

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE CHURCHMAN

July, 1911.

The Month.

The
Coronation.

THE CHURCHMAN, as a rule, is ready for the printer about the twentieth of the month preceding that of publication. The Coronation Day is on the twenty-second. It therefore follows that though the event itself will be a matter of history by the time that these lines are in our readers' hands, the observations we may make upon it must needs be in the nature of forecast and anticipation. The anticipations we form are characterized by high hopes and solemn joy. We respectfully tender to our newly-enthroned monarch our loyal wishes for his welfare, our earnest hopes and heartfelt prayer that the reign on which he is entering may not only be long in the number of its happy years, but may be a time of rich and abundant blessing from God upon him, upon our Queen, and upon all the peoples over whom they are called to rule. Both King George and Queen Mary have already shown that they regard the high estate to which they are called, not only as an exalted privilege, but also as a sacred trust. We believe that their own personal influence on the peoples of their realm will be ennobling and uplifting. We hope and pray that their reign may be memorable by the passing of much that is evil and the growth and progress of many forms of good.

The hopes we are cherishing will most fitly find their expression in the prayers we offer at this momentous crisis in the nation's history. It is of good omen for the new reign that it will be heralded by combined prayer, for we know of many Christian bodies who are arranging to make the Coronation season one of combined and special intercession. In these prayers we shall doubtless make mention of the petitions that lie nearest to our hearts. It may not, therefore, be out of place to put on record here some of the objects we think greatly to be desired for the welfare of the coming reign—objects which may well have a place in the supplications we shall offer. In the forefront of all we shall surely pray for a revival of *spiritual* religion in our midst. This can only come from God, and, we believe, will only come in response to a passionate intensity of prayer. Excellence of administration, skill in organization, the attempt to express the old truths in terms of modern thought, are not without their value. But few of those who read the signs of the times and try to estimate justly our present wants will deny that our deepest need is too fundamental for such remedies as these; it is the need for "the sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind" that "filled all the house where they were sitting."

It is only by such a descent, in overwhelming power, of the Divine Spirit on the Church that we may hope for one particular reform, the absence of which is causing a great decay of spiritual religion, and that is the revival of the conception of Sunday as a sacred day of rest. It cannot be denied that our Christian Sunday is becoming sadly secularized, and the secular view is not merely threatening Christendom from the outside. It has already penetrated far within our borders. There is an increasing tendency to regard Sunday as a weekly holiday rather than as a weekly holy day. It is a day for physical rest and recreation—or, rather, of attempted recreation without any rest—in which any idea of meditation upon God and combined worship at His throne is

tending rapidly to disappear. A strong plea might well be entered against all this on merely humanitarian grounds—on the ground that so many classes in the community seem likely to lose entirely any day of rest at all. This crowded, hurrying life of ceaseless strain is already working its own nemesis. "Nerves," and the many ills that flow from strained and disordered nerves are assuming gigantic proportions. We want a "rest cure," and the only one that will really meet our case is the weekly anticipation of the "rest" that "remaineth to the people of God."

Many of our reformers hold—and hold, we think, quite rightly—that one of the most ill-omened traits in the present development of our national character is the absence of the sense of discipline, the total lack—both in individual and in community—of any claim for sacrifice and self-devotion. The spirit of professionalism, which has so largely invaded our games, is spreading to our general view of life. We are content to be spectators, while the more strenuous ones—whoever they are who may be willing—may do the necessary work. Many attempts are being made to counteract an attitude of mind so pregnant with disaster to our people. Boys' brigades, Church lads' brigades, scouts, universal training, are simply so many attempts to convince our people that discipline, training, the individual's contribution to the welfare of the whole, are the best guarantee both of individual welfare and of national stability. But these attempted remedies, with all their excellence, are somewhat superficial. It is the conception that we are not our own, but are bought with a price; the conviction that we "serve the Lord Christ"; the knowledge that "our citizenship is in heaven"—in a word, the great truths which only the recurrence of a weekly day of worship and meditation can keep alive in our hearts—these are the things to correct our national slackness, and to make us "strong in the Lord and in the power of His might."

Other Blessings for the Reign. We may only mention now more briefly some of the blessings which many of us think are already waiting for us in the hand of God, the bestowal of which blessings, in answer to our prayer, would go far to make King George's reign the most glorious in all our annals. One is the establishment of universal peace. The late King was emphatically a peacemaker, and now America and England seem willing absolutely to repudiate bloodshed as the only arbitrament of possible difference. May other Christian nations during this reign see clearly that followers of Christ should not engage in mutual war! Another blessing that seems to come within the range of vision is that of Christian unity, leading on to Christian union. The separated Churches of Scotland are slowly but surely drawing together. The Edinburgh Conference has made it clear that a divided Christendom is powerless to evangelize the world for Christ, that disunion is the barrier to obedience to His command, and that union must no longer be a pious aspiration, but an object of practical endeavour. May it be King George's privilege to rule over subjects whose Churches, once severed, have joined in brotherhood at the feet of Christ! Finally, may there be a reconsecration of home and family life! It is no courtly flattery, but a well-known fact, that in this matter King George and Queen Mary set before their subjects a worthy and inspiring ideal. God grant that their examples may be followed, and that their realm may increasingly be established on the only sure foundation of the Christian home!

Canon Beeching and Mr. Lathbury. A little while ago there was in our pages a courteous interchange of views between Canon Beeching and some of our Evangelical friends on the subject of the Permissive Use of the Eucharistic Vestments. Since then Canon Beeching has had the opportunity of discussing the same topic in the pages of the *Nineteenth Century* with that most able and eloquent exponent of High Church opinion, Mr. C. D. Lathbury. On reading Mr. Lathbury's con-

tribution in the *Nineteenth Century* for May, we can hardly resist the temptation to address Canon Beeching with the hackneyed phrase: "I told you so." Much of Canon Beeching's argument depended on the premise that the vestments are non-significant of doctrine. On this point we ventured to reply to him that "any such contention is quite beside the point. They are in the present crisis charged with significance. It is for what they signify that their legalization is sought." Now hear Mr. Lathbury: "High Churchmen have not been contending for them all these years because there has been 'no question as to any special significance' attaching to them. The special significance does not, it is true, reside in themselves; it has come to them from circumstances. But, being there, it has grown to be of very real importance, and the universal adoption of vestments, on the score of their meaning nothing, would be a poor exchange for their gradual adoption on the score of their meaning much."

Mr. Lathbury What is the "much" which, according to Mr.
 on the Lathbury, the Vestments mean? Again, let him
 Rubric. speak for himself. "That to which they do bear
 witness is the identity of the English Church of to-day with
 the English Church before the Reformation, and with the rest
 of the Catholic Church alike in the West and in the East." He
 goes on to quote the words of the Royal Commission: "The
 Eucharistic vestments were originally the dress of ordinary civil
 life, and for four or five centuries the civil and ministerial dress
 of the clergy was identical." "But," says Mr. Lathbury, com-
 menting on this, "they are not identical now. . . . English
 congregations are not well informed upon points of ceremonial,
 but they are quite able to notice the resemblance of one priest
 to another, and in this way the Eucharistic vestments become a
 testimony to *the identity as regards Eucharistic worship* [the
 italics are ours] of the several portions—in other respects so much
 divided—of the Catholic Church." Perhaps these words of
 Mr. Lathbury may convince Canon Beeching, more than any of

ours have been able to do, that in opposing the legalization of the vestments we are not guilty of illiberal narrowness. We are fighting to maintain, not the accidents or details, but the very essence, of what is most distinctive and most valuable in our Reformation heritage.

Canon Beeching has spoken, in words for which **Mr. Lathbury and the Law.** we honour him, of the present "intolerable condition of lawlessness." Mr. Lathbury will have none of this. "Lawlessness" there may be, but it is not "intolerable." Apparently it is very admirable. It is a curious perversity—for it cannot be ignorance—that prevents Mr. Lathbury from seeing that so long as the Prayer-Book remains as the schedule of an Act of Parliament, the Privy Council is the only final authority for the interpretation of its rubrics. Those who dislike this may seek relief by constitutional means. The proper method of relief is by alteration of the law, not by disobedience to its requirements. Mr. Lathbury says: "The decisions of the Judicial Committee are no longer law, except to one English bishop and one colonial archbishop." Two points are sufficient to disprove this little piece of flippant malice. The fact that the Bishop of Manchester has recently received a memorial from over 4,000 laymen in his own diocese, thanking him for the firmness of his recent stand, shows that a disposition to obey the existing law, as constitutionally interpreted, is more deeply rooted and more widely spread than Mr. Lathbury had ever dreamed. The other point is to be found in the significant speeches of the Bishops of Durham, Liverpool and Manchester in the Upper House of the Northern Convocation. We believe that these prelates have been realizing more clearly than before the strength and the true direction of the forces they have been trying to placate.

Prayer-Book Revision. We have more than once expressed ourselves as on the side of revision. We believe that a book which dates from the sixteenth century needs adaptation for the twentieth. We are willing to agree to some

things which are somewhat distasteful to ourselves, in the interests of the common unity and comprehensiveness of the Church. But we are not prepared to admit any disturbance of the doctrinal balance of the book ; nor are we prepared, in our willingness to give and take, that all the giving shall be on our side and all the taking on the other. We believe we speak for many, possibly for most, of those members of the Evangelical school who are in favour of revision, and the events of the past few weeks have made a frank statement of our position a matter of importance. If our co-operation in the work of revision is to be continued, we must receive proper consideration. It is much to be desired that all Churchmen who are interested in the endeavour to make the Prayer-Book the best aid to worship in our modern Church should be able to work together in that endeavour. We have not yet lost hope that it may be so. But more than once the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation has rudely shaken our hopes. We have already indicated the grounds upon which we cannot agree to the permissive use of vestments. Two other matters have since arisen—the resolutions of the House anent Reservation and the Words of Administration at Holy Communion, in both of which scant heed has been paid to our position and our feelings.

There was a primitive custom, in accordance
Reservation. with which the consecrated elements were carried straight from the church at the time of the Communion Service to sick members of the congregation. The idea was that all might communicate together. In no true sense was this reservation. In itself it was certainly a harmless, and indeed a beautiful, custom. If we could be assured that all the practices which too frequently accompany reservation to-day would be forthwith given up, we would gladly welcome the renewal of this primitive custom. But we should live in a fool's paradise if we believed any such thing. There are some good, or at least harmless, things which become spoiled, and even pernicious, through improper usage. The razor which has been used to chop fire-

wood is a dangerous implement to shave with. It is useless to shut our eyes to the fact that the primitive custom differs *toto cælo* from the medieval and modern, and that reservation to-day is in too many cases a means of materializing our doctrine of Holy Communion. If the primitive custom is needed to-day, and we are disposed to doubt it, let us first be rid of all the medieval accretions to it, and then, and not till then, we shall be prepared to consider the question of its re-enactment.

This may seem a smaller matter, and perhaps in itself it is so. But the way in which it was handled in Convocation is discreditable—we are sorry to be compelled to use the word—to a fair-minded assembly. It has been decided, after strong protest, that the whole of the words of administration should be used once for each group of communicants, and then that the first half shall be said to each individual communicant. Let us recall the history of the words. In the Prayer-Book of 1549 the first half stood alone; in 1552 the second alone. It was felt that the first half was capable of a materialistic interpretation, hence the change. Under Elizabeth the two halves were combined by way of compromise. If we are now only to have one half, the second half, which is an invitation to receive, is, on the whole, rather more appropriate than the first. But we are prepared to recognize divergence of view. We shall be amply satisfied if the choice of either half be left open. Some will then use one, some the other, many at different times both. But we feel very strongly that the action of the Lower House was an unwarrantable exercise of the power of a majority, an act of ecclesiastical tyranny, which we regret very deeply indeed. Evangelicalism is sometimes twitted with being narrow and ungenerous; those who voted for this obnoxious resolution must look nearer home ere they use those words again. Let there be no misunderstanding. We are not going to be driven into the camp of the anti-revisionists, but we believe that no act of revision will reach consummation unless the Evangelical school consent, and, with

all the goodwill in the world, we cannot consent to partisan revision. We are revisionists, but once again we would make it clear—we will not be a party to the disturbance through a revised service-book of the Reformation settlement.

We refrained from saying anything last month about the controversy which has arisen about the Coronation Form and Order of Service to be used in parish churches. It has had the sad effect of dividing us on Coronation Day, for at least three forms of service will be used. The question of the words “altar” and “holy table” is not the only one involved. The very significant words of the King’s oath to maintain the Protestant Reformed religion were omitted from the Archbishops’ form. The Bishop of Manchester writes in his diocesan magazine :

“The omission of these words from the form commended by the Archbishops, adhering as that form does so closely to the wording of the rest of the Coronation Service and Rubrics, is an omission which will be noted with very great regret by most, if not by all, Churchmen.”

We venture to agree, and to express a hope that forms of service for special occasions will in future come under the particular personal notice of the Archbishops, and will not, as has been the case more than once, hurt the feelings of any school of thought in the Church.



Orders and Reunion.

II.

BY THE REV. A. W. F. BLUNT, M.A.,

Vicar of Carrington, sometime Fellow and Classical Lecturer of Exeter College, Oxford.

WE must now turn to consider the principle of corporate life, as declared in the Apostolic writings; and in this respect we find the attitude to be very similar to that which they taught with regard to intellectual truth. They regard the life of the Christian Church as consisting in a combination of freedom and disciplined order. Each individual is free to choose the sphere in which he shall exercise his gifts, and to regulate his own mode of access to God. Each congregation is to be its own master in matters of detail. And yet there must be rules to which all individuals and all congregations that wish to remain in the Church must conform. Varieties of system were allowed, but the tendency to self-assertion and usurpation was kept under strict control. No sanction was given to the idea that anybody might preside at public worship, who felt disposed to do so, without some sort of Church recognition or commission. No encouragement was given to individual congregations to regulate their own affairs entirely without regard to the practice of other congregations. In their lifetime the Apostles took great care to prevent individual or congregational liberty from degenerating into individualism or congregationalism. After their generation the same object was provided for by stereotyping the system of Church commission into the threefold ministry, and by stereotyping the system of Church organization into the co-ordination of federally united dioceses. It still remains to be proved that any better system has been evolved to supersede these. The system of Papal autocracy has proved prejudicial to liberty; the system of Congregational autonomy has proved prejudicial to discipline. Other systems, such as the Wesleyan and the Presbyterian systems, are, so far as I know, less open to either of these

charges ; but they have only attained this immunity by modeling themselves on the lines of the historic system, which the Anglican communion has retained. And it is worth while asking whether the historic system does not possess—at least, in virtue of its seniority over these later systems—a claim to allegiance, when it preserves the combination of elements which formed the groundwork of the Apostolic Church's corporate life.

The Apostolic conception contained, however, a third element, which must not be forgotten—I mean the Sacramental element. The society was prior to the individual, and the individual derived his grace through his membership in the society. He began the life of grace, the life in Christ, when he entered by baptism into the sphere of God's new covenant ; he lived the life of grace by virtue of communion with the Mediator of that new covenant. The Sacramental theory is the very basis of the whole Apostolic conception of a corporate Church life. Baptism as the symbol and means of birth into that corporate life in Christ, the Eucharist as the symbol and means of the continuation of that corporate relation in Christ between the various members of that Body—these were the indispensable requisites which the Apostles never flinched in exacting from all who desired to be members of the Church. And it is in its Sacramental theory and practice that I find the greatest asset of the English Church. It has retained the idea of Baptismal regeneration and the idea of congregational Communion ; it has not narrowed the Baptismal Sacrament by making it a reward of merit rather than a means of grace ; it has not degraded the Eucharist into a magical transaction, nor rationalized it into a mere memorial function. No doubt there have been, and are, among us tendencies at work in both of these directions ; but these tendencies are not true to the essence of Anglican Sacramentarianism any more than they are true to the essence of Apostolic doctrine on the subject. And so long as we are faithful to our own and the Apostolic theory, so long can we show a bold front in face of the perversions of other theories.

You must by now have anticipated the thesis as to the ministry to which I have been tending. It is this—that the validity of any ministerial system is to be tested by its value for the preservation of these three Apostolic principles of Church life which I have discussed. The grace of Orders, like every other grace of God, comes to the individual through the Church ; and the ordained minister is the representative of the Church. The ministry exists for the purpose of perpetuating the Church's life ; and it is thus Sacramental in its nature—an outward sign and means of the inward life of the Church. It is valid in so far as it represents a true Church life ; it is invalid in so far as it does not do so. The essential point is the preservation of the general principles of Church life, and of a duly appointed and duly qualified ministry to represent a Church life that is based on these principles. The preservation of an historic form of ministry is a matter of importance, not so much for its own sake as for the token which it gives of the Church's intention to preserve the general principles of the historic Church which find a satisfactory expression in that form.

