

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

# THE CHURCHMAN

June, 1914.

## The Month.

**The Claim  
of the  
Faithful.** AMIDST all the unhappy controversies which are now proceeding over the historic truth of certain articles of the Christian faith, there is one class of people who deserve consideration, but who receive little or no attention. We refer to the faithful laity—that innumerable body of men and women who in simple faith have staked their all upon the truth of the Gospel story. It is, of course, perfectly obvious that they who can say with St. Paul, “the life that I now live I live by the faith of the Son of God,” will not suffer themselves to be moved by any speculations of New Testament critics ; but the question remains whether it is right that Christian believers, without any pretensions to scholarship, should be exposed, as they are now, to having the very fundamentals of their position undermined by those who still profess and call themselves Christians. The critics apparently do not know how vast are the issues involved. They do not seem to realize that, if they were to succeed—which may God forbid!—in shaking the faith of believers in the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection, they would necessarily weaken faith in the Christian revelation as a whole. Are they prepared to face the position? For ourselves, we can only say that the man who first sows the seeds of doubt in the mind of another incurs a most awful responsibility. We are well aware of the excuse the critics make. It is urged that the

educated, thoughtful laity are already so seriously perturbed over what are called "Nature miracles," that, unless the alleged events can be "spiritualized," there is danger that these people will be lost to the Christian faith altogether. We believe the danger is greatly exaggerated. The number of church-going laity who independently have adopted the Modernist position is very small, although we admit that the number of those who have been led into it by the rash statements of "Liberal" clergy may be considerable. But even reckoning both classes together, they are infinitesimal compared with those who still hold fast by the Christian Creed. And it is these who claim consideration at the present time. We sincerely trust that their natural guides—the parochial clergy—will take every possible opportunity to reassure them, and to strengthen and deepen their faith. Thank God there is no reason to apologize for the Christian Creed! The things which have been most surely believed amongst us are eternally and unalterably true.

**Convocation  
and  
Modernism.** We are thankful for the debate in the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, which ought materially to have cleared the air. Yet even there the voice of uncertainty made itself heard. Was it necessary to make any pronouncement? Was not the view of the episcopate perfectly well known? Would it not be thought that they were imposing limits on honest study? These questions, and such as these, were raised by one or two prelates, who seemed to deprecate the publication of any declaration by Convocation. But the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the really great and statesmanlike speech with which he summed up the two days' debate, answered all objections, and showed that, as great unrest existed, the Church had the right to look to the Bishops for some statement which would allay anxiety. It would indeed have been a grave dereliction of duty on the part of Convocation—at least, so it appears to us—if they had passed by the matter in silence. For what was the position? Convocation was face to face with a large number of petitions

dealing with these three things—Modernism, Kikuyu, and Rubrics. The last two were practically left out of count, for, as the Archbishop said, they are being dealt with otherwise; but the anxiety shown by the petitioners in regard to Modernist attacks upon the Creed left Convocation no option but to make some pronouncement. Nor were the petitions all from one side. Indeed, by far the most influential and the most numerous signed—45,000 signatures—was that presented by the National Church League. (Parenthetically, we desire to acknowledge that we made a mistake last month in under-estimating what the response to that petition was likely to be.) There was also a petition from a number of Members of Parliament expressing their conviction “that it is essential to the interests of the English Church that our rulers should not allow it to remain in doubt whether or not an ordained minister of the English Church is free to continue to exercise his ministry after he has deliberately come to the conclusion that any historical statement of the Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds is not true.” There was also another petition—that from the Churchmen’s Union—to which we shall refer later.

The In these circumstances, the Bishop of London  
Resolution. brought forward the following resolution :

“Inasmuch as there is reason to believe that the minds of many members of the Church of England are perplexed and disquieted at the present time in regard to certain questions of faith and of Church order, the Bishops of the Upper House of the Province of Canterbury feel it to be their duty to put forth the following resolutions :

“1. We call attention to the resolution which was passed in this House on May 10, 1905, as follows :

“‘That this House is resolved to maintain unimpaired the Catholic Faith in the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation as contained in the Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds, and in the *Quicumque Vult*, and regards the Faith there presented, both in statements of doctrine and in statements of fact, as the necessary basis on which the teaching of the Church reposes.’

“We further desire to direct attention afresh to the following resolution, which was unanimously agreed to by the Bishops of the Anglican Communion attending the Lambeth Conference of 1908 :

“‘The Conference, in view of tendencies widely shown in the writings

of the present day, hereby places on record its conviction that the historical facts stated in the Creeds are an essential part of the Faith of the Church.'

"2. These resolutions we desire solemnly to reaffirm, and in accordance therewith we express our deliberate judgment that the denial of any of the historical facts stated in the Creeds goes beyond the limits of legitimate interpretation, and gravely imperils that sincerity of profession which is plainly incumbent on the ministers of Word and Sacrament. At the same time, recognizing that our generation is called to face new problems raised by historical criticism, we are anxious not to lay unnecessary burdens upon consciences, nor unduly to limit freedom of thought and inquiry, whether among clergy or among laity. We desire, therefore, to lay stress on the need of considerateness in dealing with that which is tentative and provisional in the thought and work of earnest and reverent students."

There was a third section of the resolution, dealing with episcopacy; but with this we need not now concern ourselves. The resolution was seconded by the Bishop of Norwich, and it received the support of nearly the whole House. One of the most interesting speeches was that of the Bishop of Chelmsford, who pointed out that it was not the weakest men, but the strongest men and the most saintly living persons, who were affected this time by what was going on in the Church. They had to consider how recent literature was affecting the working classes, and, secondly, the effect which it was having upon the preaching power of the clergy. The Bishop of Hereford proposed an amendment deprecating the issuing of any fresh declaration at the present time; but he found only two supporters for it—the Bishop of Southwark and the Bishop of Lincoln—and it was defeated by 24 to 3. The resolution was carried *nem. con.*, 25 voting for it. The decision is of immense importance at the present time, and should lead those who are the cause of the present disquiet to reconsider their position as ministers of the Church of England. In this decision we have a practical illustration of the meaning attached by the Bishops to the obligation laid upon them at the most solemn moment of their lives: "Are you ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word?" — "I am ready, the Lord being my Helper." We trust that this decision of Convocation will be

followed, whenever necessary, by action on the part of individual Bishops.

The value of the petition presented by the <sup>“Gravely Misleading.”</sup> Churchmen’s Union has been seriously discounted by what has happened since. Among its several statements was the following: “While asserting without reserve our belief in the Incarnation and Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, we submit that a wide liberty of belief should be allowed with regard to the mode and attendant circumstances of both.” In the course of the debate the Bishop of Gloucester pointed out that among the signatories was Professor Kirsopp Lake, “who had published a volume on the Resurrection, in which he asserted in most explicit terms that he did not believe in the bodily Resurrection in any sense at all.” The Bishop went on to say that “the memorialists asserted without reserve their belief in the Resurrection of our Lord. Was that compatible with the conclusions of the gentleman in question? It was certainly calculated to be misunderstood, and was gravely misleading.” Professor Kirsopp Lake has challenged the Bishop’s position, and in a public letter to him says: “If your lordship will look at my book on the Resurrection, you will find that it does not deny the resurrection of a spiritual body, but maintains that a resurrection or resuscitation of the flesh and blood of our Lord was not held by St. Paul.” The Bishop of Gloucester has “looked at the book,” and in a letter to the *Times* makes the following reply:

“Judging by his book on the ‘Resurrection of Jesus Christ,’ what he means by ‘resurrection’ is merely ‘the manifestation of a surviving personality.’ Indeed, he expressly says so on p. 274; and again, on p. 265, he writes as follows: ‘What we mean by “resurrection” is not resuscitation of the material body, but the unbroken survival of personal life; and the uninterrupted continuance of life excludes an interval of even three days, just as certainly as the resuscitation of the body demands it.’”

“Further, he refers in his letter to me to St. Paul’s belief in the resurrection of a spiritual body, and it would be a natural inference from his words that his belief is similar to St. Paul’s. It is clear, however, that he does not mean by ‘resurrection’ all that St. Paul meant, for he tells us in his book

(p. 242) that 'the affirmation of the belief that the Resurrection implies the resurrection of the body in such a manner as to remove all traces of it from the tomb . . . was undoubtedly made by most early Christians—*almost certainly by St. Paul*' (the italics are my own)—whereas he himself appears to hold that the true explanation of the empty tomb is that the women on the morning of Easter Day made a mistake and visited the wrong tomb (p. 250); and, if I am not doing him an injustice, he holds that the Saviour's body was all the time lying mouldering in the (unvisited) tomb, in which it had been laid on the Friday evening, and that it 'saw corruption,' as the bodies of mankind in general do."

We imagine there are not many who will think that the Bishop's words in Convocation were too severe.

