively needed to curb the savagery of the time" (p. 12). The Papal claims have notoriously caused more savagery than ever they curbed. Canon Cruttwell himself reports that the quarrel over Investiture alone cost "fifty-six years of war, sixty battles, and perhaps two million lives" (p. 224, note). Nor is it true that the Sarum Missal "formed the basis of our Prayer-Book" (p. 184). Not one-tenth part even of the First Prayer-Book Communion Office can be found in the Sarum Missal.

Each volume has a useful index, and the few textual errata, almost unavoidable in a first edition, will no doubt be corrected in any future impressions.

CHURCH LEADERS IN PRIMITIVE TIMES. London: *C. J. Thynne*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

This second edition is a great boon. The name of Dean Lefroy will always be associated with these lectures. It was at his instigation that they were delivered in Norwich Cathedral by eminent Anglican divines, and he contributes a preface. Ignatius, Polycarp, Chrysostom, Clement, Athanasius, Cyprian, Tertullian, etc., become familiar figures to us, and we are deeply grateful for an account of their lives in so readable a form. Evangelical Churchmen have no reason to be afraid of the witness of the early Fathers of the Church, and they are urged to read this volume with care.

THE PRAYER-BOOK PSALTER. With Introduction and Marginal Notes by J. G. Carleton, D.D., Canon of St. Patrick's, Dublin. *Cambridge University Press*. Price 3s. 6d.

A book to be recommended for all those who desire to understand the Psalter better, but who find it impossible to study elaborate commentaries. The printing of the text of the Prayer-Book Version and of the brief notes side by side is an excellent feature. A similar work was published first ten years ago by that excellent scholar the Rev. Arthur Carr, and in some respects we prefer the earlier book. But Dr. Carleton's volume has this advantage over its predecessor—its mechanical arrangement is better; the reader can with greater ease and rapidity acquaint himself with the notes; and there is an index, which Mr. Carr's book does not possess.

FERNANDO CORTES AND THE CONQUEST OF MEXICO. By Francis A. MacNutt. New York: *G. P. Putnam's Sons*. ("Heroes of the Nations" Series.) Price 5s. net.

The career of Cortes has a fascination about it that bids fair to last as long as history. Mr. MacNutt, who is an authority on Cortes and his times, has contrived to write (indeed, he could hardly help writing) a book of undoubted interest. But we are not prepared to justify any whitewashing of that great warrior and statesman. Spain, as represented by Cortes, at a

really critical juncture in the world's annals, behaved atrociously in her New World dominions; and we dare not forget it. Surely it is a significant fact that the final blow to Spain's colonial dominion came from that very world where she had established, amid tears and blood, her ruthless empire—founded on greed and supported by the terrors of the Inquisition. Retribution comes (though slowly) to nations as to individuals; and we do well to heed the Divine lessons on this matter which history teaches.

THE GREAT PROPHECIES OF THE CENTURIES CONCERNING THE CHURCH. By G. H. Pember, M.A. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 6s.

In this interesting volume, Mr. Pember—already widely known as the author of "Earth's Earliest Ages"—completes what he has to say on the momentous topic of fulfilled prophecy. To preterist and historicist alike the book will appeal but slightly; to the futurist it will, doubtless, appeal very strongly. It is written with considerable learning and intense earnestness; and the spiritual force that lies at the back of Mr. Pember's attitude to certain aspects of dispensational truth is a thing we are devoutly thankful for. The book is abundantly worth study, though we disagree entirely with his peculiar view of the lake of fire.

ON THIS ROCK. By Rev. Dr. H. Grattan Guinness. London: *Morgan and Scott*. Price 2s. 6d.

A masterly contrast is drawn between philosophy, the history of which has been one of "abandoned speculations," and the certainties of the Christian religion. Naturally all centres round the person of Christ the Incarnate and Ascended Son of God. While Dr. Guinness will not carry all his readers with him in the astronomical portions of his discussion, he makes us think, and this is a fine virtue.

THINGS NEW AND OLD. By Professor Knight. London: *Francis Griffiths*. Price 5s.

We have here a selection of addresses delivered at Thornton Castle and elsewhere. They are intended to dwell on the lasting phases of religious truth. We should characterize them as solid, sober, and suggestive of a deep grasp of principles. The author's style appeals to the intellect, but does not always touch the heart. At the same time he cannot fail to appeal to hard-thinking men, and he takes them along a path that will lead to safety. We wish he had given us some sermons on fundamental Christian doctrines, and wonder why he refrained.