Thus, if we judged ideally, we might say that at the present time there are no valid Orders anywhere in Christendom ; because there is no real corporate unity or corporate Church life in the Christendom of our age. The ministries of each section of Christendom represent only their several sections ; and, even if each section were national, yet Christianity would not cease to be sectional, unless there were some real basis of unity between the various national sections. And sectional Christianity is not Catholic nor Apostolic. But in such matters it is an error to proceed by the method of counting heads. That is to substitute the *volonté de tous* for the *volonté générale* ; it is a fallacious method in political theory, and it is no more commendable in the sphere of ecclesiastical politics. The question that we have to consider is, Which section at the present time best preserves the Apostolic principles of Church life under modern conditions ? The difficulty of harmonizing these old principles with our new circumstances is acknowledged ; it is proved, if

by nothing else, by the varieties of systems through which various denominations try to effect the harmony. And the existence of this difficulty should make us more cautious than we often are in pronouncing condemnation upon all systems save that to which we are accustomed. But I am convinced that the theory is utterly perverse which declares that all consideration of the results of a system, with regard to the maintenance of Apostolic principles of truth and corporate Church life, is to be subordinated to a consideration of the particular form of the ministry. That is to place the ministry in a position of greater importance than the Church. And this is a complete reversal of the true and Apostolic order.

I have tried to give some indication of the way in which I would seek to justify the English Church's system by its results in the preservation of fundamental Apostolic principles ; and I may now attempt some general statement of the position which, in my judgment, we should adopt in defining our own attitude, both positively in itself and negatively as regards other bodies. In the first place, I feel that there must be no faltering in the conviction with which we declare that we will not give up our present system of ministry. Why should we? It is not only because it is episcopal, or because it is in accordance with the system of the second century, that we must adhere to it ; the Holy Spirit might quite well have inspired, and may yet inspire, some development which would be a supersession of the episcopal system, as He inspired the development of that system itself. Still less must we claim that our ministerial system is superficially most consistent with that of the Apostolic age ; for that statement is open to serious question on grounds of simple historical fact. But the reason why we cling to the system with attachment is because we believe the life of our Church to be most faithful to Apostolic principles ; and, this being so, we see no reason why we should renounce the ministerial system, under which we have been continued in that fidelity. We see in this circumstance an evidence that the Holy Spirit has ordained the system and has not yet ordained its

successor. The intention of our Church is to preserve and perpetuate the vital principles of the Apostolic Church ; and of this intention we see the outward sign and symbol, and, judging by results, we may say the efficacious sign, in the preservation of our historic ministry. The Papal system may be more overtly orderly ; but it gains that advantage at the expense of an incalculable loss of freedom and truth. The Nonconformist system may be more superficially democratic ; but it suffers for this in a loosening of the bonds of wise discipline and a mutilation of the structure of Christian truth. No doubt our system is not perfect ; the old hierarchic ideas and the old false sacerdotalism are not yet extinct. There is a great deal yet to be done in some directions by accommodating our system to the spirit of the age, in other directions by tempering that spirit by a revival of order and discipline in practice. But everywhere we see signs that the system is looking out for the path of wise adaptation. Episcopacy means something very different now from what it meant a hundred years ago ; the aristocratic exclusiveness of the priestly order is being broken down in every direction by the reassertion of the priesthood of the whole Body ; we are tending more and more to emphasize the representative character of the priesthood, as the ministry of men who are *servi servorum Dei*, and with that tendency the false pretensions to sacerdotal tyranny are disappearing. There are also signs that we are beginning more generally to recognize that a remedy must be found for clerical disobedience and lay indiscipline. And such symptoms as these justify the belief that we are not so hidebound by our system as to be incapable of setting our house in order ; and to do this is our chief duty, on every score. We are accused on one hand of schism, on the other of Romanizing tendencies. These are but the bogies of popular polemics. But they may, at least, serve to warn us to be on our guard against any excessive self-satisfaction ; and, no less, against any sectarianism which would exalt forms above principles, or, on the other hand, against any compromise with the truth which would accept what is in principle wrong and

untrue because it has the sanction of ancient prestige. And so long as we guard against these fatal errors, we can afford to neglect the accusations of controversialists whose only stock-in-trade is the repetition of catchwords, and whose strength is in inverse proportion to their noisiness.

And, in the second place, when we come to consider our relations to other Christian denominations, one or two cautions must be borne in mind. We shall be making a grievous mistake if we hastily unchurch others and adjudge them entirely wrong merely because their official systems differ from ours. We must realize that the blame for all, or nearly all, schisms can be distributed to both sides. We must also realize that principles are of more value than forms. Thus, if we consider the case of the Papacy, it appears to me historically untrue to deny that in its time it was a natural, and necessary, and God-directed development. But we maintain that it has outlived its necessity, and that it is rapidly outliving its usefulness. We repudiate it, not at all because it was a new development from primitive theory—that is of no moment—but because it has become palpably ineffective, or rather a palpable obstacle in the preservation of the true elements of Apostolic Church life. If the Vatican were to drop the claim of Papal infallibility and to recognize Anglican Orders, even so we should not be satisfied, so long as it sacrifices, or tries to sacrifice, freedom to discipline, truth to medievalism, Scripture to tradition, and Sacramental grace to magic. The Papacy is at present prehistoric in its theories, and demoralizing in its attitude to truth; and such defects cannot be condoned for the sake of an agreement as to forms.

As to the Nonconformist systems, the position is not very dissimilar. I believe that, at the time when they arose, these systems were, like the Papacy, a natural and necessary development—an experiment that had to be tried. Whether the development was a real one, whether the experiment has permanently succeeded, as certainly it succeeded for a time, is a question which can only be answered by the verdict of history.

I believe that this answer is still in process of being given, and it is incautious to try to anticipate it too confidently. But I cannot help confessing to an uneasy feeling that the signs of the times seem to point to the ultimate giving of an unfavourable verdict. It cannot, I must think, be entirely an accident that Nonconformity is in so many cases substituting, for the declaration of spiritual doctrine and the edifying of faith upon the basis of doctrinal truth, a propagation of social and political theories or an elaborate insistence upon isolated ethical virtues, such as alcoholic temperance ; it cannot be an accident that the bonds of systematic belief seem to sit so lightly upon many Nonconformist bodies, that in some of those bodies disciplined cohesion seems neither attainable nor wanted, and that membership in them seems to be allowed so often to connote no particular duties of belief or of participation in Sacramental grace. I do not know how far the theoretic policy of all Nonconformist bodies has definitely surrendered to the giant of undenominationalism, but there can be no question that in practice they are deep in the shadow of that intellectual monstrosity. And the results are too obviously apparent in the ease with which attendants at Nonconformist places of worship change, without apparent discomfort, from a place which bears the name of one sect to that which bears the name of another sect, very widely different in historical theory from the former. It is a pure abuse of language to call such a phenomenon a token of unity. It is an evidence of merely negative uniformity. All say much the same thing, but this situation is attained only through the fact that none of them says anything in particular. The extraordinary circumstance is that such an unscientific theory yet produces such wonderful fruits of piety and philanthropy. But I feel very strongly that its fruits can never be more than individual, and Christianity is not an individualist gospel. Nor, I must repeat, is Christianity only a rule of conduct ; it is also a system of truth and a theory of life. It is not enough to "do the will" of God ; we must also desire to "know of the doctrine." And a system which spends all its

energies on conversion, and has little apparatus for edification, which has little further to teach its adherents than the consciousness of an ethical ideal and the desire for righteousness, however great may be its immediate effects upon them, is in grave danger of being unable to inspire them with lasting and growing spiritual vitality. It provides "milk for babes," but it has no "meat to give to strong men." It keeps its babes in a state of tutelage; and I fear very much that the logical nemesis of creedless, or almost creedless, Christianity is to be seen in the ethical societies, which inculcate morality with a deliberate absence of reference to any religious sanction, which make philanthropy take the place of "faith that worketh by love," which abolish the first table of the Decalogue, and substitute the love of mankind as a life-motive for the dual love of God and of our neighbour.

I began by alluding to the problem of Christian Reunion, and I fear that nothing that I have since said has done anything towards suggesting a workable scheme of Reunion. So presumptuous a programme was very far from my intention; but of one fact I am certain—namely, that in trying to induce Non-conformists to accept our system of Orders as a condition of Reunion we should be very cautious in the arguments that we use. If we take up the ground that they must virtually confess all the ministrations, from which they have derived spiritual benefit for years, to have been null and invalid, we are making Reunion impossible, and we are flying in the face of facts. The Nonconformist ministries have been too obviously blessed to be thus betrayed by those who have received through them such great blessings. I think we shall be better advised if we eschew such arguments, and place our hope in the doctrine of general intention, arguing that if they accept our Orders as a condition of Reunion they do so only as a symbol of the sincerity of their intention to revert to the true principles of Apostolic Church life, which their own system has in practice proved incapable of safeguarding. The problem of Reunion with Rome, though there is more agreement between us as to forms, appears to me

to be no less difficult as soon as we come to deal with principles. Rome itself is at present in the melting-pot, and we do not know what will be the result of its present internal conflict of tendencies. But here, again, I feel that before any Reunion between us can be possible, both sides will have to come to an agreement as to what are the true principles of Church life, and to unite on a basis of common desire to safeguard these. They will have to admit our intention, and we shall have to be convinced of theirs, before any real union can be achieved ; and I fear that such an agreement will not be reached until a great deal of water has flowed under the bridges. The official system of Rome at present may resemble ours in external points, but I can scarcely conceive that any internal difference of spirit and principle could be greater than that which at present exists between us. Meanwhile, we had better realize that the whole cause of Reunion is only jeopardized by hasty and ill-considered efforts to force a concordat, for which all sides are as yet quite unready, by well-meant offers of minor or seemingly minor compromises to Nonconformists, or by equally well-meant attempts to reduce all the differences between ourselves and Rome to a vanishing-point. Our energies at present will be better engaged in preparing the way by thoroughly considering and digesting the principles of our own position. This is not so easy a thing to do as would be imagined from the utterances of various speakers and writers, who appear to fancy that the more clear-cut a theory is, the more likely it is to be true. The position of the English Church is peculiarly, one might say irritatingly, difficult to grasp or explain, because it endeavours to hold in a due balance the complementary principles of order and freedom, of corporate authority and individual liberty, of Scriptural evidence and Church tradition ; and the balance is always tending to be raised or depressed on one side or the other. But any statement is narrowly one-sided and unjust to the true Catholic comprehensiveness of the English Church which does not recognize and allow equally for both sides ; and the only merit that I would claim for this brief and most

imperfect essay is that I have made an honest attempt to hold the balance evenly, and to state the theory of the English Church without throwing prejudice or partisanship into either scale in order to give it preponderance over the other.



Some Chapters in the History of the Early English Church.

BY THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

VIII.—THE PENITENTIAL SYSTEM AND PENITENTIALS.

THERE has been a good deal of difference of opinion as to whether the penitential system which was introduced by the Roman and Scottish missions did much good. It certainly did a good deal of harm, and if we confine our attention to the Penitential Books, or Penitentials, as they are commonly called, we may say that the harm far exceeded the good, whether we regard their effect on the clergy who used them, or the laity who were treated in accordance with the regulations laid down in them.

The penitential system as a whole was an attempt to lay upon the rough, selfish world something of the monastic discipline which had come to be regarded as the ideal life; and of course some modifications had to be made in the discipline when it was applied to lay persons living in the world. In two respects at least it did good. It taught and enforced the wholesome doctrine that sin was a pollution to the sinner, and that wrongdoing was an injury, not only to the persons wronged, but also to the wrongdoer himself. No doubt this had been taught, not only in the first ages of the Christian Church, but before the birth of Christianity, and by both Jews and Gentiles. But the penitential system drove this idea home, and emphasized the fact that personal purity and rectitude were things to be desired for a man's own well-being, as well as for the safety of

those among whom he lived ; and thus the moral sense of society was made more alert, and was raised to a higher level. The system also did a great service to society in changing the point of view from which offences were to be judged. Every great injury to the person had its customary penalty, according to a rate which eventually became embodied in laws ; and this penalty was called the *wer*, which, being of the nature of a pecuniary fine, was commonly spoken of as the *wergild*. But, whereas the *wergild* of the State was on a scale which rated offences according to the rank of the person wronged, the penitential system of the Church rated offences according to the rank of the wrongdoer. The one made an offence committed *against* a person of high rank worse than an offence committed against a person of low rank. The other treated an offence committed *by* a person of high rank as worse than one committed by a person of low rank. The difference from a moral point of view was great, and wholly to the advantage of society. The principle that *noblesse oblige*—that the nobleman is under stronger obligation to behave well than the serf, and the priest than the layman—was wholesome doctrine ; and it was no less wholesome doctrine that to kill a serf was just as much murder as to kill an ætheling or a king.

One can hardly avoid, in this connexion, talking of Anglo-Saxon *laws* ; but it must be remembered that we know very little about such things, and it is unwise to make more than tentative statements on the subject. It is convenient to talk of Ini's laws or Alfred's laws, and such language easily leads one to think of a code drawn up under the one king or the other ; but we probably make a considerable mistake if we assume that any such code ever existed. The "dooms" that have come down to us are isolated regulations—attempts to put down in black and white some of the more important customs which had become established, and which often require a knowledge of customs that were not written down in order to make the written "dooms" intelligible. That is just the knowledge which, with our present materials, it seems to be impossible to

obtain. Nevertheless, enough is known to enable us to compare the civil customs or laws of the State with the penitential system of the Church, and to see that the moral influence of the latter was in some respects superior to the moral influence of the former.

Wergild and compurgation seem always to have gone together; the higher the *wergild*, the greater the value of that person's oath in court. Every man's life had its value, and every man's word had its value, when he swore to alleged facts in a trial. The oath of the twelfhynd man was worth twice that of the sixhynd man, and six times that of the twyhynd man. The *wergild* of the twyhynd, or simple free man, was 200 shillings, and this seems to have been the unit of calculation. The estimates for the higher ranks, whether in the State or in the Church, were multiples of that—viz., twice, or four times, or six times 200 shillings. The slave had no *wergild*, and his word went for nothing in a court of justice; he could no more give legal testimony than an ox or an ass. He was simply his master's chattel. Injuries done to him were treated as done to his master, just as injuries done to the master's cattle were treated; and the master was responsible for all injuries done by his slave, just as he was responsible for what his cattle did.

Yet even in this civil legislation or traditional custom we can trace the influence of the Church. Church property was regarded as God's property, and theft of it was punished more severely than theft from a king. The word of a bishop, like the word of a king, was indisputable, even without an oath. A priest could clear himself from an accusation by denying the truth of it before the altar and saying, "Veritatem dico in Christo, non mentior" (Rom. ix. 1). A layman had to swear, and bring others to swear, that he was innocent. It is stated that a slave who was made by his master to work on Sunday could claim his freedom. Such a law is obviously of ecclesiastical origin, and it must have secured to the slave one day of rest in the week. No master would risk losing his slave for the sake of a few hours' work. But it is probable that these

customs were not the same in all kingdoms or at all periods. Nevertheless, we may assume that similar principles prevailed in almost all cases ; and the difference between estimating the gravity of a crime by the rank of the person who commits it, rather than by the rank of the person who suffers from it, is very great indeed, and this change of view may be attributed to the penitential system, which made the penance of a priest heavier than that of a deacon, and the penance of a deacon or subdeacon heavier than that of a layman. Nevertheless, at its best such a system had obvious perils, which might easily be realized. It seemed to imply, by its carefully-graduated penalties for particular sins, that by the performance of the penance the sin was *ipso facto* cancelled as if it had never been committed, just as a debt is cancelled by the payment of what has been owed ; and it might easily be understood to insinuate that the sin might be committed if you were prepared to perform the penance which was prescribed for it. Modifications were gradually introduced into the system, partly of necessity, and partly through the ingenious casuistry of penitents or of indulgent confessors, which turned these possibilities into disastrous facts.

When a flagrant sinner had delayed repentance until he was on his deathbed, it was futile to tell him that he must undergo penitential fasts for many years. He was allowed to commute these for works of mercy by donations to churches and monasteries, helping the poor, freeing his own slaves and redeeming those of other masters, building bridges, and the like. This kind of indulgence was required often, and at last was reduced to a system, with a fixed price for every period of fasting that was commuted, the price being graduated according to the rank or wealth of the penitent. Then it was pleaded that, if this commutation was allowed to all those who were supposed to be dying, some of whom eventually recovered, it ought to be allowed to all sick persons, who were, by the fact of their sickness, precluded from undergoing a long period of fasting. And then it was argued that all whose constitutions or daily employments

rendered a prolonged diet of bread and water perilous to health might claim the same right of commutation. When this concession had been made, it was obvious that the Church was favouring the rich, while being as stern as ever to the poor. The rich man might commit some scandalous crime, and quickly be reconciled to the Church by payment of the sum which was equivalent to the years of penitential discipline which his sin had incurred; while the poor man, in similar circumstances, would have to undergo the penance or be excommunicated. This rendered it necessary that some kind of commutation, other than a money payment, should be invented. If, therefore, the penitent was too poor to pay a silver penny for every day of fasting that his sin had incurred, he might recite fifty psalms instead of paying; and if he was too illiterate to recite fifty psalms, he might say the Lord's Prayer fifty times. But, supposing he was so ignorant as to be unable to say the Lord's Prayer, or had to work so hard for his living that he could not find time for reciting so many psalms or prayers daily, what was he to do? Then he might get someone else to do it for him, of course remunerating his substitute so far as he was able. Supposing that he found a good-natured substitute who did not require to be remunerated, he got off scot-free. In this way it was possible for a man to commit a grievous sin, and yet enjoy the full privileges of communion, without having done anything to prove, either to himself or to others, that he was penitent. He could tell himself and others that he had done all that the Church required.