Dr. Sanday's pamphlet ("Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism." Longmans. 6d. net) is sad reading. He has travelled very far since the days of his Bampton Lectures, and there is nothing in his later books at all comparable to what he now defines as his present position. He has undergone "development" within the last two years, and he intended to explain the nature of it, but the present discussion has precipitated his pronouncement. He kept back his pamphlet, which is an apologia for Modernism rather than a reply to Bishop Gore, until after the Convocation debate. Dr. Sanday was opposed to the Bishops making any declaration, but he readily admits that, if they were to say anything at all, they could not do other than they have done. There are two points in Dr. Sanday's pamphlet which especially claim attention. One is his contention that the recitation by the clergy of the Creeds in public worship is a corporate act, which must be broad and comprehensive, and cannot be made to serve at the same time as a minute criterion of the faith of individuals. The Bishop, he urges, omits entirely one argument which seems to be really decisive—the argument from the difference of times. Creeds composed fifteen, sixteen, or seventeen centuries ago cannot possibly express with literal exactitude the mind of to-day. Our conception of the Bible, he says, has been profoundly affected by modern criticism, and our conception of the Creeds must be affected equally. We cannot accept these dis-

tinctions. We do not understand how a man can say in a corporate capacity what he has ceased to believe as an individual; and as to the changes of time, they cannot possibly affect the truth of an historic fact. Facts cannot be affected by criticism, which is concerned with interpretation. Dr. Sanday's apologia is not clear in all its points, but the following statement is sufficiently definite :

"Two things I would ask leave to do. I would ask leave to affirm once more my entire and strong belief in the central reality of the Supernatural Birth and the Supernatural Resurrection. No one believes in these things more strongly than I at least wish to believe in them. . . . But I must in candour add that, although I believe emphatically in a Supernatural Birth and a Supernatural Resurrection, and in all that follows from these beliefs, I know that is not all that the Church of the past has believed. I must not blink this fact. I hope that I believe all that the Church's faith has stood for; but I could not, as at present advised, commit myself to it as literal fact."

Dr. Sanday thus clearly associates himself with those whom the Bishop of Oxford had in mind in his "Open Letter."

In the confusion which has arisen over doctrinal and ritual matters, it is perhaps natural that Evangelical Churchmen should be considering whether it would not add strength to what they believe to be the cause of truth if they were to join forces with one of the other Church parties in defence of the general position. We hope, however, they will do nothing of the kind. To join hands with the Bishop of Oxford's group in defence of the Creeds would be to weaken their own position in regard to the Kikuyu and Ritual controversies; to join hands with the Broad Church party in defence of the Federation of Christian Churches and in opposition to the Romanizing of the Church would be to weaken their witness to the truth of the articles of the Christian faith. The Evangelicals occupy a strong, an impregnable position in the Church of England. They have the strength, if only they have the courage, to stand alone.



## The First Chapter of Genesis.<sup>1</sup>

By E. WALTER MAUNDER, F.R.A.S.,

*Late Superintendent of the Solar Department, Royal Observatory, Greenwich.*

OUR subject is the First Chapter of Genesis. I take it that all here are agreed upon two points—

First : We believe that God is.

Next : We believe that He made the world—that is, the entire material universe.

There is a third proposition which we must also accept absolutely, if we are to discuss our chosen subject to any profit. That third proposition is : God is Himself the Author of this chapter, which tells us how He made the world.

For there are only two possible sources for the chapter : God Himself, the Creator, Who knew the mode and order of creation ; or man, who did not know, but imagined it.

It is manifest that the act of creation cannot have come under human observation ; it predated man, it escaped his experience entirely. Nor could he learn of it by tradition ; there was no one to hand down any account of it to him. Nor could he infer it from any study of what we term the processes of nature. For the act of creation is not one of the processes of nature : it preceded them all as assuredly as it preceded man himself.

That which men can observe and experience and have recorded is of value to all whom the record reaches, but if the record rests upon no experience, upon no observation, if it deals with facts that lie outside all human experience and observation, and is built up merely of suppositions, then it has no value : it is the baseless fabric of a dream. This first chapter of Genesis is only valuable if it comes to us from knowledge.

We are thus brought face to face with the fundamental question of the actuality of Revelation, for whatever may have

<sup>1</sup> Abstract of a paper read at a meeting of the Victoria Institute on Monday, April 6, 1914.

been the process by which this first chapter of Genesis was given to man, the chapter is either a revelation which came from God, or it tells us nothing.

Most men are content to accept the universe just as they find it, without inquiry as to how it came into existence or speculation as to its beginning. But there are also those in whom the sight of the order and beauty of the universe raises deep thoughts and questions, who desire to know how the universe came into existence. Many who put this question desire, and indeed expect, that the answer should be expressed in the terms of natural science. They have so ill-defined a conception of the character and scope of science that they suppose that the answer falls within its powers.

But science has its limitations as well as its powers. It deals only with relations; its observations, its deductions are only relative. The movements of the sun were noted, first, because they were movements relative to the earth; the movements of the planets were relative to the stars, and so on; of absolute motion we know nothing.

Further, the discoveries of science give us no final explanations; for, when an explanation is discovered for some mystery, the explanation itself consists in the bringing to light of something, perhaps of many things, that are themselves unexplained, and for the time inexplicable.

Again, science knows nothing of the ultimate; however far we go in any direction, whether in time or space, the inquiry of science will still be, "What is beyond?" And, if it were possible to give the decisive answer "There is nothing beyond," then science would find that it had passed the limit of its powers; it would have no further ability to deal with the situation.

The progress of science has been marvellous, and we may expect that its future will be much more wonderful than its past. But the very fact that it is progressive carries with it a necessary drawback. Science has no finality; we can never rest and be thankful that there is no more to learn. The

hypotheses which men accept to-day in science may be rejected to-morrow, and will certainly be modified. It is with things that change that science concerns itself, and with their changes, and it is the changing thought of men concerning them.

From each and all of these considerations we see that the limitations of science preclude it from giving us any message on that which is avowedly the subject of the first chapter of Genesis—the Beginning.

And the first chapter of Genesis does not give us the message of science. One example is sufficient. Astronomy is the oldest of all the sciences, but there is not a hint of even its earliest discoveries, not a single astronomical technicality is introduced; even the sun and moon are not named; we are told nothing except what an intelligent child might perceive for himself—namely, that there are in the heavens a greater light, a lesser light, and the stars also. There is nothing contrary to science told us, but neither is there any scientific revelation. Herein the chapter stands in striking contrast to all other accounts of creation; for all, whether they proceed from savage or from cultured nations, attempt to explain the origin of the universe by supposing it to have been built up out of similar materials. Similarly, Haeckel, and the school of which he is a representative, build the heavens and the earth from the primordial atom; but less logical than the pagans of old, they deny the existence of any person or force outside the universe thus self-constructed.

It is not possible to explain in terms of itself that which needs explanation. But the answer of the first chapter of Genesis is of another kind: "In the beginning, God." Here the origin of the universe is found, not in itself, but elsewhere. It is true that, if God be also unknown, we learn nothing; but, if God can be known, then His bringing the world into existence is no longer unexplained, though it may transcend our understanding. The method of His working may escape us, yet if we can know God Himself, we can learn something of His purpose,

and therefore the significance of what He has wrought. The true explanation of created things is found in the Creator.

How can God be known? The analogy of science may help us. That which men have learnt concerning sun, moon, and stars, they have learnt in one way and in one way only : it is from the sun, moon, and stars themselves that men have derived their knowledge of them ; the sole foundation of astronomy is observation. As the science has developed, and become more complex, there has been division of labour ; and now some men are observers, others are computers, and others, again, subject the results of computation to further discussion and analysis. But actual observation comes first and last and in between ; the whole structure of the science is built upon it.

So with the other sciences, as geology, biology, and the rest. We have learned of the rocks from the rocks ; of life from life. If we would learn of God, our knowledge of Him must come from Himself ; there is no other source possible. Some scientific men have argued as if, since they have learnt of nature from nature, by observation of nature, and through their natural powers, they could also learn of God from nature by observation of nature, and through their natural powers, without God having aught to do with their learning of Him.

But God must be the only source of light concerning Himself. We know of Him that which He has told us ; we can learn nothing more. He is our only possible source of knowledge in this field ; it is only in His light that we can see light.

Here, then, is the importance of the first chapter of Genesis. It is no record of events that came within human experience ; it is no inference from human speculation ; it is the word of God Himself to man. What is the message which He desires us to hear ?

There are seven great truths which, I believe, are taught in this chapter—

1. That God is.
2. That He Himself created all things.
3. That He created all things, not in one act, but in several.

4. That He made man in His own image.
5. That He gave man dominion over all the earth.
6. That He rested from creation on the seventh day.
7. That He hallowed the seventh day.

These seven great truths present us with the true relations of man to God, his Creator, and to nature, his fellow-creature. Above man is God, the infinite and eternal Creator; below man is the great and glorious universe which God has called into being. Between the two stands man; in himself, small, feeble and insignificant, but, by virtue of God's patent conferred upon him, endowed with power to have communion with God, and dominion over nature—to follow Religion, and develop Science.

To bring out these seven truths from the chapter before us is no triumph of forced and ingenious exegesis; they lie upon its surface, plain to every man. If the chapter be read to a child or to an unlearned peasant of ordinary intelligence, both would draw from it the same conclusions that I have done; indeed, in almost every case I have used the very words of the chapter itself. And these seven truths are fundamental: the teachings of this chapter are necessary—necessary for all men. They furnish the great safeguard against idolatry and polytheism, and all the unspeakable degradations of body, mind, and spirit to which these lead. This chapter declares to man from the outset his true position in the universe, and enables him to take his first step in the knowledge of God, which is Religion, and his first step in the knowledge of nature, which is Science.

The basis of all the science of to-day is found in the principle of continuity; the principle that like causes produce like effects, or, to use less debatable terms, that like antecedents are followed by like consequents, and that the phenomena perceived to-day follow necessarily and continuously from the phenomena of yesterday.

The first chapter of Genesis is not concerned with such continuity. Six times it is recorded "And God said," and in answer to that Word a change in the condition of nature followed immediately. We often speak of creation as a single

act, and there is a sense in which that holds good. But this first chapter of Genesis declares the truth that God accomplished creation, not in a single act, but in several—there were six creations.

This was not because the first creation broke down or was a failure. The creation of the first day was good and complete in itself; it has never been superseded. Light is with us to-day in all its beauty and worth; it was created good, it remains good. And so with the other creations, each in their turn.

