

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

November, 1913.

The Month.

The Church Congress. THE Southampton Church Congress has come and gone, and the Bishop of Winchester is to be congratulated on what has proved to be a Congress of deep significance, of real seriousness, and of somewhat unique importance. The Bishop of Winchester has always shown himself a brave and courageous leader, and his personality dominated the gathering. In his opening address he struck the keynote of the Congress, a keynote of no uncertain sound. He spoke of the kingdom of God in the world of to-day. "The forces of the kingdom are spiritual forces, centred in the great impetus of grace which was given by Jesus Christ, and continued by the Spirit of Jesus in His people." The kingdom has its foes, and some who know the great interest of the Bishop in social and missionary problems might have expected him to think only of external foes; but no, "we must find the opposition to the kingdom individually in our own breasts and corporately in the faults of our own class, or party, or nation, and fight it there." It is this double attitude, individual and social, self-judgment and championship, which made the Bishop's address one of the most striking and helpful that has ever prefaced the discussions of a Church Congress.

But the Bishop's opening address was not the only service that he rendered to the Congress. His plea for missions, which had no direct place in the Congress programme, was all the more

impressive for that fact. The missionary motive of the Church is not to be relegated to one session of the Congress; it is to underlie the whole. Again, it was a bold thing in this day of suffrage controversy to admit such a subject as the relation of sexes to the Congress programme, but the Bishop realized that it is time that a serious problem was lifted out of the rut of violence and of ridicule and considered in a becoming spirit, and his courage was justified by the event. Miss Royden's address at the Men's Meeting was not only unique as an episode, but unique in its force and impressiveness. Finally, it was a great thing that, at a time when the relations between the Church and Nonconformity are seriously strained, an extra meeting of the Church Congress should be held, and that Dr. Forsyth, Dr. Scott Lidgett, and Dr. Cairns should address a meeting of Churchmen, under the presidency of a Bishop, and with two other Bishops speaking with them. Bishop Talbot has dared to carry into the ecclesiastical atmosphere of a Church Congress a practical illustration of the Bishops' resolution at the last Lambeth Conference.

The purely theological discussion centred round the person of Christ in prophecy, history, and experience. Some things were said with which we shall most of us seriously disagree, but the ablest papers faced the problem in a way that will tend to help and reassure. The Dean of Wells drew attention to the tendency which has become almost dominant of late to make an unreal and artificial separation between the Christ of the Gospels and the Christ of St. Paul, and his argument in disproof of this tendency was warmly appreciated by the Congress, and will be a permanent contribution to orthodox theology. The Dean of St. Paul's had for his subject, "The Christ of Experience," and in the course of his paper he dealt several severe blows at another modern tendency—the tendency to regard the Christ of Experience as an idealized presentation of the Christ of History. He declined to be satisfied with the Christ of Ritschl or the Christ of the

**The Christ
of History.**

Modernist. He repudiated the idea that it is an historical accident whereby we regard Jesus of Nazareth as the author of our Faith. "The Christ of Experience is the same Christ who became flesh nineteen hundred years ago, whose deeds and words are present for us in the Gospels, and who promised that the Holy Spirit should descend after His departure to take His place."

The
Invocation
of Saints.

The Bishop of London devoted his Congress sermon to a careful examination of the Doctrine of the Invocation of Saints. At first sight it seems a matter of too secondary an importance to warrant its intrusion into so important a sermon. But on the whole we are inclined to think the Bishop has done the Church a service. He did not mention the "Catholic League," and he was chary of speaking words of praise or blame; but his sermon does reveal the real danger of the old practice and the extreme flimsiness of its claim for a place in the Church of England. The Bishop's sermon quotes largely and rightly from writings on the subject, and from writings on both sides. From those who are in favour of some form of the practice, comprecation or the like, we gain three admissions: that the practice of the Invocation of Saints . . . does not involve any opinion that the saints can read the heart or hear our prayers, or even know anything about us or our present needs; that the Reformers omitted all invocation whatever; that the omission was a return to primitive custom, when for about 600 years no invocations occurred in the authorized services of the Church. These admissions are such that the other side hardly needs to be put. The practice has no guaranteed value, it is not primitive, it is not Anglican. Little wonder that the late Bishop of Salisbury condemns the practice and reminds us that "our way is through God to the Saints, not through the Saints to God." Little wonder that the Bishop of London concludes his sermon with a plea for the revival in the Church of the doctrine of the communion of saints, and a clear acceptance of Bishop John Words-

worth's words quoted above. We should have been glad to have seen a clearer condemnation of the superstitious uses to which the "Catholic League" would call us, but we rejoice to note that the Bishop is alive to the danger that a revival of the practice dealt with would play into the hands of the most vulgar spiritualism, and would be dishonouring to the one Mediator, our Lord Himself.

The Church and Society. In the Extra Meeting of the Congress Dr. Forsyth dealt with the relationship of the Church to Society, and incidentally touched upon the question whether the Church should interfere in the details of social legislation. In a paragraph which we venture to quote Principal Forsyth deprecated such interference, and emphasized the duty of the Church to make men really Christian, and then to let Christians, in their political and social groups, carry their Christianity into practical effect. The speaker's point is an exceedingly important one, and we leave his words to speak for themselves :

"The Christian principle is to buy and sell under conditions that make life worth living in the sight of God. It is the Church's duty to saturate Society with such convictions and ideals, even while it may not be its duty to insist by legislation on a minimum wage. Such a step may be wise or unwise, but it is outside the Church's sphere. So with the detailed legislation about housing. The principle is the Church's trust, not the machinery. And as a rule it is not the Church that should press for particular measures or policies, but the Christians the Church makes—the members of the Church, acting in political or social groups, with entire freedom of procedure and variety of opinion towards the common principle. On such lines the Church can do far more for Society or the State than these can do for the Church."

St. Paul and the Mystery Religions. In the Congress papers one point occurred of more particular interest to the Christian student. This was a reference by the Dean of Wells to the present disposition, more strongly marked in German scholarship, to trace St. Paul's sacramental teaching and his doctrine of the Second Man from heaven to the Greek mysteries. Professor Ramsay's trenchant pen has already been employed

to show how improbable, in one particular context, this conception is. Those who wish to be informed in this matter of the general relation of St. Paul to the mystery religions will do well to read Professor Moulton's recent Fernley Lecture on *Religion and Religions*, where the treatment of the topic is discriminating and helpful. For those who read German, Dr. Carl Clemen's recent book on *Der Einfluss der Mysterien-religionen auf das älteste Christentum* will be found a mine of recent information. It is to be hoped, too, that Professor Kennedy's recent series of articles in the *Expositor* will be published in book form so as to secure a wider circle of readers. These articles show with a wealth of learning and with copious references the great instability of the connection so often asserted now between the influence of the mysteries and the thought of St. Paul.

The Bishop of Calcutta's Letter. It is greatly to be hoped that the protest which continues to be made from various quarters against the proposed tour of Miss Maud Allan in India will become effective, and that either by persuasion, or, if necessary, by prohibition, the enterprise will be prevented. The strength of the feeling against it has been adequately voiced by the Bishop of Calcutta's letter in the *Times* of October 9. He makes it quite clear that the protest is no mere expression of clerical intolerance or religious narrowness. At Calcutta, he says, "the subject was being freely discussed in the clubs, and I was assured that men of all kinds were agreed, almost to a man, in deprecating the visit." The Bishop, for his own part, has spent the whole of his working life in India, and may therefore claim to be in the closest touch with the characters and conditions of those for whom he has laboured; and he is emphatic in his assertion that, both for the general position of Englishmen in India, and for the cause of Indian morality in particular, this visit will involve grave difficulties and tremendous hindrances. Such an appeal, coming from such a quarter, should not go unsupported by Churchmen at home.

Hindrances to Missionary Work. It is an old and sadly true story that the work of the missionary and the philanthropist in heathen lands has been hindered by the advent of the trader and the drink-seller, exploiting and debauching the very natives whom their fellow-countrymen are giving their lives to save. Workers at the home base may well strain every nerve and strengthen the hands of their missionary brethren. To create a body of public opinion and a spirit of public life at home which shall be less heedless of and more actively sympathetic with philanthropic ideals abroad is one of the contributions which the home Church may well try to make to missionary enterprise. As Archdeacon Watkins said at the recent Durham Diocesan Conference: "We need ourselves to be a truly Christian people. Would you, if you could, lift any great city from England and place it in the middle of India or Africa, and tell the people, 'We have brought you Christianity'? Would you dare to do it?" The Mohammedan trader is a propagandist of Mohammedanism. We must pray for and work for the time when the life and conduct of the Englishman generally will be a help and not a hindrance to the proclamation of the religion of Christ.

Christian Reunion. The question of reunion with the Church of England has recently given rise to an interesting series of letters in our contemporary, the *Methodist Recorder*. The correspondence makes it clear that some, at any rate, look with wistful affection to their Mother Church, with deep desire for the ordered services of her liturgy. It is equally clear, on the other hand, that many perceive barriers which are felt, at present, to be insuperable. On some of the letters from this side we have one comment to make. The writers seem to take it for granted that the extreme view of the Sacraments and the ministry stand for the mind of the Church of England. They apparently ignore the not inconsiderable body of opinion in the Church which is not committed to the high sacerdotal view of the ministry, with all its resulting deductions. Our own view of

the matter is clear. We hold that much yet remains to be done in the way of social intercourse and mutual personal acquaintance before the time is ripe for any definite propositions of reunion. Anglicans and Nonconformists at present view one another from opposite sides of a high wall. There are many barriers to be broken down on both sides. Opinion must be enlightened and hearts kindled before formal proposals can be made.

**The Needs
of the
Children.**

While it is true that some of the characteristics of our age are calculated to cause grave apprehension in the minds of thinking men, one feature stands out which is of brightest omen for the future, and that is the awakening sense of deep responsibility for the child-life of the country. It has been said that the present century will stand out in our annals as "the children's century." The ways in which this real interest is displaying itself are manifold. A recent Order in Council deals with the establishment of Juvenile Courts in certain of the Metropolitan Police Courts. It is a measure of real humanity that children when under examination for juvenile misdemeanours should no longer be thrown into close association with the hardened and habitual criminal. There is also growing up a better understanding how closely such juvenile "crime" as does exist is bound up with the overcrowded and insanitary conditions into which the children are born. In other words, there is to be noted a wise attempt to remove the causes of juvenile wrongdoing and, where unhappily it exists, to correct it in more humane and reasonable fashion.

**A Brighter
Outlook.**

How recent is this feeling may be realized from the fact that the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children is not yet thirty years old. Since the foundation of that Society many kindred enterprises have been set on foot for the amelioration of child-life, and the Women Workers' Conference, recently held at Hull, had for its main topic "The Children of the Nation." "Here assuredly," as the *Times* emphatically says, "women are in their proper

sphere. Of all the wide-reaching effects of the women's movement none is more clearly right and wholesome than this—that all through the country women are, because of it, increasingly alive to the sufferings and the claims, the rights and the wrongs, the needs and the possibilities, of the children to whom they have given birth." One more aspect of the movement may be mentioned in what may be called the reform on rational lines of Sunday-school work. An exhibition, believed to be the first of its kind, illustrating modern methods of teaching in Sunday-schools, was recently opened by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, while doing justice to the excellent work of the past 130 years, declared that for the twentieth century we need a different plan, system, and apparatus. A better day is dawning for the nation's children.



Stephen—The Pivot of the Acts of the Apostles.

BY THE REV. T. W. GILBERT, B.D.

THE Acts of the Apostles contains three leading ideas. In the first place there is the fact that a new era had arrived in which the influence of the Holy Spirit was to be manifested through the agency of the followers of Christ; this is supplemented by that which the Holy Spirit's influence was to attest—viz., the Universality of the Gospel, whilst running through the whole narrative is the record of Jewish opposition. Now, it is quite clear that in reference to the manifestation of the Holy Spirit as shown in the Acts of the Apostles, there are no clear marks of development, and, indeed, to expect such would be to reduce the revelation to something of a mechanical process. Development, however, is seen, but it is found in the realizing and proclaiming by the disciples of the Universality of the Gospel, and also in the opposition of the Jews to the new teaching. The purport of this paper is to show that the prime cause of the development of the idea of the Universality of the Gospel and consequently of the opposition on the part of the Jews to Christianity, was Stephen the Deacon, and that Stephen, therefore, is the pivot of the Acts of the Apostles.

The parting commission of our Lord to His disciples was that they should be His "witnesses," but the commission was clearly defined in its scope—viz., "both in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and unto the uttermost part of the earth." It was not long before the first step was taken, under the leadership of Peter, of defining this commission and making it their own, and on the Day of Pentecost the beginning was made in the long process which was ultimately to make the Gospel accessible to the world. On that particular day "Jews, devout men from every nation under heaven," listened to the witness of Peter concerning his Master, and to these people gathered from the countries round the Mediterranean was the

word given, "For to you is the promise and to your children," and that which perhaps marks the only progressive note in Peter's speech, "to all that were afar off." It is evident that Peter had at least broken away from any local ideas with reference to the Gospel, but at the same time it is clear that his interpretation of Christ's words meant that "unto the uttermost part of the earth" and "to all that are afar off," was to be limited strictly to the members of the Jewish race. Even taking his words in iii. 26, "unto you first," as bearing the interpretation that those who were not "sons of the prophets and of the covenant which God made with your fathers" (iii. 25) should ultimately share in the Messianic Kingdom, this was merely a general Jewish expectation which was to be realized by Gentiles becoming proselytes of the gate. The simple and definite teaching of Peter was that of v. 31: "Him did God exalt with His right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour for to give repentance to *Israel*." Hence his work was what might be called of an intensive character, to create in the countrymen of our Lord a strong body of Christians whose natural characteristic of cosmopolitanism (to use Julius Cæsar's idea) would facilitate the expansion of Christianity when the widening vision came. Thus it is the "Jews, devout men," who are numbered amongst the converts on the Day of Pentecost, and Jerusalem itself was soon filled with the new teaching (v. 28) by the influence of the eight thousand who had early turned to Christ (ii. 42; iv. 4). Very soon the next district mentioned by our Lord was evangelized, for the influence of the healing of the sick (v. 16) was sufficient to drive home the truth of what common report had brought from Jerusalem, and, therefore, even before the scattering of the disciples mentioned in viii. 1, Judea would have known something of the Gospel. Any further advance on the part of Peter seems wanting, however, after this particular stage had been reached; Jerusalem, Judea, and the influence of the Jews "from afar off," could alone be attributed to him, and the further expansion was due rather to the influence of another mind.

The instrument for spreading the idea of the Universality of the Gospel, which Peter seems to have imperfectly grasped, was Stephen, and hence the obvious reason for the insertion of his long speech in ch. vii., the principles of which were to be the basis of all future action in the spread of Christianity. Stephen was a Grecian Jew, and his analytical and philosophical bent of mind is seen in his historical treatment of the purpose of God in the history of the Jews. What Stephen proclaimed to the Jews was this, viz. : That God revealed Himself to Abraham in heathen Mesopotamia and Haran ; therefore the Revelation of God was not local. He had given Abraham no actual possession in Canaan, and hence Palestine *per se* was not unique in the sight of God. He had revealed Himself to Joseph in Egypt, and to Moses in Midian, in the wilderness, and in Sinai ; the Tabernacle itself had been moved from place to place in the desert and in Canaan ; such a God could not therefore be a God of one place and nation only. This it was which made Solomon's prayer so vital a truth (vii. 49) ; it was merely the enunciation of what is heard later from St. Paul, that the God of the world and of Nature was not for the Jews only. It needed but the reproach in vii. 57, that circumcision should be recognized as embodying a principle and not simply an ordinance or totem, to reveal how completely Stephen had broken away from the insular ideas of the Jews, and that he had grasped the truth of Universality which Christ had given.

Here, then, we reach a crucial point in the history of Christianity, for the influence which came from Stephen was destined to revolutionize the position till then occupied by Peter and the Apostles generally. This is at once brought home by the fact that the next outward movement of evangelization comes, not from Peter or any other of the Apostles, but from Philip, a fellow deacon with Stephen and, like him, a Grecian Jew, and hence influenced by Stephen's spirit. Philip, therefore, actuated no doubt by force of the persecutions (viii. 1), but also impelled by the teaching of Stephen, went down to Samaria, and began to preach Christ (viii. 4). Evidently there was a feeling of

irregularity about Philip's procedure, because of the despatch of Peter and John to give, as it were, an official approval of the new departure on the part of the newer teacher. Whether this view be correct or no, Peter and John accepted the situation and confirmed it by preaching in the villages of the Samaritans (viii. 25), but it is significant that Philip is at once led on further and is the means of extending the Gospel by the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch and by preaching as far as Cæsarea (viii. 40). In the meanwhile it is noted that the Gospel had reached Damascus (ix. 1, 2), Tarsus (ix. 30), Lydda (ix. 32), and Joppa (ix. 36), and thus at the close of the ninth chapter of the Acts it is possible to say that Judea, Samaria, and a few outposts had been Christianized, and that this advance was due to Pentecost or to Stephen. At this point it seems that a special revelation was given to the leader amongst the Apostles in the hope that it would open his eyes to the full significance of the Gospel as something for *every* creature and not for Jews only. The vision which was granted to Peter (x. 9-16) served the purpose of revolutionizing his mind to a fact which evidently the work of Stephen and Philip and the influence of Pentecost had not driven home.