THE MYSTERY OF SEVEN. By E. M. Smith. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 2s. 6d.

The writer is well known in the book "The Mystery of Three," and this is equally interesting in its subject. Eight chapters on studies in Old and New Testament alike reveal the prominence and importance of the subject. "The mystery of the number seven runs through the whole Bible."

BISHOP HARPER. By Rev. H. T. Purchas, M.A. Melbourne and London: *Whitcombe and Tombs*. Price 5s.

A second edition of this book, revised and enlarged, is welcome. It contains the account of a devoted life, and the Church in New Zealand may well be proud of its first Bishop. The biographer, who has done his work well, tells us

“that the aims of the founders of Canterbury and of the first Bishop were the same, but when the colonizing machinery broke down, the man succeeded. Therein lies the moral of the tale.”

THE CRUCIALITY OF THE CROSS. By P. T. Forsyth, D.D. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 5s.

We are profoundly impressed with this book. Open it where one will, one is struck by the deep spirituality of its teaching, to say nothing of the emphasis it lays throughout on an aspect of the Atonement that is by no means appreciated or understood at the present time as it ought to be. “What is lacking,” says Principal Forsyth, “to current and weak religion is the very element supplied in the atoning Cross as the reconciling judgment of the world.” The old fixed standards of religion are rapidly being shifted; change is everywhere, together with much decay in the region of vital elements in Christian life; we are conscious of disintegration forces that threaten, not the outworks only, but the very citadel of the faith. And while we fumble after a moral centre, following the will-o’-the-wisps of novel doctrines, we are prone to forget that the old Evangelical belief in the One Sacrifice on Calvary is alone the central object round which, and in which the hopes of mankind must finally anchor. This able book emphasizes the need of the world, and points the true solution; and very cordially do we give it welcome.

MY RECOLLECTIONS. By Eugene Stock. London: *Nisbet and Co*. Price 6s. net.

Dr. Eugene Stock has for so long been a prominent figure in the religious world; his work in connection with missions in general, and with the C.M.S. in particular, has been so fruitful; his interests have been so varied, and have touched our social and religious life at so many points, that a volume of personal reminiscences cannot fail to be of unusual interest. We strongly recommend, therefore, this entertaining and valuable record to all our readers. Not the least interesting of its five-and-thirty chapters is the last—“A Confession of Faith.” We note with pleasure that the book is furnished with a full and careful index.

OUR BIBLE TEXT. By W. E. O. Oesterley, D.D. London: *Sheffington*. Price 1s. 6d.

This capital little book should be read by all those who are anxious to acquaint themselves with the actual state of the Biblical text as it appears to scholars in the light of recent research. “The scientific spirit,” as Canon Peile justly says, “has a part to play in devout study.” The scientific spirit is not necessarily rationalistic; to allow this is to yield a point to the enemy. Three chapters which make up this book are: (1) A Papyrus of the Ten Commandments in Hebrew; (2) The New Sayings of Jesus; (3) The New Uncial Manuscript of the Gospels.

THOUGHT AND DISCIPLESHIP. London: *C.M.S. House*. 1909. Price 1s. 6d.

This little book contains ten addresses given at the C.M.S. Summer School in June of last year, together with an appendix. The contributions, though necessarily of varying merit, are strung upon a single thread of

thought. That thought is threefold: The evangelization of the world, the growing need for preaching the Universal Gospel, the uniqueness of the opportunity offered to the Christian Church to-day. If one address more than another is to be singled out for special notice, we should be inclined to name Bishop Montgomery's excellent and suggestive "forecast" entitled "The Church Universal."

**GODLY SELF-CONTROL.** By Rev. Dr. Pierson. London: *Marshall Bros.* Price 1s.

**TALKS WITH BEGINNERS IN THE DIVINE LIFE.** By Rev. E. H. Hopkins. London: *Marshall Bros.* Price 1s.

**LIFE ABIDING.** By W. H. Griffith Thomas. London: *Marshall Bros.* Price 1s.

Dr. Pierson is a great Christian psychologist, and his counsel will be found spiritual and practical. Mr. Hopkins speaks with authority and wisdom, and his clear, concise way of putting things is particularly valuable. The third book is on the subject of the Bible and prayer in relation to the Christian life.