But because these six separate fiat were creations, they escape the research of science. Science deals only with relations, the relations between created things; it can only consider secondary causes, and it is limited by the continuity of their operation. That which precedes the continuity of nature is creation; that which follows creation is continuity. Hence the two terms are mutually exclusive; any event or phenomenon that falls within the range of continuity is not creation, and the act of creation is no incident of continuity.

What was the nature of the six "days" of creation? What was their length? And where are we to place them in the course of time?

An astronomical day, or rather let us put it, "a day of man," involves four things: an earth that has obtained definite form; that has begun to turn on its axis; a sun that shines; and a man upon the earth to see. In order that "evening" and "morning" may indicate definite points of time, a fifth requisite is necessary—a selected locality upon the turning earth, from which the sun may be seen to set and to rise.

The chapter before us gives us no hint that at the moment when the word of command of the first day was spoken, the earth had received any definite form. There is no hint of its rotation, nor of any choice of a special locality. It was not until the fourth day that the sun was set in the firmament to give light upon the earth; nor until the sixth day that there was a man to perceive the succession of evenings and mornings. Surely, then, the seven days of Creation are not seven days of

man, but seven days of God. But this must give them a stronger, not a weaker, claim to be rightly called days. If God regards them as days, then days they were in the fullest sense; no matter how difficult—nay, perhaps impossible—it may be for us to define them in our vernacular. Yet, since man was made in the image of God, it may well be that the days of man are faint types or images of the days of God; the six days of man's labour, of God's six days of creative work; the seventh day of man's rest, of the day which God blessed and sanctified.

But if it is impossible for us to define the days of God in the terms of our human experience of time, is it impossible that God should translate them for us? We find that the record of each day's work is concluded by the same formula—"and there was evening, and there was morning." This expression is both unusual and striking, particularly in the case of the first day. "And there was evening and there was morning, day one."

The suggestion to my own mind is that each "day" was bounded by its evening and by its morning. The natural objection to this view is, that the interval between evening and morning is not "day," but "night"; but the objection itself recalls the suggestion once put forth by Hugh Miller, and adopted by the late Rev. Professor Charles Pritchard, in his work, "Nature and Revelation," that the seven days of Creation corresponded to seven successive dreams given to some prophet of old.

But if the record of Creation was the record of a series of visions, there must have been a reality which it represented and expressed.

Five times over in the chapter we read "God saw." How often have these words been read as if they ran, "man saw"? It is not the same thing, for "the Lord seeth not as man seeth, for man looketh on the outward appearance" (1 Sam. xvi. 7). Man sees the outward appearance, the effect, the phenomenon; God sees the inward substance, the causes, the reality—that which lies at the basis of nature, as well as that which is at the basis of character.

This thought is strikingly expressed in the 139th Psalm:

“ My substance was not hid from Thee,  
 When I was made in secret,  
 And curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth.  
 Thine eyes did see my substance yet being unperfect ;  
 And in Thy book all my members were written,  
 Which in continuance were fashioned,  
 When as yet there was none of them.”

And these words are as applicable to the weaving of the wondrous fabric of the Cosmos as to that great mystery, the formation and growth of the yet unborn child.

“ Which in continuance were fashioned.” The continuity of nature is the dominant note of science to-day, the thought that nature as it now is has been “ fashioned in continuance ” from its condition in the past. It is a new thought in these our times ; it has hardly found general recognition for three generations of men, yet it is clearly intimated here and elsewhere in the Scriptures in documents that were written nearly three thousand years ago.

We have seen that creation precedes continuity, and is not an incident in its course ; but when did creation take place ? The answer to that question is not so obvious as some have been ready to suppose.

The existence of man as recognized by God Almighty did not begin with man's own consciousness of it, but with the beginning of that continuity of nature which eventually resulted in man's coming into living, conscious existence. He existed to God long before he existed to himself. This truth is set forth with great distinctness in the address of Wisdom, in the Book of Proverbs, where the work of creation is especially referred to.

“ The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way,  
 Before His works of old,  
 I was set up from everlasting from the beginning,  
 Or ever the earth was.

\* \* \* \* \*

When He appointed the foundations of the earth,  
 Then I was by Him, as One brought up with Him :  
 And I was daily His delight,  
 Rejoicing always before Him ;  
 Rejoicing in the habitable part of His earth ;  
 And My delights were with the sons of men ” (Prov. viii. 22-31).

Six times God uttered the creative word ; six times that word was followed by the instant coming into existence of that which had been commanded. But when God beheld that which He had made and saw that it was good, does it follow that, could a man have been there to look on, there was anything present which would have been apparent to his sight—anything, that is to say, that he could have recognized as an accomplishment of the command? Turn back to the text which I have already quoted : “Thine eyes did see my substance yet being unperfect, and in Thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned when as yet there was none of them.” Is not the Psalmist here enunciating a truth that concerns much more than his own bodily existence? If this earth of ours had consciousness and spirit, as well as mass, might it not repeat the very words of the Psalmist? Might not sun and moon and all the heavenly host join in the same ascription, and so with all the forms of life and energy?

And this not only because God is all-knowing, foreseeing the end from the beginning, and beholding the thing that is afar off as if it were near ; but because He can perceive and gauge the outcome of the hidden forces now secretly in operation. To Him the far-off results are present, both because He is not subject, as the creature is, to the limitations of time, and because He sees the causes that are working towards the final effect. When God spoke it was done, and God saw it, and saw that it was good, for He had then put forth the power that would accomplish His entire purpose. “So shall My word be that goeth forth out of My mouth : it shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it” (Isa. lv. 11).

In the foregoing paper I have tried to bring out the thoughts which this first chapter of Genesis have impressed upon me.

I think it tells us of the Beginning ; that God created all things ; that He created all things in seven days of God. By creation I do not understand the bringing of all things into

their final manifestations, but the bringing into operation of the essential powers and principles which should lead to those manifestations in the fulness of time.

I do not know when the beginning took place ; I do not think the slightest hint is afforded to us. I do not think that we can determine how long in human measure were those seven days of God. The suggestion pleases me, I must admit, that they were revealed to man in symbol and in vision in seven consecutive nights ; that between the evening and the morning the seer, whoever he was, saw in dream the work of the successive days of God's week. It may be that God, in His acts of creation, may have consented to limit Himself by the very limitations of time which hereafter would be the necessary limitations of His predestined creature, man, and that the week of God may have been, in absolute duration, exactly equal to a week of man. It may be, but unless God tells us so in so many words we cannot know, and I do not see that it matters to us.

The first chapter of Genesis is no handbook of science, no epitome of the course of evolution. It is the revelation of God. "God said" ; "God saw" ; "God created" ; "God called" ; "God made" ; "God appointed" ; "God divided" ; "God ended" ; "God rested" ; "God blessed and sanctified."

If I am right, it is through missing this essential thought that the idea has arisen that there is some conflict, some opposition, between the teaching of this chapter and the discoveries of science.

Science deals only with the relation of created thing to thing within the continuity of nature, and can in no direction extend its researches to its origin and beginning, its creation. This chapter does not deal with the relations of thing to thing, but reveals God the Creator, the Origin and Beginning of all things. Our powers of observation and reflection were given to us by God in order that we might acquire the knowledge of external nature for ourselves. But the Creator Himself is here

revealed to us, because our natural powers of observation and reflection are incompetent to make Him known to us.

And this revelation is for the purpose of teaching man his true relation both to God and to nature. He is made in the image of God, after His likeness. Here is the high dignity of man, his solemn responsibility ; the duty is laid upon him of showing forth to his fellow-men and to his lower fellow-creatures the love and mercy, the truth and justice, the wisdom and patience, of Almighty God, the God whose image he was created to bear and to make manifest.

Here lies his right to dominion over nature ; not in his own essential worth, but in the fact that he is God's chosen representative. Independent power and authority he has none ; as the son of God, made in His image and likeness, deriving all his life and power and authority from Him, God "hath put all things under His feet."

Here has arisen the conflict between Religion and Irreligion ; there is none between Religion and Science. "Religion" means "the binding of man to God," a binding which, if he is to manifest God's image, and to rule as God's representative, is essential. Irreligion means the dissolution, the denial, or at least the neglect of this relation. Hence there are many who are ready to admit in words that there is a "Great First Cause," but in practice they ignore Him ; He is to them merely "a negligible factor."

The brute beasts know not God, and cannot hold intercourse and communion with Him ; they follow their natural propensities and passions, for they are not capable of anything higher. But if man, by creation the son of God, made in the image of God and to manifest His likeness, holds himself separate from and independent of God, the beauty and perfection of created nature is destroyed, and man, the highest of created things, becomes most out of harmony with the purpose of his being. For Manhood consists in this, that Man show forth God's image and make manifest His likeness.

## The Record of the Several Religious Parties Relative to Art.

BY THE REV. J. WARREN, B.D.,  
*Trinity College, Dublin.*

THERE are not so many now who reckon the Church of Rome, whatever her other delinquencies, to have been always the trusty and the unique nurse of the fine arts—whether these be viewed as fulfilling their own distinctive, peculiar function, or as serving as a factor auxiliary to Christian knowledge and devotion—though the delusion has been dying an uncommonly hard death. It should be understood that in the pre-Reformation era the Protestant, the primitive Christian, spirit had never been entirely dispossessed. It lingered on in the Church, actuating the minds of craftsmen, if only fitfully; an undercurrent, a tendency unidentified, a heaven-born impulse towards originality, which could be religious without being ecclesiastical, which asked for no priestly prescribing of the objects and details round which it would entwine its idealizings. Not the Renaissance alone disclosed this underswell, though in that period we witness an intensification and in some ways an exaggeration of it. Ecclesiasticism had not then knitted up its regulations and administrative forces with its later thoroughness. Genius felt no tug of any arbitrarily and precisely measured chain. She could roam through art's lovely demesne without being now and then pulled up sharply at some door marked "Private." The layman was considerably more "free to serve." Men such as Dante and Michaelangelo could never in modern days have so far developed and exercised their powers according to their own bent within the pale of that Church which now claims them for her scions. But eventually the Reformation brought about the inevitable sifting. And Ruskin judges that "Romanism, instead of being a promoter of the arts, has never shown itself capable of a single great conception since the separation of Protestantism from her side."