Thus when he stands before Cornelius and his friends it is with a confession of past blindness, "God hath shown me" (x. 28), but at the same time with a positive statement which reveals an element of strangeness in the speaker. "*Every one* that believeth on Him shall receive remission of sins" (x. 43); such are the words which in themselves proclaim the Universality of the Gospel in all its fulness, but it is "of a truth I perceive" (x. 34), and the verb *καταλαμβάνομαι* implies a strangeness and hesitancy foreign to the general statement of x. 43. It seemed as though Peter was wavering in the balance, but now if ever was the time that the definite forward movement should be taken and the work pressed on of proclaiming the Gospel for Gentiles as well as Jews. Up to the present no clearly defined Gentile people had actually been touched by the Apostles or even by Philip. It is true that a more liberal outlook had been

gained when Samaria was evangelized, but the Samaritans had always been loosely connected with Judaism; a wider horizon had also been gained when Philip baptized the eunuch, but the latter was obviously a Jewish proselyte. A great advance was made when Peter admitted Cornelius and his friends into the Christian Church, but here again there was evidently some kinship to the Jewish faith, as the term "devout" and the ninth hour of prayer (x. 1, 2) imply.

The time had arrived in the stage of expansion when the non-Jewish world itself should be touched; the point towards which the Divine Commission (i. 8) given by Christ and enunciated clearly by Stephen was moving had now arrived. But the leader of the Day of Pentecost was to be leader no more, for the exponents of Christianity for the world were to be found in other than the Apostolic circle, and we come back once more to the influence of Stephen.

The work of Stephen was evidently of an educational character, and it is clear that the man who was capable of reading the lessons of history—as evidenced in his speech before the Council (ch. vii.)—would be equally ready in teaching the same lessons in private. Thus we find him at work amongst the thoughtful men of the day (vi. 9), and sowing seed which was destined to ripen at a critical period in the history of the early Church. For the fact which faces us is this. At the moment when Peter was dimly groping his way to the full meaning of being witnesses "unto the uttermost part of the earth," unnamed men had taken the lead where he hesitated to go, and these unnamed missionaries had derived their inspiration from Stephen. Such is the inference to be derived from xi. 20, 21, and vi. 9. The men of Cyprus and Cyrene, taught by Stephen that God was the God of the world and not of the Jews only, put the logical conclusion upon the Divine Commission (i. 8), and at Antioch "spake unto the Greeks also, preaching the Lord Jesus."

Evidently a more liberalizing spirit was necessary if the words and command of Christ were to be fully put into effect; the insular Jewish mind needed still further enlightenment, and

that enlightenment came through the agency of these Hellenic Jews. The balance of influence, therefore, moved at once to Antioch, which was soon revolutionized by the unnamed disciples of Stephen. It is significant of the spirit which was bringing about this revolution in the insular ideas of Jews towards the Gospel, to note those who were the leading men of the Church at Antioch. Reference to xiii. 1 shows that they comprised Barnabas of Cyprus and Lucius of Cyrene, men who had caught the spirit of their compatriots (xi. 20, 21) owing to their contact with the Hellenic influences. In addition there were Symeon called Niger, and the double name indicates one accustomed to mingle amongst non-Jews; Manaen the foster-brother of Herod, and therefore one who would be open to the liberalizing spirit which contact with Greece and Rome would bring; and Saul of Tarsus, a city which had known something of Eastern mysticism as well as the influence of Alexander the Great and his descendants, and later of Rome. Here, therefore, were men whose whole life and upbringing were preparing them for the work committed to them. If Saul could pride himself on being a native of Tarsus, a citizen of no mean city, which knew the meaning of Greek influence; if, also, he could lay claim to Roman citizenship by birth; if, moreover, similar attributes could be predicated of Barnabas surnamed Justus, Symeon called Niger, whose double names revealed at least contact with Rome and Hellenic ideas, then, in the atmosphere of such men, Jewish insularism could not long survive. Their acceptance of the secular rights which accrued to Roman citizens involved the acknowledgment of a social and political universality, whether Greek or Roman, which must bring in its train, sooner or later, the acknowledgment of the possibility of religious universality. It is not too much to say, therefore, that the purely Jewish spirit had been incapable of realizing the full purport of the Divine command to be witnesses "unto the uttermost parts of the earth," and that it was due to the Hellenic training of Stephen and to the unnamed men of Cyprus and Cyrene that the narrow Jewish idea gave place to the broader conception of

the Universality of the Gospel. In Antioch this Universality was proclaimed, and was Divinely approved in a somewhat significant way. "The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch," so we read in xi. 26, but the Greek word for "called" is not the usual *καλέω* but *χρηματίσαι*, which, whenever used, implies a Divine admonition (*cf.* Acts x. 22 ; Heb. viii. 5 ; xi. 7 ; xii. 25). The word "Christian," also, is itself full of significance, for it includes Hebrew thought in the idea of the Anointed One, Greek language in the word "Christ," and Latin influence in the ending "iani." The Divine approval of the work of Stephen and his followers was therefore proclaimed by a Divine revelation and by the bestowal of a title which, by comprising the three representatives of the powers which influenced the world, foreshadowed the world-wide significance with which Christ had given His commission. Viewed in this light, therefore, the choice of Saul to be the Apostle to the Gentiles bears the appearance of Divine disapproval of the meagre ideas of the early disciples, whilst the statement of St. Paul in xxvi. 17, 18, implies that he was deliberately appointed by God because of the failure of the Twelve.

At this point, therefore, we enter upon the third stage in the development of the idea of the Universality of the Gospel. The first phase was concerned with the purely Jewish idea of expansion, of Universality amongst the children of Israel only ; the second with the enunciation of the world-wide aspect by Stephen and the gradual expansion of his ideal through the medium of Philip and his unknown followers of Cyprus and Cyrene. The third stage will show the influence of Stephen in the missionary journeys of St. Paul, with the cross current of Jewish insularism striving against the more liberal spirit.

Chosen by God, therefore, in default of the older disciples, St. Paul, the product of the Antiochian school, is "sent forth" to carry the Gospel to other than Jews. There is, however, no trace of iconoclasm in his spirit, for only slowly does the complete idea come even to him. The "work whereunto he had been called" was the Gentiles, yet on landing at Salamis it is

to the Jews he goes; the proconsul (a Gentile) has to *send* for him. So, again, at Antioch and Iconium (as, indeed, later) St. Paul goes first to the Jews, but his note grows stronger and his vision wider as he advances. In his first speech at Antioch he identifies Christ with the Messiah (xiii. 23); in his second speech in the same place he definitely proclaimed the Universality of the Gospel as inclusive of the Gentiles (xiii. 47). The influence of Stephen had thus carried Paul to the most explicit declaration yet made of the inclusion of the Gentiles in the Gospel, but his Hellenic spirit took him even further. At Lystra it was not Paul the Jew who was speaking, but Paul the man of Greek training, and the Universality which Christ had proclaimed became grounded on the witness of Nature to "the living God . . . of all the nations" (xiv. 15, 16). Hence it is well to note how this particular point is marked, for it is the evidence of this journey which finally assures the disciples of that which had been implicit all along—*i.e.*, that a door of faith was open for the Gentiles as well as Jews (xiv. 27). The news was still something of novelty. Paul and Barnabas tell the brethren in Phœnicia and Samaria (xv. 3), and the recital evidences that the work of Philip (viii. 4) had obviously been amongst Jews only. The question of circumcision which arose also reveals that the minds of the Jewish Christians were revolving in a narrow circle, and that they had not grasped Stephen's idea that circumcision involved principle, and not simply ritual. A distinct step forward, however, is noticeable. Peter, some ten years now since the conversion of Cornelius, is at length able to say that he believes the Gentiles will be saved in the same way as the Jews—*i.e.*, by grace—whilst St. James simply takes up the position of Paul at Lystra when he speaks of the "residue of men seeking after the Lord, and all the Gentiles" (xv. 17).

Fortified, therefore, by the approval of the official leaders at Jerusalem, St. Paul set out on the journey which was to put the seal to his life's work. The widened vision which had characterized his first journey was now to be consummated by clear

and definite work for the Gentiles. Hence, probably, the significant dropping of Mark (xv. 38). It was obviously no fear of physical incapacity on his part which made St. Paul decline to have him in this second journey, for the route chosen was easier of travel than that pursued on the first journey. Evidently Mark was not whole-hearted in the wider ideas which Paul had enunciated and put into practice, and there was to be no room in this journey for any but those who would carry the commission of i. 8 to its proper conclusion. This seems to have been the spirit in which St. Paul set out; there was evidently a clear-cut plan in his mind for the pursuit and consolidation of the work amongst the Gentiles. Thus, after his journey across Asia Minor, the appeal of "a man" (xvi. 9)—not a Jew—is sufficient to enlist instant action for work amongst Gentiles, whilst the results of his work at Philippi, by its very cosmopolitanism—resulting as it did in the conversion of a Roman, a wealthy Greek woman of Thyatira, and a slave—set the seal of Divine approval upon this forward movement. Once within the region of Greek thought and influence, however, the definite plan of the Apostle is slowly unfolded. He had come into contact with many Greeks at Thessalonica and Berea (xvii. 4, 12), and in Athens, especially, the note which he had sounded at Lystra (xiv. 15-18) was again given with studied and reasoned power. The God whom he proclaimed on the Hill of Ares (xvii. 22-31) was no longer the God who considered some men "common or unclean," but one whose relation to the world was based upon a nobler idea. He is the Father of mankind, for our rational instincts tell us "we are His offspring" (xvii. 28). He has set a standard of righteousness "for the whole world" in Jesus Christ, and has given a pledge of it to "all men" by the Resurrection (xvii. 31). At this point, therefore, we reach the climax of the conception of the Universality of the Gospel. Stephen had clearly seen this from the history of the Jews themselves, and the one upon whom his mantle had fallen now showed that the accumulated results of human history and experience pointed to a Universal Father

of mankind whose universality could not be narrowed down into a Messiah for the Jews only, but who of necessity would send the "man whom He had ordained" to be the Saviour of "all men," and not of the Jewish race alone.

The ideas and thoughts are strangely modern in their conception, but they were the logical outcome of the spirit and teaching of the proto-martyr to whose death the Apostle of the Gentiles had been consenting. It is significant, however, to note what followed the visit to Athens, for the procedure of St. Paul now follows closely on the lines laid down by Stephen. The work of the latter had not been spread over a wide area, and there is no account of any extensive journeys to proclaim the Gospel to the Gentiles. On the contrary, his work was done in Jerusalem only (v. 8-10), but the work was intensive in character and calculated to produce, as we have already seen (xi. 20, 21), ever-widening circles of influence. So now St. Paul seems to take up the same plan. No longer were there to be journeys across Europe, but rather concentration and teaching, in the hope that results might follow similar to those which accrued from the methods of the martyr-deacon. No places could have been better suited for St. Paul's purpose than Corinth and Ephesus. Stephen had concentrated his attention on the Hellenic synagogue in Jerusalem in order that its cosmopolitan character might result in widening the area of Christian influence and ideas; so now in Corinth and Ephesus St. Paul fixed upon a base equally effective. Corinth was one of the keys of the Roman Empire. It was a geographical centre, since it was on the highway between Rome and the East; it was also a link between Northern and Southern Greece, whilst the prevailing Hellenic atmosphere guaranteed at least an absence of insularism. Ephesus also was similarly favoured as to situation; its position as the trade emporium of the East meant a constant flow of traders and visitors; this constant influx meant the centring of the ideas of Greece and Rome as well as of the East, and made possible, therefore, the outflow of doctrines which might be enunciated in Ephesus. Hence St. Paul spent

some three and a half years in Corinth and Ephesus teaching (xviii. 11) and reasoning (xix. 9), with the result for which he had no doubt wished—*i.e.*, “that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord, both Jews and Greeks” (*cf.* xix. 26).

It is now, and not until now, that St. Paul's thoughts turn to Rome (xix. 21). The fact seems to imply that he felt his work was done so far as the East was concerned, and that in Rome he might bring to a proper conclusion the task which had been entrusted to him. Yet it is significantly stated that another journey confronts him before Rome is reached, for Jerusalem itself must be visited (xix. 21), and the reason of it lies in xx. 4. There were to accompany him seven Gentile Christians, whose presence was to be living evidence of the seal of Divine approval upon his work: two natives of Asia Minor, the fruits of his earlier missionary work; three citizens of European Greece, the scene of the first part of his second missionary journey, and two representatives of the Province of Asia, the result of his intensive work at Ephesus and Corinth. Here was comprehensive and convincing testimony to the truth of the Universality of the Gospel for which St. Paul stood. It was no wonder that a profound impression was produced among the elders at Jerusalem, and that they “glorified God” when they heard and saw what God had been doing through His chosen agent. The disciple of Stephen had at length come to his own, and the influence of the proto-martyr at last had reaped its reward.

The above sketch of the unfolding of the Universality of the Gospel has shown the centrality of Stephen in this development; the record of the opposition of the Jews to Christianity will witness to the same fact.

It is clear that if the Acts of the Apostles records a progressive unfolding and development of the idea of the Universality of the Gospel, it is equally true that there is also development in the negative position taken up by the Jews. At the outset there was no conception that Christianity was iconoclastic in

character, for the first Christians were sincere Jews who kept the regular hours of prayer (iii. 1 ; ii. 42), looked to the Temple as their sanctuary (ii. 46 ; v. 12), and were, as ii. 47 significantly declares, "in favour with all the people." Hence the primary move in the direction of opposition was not democratic in origin but was, on the other hand, purely official in character. Peter and John were arrested on the first occasion (iv. 1-3) simply because of their teaching regarding the Resurrection, which offended the Sadducees. The Sadducees are to be identified with the "priests of the temple" (iv. 1), whilst the "Captain of the Temple" also was a priest ; hence this proclamation of the Resurrection of Christ at once roused into opposition the official custodians of the Temple, who were also the central authority in the Holy City. It was therefore a combination of official zeal against the rise of a new sect, coupled with a dislike for the doctrine to which they themselves were opposed, which induced the further action on the part of the Sadducean priests. They could not get behind the evidence of their senses with respect to the impotent man (iv. 16), but they were determined that a movement subversive of their own power and position should not be allowed to develop (iv. 17). This accounts, therefore, for the first three arrests of the Apostles, "they were filled with jealousy" (v. 17) lest the new movement "which filled Jerusalem" (v. 28) should mean their own deposition from power, and thus "bring this man's blood on us." Hence the concerted action of the whole Sadducean party (v. 17) to destroy the incipient movement which might spell ruin to themselves.

Apart, therefore, from the teaching of the Resurrection, there seemed to have been nothing on the part of the Apostles calculated to arouse very strong opposition from the Jews, and at the close of the fifth chapter the spirit of opposition is confined to the priests of the Sadducean sect, who were fearful that the new teaching would mean the escape of a considerable number of Jews from their official oversight, a position which would involve their own downfall, and this by the subversion of the chief tenet of their belief.

The next move, however, came from the Pharisees and their satellites, the Scribes. The influence of this party was confined mainly to the synagogue, and it was in the synagogue that they came into contact with Stephen (vi. 9). The teaching of the latter was not confined to one particular point, nor would the Pharisees be concerned to narrow down their discussions to the one subject which had roused the opposition of the Sadducees (*cf.* xxiii. 9). On the contrary, as we have seen above, the teaching of Stephen would be so subversive of the position occupied by the Pharisees as guardians of the Law that it very quickly drove them to declare, "We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and against God." Hence the natural result followed, Pharisees and Sadducees joined hands to crush the innovators, and with the cry of "The Temple and the Law in danger" (vi. 13) appealed to popular prejudice in the hope of stifling the now spreading movement.

This, therefore, was the attitude of the Jews up to the moment when Stephen stood before the Council; the spirit of opposition was primarily official and confined mainly to interested parties.

After the speech of Stephen, however, the whole position was radically changed, and the change is merely one more indication of the fact that Stephen is the pivot upon which the Acts of the Apostles turns. The words of Stephen in ch. vii.—as seen previously—were an endeavour to show in the history of the Jews a philosophic basis for the Universality of the Gospel, and to make his hearers realize that the God who did not confine His operations to one particular land was indeed the God of the whole earth and of all people. Incidentally he had shown something of the progressive character of the Revelation of God to the Jews and the consequent transient nature of the externals of Jewish religion—*i.e.*, the Tabernacle, the Law, and the Temple. Such ideas, however, were revolutionary to a people who had identified religion with nationality. If the Law and the Temple were not the permanent embodiment and representation of their national faith, if God were indeed the God of the whole world in the sense that He was to be the God

of all and of every nation, then the expression "the God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob" would lose its meaning for the Jews. The whole feeling of nationality therefore rose up against such apparently anti-national and unpatriotic teaching, and the opposition of the Jews, therefore, entered upon its second stage. At the outset it had been official; it now became national, and fierce opposition was offered against what was considered detrimental to national consolidation.

The opposition, from this point onwards, is traced along the path of Stephen's influence. Stephen himself paid the penalty for his supposed iconoclasm with death (vii. 59-60), and his followers immediately felt the iron hand of oppression (viii. 1; ix. 1). When Saul, the pupil of Stephen, follows in the footsteps of his master and teacher he is at once threatened with death, both at Damascus (ix. 23) and at Jerusalem (ix. 29), whilst, on the other hand, it is significant that the other Apostles who had not yet proclaimed the Universality of the Gospel on the lines laid down by Stephen are allowed to remain in Jerusalem unharmed (viii. 1). Yet after the conversion of Cornelius, when Peter was groping his way to the fulness of Christ's commission and the Apostles had publicly proclaimed the (xi. 18) truth for which Stephen had died, it was still more significant that Herod should kill James and seize Peter (xii. 23). Herod had at all times desired to identify himself with Jewish national life, and in this act against the Apostles, who were now proclaiming a seemingly anti-national doctrine, he struck a blow for Jewish insularism which would be hailed as the act of a true patriot.