**SPIRITUAL PHILOSOPHY.** By the Most Rev. S. T. Nevill, D.D., Primate of New Zealand. London: *Longmans.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

This little book contains two lectures delivered in Dunedin Cathedral last year. The plan of the writer (by whom the doctrine of Divine immanence is fully maintained) is to trace the progressive manifestation of the Divine through media less capable of receiving Him, up to the being who receives so much of the life of God as "to be qualified for a sacramental union with Himself." Hence, says the writer, there is nothing arbitrary or abnormal in Christianity; it is obedient to Divine law.

**AN AWAKENING AND A CRISIS.** By Dr. G. Grilli. London: *C. J. Thynne.* Price 1s.

The awakening is the religious awakening in Italy of to-day. To this is added "A Crisis of Souls in Romanism," translated by Mrs. Matheson and revised by Signor Dalla Vecchia. Those who care about the Romish controversy—and who should not?—will read this, and pray more earnestly for those that live in other lands under the blight of Rome.

**THE GOD OF THE BIBLE.** By Mrs. J. Trumper. London: *Elliot Stock.* Price 2s. 6d.

We like this little book, which rings true to the Word of God and breathes a great loyalty to Christ. It covers a lot of ground, dealing with creation, salvation, and sanctification.

**CHAPTER AND VERSE.** Arranged by L. H. M. Soulsby. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 6d.

Miss Soulsby's idea is admirable, for she gives us whole chapters from which the daily text is taken, and so there is a continuity of reading of God's Word.

**THE SYRIAC CHURCH AND FATHERS.** By Rev. De Lacy O'Leary, B.D. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2s.

These lectures, delivered in Bristol University College on to a large extent unworked field, are full of interest and instruction, and packed with facts relating to a Church that affected the history, liturgy, and institutions of the early Church.

**JAMES GILMOUR OF MONGOLIA.** Edited by R. Lovett, M.A. London: *R.T.S.* Price 1s. 6d.

This cheaper and excellently got-up edition should find many purchasers. The biography of this great, brave, ardent soul, who, it is not too much to say, was not behind the Apostles in his love for God and souls, is just the reading needed by an apathetic and time-serving age.

**THE HEAVENLY HORIZONS.** By Madame de Gasparin. London: *The Pilgrim Press.* Price 2s.

The style, spirituality, and fidelity to the Word of God, which mark this book, are manifest. Those who read, treasure. It is an antidote to materialism, and an inspiration to the toil-worn, dust and sorrow-laden traveller. Its message of the future life is one that needs a present emphasis. Dr. Campbell Morgan writes an introduction in high terms.

**CHRIST OUR EXAMPLE.** By Caroline Fry. London: *C. J. Thynne.* Price 1s.

Another reprint of this standard book, now in its twenty-ninth thousand, must be always welcome. It is prefaced by an introduction entitled "Caroline Fry: a Story of Grace," by the late Rev. T. S. Dickson, of Edinburgh. This is followed by a new preface

by the venerable Canon Christopher, of Oxford, who has made the circulation of this valuable and spiritual book one of the aims of his life.

**A STUDY OF THE EPISTLE TO THE CHURCH OF LAODICEA.** By the Rev. R. L. Allnutt. Guildford: *Clarke and Son*.

Prebendary Fox writes a commendatory Preface to the useful little book of this venerable writer.

**THE HOLY ANGELS.** By Rev. J. E. Hall, M.A. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s. 6d.

The writer gives us a study of the Word of God on the subject, and his treatment as it stands on this basis is satisfactory and suggestive.

**LEPERS SOUGHT HIS FACE.** By E. C. Horder. London: *C.M.S.*

What heathenism has done and what Christ has done for these piteous objects should be read by all. A perusal of this would cure a selfish heart.

**OTHER PEOPLE'S PRAYERS.** By E. Mabel F. Major. London: *C.M.S.*

Here again is a missionary book of a most arresting kind for mothers' meetings, etc. The "other people's prayers" are those of heathen and Mohammedan people, and show up by way of contrast their need and our privilege and responsibility.

**UNITED WORSHIP.** By Right Rev. Bishop Awdry. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s. 6d.

This illustration of united worship in our service for morning and evening prayer was originally intended for Tokyo students. It will now command a larger audience, and will be found useful for Sunday-school teachers.

**HOW GOD ANSWERS PRAYER.** By Charlotte Mason. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd* Price 2s. 6d.

The story of a most interesting and remarkable work for God. Miss Mason is the founder of what is known as the House of Rest for Christian Workers in London and Eastbourne, and here is the account of its foundation, growth, and development. It is a significant proof of the power of prayer, and Miss Agnes Weston, who writes a preface, truly emphasizes its witness to the Providence of God and the power of simple faith in Christ. Hundreds of Christian workers have been blessed in soul and body through Miss Mason's efforts, and this little book serves to bring a valuable institution more definitely before those who rejoice to know "How God answers prayer," as well as before those who rejoice to be able to help God to answer His people's prayers.