One department of art there is to which, ere passing from

this point, particular reference may perhaps be made. Rome's advocates in latter years have been claiming the Gothic style of architecture as a creation peculiarly hers. Yet the original Gothic builders were laymen, not clerics, and, indeed, are known to have often left whimsical traces imprinted on their work of their lax veneration for the latter. To the last the ecclesiasticism at the Italian headquarters was chary of encouraging their work. Generally speaking, we do not get Gothic churches south of Milan. The style had fallen into universal disuse a good while previous to the Reformation. The building of Cologne Cathedral, *e.g.*, had been brought to a standstill through this widespread apathy. And, as for the post-Reformation period, to quote Ferguson's standard "History of Architecture," "if the countries which remained Papal did not learn to hate, they at least learned to despise the works of their forefathers; they saw the most beautiful Gothic churches fall to decay" without regret. Nor did the modern revival of the style owe anything to Romanist encouragement. Pugin deplored the dissimilarity of ideal in this respect between his church leaders then in England and the men of old time. Wiseman, and Newman after him, had no appreciation for Gothic. Sir F. Scott, in the dispute over the building of the Foreign Office, could at that date (1860) point out how "in modern times the Ultramontane party have formally protested, by means of their organs in the Press, against the use of Gothic architecture as being heterodox and alien from the practice and customs of Rome."

It is enough, however, for our purpose to demonstrate that Protestantism puts no damper on art. Dr. Hans Rost, a Romanist writer, who has lately published a work on the social condition of German Roman Catholics, after airily declaring that "the Catholic Church has been through the centuries the upbearer of art," finds himself compelled to admit that in the art domain Protestants exceed, and Romanists fall short of, their due numerical proportion.

It is not being contended that the proficiency of a race or community in art will always be proportionate to its possession

of revealed truth. Naturally it need not be so, inasmuch as art and religion occupy quite distinct planes, though they were ordained by the same Author, and therefore cannot ultimately be discordant. Nor has it been so historically. The Greeks were, and doubtless will prove for all time to have been, the world's paragon artists. But then they never refused or suppressed the Gospel light, for in the good pleasure of God it did not come their way, whilst the same Divine good pleasure ordained that out of the treasury of "general grace" they should be favoured and endowed with this lovely gift. Analogously in the case of the medieval Communion, as Ruskin has said, "so long as, corrupt though it might be, no clear witness had been borne against it, so that it still included in its ranks a vast number of faithful Christians, so long its arts were noble." But since the Reformation Rome has had opportunity to accept, and has rejected, a clearer light.

\* \* \* \* \*

The first representatives of the more strict or, if anyone wills, more stringent type of Protestantism, as it emerged at the Reformation, are now receiving more of the credit due to them for the sane and generous attitude which they entertained towards art and the good service they rendered in her cause. Even Calvin is well on the road towards recovery of his repute. "All the arts come from God, and are to be respected as contrivances Divine." The fine arts are "excellent gifts of the Holy Ghost." Art was intended to disclose to man ideals beyond what the corrupted world of reality can offer us. Objection to sculpture based on the Second Commandment was unworthy of refutation. So he thought and wrote, many have come to know. In particular, as it is of the essence of art to suggest or convey an impression of the infinite and boundless, so it is also her principle, Calvin perceived, that every appropriate object in nature and life should be enlisted as a subject for idealization, and that every individual should equally share in the enjoyment of her creations. The Renaissance, it is true, had done something to fulfil these latter conditions. Its

art made a beginning in dealing with home scenes, and in bringing pictures into homes. Art then stepped out genially from her immurement in the sanctuary, but it was only to put on presently the gyves of a "classic expert" exclusiveness in workmanship. Accordingly the privileged task remained for Calvin pre-eminently, both in his own person and through those professional workers who followed him and shared his spirit and tenets, to restore to art her imperatively essential but long-lacking catholicity. Men like Taine and Carrière, though no friends of its theology, both concede the services of Calvinism in the liberation of art then. The plain citizen, the common man, was discovered, and came by his own, when personal "election" had been adopted as a creedal keystone. The "daily round" came to be deemed worthy, as well as capable, of the enhancement of idealization.

Calvin restored to the people the knowledge and use of the Psalter, which during the Middle Ages had lain in Latin dress, incomprehensible to the generality. It was his Genevan metrical Psalter that gave the lead to the Church of England in the metrical hymn direction, according to Hardwick. He memorialized the Geneva City Council to assist in the good work. He summoned Bourgeois to the task of setting the metrical renderings to music; and Bourgeois's tunes, we read in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, "in their original form, are masterpieces which have remained popular on the Continent from the first, and are the best that can be imagined for solemn congregational singing." Yet writers in both the religious and the æsthetic domain, and Evangelicals not least, through prejudice and culpable lack of knowledge, have persistently represented Calvin as insensible to song as well as to art in general.

Then the Dutch school, culminating in Rembrandt, took Painting by the hand and led her outside her previous cribbed and cabined groove. Art at that point, Lord Leighton says, "more and more seized upon every object, not of mere display, but of daily use, the steadfast and prevailing aim being 'that everything which had form and colour and was capable of

adornment should be ennobled by the touch of Art.'” At a later stage, from among the ranks of English Protestantism, there arose the great masters who gave the lead to the world in landscape painting. These were by descent and associations more closely linked with the stricter school than with any other. And the soil had been prepared for them by the poetry of Thomson of the “Seasons,” and, earlier still, though in less detail, by the verses of Milton and Marvel—utterances which had awakened appreciation and reverence for the beauty and grandeur of God’s ever open and accessible temple of nature. The names of Gainsborough, Constable, Crome, and Cotman will occur to the reader as the foremost among this galaxy of artists. And it is a simple fact that they in their turn inspired the French masters, Millet and his fellows, who founded the renowned “plein air” school of art.

Further, if poetry be the highest form of art, and if art’s “shareability” should be on the broadest plane that is consistent with propriety, the Evangelical Revival must not be denied its due meed of credit. It found our secular poets destitute of the lyrical note. “Whatever else the poets of Pope’s time could do they could not sing,” writes Mr. Beers, the historian of English Romanticism. And it revived that note. That epoch proved to English hymnody what the Augustan was to Latinity.

But the range of their potentialities in the realm of the fine arts has never been fully gauged by the Protestant peoples. Other fields of more pressing importance have commanded an unceasing outflow of their imaginative energies—the engineering, the mechanism, the institutionalism, so multifarious in their nature, which have made the modern world so different from what it was. Nor can the Romanist pretend not to understand this exigency; his own monks have relinquished the old art of manuscript illumination, finding that other concerns have a more urgent claim on their time and skill.

Even the Puritans are receiving a somewhat fairer treatment in the matter of possession of artistic sense and appreciation. The old sweeping assertions are not being made. Theirs was a

lot of stress, little conducive to sedulous cultivation of the lighter charms of life. But the finest music comes forth from the harp-strings when they are straining and taut. Spencer and Marvel, as well as Milton, sang; Coverdale, too, disclosed the rhythmic capacities of prose. The facts concerning Cromwell's services to music have been laid bare, as well as his valuable encouragement of painting (in which he was ably seconded by his chaplain, Stirry, a connoisseur in that branch), and his rescue for the nation of masterpieces which Charles had been inclined to sell. The memoirs also recounting the varied accomplishments of the regicide, Hutchinson, have been read afresh; and it is recalled how Wren trained himself for his craft during that Commonwealth period.

True, they were disposed to exclude the fine arts from the precincts of worship. They dreaded the "handmaid" becoming a Hagar. They dreaded worship-inspired art degenerating into mere art-inspired worship. So had the Moors of Spain, who yet created the Alhambra. The private chapel of Lenthall, Speaker of the Long Parliament, with its carved angels guarding the entrance, aptly typified the Puritan attitude to art. Representative Puritanism carried its hostility no further, as even the Rev. P. Dearmer recognizes, though the inferior spirits did revive the old mistake of preferring world-flight to world-conquest. For unmeasured repression of artistic feeling on the part of responsible religious leaders, we have to hark back to some of the more eminent of the medievalists, aye, to some of the most revered of the Fathers, against whom, somehow, no one ever remembers to take up this reproach.

\*            \*            \*            \*            \*

What have been the services of Tractarianism to art? It is high time that the question was asked. There is more than a dumb, tame acquiescence on the part of Evangelicals in the idea that the interests of art have been fostered and advanced in a peculiar and decisive degree under Ritualistic auspices. Indeed, Evangelicals themselves are constantly heard stating that the outstanding principle and characteristic of the movement has

been an over-emphasis and a too exuberant cultivation of the æsthetic sense, in connection with the externals of worship. It is taken for granted apparently that the art requisitioned is in its essence genuine and accurate, though to be sure misplaced, or at all events overvalued and obtrusive. And so the impression is formed that, while the system must be decried on doctrinal grounds, on this secondary plane its leading spirits have earned our gratitude and veneration for their trusty, enthusiastic, and almost consecrated zeal in the cause of art, God's next best gift to man. Nay, the simple-minded Evangelical, though consoled with the conviction that he possesses a clearer Gospel light, has been made to feel that there is something relatively gross and coarse about his mental make-up, that he lacks taste and a refined sensitiveness, as compared with his Ritualistic neighbour, lay or clerical. Is there warranty for any such conclusion ?