The same spirit of opposition to doctrines which embodied in them antagonism to the Jewish national position is observable in the experience of St. Paul. At Antioch and Iconium he is forced to flee because, in the former town, he had applied the reasoning of Stephen and seen that there was "light for the Gentiles" (xiii. 47) as well as for Jews. At Lystra, where he shows the witness of Nature to God as the God of "all the nations" (xiv. 16), he paid the penalty almost with his life

(xiv. 19). So again at Thessalonica (xvii. 5) and in Greece and Asia generally (xx. 3, 19), the spirit of opposition was roused against him for the same reason which brought death to Stephen (vi. 13; xxi. 20, 28). The Jews felt it certain that the application of the principle enunciated by Stephen and applied by Paul would indeed mean the passing of the Law, the Temple, and with them the nation itself. This is the meaning, therefore, of the outburst on the part of the Jews when St. Paul explained his commission to the Gentiles (xxii. 21, 22); it meant that his hearers had mentally raised a ring-fence enclosing the Jew, his Temple and Law, and that he who attempted to break down the fence would share the fate of a traitor.

Apart from this Jewish opposition to any effort on the part of the Apostles to touch those outside the Jewish nation, we can see, in the relationship of the Christian Jews to the question of circumcision, another phase of this insularism which identified belief with nation. The challenge to Peter (xi. 2) after the conversion of Cornelius, simply showed that the Christian Church in Jerusalem was ranging itself on the side of patriotic feeling, and it was but the natural attitude from men who were above all things "of the seed of Abraham." This, again, was the motive which prompted the deputation from Judea to descend on Antioch (xv. 1) with the *ipse dixit*: "except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses ye cannot be saved," and similarly when Paul and Barnabas had returned to Jerusalem (xv. 5). It meant that the conservative nationalism of the capital was hurling itself against the new spirit which was spreading from Antioch, and this simply heralded the decline of Jerusalem from its position of uniqueness as the centre of religious faith and worship.

The examination, therefore, of the development of the two main ideas of the Acts of the Apostles reveals how inseparably they are connected with the work of Stephen, and shows that Stephen is the pivot, or central factor, round which the whole of the Acts revolves.

The Church and the Poor.

A SERIES OF HISTORICAL SKETCHES.

By W. EDWARD CHADWICK, D.D., B.Sc.

XI.

I. THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION.

IN studying the Industrial Revolution and its effects, two classes of facts must be studied side by side. Both may be regarded as parallel and contemporaneous causes: the first of the actual revolution, the second rather of the evils which accompanied it. In the first class I would place the great physical and material changes which commenced about the middle of the eighteenth century, and among these we must put the discovery of certain mechanical inventions whose effect in the way of increased production it is difficult to overestimate.¹ In 1760 the Bridgewater Canal was constructed; this introduced a means whereby the cheap transit of heavy materials such as coal became possible. In 1764 Hargreaves produced his "spinning jenny"; in 1765 Watt invented the steam engine; in 1767-70 Arkwright produced his "water-frame," which practically necessitated the factory or mill. In 1775 he took out a second patent "which enabled him to co-ordinate the processes of carding, drawing, roving, and spinning. He was now able to send raw cotton into his factory and bring out thread, almost the whole work being done by machinery."² In 1779 Crompton invented the "mule," which produced a thread at once fine and strong. In 1785 Cartwright produced the power loom, and as early as 1789 steam was applied. I give these examples from a single branch of industry—the cotton trade. In other textile industries—for instance, in connection

¹ There were, of course, earlier inventions—*e.g.*, Kay's "flying shuttle," about 1730; and ten years after this there was a spinning mill at Northampton. There was also Savery's "fire engine," used early in the century to clear mines of water.

² Meredith's "Economic History of England," p. 246.

with the use of coal, with the production of iron and steel, and in various branches of mechanical engineering—during the same period similar inventions were being made and employed.¹ We are, of course, now dealing only with the early days of the Industrial Revolution, for actually the movement so described has never ended. It still continues, and from the time of which we are speaking down to the present day discovery has followed discovery, and one invention has succeeded another with ever increasing rapidity; while the almost innumerable applications, first of steam, then of electricity, and lastly of petrol, have enabled these inventions to be applied in a constantly widening sphere. It must be remembered that these various inventions at least synchronized with other changes—rapid increases in population, in trade, also in the aggregate wealth of the nation. The inventions may have at least to some extent been due to the pressure exerted by the growth of population and trade; and certainly it was the increase of wealth, that is of available capital, which made their application so widely possible.

All these various changes—in methods of production, and in large increases of population, trade, and the aggregate national wealth—are facts belonging to the category of the physical and the material.

The second class of facts to which I just now referred are those connected with the equipment of both the Church and the State at this time to deal with the new social problems which arose in consequence of these immense changes. This equipment should have been twofold: first, in the sphere of ideas, that is of thought, or doctrine, or principles (for ideas are the motive and ruling powers of conduct); secondly, in the sphere

¹ There was, of course, in the last half of the eighteenth century an immense improvement in the methods of agriculture. Partly by means of these, Coke raised the rent of his Holkham estate from £2,200 in 1776 to £20,000 in 1818. (Meredith, *op. cit.*, p. 244.)

Also immense tracts of land were enclosed, as much as 7,000,000 acres between 1760 and 1843; small farms gave place to large ones; cultivation became more and more scientific; the rural population became not only relatively, but actually smaller. See Toynbee's "Industrial Revolution," pp. 67 *et seq.*, 206 *et seq.*

of organization, which is the chief means or instrument whereby any political or religious body is able to carry out and propagate its ideas. Actually we find in the middle of the eighteenth century, on the part of both Church and State, very inadequate views of their responsibilities, and consequently a very inadequate discharge of their duties. These inadequate views were due to equally inadequate conceptions of the true nature of both man and society, and also of the responsibilities to both on the part of those who are in authority.

It is impossible for me even to sketch in outline either the theological and philosophical, or the political and social, ideas which were chiefly prevalent at that time. The Church was certainly not wanting in men of very considerable intellectual power.¹ She had thinkers who might have set forth the New Testament conception of the supreme value of the individual life, also of the responsibilities both of the individual to society and of society to the individual. But the religious teachers of that time were otherwise engaged. In the earlier part of the century they were occupied in vanquishing the Deists,² and at intervals throughout it they were busy with the Trinitarian³ controversy. The work they did was useful in its way;⁴ those who attack the Faith must be answered. But controversy is not the only, it is not even the chief, duty of the leaders of the Church. One of the principal causes of the failure of the teachers of that time was their constant insistence upon the "prudential" aspect of religion.⁵ They were always dwelling upon the "reasonableness" of Christianity; they were content to point out how "expedient" a belief in it was. There was no teaching of the responsibility for man as man—that is, for man redeemed by Christ. The truth, that by the Incarnation

¹ This was especially so in the early part of the eighteenth century.

² On the "Deists," see Abbey and Overton, "The English Church in the Eighteenth Century," chap. iii.

³ "On the Trinitarian Controversy," *ibid.*, chap. vi.

⁴ Then, as so often, the "apologists" made the road for the so-called "more spiritual" teachers who followed them.

⁵ This may be said to be equally prominent in such otherwise different teachers as Butler and Paley.

man's physical and material welfare, as affecting his spiritual welfare, must be a matter of concern to the Christian, seems to have been entirely forgotten. Then there was no sense of the *corporate* life of the Church, of her corporate responsibility towards the ignorant, the poor, and the oppressed.

The current philosophy and ethics of the time were as inadequate as its theology. Hobbes, whose influence upon thought was still strong, held something very like "the natural unsociality of man,"¹ and that, "since all the voluntary actions of men tend to their own preservation or pleasure, it cannot be reasonable to aim at anything else."² There is nothing very lofty in Locke's reason why one man should not hurt another—viz., "because the person is another man—that is, an animal related to us by nature whom it would be criminal to harm."³ Bishop Butler was certainly a great ethical teacher, yet it can hardly be denied that he assumes that the ultimate appeal must be to the individual's interest. Also he seems to admit that, should the dilemma arise in which "reasonable self-love" and conscience should come into conflict, conscience would have to give way, because "our ideas of happiness and misery are of all our ideas the nearest and most important to us."⁴ Hume regarded justice, veracity, and fidelity to compacts as "artificial" virtues, due to civilization, and that our approbation of them is founded upon our perception of their useful consequences.⁵

Burke was in some respects a really great statesman, but we cannot acquit him of teaching political expediency; and when he regarded revealed religion as something not entirely different from an "adventitious" addition to natural religion, he was only echoing the prevailing conception of his age. As Professor Maurice says: "Burke was the masterly investigator of a *nation's* constitution, of a *nation's* obligation." He was at the same time "the masterly protester against every attempt to merge this constitution and these obligations in some general

¹ Sidgwick, "History of Ethics," p. 164.

² *Ibid.*, p. 177.

⁵ Sidgwick, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

² *Ibid.*

⁴ Sermon xi.

theory which concerned all men equally.”¹ But Burke apparently gives no answer to the question whether “there was not a conscience which demanded that if the multitude were swine, they should not be left as swine; whether there was not food, and that the highest food of all for which they had powers of digestion, for which they might also have an appetite?” To quote Professor Maurice again: “Burke could give his aid in extinguishing what was false. . . . He could bid them cast away nothing that had been given them, and expect nothing from what they created out of their own fancies. He could *not* show that there is not a city for men which hath [the] foundations, nor that all the cities of the old world and the new are not to walk in the light of it.”² The doctrine of “expediency” is even more clearly taught by Paley, who held that it “is the one foundation of moral and political philosophy.” To him “moral obligation means a motive which is ‘violent’ enough to produce obedience to it. There is no motive sufficiently violent but a self-interest which stretches through an interminable future.”³ Paley thought Hume “right in supposing that justice and benevolence have no foundation except in utility.” But he thought Hume wrong “in fancying that a sufficient sense of what is useful, and therefore a sufficient motive to be just and benevolent, could be created in men’s minds unless they were promised enormous future rewards, if they were just and benevolent, and were threatened with punishment of unmeasured magnitude and duration if they were not.”⁴ After considering the teaching of Paley, I ought to have proceeded to deal with that of Bentham and the Utilitarians, but these, so far as their practical influence is concerned, belong to a later period of the Industrial Revolution than that which I am now examining.

¹ “Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy,” vol. ii., p. 595.

² *Ibid.*, p. 596.

³ “While Burke was working out his ideas of a nation’s expediency by hard practical conflicts with its pride and avarice, William Paley was teaching, in the halls of Cambridge, that expediency is the one foundation of moral and political philosophy” (Maurice, *op. cit.*, p. 596).

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 597.

I have entered somewhat fully into the theological and philosophical teaching of the eighteenth century, because, apart from the ideas which were generally accepted at the time, it is impossible to understand adequately the conduct of either rulers or churchmen in reference to the changes that were taking place, or rather to the social evils which were rapidly growing in magnitude.

But, as I have said, besides considering the ideas or principles accepted in any period, we have to consider the organization then available in Church and State for applying these. In the Church at this time there was practically nothing to which the term "organization" could be applied. Since the silencing of Convocation in 1717¹ there had been absolutely no assembly through which the Church, as a corporate body, could utter her collective opinion, had she wished to do so. Such gatherings as diocesan conferences were unknown. The very size of some of the northern dioceses, especially when we remember the means of locomotion in those days, precluded any collective gathering of clergy except upon the rarest occasions. In the Northern Province, apart from Sodor and Man, there were but four dioceses—York, Durham, Carlisle, and Chester; even part of the Archdeaconry of Richmond in North-West Yorkshire was then in the Diocese of Chester. Probably the last qualification for an aspirant to a bishopric in the days of Walpole would have been organizing ability. Again, "what would now be considered the most ordinary parts of parochial machinery were then wanting. . . . The population of the country had far outgrown the resources of the National Church, even if her ministers had been as energetic as they were generally the reverse, and there were no voluntary societies for home missions to supply the defects of the parochial machinery. . . . Beyond the personal influence which a clergyman might exercise over his friends and

¹ In the years preceding this Convocation had been doing much good work (see Abbey and Overton, "The English Church in the Eighteenth Century," pp. 283 *et seq.*). On the causes which led to the silencing of Convocation, see "A History of the English Church" (Macmillan's), vol. vii., pp. 16 *et seq.*

dependants in his parish . . . his clerical work consisted solely in reading the services and preaching on Sundays."¹

The political organization of the time, so far as this was available for translating any ideas into practical measures for the welfare of the people, was, compared with what we possess to-day, extremely inefficient. Parliament did not in any sense represent the people. Even such changes towards this as were affected by the First Reform Act² were as yet three-quarters of a century in the future. Large and growing centres of trade and population, as Manchester and Birmingham, were, as we have seen, without a single representative. Then we must remember that it was illegal for workpeople to combine with a view to improving their financial condition.³

Thus, in the middle of the eighteenth century—that is, when the Industrial Revolution began—there was, both in Church and State, at once a singular absence of lofty ideas for the betterment of the people, whether spiritually or materially, and also of any organization for propagating these.

This was specially unfortunate, because at that time the material condition of the poorer classes, if far from satisfactory, was actually better than it had been previously. This is proved by the fact that a larger amount of the necessaries of life were obtainable for the same amount of labour.⁴ "It was during the rule of Walpole that the seeds of our commercial greatness were gradually ripened. It was evidently the most prosperous season that England had ever experienced."⁵ How very different the condition of great masses of the poorest people became as the Industrial Revolution proceeded will be seen only too clearly. The terrible thought to us must be that the frightful social and also moral evils which accumulated towards the end of the eighteenth century, and grew greater and greater

¹ Abbey and Overton, "The English Church in the Eighteenth Century,"

p. 299.

² That of 1832.

³ This had been prohibited so long ago as 1548 by 2 and 3 Edward VI., cap. 15; also in 1720 by 7 George I., cap. 13; in 1725 by 13 George I., cap. 34; and in 1749 by 22 George II., cap. 27. On the "Combination Act" of 1800, see Dicey, "Law and Opinion," pp. 95 *et seq.*

⁴ Nicholls, "History of the Poor Law," vol. ii., pp. 55 *et seq.*

⁵ Hallam, "Constitutional History of England," vol. iii., pp. 301, 302.

until far into the nineteenth, ought never to have been allowed to do so.¹ The causes of these evils should have been checked nearly a century before they actually were so. As Dr. Arnold once wrote of the period of which we are speaking: "All the evils of society were yet manageable; while complete political freedom and a vigorous state of mental activity seemed to promise that the growth of good would more than keep pace with them, and that thus they might be kept down for ever. But tranquillity, as usual, bred carelessness; events were left to take their own way uncontrolled; the weeds grew fast, while none thought of saving the good seed."²

The chief thing to remember—indeed, the real key to the situation which arose at the end of the eighteenth century—is that the policy of non-intervention, *i.e.* the belief in this as a working principle, became more and more firmly fixed.³ During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the opposite policy had prevailed. The State had interfered everywhere. It had attempted to regulate conduct in almost every department of life. For instance, it had fixed both the amount of wages and the prices at which goods were to be bought and sold; it had imposed duties on imports and bounties on exports. But with the new conditions, that is with the new power which invention had put into the hands of capable and energetic men, with the great increase of capital, with the opening up of new markets for goods which could be rapidly produced and sold at a large profit—with the coming of all these, all kinds of restrictions and regulations were felt to be unbearable. Men demanded freedom for each man to develop his own business in the way most profitable to himself, to make the utmost of his resources,⁴ and

¹ "The more we examine the actual course of affairs, the more we are amazed at the unnecessary suffering which has been inflicted upon the people" (Toynbee, "The Industrial Revolution," p. 35).

² Quoted by Dicey, "Law and Opinion in England," pp. 76, 77.

³ The gradual acceptance of the doctrine of *laissez faire*, until for a time it became almost unchallenged, is the chief of all the keys to the economic history and to the social evils of the period which stretches from about 1790 until almost 1870. On the doctrine of *laissez faire* and its results, see Toynbee, "Industrial Revolution," pp. 158 *et seq.*

⁴ Upon how political theory in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was governed by considerations of trade, see Hertz, "The Manchester Politician," chaps. i-iv.

also to use to the full the new opportunities which were constantly opening out.

Adam Smith, in his celebrated book, "The Wealth of Nations," which first appeared in 1776, gathered up and expressed with considerable clearness the thoughts and convictions of the time. Largely because he wrote, not for the philosopher, but for the practical statesman and the man of affairs, and just because his teaching so exactly agreed with what these latter saw would be to their advantage, his book from the first attained very considerable authority, and for certainly not less than three-quarters of a century its principles were generally accepted. The two fundamental ideas of "The Wealth of Nations" are "the belief in the supreme value of individual liberty, and the conviction that Man's self-love is God's providence, that the individual in pursuing his own interest is promoting the welfare of all."¹ Put together, these principles imply that all that is needed for prosperity is to give scope to every man to work out his own welfare, according to the dictates of self-interest. The almost universal acceptance of the truth of this thesis is the essential key to understanding the economic conditions and the social evils which rapidly developed, and which persisted for at least three-quarters of a century. How very untrue the thesis actually is, the appalling misery suffered by multitudes of the poorer and weaker members of the community during the first half of the nineteenth century, and the harvest of social evils (largely arising from this misery) from which we are still suffering to-day, are more than sufficient proof. Conduct is ultimately governed by ideas, and if we want a striking instance of the necessity of right thinking, and also of the dangers of accepting a false doctrine of man, and a false doctrine of society, we certainly have it in the results of accepting the teaching of Adam Smith and David Ricardo.²

¹ Toynbee, "Industrial Revolution," p. 148. With Adam Smith's influence must, of course, be associated that of David Ricardo, who was born four years before "The Wealth of Nations" was published, and whose influence was at its height from about 1817 onwards.