Such cases were not only possible, they actually occurred, and evidently they were not rare. We have seen that the Council of Clovesho found it necessary to proclaim that no one must think that psalm-singing will free people from the obligation to practise other good works, or that sins can be cancelled by the fasts and prayers of other persons. It also told the clergy to remind their flocks that alms and prayers, although certainly useful, are designed to be only auxiliaries of fasting, and not substitutes for it. The bishops, however,

seem hardly to have been in earnest about the matter. The indulgences and commutations and substitutions which they condemned were, little by little, sanctioned, first by silence, and then by formal permission.

When this system of counting the austerities and devotions of other people as penance for one's own sins had become recognized and accurately graduated according to a known rule, it developed to an extent which is hardly credible, and which in any sphere other than that of the solemn work of reclaiming sinners and freeing them from their sins would seem to be grotesque and absurd. In order to be safe from the suspicion of exaggerating for controversial purposes, it will be well to take the description of the process from a Roman Catholic writer of great learning and fairness. The case is that of a wealthy thegn who had committed a crime for which the established penance would be a rigorous fast for a year. "At his summons, his friends and dependents assembled at his castle; they also [*i.e.*, as well as the thegn himself] assumed the garb of penitence; their food was confined to bread, herbs, and water; and these austerities were continued till the aggregate amount of their fasts equalled the number specified by the canons. Thus, with the assistance of one hundred and twenty associates, an opulent sinner might, in the space of three days, discharge the penance of a whole year" (Lingard, "The History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church," i., p. 339). It was stipulated that the sinner must do a fraction of the penance himself; and he was admonished that the experiment of getting other people to do the greater part for him was a doubtful one, and that he must sanctify the experiment by true contrition. But such admonitions were not likely to have much effect, when the practice of vicarious penance had been not only allowed but regulated in detail. Lingard states that he has found no instance of it later than the reign of Edgar; but, of course, that does not prove that the custom came to an end then. In history generally, and especially in ages in which historians are not found and chroniclers are few, it is things which are of frequent occurrence

that are not recorded. One may conjecture that an arrangement which was so much in accordance with the wishes of the powerful and wealthy would not easily die out of itself or be put down by ecclesiastical authority. It would be interesting to know whether ecclesiastics themselves ever made use of it.

It is in the Penitentials or Penitential Books that the system is seen at its worst. Such things had many names; *libri pœnitentiales*, *pœnitentialia*, *leges pœnitentiæ* or *pœnitentium*, *pœnitentiales codices*, *peccantium judicia*, and so forth. Apparently they were seldom put forth with the authority of any Council, but generally with that of some individual teacher or bishop, who had a reputation for piety and for skill in dealing with penitents. Councils, as a rule, seem to have condemned the use of them, or, at any rate, of certain provisions in them, as we have seen was the case with the Council of Clovesho. The best known examples are the Anglo-Saxon Penitentials of the period which we are discussing, but such books were common enough on the Continent. It is erroneous to suppose that they were introduced into Britain from Rome, whether by Archbishop Theodore or any of his predecessors. It is quite clear from Adamnan's "Life of Columba" (i. 22, ii. 39; see Fowler's edition, p. 35) and other sources of information that penitential canons existed in the Keltic Church. We have extracts from the "Book of David," Bishop of Minevia (St. David's) in the sixth century, which was of this character; and there is a "Book on the Computation of Penances," which is attributed to Cummian, who sided with Rome against his Keltic brethren on the Paschal question in the seventh century. It has been thought that Theodore's Penitential is largely based on Cummian's, but chronology is against this.¹ The later Penitential of Archbishop Egbert of York, however, does owe some of its items to Cummian. To what extent the Penitential which bears the

¹ Dean Hook thinks that Theodore must have been acquainted with the Penitential of John the Faster (*d.* A.D. 596), the opponent of Pope Gregory the Great ("Lives of the Archbishops," i., p. 168). In the form in which it has come down to us, this Penitential has the horrible features alluded to below.

name of Theodore is really his is a question not easily determined. But that he did issue such a document, not for general information, but for the guidance of parish priests, is certain : and whatever harm it may have done by lowering the tone of spiritual life in an unwise attempt to raise it, we ought to remember with gratitude that it had a good deal to do with establishing the parochial system in England. The Penitential assumes all through that every English Christian has a church to worship in and a priest to minister to him both publicly and privately (Haddan's "Remains," edited by Forbes, p. 323 *et seq.*).

There is a Penitential which bears the honoured name of Bede, and some scholars of repute accept it as his. But the latest editor of Bede gives good reasons for doubting whether he ever compiled anything of the kind. Bede does not mention it in the list of his writings at the end of his "Ecclesiastical History," nor does he allude to it elsewhere. Egbert, who was Bede's pupil, in compiling his Penitential, states that he borrows from Gregory and Theodore, but says nothing about obligations to Bede. Moreover, Bede, who tells us so much about Theodore, never mentions that Theodore had issued a Penitential, which he surely would have done if he had used it ; and the Penitential attributed to Bede is only a compilation from Theodore's and other works of the kind. "On the whole, the arguments are against Bede's authorship, and we should be thankful to believe that Bede had nothing to do with such a matter. The penitential literature is, in truth, a deplorable feature of the medieval Church. Evil deeds, the imagination of which may perhaps have dimly floated through our minds in our darkest moments, are here tabulated and reduced to a system. It is hard to see how anyone could busy himself with such literature and not be the worse for it" (C. Plummer, "Bædæ Opera Historica," i., p. clvii *et seq.*).

The reader will find similar condemnations of these books in the "Dictionary of Christian Biography," iii., p. 367 ; iv., p. 932 ; "Dictionary of Christian Antiquity," ii., p. 1608. They seem to have been much used in the Gallic Church, for a good many Frankish Penitentials are still extant ; and there they were con-

demned by synodical authority early in the ninth century, by Councils at Châlons (A.D. 813), at Mainz (A.D. 829), and at Paris (A.D. 847); which also appears to show that they were so widely diffused and so generally employed as to be a serious and notorious evil. They are to be entirely rejected and discarded, and bishops are charged to destroy them wherever they come across them. Apparently these Frankish Penitentials were nameless, *quorum certi errores, incerti auctores*, and therefore it would be more easy to drive them out of use. But in England the names of Theodore and Egbert, which were rightly assigned to books of this kind, and the name of Bede, however wrongly assigned, would make it more difficult to get the Penitentials discarded, and as a matter of fact they continued to be copied for a long time.

It is only right to remember, when we read of the appalling minuteness with which sins of the flesh are tabulated and estimated as to degrees of enormity, and therefore as to corresponding degrees of penance, that the whole system originated in misguided zeal in dealing with the vices of *heathen*, to whom such things were either a matter of course or a joke. But we cannot argue that, if the Penitentials had not been in the first instance framed for converts from paganism, such sins would hardly have been mentioned. The damning fact is that they continue to be mentioned, and discussed with increasing minuteness, when the Penitentials are to be used in dealing with persons who have had Christian progenitors for generations, and in particular with the inmates of monasteries. As Haddan long ago pointed out, in dealing with Montalembert's too favourable estimate of "The Monks of the West," if a whole series of minute laws is repeated again and again, through many centuries and in all countries, respecting "certain acts of wickedness as committed by a special class of men, we fear it is plain proof that such wickedness not only existed, but was common in that class.¹ In truth, the framers of canons and

¹ For the extraordinary severity of the penalties inflicted by monastic discipline on quite ordinary and even trivial faults, see I. Gregory Smith, "Christian Monasticism," chap. vii.

penitentials must have been destitute of common sense, as well as common decency, if anything save stern necessity drove them to fill their pages with that which forms the staple of their contents." Anyone who cares to verify the truth of this has the material provided for him in vol. iii. of Haddan and Stubbs' "Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland." The later developments of the system in the matter of Indulgences are sketched in Lindsay's "History of the Reformation," vol. i., pp. 213-227.



The Date of the Crucifixion.

BY LIEUTENANT-COLONEL MACKINLAY.

IN the April number of *THE CHURCHMAN* the Rev. D. R. Fotheringham, M.A., F.R.A.S., asserts (p. 266) in his striking and interesting article, "Fresh Light on the Date of the Crucifixion," that "astronomy not only narrows the uncertainty of the year, but also definitely decides once and for ever the still more engrossing question as to the exact day of the Crucifixion," which, he says, was on Friday, April 3, A.D. 33. He also states (p. 271) A.D. 29 is "a date that is no longer astronomically tenable" for that event.

He argues thus—the Crucifixion took place on a Friday and on the Passover day (14th of the lunar month Nisan), but in A.D. 29 that day fell on *Saturday*, March 19, because (according to his deductions) Nisan 1 was on March 5, when the new moon was first visible.

If Nisan 1 had fallen on the day previous (March 4), Nisan 14 would also, of course, have been a day earlier—viz., Friday, March 18, in which case the calendar would have agreed with the supposition that A.D. 29 was the year of the Crucifixion.

The question then turns on the point whether March 4 could have been Nisan 1 in A.D. 29.

In that year the beginning of the month might have been determined: (1) By actual observation of the new moon; (2) Possibly by some calculation, if the evening of March 4 were cloudy; (3) Possibly by some empirical rule.

(I.) Mr. Fotheringham states that the new moon could not have been seen just after sunset on March 4, A.D. 29, as it was then too young and not well placed for visibility in the sky. He bases this denial on a definite rule (p. 267) propounded by his brother, the eminent mathematician, J. K. Fotheringham,¹ Esq., M.A., D.Litt. This rule² is deduced from seventy-six observations of the times of earliest visibility of the new moon, and of latest visibility of the old moon, made during the years 1859 to 1880 at Athens and its neighbourhood, all of them by Julius Schmidt, except five, which were by Mommsen. The conclusion is rightly arrived at (and for this our thanks are due to Dr. Fotheringham) that visibility is not determined by the age of the moon alone, but also by its declination, which contributes to influence its position in the heavens with regard to the sun. According to Dr. Fotheringham's rule, the new moon was certainly not visible on March 4, A.D. 29.

Let us examine the basis on which this rule rests. The records of the observations were sent by Mommsen to Bruhns,

¹ See Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, May, 1910, on "The Smallest Visible Phase of the Moon," p. 530. Also *The Journal of Theological Studies*, October, 1910, on "Astronomical Evidence for the Date of the Crucifixion," p. 120; the investigation of the rule is not given in THE CHURCHMAN.

² The rule asserts that the new moon will be visible if situated above an imaginary arc in the sky whose highest part is 12° above the setting sun, but the moon will be invisible if below that line. Dr. Fotheringham states (Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, May, 1910, p. 530) that the "observations give a very clear dividing *line* between the conditions of positive and negative observations." Though his rule cannot be accepted as accurate, as will be shown later, it is an important step in the right direction, as it leads the way to the true statement, that if the new moon is situated above a certain arc-shaped *band* whose highest part is 12° above the setting sun, it will certainly be visible in ordinary cloudless weather; if below the *band* it will certainly be invisible under all circumstances; but if the new moon appears in the band itself, its visibility will depend upon the clearness of the atmosphere, the lower positions of the band naturally requiring the most perfect conditions of the air and the keenest vision on the part of the observer, in order to secure visibility.

but the latter failed to deduce from them an exact method for determining the first visible phase of the moon at sunset or the last visible phase at sunrise. Quite recently, however, Dr. Fotheringham claims to have done so. He found that seventy-four out of the total of the observations obeyed the rule which he constructed ; but two cases (Nos. 2 and 43), when the thin crescent of the moon was plainly visible, were very decided exceptions ; these exceptions were both observed by Schmidt, an astronomer and observer of the first rank. Dr. Fotheringham, however, disregarded these two observations, because one was that of the old moon, and the remaining one then became only one exception out of many observations. This surely was an unwise step to take, especially under the particular circumstances of the investigation, because on further inspection it was found that at least forty-six¹ of the observations were made when there could have been no doubt whatever that the moon would be visible, provided the sky were not cloudy. These forty-six observations were therefore useless for the testing of visibility. The number of suitable observations for the purpose in view was therefore reduced to thirty at the outside, and two undeniably trustworthy exceptions in thirty should certainly be regarded, there being no valid reason to reject an observation of the last visibility of the old moon.

It is also noticeable that during the last six years of the observations—viz., from January, 1874, to January, 1880—no attempt whatever was made to observe any new or old moon as badly placed for visibility as the two previously mentioned successful exceptions to the rule. Mommsen made one of his observations (No. 73) when out for a walk, and he himself suggests that his failure to observe might possibly have been due to obscuration produced by Mount Hymettus ; he then continued watching until the stars disappeared, but this raises a doubt, says Dr. Fotheringham, whether, if the walk had been

¹ In all these instances the moon had an altitude of over 12° at sunrise or at sunset, and was always visible. Nos. 47 and 36 had altitudes as great as 28.7° and 32.8° above the rising sun, and No. 18 an altitude of 21.1° above the setting sun.

prolonged a little longer, he might not have been successful in seeing the moon. Another of his observations (No. 74), when he failed to see the moon, was made on a cloudy evening, though there were breaks at times through which the moon might have been seen. Evidently Mommsen's observations are not very reliable.

It would therefore appear that Dr. Fotheringham's rule is not based on suitable data: we are confirmed in our distrust by the fact that Mr. D. W. Horner,¹ a well-known and careful observer, and three others saw the new moon with the naked eye on February 10 last year (1910) in England when it was only sixteen hours old. According to Dr. Fotheringham's rule this new moon ought not to have been seen.

It is true that the new moon of March 4, A.D. 29, was only about thirteen and a half hours old, but it was placed about as favourably for visibility² as Mr. Horner's new moon of last year. It is difficult, therefore, to believe that the new moon of March 4, A.D. 29, could not possibly have been seen by unaided vision, specially when the following facts are considered.

(a) The atmosphere of Palestine is much clearer than that of England; as an instance of difference of visibility caused by difference of atmosphere, it may be mentioned that when the present writer was on the Transit of Venus Expedition in 1882, the planet was seen for several hours every day for weeks together with the naked eye on the voyage out, and also in Jamaica; but in England he has very seldom seen the same planet in the middle of the day or early afternoon, and only with considerable difficulty by unaided vision.

(b) In the latitude of Jerusalem ($31^{\circ} 47' N.$) darkness comes on after sunset more rapidly than in England, or even in Athens;

¹ See *The Observatory*, April, 1911, pp. 162-3, and *The English Mechanic*, May 5, 1911, p. 308. Letters by D. W. Horner.

² See *The Observatory*, May, 1911, p. 203, letter by C. T. Whitmell, who calculates the altitude of the new moon seen on February 10, 1910, at sunset, as about $4\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$; difference of azimuth of the moon from the setting sun 10° . The same elements for the new moon at sunset March 4, A.D. 29, would be about altitude 6° , azimuth $6\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$.

consequently the new moon can be seen more easily in Palestine than in the other two countries.

(c) Jerusalem is about 2,600 feet above the sea; celestial objects near the horizon can there be seen with greater clearness than from a lower level, because there is a less density of air to look through.

(d) The Jewish observers were specially trained to search for the new moon with the naked eye. Probably they were among the most skilful of such observers who have ever lived. They had constant practice for hundreds of years from a fixed position, and they must certainly have known, very approximately, *where* to search for the new moon in the heavens—a most important matter when endeavouring to “pick up” a faint celestial body.

(e) With distant objects, only a little raised above the horizon, the atmospheric conditions of visibility vary greatly at different times at the same place. Thus, the Welsh mountains may be seen from the Irish Coast, near Dublin, on some few days in the year, but they are not visible on *every* cloudless day. It would appear, therefore, to be unwise to conclude that because the new moon is not visible to the naked eye on some ordinary cloudless evening that it *never* can be seen when in the same or even in a worse position. As a matter of fact the new moon (No. 53) of December 20, 1873, which was looked for, but not seen, by Schmidt at Athens, was in almost the same position, relatively to the sun, as the new moon which was seen by Mr. Horner at Tunbridge Wells, on February 10, 1910, when doubtless the atmosphere was exceptionally clear. Hence Dr. Fotheringham¹ was hardly correct when he stated “the problem (of the visibility of the new moon) is almost purely astronomical and not atmospheric.” All observers are well aware that, at low altitudes in particular, the condition of the atmosphere has an immense influence on the visibility of objects which are difficult to see.

Taking all these facts into consideration, it is impossible to

¹ Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, May, 1910, p. 530.

be certain that the new moon was not seen by the naked eye, if the sky were clear, on March 4, A.D. 29.