Take architecture. Tractarianism is imagined to have been the fairy godmother of the Gothic style. Yet (1) it is a fair presumption that that school never cultivated it on its own merits as a form of art, but simply on the score of its having been a medieval feature. It is instructive to recall, if Laud be considered to have had any affinity with them, that old St. Paul's in his day was the finest of English Gothic cathedrals, and yet that apostle of "the beauty of holiness," as he deemed it, collected a huge sum for the rebuilding of this ancient fane, and Inigo Jones was authorized to pull down the old work and to re-erect it in the Grecian style. The Laudian diarist, Evelyn, is also scathing in his scorn of Gothic. (2) Their exertions in this department are now widely recognized to have been one prolonged process of bungling. In the main they have but succeeded in caricaturing and, where restoration was intended, in spoiling the old Gothic. Canon Rawnsley's strictures in the new "Prayer-Book Dictionary" on the pseudo-Anglican connoisseurs of the past sixty years are worth reading. He quotes Mr. Thackeray Turner to the effect that they have "robbed the majority of our ancient churches of their true expression." Gilbert Scott in his day used to wax eloquent on the wholesale

mischievous mischief that was being wrought by "neo-medieval architects." "Has not the hand of a false and destructive restoration swept like a plague over the length and breadth of our land?" "Greater havoc has been made among sacred edifices in our own time—boasting as we do of a revived taste for their beauties—than they had experienced from three centuries of contemptuous neglect." Oddly enough, present-day authorities include himself as well among the delinquents (see the "Encyclopædia Britannica" and the Home University Library Manual). And (3) they took little pains to obviate the defects to which the genuine Gothic is liable. It is notorious how acoustic considerations have been overlooked in the modern lavish attempts at the style. The quality of solidity, also, has been unduly sacrificed. Churches (and other buildings) seem as though they were erected for the admiration of the passer-by rather than for the comfort and convenience of the users. Mr. Beresford Pite aptly remarks that whilst the wisdom of serpents has always planned theatres and music-halls in keeping with their primary requirements, under this movement the foolishness of doves has continued to plan churches upon other principles. In a true rendering of art utility would be combined with beauty, as it ever is in the primordial art of nature.

And take music. Sacerdotalism removed organ and choir from their former position in the west gallery in order that the "priest" might have his retinue of quasi-Levites in the aisle and chancel. How has this enhanced Church music in point of art? Let Sir Walter Parratt, the King's Organist, answer. Addressing the Bristol Church Congress, after being introduced by the President as the "Archbishop of Music," he deprecated the almost invariable arrangement of placing the choir in a narrow chancel, from which the sound emerges most imperfectly, in addition to the fact that the congregation, seeing in front a number of people paid more or less to do their work, makes small effort to participate. He declared emphatically in favour of the west end position for the organ, as did a Diocesan Committee under Bishop Gore, at Worcester, some little time

subsequently. Women's voices were silenced in the choirs with the same end in view, and yet who will pretend that vocal music, as an art, was furthered by the exclusion of a factor which is reckoned as indispensable in the oratorio? "The interpretation of vocal music is specially the province of woman," says the music historian Upton; "it is a realm where her sway will always be undisputed." Again, in respect of the wording of devotional compositions, Professor Shuttleworth attests that "Hymns Ancient and Modern" "set the fashion of a type of hymn in which it is impossible for a thoughtful man to join with reality and intelligence"; and Dr. Walker, in his "History of English Church Music," passing under review the music which dominated the period subsequent to 1861, when that collection appeared, characterizes it as redolent of sentimentalism, as revelling in cheap, sugary harmony, as lacking the bracing sternness which lies at the root of the supreme music of the world; and he judges the period to be one on which future historians of our religious music "will look back with the reverse of pride."

Evangelicals may be assured that the Word which God inspired and the artistic talents He bestows will not prove to be habitually divergent. There are other minor departments of art, wherein the above result equally discloses itself. The Grinling Gibbons wood-carving was contemptuously cast out of Winchester College Chapel and other churches while the pseudo-Catholic tide was at full swell. Cardinal Logue lately consecrated an oratory in Co. Louth, which is adorned, as the Romanist papers gleefully told, with some of these discarded treasures. And in the *Nineteenth Century* of June last there was sad but instructive reading as to the extent to which old Church plate has been flung out to make way for new imitations of medieval vessels.

More than once Ruskin insisted that love of newness, novelty, was a prime indication of bad taste. Nor can a party which looked with favour on the Ober-Ammergau Passion Play very cogently claim the palm for delicate sensibility. Neither can

they point to an increased appreciation for good art among the populace, as an outcome of their revival; it is emphatically the other way in the judgment of one of themselves, the art critic, Mrs. Russell Barrington.

A word more. Ritualistic art-fashions have their tides and ebbs, and it is a pitiful and undignified thing that Evangelicalism should seem so prone to get sucked into their backwash. The new "Encyclopædia Britannica" justifiably regrets that the Liverpool committee should have clung to the "played-out bias" for Gothic, and did not take the opportunity to evolve a Protestant type of cathedral, with central area and dome. The Oriental dome, in the view of Tyrwhitt, was matchless as an expression of sublimity and soaring aspiration. Again, in many quarters people now are finding themselves more secure from musical vagaries in the High Church than in the supposed Evangelical congregations. And the sequaciousness may be observed in a variety of the more subsidiary accessories. One of these, by way of exemplification, may be accorded the briefest closing notice—the Continental soutane, commonly called the cassock. Once it might have seemed a veritable bathos so to refer to it; but surely not now, when its absence from the attire of an officiating clergyman is more resented by many "Evangelicals" than the absence of the Atonement message from his sermons. We would simply raise the point whether its adoption is in harmony with true artistic principle. Lord Leighton and other authorities like him have effusively admired the long flowing vesture of classic days, and surely the undocked surplice approaches it more closely than the newer garb. It is a canon of Art that she should suggest the boundless, or at least not obtrude a boundary. Landscapes are never painted as enclosures; a slanting and not an even cut is given to the flower-stalk. Edgings have been discarded in latter-day wall decoration in obedience to the same instinct. It is possible to secure the "neat" at the sacrifice of the artistic.

## Voices from the Past : John Hackett.

BY THE REV. G. S. STREATFEILD, M.A.,  
*Rector of Goddington, Bicester.*

I HAVE a volume of seventeenth-century sermons of the Restoration period, which came into my possession nearly thirty years ago. I was in the habit of paying a visit from time to time to an "Old Curiosity Shop" in a provincial town. On one such occasion the proprietor produced a bulky volume with the remark that it was just the book for me: "There's black letter!" he exclaimed, as he opened the book and proudly pointed to the coarse, thick type so commonly used in those days. I did not correct him, and on turning over the pages agreed with him that it was "the book for me," and it became mine for the modest sum of five shillings. I do not suppose it would really have been worth that in the open market, but for the fact that in the middle of the volume, bound up with twenty sermons, is a clean and perfect copy of the first Report issued by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Nevertheless, a large proportion of the sermons were by men of renown in their day, and some of the sermons themselves enjoyed a more than ephemeral reputation.

They represent, it need scarcely be said, a period when one of our "twenty minutes" performances would have been thought an insult to the intelligence of the ordinary worshipper, and anyone who sits down to read the volume now before me must make up his mind to face from twenty-five to forty pages of closely printed matter, in some cases running to thirteen or fourteen thousand words. Further, the unrelieved dulness of some of these productions makes the reading of them hard work; yet they are well worth reading for their solid reasoning and their unmistakable earnestness. The chief interest, however, of the sermons is to be found in the light that they throw on contemporary history, and the help they afford us in realizing

what was then being said and done in the religious world; and it may not be altogether waste of time to examine some of these twenty discourses, with the view of illustrating from them particular aspects of the condition of religious and ecclesiastical thought in our country at the time of their production.

Often have I wondered who it was that collected these sermons and had them bound in strong calf binding, which is good and sound to-day. I incline to the belief that the volume started on its career in the library of some parish priest of moderate, but decided, Church views, with a strongly anti-Roman bias, and with a devout longing, on the one hand, for the return of non-conformists to the bosom of the Church, and, on the other hand, for the spread of the Gospel beyond seas. Further, I find indications of a mind in sympathy with much that had come, and was coming, from the pen of Cambridge Platonists, a mind that would have felt at home with Bishop Jeremy Taylor and Archbishop Usher.

The subjects treated in the sermons are those of permanent import and undying interest. Here, for example, in this volume are sermons bearing upon the subject of conformity and reunion preached in 1661, 1664, 1668, 1683, and 1692, the last of these seeing the light three years after the triumph of Christian charity in the Toleration Act of 1689.<sup>1</sup> It was a time, as we well know, when non-conformity was fighting for its very existence, and it can be no anachronism for us at the present day to listen for a few moments to what some of the best-known Churchmen of the day were saying on the subject of union and reunion. Their utterances are characterized by such vigour and lucidity that, from whatever point of view they write, it affords me satisfaction to rescue some small fragments of their work from utter oblivion.

Here is a sermon preached by John Hacket, D.D., Chaplain-in-Ordinary to His Majesty, before the King's Majesty at

<sup>1</sup> This, of course, must be said with considerable reservation. The civil disabilities of Dissenters were not removed by the Act, whilst Romanists and Unitarians were expressly excluded from its operation.

Whitehall on Friday, March 22, 1661; published by His Majesty's appointment.