² "Ricardo's economic assumptions were of his own making . . . his philosophical assumptions were derived from Adam Smith, whose intellectual

One factor which most injuriously affected the poor during the first seventy-five years of the Industrial Revolution was due to the nation being throughout this period almost continuously at war. Then, as always, war meant three things: First, it meant that thought, energy, and money, which might have been devoted to the improvement of the social condition of the people, were expended upon the war; secondly, it meant an enormous increase in taxation, the heaviest burden of which then, as is usually the case, fell upon the poorer classes; thirdly, it meant an immense rise in price of all the necessaries of life. From 1755 to 1764 the average price of corn was 37s. 6d.; from 1765 to 1774 it was 51s.—a rise of 35 per cent.;¹ in 1782 it was 53s. 9½d.; in 1795 it was 81s. 6d.² There was also a very considerable rise in other classes of provisions and also in rent.³

The first hundred years of the Industrial Revolution was a period during which there seems to have been an unusual amount of oppression of the poor and the weak by the rich and the strong. There were at least two reasons for this: First, the opportunities for amassing wealth were unusually great, and consequently the temptation to use these to the full, even at the cost of a practically unlimited exploitation of the workers, was proportionately great;⁴ secondly, owing to the prevalence of inadequate and un-Christian views of both man and society—though their un-Christianity was not clearly recognized—men who had no actual wish to do wrong were prevented from seeing the real iniquity of their conduct.⁵ Among the most fertile of all the causes of the ineffectiveness of religion and of the failure of Christianity to make the progress which it should, has always been a contradiction between the opinions professed and the

position he accepted in the main without question" (Toynbee, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 148).

¹ These figures are from Nicholls, *op. cit.*, vol. ii., p. 74.

² Toynbee, *op. cit.*, p. 82. For the further great rise during the war with France see the next chapter.

³ Toynbee, *op. cit.*, pp. 72 and 108.

⁴ This was especially the case in regard to pauper child-labour.

⁵ See quotations from Lord Shaftesbury's private diary on the conduct of such men as Gladstone and John Bright (over the "Ten Hours" Bill), quoted by Dicey, "Law and Opinion," pp. 231 *et seq.* See Professor Bennett's

conduct pursued by men calling themselves Christians. This contradiction was then more glaring than usual ; but at the same time we must remember that this was at least partly due to a very imperfect conception of what Christianity involved. This defective conception not only prevented the ordinary layman from acting as a Christian ; it prevented even otherwise earnest clergymen from speaking, as the old Hebrew Prophets would have spoken, of the iniquity of oppressing the poor.

The moral standard at the close of the reign of George II. was, among all classes of society, but especially among the richest and poorest, extremely low. I need not stay to prove this statement, for the evidence is only too abundant. Among the richest class there was great extravagance, especially in the way of gambling ; drunkenness pervaded all classes ; and where any form of industry called together large numbers of ignorant, unskilled workmen, the restraints of orderly society were almost entirely removed.¹ With the accession of George III. the moral tone of the Court certainly improved, and to some slight extent this affected the tone of society generally ; but the improvement was far from what it should have been, and for nearly a century after this time the moral standard, especially among the poor, was deplorably low. It has been asserted that during this time the clergy set a distinctly bad example ; the charge has even been made that there was widespread immorality among them. For this charge there appears to be very little justification. Their greatest failing seems to have been a really culpable inactivity in discharging the responsibilities of their office. Their faults were chiefly those of omission. They failed to do their duty, and

essay on Social Ideals in the Old Testament in "Christ and Civilization," pp. 49 *et seq.*

¹ "The mania for gambling in all forms pervaded society ; ladies did their shopping where with every purchase they were given a ticket for a raffle. . . . The picture of the under-side of life in England during the second quarter of the eighteenth century is appalling. . . . In 1750 London physicians reported 14,000 cases of illness, most of them hopeless, due to the use of gin. . . . Every sixth house in London was a gin-shop. . . . Throughout the country things were little better. . . . Wherever any form of industry called together large numbers of ignorant, unskilled workmen, the restraints of orderly society were almost entirely removed. . . . Philanthropy was hopeless of them. The Church seemed powerless to take religion to them" (Winchester, "Life of John Wesley" pp. 73 *et seq.*).

therefore to be an influence for good among their people, who in consequence sank lower and lower into moral deterioration, and not infrequently into profligacy and crime.

I have thought it well to describe at some length the actual conditions which existed at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, because, apart from a knowledge of these, it is impossible to understand either the actual course which the Revolution pursued or its many evil social results. The causes of the unhappy condition of the poorest classes of the population in our great towns to-day, and the reasons for the present attitude of these classes towards organized Christianity, can be clearly traced back to the evil course which the Industrial Revolution—so far as the poorest and most helpless part of the people was concerned—was allowed to take. And it was allowed to take this course very largely because there was in those who at that time should have done something to form public opinion a totally inadequate conception of Christian doctrine, and consequently an equally inadequate discharge of Christian duty.

There is one movement belonging to the eighteenth century which no one who wishes to describe the relations between the Church and the Poor during that period can possibly ignore. The "Evangelical Movement" was primarily neither social nor economic, yet indirectly it had certain undoubtedly important social and economic consequences. It profoundly affected the moral characters of those who were strongly influenced by it. Because it taught them to live as Christians, it taught them not only to do their duty to God, but also to themselves and to their neighbours.¹ Because it was a warfare against all forms of *sin*, it could not fail to be a warfare against vices which had a most deleterious influence upon the social and economic welfare of the people. In those days, as in these, a great proportion of the misery from which the poor suffered was self-inflicted.

¹ In this connection we must remember William Wilberforce's "Practical View," published in 1797, and which had an enormous circulation.

Then, as now, intemperance and other vices were among the chief causes of poverty and social misery. We who look back upon the Evangelical Movement, and to whom its results (or want of these) are known, can see where it failed to be the power which it might have been. We can see great gaps in its theology. We can see the narrowness of some of its conceptions of Christian truth, and consequently its failure to affect certain spheres of Christian life and duty. We can see its failure to grasp the idea of the Christian society, and therefore its failure to teach the individual Christian his social responsibilities. We can see its failure to understand and therefore to teach the "sacramental" character (in the true sense of the term) of both Christian life and Christian conduct. It did not understand that the physical or the "material" was at least one channel of the spiritual; it did not realize the effects of the physical—in the most comprehensive meaning of the word—upon the spiritual life; it did not realize the deleterious influence upon character of the want of sufficient food and a healthy dwelling, and of at least a "living wage";¹ in short, it did not teach clearly the need of the sanctification of the physical² to the highest ends and purposes. It did not put the doctrine of the Incarnation in its true relation to the doctrine of the Atonement. It failed to comprehend, and therefore to teach, the essential unity of all life. It did not insist with sufficient clearness upon the essential connection of the life of this world with that of the world to come. Some, but by no means all, of its leaders were open to the charge of teaching a conception of the Atonement and of the "Plan of Salvation" which at least savoured of the mechanical, and so were in danger of becoming *unmoral*. But when we have admitted all this, we cannot fail to see that the movement had far-reaching consequences for good. The effects of Wesley's preaching upon the moral lives of the people were

¹ When life is a perpetual struggle to maintain a bare physical existence, there is little or no energy left for thought upon higher things.

² In the light of present controversy I prefer to use the term "physical" rather than "material."

enormous, especially among the lower middle classes,¹ though probably not to the same degree among the poorest of the poor. It has been held—and not without a measure of truth—that it was largely owing to the influence of Wesley and his co-workers that there was no movement in England at the end of the eighteenth century corresponding to the Revolution in France.

I cannot here attempt to sketch the history of the Evangelical Movement even in barest outline,² but a few dates may help to put it into the right connection with other movements and events. John Wesley began his great preaching campaign in Bristol in 1739, and about the same time Whitfield and Charles Wesley began the work in London; in 1742 Grimshaw went to Haworth; in 1746 Samuel Walker became curate of Truro; in 1749 Romaine was preaching in London; in 1759 Henry Venn left Clapham for Huddersfield; in 1760 Fletcher went to Madeley; and in 1764 John Newton was curate of Olney.

When we examine the records of the work which these men accomplished, we find abundant evidence of a generally philanthropic spirit at work, side by side with their passion for saving souls.³ In their several parishes they attacked drunkenness and immorality, and they did all they could to assuage suffering due to poverty and sickness. Grimshaw would personally clear the public-houses of tipplers on a Sunday morning;⁴ Venn was even greater in his dealing with individuals—in the strong sanctified common sense which he brought to bear upon the difficulties of “weavers and shepherds”—than he was in his pulpit ministrations;⁵ the effect upon the moral life of the seaport of Hull from

¹ At times Wesley was intensely practical. He refused to preach at St. Ives so long as his hearers took part in smuggling; he absolutely forbade bribery at the Bristol election, and this at a time when “everybody” smuggled and “everybody” bribed. See Winchester’s “Life of Wesley,” pp. 213, 214.

² The histories of the movement are numerous—*e.g.*, Balleine’s “History of the Evangelical Party,” and Canon Overton’s “The Evangelical Revival in the Eighteenth Century.”

³ Reliance upon works was indeed one of the errors against which they chiefly preached; the doctrine of the hymn “Rock of Ages” was their doctrine, and the variety of secular learning and charitable works their theme . . . yet they owed their prominence “[at any rate, in the early years of the nineteenth century] to their activity in philanthropic movements” (“The English Church in the Nineteenth Century,” F. W. Cornish, p. 9).

⁴ Balleine, p. 48.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

the preaching of Joseph Milner was enormous ;¹ at Truro, owing to the influence of Walker, the cockpit and the theatre had to close their doors ;² Fletcher had six Sunday-schools in different parts of his great parish,³ while at Creaton Thomas Jones commenced both a sick club and a clothing club.⁴ Then the philanthropy of the so-called Clapham sect—that is, of John Thornton, Henry Thornton,⁵ William Wilberforce, and others—must not be forgotten. It was William Wilberforce and Henry Thornton who found the means for the wonderful work which Hannah More did among the children in the villages of the Mendips.⁶

All this being so, the question may naturally be asked, Why was not the philanthropic work of these men more effective? Why had it not a wider and more lasting influence?⁷ Why did it apparently so little to stem the flood of misery—and not only of misery, but of vice and degradation—which poured over England, and especially over the large towns and manufacturing districts in the last years of the eighteenth century and far into the nineteenth? The chief reason was that their philanthropy, like their theology and their religion, was largely individualistic. They were most assiduous in trying to relieve the individual cases of poverty which came to their notice. But except in what they did for education (in their purely spiritual capacity), the leaders of the Evangelical School do not seem to have grasped the necessity for attacking *causes*. They do not appear to have realized that the relationships of society—those between rich and poor—were then fundamentally wrong. Doubtless their political economy was that of their age, and apparently they did not see that, as this was utterly un-Christian in theory, consequently it must be so in practice.⁸ They cannot have realized that charity, however

¹ Balleine, pp. 53, 54.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 65, 66.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 58-62.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 83.

⁵ In four years, 1790-1793, Henry Thornton gave in charity £20,408, while in the same years all his other expenses were less than £7,000.

⁶ Upon this work see Balleine, *op. cit.*, pp. 103, 104.

⁷ I except, of course, the fight against the Slave Trade, and the (much later) work of Lord Shaftesbury, *vide* the following paragraph.

⁸ The way in which Christian leaders—*e.g.*, Whitfield and Newton—took part in the Slave Trade is a striking example. See Balleine, *op. cit.*, pp. 100, 101.

lavishly bestowed upon individuals, was no substitute for the oppression of one class by another. They did not see the futility of palliating the sufferings of individuals while, by an iniquitous social and economic system, poverty and every kind of attendant degradation were being multiplied.¹ Historical parallels are proverbially dangerous. But the methods of philanthropy pursued by the Evangelicals towards the end of the eighteenth century were far nearer to the methods pursued in the Middle Ages than they were to those of either Calvin or of the men who did so much to make the Poor Law effective in the reign of Charles I. But both Calvin (though not in the ordinary acceptation of the term) and the advisers of Charles I. were "High" Churchmen—that is, they had a lofty sense of the reality of the Christian community, and therefore of the necessity of bringing statesmanship to bear upon the welfare of the community as a whole.

I am here, of course, speaking of the earlier Evangelicals. I am not referring to the men who were instrumental in the abolition of the Slave Trade, nor to those who, like T. F. Buxton and Lord Ashley (afterwards Earl of Shaftesbury), belonged to what has been termed the "third generation." These men had a far wider conception of philanthropy; they saw that oppression and poverty could not be attacked satisfactorily by individuals as individuals seeking to deal with individual cases. They saw that the conscience of the nation must be roused, and that the nation's rulers must be compelled to corporate action on behalf of the national welfare. But the work of these men does not belong to the period with which I have dealt in this chapter—the first five-and-twenty years of the reign of George III.; it belongs rather to the early years of the nineteenth century.

In the next chapter I hope to deal more particularly with the period which stretches from the close of the American War to the years immediately following the Battle of Waterloo.

¹ Many of the Evangelical laymen were keen business men. The connection between keen competition in business and individualism in religion is worthy of study.

The Era of Persecution: A.D. 64-313.

BY THE REV. T. HERBERT BINDLEY, D.D.

THE pious fancy of the fourth century which counted ten persecutions, corresponding in number to the Ten Plagues of Egypt, was sufficiently exploded by St. Augustine in the eighteenth book of his "De Civitate Dei" (cap. 52). Yet the idea has constantly persisted, though the names of the persecutors have varied a little sometimes from the list which he enumerated as current in his own day. These were Nero, Domitian, Trajan, Antonianus, Severus, Maximin, Decius, Valerian, Aurelian, Diocletian. It will be the aim of this paper to shew that only five Emperors were personally responsible for persecutions of the Christians—namely, Nero, Domitian, Decius, Valerian, and Diocletian; and to inquire into the causes which led the Roman Government to proscribe a religion which it had at first ignored or despised as being a mere sect of Judaism. For there was a time when St. Paul could, as a Roman citizen, appeal with confidence from the turbulent injustice of both Jew and pagan to the well-known equity of the Roman law to defend him. The starting-point is the acquittal of St. Paul in A.D. 60-63, and the proscription of Christianity as a criminal offence in July, 64.

It is well to point out at once that, as Mommsen reminded us, the attitude of the Roman Government towards Christianity was determined by its attitude towards all other foreign religions. It was only part of the general Roman policy towards questions where religious, social, moral, and political interests were inter-involved. The early Roman religion was essentially national, and this character was only modified by polytheism in process of conquest and annexation and consequent enlargement of popular sway. *Dii novensiles* existed alongside *dii indigetes*, but were not allowed within the *pomerium*. The general policy

has been well described as one of watchful toleration. The magistrates held a powerful weapon in their hands in their *coercitio* (summary jurisdiction), under ordinary police regulations, which could be put into force without any specific legislation ; and this was not infrequently exercised to exclude foreign cults which endangered public safety or morality.

Judaism was to a certain extent an exception to this general policy. Though their religion was regarded by men like Cicero as a "barbarous superstition," it had to be reckoned with ; and accordingly the Jews were granted by Julius Cæsar a number of privileges, under which they could worship freely, and claim exemption from various harassing services. They were always, however, aggressive and proselytizing, and consequently objects of dislike, contempt, and hatred.

Rightly to appreciate the development of the causes of persecution, it is necessary to review the first instances of the attack upon Christianity as they are presented in the Acts of the Apostles. For although the cases there recorded are, with two exceptions, Jewish charges, yet the treatment of these accusations by the Roman magistrates gives the key to the problem in its earliest stages, inasmuch as Christianity was regarded at first simply as a sect of Judaism ; and when the Christians were distinguished in the heathen mind from Jews, it was not with any discriminating knowledge of the unique, universal, and absolute claims of the new religion. Throughout St. Paul's career he claimed to be a Jew, and an exponent of the true consummation of Judaism ; and it was as a Jewish renegade that he was persecuted by his own kinsmen (Acts xxiv. 5). No doubt, as in Christ's case, disloyalty also formed part of the indictment before the Roman magistrates (Acts xvii. 7 ; xxv. 8), but the magistrates saw clearly enough that there was no real ground for such accusations. In fact, the chief cases of persecution, which came from the Jews, were dismissed by the Roman governors, partly because of the supreme contempt felt by all officials for the turbulent Jews and their religious disputes, and partly because any open, or even

indirect, denunciations of the Christians on the ground of disloyalty were too palpably fabricated to deserve serious notice. Thus it came about that, from the circumstances of the case, the action of the Roman Government tended to shield the Christians from Jewish malice. This, however, was a stage soon passed through, though it certainly lasted until after St. Paul's liberation in 60. This comes out very clearly in the Acts; and at the risk of being tedious, we must examine the narratives there given at some little length. There are six cases which throw light upon the subject:

1. The first is a pagan charge brought against St. Paul at Philippi (Acts xvi. 19 *et seq.*):

"These men, being out-and-out Jews, exceedingly harass our city, and lay down customs which it is not lawful for us to receive or do, inasmuch as we are Romans."