**SIMPLE EYE TEACHING.** By A. W. Webster. London: *Sunday School Union.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

A collection of illustrations and outlines for the use of teachers and speakers to children. It is by a well-known worker, whose early death has deprived the cause of Sunday-schools of one of its most valuable helpers. The book is full of most useful material, and cannot fail to help speakers and teachers. Hints about blackboards, plans of addresses, suggestions for object lessons, and outlines from the Bible, are here in abundance. All workers among children should make a note of this book. They will find it of great service.

**ORDINATION PROBLEMS.** By the Right Rev. the Bishop of Salisbury. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2s.

Two valuable essays, one on "Reordination," and the other on "Ordination, *per saltum*, and Home Reunion." They are marked by all the wealth of learning for which the Bishop is so widely known and honoured. They form a distinct contribution to the subject, and those who cannot follow the writer on every point should on this account pay the more heed to the positions maintained and the arguments adduced. In view of the increasing importance of the subject of Home Reunion this little book must not be overlooked.

**GLASTONBURY AND THE GRAIL.** By Melchior Macbride. London: *Hunter and Longhurst.*

A mystery play concerning the introduction of Christianity to England by Joseph of Arimathea. We are impressed neither by the doctrine nor the poetry to be found here.

**ALWAYS IN A MUDDLE.** By Marianne Filleul. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 6d.

This simple story has an obvious moral, which should be digested by lazy and unready housewives, and, indeed, by all people of the dilatory disposition.

**THE REJECTED KING.** By an Old Disciple. London: *C. J. Thynne.* Price 2s. 6d.

The old disciple is a Bible student, and his subject is the Lord Jesus Christ. He writes with force and learning, and a perusal of his pages, while revealing positions which cannot be accepted, will prove a help and inspiration to the reader.

## GIFT BOOKS AND FICTION.

**THE WHITE PROPHECY.** By Hall Caine. London: *William Heinemann*. Price 4s. net.

A blend of the novel and the political pamphlet. As a novel it is not, in our judgment, to be compared with the earliest works of the author. As a political pamphlet, it is calculated, we fear, to give a one-sided impression both of British rule in Egypt and also of Mohammedanism as a religion. Mr. Hall Caine's views of Mohammedanism and Christianity seem to show that he has no real acquaintance with the genius of either, or with the fundamental and eternal differences between them. And, further, we cannot help expressing our strong objection to some of the passages in this book, which appear to us quite unnecessary to the development of the story.

**THE ATTIC GUEST.** By R. E. Knowles. London: *Andrew Melrose*. Price 6s.

A fascinating story, well written, full of life, admirable for its delineation of character, and sustaining the reader's interest to the very end. But we feel sure it will be marred and even spoiled for many readers by an incident towards the end, for which nothing in the earlier part prepares us; indeed, its introduction seems entirely unnatural. Apart from this, we should have given the book unqualified praise as one of the best novels in the present day. As it is, we are compelled most reluctantly to say that we closed it with disappointment, and we are only able to praise it as a whole with qualification. It is so very good, except for this one incident, that we could wish it were rewritten and another episode substituted, which would be far more in harmony with the rest of the work.

**DAWN IN TODA LAND.** By C. F. Ling. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

The little known Toda people of the Nilgiri Hills are here described in an interesting and sympathetic way. The beginnings of missionary effort, with its failures and small successes, are shown. A good foundation for future work seems to have been laid by faithful, loving labour. The illustrations are excellent, and the book well worth careful reading.

**JOHNNY LEWISON.** By A. E. Jacomb. London: *Andrew Melrose*. Price 6s.

This novel is well named, for it deals only with the love story of Johnny Lewison, the son of a rich, vulgar Jew. There are no by-paths, and we must confess that we became very weary of the detailed particulars of the hero, which go on from chapter to chapter. The authoress is very clever in her delineation of character; this is quite the best feature of the book. As a story, however, it is disappointing, for there is little in the way of incident to lift it above the ordinary and obvious.

**A DANGEROUS INHERITANCE.** By Alice W. Fox. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2s. 6d.

Of quite thrilling interest is this story of an American heiress. The heroine is brought to England for her education, and placed in a country rectory among a family of children. Here she is happy enough until kidnaped. Her disappearance is not stranger than her reappearance at the breakfast-table after some months of adventure and odd experiences. The young people will enjoy this absorbing tale.