(II.) Let us now suppose that the evening of March 4, A.D. 29, was cloudy, and that the new moon was hidden. As a mean lunation contains only a very little more than twenty-nine and a half days, the months must have consisted of twenty-nine and thirty days alternately (on an average), with an excess of a thirty-day month about every two and a half years. It is certain that no month contained more than thirty days, even if no observation of the new moon could be made. Might not a month occasionally have consisted of only twenty-nine days, even if the new moon were hidden? In some cases it was known beforehand when a new month would begin, for David once said to Jonathan, "Behold, to-morrow is the new moon" (1 Sam. xx. 5). We do not know whether these words were spoken on the twenty-ninth or thirtieth day of a month. That only twenty-nine days were *sometimes* given to a month, without an observation of the new moon, is most probable, for if it were not so, and if the new moon had been clouded on only a few successive occasions, each month would have contained thirty days; it would then be found that when the new moon at last appeared it would be on an evening just after the close of the twenty-eighth day of the month. This would have caused great confusion in the calendar, because in that case the month just finished could only have contained twenty-eight days. It is possible, therefore, that if the new moon on the evening following the twenty-ninth day of the previous month (Adar) A.D. 29, had been obscured by cloud, the next day, March 4, might have been proclaimed Nisan 1. The evidence about the use of any rules or calculations for the Jewish calendar in such cases in the first century is unsatisfactory.

(III.) Let us now consider any possible empirical rule. Dr. Fotheringham states¹ that at one time, according to an ancient authority, it was the custom to make Adar (the month before Nisan) always to consist of only twenty-nine days, in

¹ *Journal of Theological Studies*, October, 1910, pp. 125, 126.

order to enable Jews in distant countries to know some time beforehand on which day to observe the Passover, thus insuring that all might keep it simultaneously. Dr. Fotheringham does not think that this rule was carried out in the time of Christ, but he admits that it might have been. It is therefore not impossible that in A.D. 29 the month Adar may have been allotted only twenty-nine days on this account, in which case Nisan 1 would have been on March 4, and consequently the Passover and the Crucifixion on Friday, Nisan 14 (March 18). The Rev. D. R. Fotheringham does not allude to any such possibility in his recent article in *THE CHURCHMAN*.

To sum up the astronomical part of the subject, Dr. Fotheringham's valuable investigation shows, what had long been known, that it cannot certainly be said from astronomical or calendar considerations that A.D. 29 fulfilled the conditions necessary to mark it as the year of the Crucifixion. On the other hand, neither he nor his brother has proved that date to be impossible.

Although it cannot be allowed that Mr. Fotheringham has succeeded in his argument that A.D. 29 was not the date of the Crucifixion, nevertheless he has done valuable service in drawing marked attention to the subject of the smallest visible phase of the moon, because it has an important bearing on Biblical chronology. It is hoped that this subject will be further investigated in astronomical circles.

The historic difficulty in the April *CHURCHMAN* as to the interpretation of the fifteenth year of Tiberius in Luke iii. 1, if A.D. 29 is taken to be the year of the Crucifixion, has been repeatedly raised. But scholars such as Alford, Sanday, Turner, and Ramsay accept the interpretation that Luke iii. 1 accords with the date A.D. 29 for the Crucifixion.

In the lax and changeable methods of counting regnal years in those days, the exact date cannot be fixed with certainty from this verse in Luke; the beginning of the reign of Tiberius *may* be the commencement of some position of rule which he took up at a certain time, or it *may* be the subsequent date of the beginning of his undivided sway.

Mr. Fotheringham, in his Article in *THE CHURCHMAN*, has only brought forward two evidences of date, both from Scripture, but there is another Bible passage which points (on the supposition of a three and a half years' ministry) to the year A.D. 29 for the Crucifixion,—“Forty and six years was this temple in building” (John ii. 20). There are also other New Testament verses which indicate a very definite year—that of the first of the enrolments (Luke ii. 1-2). These Roman enrolments took place every fourteen years. The date most consistent with this Gospel quotation is 8 B.C., which also indicates, of course, the year of the Nativity. If this be so, and if the Crucifixion were A.D. 29, the Lord's age at the beginning of His (three and a half years') ministry would have been just thirty-two years, which, according to Alford,¹ is correctly covered by the expression “about thirty years of age” (Luke iii. 23, R.V.). But if the year of the Lord's death were A.D. 33, His age at the beginning of His ministry would have been thirty-six years, which is not consistent with the expression “about thirty years of age.”

There is a mass of secular historic evidence in favour of 8 B.C. and A.D. 29 for the dates of the Nativity and of the Crucifixion respectively. The former date agrees with the express statement of Tertullian that Christ was born during the rule of Sentius Saturninus, and the latter date is in accord with the universal testimony of the early Latin fathers that the Lord suffered under the rule of the Gemini. There are also other reasons for A.D. 29 as the year of the Crucifixion which were given in *THE CHURCHMAN* (March, 1910).

We thus see that many evidences point to A.D. 29 as the date of the Crucifixion, and that the two considerations brought forward by Mr. Fotheringham do not contradict that supposition.

But supposing that his date A.D. 33 is accepted for the Crucifixion, he does not tell us how he would dispose of the remaining strong evidences which support A.D. 29 and negative A.D. 33 as the year of that grand event.

This subject is of great importance, because if we prove (as

¹ The Greek Testament, note on Luke iii. 23.

we believe we have) that *all* the evidence supports A.D. 29, we demonstrate that the Crucifixion was an historic fact, and not the myth which it is asserted to be by some popular writers of the day.

Cordial thanks are given to Mr. E. Walter Maunder, F.R.A.S., of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, for much help given in the preparation of this article.



The Religious Philosophy of William James.

BY THE REV. ALBERT WAY, M.A.,

Pusey House, Oxford.

II.

WE Christians have some good reasons, we saw in the former article, for welcoming this new American way of looking at religion. Scientific men have too often set religion altogether on one side by simply "pooh-poohing" it, but now someone has come forward from the heart of the scientific world and demanded fair play. It is true, he says, that the churches seem often to contain only bigots, who have never thought their faith out for themselves, and that systems of theology have rested on unproven and unprovable ideas rather than on facts, and yet religious institutions and theologies are, after all, only secondary products of religion. Let them by all means be put on one side, but only in order that we may look fairly and sympathetically at the primary product and real home of religion—the hearts of individual men. Professor James was addressing himself, we saw, to the scientific people who think that religion can all be explained away on materialistic principles, and showed them that it is not simply a theory, but an actual power. And if this is the case, he went on, it cannot be unreasonable to adopt the believing attitude of mind, if only because the saints have been more effective than the merely

moral men, and because we can see that belief is in very many cases an essential factor in action.

"There are cases, for example," he says, "where a fact cannot come at all unless a preliminary faith exists in its coming. And where faith in a fact can help to create the fact, that would be an insane logic which should say (as writers like Professor Clifford used to say) that faith running ahead of scientific evidence is the 'lowest kind of immorality' into which a thinking being can fall. Yet such is the logic by which our scientific absolutists pretend to regulate their lives! No; in truths dependent on our personal action, faith based on desire is certainly a lawful and possibly an indispensable thing" ("Will to Believe," p. 24).

"The greatest saints, the spiritual heroes, whom everybody acknowledges, are successes from the outset. They show themselves, and there is no question; everyone perceives their strength and stature. Their sense of mystery in things, their passion, their goodness, irradiate about them and enlarge their outlines while they soften them. They are like pictures with an atmosphere and background; and, placed alongside of them, the strong men of this world, and no other, seem as dry as sticks, as hard and crude as blocks of stone or brickbats. In a general way, then, and on the whole, our abandonment of theological criteria, and our testing of religion by practical common sense and the empirical method, leave it in possession of its towering place in history. Economically, the saintly group of qualities is indispensable to the world's welfare. The great saints are immediate successes; the smaller ones are at least heralds and harbingers, and they may be leavens also, of a better mundane order. Let us be saints, then, *if we can*, whether or not we succeed visibly or temporally. But in our Father's house are many mansions, and each of us must discover for himself the kind of religion and the amount of saintship which best comports with what he believes to be his powers and feels to be his truest mission and vocation. There are no successes to be guaranteed, and no set orders to be given to individuals, so long as we follow the methods of empirical philosophy. This is my conclusion so far" ("Varieties of Religious Experience," p. 376).

Professor James's trenchant refutations of a bland materialistic incredulity in "The Will to Believe," and in the early chapters of "The Varieties of Religious Experience," are undoubtedly a contribution of permanent value to apologetic literature, and they have helped many people to a more receptive attitude towards religion. They have had the same kind of effect, one may say, on the mind of the ordinary man as the development of foreign mission work. Educated men are coming in a way to believe in missions, instead of talking against them, because they have begun to realize their effectiveness. The missionary is often seen to be succeeding with the

child races of the world where the politician and the educator have been powerless, and many people, who perhaps have no personal belief in religion, are coming round to the opinion that Christianity is a good thing for uncivilized nations.

Foreign missions are being commended and supported—in other words, on the ground, not of their truth, but of their effectiveness. And the same is true of William James's way of defending and commending the religious attitude of mind. We are urged to set on one side the assertions of theology, and to concentrate attention upon the undeniable fact that religion is in individuals an experience and a power.

Thus both the psychological and missionary movements in their different ways have been of service to religion by bringing it into relation with practical life, but in both there is obviously the same danger of encouraging an indifference to the truth that lies behind the power. They are both so occupied with the effects of God's working that they tend to ignore His nature and even His very existence.

If religious conviction were simply a heightening of natural buoyancy and courage—a mere impersonal reinforcement of human capabilities—this way of treating it might conceivably be satisfactory, but, unfortunately for the new school of apologists, this is not the case. Religious conviction not only changes men's spirits and makes them able and willing to act in a way different from the way of the world, but it causes them to make dogmatic assertions about the nature of the spiritual world, and the honest student of human nature cannot therefore evade the question, Are these assertions true? Professor James, one feels, would immensely like to find a good reason for evading it; his whole temperament, so to speak, makes him long to be able to march along gaily with the Salvation Army band, and then slink round the corner when the sermon begins. He sees, however, quite clearly that this cannot be done, and so he braces himself rather desperately to face the difficulty, and to be loyal both to his sympathy and to science. He stands there steadily, then, on the outskirts of the crowd, listening to one saint after another

through the Christian centuries, giving his testimony and fearlessly proclaiming that he has found the truth. But no steady current of fact seems to reach him upon which a scientific induction can be built. The "one truth" seems to the critical observer to take a different colouring and shape for every different mind, and the longer he listens, the more bewildered he becomes. He would gladly give no answer at all, but the seekers after truth crowd round him and compel him. "You have listened to all the sermons. What are we to do, then, and to believe?" Reluctantly the answer comes: "So long as we follow the methods of empirical philosophy, there are no set orders to be given to individuals."

"In the interests of intellectual clearness, I feel bound to say that religious experience, as we have studied it, cannot be cited as unequivocally supporting the belief in a one infinite God. The only thing that it unequivocally testifies to is that we can experience union with *something* larger than ourselves, and in that union find our greatest peace" ("Varieties of Religious Experience," p. 525).

"Here the over-beliefs begin; here the prophets of all the different religions come with their visions, voices, raptures, and other openings, supposed by each to authenticate his own particular faith. Those of us who are not personally favoured with such specific revelations must stand outside of them altogether, and, for the present at least, decide that, since they corroborate incompatible theological doctrines, they neutralize one another and leave no fixed result. If we follow any one of them, we do so in the exercise of our individual freedom, and build out our religion in the way most congruous with our personal susceptibilities. Over-beliefs in various directions are absolutely indispensable, and we should treat them with tenderness and tolerance, so long as they are not intolerant themselves. As I have elsewhere written, the most interesting and valuable things about a man are usually his over-beliefs. Disregarding the over-beliefs, and confining ourselves to what is common and generic, we have in the fact that the conscious person is continuous with a wider self, through which saving experiences come, a positive content of religious experience which, it seems to me, is literally and objectively true so far as it goes" (p. 513, *et seq.*).

The picture of the kindly philosopher at the street corner stands out before us from these sentences. For the moment the situation is saved. The ardent zealots retire, a little baffled, but unable to say that he has been unjust to them. His academic disciples breathe freely once more; he has not capitulated to the fanatics. But in a few minutes the real seekers after truth come

back again. "But surely there are other methods than those of empirical philosophy? Is there no system of reasoned theology by which all these apparently conflicting 'truths' can be tested?"

As he sets himself to answer this question, he becomes harder and more professional and the sympathy begins to fade from his face. As we saw in the last article, he has an instinctive dislike of ready-made maps, and he allows this prejudice to warp his customary openness of mind. He always suspects theology of being at bottom unscientific, and of resting on mere notions instead of facts. He quotes Newman as a typical example of the theological mind, when he defines theology as "the science of God, or the truths we know about God, put into a system, just as we have a science of the stars and call it astronomy, or of the crust of the earth, and call it geology." This claim of religion to systematize itself is always too much for his tolerance, and he breaks out accordingly rather petulantly against the bare suggestion of any *a priori* method in these matters. When he spoke above about the impossibility of finding any one definite line of religious truth, "so long as we follow the methods of empirical philosophy," it sounded as if he might be prepared to admit some other method. As a matter of fact, that is the only method in which he believes, and the bare suggestion that there may be a different method throws him at once on the defensive. It seems to be opening the door to everything which the new method of Pragmatism has set itself to discredit. What we need, he has been saying, is to unstiffen our theories. "Pragmatism has no prejudices whatever," he is emphatic in asserting, "no obstructive dogmas, no rigid canons of what shall count as proof. She is completely genial; she will entertain any hypothesis; she will consider any evidence" ("Pragmatism," p. 79).

Thus his new method seems to force him into antagonism with every school of thought which teaches that the work of the individual mind is to adjust itself to eternal and pre-existing realities.

"Philosophy has always professed to prove religious truth by coercive argument, and to found religion upon universal reason; but, as a matter of

fact, philosophy has always failed to make good its pretension to be objectively convincing. The arguments for God's existence have stood for hundreds of years with the waves of unbelieving criticism breaking against them, never totally discrediting them in the ears of the faithful, but on the whole slowly and surely washing out the mortar from between their joints. No; the Book of Job went over this whole matter once for all, and definitely. Ratiocination is a relatively superficial and unreal path to the Deity: 'I will lay my hand upon my mouth; I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth Thee.' An intellect perplexed and baffled, yet a trustful sense of presence—such is the situation of the man who is sincere with himself and with the facts, but who remains religious still. We must, therefore, I think, bid a definitive good-bye to dogmatic theology. In all sad sincerity, I think, we must conclude that the attempt to demonstrate, by purely intellectual processes, the truth of the deliverances of direct religious experience is absolutely hopeless" ("Varieties of Religious Experience," chapter on Philosophy).

The earnest truth-seeker finds himself dismissed accordingly with rather a sharp warning. If he wants a ready-made system of religious truth, he cannot find it in the religious experience of the saints, and he must not try to find it in any *a priori* philosophy. But why, thinks the Pragmatist—and this is the really important thing to notice—should he want to find it at all? The controversy has revealed, in fact, the deep-down difference of temperament between the scientist and the philosopher, between the empirical student of human nature and the mystic who is athirst for the absolute.

If a man's interests are confined to the study of human nature and the conditions of its efficiency, religion will only seem important to him in so far as it promotes that efficiency, and he will have neither sympathy nor patience with its claim to reveal the eternal truth of things. He is like the politician who is interested in missionary work only in so far as it tends to produce good citizens, and is ready to support any and every creed which can do this. Such a temperament inclines men, in fact, to be sceptical about abstract truth altogether, and a little scornful of those who cannot be content without it.

Provided you have light enough, they say, for your next step, why trouble about discovering the light of the world? This mood is as prevalent nowadays in philosophy as in politics, and

in Pragmatism it has received formal expression. The Pragmatist tries to confine his attention to the actual facts before him, and is frankly impatient with the mystical temper, which tries to look always at actual facts in the light of some universal truth. He seems, indeed, to have abandoned almost explicitly the great quest which has been the inspiration alike of thought and of prayer.

"The only thing that religious experience, as we have studied it, unequivocally testifies to is that we can experience union with something larger than ourselves, and in that union find our greatest peace. Philosophy, with its passion for unity, and mysticism, both 'pass to the limit' and identify the something with a unique God who is the all-inclusive soul of the world. Popular opinion, respectful to their authority, follows the example which they set. Meanwhile the practical needs and experiences of religion seem to me sufficiently met by the belief that beyond each man, and in a fashion continuous with him, there exists a larger power which is friendly to him and to his ideals. All that the facts require is that the power should be both other and larger than our conscious selves. Anything larger will do, if only it be large enough for the next step. It need not be infinite, it need not be solitary. It might conceivably even be only a larger and more godlike self, of which the present self would then be but the mutilated expression, and the universe might conceivably be a collection of such selves, of different degrees of inclusiveness, with no absolute unity realized in it at all" ("Varieties of Religious Experience," p. 525).