This charge arose out of the cure of the possessed damsel, which had resulted in a pecuniary loss to her owners. Popular and magisterial prejudice is appealed to on the ground that the Apostle and his companions were Jews; but the real charge preferred is that of an anti-Roman factiousness, dangerous to the peace of the city—a very safe charge on which to insure summary conviction, for Jewish unrest was proverbial and always promptly suppressed in Rome and the provinces.

2. The next case is a Jewish charge at Thessalonica, arising from jealousy at St. Paul's influence (Acts xvii. 5 *et seq.*):

"These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also . . . and these all contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, saying that there is another Emperor—Jesus."

Here is the same charge of sedition, which Jews and Greeks equally found an efficacious weapon to use against their enemy; but there is added in this case, as in our Lord's, an accusation of direct treason. The "decrees of Cæsar" probably would be those which involved some recognition of the worship of the emperor, for which Paul and Silas were alleged to have substituted that of Jesus. But the charges were evidently either not

substantiated or discredited by the magistrates, as the accused were admitted to bail and released.

3. The third case is another Jewish charge, at Corinth, before Gallio (Acts xviii. 13):

“This man persuadeth men to worship God contrary to the law.”

This was purely a Jewish question, as Gallio saw. The law was the Jewish law, not the Roman law, as in the two previous cases; consequently its alleged contravention came under the head of neither legal injustice nor moral delinquency, and the case was dismissed.

4. The fourth case arose at Ephesus. It is a pagan charge due, as at Philippi, to pecuniary loss, real or feared (Acts xix. 26 *et seq.*):

“This Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods which are made with hands; and not only is there danger that this our trade come into disrepute, but also that disrespect be shewn to the great Artemis.”

The opening and closing words of Demetrius' speech were merely rhetorical. The charge of “atheism,” or sacrilege, or blasphemy towards the goddess, was contradicted by the recorder, and the real *motif* underlying the accusation—that of injury to the silver shrine-makers' trade—was ignored. Nor was the Apostle taken before the magistrates; the Asiarchs befriended him, and he was not even apprehended.

5. The next case is of more importance than any of the preceding, as being the first instance of a formal trial of St. Paul before a Roman procurator with Jewish counsel against him (Acts xxiv. 5). Tertullus formulated three charges: St. Paul was (*a*) a pest, and a creator of seditions amongst the Jews throughout the empire; (*b*) a ringleader of the Nazarene sect; (*c*) a profaner of the sacred Temple.

St. Paul's defence followed the lines of his indictment. He defended himself as a Jew, not specifically as a Christian. He was a peaceful citizen, no creator of strife in any form or place, but a sincere Jew believing in the fulfilment of the Jewish Scriptures. He challenged his accusers to prove against him

any wrong-doing. The case was remanded until the arrival of the chiliarch Lysias, and St. Paul was treated as a prisoner in the first class. The venality of some Roman procurators, as exemplified in Felix' subsequent conduct (verse 26), is to be noted, for it was eventually the reason of St. Paul's appeal to Cæsar.

6. The sixth and last case is still more interesting, as being the final trial in Palestine on a number of Jewish charges before Festus (Acts xxv. 7 *et seq.*). The "many and grievous charges which his accusers could not prove" may be detected in the lines of St. Paul's defence: "Neither against the law of the Jews, nor against the Temple, nor against Cæsar have I committed any offence."

We notice that in the resuscitation of the case before a new governor the previous Jewish charges, which Tertullus had relied upon, are strengthened with an additional imputation of disloyalty to the emperor. In the result, the Jews objected to their enemy being released (Acts xxviii. 19), and St. Paul appealed to Cæsar. Confident in his innocence of political disaffection, he felt obliged to appeal from the possible partiality and cupidity of the procurator to the emperor himself, despairing of justice from any other tribunal. From a subsequent conversation between Festus and Agrippa, it appears that Festus regarded the case as purely a question of Jewish "superstition," involving no criminal charge for investigation; certainly there was nothing to justify the Jews' demand for his death. But a further informal inquiry was held in the presence of Agrippa and Berenice as well as Festus, in order to find something to put upon the charge-sheet (Acts xxv. 25-27). The final decision arrived at was St. Paul's complete innocence of any breach of the law: "This man hath done nothing worthy of death or of bonds, and might have been released but for his appeal to Cæsar" (Acts xxvi. 31). This decision St. Paul himself correctly represented to the Jewish leaders in Rome on his arrival: "Although I did nothing against the people or the customs of our fathers, I was delivered as a prisoner from Jerusalem into

the hands of the Romans. And they, after examination, were desirous to release me, because there was no cause of death in me. But when the Jews spake against it, I was compelled to appeal to Cæsar" (Acts xxviii. 17-19). What caused the appellant's long detention at Rome—whether his case was ever heard, on what grounds he was released—we cannot say. But if his appeal did come before Nero, the verdict could only have repeated the decision of Festus and Agrippa, and his release would naturally follow.¹

The Jewish leaders at Rome pretended that all they knew of the Christian body was that it was held in universal disrepute (Acts xxviii. 22). It is therefore necessary for us to go back behind St. Paul's case in order to find reasons for the general odium in which the Christians were held, so that it was possible, and even easy, for Nero to divert the popular fury from himself to them, and to explain what grounds Tacitus could have had for his statement that the Christians were hated *per flagitia*, on account of their abominations ("Ann.," xv. 44). Such a character could not have been gained in a day.

The causes of its acquisition must doubtless be sought in the first instance in the unreasoning prejudices of the populace, and not in the reasonably formed judicial opinions of the magistrates or officials. The various grounds for this unpopularity may be summarized under five heads :

1. In so far as the Christians were looked upon as a religious body connected with or sprung out of Judaism, they inherited the general ridicule and dislike which pursued the Jews in every quarter of the world.

2. We have already seen that in the case of St. Paul himself, both at Philippi and at Ephesus, a second ground for odium was presented. Christianity interfered with the success of certain trades, and entailed pecuniary loss on certain tradesmen. That masters of divining girls and shrine-making silversmiths represented types of a number of other tradesmen who suffered, or

¹ On this point see the present writer's paper in the *Interpreter* for January, 1913, on "The Pastoral Epistles."

claimed to suffer, from the progress of Christianity, is clear from the defence, at a later period, of the Christians made by Minucius Felix and by Tertullian against the charge of their being commercially profitless, *infructuosi in negotiis*. They took no part, for instance, in pagan religious festivals and gifts to the gods, nor did they countenance by their presence the popular amusements of the theatre, the arena, or the circus. Still less could they patronize those trades which pandered to the lax morality and superstitions of the age—"lenones, perductores, aquarioli, sicarii, venenarii, magi, harioli, haruspices, mathematici" (Tert., "Apol.," 43). Thus the pockets of a number of the lower class of citizens would be affected, and their resentment incurred.

3. The general behaviour of the Christians in the world would also have no small share in their unpopularity. Their aversion from participating in the usually frivolous mode of passing time would brand them as unsociable and misanthropical; and when their reasons for their preternatural seriousness were investigated and known, it would be found that many of their tenets and beliefs were apparently dangerous and revolutionary. Their social theories would be alarming. Their boundless charity and hospitality towards one another was only exercised in default of a desiderated communism. Slaves were treated as equals in the sight of God, and admitted to the same privileges as the free-born in this new and secret brotherhood. Their fanatical expectation of a speedy dissolution of the universe by fire led them to neglect the affairs or ignore the claims of family life, and even imparted a distaste for entering upon its duties at all. A fierce preference for virginity as the most fitting state of readiness in which to meet the Lord, and a disembarrassment from all secular matters, coupled with mysterious theories of another citizenship *in cælis*, would all combine to justify Tacitus' view that they followed a "detestable superstition," and were possessed with an intense dislike for the claims of civilization (*odium generis humani*). The terms in which Pomponia Græcina is described, so early as A.D. 57, added to the fact of

her arraignment before a domestic tribunal, can leave but little doubt that the "foreign superstition," which was held to have created in her a misanthropic and dangerous gloom, and which was also suspected of encouraging impurity and abominable crime, was in reality Christianity. And her case, again, may be taken as typical of the general impression which Christianity would make upon the popular mind.¹

4. By their neglect of the prescribed worship of the State gods the Christians, as distinguished from the Jews, incurred the charge of "sacrilege." The word is not used technically, but in the general sense of impiety; and so it appears at a later time in the phrasing of Cyprian's sentence: "Diu sacrilege mente vixisti . . . et inimicum to diis Romanis et sacris legibus constituisti." The refusal to sacrifice was evidence to the magisterial mind of an *obstinatio dementia*, or stubborn resistance to the requirements of the laws in religious matters; while the possession of no temples or altars (in the pagan sense of these words) prove conclusively to the popular mind the "atheism" of the Christians. This was, indeed, the specific indictment brought against Flavius Clemens and his wife in A.D. 95, and it had to be met by all the Apologists from Justin Martyr to Lactantius. It was the favourite weapon snatched up by the populace in times of unreasoning panic and superstition, when public disasters and calamities woke up the slumbering paganism of the Empire and frightened its professed devotees into a retaliation on those whom they regarded as the godless insulters of the ancient deities. Hence the popular outcry: "Away with the atheists. *Tolle sacrilegos.*"

5. It was not an unnatural conclusion for the pagan mind to draw from the absence of any visible objects of worship amongst the Christians, that they met in secret to indulge in religious rites of an abominable kind which would not bear the light of day. Consequently they were generally credited with magical practices and impure orgies which involved infanticide, cannibalism, and incest. The charges were based, no doubt, in great

¹ See Lightfoot, "Clement of Rome," i. 30.

measure upon ignorant and distorted rumours of the Christian Love-feast and Eucharist, which were circulated probably by the Jews in the first instance, and which easily won credence amongst a people not themselves distinguished for purity of life and conduct. We can thus explain Tacitus' classification of Christianity amongst *cuncta atrocita et pudenda* which skulked to Rome for concealment. Once convinced of the Christians' practice of these enormities, it would be easy to extort evidence under the rack from domestic slaves, as was done in the trials of the Gallican Christians in A.D. 155 or 177, whose heathen slaves, out of mere fear of torture, made false statements of this nature at the instigation of the soldiers. Christians thus came under the ban of unlawful associations (*collegia illicita*), all clubs and societies unrecognized by the law being viewed with the gravest suspicion and forbidden by severe legislation. Under this same head of secret meetings we may group the charges of magic and sorcery which found place in connexion with the Neronian persecution ; for the term " malefica " used by Suetonius of the new religion implies this ; and the methods of execution described by Tacitus—burning, crucifixion, and exposure to wild beasts—were the proper punishments for witchcraft. It is worthy of notice that the Justinian Code speaks of magians as *humani generis inimici*—a phrase almost identical with Tacitus' description of the Christians cited above.

There is sufficient body of evidence in the five grounds of unpopularity just considered to assure us that Nero would have no difficulty in stirring up an attack upon the Christians in the manner which Tacitus ascribes to him.

The order of the Neronian trials seems to have been somewhat as follows : Some well-known Christians were arrested as authors of the conflagration. These confessed their Christianity, and were compelled to indicate other of their co-religionists. Tried for incendiarism before the *Præfectus urbi*, they were found to hold views which seemed to be not incompatible with the wilful destruction of the city by fire ; but, although the evidence broke down which was required to connect them

directly with it, sufficient was gathered to brand Christianity as a capital offence, since it was hostile to the ordinary good discipline and law of the Empire. The mere profession of it, *nomen ipsum*, became punishable with death. Henceforward, Christianity was a standing offence, not because it was a *religio nova*, or *illicita*, but because it was inherently dangerous to the social stability of the State. But the exact method of procedure in any given case was still in the discretion of the magistrate. He might condemn on the simple ground of "Christianity," or on a charge of "atheism," or "sacrilege," or on account of the *flagitia* connected with Christianity. To the pagan mind Christianity and crime were synonymous. Thus, in the First Epistle of St. Peter (iv. 15) and in the Second Epistle to Timothy (i. 11 *et. seq.*, ii. 9)—both documents of this Neronian period—we find reference made to condemnation for the "Name," while St. Paul says he was suffering for the "Gospel" and as "a malefactor." Even in Tertullian's time specific charges continued to be brought against the Christians, although the *confessio nominis* was quite sufficient for conviction.

It is no doubt true that when once Christian tenets and practices were believed to be inimical to the existing order and peace of the State, no special law or enactment would be necessary for their repression, and Suetonius ("Nero," 16) mentions Nero's regulations for the punishment of the Christians side by side with other police measures of a permanent nature; but the question has by no means been settled whether Nero did or did not promulgate a law explicitly proscribing Christianity. Mommson and others believe that no direct legislation against the Christians existed until the edict of Decius. Ramsay would place it in the Flavian period, while Duchesne, Batiffol, Callewært, with a goodly following, maintain that Nero did specifically decree the outlawry and extermination of the Christians. Sulpicius Severus ("Chron.," ii. 11, 29), probably relying on Tacitus, mentions edicts and laws forbidding Christianity, and uses a phrase which recurs verbatim in later writers so conspicuously as to lead to the belief that he is quoting the exact words of a

terse law — “Non licet esse Christianos” (cp. Tertullian, “Apol.,” 4, “Non licet esse vos”; the Acta Apollonii, as translated from the Armenian by Conybeare, § 23, “No one shall be named a Christian anywhere at all”; Origen, “Hom. in Jos.,” 9, “Decreverunt legibus suis ut non sint Christiani”). It is consonant with this view that Lampridius, writing of the toleration shewn to the Christians by Alexander Severus, says, “Christianos esse passus est” (Sev., 22); and that the decree of toleration issued by Galerius begins, “*Denuo sint Christiani*” (Lactantius, “De Mort. Pers.,” 34). This use of precise terms can scarcely be a coincidence; it rather shews that all these writers were acquainted with an original law which was expressed as above. Tertullian distinctly charges Nero with being the first to attack the Christians savagely with the imperial sword, and complains that the Neronian policy in regard to the Christians was the only relic of his policy which remained unaltered at the time he was writing (“Apol.,” 5; “Ad Nat.,” i. 7).

We may now pass on from the general position laid down in Nero’s reign to a review of the evidence of persecutions in the succeeding years.

The Emperors Vespasian and Titus (A.D. 69-81) took no fresh steps in connexion with the Christians. Domitian (A.D. 81-96) probably brought about their more frequent identification by his rigorous insistence on the worship of the Emperor. Some such test as sacrificing to the image of Cæsar seems to be clearly alluded to in the Apocalypse (see xiii. 8, 15; xx. 4; cp. xiv. 9, xvi. 2, xix. 20). The refusal to conform to this requirement would be an overt offence under the law of *majestas*; and from this time onwards “disloyalty” became a further charge, in addition to that of gross criminalities, to which the Christians were liable. But Domitian was further responsible for a direct attack upon a class of persons in Rome who are described as drifting into Jewish customs; and amongst these were Flavius Clemens and his wife (whose Christianity has been sufficiently established), who were accused of “atheism.” The sufferers were numerous, some being executed and some

banished (Dion Cass., lxxvii. 14; Sueton., "Dom.," 15; Melito *apud* Euseb., "H. E.," iv. 26-29; Euseb., iii. 17 *et seq.*; Lightfoot, "Clem. of Rome," i. 34). Hegesippus connected this persecution in A.D. 95 with Domitian's jealous examination of the survivors of the Davidic royal line, and its cessation with their dismissal. Tertullian probably followed the same authority as Hegesippus (Euseb., iii. 20; Tert., "Apol.," 4).

Our next evidence is found in the correspondence of Pliny and Trajan in the year A.D. 112. It discloses the fact that, as under Nero, Christianity was a capital offence. The accused who denied or recanted were subjected to test—would they invoke the gods, sacrifice to the Emperor's statue, and revile Christ? If so, they were released. Evidently Pliny was here following the ordinary procedure. But there were certain special features attaching to the problem in his province of Bithynia which caused him to feel some hesitancy. The number of the Christians was very large. Crimes were in the universal belief connected with the Christian "name." Should this point be investigated? Did age or youth make any difference in the severity of the punishment to be inflicted? Trajan ruled that Pliny's action had been correct. Christianity was a capital offence; but its professors need not be hunted out, and sincere recanters might be pardoned, the alleged *flagitia* not being deemed proven. On the other points common sense, and no hard and fast rule of universal application, must guide him. This decision was not a logical one, as Tertullian derisively pointed out, but it was eminently politic. Christianity was not yet recognized as a dangerous organization, and yet its individual members merited punishment by way of example for their disobedience to the imperial cult and laws.