Few clergymen of the Restoration period were better known, none more respected, than John Hacket. Already a man full of years (he was born in 1592), he was soon to be full of honours. As far back as the later years of James I. he had exercised considerable influence in the ecclesiastical world. In 1623 he was elected Proctor in Convocation and made Chaplain to the King, with whom he was a great favourite. In 1624 he was presented to the important living of St. Andrew's, Holborn, and in the very same year to Cheam, in Surrey, "the one for wealth, the other for health." He preached to crowded congregations, and was an active parish priest. He used his influence in the cause of moderation when Laud was pursuing his policy of intolerance towards the puritanically inclined section of the clergy, and in the struggle which took place between Church and Parliament he took a discreet and dignified part. On the triumph of Parliament he was deprived of the well-endowed living of St. Andrew's, Holborn, but was permitted to retain the benefice of Cheam. There, not without personal risk, he continued his ministry throughout the period of the rebellion and Protectorate. On one occasion a Roundhead entered the Church and, presenting a pistol at the Rector, ordered him to stop. Hacket refused to discontinue the service, saying that he would do as befitted a divine, and that the other might do what became a soldier. It is recorded of him that he committed the Burial Service to memory in order that he might use it without giving offence to the Puritans.

On the return to England of Charles II. in 1660, Hacket forthwith took a prominent place in the Church, and was made Chaplain to the King.<sup>1</sup> He was at once offered the Bishopric of

<sup>1</sup> Dr. T. Plume, in his "Life of Bishop Hacket," records the fact that the Bishop had preached eighty times before the three Kings—James I., Charles I., and Charles II. "A Century of Sermons," by Bishop Hacket, edited by his biographer, T. Plume, was published in 1675. Samuel Taylor Coleridge read these sermons, and has left us his impressions of them in his "Remains," vol. iii., p. 175. They are, to his mind, "a conspicuous example

Gloucester, but declined it. In the following year, however, he accepted the See of Lichfield and Coventry. In spite of his sixty-nine years he displayed in his episcopal labours the activity and enthusiasm of youth. He found the cathedral in ruins. Giving lavishly of his own substance, he raised no less than £20,000 for its restoration, and had the satisfaction of seeing the work completed the year before his own death, which took place in 1670.

John Hacket was a man of strong character and undaunted resolution, as was shown in his dealings with Thomas Wood, his own Dean, and his successor in the see.<sup>1</sup> The Dean openly opposed the Bishop in his efforts to restore the ruined cathedral. The Bishop retaliated by publicly excommunicating the Dean. It was a bold step to take, but the good Bishop's reputation did not suffer by it; and as Thomas Wood, many years afterwards, was suspended from his episcopal office for simony, our sympathies may fairly go with the courageous Bishop, who excommunicated him in 1667. "Perhaps the secret of Hacket's wonderful energy to the very last may be found in his favourite motto: 'Serve God and be cheerful.'" <sup>2</sup>

When the Act of Uniformity came into force the Bishop used all his influence to persuade ministers threatened with ejection to conform. It may be that his sense of humour seconded his efforts in this direction. To one, Christopher Comyns, he remarked: "I hear you have often said that hell is paved with bishops' skulls; I desire you to tread lightly on mine when you come there!" <sup>3</sup>

---

of weaving the most childish interpretations and fancies of the Fathers into his public utterances." He "could trick himself up in fantastic rags and lappets of Popish monkery; could skewer frippery patches, cribbed from the tiring room of Romish Parthenolatry on the sober gown and cassock of a Reformed and Scriptural Church." But Coleridge is conspicuously unfair in his criticism. A critic is self-condemned when he takes up a volume of seventeenth-century sermons and expects to find in it specimens of nineteenth-century preaching.

<sup>1</sup> For the scandal connected with the elevation of Dean Wood to the Episcopal Bench, and for the part that the infamous Lady Castlemaine, mistress to Charles II., played in this piece of preferment, see John Houghton's "Church of the Restoration," p. 500.

<sup>2</sup> Overton, "Life in the English Church 1660-1714," p. 29.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. T. Plume's "Life of Bishop Hacket."

The sermon from which I propose to give a few extracts was preached, as we learn from its close, in deference to the direction of the first Nicene Council that a Synod should be held in the season of Lent, with the aim of composing differences and preparing the Church for her Easter festival. In some of his first words the preacher shows how deeply he was impressed and affected by difficulties arising from disunion. "If," he says, "Babel itself could not be built up among a *discord of tongues*, how much more can Sion never be well built up with *discord of hearts*. If the nets be broken, the fishers of men may catch a draught, but they can keep nothing."

The sermon embodies a defence of episcopacy, but on the whole is a model of caution; nor would it have been easy, on the ground of this utterance, for either the stiff Anglican or the party of compromise to have brought any charge against the preacher. His text on the occasion was Acts xv. 39: "The contention was so sharp between them that they departed asunder one from another." The first paragraph of the sermon is a key to the whole. "The contents of this chapter are famous for two things that had most contrary events. The one how a great variance was concluded with a happy concord; the other how a small variance did proceed to an unhappy discord." The great variance was that which arose between Paulinism and Judaism, which was settled by compromise; the small variance between Paul and Barnabas, small because "they fell not out for anything that touched the life of truth, or the honour of Christ," ended in separation—"they departed asunder one from another."

Let the Church take warning from the story of these two good men. "The walk of men is contention (1 Cor. iii. 3): the way of God is peace. We are sure He is in the still Voice; we are sure He is not in the whirlwinds of controversies and uproars." The preacher warns his hearers that "God will depart from that Church where the flames of notorious discords are broken out." From the general tenor of the sermon we may infer that Hacket, while not averse to concession on the part of the Church, was fully persuaded that submission was both the

wisdom and duty of the non-conformist ; and he must have had the non-conformist body chiefly in his mind when he wrote : " First bring a supple, a soft, a tractable mind that hath a good affection to agreement, and I will undertake to furnish you with rules enough that, if you differ in no greater things than Paul and Barnabas did (yea, what if they were greater ?), you may soon greet one another with the kiss of peace. But if we stand at this distance, ' I have pitched on my resolution, I must have my will, and will not yield an inch,' such an untractable obstinacy, can never profit by any exhortation. ' Only by pride cometh contention,' says Solomon." Unfortunately, the supple, soft, tractable mind that he postulates was not to be found on either side.

The law, he maintains, must take its course. " There is no exception to be made against the sentence of the law under which we live. It is an indifferent judge ordained to try our causes before we were born. It hath no passions, no kindred, no corruption to transport it." It must be confessed that the next few years, with their harsh and cruel policy towards non-conformity, were destined to give the best possible ground for challenging such a statement. " Why," continues the preacher, " should men take exception to the canons of the Church and the form of prayer provided by authority?" He points to the early Christians dragged to heathen rites and festivals—nay, to flat idolatry. " How glad would they have been to have nothing laid upon them but canons for ceremonies and forms of prayer. Now they are wanton. And, being no longer scared with the howling of the wolf, they are offended at the whistle of the shepherd." There is something, we must admit, irresistibly comic in the picture presented to us of uncompromising disciples of Archbishop Laud sitting on the Episcopal Bench and whistling back the sheep that had strayed from the Anglican fold into the wilderness of non-conformity. And when we call to mind the harsh and overbearing attitude of the Church at the Savoy Conference, which was to meet only three days after the preaching of this sermon, we are certainly reminded rather of the howling of the wolf than of the whistle of the shepherd. The King, who

would himself have welcomed a policy of toleration, and even of compromise, was helpless in the hands of a nation almost mad with the spirit of reaction; and though moderate men on both sides might still indulge the hope of reunion, it required no gift of prophecy to see that the Presbyterians, who had done so much to place the King upon his throne, would have to complain of cruel neglect and broken faith.

The Bishop, Hacket maintains, is the appointed arbiter. "What think you of arbitration? When many take the thing in hand, commonly, it is so long a-doing that it is never done. Make the appeal, then, to few. Nay, why not *to one Person*? I am so directed by the Apostle, 1 Cor. vi. 5: 'Is there not a wise man among you that shall be able to judge between his brethren?' . . . Unless you give some prerogation of power to *one Bishop in a diocese* to examine external order and maintain sound doctrine, you will have so many fashions as there are men, and so many Faiths as there are parishes."

Once more the preacher points to Paul and Barnabas. Theirs was a quarrel within the very bosom of the fold, and between leaders of Christ's Church. "This was a jar at home, amongst themselves; a civil war. I tremble to speak the word, though in a bare metaphor"—and we can almost see the deprecatory and effusively loyal glance that the preacher, as he spoke the words, threw at his royal hearer. "This is not an opposition between Ishmael and Isaac of two venters, but between Jacob and Esau in one womb—nay, between the pilot and the master in one ship. God help us if the right hand fight against the left, when both are made to defend the body! When the rams of the flock contend, the poor sheep that look on must stand amazed." Thus the future Bishop of Lichfield deploras the divisions and misunderstandings that prevailed within the Church itself; and we must remember that he was speaking before the passing of the Act of Uniformity, which, at whatever cost, did introduce some measure of external order and agreement within the Church.

Yet, after all, whatever the mistake, whether of Paul or

Barnabas, there was more of infirmity than sin in it, since they both believed that they were acting for the glory of God. "Cloth of the same making hath not always the same dye. Here's one wool and one cloth, but dipped in two colours"—but the thought is not followed up, as it might have been, in the cause of charity and comprehension.