"The alternative between Pragmatism and Rationalism, in the shape in which we have it now before us, is no longer a question in the theory of knowledge—it concerns the structure of the universe itself. And it is impossible not to see a temperamental difference at work in the choice of sides. The rationalist mind, radically taken, is of a doctrinaire and authoritative complexion. The phrase 'must be' is ever on its lips. The bellyband of its universe must be tight. A radical pragmatist, on the other hand, is a happy-go-lucky anarchistic sort of creature. If he had to live in a tub like Diogenes, he wouldn't mind at all if the hoops were loose and the staves let in the sun.

"For pluralistic pragmatism, truth grows up inside of all the finite experiences. They lean on each other, but the whole of them, if such a whole there be, leans on nothing" ("Pragmatism," p. 259).

We must all have a great deal of sympathy with this adventurous temperament, whether we meet it in the school-boy or in the philosopher, and when it confronts us in the shape of Professor James's irresistible bonhomie, it has undoubtedly a very charming side to it. But it is confessedly only a one-sided mood, and, if it tries to make out that it is the only

right method for handling life, it carries with it, surely, its own condemnation. Such a mood represents obviously the way men feel in their unphilosophic and non-religious moments, and it is the purpose of philosophy and religion alike to discipline and deepen it. The "King's fool," with his clever, irresponsible banter, served an invaluable purpose as a critic, but it would never have done to put him on the throne. In the same way, one may welcome the Pragmatist's desire to unstiffen our old theories, while refusing to let him take the backbone out of philosophy altogether.

The question at issue, however, is not settled by saying that these conclusions spring from a certain kind of light-hearted temperament, and represent rather a superficial way of looking at life. If we are unwilling to accept them, they must be criticized upon independent grounds, and good reason must be shown for holding that it is possible to handle experience on *a priori* principles. The Pragmatist contends that—temperament or no temperament—his is the only philosophy justified by the facts. From the data before me, Professor James would say, I am unable to believe that God has revealed His nature and will to men in a single definite religious system.

The philosophic quarrel we may safely leave to the philosophers, but the religious conclusions of the new school of psychology are a definite challenge to the Christian self-consciousness. If the case is not to go against us, we must up and give our testimony, and explain why we think the verdict is unjustified. We must say, like the Apostles, that we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard, and then stand our ground fearlessly, even though we have to encounter much scornful incredulity from the learned world. We know from history, no less than from prophecy, that the simple truths of Christianity will always be a stumbling-block to those who cannot use them as stepping-stones, and it would be foolish to expect any general assent to them. But the time has come, in this particular field, when clear distinctions need to be drawn, and men be obliged to choose their side.

Now the first thing, I think, which occurs to a Christian, upon reading Professor William James, is that his conclusions explain only such a very small part of his data.

The kind of religion which he considers adequate to explain the phenomena and to meet the needs of human nature would appeal really only to the people whom he calls the "healthy-minded," and dismisses in one chapter as knowing very little of the mysteries of the spirit's life. Their religious needs are met by a sort of vague, impersonal Theism, with no definite dogmas, but supplying an emotional reinforcement to the isolated personality and a new motive for the duties of life. And yet the greater part of his book is taken up with those whom he calls the "sick souls," who need and find "conversion," and for whom this vague assurance of a larger world is plainly insufficient. Indeed, it would not be too much to say that his conclusions would be repudiated indignantly by nearly all the religious people upon whose testimonies they are supposed to be founded.

The convictions about God, which he sets aside so patronizingly as mere individual over-beliefs, were, as a matter of fact, for them the central truths which made their religion real. No one who had ever seriously studied the phenomenon of the sense of forgiveness could maintain that the thought of a Divine act of redemption is a mere negligible idiosyncrasy of belief. And yet redemption by an act of self-sacrifice done by God for man does not appear at all in Professor James's final statement of the minimum creed which explains the data supplied by religious experience.

Secondly, a Christian feels very dissatisfied with Professor James's choice of examples. He seems to have thought that abnormal people, whose religious history had been a turbulent upheaval, and who wrote their own spiritual autobiographies, were the only really characteristic specimens for his purpose. He ignores, therefore, the great mass of ordinary Christian people in all ages who have not had exciting inner experiences, but in whom the sense of sin and forgiveness and reliance on

grace and victory over temptation and quiet consciousness of the truth of the Incarnation has been just as real, and just as much an individual possession, as they were for St. Augustine or Luther, or any of the more modern believers whom he quotes. All these ordinary folk are dismissed in an off-hand way as mere conventional adherents of the traditional observances of their countries, whether it be Buddhist, Christian, or Mohammedan. "Their religion has been made for them by others, communicated to them by tradition, determined to fixed forms by imitation, and retained by habit." Real faith, he maintained, can be found "only in individuals for whom religion exists, not as a dull habit, but as an acute fever, rather." We all know there are plenty of professing Christians whose religion is such as he describes, but this indiscriminate lumping together of all unemotional Christianity with traditional religiousness betrays a great ignorance of actual human nature. It is important to emphasize this point, because it shows how his natural sympathy was warped by a certain academic exclusiveness. He had never explored the religious consciousness of the average man. It is a constant temptation of academic people to argue as if the ordinary man will accept uncritically whatever is offered him, and it is perhaps only by studying at close quarters the religion of the poor that one finds out how false this assumption is.

Lastly, the Christian feels that the radical defect in Professor James is that he did not know what the religion of the Incarnation has really claimed to teach. Like so many educated men nowadays, he cannot be said to have rejected the claims of our Lord, because he had never really considered them. One is conscious of this in all that he says about systematic theology. He complains that it is founded, not on fact, but on fancies, and speaks indeed as if all Christian theology rested on no firmer foundations than—let us say—the mediæval speculations about the orders of the angels or the condition of the souls in purgatory. If he had studied the actual history of Christian dogma, he would have seen that its central conclusions are based directly upon the claim of our Lord to be equal with the Father and to have

become incarnate in order to save believers from sin. In other words, the *a priori* principles of the Christian philosophy are based, not on theories, but on a supposed historical fact. It may, of course, be questioned whether the facts justify the theology, but it cannot be questioned that they have always been looked to as its starting-point and justification. There is no trace, however, in Professor James's writings that the doctrines of the Incarnation and of the new life of fellowship with God in Christ through the Sacraments had ever presented themselves to him as a "living option." Nor does he seem to have realized that the union with God offered by Christianity is entirely different in kind from that offered by any other religious system, and so he was quite willing to view it as being no more or less true than Buddhism or Confucianism. If anyone had confronted him with the supposed facts of the Christian story, he would have answered vaguely that their historical character had been shattered by modern criticism, and that the doctrines of St. Paul were derived from Greek speculation. In an English University such airy generalizations could not, of course, be made with impunity. There would be theologians on the spot prepared to challenge and refute the mistaken results of much modern criticism, and to show the impressive unity and continuity of the Christian witness to the Catholic faith about the Person of Christ. But Professor James moved in quite different circles, and probably thought that "historical Christianity" had been abandoned by all competent scholars. His writings always make one feel the need for better orthodox theologians in the American Universities.

The consequence of this ignorance of Christian teaching and a defective use of the data is that a method of handling religion, in itself quite legitimate, has become in Professor James's hands the very reverse of scientific. The operations of God's grace in the lives of certain exceptional individuals are of course as legitimate a phenomenon for scientific observation as any other, but they ought not permanently to be considered apart from the general religious life and thought within which they have appeared.

An exclusively psychological way of looking at Christians suggests the picture of an unhappy recruit in his new uniform being gazed at by his old friends in the village. He is forlorn, awkward, and unexplained—isolated from his proper environment and unable to show the qualities which he knows himself to possess. Under such a scrutiny neither the recruit nor the Christian can give a true account of himself, and the village gossips learn no more about the British Army than the modern philosopher learns about the kingdom of God. A Christian must be judged in relation both to Christ, whose servant he is trying to become, and whose life he is more or less imperfectly expressing, and to the Church, the spiritual society within which he is merely a more or less insignificant and unworthy co-operator. This grace or religious experience, in which he is seen to share, belongs to him not as an isolated individual, but as a member of Christ and of the Church, and this is an essential feature indeed in his consciousness. “While ye have the light,” our Lord said, “believe on the light, that ye may become sons of light.” This is just what the Christian feels. His effort of self-surrender brings him into a sphere of light and power which is independent of himself, and will persist, whether he himself continues to stand in it or not. A true observation of grace in individuals then is bound to lead to the study of God. The work which Christ does in the hearts of men is to bear witness of Him, that the Father has sent Him. In other words, the religious psychologist must be prepared to become a Christian, or he will cease to be scientific.

These are the considerations which I think ought to be borne in mind in approaching the new method of religious apologetics. There is nothing really wrong about the method itself, provided it is properly applied. If future investigators in the same field will learn to be true to all sides of life, to past experience as well as to the present, to the witness of theology and religious institutions as well as to that of individuals, Christians will have nothing to fear, and a very great deal to gain from their work. The defects which we have had to point

out in Professor James's application of the method were due in large measure to the meagre and ambiguous witness of the Christian life around him. It is for us Christians of the twentieth century to see to it that his successors are set free from his disabilities.



Endowments and Disendowment.

BY THE REV. C. F. RUSSELL,
Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge.

N EARLY sixty years ago was published "The Warden," by Anthony Trollope, the first of the six famous "Barsetshire" novels. Modern lovers of Trollope—and it is to be hoped they are not few—will not need to be reminded of the story; but those who are not acquainted with it may be told briefly that it relates the mental and social conflict through which an elderly clergyman passed as his conviction grew that he was not honourably entitled to the large income attached to his sinecure as Warden of a Charity Hospital. Mr. Henry James has described the book as "simply the history of an old man's conscience."¹ In striking contrast is the attitude adopted by the Warden's son-in-law, a worldly-wise Archdeacon, who "did not believe in the Gospel with more assurance than he did in the sacred justice of all ecclesiastical revenues."² This gentleman hears that there is a flaw in the legal action which has been initiated against his father-in-law, and his subsequent advice to the old man shows us to what extent he is really aiming at justice. "All we are to do," he tells him, "is to do nothing."³ "Can't you see that if we tell them that no action will lie against you, but that one may possibly lie against some other person or persons, that we shall be putting weapons into their hands, and be teaching them how to cut our

¹ In his "Partial Portraits." Quoted in introduction to "The Warden" in *Everyman's Library*.

² "The Warden," chap. v.

³ *Ibid.*, chap. ix.

own throats ?”¹ When the Archdeacon is at last convinced that it is his father-in-law’s determination to resign, he exclaims : “ Eight hundred pounds a year!—eight hundred and eighty with the house—with nothing to do. The very place for him. And to throw that up because some scoundrel writes an article in a newspaper ! Well—I have done my duty. If he chooses to ruin his child I cannot help it.”²

Let us turn from this novel to a very different book of our own day. In 1907 Dr. P. T. Forsyth delivered at Yale the Lyman Beecher lecture on preaching, and in the epilogue to the lectures in their published form we find these words :

“ [The Church’s] idea of justice has become a byword. Ecclesiastical justice is sport for the Philistines. The justice of a church court or of ecclesiastical politicians is a matter of mockery. In the great churches—the Catholic, Orthodox, or Established—men of personal honour and uprightness lose the sense of social justice as soon as a question arises which threatens the interest of their Church. They are perfectly sincere, and equally incapable of grasping the just thing.”³

In the first part of this quotation, Dr. Forsyth is speaking of the whole Catholic Church ; but his subsequent reference to the Establishment presses the accusation home to ourselves. Whether or not we hold that he is mistaken in his view, at least we must admit that his words are not due to political excitement or to religious controversy ; they express his sincere and deliberate conviction, and must be understood as representing a considerable section—if not the greater part—of the thoughtful Nonconformist opinion of the day.

It is sometimes startling as well as unpleasant to see ourselves as others see us ; yet valuable lessons have occasionally been learnt as the result of the painful experience. And it is because the present writer is profoundly convinced that both Anthony Trollope’s delineation of his strong-minded Churchman’s mode of reasoning and Dr. Forsyth’s unflattering charge are unhappily true, that he ventures to bring forward some considera-

¹ “ The Warden,” chap. ix.

² *Ibid.*, chap. xviii.

³ “ Positive Preaching and Modern Mind,” p. 372.

tions on the subject of the endowments and the possible disendowment of the Church of England.

It will be well at once to clear the ground in one direction by saying that the writer fully shares the general apprehension that any scheme of disendowment would impose some grievous hardships upon the Established Church. These hardships would probably be temporary and external only ; at any rate, we cannot with certainty speak of them as permanent and essential, for there are many grounds for thinking that the Church's recovery would be both steady and swift. But, still, the statement with this qualification is undoubtedly true. The immediate visible effect of disendowing would be to plunge us in serious difficulty.

While, however, the writer is bound to admit this, he cannot associate himself with those who see in these prospective circumstances a final proof that disendowment must be wrong. The fact is that such troubles might be the result either of a right or of a wrong course, and in themselves they prove nothing. If a man is in unlawful possession of large estates, it always involves hardship for him to be called upon to relinquish them. This illustration is not intended to compare the endowments of the Established Church with property which is fraudulently held ; that would be to beg the whole question ; but to point out that the entailing of hardship is a mere accident in morality, and is found to characterize right conduct as often as wrong.

Yet, strange as it may seem, it is not difficult to find Churchmen who content themselves with this plausible but illogical defence of existing conditions. "Disendowment would cripple the Church, therefore it must be resisted" is their apology in brief. But the answer to the question, "Would disendowment hurt us?" must not be construed as the answer to the question, "Is disendowment wrong?" The two are distinct, and the inquiry must proceed at least some way further yet.

If a serious opposition is attempted, and not merely the immoral one which has just been exposed, it usually takes the

form of the following argument (in which the clauses are lettered for reference) :

(*a*) The endowments of the Church of England were given to it in the past ; (*b*) therefore they are its lawful possession in the present ; (*c*) therefore it would be an act of robbery to deprive the Church of them now or in the future.

The validity of this proof is supposed by those who rely upon it to be self-evident ; and it must be conceded that a superficial examination of it may well lead to the belief that it is unanswerably convincing. But when we have reached this pleasant state of mind, we are surprised to find that, somehow or other, the argument does not in point of fact convince everybody, as of course it should. In spite of its self-evident validity there are many persons who do not agree that it would be an act of robbery to deprive the Established Church of some of its endowments ; and if we seek to minimize the significance of this fact by remarking that such persons are financially interested in the dispute, and are therefore unable to judge fairly in regard to it, we are pained to find that our words recoil upon ourselves, and that we are equally debarred from a place on the judgment-seat.

We cannot, then, ignore this divergence of opinion as to the conclusiveness of our reasoning. And this divergence is, in itself, of importance. If an induction from certain facts commends itself to a body of scientists, they may be inclined at first to assume that it is true. But if it is found that another body of scientists, the number and importance of whom are comparable with those of the first, disputes the truth of the induction, while they are admittedly as fully acquainted with the facts and as well qualified to judge of them as the others, then that very fact will cause the original group to withdraw their uncompromising statements, and to reserve their decision, while they admit that the argument on which they had relied may not after all be as sound as they had formerly supposed it to be. It is, therefore, one of the salient facts to be noticed in our inquiry, that a large body of persons whose religious principles and motives we have

no right to question, and for whom many Churchmen are forward to assert their fraternal feelings, do not regard disendowment as evidently and necessarily dishonest; and our discovery of this, if it does nothing more, should make us apply to our argument the strictest investigation that we can.

The result of such an investigation is, that we find that neither of the conjunctions "therefore" in the argument is justified. The truth of clause (*a*) does not necessarily carry with it that of clause (*b*); and the truth of clause (*b*) does not necessarily carry with it that of clause (*c*). This is not to say that clauses (*b*) and (*c*) are in themselves untrue; but that, if they are true, their truth must be established on other grounds. Let us turn our attention to these points.

It is needful that we should beware of taking the word "disendowment" in a narrower sense than that which it properly bears. Many writers, when they use the word, mean by it the twofold process of taking from the Church of England some or all of its endowments and applying them to secular purposes. This use of the word cannot be upheld. It is, no doubt, the case that most schemes of disendowment are of such a sort, but there is nothing to hinder the word from being used when the new objects to which the money is to be devoted are not secular but religious. Throughout this article the word is used without any assumption as to the nature of those objects.

Yet, even when the word is taken in this unduly narrow signification, it has been pointed out by Professor R. C. Moberly that in the event of a scheme for Disendowment following upon, or being joined with, one for Disestablishment, it cannot fairly be denied that the past connection of State and Church, which existed when the endowments were made, gives the former the right to claim, to some real (though it may be slight) extent, a joint ownership of them.¹ At the same time, inasmuch as it

¹ "If . . . the union [of Church and State] is at last to be dissolved, ought not the State, as in the case of a dissolution of partnership, to claim at the least some, perhaps undeterminable, mixedness of ownership with the Church?"