Our next document is the rescript of Hadrian to Fundanus, proconsul of Asia, A.D. 124. The Emperor had been consulted by Fundanus' predecessor, Granianus, much as Trajan had been consulted by Pliny; and Hadrian's reply was intended to prevent mob-violence, vexatious indictments, and false accusations for purposes of extortion. He forbids the Christians to be con-

demned by mere popular clamour; they must be proved to have acted contrary to the law; and their false accusers are to be punished (Euseb., iv. 9; Just. Mart., "Apol.," i. 9). The effect of this rescript, which, of course, only applied to Asia—where the Christians were especially numerous and the problem acute—while leaving undisturbed the existing status of Christianity as a capital offence, would be to insure a formal trial of the accused. According to Melito, similar instructions were sent to other provincial governors. A similar policy was pursued by Antoninus Pius (A.D. 138-161). Persecutions naturally followed their usual spasmodic course, as the martyrdoms of Polycarp, Ptolemæus, Lucius, and Publius in different parts of the Empire shew; but no fresh impetus was given to them by the Emperor. Hence Tertullian, Sulpicius, and Melito quite correctly disclaim him as a personal persecutor.

Marcus Aurelius followed in the same course, though the persecutions in his reign were severe and intense. In Asia, Melito complained of new ordinances issued by the proconsul under which the Christians were sought out, and informers were rewarded with the property of the accused. In Rome, Justin was put to death, and many Italian Christians condemned to the mines. In Gaul a number of Christians fell victims to the popular fury which was abetted by the cruel governor. This remarkable increase in persecutions is adequately accounted for by the general panic of the populace in the face of the fearful ravages of the pestilence and unprecedented calamities in the form of earthquakes, famine, inundations, and foreign and civil wars. There is no evidence to connect the persecutions in this reign with any fresh legislation on the part of Aurelius, though no doubt the Emperor's well-known contempt for the Christians would instigate provincial officials to put the existing law in force more rigorously. This comes out clearly from the Epistle of the Gallican Churches. The persecution arose in the first instance from the mob. Those who confessed their Christianity were imprisoned by the chiliarch to await the arrival of the governor. When he came they were treated with great harsh-

ness, although they protested their innocence of either "atheism" or "impiety." Their slaves, under torture, accused them of cannibalism and incest, which increased the popular rage against them, and all kinds of torture were resorted to in order to expiate the supposed insults to the pagan deities. Those who denied their faith were imprisoned along with the rest, but were branded now, not as Christians, but as guilty of murder and abominable impurity. The Emperor was consulted only with respect to the case of Roman citizens, and he replied that the usual penalty of death must be paid, but he reaffirmed Trajan's ruling that recantation purchased pardon. It is obvious that Aurelius was not personally responsible for the Gallican persecution, and that his ruling was in mitigation of the extreme cruelty of the governor.

Aurelius died March 17, 180. At the commencement of Commodus' reign the Madaurian and Scillitan martyrs suffered in Africa, and Apollonius was beheaded in Rome; but with neither case had the Emperor any personal connexion. Indeed, throughout this reign the Christians, at any rate in Rome, were treated more favourably, probably through the influence of Marcia.

From Commodus we pass to Severus (A.D. 193-211), who protected the Christians from mob-law in Italy (Tertullian, "ad Scap.," 4), but by a local rescript, in Syria in 202, forbade fresh converts to be made. The martyrdoms of Perpetua and her companions at Karthage in the next year may possibly be connected with this or a similar rescript, but were more likely due to some popular outbreak, such as Tertullian describes and couples with the very vice-proconsul, Hilarian, who condemned them.

Passing over the reigns of Caracalla, Macrinus, and Elegabalus, we find that, under Alexander Severus (A.D. 222-235), Christianity was undoubtedly tolerated, though not formally recognized. This was due to his own eclectic opinions, and not least to the influence of his mother, Mammæa, who, during a visit to Antioch, had conversed with and been instructed by

Origen (Euseb., vi. 21). His successor Maximin (A.D. 235-238), out of rancorous spite towards the members of the late imperial household, which contained many Christians, rudely interrupted the peace which Alexander Severus had given to the Church, and, in order quickly to destroy its power, directed his attack against the rulers of the Church. A local persecution in Capadocia, which called forth Origen's "Exhortatio ad Martyrium," was due to popular clamour against the Christians, provoked by a panic at the occurrence of earthquakes and other disasters. This appears in a letter of Firmilian (*apud* Cyprian "Epp.," lxxv. 10), where the area of the persecution is limited to his own district, and while complaint is made of the cruelty of Serenianus the governor, nothing is said of the Emperor's hand in it. Maximin's policy was still unrealized at his death, and peace was again enjoyed by the Church during the following reigns of the Gordians and Philip the Arabian.

But with the accession of Decius (A.D. 249-251) the first really systematic method of persecution began, and by far the severest trial which the Christians had yet undergone befel the Church. In his zeal for the restoration of the old Roman virtue, discipline, and religion, Decius could not fail to collide with the Christian body, which had now long been fully and extensively organized. The edict of A.D. 250 ordered the magistrates throughout the Empire to bring back the Christians to the old religion, or, failing this, to inflict the usual punishment. Such, at least, we gather to have been its import, for its text has not been preserved. The course of the persecution may be traced in Eusebius, Dionysius, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyprian's letters and his treatise "De Lapsis," and in the Western Kalendar of Martyrs. Decius' object was undoubtedly to exterminate a body which obstinately refused to fall in with his desire to maintain in renewed integrity the worship of the ancient deities. The same attitude was taken up by Valerian (A.D. 254-260), who, although at first favourably disposed towards the Christians, was driven, under the influence of his Chancellor of the Exchequer, Macrianus, to become their perse-

cutor. The immediate occasion was an outbreak of fanatical superstition induced by the stress of the times—pestilence, fresh inroads of the barbarians, and Persian invasion on the eastern frontier. In June, 257, when in the East, he placed in the hands of his minister an edict which bade all who were not worshippers of the Roman gods to conform outwardly, under pain of exile; while in Egypt, under Æmilianus the prefect, Christians were forbidden to assemble for worship or enter their cemeteries under pain of death. In the following year a much severer edict was published, since the former one had failed in its purpose. This second edict condemned all clerics to death; laics of high rank to degradation and loss of their property, or death if obstinacy were shown; “matronæ” (*i.e.*, wives not in the power of their husbands) to confiscation of goods, and exile; and “Cæsariani” (*i.e.*, not “members of the imperial household,” *but* revenue officers employed under the Chancellor of the Exchequer in matters of distraint and escheat) to confiscation of goods and labour as chained conscripts on the imperial farms. These orders were made known by letters to the provincial governors. The object of Valerian was evidently to remove the officials and leading members of the Church in the hope that the rest would be thereby terrified into submission. The persecution raged in all parts of the Empire—Spain, Italy, Palestine, Africa, and Egypt.

Valerian’s son and successor, Gallienus (A.D. 260-268), put a stop to the persecution by public proclamations in 261, and by rescripts to the Bishops restored to the Christians their cemeteries and freedom of worship. This edict for the first time granted to the Christians the full and free exercise of their religion. But it did more. It restored to them their cemeteries and property which had been confiscated under Valerian’s laws; it recognized the Bishops officially as heads of the Church organization, and it empowered them to use the secular arm to uphold them in their newly granted rights. No apologist had ever asked for more, not did the edict of Milan in 313 go further than this.

The same toleration continued through the reigns of Claudius and Aurelian, though the latter Emperor made elaborate preparations for repressing Christianity, which were only prevented from being put into execution by his sudden assassination. The Church rejoiced in this rest and tranquillity until the nineteenth year of Diocletian, A.D. 303. The causes of this last and severest persecution are involved in some obscurity, but it seems that the prime mover and instigator was not Diocletian himself, but his Cæsar Galerius, whose hatred of the Christians was well known and fully reciprocated by them. Diocletian, by Galerius' machinations, was somehow tricked into believing that political danger was to be apprehended from the Christians, and it was against those of them who held official positions that the attack was chiefly directed. The first edict, issued on February 24, 303, was based on Valerian's edict of 258, but it differed from it in some important particulars. It ordered no bloodshed, but contented itself with degradation from civil status; in fact, it put Christianity back into the position of a *religio illicita* which it had occupied before the edict of Valerian. It bade the churches to be demolished, the sacred books to be burnt (this was an entirely novel provision as a measure of repression), persons of rank to be degraded, and minor officials¹ to be deprived of liberty.

It is important to note that in this first edict there is no mention of the clergy, as in Valerian's edict, shewing that Diocletian was not as yet committed to a religious persecution pure and simple. He hoped to deter future converts by depriving existing Christians of all their civil honours, rights, and privileges. This, however, was not sufficient to satisfy the hatred of Galerius. Fires in the palace, perhaps contrived by Galerius himself, treasonable rebellions in Cappadocia and Syria, were attributed to Christian discontent; and Diocletian

¹ Eusebius' phrase is obscure; but it so evidently corresponds to "Cæsariani" in Valerian's edict that I have not hesitated so to understand it. Eusebius might easily have mistaken the Latin word to denote "members of the imperial household," and in this mistake he has been followed by a multitude of modern writers.

was induced to issue a second edict, which attacked the clergy and ordered the immediate imprisonment of every one of them throughout the Empire. But even now Diocletian stopped short of inflicting the death penalty. A third edict, issued in December at Diocletian's *vicennalia*, permitted recanters to be released, and fearful methods of torture were employed to compel the prisoners to sacrifice. But it was not until the publication of the fourth edict that the general persecution of all Christians began. This was issued in April, 304, and was due to Maximian alone, Diocletian being too ill to take any part in the government until January, 305. This monstrous document ordered every Christian in the Empire, laic as well as cleric, to offer sacrifice and libations to the gods on pain of death.

Something of the awfulness of the sufferings and of their widespread area has been preserved in the pages of Eusebius. The persecution raged from Syria and Egypt to Britain; but after the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian in 305, Constantius Chlorus in Britain, and, after July, 306, his son Constantine in the Gauls, gradually put a stop to the persecution in their provinces. In the East it was kept up by Galerius until 311, and by Maximinus Daza still later. The Church was not, indeed, really free from anxiety until Constantine and Licinius issued the Great Edict of Milan late in 312 or early in 313, which placed all religions on an equal footing of toleration by the State.

With this date ends what is known as the Era of Persecutions. Other phases of persecution did, indeed, follow, such as befel the Homoousions from the Arians, and the Christians generally from the apostate Emperor Julian; but these do not fall within the scope of this paper.



The Presence to Believers.¹

BY THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF EDINBURGH.

WE have seen reasons why those who enjoy the Indwelling Presence of Christ by His Spirit should feel drawn to a fuller realization of this Presence by fellowship with the Church. But there is an additional reason which we are now to try and draw out. There is a Presence of Christ with His Church which makes this fellowship of infinite value. It is possible that some might reply, "With the Presence of Christ within me I need no external Presence. He gives me all I want." And yet, if it were known that Christ were actually in Palestine or in Russia or Italy, these would be amongst the first to seek Him out. The confirmation of His Indwelling Presence by an interview with Him would be of infinite value, just that which they hope to gain when they pass through the veil. But this they know to be denied. The Indwelling Presence of Christ by His Spirit was to be the substitute for the Objective Presence. Did He not say so? Did He not assert to His disciples who were grieving over His departure, that it was necessary that He should go away, and that if He went not away the Holy Ghost would not come to them? Was not the Holy Spirit to be His Substitute, to take His place? How unwise, then, to seek for that which God in His Providence has taken from us. We must rest, and rest of course with infinite satisfaction, on the truth of His Indwelling Presence.

There is no Objective Presence, that is gone. But may it not be said that when He said He would go away, that He was speaking of that particular kind of Presence with which they were familiar—namely, the Presence susceptible to sight and touch. That has gone—that passed with the Ascension. But is there no Presence but that which is revealed to hands and eyes? Ask the husband who has lost the wife who was

¹ From "The Shrine and the Presence," a New Work by Bishop Walpole. Ready November, 1913. 2s. 6d. net. London: Robert Scott.

partner of all his thoughts. He will tell you that at times she is more present even than when she was by his side, and that this is not due to imagination or memory, for at times he is taken unawares and convinced of her presence without any thought of her. Now and again that sense comes with irresistible force. He feels it at special times and in special places, and no one will convince him that it is unreal. But this is only one of many illustrations with which history and experience abounds.

I do not refer here simply to the many spiritual manifestations that have been made to the living during the passing of someone dear to them, of which there are too many examples to allow us to put them by as deceptions or impostures, but to the many acts of what we may call projected presence, when by a sustained effort of earnest thought someone has, as it were, forced himself upon our thinking. Such communications force us to feel that presence is not confined to sensible manifestations. And to this might be added the numberless examples of the revelation of God to His servants with which the Old Testament abounds. With the exception of the Incarnate Lord, the greatest and most striking examples of Personal Presence have been independent of a body.

Our Lord, then, when He said, "It is expedient for you that I go away," may have only meant that "I go away as far as the body is concerned." "For if I go not thus away the Spirit will not come unto you"—*i.e.*, "You will never gain a spiritual conception of Me, for the Flesh would be a hindrance, not only confining, or appearing to confine, My Presence to a particular place or spot, but so identifying it with expression, speech, or touch, that it would be difficult for you to realize a Presence unless shown in that way." For the recognition, a purely Spiritual presence, it was necessary that the limitations and hindrances of the body should be away.

Such an interpretation of the words is possible, and is made certain by other declarations.

Is it not true that again and again it is necessary for the proper appreciation of some friend who has been living with us

it is needful that he go away? When he is gone the Spirit within us at once interprets him in a larger way than before was possible. We see things we never saw before, hear meanings in his words that were never plain to us, discover points of character that were hidden from us. We feel ashamed at our want of discernment. Such is the effect of the disappearance of this outward form. That of itself is sufficient to enable the Spirit to give the interpretation. If our friend's spiritual presence could be preserved whilst his bodily presence was removed; if we could lose the outward and yet keep the inward, we should, while not having all we want, have a great gain. And there is no reason in itself why this should not be so with ourselves, but for it we have no proof. In the case of our Lord it is different. His own words and the experience of His disciples after the Resurrection make it almost certain.

The teaching He gave on the eve of His Passion is full of instruction in this particular matter. The disciples were in gloom and despair at the thought of His leaving them. They were in the position of the friends of Socrates, who gather about him as he prepares himself for the poison. Socrates, however, can give them no comfort. "Which is the better off, he who is going or those who remain behind?" He cannot say, but what is certain is, he will see them no more. Christ, on the other hand, speaks of returning. "I will not leave you comfortless," He says, "I will come to you—not in the old way (for the world will never see Me again)—but in some new, secret way, for you will behold Me." And then one of His disciples, puzzled over this new mode of Presence, which they could penetrate but which would veil Him from the world, asks: "How is it possible? How can you manifest yourself to us privately and yet not to the world?" And our Lord replies that the discovery of His Presence will be made to Love. Therefore, they were not to be troubled by the thought of His going away, for though it was true He would go away, it was also true that He would return. "I go away and I come unto you." From this it is clear that, though not with them again

after the old way, yet He would not leave them, but be with them in some new way.

It was impossible, of course, that His disciples should be able to understand how this would be till they were taught by the revelations of His Presence after His Resurrection. These gave a kind of knowledge, though it left more unexplained than clear. In the first place, they were unseen by the world. Neither Pilate, nor Herod, nor Caiaphas, nor the Pharisees ever saw Christ again. And, in the second place, they were revealed in answer to human need. One who was broken-hearted over His loss found Him present to comfort her. Two disciples who were in despair over the mystery of the Cross and the strange rumours they had heard, found Him at hand to explain these difficulties and give them peace. Five friends who had passed a night of fruitless labour discovered that He had not only turned their disappointment into joy, but prepared them a refreshing meal. The Apostles assembled in doubt and perplexity, not knowing what to make of all they had heard, were at once reassured by His Presence.

This gracious gift of Presence was not, then, given to satisfy curiosity or in self-justification, as though He would prove how wrong and foolish they had been in their gloomy expectations, but to remove difficulty or to comfort sadness. And at first it was given in outward form. So far as they could discover, this was in no way different from that which they had known when He was with them. "Handle Me and see. Behold, it is I Myself," He said unto them. It was not a phantom appearance, but the full Christ, body and soul. It was a human Presence, but only discernible, as we have already said, to Love. For there were remarkable and quite unaccountable phenomena which differentiated it from all previous appearances. He came as suddenly as He went. And where He came from none ever knew. In fact, the coming was a manifestation of One Who was previously present, though hidden, rather than any advance from a distance. At one time He was in the garden, at another in the cottage at Emmaus, at another in the Upper Room, and no one

supposed that He had walked from place to place in order to be present, but that at His will He showed Himself where He pleased. It was as though we, by thinking of someone whom we loved, could project our personality and show ourselves to him without going to him, and also in such dress as we chose. These outward manifestations were obviously necessary for a time. It is difficult to see in what other way He could convince doubting disciples of the reality of His Resurrection. He must be seen, heard, and touched, in order that they might realize that it was not simply a manifestation of the Spirit of Jesus. But such accommodation to human weakness was only transient. One of his first messages was : " Go, tell My brethren that I am ascending to My Father and your Father, to My God and your God"—*i.e.*, " that these outward manifestations which hide the full effulgence of My glory are passing and will cease." And so they did.