The preacher's thoughts, however, are not confined to the problem of reunion in his own land. He widens his outlook and contemplates the Reformation movement as a whole. And in so doing he emphasizes two causes of contention between those who have abjured the dominion of Rome, which outweigh all others. "There two wounds deeper than others, which cannot be concealed, that stink and are corrupt through our foolishness." One of these wounds is "through the unrelenting ubiquitaries among the rigid Lutherans never ceasing to cry out, and yet never proving, that, with the substance of bread remaining, Christ's fleshly body is in the Sacrament of His Supper." The other wound is the fiercely debated question of the externals of worship. "These are the two quarrels at which the Papists clap their hands to see us brawl among ourselves." Then he turns upon the Papists. "Do they insult upon us for it? What, they? whose janglings are ten for one of ours, and twice ten times greater, as a millstone is bigger than a pebble!"<sup>1</sup>

What is most worthy of note in the foregoing observations is surely this—namely, that, in the judgment of a zealous episcopalian like Hacket, not the lack of episcopal government and orders, but the doctrine of consubstantiation, was the chief bone of contention between Anglican and Lutheran; and we may conclude from this pronouncement that John Hacket, had

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Plume, in his "Life of Bishop Hacket," tells us that the Bishop "was extremely afflicted for the horrible division of Christians through the jugglings of the Papacy." Further, "he believed that Papists ever bear bloody minds towards us, and want nothing but power and opportunity to make as many bonfires in England as they had done formerly." Five years before this sermon was preached before King Charles the massacre of Piedmontese Protestants took place; in 1685 the Edict of Nantes was revoked.

he retired to the Continent during the Great Rebellion, would have had no more compunction than Bishop Cosin in communicating with members of the Reformed Church in Germany, France, or Holland.

Once more, towards the end of his discourse, the preacher emphasizes the triviality of the cause that separated Paul and Barnabas, and it is implied, though not actually stated, that they might have found a way out of the *impasse* by mutual concession. "Sacrifice small, indifferent things to the fruition of peace. To hold fast our conclusions in *petty matters*, with all the strength of our will and wit, is not constancy, but a worse thing." Without venturing to judge between Paul and Barnabas, Hacket observes that the ancient Church acted in the spirit of Paul, "for if a clergyman shrunk in the wetting, as we say, either he was thrust down to a laical communion, or chastened with a penance of many years." In the Middle Ages and the latter times, he further remarks, the Church has followed in the steps of Barnabas, and acted with undue remissness.

"'They departed asunder one from another.' This is the last point and the saddest word of the text." And yet Satan defeated his own end when he stirred up this strife, for Paul and Barnabas went in different directions scattering the seed of the Kingdom.

The sermon closes with a further vindication of episcopacy as against congregationalism. Barnabas and Paul "performed what they intended, *to visit their brethren in every city where they had preached the word of God*. All governments, in all ages, have approved this to be the best way to conserve unity. Not that every city, much less every conventicle, should be entire within itself and acknowledge no authority over it. As if every parish should be like a several island divided from the continent. . . . It is impossible to avoid a multitude of corruptions in Faith, and not to contract a prodigious licentiousness in discipline, when the part, *against nature*, shall not depend on the whole. . . . Then the whole Church shall be nothing else but a great schism, and yet no man shall be convinced to be a

schismatic." As for Paul and Barnabas, "though they *were two* upon a small disgust, yet they remembered there was but *one Shepherd and one sheepfold*, whose peace they studied to preserve by their pastoral vigilancy." So here we have Dr. Hacket wielding the favourite weapon of Rome, substituting the false reading *ovile*, sheepfold, for *grex*, flock.<sup>1</sup> The lesson contained in the true reading of John x. 16 has not yet been fully learned by the Anglican Church. Had the genuine text come down untampered with from Apostolic times, and the true meaning of Christ's words been fully grasped, how much of the unhappy strife of the last 350 years might have been averted! Thus the sermon we have been examining closes with a false note, a note of intolerance and exclusion. In this the preacher only reproduced the knowledge and the spirit of his own day; and, taken as a whole, the sermon, considering the time at which it was preached, is a moderate expression of Anglican conviction, and as sensible, we may add, as it is moderate.

The discourse was "publish't by His Majesty's Appointment." Whether His Majesty listened attentively to every paragraph of this formidable production of eight-and-thirty pages is open to reasonable doubt; but John Hacket was already in the King's good graces, since he held the post of "Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty." The Chaplain was soon to be a Bishop, and we may be allowed to surmise that this very sermon may have proved a step to his promotion. Against that promotion nothing can be said, for he proved a most active and resourceful administrator of the Diocese of Lichfield and Coventry.

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Westcott remarks: "The translation 'fold' for 'flock,' 'ovile' for 'grex,' has been most disastrous in idea and in influence" (*comment., in loc.*). Wycliffe, following the Vulgate, made "one fold" familiar in English, and the false reading remained uncorrected until the revision of 1881.



## The Situation in China.

BY THE VEN. A. E. MOULE, D.D.,

*Rector of Burwarton-cum-Cleobury North; Missionary to the Chinese since 1861.*

“IT is, of course, impossible to dogmatize without sufficient evidence.” So wrote our leading journal the other day, and thereby the writer seemed to do the very impossible thing which he condemns, for he appears dogmatically to assert what dogmatic persons can do or cannot do. If he had said what, presumably, he implies, that it is illegitimate so to dogmatize, that would be more to the purpose. For it is an age of dogmatism, and there has been so much of dogmatic assurance and vaticination on the subject of the present article, that people’s minds are much exercised by the almost complete falsification of these assurances. The extreme difficulty of realizing for oneself, and of assisting others to realize, the realities of the situation in China, arises in great measure, perhaps, from the very situation of the great land; and the reverberations of the thunderstorm now breaking and raging over China, always subdued by distance, are now rendered almost inaudible by the gusts and claps and glare of the storm of present danger and distress hanging and roaring over England itself.

Yet we *must* listen and must watch the barometer of China’s situation, dropping in one short year, as some seem to think, from set-fair, and their hope of a Christian revolution, to the stormy depths of reaction, and the alternatives of anarchy, or civil war, or relentless autocracy, or a constitutional monarchy, with a constitution well-ordered, and not illusive, and incomplete. For China, no less than England, belongs to our Lord’s kingdom. “China for Christ” is not a mere enthusiastic early missionary rallying cry; it is the sober, certain, eager hope and resolve of the Church, aye, and of God Almighty Himself, and we may humbly ask, Why tarry the wheels of His chariot? Or

thus, "Watchman, what of the night?" Possibly the present writer may be of some service in discussing the present situation, from the fact that he has seen China face to face enter into a storm of revolution, rebellion, and direst confusion, and emerge from it, fifty years ago and more, at the time of the not dissimilar Tai-ping Rebellion; he witnessed also, in person, the progress of reform and the assertions of China's rights up to the outbreak of the recent revolution; and such an experience ought to be of ratiocinative service in grasping the present and imminent developments.

Just now, while I am writing, news comes in alarming fits and starts: "The mysterious White Wolf is marching on Si-ngan-fu, and the Government garrison there is of doubtful loyalty, and even the troops sent to reinforce the garrison, with pay long overdue, are reported as mutinous," and later "the White Wolf" brigands have been defeated by the Government troops. Meanwhile, in Nanking, half-way down the vast 1,800 miles sweep of China, north to south, and the chief military centre in the great Yang-tse Valley, and in Peking itself, the centre of all government, a reign of terror exists, and the heads of political suspects are falling fast.

So in 1860, before this same city, Nanking, the scene afterwards of Gordon's exploits, 70,000 Imperialist soldiers, paralyzed by the dashing sortie of the beleaguered Tai-pings, laid down their arms and joined the rebel leader. It is no new symptom; and it is now, apparently, in China, a race of money—who can best bribe or buy the army's loyalty by outbidding the others. But a far worse symptom is the apparent fear that things have reached that desperate stage, where relentless cruelty, on either side, is deemed the best policy of success, a lamentable reversal of that proud boast two years ago, that the Republic was established by the most bloodless revolution ever known. The White Wolf harries the helpless and unresisting people, and not the Government army alone. The Government, if it exists still, cuts down suspects, and doubtless some innocent suspects, as fiercely as open enemies; and to strike terror is, they suppose,

the surest way to produce loyalty and patriotism. For so far as we can discern, that patriotism—the existence of which we used to doubt in China, and the uprising of which was one of the most striking phenomena three years ago—is for the present extinct or dumb in terrified retirement. The White Wolf is not, surely, a patriot, or is he, after all, carrying in his retinue refugee patriots of the rebellion? And Yuan Shih-kai may be a patriot in the highest sense, if thus alone he can save his country from anarchy. But it is not our idea or ideal of patriotism so to act. Whence has come this change?

We have not yet, however, fully described the situation in China. A message from Yuan Shih-kai to the provincial governors and officials generally, urging them as an act of true patriotism to remit to Peking the required taxes and revenue, lest China, paralyzed in her own administration and unable to keep her promises to the Western Powers and Japan, should follow the melancholy lead, with dismemberment, subjection, and alienation, of Egypt and Corea, throws perhaps a most lurid light on what China herself dreads for herself should this state of anarchy and unrest continue. It reminds the writer of another vivid parallel between China in 1914 and China in 1861. The same prospect of collapse and dismemberment, not so much a calamity, as the very possible and desirable solution of a hopeless situation, faced China and European nations then. I remember calling on board a British gunboat in the river at Ning-po, as the Tai-ping rebels were advancing on the city for their last victorious campaign, but with their power, as well as the Imperial power and dynasty, both tottering for a final fall. The officers showed me a map with the tripartite division of China provisionally traced—between Russia in the north, Great Britain in Central China, and France in the south.