"I cannot but think it well worth while to put this case, not only because some such feeling has a place, in fact, in many minds, but also because I am

was admittedly the intention of previous benefactors of the Church that their gifts should be employed for religious purposes, we shall probably agree with Moberly when he concludes that the State would be wrong if it should seek to justify on the ground of that mixed ownership any scheme for diverting the Church's endowments to secular ends.

If, however, we use the word "disendowment" without necessarily implying the secularization of Church property, it appears at once that its possibility does not depend upon the English Church being previously or simultaneously disestablished, but must be considered alone and on its own merits. And now we meet the Nonconformists' plea, which may be summarized as follows: "In past centuries, the Church of England was the Church of the whole nation in a way that it is not to-day. It was, practically, the only Christian religious body in the country. Those persons, therefore, who wished to devote their property to the extension of the kingdom of God found only one organ of religious activity to receive their benefactions. We cannot, then, deduce from the way in which they bestowed their gifts any more definite conclusion than that they wished to endow religion. If we assert that in every case the desire was consciously present to endow the Church of England, as distinct from other bodies which might thereafter come into existence, we are asserting what we cannot prove. Now, the Established Church to-day is not alone in representing the Church of the past. The various Nonconforming bodies are co-heirs with it of the earlier Church. And hence they are entitled to some share in those gifts which the devotion of our Christian forefathers bestowed."

Such is the claim; and it may be freely confessed that if it were to be recognized, the difficulty of effecting the redistribution of the Church's endowments that is asked for could hardly be exaggerated. But this difficulty must not blind us to the

persuaded that there is in it some element at least of truth, which it would be perilous for us to ignore" (Moberly, "Problems and Principles," pp. 193, 194).

cogency of the appeal. In particular, the claim of Nonconformists to be co-heirs with us of the religious heritage of the past, on which the whole case rests, is one which can be set aside only by those Churchmen who assume that episcopacy is essential to the existence of the Christian society. It may, perhaps, be said that the claim, as a whole, could not be maintained in a court of law. On such a point, the writer has no desire, as he has no competence, to express an opinion. He is content to observe that it will be an evil day for the Established Church when it elects to take refuge from the ruling of its conscience behind a decision of the law courts; and thereby proclaims that in such a matter as this it desires only to take Trollope's Archdeacon Grantly for its model, and to aim, like him, at nothing save a legal victory.

It does not follow, then, that because the Church's endowments were bestowed upon it in the past they should now be regarded as of necessity its own. At the least, the opposite contention is arguable. And with regard to the second fallacy in the ordinary Churchman's defence of the endowments, it is sufficient to say that in no case are rights of property absolutely and eternally independent of State revision. For example, every time that a compulsory sale of land is effected for a public purpose, and the price paid is not within the final decision of the owner, personal rights of property are compelled to give way to public ones. Of course, it goes without saying that any interference of this kind must be rigidly justified on weighty public grounds, if it is not to become mere persecution by the State. But it remains true that the right of the State to interfere with property on particular occasions must be admitted, and hence it is not permissible for us to say off-hand that any scheme for the disendowment of the Church of England is necessarily dishonest, and does not even require to be argued, even if it should first have been proved that the whole of the ancient endowments justly belong to the Church to-day.¹

¹ Cf. Moberly, *op. cit.*, pp. 179, 180. And see also the following (p. 190): "Any suggestion that a dedication once for all to God's service makes God so

The present writer is willing to admit that in his opinion the appeal which he has put into the mouth of the Nonconformists embodies a just and reasonable principle. If it should ever come to be generally accepted, such a readjustment of ecclesiastical endowments would raise, as has already been said, a large number of most difficult questions. Clearly, the Church could not, in such a settlement, be called upon to give up its recent endowments in the same way as its earlier ones. For many years, the permitted existence of Nonconformity has enabled us to say that recent Church endowments were intended for the Church, and not for other bodies, with a certainty which, as we have seen, we could not feel in speaking of more distant centuries. To these, Nonconformists can no more lay claim than the Church of England, on the other hand, can lay claim to a share in the funds subscribed by the former for the purposes of their own denominations last year. Thus, it would first be necessary to fix such a date that all endowments made thereafter should not be liable to revision.¹ This in itself would be an exceedingly difficult matter. And when it had been settled, we should be faced with a harder problem still—the proportional redistribution to-day of endowments made before that date. Moreover, it will not have failed to be noticed that if the case for redistribution can be made out now, a new adjustment will be demanded whenever the relative positions of the different religious denominations alter. We are not concerned to discuss the solutions of these problems here, but it may at least be said that there is no reason to suppose that they would be found insoluble. And it must be emphasized that, even if they were

the owner (in the human sense) of a property that it cannot, without sacrilege, be diverted from divine use for ever, suggests (I own) nothing to me so directly as the warning word 'Korban.' This statement of principle, of course, leaves untouched the view expressed earlier in this article, and held by Professor Moberly himself, that the State would, on other grounds, not be acting equitably in the present case if it should appropriate the Church's endowments to secular objects.

¹ The year (1818) of the first Church Building Act has been suggested in something like this connection (*cf.* "The Radical Programme," p. 163), but this date is not early enough to satisfy the conditions authorized above.

far more intricate than they would seem likely to be, we ought not, for that reason, to hold back from the task of confronting them, if the moral motive to such a course should once have been recognized.

Such questions as these need not detain us; and, indeed, the writer has little expectation that his view will commend itself to many Churchmen. But, at any rate, he claims to have established his thesis that the defence of the Church's endowments is not the easy, self-evident thing that it is often supposed to be. There are, after all, two sides to the question. The anti-Church opinion, as it is called (as if he could ever be an opponent of the Church who calls upon it to be, at all costs, just!), can, at the least, be argued. We have no right to denounce the supporters of disendowment as obviously dishonest and insincere.

Professor Moberly, to whose "Considerations upon Disestablishment and Disendowment" reference has so often been made in this paper, was opposed to both the one and the other. He wrote: "Even upon the hypothesis of disestablishment . . . I am by no means yet convinced that it is nationally right to disendow." But he immediately added: "I am open, indeed, to be convinced."¹ Is such impartiality of investigation, such determination to be guided by right principles and not by self-interest, more common to-day than when "The Warden" was written? It would not be easy to prove that it is.

As a recent example of the sort of logic that is considered good enough for this controversy, a passage may be quoted from the *Record* newspaper of August 26, 1910. Commenting upon the letter of Mr. John Morgan, of Aberystwith, to the *Times* of August 19, in which he had proposed such a scheme of concurrent endowment for Wales as has been put forward here (in the event of the Church in Wales being disendowed), the *Record* made the following remarks:

"Of course, if it were certain that the endowments of the Church are to be confiscated in any case, then, no doubt, there is something to be said for

¹ "Problems and Principles," p. 210.

applying them in part to the religious work of other Churches, instead of to purely secular uses. But even in that case there is surely strength in the plea that the endowments of Nonconformity should be subject to the same revision. This point is well put by another correspondent of the *Times*, who urges that, as Mr. Morgan would divide Church endowments between the Church and Nonconformist bodies in the proportion of ten to fifteen, Nonconformist endowments should be divided in the same proportion, Nonconformity taking ten and the Church fifteen. Viewed in this light, Mr. Morgan's proposal for concurrent endowment will not look quite so attractive."

Such a reply to Mr. Morgan is only made possible by ignoring the essential facts on which his suggestion may be presumed to rest. In the first place, it ignores what has been noticed already, that inasmuch as the endowments of Nonconformity do not date from such early times as those of the Church—and it is only in regard to the early endowments of the Church that the real need for adjustment exists—the former are clearly not liable to the same revision as the latter. And, in the second place, even if they were, it is evident that the essence of the redistribution proposed does not consist in taking away three-fifths of all endowments all round, but in redistributing them in such a way that Nonconformists should have half as much again as the Church; so that whatever we may think of the proposal, it is simply misrepresentation to suggest that "the same revision" of Nonconformist endowments would mean that they should be "divided in the same proportion, Nonconformity taking ten and the Church fifteen." Can we be surprised if our reputation for ecclesiastical justice is low? Will such a mode of dealing with the question lead Dr. Forsyth to withdraw his charge?

It will be urged, at this point, if not before, that even if the Church of England were to express her willingness to consent to a scheme of concurrent endowment, it would not now satisfy the Nonconformists. This was, indeed, the *Guardian's* comment on Mr. Morgan's letter,¹ and in the following issue of that paper (September 2) a further letter appeared in which that gentleman himself said: "I confess that Nonconformist

¹ "Concurrent endowment is one of the 'might-have-beens' which it would need an entire revolution of current opinion to bring back into the category of the feasible."—*The Guardian*, August 26, 1910.

opinion is overwhelmingly opposed to my proposal." But what is the explanation of this state of things? Is it not that Non-conformists have always found the Church of England ready to stigmatize any scheme of disendowment as dishonest, and have thus learnt long ago that their sole chance of obtaining any revision at all of the old endowments lies in uniting their demands with those of secularists? But who would dare to say that they would still insist upon secularization if they found—what they have never yet found—the Church itself ready to admit the force of their argument, and ready also to unite with them in working out an equitable readjustment, provided only that the religious character of the endowed objects was maintained? The fact is, that the "revolution of current opinion," of which the *Guardian* speaks, is in reality a revolution of the current opinion of the Church, as much as of any other body, and is therefore to a considerable extent within the Church's power.

It will probably be asked by some readers why a Churchman, of all people, should write an article like this. Is not such a raising of questions with regard to our endowments the rankest disloyalty? If they must go, is it not rather the part of its sons to leave the despoiling to be done by the hands of foes, or at least by those who are not its members, and to avoid any word or deed which might add to the weight of the assault? Several answers to the question are possible. First and foremost must be the simple statement that it does not in fact betoken any want of love to our own Church to esteem its honour more highly than its financial condition—more highly, even, than its apparent effectiveness. It is to be feared, however, that the simplest expression of this truth will be condemned as pompous and grandiloquent. How should the writer dare to assume that his moral sense is more enlightened than that of others? Yet, after all, the answer is necessary, for it is the only final one to those who urge—and there are many who seem to do so—that loyalty to the Church can only be shown by keeping guard over its pockets. Such a notion of loyalty does not spring from pure or disinterested love.

Or, again, the reply may be given—and it is only the same one with an outer, in place of an inner, reference—that this inquiry is a debt which Churchmen owe to Nonconformists. On the hypothesis that there is at least some truth in the claim of the latter to a share in our endowments—and for the moment this hypothesis is assumed—it is not right that the struggle for a revision should be left to them to carry on alone. At present, the attitude of the Church of England is that of an army which disputes every inch of a territory, and yields only what it must; and this, in the mind of many of its members, for no better reason than that it finds its ownership useful. It is really remarkable that Churchmen should be willing to-day to assert the profound respect with which they regard the Nonconforming bodies, while at the same time they ascribe to them, in this particular matter, a moral sense which would disgrace a child. Does our vaunted love for them, does our sacred conviction that they, as well as we, give manifest signs of the power and presence of the Holy Spirit, leave us in the belief that they are ready to conspire in an act of robbery? Or can it be that our refusal to argue, and our delight in denunciation, arise from a doubt as to the fairness of our own claims? We owe it, then, to Nonconformists that these questions should be raised.

Lastly, it is worthy of remark that a practical policy is involved. There are many persons who will have nothing to do with principles, and are fond of asserting that an ounce of practice is worth more than a hundred pounds of theory; and it may be that they will say that all that has been urged here is abstract, and therefore of no importance. As a matter of fact, it has a very important practical bearing. It cannot be denied that the danger of a secularist scheme of disendowment is great at the present time; it will become greater in the future. Its strength is due in large part to the support which it receives from Nonconformists, who see in it their only hope. Surely, in the presence of such a danger, even if the claims of Churchmen were far more widely admitted than in fact they are, it would be

politic to concentrate our strength on the maintenance of the religious character of the endowments. We are told, indeed, that this is impracticable; that "concurrent endowment is one of the 'might-have-beens.'" But the Church has never, hitherto, expressed its willingness to unite with Nonconformists in the consideration of such a scheme, with the sincere determination to understand their point of view; and doubtless they have long ago ceased to hope for it. Yet if Churchmen were to adopt this attitude, and they had to choose between supporting either such a scheme for revision or the plans of secularist opponents of the Church, there can be no question to which side they would lean. The decision of the religious bodies of the nation on such a point would be unanimous, and it would be irresistible. That unanimity could be brought to pass by the Church of England.¹

It would be something worth striving for to preserve the endowments for the cause of Christ. It would be more worth striving for to achieve this result in a way which would bear much fruit in Christian love, and would help forward those spiritual relations apart from which there can be no thought of reunion. And, most of all, it would be worth striving for to present to the nation and to the world a great object-lesson as to the aims and ideals of our Established Church, and to show that it could practise, as well as preach, the subjection of revenue to righteousness.

¹ An exception must be made to the above statement in so far as tithes are concerned. It appears to the writer that there is a great deal to be said in favour of such a revision of these particular endowments as would include the secularizing of a part of them.



Something about Bell-founders and their Bells.

By M. ADELINÉ COOKE.

HOW interesting it would be to know somewhat of the names and doings of those old-world bell-founders—perhaps the title is rather pretentious—who cast the crotals found in ancient barrows and the hand-bells which did service until, with increasing wealth and knowledge, a more opulent and sonorous sound was desired. Certainly Mr. Raven, in his book on bells, puts forward a fascinating theory of metal journeying in Phœnician vessels to be cast into shape and returning to England in the form of crotals; and subsequently he draws a delightful picture of hawkers' carts tracing the British trackways, and later supplies being stored at stations along the great Roman roads. Yet bells were made in Britain at a comparatively early period. Did not St. Boniface—born in the year 680—send a present of a hand-bell to the Pope? and it may safely be presumed that even so prominent a divine would have scrupled to offer what might not be relied on both for use and beauty. The renowned St. Teilo was presented with a bell by his people. Would that history recorded how it was cast, or whether its wonderful properties were simply the result of close association with its richly-endowed owner. This bell not only “condemned the perjured and healed the sick,” but also sounded every hour of its own accórd! Bells were evidently in general use in England about the seventh century, from the manner in which the Venerable Bede alludes to the bell rung at the death of the Abbess Hilda of Whitby. But religious establishments would naturally take the lead in such a matter, and very probably the monks themselves were the founders. And in that portion of the Bayeux tapestry which portrays the funeral of King Edward the Confessor, two wonderful urchins are armed with two hand-bells each. There is scant evidence, if any, to show who cast the celebrated peal of bells which was the pride of Crowland

Abbey, though we may reasonably conclude that it was founded by the monks. This peal led the way in the practice of naming bells after important personages. The great bell was called Guthlac, after the hermit who first sought out the lonely spot among the treacherous bogs and waged spiritual warfare with demons. Tradition affirms that its sound was most efficacious in curing those suffering from headache! The other six, which were added in the time of Abbot Egelric, received the titles of Turketyl, his predecessor in the office, Betelin, Tatwin, Pega and Bega, and last, but not least, St. Bartholomew, whose thumb was one of the prized relics of the monastery, and who, of course, would confer additional virtue against peril by thunder and lightning. Unfortunately, however, this did not prevent destruction by fire. A century later a fire broke out, and belfry and bells were no more. But, in 1113, Fergus of Boston, *brasiarius* as he is termed, and practically the first bell-founder whose name is known, presented two skillets to the despoiled abbey. As the craft of bell-founding gradually became the work of others beside the monks, Alwoldus of London comes to sight. He appears to have been thought very highly of and quite at the top of the tree regarding his trade, for he is designated *campanarius*, whereas his fellow-craftsmen are merely termed *ollarius* or potter. They seem to have lived principally in the neighbourhood of St. Botolph's-without-Aldgate. These "potters" were often men of substance and evidently held what we should nowadays consider a good position. They bought and sold lands, frequently acted as mayors, made wills directing the bestowal of their property, and sepulchral brasses and monuments were raised to their memory. Often they took their surname from their craft, like William le Belyetere, a provincial founder, though one man there was who evidently held himself in such high repute that he placed on his bells the name of his county after his own. One is thus inscribed :

"Stepne Norton of Kent,
He made in God intent."

The *campanarius* or Belleyettere by no means disdained to make lavers, pots and pans beside founding bells; thus he was frequently termed potter. Brasyer was another cognomen, and there was a Robert Brasyer who also served as bailiff, sheriff and mayor. But bell-founders frequently followed a second trade, whether by way of having two strings to their bow, who can determine? So this Robert's son also followed two occupations according to the entry of his name when admitted to the freedom of the city. "Rics Brasyer Goldsmyth, fil Robti Brayser Belzet."

The notable Henry Jordan or Jurden displays a number of signs upon his bells which would apparently indicate that he also pursued the calling of a fishmonger, which, to our mind, does not seem to assort at all well with that of a founder. But did not three generations of De Ropefords who lived at Paignton during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries actually do business as founders, clock-makers, and organ-builders! Truly a diversity of talents! Early bells were long and pear-shaped, and entirely devoid of any mark or ornament. Not until the reign of King Edward I. were attempts begun at inscribing them. The oldest bell in England which is dated is found at Claughton Church, and the date of the year is 1296. So that this casts grave suspicion upon a bell at the Norman church of Studland which is generally supposed to be of great antiquity. It bears the date 1065—more than a century before the foundation of the church—an inscription, "Drawe Neare to God," and what may be considered the trade-mark of the founder, the initials C. P., and between them the figure of a bull. It would indeed be interesting to know the true history of this remarkable bell.