When all who loved had been convinced of the truth of His risen Body, then their object was attained. And so then came the last revelation, what we call the Ascension, when, by His going upward and His attitude of blessing, it was plain they had closed. Some have supposed that this last manifestation was an indication that He was now leaving the earth and going far, far away. Such words as—

" Lo, the heav'n its Lord receives,
 Yet He loves the earth He leaves ;
 Though returning to His throne,
 Still He calls mankind His own.
 Lord, though parted from our sight,
 Far above the starry height,
 Grant our hearts may thither rise,
 Seeking Thee above the skies "

—give an impression of a passing away from the earth, up and up, beyond the planets, beyond the stars, to some Throne infinitely far off, to some mysterious centre of the Universe where the Incarnate Son of God reigns. But that is not the impression the Bible desires to leave. It is not that Christ is infinitely far off, but really nearer ; not that He is removed from the world,

but that He still belongs to it and cares for it. As Dr. Maclaren writes: "The Ascension is not a leaving of the earth, but a passing into the heavens, that He might more fully and for ever dwell with us on earth. It does not mean Christ's withdrawal from us, but it means the possibility of Christ's remaining with us in higher and nobler fashion." Or, to quote Dr. Swete: "As the Incarnation was not a physical descent, so the return of the Incarnate Son to the Father was not a physical elevation. The momentary lifting up of the risen Christ in the sight of the Eleven can only be regarded as the symbol of the lifting up of our Humanity in Him to that spiritual order which is as far above our present life as the visible heaven is above the earth."¹ So, again, Bishop Westcott, in his "Historic Faith," writes: "We are not to think of this Ascension of Christ as of a change of position . . . it is rather a change of the mode of existence." So Dr. Milligan: "When, therefore, we speak of our Lord's Ascension into Heaven, we have to think less of a transition from one locality to another than of a transition from one condition to another." The Ascension, then, did not contradict the impression left by the other appearances, of a Presence ever near and ever ready to be manifested, but only signaled the fact to which they all more or less pointed, that Christ had now withdrawn from the earthly side of things, that "order under which we live on this side of the grave," and had entered the heavenly places.

We are not, then, to think of the right hand of the Throne of the Majesty in the heavens where He is set as some central of the Universe, but rather adopt St. Augustus's interpretation: "*Dextra Dei ubique.*" Nor are we to suppose that the holy place into which Christ has entered is some place in a far-off celestial heaven, but that it rather refers to every place on the earth where, through His ministry, He pleads His sacrifice before the Father. The Sanctuary and the true Tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man, of which He is the Minister (Heb. viii. 2), is not some ethereal, supernal region

¹ Dr. Swete, "The Ascended Christ," p. 8.

above the clouds, but the Church, His Body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.

The heavenly places, far above all principality, power, might and dominion, and every name that is named where Christ is set (Eph. i. 20, 21) are not places infinitely removed by millions of miles from our planet, but those same places in the spiritual order where He has made us to sit (Eph. ii. 6).

In other words, Christ has not changed his relationship to the earth, is not now governing it from a distance instead of near at hand, but is amongst us to-day more perfectly than in the days of His flesh. It is well to be reminded of the fact.

We are all more or less inclined to think of Christ's Presence, so far as we think of it at all, as either in some distant sphere, or so universally diffused as to be in no way different from that of the Father, in which we live and move and have our being. He is present to our planet as He is present to Mars, Saturn, or Sirius. "He is present as He was before the Incarnation—neither less nor more. The warm intimacy of the days of His flesh is over. The Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us for thirty-three years, and then departed, leaving His Spirit, as every great personality does when he dies. The earth was once irradiated by the Light of the World, but now the Light is withdrawn, like some distant star that can only be discerned with the telescope. The romance of the world has departed. In a brief period, those who were in the secret came to Him, showed Him of all their troubles, and were comforted and relieved; but that was the Golden Age, which has passed away, like that older age of which the races of the world have still traditions. And so the spiritual atmosphere is tainted with doubts and denials."

If some Mary Magdalen, grieving over some great spiritual loss, were to say that she had found Him in the Garden, or some band of devoted disciples in great perplexity had steadfastly affirmed that He was in the room with them and gave them His Peace, then we at once cry out against a localized

Presence. "You do not mean you found Him in that place, but only that you imagined that He was there, just as I imagine Him to be here." It is not a question of reality, but only fancy. And so, too, the preaching in our Churches seems to imply an absent Christ. We hear of what Christ did nearly two thousand years ago, and of what He will do when He comes again, but apparently there are comparatively few who speak of what He is doing now. We hear of the Church, but as though it were a society separate from Christ. Its dignity, its importance, its age, and the lustre that has gathered about it in all lands, these are themes for praise and gratitude; but as the instrument of Christ, as the means whereby He reveals His Presence and does His work, as His shrine where He dwells, how partially is this recognized throughout Christendom!

And yet there is no truth of anything like the same practical importance. Outward presence is as necessary to us so long as we are in the body as inward presence. We are so made that the reality of the best blessings we know is more or less dependent upon their confirmation in experience. I have a sense of beauty, and can recall beautiful scenes before my mind, and a picture, photograph, or poem will help much to enable me to realize the mental picture, but it is when the place is present to me that my enjoyment is complete. I may think of my friend, call to mind his delightful traits of character, his considerateness, good humour, sincerity, but when I pass into his presence, or he into mine, it is then my thoughts gain distinctness and strength.

Presence is, of course, always much more than propinquity. When we are led to say of someone, "I don't care whether he is present or not," his presence will be nothing to us, even though he were standing close beside us. Indeed, so dependent is presence on mutual thought and sympathy, that even when there is no dislike or moral repulsion, even then we may be surprised on learning that one whom we greatly wished to see us was sitting almost beside us without our knowledge. Presence necessarily depends on sympathy, that subtle com-

munion of spirits that eagerly desire to share common thoughts and aspirations. Only friends can be present with one another. Husbands and wives living with one another may yet never be present to one another. In such a case, when one leaves the home no difference is made to the other by his or her departure, except a feeling of constraint is removed. But though presence depends on sympathy, and can be enjoyed without physical nearness, it is greatly helped by it. Doubts are removed, fears vanish, anxieties disappear now that our friend is with us. The truth, then, of Christ's Presence—*i.e.*, of Christ coming to us, and not simply indwelling us, is one of transcendent interest. Men have rightly felt that they were ready to contend to the uttermost for it, that they would rather give up than be deprived of it, that worldly honours or pleasures were not to be thought of in comparison with it.

Now we have seen that there is nothing to show that our Lord's Ascension made any difference in this respect—*i.e.*, except, as Dr. Maclaren says, to make Him more near, more available, more accessible. This is, of course, what we should have supposed. He who loved human nature so much as to take it for his eternal tabernacle and to work and die for its purification and restoration, was not likely to make His Presence more remote when He went to His Father. He who knew the value of Presence, who engaged the home of Martha and Mary, who felt the want of His disciples' presence in His agony—"What, could ye not watch with Me one hour?"—was not likely to leave us without His own Presence. It is true that, in order that man might gain a true conception of His personality and character, He must withdraw the outward manifestation; we could no longer see Him face to face, no longer feel the touch of His hand—though even this was experienced by St. John in his old age—but every other blessing of Presence was to be ours. He would come to us at times and in places, and would reveal His coming. The worker, the sufferer, the lonely, the doubtful, might all have the comfort of His Presence, and something more immediate, more personal than the Universal Presence of Him in whom

we live and move and have our being. Only it would naturally depend upon the law of Presence—*i.e.*, love and sympathy. Unless a man love Christ he will never feel His Presence; to him there is no Presence; but, as our Lord promises: "If a man love Me . . . My Father will love him, and We will come unto him, and make our abode with him." He does not say "in him," but "with him"—*i.e.*, beside him. Bishop Westcott, commenting upon this passage, says: "The idea is that of a recognition without, so to speak, and not of the consciousness of the divine within. The Christian sees God by Him, he becomes and finds a dwelling-place for God, and does not only feel Him in him"; and he sees in it a fulfilment of that old promise that God gave His people centuries before: "I will set My tabernacle among you . . . and will walk among you, and be your God, and ye shall be My people" (Lev. xxvi. 11). Where there is need and where there is a loving recognition of Christ as the one who will answer our need, He comes as He came of old to Martha and Mary when they had lost, perhaps not immediately (in their case we know He stayed two days in the place where He was in order to do more for them by the delay than by the coming), but certainly.

And again and again there have been those whose faith has enabled them to recognize His Presence. St. Augustine had no doubt of it when he heard the words, "Tolle lege, Tolle lege"; the Staffordshire lad who was roasted by his mates before the furnace, and afterwards said that he had never felt Christ so near to him, was fully aware of it; mourner after mourner has testified to it. He came as He promised He would, and they knew that He came. No testimony that they could give would satisfy a man of the world; no testimony that Christ could give would satisfy Herod or Caiaphas. It was not given for that purpose. Men cannot be saved that way. If they do not believe the Bible, even the appearance of one risen from the dead will not convince them and lead them to repentance, and if they do they will have their own testimony.

The great truth that will amaze the unbeliever in the day when all things are made plain, will be the truth that Christ was

amongst us during our lifetime, and we knew Him not. We failed to recognize His comings to us, and we failed to recognize His identification with the Church. We shall then feel what a difference it would have made to our lives and thinking had we known it. Our inner spiritual experience would have been confirmed, our faith deepened, our love enlarged. Sometimes, when we see the botanist anxiously searching beside some burn that is tumbling down the mountain side for some specimen that will convince him of the reality of that of which he has read in books, or the historian carefully examining the contour of some field of battle which may reveal the presence of some great leader, or the scholar looking for some phrase which may show the presence of a writer whose authorship is questioned, we wonder whether the same earnest and determined spirit that finds treasures of which the world is ignorant might not find in their own personal history secrets infinitely more valuable in the disclosure of Christ's Presence to their soul. Christ has been with us on hundreds of occasions when our doubt or want of love kept Him hidden. St. Mary Magdalen would have never known He was near had she not heard her name called, and so her trust awakened. The two disciples at Emmaus did not know till He had vanished who had been their guest. St. Peter needed St. John's insight before he could see Him on the shore. All these incidents show how easily we may miss Him through lack of sympathy or perfect trust, but they all point to the reality and nearness of His Presence. The Christ within, then, is moved by the Christ without. As the sun is glorified by finding its reflection in the pool below, earth and heaven then meeting, so the Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, rejoices to find Himself mirrored in the individual soul that is moved by His Presence. These two, the outer and the inner, are, as Baron von Hegel says, necessary conditions for faith and love, the unconscious or variously obscure but most real, and when favoured, powerful presence within us of an inward Christ, pushing upwards and outwards with a view to joining hands with the outward Christ Who is pressing inwards, the one crying "Seek ye My face," the other "Thy Face, Lord, will I seek."

The King's Plan.

A LONG time ago there lived a King who took great delight in teaching his people good habits. One night he put a large stone in the middle of the road near his palace, and then watched to see what the people who passed that way would do.

Early in the morning a sturdy old farmer named Peter came along with his heavy ox-cart loaded with corn. "Oh! these lazy people!" he cried, driving his oxen to one side of the road. "Here is this big stone right in the middle of the road, and nobody will take the trouble to move it." And he went on his way, scolding about the laziness of other people, but never thinking of touching the stone himself. Then came a young soldier, singing a merry song as he walked along. A gay feather was stuck in his hat, and a big sword hung at his side, and he was fond of telling great stories of what he had done in the war. He held his head so high that he did not see the stone, but stumbled over it and fell flat in the dust. This put an end to his merry song; and as he rose to his feet he began to storm at the country people. "Silly drones!" he said, "to have no more sense than to leave a stone like that in the middle of the road!"

Then he passed on, but did not sing any more. An hour later there came down the road six merchants with their goods on pack-horses, going to the fair that was to be held near the village. When they reached the stone the road was so narrow that they could hardly drive their horses between it and the wall. "Did you ever see the like?" they said. "There is that big stone in the road, and not a man in all the country but that is too lazy to move it!"

And so the stone lay for three weeks. It was in everybody's way, and yet everybody left it for somebody else to move. Then the King sent word to all his people to meet together on a certain day near his palace, as he had something to tell them. The day came, and a great crowd of men and women gathered

in the road. Old Peter, the farmer, was there, and so were the merchants and the young soldier. "I hope the King will not find out what a lazy set of people he has around him," said Peter. And then the sound of the horn was heard, and the King was seen coming towards them. He rode up to the stone, got down from his horse, and said: "My friends, it was I who put this stone here three weeks ago. It has been seen by every one of you, and yet everyone has left it just where it was, and scolded his neighbour for not moving it out of the way." Then he stooped down and rolled the stone over. Underneath the stone was a round, hollow place, in which was a small iron box.

The King held up the box so that all the people might see what was written on a piece of paper fastened to it. These were the words: "For him who lifts the stone." He opened the box, turned it upside down, and out fell a beautiful gold ring and twenty bright gold coins. Then everyone wished that he had only thought of moving the stone instead of going around it and finding fault with his neighbour. There are many people still who lose prizes because they think it easier to find fault than to do the work which lies before them.



The Missionary World.

THE fourth meeting of the Continuation Committee of the World Missionary Conference is to be held in Holland in mid-November. As a preliminary to it Dr. Mott, fresh from his remarkable conferences with representative missionary bodies in India, Japan, and China, is giving some days to meeting the leaders of the various Missionary Societies in Ireland, Scotland, and England. Each year sees the links between the Continuation Committee and the Societies which support it drawn closer, and the uses of this international and interdenominational organization are being increasingly recognized. A remarkable statement on "The Progress of the Movement for Co-operation in Missions," made by the Secretary of the Continuation Committee at the Conference of Representatives of British Missionary Societies held at Swanwick last June, has just been issued, and can be had through the various Missionary centres. Mr. Oldham shows the need arising out of modern conditions for some machinery for international action and investigation, and outlines the work of the Special Committees working under the Continuation Committee. An appendix contains a full statement of Continuation Committee Finance. Prayer is especially desired that Dr. Mott's Conferences with the Societies may be fruitful, and that the meeting in Holland may prove to be a starting-point for enlarged and deepened service. The central problem of all this work is well stated in the closing paragraph of the pamphlet referred to :

"No one can take a broad view of history and of the present situation in the world without realizing that Protestantism has manifested elements of weakness through its innumerable divisions, and that these weaknesses make themselves felt in a specially acute form in the face of the tremendous constructive task to which the Church is called in the non-Christian world. It is not possible to go back to the unity which was broken at the Reformation, but only to go forward towards a larger and a higher unity, which recognizes and is based on the freedom of the Christian man. . . . Behind all the consideration and discussion of the question of co-operation, ennobling it and filling even petty details with large and deep meaning, lies the question

—a question of real and great historical significance—whether there is among the leaders of the Missionary Movement the loftiness of Christian character, the statesmanship, the largeness of vision, the breadth of sympathy, and the faith in God to enable them to achieve, for the sake of the evangelization of the world, in a measure that has never been achieved before, a living, free, rich, effective unity, in which the gifts that God has bestowed upon each will find their highest expression, and the resources which He has entrusted to His Church will be used to the uttermost for the speedy advancement of His kingdom.”

* * * * *

In one of the missionary magazines for October the fear is expressed that the offerings made as the outcome of the C.M.S. Conference at Swanwick may prove to be in part subtracted from money hitherto given to other societies. There are said to be some admitted instances of this. The present writer, on the other hand, knows of several instances in which gifts to other societies, and even to home work, have been the direct result of the Swanwick message. The fear, in view of the existing financial depression and discouragement, was, perhaps, bound to find lodgement in some minds, but we cannot for a moment give it credence. Such transference would dishonour both God and man. Self-denial cannot be exercised by denying some worthy object its wonted gift.

* * * * *

The C.M.S. literature specially prepared for the winter's work is now ready—"Plans for Advance," in which the needs of the C.M.S. fields and the Committee's policy as to meeting them are set forth, and a small pamphlet on the message of Swanwick. It is striking to hear from pulpit after pulpit reference to the influence of the Conference, and to note the steadiness with which men and women are seeking to translate its meaning into practical life.

* * * * *

The East and the West completes this quarter its eleventh volume; the cause of missions owes much to the catholic spirit of its editor. We wish the magazine increasing prosperity. The present number is a good one, the two outstanding articles being Bishop Alan Gibson's account of Christianity among the

Bantus in South Africa, and the Rev. Frank Lenwood's thoughtful study of "Reverges of Caste upon the Christian Church in India."

* * * * *

The Moslem World has two interesting articles on Persia, one showing somewhat unexpectedly that Russian influence in the north favours the advance of missions. The short paper on "Moslems of China and the Republic" is full of information. Chinese Moslems also receive consideration in the *B.M.S. Herald* and in the first of a series of papers in *India's Women*. Two of the articles in the October *Moslem World*—"Points of Contact and of Contrast" and "The Latest Muhammadan Mare's Nest"—are perhaps more full of truth than of love.

* * * * *

The International Review of Missions deals, in able articles, with the influence of the revolution on religion in China, with the effect of the Balkan War upon Christian work upon Moslems, and with some burning questions on the relation between Church and Mission in Japan. There are also three good papers on Christian literature in Japan, in China, and in India. Professor Harlan Beach writes on the preparation of missionaries. Lord William Gascoyne Cecil contributes an attractive little article on indigenous Christianity, with a rabbit and kangaroo illustration which will be welcomed by missionary speakers. Professor Duncan Black Macdonald brings the remarkable series of papers on the vital forces of Christianity to a close. Study circles using the new textbook *The Spirit of Japan* will find this Review a storehouse of valuable matter. Besides the longer articles which have appeared in number after number, such shorter contributions as Professor Cairns' consideration of the "Message to the Japanese People," just issued with the approval of seven hundred missionaries (see pp. 800-4), will materially aid intelligent study.

* * * * *

In connection with the double thought of Japan and a Mission-study textbook, two other volumes call for mention.