**BERNICIA.** By Amelia E. Barr. London: *Andrew Melrose*. Price 1s. net.

This story takes us to the time of George Whitefield. We are introduced to the grand dames who were impressed by his preaching. Bernicia, the wilful and charming heroine, and Claire, the Puritan maiden, provide us with romantic and pretty love stories. The publisher is to be congratulated on this excellent start of a new series. We hope that future volumes will be as interesting and attractive as this one.

**IN QUEST OF A HERITAGE.** By Emilie V. Smith. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s.

Tells how a young woman, brought up as a foundling, answered an advertisement in the expectation of finding herself somebody of importance. Her disappointment and consequent unhappiness lead her in the end to accept the love and home offered by an honest and humble working man. The story unfolds a tragedy which is not worked out too well, and which makes great demands upon the reader's credulity.

**A FIRST BOOK OF WILD-FLOWERS.** By M. M. Rankin. London: *Andrew Melrose*. Price 6s. net.

A book well named, for it is just the thing needed by a mother or teacher who wishes to interest a child in our commonest wild-flowers. The coloured illustrations, by Norah Hedley, are perfectly charming, and, best of all, are so true to Nature that one cannot fail to identify the flower with its pictorial representation. The reading matter is clear and sufficient, and free from too much detailed explanation and description.

A LITTLE MILITARY KNIGHT. By E. M. Green. London: S.P.C.K. Price 2s.

We have much enjoyed this children's book. Adrian, the hero, was a true boy knight, and well deserved his spurs. He was a brave, lovable little fellow, and we advise young folks to lose no time in making his acquaintance. It is a delightful story, and interesting from beginning to end.

### PAMPHLETS AND PERIODICALS.

THE OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE REVIEW. MICHAELMAS TERM, 1909. London: *Constable and Co., Ltd.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

It is curious that not one of the seven articles which make up this number has any special connection either with Oxford or Cambridge, nor can we say that the articles themselves are of any outstanding value. The first is "Let Knowledge be Power," by Colonel Pollock. Another discusses the "Early Homes and Haunts of Carlyle," while still other subjects are "Thrift on Fifteen Shillings a Week," and "Some Servian Folk Tales." We are glad to see that the reviews of books are continued. They constitute the best feature of the number, though why the Theology of the quarter should be limited to one volume, and that by Dr. E. A. Abbott, is difficult to understand.

THE EFFICIENCY AND INEFFICIENCY OF A DIOCESE. By the Right Rev. the Bishop of Worcester. London: S.P.C.K. Price 6d.

The primary Visitation Charge of the Bishop of Worcester, and full of practical interest to all Churchmen, whether in or outside the diocese itself. It bears the marks of the Bishop's well-known power as a great worker.

THE SPIRITUAL GUIDE. By Miguel de Molinos. Edited and compiled by Canon R. Y. Lynn. London: *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.* Price 1s. net.

A reprint of the well-known and famous work by the Spanish Jesuit which largely led to his condemnation and imprisonment. From the standpoint of the New Testament it is of course inadequate, but its general principle of direct fellowship with God is so true that we are not surprised at the treatment its author received by the Jesuits.

STUDIES ON THE HOLY SPIRIT. By R. P. Wilder. London: *Student Christian Movement.* Price 2d.

Ten studies in outline form on the supreme subject of the Holy Spirit. They are based upon the Acts of the Apostles, and are intended for use in Bible circles and private study. Mr. Wilder is one of the best known and most honoured workers in connection with the Student Christian Movement, and these studies show him at his best. Nothing would be more spiritually profitable than to take this subject under the guidance of Mr. Wilder's knowledge of Holy Scripture and his deep spiritual experience. We heartily commend this admirable pamphlet.

THE CHURCH GAZETTE. December, 1909. London: *National Church League.* Price 2d.

We look forward month by month with real interest to this organ of the National Church League, and we commend it to our readers as one of the most useful sources of information on present-day Church questions. The number before us has a valuable article on "Incense," by Mr. W. Guy Johnson, which conveys in a short space all the facts of information needed for a discussion of this subject. Other articles are on "Fasting Communion," and "Faith and Knowledge," while the Editorial Notes and the record of work done by the League are also full of deep interest.

SYSTEM IN PAROCHIAL WORK. By J. J. Wilson. London: *John F. Shaw and Co., Ltd.* Price 6d.