An Evesham monk, Walter of Odyngton, wrote down—of course in Latin—the first known instructions on the art and craft of bell-founding. He lived in the reign of Henry III., but although monastic foundries existed for a considerable period, they were gradually ousted by the trade foundries, which very probably were enabled to do business on a larger scale and were therefore largely patronized. The last ecclesiastical founder of

whom we hear mention was Thomas Hickman, Sacrist of St. Augustine's, who cast a bell in 1358 for Canterbury Cathedral. Belonging to the trade was the famous Richard Tunnoc, city bailiff of York in the year 1327. The remarkable bell-founder's window in York Cathedral which perpetuates his memory gives quite a lesson in the diverse and wonderful methods of casting bells. Evidently he was a very great man.

Besides the Metropolitan bell foundries there were foundries at many important provincial towns such as Norwich, Bury St. Edmunds, Nottingham, Colchester, Gloucester, Bristol and Lynn. At Salisbury, too, in the fourteenth century there was a foundry for bells and pots. A few foundries also existed in quite country places. There was one on a small scale at Burford, Oxfordshire. Neale was the name of this local worthy, and he was honoured with burial in the north transept, which is usually called Bellfounder's Aisle, of the stately church. Four at any rate of the eight bells famous for their tone were his work, for they bear the inscription :

" Thomas Silvester, John Hunt, R. Taylar,
T. Tynckes.

C. G. H.

W. A 1635.

Henry Neale made mee."

The Church of Fontmell Magna in Dorset is fortunate in possessing what must surely be two pre-Reformation bells. They are inscribed respectively : " Intercede Pia pro nobis Virgo Maria," and " Ave Maria." I cannot give the precise date, and this conjecture may doubtless be proved incorrect, yet it is not usual to find invocations to the Blessed Virgin Mary after the Reformation.

But beside these stationary works there were a number of itinerant bell-founders who journeyed from place to place just where their services were most likely to be needed. There is something very picturesque about the lives of these wanderers, whose bells are often found at tremendous distances from each other all over England, pretty positive proof of the journeys they

must have made. The itinerant one did not disdain to make "pannys, potys and other like," and no doubt was welcomed with pleasure and his opinion asked concerning the church bells if there happened to be anything amiss. These he would recast upon the spot, in the churchyard most probably, all materials being supplied. The existence of such a furnace was discovered at Scalford, together with a quantity of bell-metal. This metal was often got together in all kinds of different ways. Parishioners gave and collected money to buy necessary material, but much was also given in kind—basins, platters, lavers, kettles, pots—so as to help forward the work. There is a certain story of a bell-founder who discovered just at the critical moment that, despite all efforts, he was considerably short of material. Imitating the celebrated Benvenuto Cellini when casting the Perseus, he seized all the pewter pots and culinary utensils on which he could lay hands and cast them into the furnace. Perhaps it was another of these itinerant seekers of trade and fortune who figures so amusingly as the "prowd potter" in Ritson's "Robin Hood Ballads."

When church bells needed recasting and no itinerant founder came that way, there was much ado to send them to the nearest foundry. The churchwardens of the time conveyed the bell or bells with the utmost care and received them back with pride. It was also the duty of these indefatigable ones to post to and fro to arrange with the founder, and all these excursions swelled the cost and made it an expensive affair for the parish in question. Sometimes, too, they were not satisfied with the work, and much litigation ensued. Indeed, the craft of bell-founding was by no means easy nor the bell-founder's life free from care. What with difficulties with unsatisfied churchwardens, trouble about the payment of money promised and fluctuations of trade, there was much to harass him. Are we not, indeed, told of one who actually committed suicide because he could not get his bells in tune! As a rule, however, they appear to have achieved fair fortunes, been men of prominence, and left long wills disposing of their wealth and bequeathing their foundries to those who

were to carry on the trade. One of the quaintest of these wills is quoted in "Church Bells of Cambridgeshire" and "Church Bells of Suffolk." It concerns a founder named Chirche, who evidently had given largely during his lifetime and desired that all should be in order for the future. "I will that Thomas Chirche my sone do make clene the grete lectorn that I gave to Seynt Mary chirche quart'ly as long as he levyth."

Very beautiful and interesting are many of the founders' marks or stamps and the dedications and inscriptions placed on bells. Longobardic lettering gave way to black-letter, roughly speaking, about the fifteenth century. Bells often bear dedications to the saints, apostles and martyrs, the name of St. Katherine appearing very frequently. Of course there are dedicatory hexameters to the Virgin Mary. St. Peter and St. Andrew were also popular, and the assistance of St. Barbara was often invoked, no doubt because of the special power ascribed to her in quelling storms. The ringing of bells was generally considered to drive away demons and dispel thunder and lightning. Norwich foundries were particularly famous for the beauty of their capital letters. Three bells, the lowest of which is surmounted by a crown, seems to us a specially apposite foundry shield. William Culverden, who lived during the reign of Bluff King Hal, is known by a beautiful rebus. Emblems of the Four Evangelists sometimes appear. Edward I. is also the first Sovereign whose head figures on bells. Stephen Tonni, who worked at Bury St. Edmunds, which had been active in bell-founding during the Plantagenet period, used a striking floriated cross; two other Tudor worthies were William Land and Thomas Draper. One of the Purdues is met with at Sherborne, where, in 1670, he recast the great bell given by Cardinal Wolsey. It bears the half-rhyming formula usual in such cases. "This bell was new cast by me, Thomas Purday, October 20, 1670," but it is also inscribed :

"By Wolsey's gift I measure time for all,
To mirth, to griefe, to church, I serve to call."

This worthy died at the ripe old age of ninety, and if he composed his own epitaph, as may have been the case, years had certainly not destroyed his confidence and conceit :

“ Here lies
The bell-founder,
Honest and true,
Till ye resurrection
Nam'd Purdue.”

Miles Graye, the famous Colchester founder, could not, at any rate, complain of lack of business. In Suffolk alone there are no fewer than ninety of his bells. A Norwich founder, William Brend, placed on his bells a monogram which included the initial of his wife's name of Alice. I cannot resist concluding these scant details concerning bell-founders and their bells with a quotation about the history of the treble bell at Brixton or Brightstone in the Isle of Wight, which was recast by Thomas Mears, and bears this exceedingly quaint inscription :

“ In the year 1740 John Lord zealous for the promotion of Campanologia's art caused me to be fabricated in Portsmouth and placed in this tower. 60 years I led the peal when I was unfortunately broken in the year 1800. I was cast in the furnace, refounded in London and returned to my former station. Reader thou also shalt know a Resurrection. May it be unto eternal life.”



The Missionary World.

THE meeting of the Continuation Committee of the World Missionary Conference has, judging from the official reports, abundantly justified the high expectations built upon it by thoughtful students of Missions. It is evident that what was best and most distinctive in "Edinburgh, 1910," has come to stay, and that the work set on foot by the commissions as embodied in the reports is to have extensive development. The most important action taken by the committee was the decision to issue an *International Review of Missions*, under the editorship of Mr. J. H. Oldham, with an international advisory editorial board composed of missionary specialists and scholars. Such a *Review* will double the value of all existing missionary publications. It will carry forward the study of missionary problems on a line that will be auxiliary to all present work, and that will supplant none. It will enable workers immersed in one organization to see it in relationship to all others, and will, by widening the area of comparison, do much to combine and unify thought. We are already deeply indebted to *The East and the West* for the width of its thought and the universality of its survey, but it has never attempted the constructive associated international work which the new *Review* proposes to undertake. The two quarterlies will appeal, to some extent, to a different class of readers, but for the most part they will lie side by side on our study tables, not rivals, but allied forces for the spread of the Gospel in the world. The S.P.G. Report shows that 37,500 copies of *The East and the West* were printed last year, indicating a circulation of over 9,000 a quarter. This ought to increase, not lessen. The *International Review*, appealing alike to Free-Churchman and to Anglican, to British and American and Continental thinkers and workers, and to English-reading members of the Churches on the mission-field, should at once secure a circulation which will relieve the Continuation Committee of all anxiety as to its

finance. The first number is to be issued early in 1912. The subscription price will be 6s. yearly, net, post free.

* * * * *

No incidents in the long history of the C.M.S. are more full of romance and inspiration than those connected with the Mediterranean Mission, begun in 1813. The eyes of the young society were eagerly fixed upon the "ignorant Christians"—Greek, Armenian, Syrian, Coptic—round the Mediterranean Sea. "Though in many points far gone from the simplicity and purity of the truth," the Committee held that "they also possess within themselves the principle and means of reformation." The appeal for action came from a Roman Catholic doctor in Malta, who urged that as his own Church was unable to revive the Eastern Churches, the Church of England ought to undertake the work. At that time it was not unknown for sixty-nine days to be spent in getting from Malta to Constantinople, yet forthwith these fathers of ours set to work. William Jowett, Wrangler and Fellow of St. John's, Cambridge, was planted on Malta as "literary representative," with a view to helping and influencing, by personal merits and by literature, the Churches round the Mediterranean Sea. It is worth while to look up the details in Dr. Stock's "History of the C.M.S." Josiah Pratt's utterances at the official sending forth of Jowett are noteworthy for their breadth of spirit and their grasp of truth. The objective of the C.M.S. Committee was the evangelization of the non-Christian world. "As these churches reflect the clear light of the Gospel on the Mohammedans and heathens round, they will doubtless become efficient instruments in rescuing them from delusion and death." At first there was response; then "Eastern Christendom declined to be enlightened and quickened by missionaries from the West." Gradually the workers were withdrawn. A summary of the work of this mission, issued by the C.M.S., closes with these words: "The time of the vision was not yet, but it will surely come."

* * * * *

History repeats itself in recurring cycles—the same, yet not the same. We are on a great spiral, and in the ways of God return on a higher level to a place we have passed before. The Constantinople Conference of the World Student Christian Federation, the Report of which lies before us,¹ suggests that in a new connection, with an altered emphasis, but with the same broad hope in outlook, the time of the vision has come. It is not the programme of the Conference, nor the list of speakers, nor the summary of the addresses given, which is so impressive: it is the composition of the Conference itself. A list of official delegates is given at the close in the alphabetical order of the lands from which they come: Argentina, Australia, Bohemia, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain and Ireland, Greece, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Persia, Roumania, Russia; under “Turkish Empire,” the following: Turkey-in-Europe (15 delegates), Asia Minor (35 delegates), Syria (11 delegates), and Robert College (17 delegates); the Union of South Africa, the United States of America, and several “fraternal” delegates who were leading representatives of various Eastern Churches, or of educational establishments, or of the Press. “Never since the early centuries of Christianity,” says Mr. J. W. Farquhar in his “Impressions of the Conference,” “has such an assembly been held. The East and the West have once more found their bond of union in Christ. There were envoys, not only from every great Western branch of the Church, but from the Greek Orthodox Church in every land . . . from Gregorian, Nestorian, Coptic, and Maronite Churches, and from the Jacobite Syrian Communion of Travancore. It was a heart-moving thing to see present at every session several priests of the Orthodox Church, drinking in everything most eagerly.” In an interesting sketch of the Conference given in the *Student Movement* for June, Mr. Tissington Tatlow describes the preliminary work done by Dr. Mott and Miss Rouse, the two secretaries of

¹ Price 1s. 6d. net, post free. Can be ordered from the Student Christian Movement, 93, Chancery Lane, W.C.

the Federation in the Balkan States and the Levant, and also records the special opportunities given by the ecclesiastical authorities. For instance, Dr. Mott touched at Smyrna, whereon "the Bishop of the Greek Orthodox Church sent out runners and brought together a meeting of 500 of the most influential Greeks in the district." All this is singularly pregnant with life and hope. A great opportunity lies before the federated student movements. The leadership lies in hands we have learned to trust, and God reigns over all. The whole situation calls the whole Church to co-operating prayer and to generous help.

* * * * *

A valuable appendix to the Constantinople report gives a summary of the student movements affiliated to the Federation. It is stimulating reading indeed, and opens a world of need and of strenuous Christian service which is, for the most part, unknown to the Home Church. Our own Student Christian Movement—whose summer gatherings at the new Conference Estate, The Hayes, Swanwick, Derbyshire, will be in session this month—reports 66 unions in men's colleges, 85 in women's colleges, and 61 associated theological colleges. The Student Volunteer Missionary Union, a department of the movement, has a membership of 3,580. Some 4,200 students are enrolled in Bible Circles connected with the movement. In soliciting these reports for Constantinople from the affiliated movements, a list of questions was sent out. The last one runs as follows: "Name the more baffling problems of your movement, concerning which you desire the prayers of the leaders of other movements." To trace the answers to this through the various reports is a revelation of Christian warfare, and a most compelling call to prayer. Here, for instance, is what Scandinavia says: "Our greatest problem is how to attain the full reality of Christianity, and how to make our people see the fact of Christ." And Germany: "We are praying, and ask others to pray with us, that we may be kept from doctrinal disputes and conventicleism, and that to us may be given more missionary spirit, and more conversion of students." And China (with a

student membership of many thousands): "The most difficult problems . . . are the securing of well-qualified leaders for the Bible Classes, the better planning of the religious meetings, and the securing of more Chinese travelling secretaries." And Japan: "The preparation of Biblical courses of study suited to our needs continues to be an unsolved problem." And Great Britain (amongst other needs): "For guidance in view of the prevailing theological unrest; that all the evangelistic work and doctrinal teaching given through our movement may build up men in the faith." These students are at grips with realities.

* * * * *

Two pamphlets of great significance give point to the C.M.S. advance in its Educational policy at this time. One is the Extension Fund Report of Trinity College, Kandy, Ceylon; the other is the report of the Oxford and Cambridge Hostel at Allahabad. Those who shared in Mr. A. I. Fraser's hopes when he was last in England will give thanks for the signal way in which, notwithstanding many trials, his great educational experiment is being justified. Trinity College, Kandy, is not only doing good work for the island of Ceylon, but for the whole cause of missionary education. It is working out towards solution problems which have lain in many minds. And it is doing so in full relation with the other aspects of missionary work. Not only are the boys being trained in social service and in definitely Christian work, but we find one of the English masters throwing himself into a breach for ordinary out-station work. The training colony for catechists, a great united scheme in which all Christians in the diocese—except the Roman Catholics—are joining, has a large place in Mr. Fraser's thought; and to raise funds for it the C.M.S. United Conference are asking him to visit England next winter. Thus in Kandy "education" is being interpreted in its broadest sense, and the training of Christian workers is being given adequate place. Equally important, and equally sane, is the Rev. W. E. S. Holland's work in North India, which has abundantly proved itself in ten years' strenuous service; 450 students, including those

now in residence, most of them Brahmins, have passed through the Hostel. Four times more applicants apply for admission year by year than space will admit, and the Hostel has won the confidence of the Government, the Universities, and the people. Religious instruction is purely voluntary; this, as Mr. Holland says, "was at first a bold experiment, but has abundantly vindicated itself." Last year 66 out of 82 men in residence were engaged in regular Bible reading with one of the missionary staff. Mr. Holland's notes on the spirit and tone of the Hostel are delightful reading, and he throws valuable light on problems of Indian unrest. "Apparently, no one who has taken part in athletics has ever been condemned for sedition." In a brief statement just issued as to the Short Service Scheme (by which University graduates go out for periods of from two to five years to Christian schools, colleges, and hostels in the mission-field to reinforce the teaching staffs and the spiritual influence of the institutions, and to obtain opportunities for studying non-Christian conditions and Christian missionary work at close quarters) we note that Trinity College, Kandy, and the Oxford and Cambridge Hostel, Allahabad, are amongst the C.M.S. institutions where there are openings this year for "short-service men." Could there be a more magnificent chance? Particulars can be had from Mr. T. R. W. Lunt, Church Missionary Society, Salisbury Square, E.C.

* * * * *

The whole educational scheme of the C.M.S. is unfolding on broad and most suggestive lines. It is showing relationship not only with the home educational world, but also with the great body of educated laymen in commercial and professional life who are as yet largely uninterested in foreign missions—a fact, we are convincingly told, which is more our fault than theirs. The reason "why laymen are not interested" is well discussed in the *C.M. Review* for June, and a brief paper containing "Some Suggestions with Regard to the Home Policy of the Education Committee" has been issued, signed by Bishop Ingham and Mr. Bardsley. From it we learn that plans of promise are on

foot for 1911-12, including a special presentation of the need by "a small party of picked C.M.S. educational missionaries," and an attempt to reach non-supporting, influential laymen by means of dinners to be carefully organized in various centres, backed by much prayer. Two of the picked speakers will, as far as possible, be assigned to each dinner. Their message will not primarily be an appeal for money, but will take a broadly Christian line. The whole scheme is well-conceived and well-stated, and, given the generous aid in fellowship and co-operation of all present workers, should do much to break new ground.