One is *The Christian Movement in Japan*, a year-book issued by the Conference of Federated Missions, and procurable in London from the Religious Tract Society, price 5s. It contains information of every kind about missionary work, and an excellent "General Survey." The work of Anglican Missions finds adequate place. It is a book which leaders of study circles will find most useful. The other volume is itself a textbook—*The Missionary Motive*, price 1s. 6d., issued by the Student Christian Movement. Eight writers each contribute a chapter, yet the book makes an impressive whole. Whilst primarily intended for the colleges, it should be widely used also in the Church.

* * * * *

Among the many articles worth reading in the other missionary magazines the following claim special notice: In the *C.M. Review*—the whole number is above the average—a brief and temperate statement on "The Central Board of Missions and the Missionary Societies," by Sir W. Mackworth Young, and "A Form of Prayer for the Admission of a sometime Mohammedan as a Catechumen," by the Rev. W. H. T. Gairdner; in the *Missionary Review of the World*, a long report on "The Call of Moslem Children," given at the World's Sunday School Convention at Zurich last July (this appears also in *Blessed be Egypt*); in the *Wesleyan Foreign Field* interesting historical, biographical, and inspirational matter in connection with the Centenary; in the *L.M.S. Chronicle* a clear statement of the present situation of the Society and the consequences which would follow retrenchment; in the *S.P.G. Mission Field* an article reporting on the extent and need of their Medical Missions; in *China's Millions* a long and interesting account of itinerating work in Anhwei, and the story of "A Living Epistle"; and in *The Bible in the World* a suggestive opening meditation by Mr. A. G. Jayne, a paper called "In the Country of Othello," and the first part of a series by Mr. William Canton, the historian of the Bible Society, under the title of "Pioneers! O Pioneers!"

There is a growing sense that there should be an increase of missionary intercession in the ordinary services of the Church, and not merely on special missionary occasions. Such an enrichment of public worship would be fruitful in results. Prayers suitable for use have been provided, and episcopal sanction is not lacking. Clergy who desire to see their congregations imbued with missionary spirit have perhaps their greatest opportunity here. In India the use of Bishop Cotton's Prayer for Missions is very general in the ordinary services of the Church.

G.



Discussions.

[The contributions contained under this heading are comments on articles in the previous number of the CHURCHMAN. The writer of the article criticized may reply in the next issue of the magazine; then the discussion in each case terminates. Contributions to the "Discussions" must reach the Editors before the 12th of the month.]

A DEFENCE OF EVENING COMMUNION.

(The "Churchman," October, 1913, p. 764.)

MANY besides myself will have read with much thankfulness the scholarly, lucid and, I would add, conclusive article in the October number of THE CHURCHMAN on Evening Communion. May I follow it up by urging two or three practical considerations which forcibly confirm the view of the anonymous writer of the article in question?

1. I would point out that insistence upon an Early Communion clashes with the very genius and spirit of Christianity, in that it makes participation in the highest means of grace and the holiest act of worship a perfectly easy matter for the well-to-do, and one of the greatest difficulty (if not impossibility) for the poor. What can be easier, where there is a well-ordered household with its staff of servants, than for master and mistress and servants (in their turn) to attend an eight o'clock celebration? But what is so easy in their case is difficult, if not impossible, to the poor woman with a young family to be dressed, fed, and got off to Sunday-school. And what shall we say of the milkman, the groom, the ostler, the maid-of-all-work with an unsympathetic, perhaps irreligious, mistress?

"To the poor the Gospel shall be preached"; and anything that raises a barrier in the way of the poor that does not exist in the case of the well-to-do is contrary to the very genius of Christianity. To

insist on *this* hour and to forbid *that* for the Holy Communion, raises little or no barrier between my well-to-do neighbour and the Holy Table; it does place a very real barrier between many of my poorer neighbours and the feast of life. The same argument holds good as between the strong and healthy on the one hand, and the aged and feeble on the other. What is so easy for the one may be very difficult for the other.

2. A second point I would urge is this: That cannot be contrary to the essence and inwardness of a thing which would be required by its ideal. What, in this case, is the ideal? It is that every baptized adult should not only be a communicant, but a regular communicant—perhaps a weekly communicant; for, going back to primitive times, we find that weekly communion was the practice. Now, suppose that the ideal were attained. I do not say that it ever will be, but suppose it were. What would be our position? Would it be possible to insist on everyone communicating at an early hour? Should we not, in order to meet the necessities of the case, be obliged to have the Holy Communion administered at different times in the day? And my contention here is, that what would be required by the ideal cannot, in the nature of things, be unjustifiable. If the ideal towards which we strive were reached, we should, as it seems to me, witness the *reductio ad impossibile* of early, fasting communion as a matter of *necessity*, instead of *choice*, which of course it can quite legitimately be.

3. But I leave the ideal and pass to the real. It is one thing to preach the necessity of attending an eight o'clock celebration in a town church where all the worshippers live within ten minutes of the church door; but what of country parishes where the worshipper may have to walk two or three miles, sometimes much more, to church? This aspect of the case was brought home to my mind very forcibly when exploring the Roman wall in Northumberland and Cumberland. From that ridge, that sort of backbone, along which the Roman wall runs across the moorland you look down upon parishes of vast extent. I know parishes respectively of 36,000, 32,000, 23,000 acres; I have been told (though for this I cannot vouch) that there is a parish consisting of 60,000 acres. These vast parishes are dotted over with small farm-houses and labourers' cottages. For by far the greater part of the population the parish church is many miles distant. In such conditions—conditions found in many of the wilder parts of England and Wales—is insistence on early fasting communion a reasonable thing? It appeared to me that the only way of ministering to the wants of the people in such a district would be for the clergyman to perambulate his parish, holding services at different hours in different quarters of the area under his charge, with the Holy Communion as an essential part of every service. The only alternative, it seemed to me, would be to have at least half-a-dozen priests for a population of 1,200 or 1,500 at the most, which is another form of the *reductio ad impossibile*.

I will only add that the present habit of reception at rare intervals and non-communicating attendance as a regular practice (how near is the approach here to Roman use!) is the unscriptural and unprimitive corollary of insistence upon early fasting reception.

G. S. STREATFEILD.



Notices of Books.

SKETCHES IN WESTERN CANADA. By the Rt. Rev. Bishop Ingham, D.D., and the Rev. C. L. Burrows, M.A. *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 2s. 6d.

It was a foregone conclusion that some members of the recent Mission of Help would give us some account of the places visited and the work done, as well as their impressions of Canadian Church life. None could have done it more pleasantly or effectively than the authors of this attractively got up little volume. There are graphic accounts of work at Lloydminster, Strathcona, Edmonton, and Stonewall, and verbal snapshots of prominent Canadian Churchmen. The impressions are arresting. The exclusion of religious instruction from the public schools is shown to be a drawback, and the loss to the rising generation very real and evident. The Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. are said to be prominent institutions in the West, doing valuable work, and the Scout movement, which has "caught on" in Canada, comes in for unqualified praise. Not the least interesting chapter is one contributed by a Canadian clergyman, in which he points out some of the weaknesses and perils by which the Canadian Church is beset. These pages constitute a trumpet-call to both clergy and laity, and, indeed, there is much that English Churchmen would do well to take to heart. In the closing chapter we have the picture of an old friend and his home—Dr. Griffith Thomas, who is spoken of as "lent to Canada for a time."

HINDUISM ANCIENT AND MODERN. By the Rev. J. A. Sharrock, M.A. *S.P.G.* Price 2s. 6d.

The author, who was for many years a missionary in South India, and is now Principal of St. Boniface College, Warminster, expresses in his preface regret that the study of comparative religion is "almost entirely ignored" in the training of missionaries who have to be prepared for the "usual theological examinations." His work is an attempt to bring ancient and modern Hinduism within the purview of "that large body of men and women who are now interested in Missions," and it is written in the consciousness that "Christianity is face to face, and in deadly conflict, with the great religions of the world—to conquer or be conquered." He has given us a volume which should appeal to Hindus seeking the light, as well as to English Christians who want to understand a religion professed by so many of their fellow-subjects.

AN HEROIC BISHOP. The Life Story of French of Lahore. By Dr. Eugene Stock. *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 2s. net.

In these pages Dr. Stock has given us a delightful sketch of one who is in the front rank of modern missionaries, but whose work is not so well known

as it deserves to be. From first to last he was a pioneer, and though he had held the bishopric of Lahore, he closed his life as a plain missionary in Persia. Such men as Bishop French have helped to raise our conceptions and enlarge our outlook, and in our materialistic, pleasure-loving age have demonstrated the fact that Christianity has not ceased to produce lives that count all things but loss for the Lord. We wish the book a wide circulation.

ADVENT CERTAINTIES. F. B. Macnutt. *Robert Scott.*

It is more than time that Churchpeople faced the question as to what they really believe, in their heart of hearts, as to the Advent hope. In how many of the "Advent Courses of Sermons" which will be announced so soon will the season which the Church has set apart for one purpose be used for some other? Sermons on the first coming; sermons on the present coming; sermons on a mystical coming; sermons on no coming at all! But where shall we find sermons which proclaim with enthusiasm and without apology a literal personal triumphant return of Jesus Christ as King and Judge, breaking in unexpectedly upon an unprepared world, and bringing a new Kingdom which is more than, and different from, an evolution of present conditions?

We shall find such sermons in the book before us. Canon Macnutt, with vigorous phraseology, dispels the "mists of uncertainty" which close round the modern Christian, the "limping, half-paralyzed pilgrim through shadowland," at whose coldness of heart at the Advent Message the early Christians (we are truly told) would have gazed with such sad surprise. He is less concerned to bring out details of the "certainties" than to emphasize always the great broad inspiring facts that Christ is really coming again, and this main theme runs through all the sermons, even though titles and texts vary.

There are plenty of replies to German critics, and frequent references to social problems, and an excellent passage urging to missionary endeavour, but all six sermons strike us as being pretty much alike, and they are probably more profitable when read in the study than when heard from the pew.

Six other sermons complete the book, and deal with the Passion and Ascension of our Lord and the gift of the Holy Spirit. We rather lose our way in Sermons x. and xi., but we like the Ordination Sermon (xii.) as well as any in the book.

CHARACTER AND RELIGION. Edward Lyttelton, M.A. *Robert Scott.* Price 5s. net.

The Headmaster of Eton has placed us all under debt. His book is a careful and exhaustive treatment of a most important modern question. The arguments from every quarter have been most clearly and fairly set out, and the whole sifted material brought together.

Is it enough to teach morals without religious dogma? Can character be formed without a Christian basis? Why not be content to teach our children to be loving, unselfish, and altruistic, without bothering about difficult matters like the Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection, Ascension, and Divinity of Jesus Christ? Because you cannot, replies Mr. Lyttelton. Search history through for any motive able to make men admire and strive for the cluster of virtues comprised under the broad head of "Humility," and

you search in vain. Even the lofty teaching of Plato produced nothing better than Aristotle's ideal man, who "rates himself at the highest possible rate" and "wishes to be superior"; nor could the wonderful teaching of Old Testament Psalms and Prophets prevent Pharisaism from developing and becoming the ideal of the nation whose writings these were. The innate egoism in man is only conquered as he apprehends something of the self-effacement of the Divine Being who took human nature and deliberately died a shameful death on his behalf. Anything short of this completely fails to account for the rise, during the Christian era, of the general admiration for the qualities of humility which before were almost despised.

The book does not pretend to be light reading. It is a serious discussion, seriously undertaken by one who has thoroughly mastered the subject. It makes it perfectly clear that "secular education" will fail to produce character. The book should be bought and studied.

RUDOLF EUCKEN: HIS PHILOSOPHY AND INFLUENCE. By Meyrick Booth, B.Sc., Ph.D. (Jena), Translator of "Main Currents of Modern Thought." London: *T. Fisher Unwin*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

Professor Eucken is especially interesting to the Christian student, because he regards the spiritual life as the centre of all reality, and because he demands man's co-operation in that spiritual life. After the many efforts that have been made in every age by agnostic philosophers to find a solution of the problem of life, efforts which have always failed, it is refreshing and encouraging to find that the great thinkers of to-day are coming to the conclusion that Christianity alone offers us an adequate solution. Eucken is clearly convinced of this, and although his interpretation of Christianity is not ours, he realizes that Christianity has triumphantly succeeded just where Eastern religions and non-Christian systems of philosophy have failed. Many of us have neither the time nor the philosophic training to appreciate Eucken in his own works, and so we are devoutly thankful for the plain and interesting sketch which Mr. Meyrick Booth has given us. It is a book worth reading and worth thinking over.

AT CLOSE QUARTERS. By John A. Hutton, M.A. THROUGH NIGHT TO MORNING. By A. C. Dixon, B.A., D.D. LIFE'S FLOOD TIDE. By J. Stuart Holden, M.A. London: *Robert Scott*. Price 3s. 6d. each net.

Mr. Robert Scott is rapidly becoming a great publisher of good sermon literature, and his publishing house need not be ashamed of any of these three volumes. Of the three, that by Mr. Hutton is, perhaps, to the reader the most interesting and suggestive. Mr. Hutton has the rare touch of originality, and his method of treatment, as well as his wealth of illustration, make these sermons particularly interesting to read. The best introduction to the book is the mention of some of his titles: "The Injury from Lower Approvals," "The Shame of being Neutral," "The Cure of the Questioning Spirit," and many more.

Dr. Dixon's volume is in the main evangelistic, with just an occasional sermon for those already won. The Gospel which he preaches is the full Gospel, and he preaches it with a wealth of illustration, American in its wealth, but quite English in its suitability. Here is one picked out by

chance: "I am quite sure that I own ten or a dozen umbrellas in London, while I possess only one or two. Some time ago I owned a good overcoat, but someone came into my study and took it out. I still own it, but he possesses it. It is possible for God to own us, while the devil possesses us. The ideal Christian is the man who recognizes the ownership of Christ, and realizes His full possession through the Holy Spirit."

Of Mr. Stuart Holden's volume little need be said. His sermons are too well known to need introduction, and when it is said of this last volume that the sermons printed here maintain the level of his other published works, a large circle of readers is at once assured.

IN THE UPPER ROOM. By D. J. Burrell, D.D., LL.D. London: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 2s. net.

This is a new volume in the Short Course Series, which has already given us so much that is excellent. Dr. Burrell has chosen for exposition a series of chapters which are full of difficulties, which have often been expounded before, and which are some of the most precious in the Christian Church. His volume is worthy of the series, and it will take its place with the most excellent expositions of these chapters. It is suggestive, aptly illustrated, beautifully devotional, and thoroughly scholarly—a real contribution to the literature of the Great Discourse.

Received: **THE HYMN-BOOK OF THE AGES.** By S. B. Macy. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 3s. 6d. net. The "Hymn-Book of the Ages" is, of course, the Pealter which Mrs. Macy prints, with comments and prayers, in a very attractive form. **WINNING A PRIMITIVE PEOPLE.** By Donald Fraser, with an introduction by John R. Mott, LL.D., F.R.G.S. London: *Seeley, Service and Co., Ltd.* Price 5s. net. Mr. Fraser we know, Mr. Mott we know, the Primitive people we shall get to know by means of this thoroughly attractive book. **WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY AND TELEPHONY.** By Charles R. Gibson, F.R.S.E. London: *Seeley, Service and Co., Ltd.* Price 2s. net. A popular account; just the book for a scientifically inclined lad. **THINGS SEEN IN OXFORD.** By Norman J. Davidson, B.A. (Oxon). London: *Seeley, Service and Co., Ltd.* Price, cloth, 2s. net. Another volume in this excellently illustrated series. **THE PRESS AND ITS STORY.** By J. D. Symon, M.A., Assistant Editor of *Illustrated London News*. London: *Seeley, Service and Co., Ltd.* Price 5s. net. An excellent gift-book for young and old. **A KALENDAR OF HYMNS ANCIENT AND MODERN.** By Rev. R. S. Genge, M.A. London: *Humphrey Milford* (Oxford University Press). Price 2d. net. **OLD TESTAMENT LEGENDS.** By M. R. James, Litt.D., King's College, Cambridge. London: *Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd.* Price 3s. 6d. net. This is a collection of stories gathered from some of the less known of the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament, told of patriarchs, kings, and others. The title is a little unfortunate, but the book is decidedly interesting. **THIS WONDER-WORLD.** By Agnes Giberne. London: *R.T.S.* Price 1s. 6d. An introduction to modern science for growing boys and girls; very simply written. **NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS.** London: *Roffey and Clark*, Croydon. Price 2d. each net. A series of little pamphlets reprinted from the *Lay-Reader*. **THE TREASURY OF DAVID.** By C. H. Spurgeon. New edition, issued in forty-eight fortnightly parts, 7d. each net. London: *Marshall Brothers, Ltd.* A new edition in serial form of this well-known work. **HIS LITTLE BIT O' GARDEN.** By Mildred Hill. London: *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.* Price 1s. 6d. net. A missionary story and a love story woven into one. **HEROES OF THE INDIAN MUTINY.** By Edward Gilliat, M.A. (Oxon.). London: *Seeley, Service and Co.* Price 5s. **IAN HARDY, NAVAL CADET.** By Commander E. Hamilton Currey, R.N. London: *Seeley, Service and Co.* Price 5s. Two gift-books of the kind for which this firm has made itself famous. **SUBMARINE ENGINEERING OF TO-DAY.** By Charles W. Domville-Fife. London: *Seeley, Service and Co., Ltd.* Price 5s. net. A popular gift-book of a scientific kind, but not quite of an elementary nature.