Interesting suggestions for methodical work in our parishes. Clergy, senior and junior, will be glad to compare notes with the author.

A HANDBOOK FOR CLERGYMEN'S WIVES AND CHURCH-WORKERS. By Alice M. Moor. London: *Elliot Stock.* Price 9d. net.

The Bishop of Chichester commends this booklet as meeting a real want, and likely to prove of help to clergymen's wives and other lady Church-workers. We observe that a list of the colours for the Church's seasons is given, though we have quite failed to discover the legal warrant for these in our Prayer-Book.

THE SUPPER OF THE LORD. By W. E. S. Nottingham: *H. B. Saxton.* Price 1d.

This booklet, by a leading Nonconformist in a northern town, has been sent to us for notice, and we are glad to call attention to its spiritual helpfulness as a preparation for the Holy Feast.

CHRIST IN THE HOME. By Canon Walpole. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 6d.

A dainty booklet. Apart from the writer's erroneous view of Baptism, it contains not a little admirable counsel, well expressed and forcibly applied.

DREAM DAYS. By Kenneth Grahame. Nelson's Shilling Library. THE FARM OF THE DAGGER. By Eden Phillpotts. Nelson's Sevenpenny Library. London: *Thomas Nelson and Sons*.

The new volumes of series which are issued with unflinching regularity, and received with equally unflinching welcome.

THE CHURCH PULPIT YEAR-BOOK, 1910. London: *James Nisbet and Co., Ltd.* Price 2s. net.

A complete set of outline sermons for the Sundays and holy days of the Liturgical Year, together with addresses to men and sermons on special subjects. Intended to help busy clergy by way of suggestion.

NISBET'S FULL-DESK CALENDAR FOR 1910. London: *James Nisbet and Co., Ltd.* Price 1s. net.

A pad with one leaf for every Sunday and holy day of the Church's Year. Very convenient and useful, but still containing the references to ecclesiastical colours which are unknown and illegal in the Church of England.

Messrs. Marshall Bros. have sent us the John Ploughman's Sheet Almanac for 1910 (price 1d.), with a motto for each day, taken from Spurgeon's work; Spurgeon's Illustrated Almanac (price 1d.), with texts selected by Pastor Thomas Spurgeon, and information about the Metropolitan Tabernacle; and the Life of Faith Almanac (price 1d.), containing contributions in prose and poetry, specially associated with the Keswick Convention.

The annual parcel of Calendars and Churchman's Almanacs from the S.P.C.K. was received too late for notice last month. They are provided in no less than ten different forms (and prices)—as almanacs, desk calendars, desk pads, and pocket-books. Their usefulness has been abundantly proved by years of experience, and it is only necessary to call attention to them once again. A booklet providing a statement of the parochial offertory for the year is also provided.

## REFERENCE BOOKS.

WHO'S WHO. London: *A. and C. Black*. Price 10s. net.

This Annual is always welcome, and year by year it increases in size and importance. There is no publication to compare with it for information about leading people in our own country and America. Telegraphic addresses and telephone numbers are now added to the brief but clear biographies. For its own particular purpose it is indispensable.

WHO'S WHO YEAR-BOOK. London: *A. and C. Black*. Price 1s. net.

This is made up of the tables which were formerly included in "Who's Who" itself. It is thus closely connected with that book, and gives a vast amount of information in a very convenient form which will not be readily found elsewhere. One curious heading is "Preachers to Hear in London," giving only thirteen Churchmen and still fewer Non-conformists. We did not realize that London was so poorly off for good preachers.

THE WRITERS' AND ARTISTS' YEAR-BOOK, 1910. London: *A. and C. Black*. Price 1s. net.

While this necessarily appeals to a limited class of readers it is particularly important for all who come under the title of "writers" or "artists." It includes a list of the daily and weekly papers, of monthly and quarterly magazines, with other important and valuable information for all who have to use their pen. A truly useful compendium.

THE ENGLISHWOMAN'S YEAR-BOOK, 1910. London: *A. and C. Black*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

Intended for all women who take any part in public or social life. It consists of no less than seventeen sections, dealing with various aspects of women's life and work.

THE LITERARY YEAR-BOOK, 1910. London: *George Routledge and Sons, Ltd.* Price 6s. net.

Contains full directories of authors, agents, booksellers, periodicals, publishers, etc., and a complete list of returns by public and other libraries; a section on Law and Letters, and a classified list of cheap reprints. Brief biographies are also provided. Exceedingly useful.