* * * * *

During the holiday season, many readers of THE CHURCHMAN have contact through summer chaplaincies with the two societies which aid Church ministrations in the Dominion of Canada. We have realized the importance of the individual child, but scarcely of the child-nations in our great Colonies. Canada is in her growing stage—over 311,000 immigrants, an increase of 49 per cent., are said to have entered the country from the United States and elsewhere in the year closing last March. All that is said as to the value of reaching the child before habits are fixed is true of the child-nation. Canada is now accessible, and grateful for our help. The income of the Colonial and Continental Church Society shows a steady increase. During the last four years thirty clergy and a hundred laymen have been sent out through its North-West Canada Fund. But very much more could be done, and needs to be done, if men and means were forthcoming.

* * * * *

Brief mention of other points which claim our notice this month must suffice. The S.P.G. are issuing their *Home Workers' Gazette* monthly, instead of quarterly, and it is to be Bishop Montgomery's special charge. The first number was avowedly put together under great pressure, and bears the marks of haste. But it has much promise, and may do as good work for its own constituency as does the admirable *C.M.S. Gazette* in another sphere. The last page of the June *C.M.S. Gleaner* is worthy

the special attention of all who lead devotional and intercessory meetings. It gives a very beautiful and suggestive "Vision of Earth," intended as a foundation for an "Edinburgh" central act of silent prayer. The London Missionary Society (16, New Bridge Street, E.C.) have issued, in a penny pamphlet called *The Heart of Vaiea*, letters of singular interest and beauty. They are written by a Samoan woman who is working alone as a missionary teacher in New Guinea, and are addressed to the missionary lady who taught Vaiea as a girl in Samoa, and who now translates the letters, and adds a brief sketch of the writer. For artlessness, reality, and devotion these letters will not easily be surpassed. The *Annual Report of the Central Board of Missions* has just been issued, and can be had from the secretary at the Church House, Westminster, S.W. Lastly, the new C.M.S. *Intercession Paper* (for July and August) suggests topics for meditation and prayer which will help to make fruitful many a holiday. A subject for a daily ten-minute meditation upon the Life of our Lord is outlined, and will form a bond of union between scattered workers as well as a deep preparation for future work.

G.



Discussions.

"HISTORICAL RECORDS AND INSPIRATION."

(*The Churchman*, May, p. 337; June, p. 472.)

I THINK that Canon Girdlestone's comment tends to obscure one of the chief conclusions of my paper. I sought to prove that intellectual honesty must lead the inquirer ultimately to one of two positions: (1) a belief in verbal inspiration of the most rigid and uncompromising sort, which secures itself only by ruling out of court all the witness of science and history, and therefore leaves no room for any Biblical criticism at all, whether conservative or liberal; and (2) such a belief in inspiration as consists with a determination to accept, on adequate evidence, any of the results of such criticism, and therefore has recourse, when any dispute arises, to a renewed careful scrutiny of the

evidence rather than to a denunciation of the conclusion as unchristian. Of these two positions it may be said that the first denies, while the second affirms, the present activity (of the same kind as in the past) of the Holy Ghost.

I wish to insist that recourse must be had *ultimately* to one of these two positions ; that no intermediate one is logically tenable. But this, of course, is very far from saying that at the present time every Christian occupies one or other of them. It is obvious that very many persons are at present trying to maintain some sort of balance midway between these two extremes. And so there is no need for me to disagree with Canon Girdlestone when he doubts whether Mr. Pilter accepts what I called a "mechanical theory" of inspiration. Perhaps he does not ; he certainly makes no attempt to defend the extreme logical form of it which I have just outlined. But at any rate he is standing somewhere between the two extremes, and it is just for that very reason that his position is open to the attack which I tried to bring against it.

I believe that this description of the state of things will enable us to understand the perplexing inconsistencies which occur in the remarks of leading Churchmen from time to time. It is notorious that the same speaker is often claimed as a supporter by both sides in the controversy—one party finding in some of his utterances a frank admission of the rights of the intellect, and the other appealing to some equally unmistakable insistence on the iniquity of modern critical conclusions. The explanation is, after all, a simple one. The speaker has relinquished the first point of view without adopting the second, and is trying to maintain a precarious balance between them. But such a position is necessarily one of unstable equilibrium ; so long as he is left entirely undisturbed from without, it may seem satisfactory enough, but the lightest breath of an inquirer will reveal its instability, and will set him moving to this way or to that. And the approach to one extreme will be arrested by some other inquirer, only to be succeeded by as uncontrolled a movement in the opposite direction. In other words, the speaker, under stress of criticism, makes statements the logical implications of which he does not perceive ; but they are perceived, and attention is called to them, by others, with the result which has been described already. And I am persuaded that this result is inevitable when the attempt is made to combine friendliness to conservative criticism with hostility to that which is called liberal.

C. F. RUSSELL.



Notices of Books.

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL QUESTION IN THE GOSPELS. By Rev. C. W. Emmet, M.A. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 6s. net.

Mr. Emmet is a writer over whom the plain man may well rejoice. He takes difficult and intricate problems of present-day criticism, and presents them in language which all can understand. Many of these chapters have appeared before, but it is well that they have been collected and published. Many a hardworking clergyman, many an intelligent layman, desires to know something of the problems of which he hears; he has little time, and perhaps scarcely the trained skill, to work through the large and difficult writings of Schweitzer, Harnack, Tyrrell, Loisy, or even of our own Dr. Sanday, and he longs for help. Here is exactly the help he needs. Mr. Emmet's earlier papers deal with the problem—not, indeed, a new one—which Professor Burkitt has made prominent in England and Schweitzer on the Continent: Did our Lord expect a coming of the kingdom, immediate and complete, in His own earthly lifetime, and was He accordingly mistaken? This is one of the books that our readers should get and read, so we do not propose to follow the argument. It is full and cogent; it shirks no difficulties; and it finds space for the consideration of the practical question as to our Lord's moral teaching. The new school suggests that our Lord taught an idealistic morality because He only looked upon it as temporary; it was an "Interimsethik," and as such could afford to be extravagant. Mr. Emmet shows that the eschatological school are compelled to admit, in the words of Johannes Weiss, that our Lord sometimes "seeks to inform and help the world, as though it were destined to continue."

To Eschatology the largest space is given, but the other chapters are equally clear and informative. He discusses the Abbé Loisy's view of the Gospel story, and most valuably criticizes it: he writes a clear essay on Harnack's view of the second source of St. Matthew and St. Luke, the so-called Q; he states and rejects the theory that the Magnificat is ascribed by St. Luke to Elizabeth, and incidentally defends the authenticity of the canticles of the early chapters of St. Luke. He defends Zahn's view that Galatians was the earliest of the Pauline Epistles, makes St. Paul's visit to Jerusalem in Acts xi. coincide with the visit of Galatians, and inclines to accept the "Western" reading of the decree of the Council of Jerusalem, which omits the words "from things strangled," making the decree refer no longer to matters of ceremonial, but to matters of morals, idolatry, murder, fornication.

Altogether the book is a most valuable and suggestive one, and we warmly commend it to our readers as worthy of a place on their shelves.

THE ASCENDED CHRIST. By Henry Barclay Swete, D.D. London: *Macmillan and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

Ascensiontide has been frequently a neglected festival, and the lessons of our Lord's ascended life are often too little appreciated. Dr. Swete's little book will help us to a better understanding. It is an attempt to expound the doctrine of the Ascension and the Ascended Life of our Lord. To Dr. Swete

all the references in Scripture to the session of our Lord have their ultimate origin in Psalm 110. Arguing from this, he contends that the session of our Lord in glory does not imply rest, but rather an agelong conflict with the powers of evil. Probably we might combine both ideas. The session implied that the work for which Christ came to earth was ended; it did not imply that all His work was ended. Professor Swete tells us much of that heavenly work when Christ, as King, Priest, Prophet, Mediator, Intercessor, Advocate, Forerunner, sat down with His Father in His throne. All these chapters are full of helpful suggestiveness. Then there follows a chapter on the "Presence in the Midst." Dr. Swete quite rightly says that two or three Christians met for Common Prayer may claim the promise of His presence. He insists that we may especially expect that presence in the Holy Communion, and that where Christ is present, though His presence is not corporal, He is to be adored. He adds: "No adoration, of course, is intended or ought to be done to the symbols—it is not the symbolic figure of the Lamb that all heaven worships—nor to any corporal or localized presence whatsoever." Dr. Swete is quite clear that "neither in heaven nor on earth can there be any repetition of the Sacrifice." He is quite clear, also, as to the priesthood of the laity. "We come to God through Him, not merely as suppliants or worshippers, but as priests. But there are some few things in the book which do not seem quite so true to Scripture. For instance, on p. 43, Dr. Swete speaks of our Lord's presence in heaven as "a perpetual and effective presentation before God of the Sacrifice once offered," and we respectfully venture to ask where is the Scriptural warrant for this. We are moved to ask it the more because the phrase, or something like it, occurs more than once. Again, he writes on p. 47: "There can be no reasonable doubt that the Eucharist stands in a very special relation both to the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ and to His priestly Self-presentation in Heaven." He speaks quite truly of the double aspect of the Sacrament as an act both of Communion and of Commemoration. But he calls the Commemoration the Church's counterpart on earth to the Self-presentation of our Lord in heaven. In a footnote he admits that *ἀνάμνησις* is not the usual nor liturgical word for memorial, and that it must not be pressed in that sense. On the next page he uses the passage in Heb. xiii. 10 as having a reference to Holy Communion. We regret that Dr. Swete should have given the weight of his influence to views which Dr. Westcott has so effectively traversed. We are very reluctant to criticize one to whom the study of the New Testament owes so much, but in the interests of truth it is necessary to ask that teaching of this kind be shown to be Scriptural before we can accept it.

F. S. G. W.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE BIBLE: ST. MARK. Edited by Rev. James Hastings, D.D. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price, general, 10s.; to subscribers 6s. net.

We have already warmly commended the first volume of this series, that on Isaiah. We can equally warmly commend this. The book is not a collection of sermons, neither is it a collection of skeletons for the preacher to clothe with flesh and blood; it is rather flesh and blood for which the preacher must find a skeleton, if it is to help him to make a sermon. But

we would warn him that as a living organism is not a thoughtless throwing together of bones, flesh, and blood, so, if he attempts to use this book as a substitute for thought, he will make bad sermons. To the preacher who really tries to prepare his sermons the expositions and illustrations of this book will be of the utmost value. Let none others buy it.

THE PROGRESS OF REVELATION. By the Rev. G. A. Cooke, D.D. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 4s. 6d. net.

THE SERVANT OF GOD. By W. B. Selbie. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 6s.

THE LOVE AND WISDOM OF GOD. By Edward King, D.D. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 5s. net.

We have here three interesting volumes of sermons, widely differing each from the other, but all equally worthy of publication. Professor Cooke's is one of the "Scholar as Preacher" series, and deals largely with the Old Testament. Professor Cooke is a higher critic, perhaps some would think an extreme higher critic, but his sermons are marked by a real reverence for the Bible, and by a strong spiritual tone. They are scholarly, as we could expect, but they deal with practical Christian life in a way which cannot but help those who read them.

Principal Selbie's volume is also the work of a scholar, but his sermons are much more doctrinal than critical. He too deals largely with the Old Testament, but the Atonement through Christ is the real centre of his message. He writes very wisely along the line that the fact of the Atonement is one, but the theories of the Atonement are many. In the main he accepts the position of Dr. Dale, but he does not forget all that has been written since. One passage puts the general position so well that it deserves to be quoted in full:

"A man is no more saved by his theory of salvation than he can feed his body with a treatise on health. In the New Testament we have the fact of the Atonement stated, and but little more. But the statement is so wide, so many-sided, so richly illustrated, that on the basis of the New Testament alone various and even contradictory theories of the Atonement have been built up. The mandate of the New Testament to the preacher is to preach that Christ died for the ungodly, and to the Christian to receive that message, and with it pardon and peace. But to the natural man the message is a mystery and a stumbling block, and so the effort has been made to explain it, to make clear to the intelligence what appeals rather to the heart—to give a theory of the Atonement."

For the third volume—namely, that by the late Bishop of Lincoln, we owe a real debt to the Rev. H. T. Morgan, now also gone to his rest, and to Canon Randolph. The sermons cover a large portion of the Bishop's life, and were delivered under a great variety of circumstances. They have much to teach us who are also preachers. They are marked by indications of wide reading; they are illustrated with remarkable resource and versatility; above all, they bring us into an atmosphere of truly spiritual religion. No one will read them, not even those who differed most from Bishop King, without understanding something of the reason why he exerted so great an influence, and commanded such universal affection.

These three volumes form a valuable contribution to our stock of sermon literature.

F. S. G. W.

THE RIGHT TO BELIEVE. By Eleanor Harris Rowland, Ph.D. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

This book is written by the instructor in philosophy and psychology in Mount Holyoke College, U.S.A., and is the outcome of the author's efforts to deal with the religious difficulties of those whom she is instructing in kindred subjects. Her method of dealing with the problems of those who are anxious to believe is both original and suggestive.

There are six chapters, in addition to the Introduction, covering such subjects as "The Necessity for a Belief"; "Does God Exist?"; "The Nature of God and Man"; "The Divinity of Christ"; "The Problem of Evil," and "Prayer."

The writer's studies in philosophy and psychology are brought to bear upon these great questions, and oftentimes alternatives are presented in a most striking and convincing way.

Nothing is taken for granted. Arguments in favour of religion are stated hypothetically. The logical man who refuses to accept them because they are not supported by facts must also refuse to accept the contrary arguments if the facts are likewise wanting. A third possibility is excluded, according to Aristotle's "Law of excluded middle."

Pursuing this line of reasoning, the writer often presents in forcible fashion the overwhelming difficulties of unbelief. This little work forms a most excellent apologetic, and one which we heartily commend to those who are called upon to deal with honest seekers after truth.

Received: BIBLE AND CHURCH LINKS. By C. M. Parks. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s. 6d. A large collection of information about the Bible and the Church—some valuable and some wholly unnecessary. THE REVISED VERSION OF THE HOLY BIBLE DIVIDED INTO VERSES. *Cambridge Press*. Prices various. An edition which many of us have desired for a long while. The familiar paragraphs of the Revised Version are broken up into verses. It will do more to popularize the Revised Version than any edition yet. THE CORONATION PRAYER-BOOK. Oxford: *University Press*. A beautiful edition in white buckram and other bindings, with photographs of the King and Queen, an illuminated title-page, and delightful printing. It is dedicated by permission to the King, and contains the Coronation Service itself. THE HEBREW PROPHETS. By Woods and Powell. Oxford: At the *Clarendon Press*. Price 2s. 6d. The third volume of this edition of the Prophets, containing Obadiah, Ezekiel, and the latter half of Isaiah. The earlier volumes have already won for this edition a high place among the many attempts to make the Prophets intelligible to young students. THE LIFE STORY OF QUEEN MARY. By J. R. Brewer. London: *R.T.S.* Price 2s. 6d. A wonderfully cheap, well-illustrated story of the Queen's life, in simple style and large print. An excellent gift-book. THE LORD'S PRAYER. By J. E. Field. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s. 6d. An interesting account of the history and liturgical use of the Lord's Prayer. THOUGHTS ON GETHSEMANE. By L. M. Warner. London: *Morgan and Scott*. Price 3d. Many have already read Miss Warner's poems, and we gladly commend them to many more. They are simple and spiritual, and breathe the spirit of the Gospel. THE REVELATION OF THE TRIUNE GOD. By Rev. Bernard Herklots. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 1s. 6d. net. Mr. Herklots' poem has reached a new edition, as, indeed, it deserved to. BRITISH JOURNAL OF INEBRIETY. Edited by T. N. Kelynack, M.D. London: *Baillière, Tindall, and Cox*. Price 1s. net. A journal devoted to the scientific study of the problems of strong drink. THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW. Edited by Rev. A. C. Headlam. London: *Spottiswoode and Co*. Subscription price 12s. per annum. The most attractive articles are those by Canon Beeching on "The English Bible," and Dr. Burn on "Cardinal Pole." MULTITUDE AND SOLITUDE. By John Masefield. London: *T. Nelson and Sons*. Price 7d. net. THE LONDON POLICE COURTS. By Thomas Holmes. London: *T. Nelson and Sons*. Price 1s. net. THE AMATEUR POACHER. By R. Jefferies. London: *T. Nelson and Sons*. Price 1s. THE GIFT. By S. Macnaughtan. London: *T. Nelson and Sons*. Price 7d. net. SELECTIONS FROM EDMUND BURKE. London: *T. Nelson and Sons*. Price 6d. A PLAIN MAN'S THOUGHTS ON BIBLICAL CRITICISM. By Eugene Stock. London: *Longmans, Green and Co*. Price 3d. net. GUIDING THOUGHTS. By Dr. Moule. London: *Marshall Brothers*.