In those early days America did not count, locked as she was in her internecine death-struggle; Germany's colonial and foreign far-stretched-out mailed fist was not yet in evidence; Japan was dormant as to aggression, but fiercely anti-foreign, and biding her time; and China, if she was to be broken up, was at the mercy

and disposal practically of the three then dominant nations—England, Russia, and France. Her hope now of integrity still emerging from conflict and anarchy, lies probably in this very fact, that the “powers” are so many, and will so jealously watch each other’s actions, and Japan and England are so avowedly united in this very resolve to maintain the integrity of China, that “young China’s” hysterical dream of Westernizing everything in China will not be realized by the West annexing the great land. But the very suggested fear of Yuan Shih-kai is ominous in its possibilities. It is almost inconceivable, save for those who have long known China’s incomprehensible vitality amidst apparently deadly collapse, to notice the change in the situation during so short a period as six or seven years. Reform of practical utility and of sane soundness had begun in China under the Manchu Dynasty, quickened into action by the spectacle of Japan’s astonishing victories and masterful achievements, and almost compelled into action by the gathering voice of public opinion, and the people’s demands enforced more or less articulately by their provincial and district assemblies. A change was effected where we never looked to see it—in the army. There, where ten or twenty years ago 80 per cent. of the soldiers were reported to be bad opium-smokers, the vice was checked and fast being eradicated; the officers and mandarins if they would not break off the habit resigned their commissions and seals of office. The policing of the streets and of the once robber-swept high roads through hill and plain, was effective; and the soldiers, well-clothed and well-disciplined, were becoming the pride and the confidence instead of being the curse and the dread of the country-side. This has, we fear, largely disappeared with the general anarchy. In some places the regiments are still under control, and in one city especially a strong and growing work of Divine grace is going on in the garrison, and many have become Christians. But elsewhere the soldiers, underpaid and ill-commanded, either mutiny or are disbanded; and having no means of subsistence join the bands of marauders, or White Wolf, or others; and security and

peace and hope seem banished from the land. This alarming feature in the situation, and one greatly affecting not only the safety but the very possibilities of work for our Missions, may soon pass. We noticed the same in China after the defeat of the Tai-pings at Ning-po, and after their final overthrow by Gordon and Li Hung-chang. Hundreds of foreign freebooters and the riff-raff of all nationalities who had been hired by Tai-ping or Imperial rule as mercenaries, were paid off and disbanded, and ranged the country for months, levying blackmail, presenting revolvers at the head of missionary evangelistic boats, and demanding money; and three thousand trained troops—Hunan braves—sent down from Shanghai to embark at Ning-po for Foochow, to meet the Tai-pings who were supposed to be entering that province, maintained a week of terror in Ning-po, firing shotted guns by mistake or of malice prepense, which rattled their farewell salute on the missionary's home, who had tried to get into touch with them; and, finally mutinying on board ship, had to be battered down during the whole voyage. The aftermath of China's wars and rebellions is worse than the clash and fury of actual fighting. The alarming symptom now is that it seems so widespread and getting so beyond control.

A further comparison between the two rebellions of 1850-1864 and of 1912-1913, if it does not weary our readers, may not only be interesting, but it may perhaps throw some light on the causes of the grave situation in China which we are considering. The Tai-ping struggle, which lasted thirteen years, and cost twenty million lives, and devastated thirteen out of the eighteen provinces in China, was in a sense unpremeditated, unless by the preternatural visions which in the delirium of long illness Hung Seu-tsuen avowed that he had seen. But the revolt against the Manchus sixty years ago was more justified, perhaps, because of gross misgovernment and rampant corruption than the recent outbreaks, whilst the Government, weakened by disastrous foreign wars, and by the distractions of local administration, was unable to withstand the gathering fury of the

insurrectionists. The leader, a half-Christian, had Christians of conspicuous ability round him, and though the actual fighting was not the Tai-ping's initiation, and was begun by a small body of men unjustly suspected and attacked, standing on their defence, yet it assumed the character, in the eyes of China and of Europe, of a Christian revolution and rebellion against the powers that be. It was almost hailed as such by fervid authorities in missionary debates and meetings at home, even as the present revolution has been thus heralded and acclaimed by uninstructed enthusiasts of the present day. Does the explanation of the final failure and the complete extinction of the first, and the apparent debacle and sweeping of the boards in China now—though we may be premature, I admit, in assuming such an end—does the solution of the difficulty and moral of the spectacle lie here, that the avowed Christian participation in either one was unchristian, and that Nemesis follows the attempt or assumption to introduce or establish or recommend Christianity by the sword?

Something like a wail and shudder of agony moves one's heart when we look back one short year and recall the electric flash of sympathy which sent Christendom to its knees in prayer for China, when she heard that the Chinese acting-Governor had summoned the Christians in China to fall to prayer for their country and its rulers in a crisis of extreme gravity. Was that a diplomatic or a genuine acknowledgment of the truth and power of the Christian faith; a recognition that China at length renounces all intolerance and all disabilities, and bows with her Christian sons before a God worth praying to? At any rate, the prayers of Christendom were genuine; and is this disastrous situation God's answer? Possibly yes, but only in preparation for a universal and supreme blessing after the Nemesis has done its work. Not by such means of secret plotting and sedition and conspiracy abroad and nearer home, abetted and instigated too often, it is to be feared, by foreign teachers and patrons; not by sudden and cowardly attack, and without even declaration of war, and this even when the Manchu Dynasty was yielding

point after point of necessary reform, and putting into effect scheme after scheme of drastic change, and listening, however tardily, to the people's supposed voice—not so does God's kingdom come : and the coming of that kingdom alone can bring peace on earth. I am dealing here, it will be noticed, chiefly with the idea which has possessed the minds of many true lovers of China and of God's work there, that the recent revolution was almost a Christian revolution. For it may be rejoined very plausibly that the supposed Nemesis should fall by the assumption solely on the Christian agents in the revolution ; or that Christian self-denying ordinances as to taking part in dynastic revolution and rebellion cannot control the ethics of the rest of mankind. But our contention is that the revolutionary party in China's present struggle was not guided by Christian ethics at all. They were not standing on their defence against armed attacks on their liberties and guaranteed rights. They were not as with some of the actors of another threatened tragedy, loyal and law-abiding subjects of the King and realm, thrust with violence away from that well-trying rule, and introduced to another and quite opposite control. If there had been provocation and high-handed tyranny in China's past, that had all been changed or was changing, and patriotism—unless it was the dislike of an alien rule which yet had lasted, and without grave harm to the Empire, for 300 years—true patriotism, was not much in evidence. Perhaps also a less abstruse account of the present apparent failure may be found in the policy so hastily and in so headlong a way adopted of Westernizing everything ; and this with no assured consensus of popular opinion and persuasion behind them, the only assurance being that of China's young men in their own wisdom. In some reforms—as, *e.g.*, in the great and almost supernatural opium reform, which will, we trust, survive and maintain its great and victorious strength all through China's present convulsions—nothing but the consciousness and assurance of such a consensus of the public and private conscience of China would have justified the attempt, and, through God's gracious power, have made the attempt successful. Perhaps

here will be found one great answer to the concert of prayer for China. But in other changes we hear that the people with great rejoicing went back at the permission or direction of Peking to their immemorial New Year's date and ancient observances, and the "new style" is set aside gladly for the time. There are strange symptoms observable in this perplexing land, however, which give the hope that a shock has been given to real and harmful ignorance and folly and superstition in education and in religion. The very fact that the Chinaman's natural histrionic art is seen now in reproducing to the merriment of an intelligent audience the scenery of an old-world village school (though here perhaps our young friends know too little with their Western ideas of what that old system has done for their ancestors), and a Buddhist priest at his begging and perfunctory devotions, and acting the very gods themselves, "they must needs be borne, because they cannot go," it is impossible to believe that reaction in China can ever bring back, with power or persuasion, the follies or untruths of false religion and superstition.

Yet with one more backward glance before I pass to the situation of missions in China, we cannot forget when attempting to moralize, and philosophize, and dogmatize on China's present state and prospects, that a similar awakening and passion for Western things, a similar scheme of reform, a similar and even greater overthrow of idolatry, has swept over China, and has passed by with the strange spectacle of her uprising as in a dream again, with the old methods scarce touched by the reform, and the old idolatry revarnished, however much discredited. We have heard the ridicule, yet steeped evidently in distress and regret poured upon the idols after the iconoclastic Tai-pings had swept by—"How could they save us, when they could not keep their own heads on their own shoulders?" And then they set themselves to the task, after two or three years of stolid despair, to rebuild their shattered temples and regild their decapitated idols. The idols in numbers of temples have now, by the revolution, been utterly "abolished," not from conviction

of faith in the true God so much as from room demanded for the Westernized schoolmasters in their spacious and otherwise useless buildings. Will these dethroned and outcast idols be restored again to their pedestals and worship if the old order is seriously re-established? This is possible, but hardly likely, for these successive revolutions of thought in China, though they may seem abortive and futile, yet one by one surely disintegrate more and more the foundations of superstition and ignorance in the land. I remember just twenty-one years ago listening to a speaker in Shanghai, at one of the early meetings of the Society for the diffusion of Christian and general Western literature in China, descanting on the effect of the enlightenment and principles of reform which were permeating the views of thoughtful Chinese. The process, he said, is slow, almost imperceptible at times; but thus it is that the mountains and hills of pride and prejudice must be brought low, and every valley of ignorance and degradation exalted, so will come the new era for China and the world. "*Finish the quotation!*" I inwardly exclaimed; but he stopped short, and left us wholly dissatisfied. Reform, enlightenment, instruction, education, science, art, social elevation, all will fail unless "the glory of the Lord be revealed," and unless they are all illumined and fired and inspired by the knowledge of the glory of the Lord in the face of Jesus Christ.

*(To be concluded.)*



## Sunday-School Reform.

BY THE REV. CANON MORLEY STEVENSON, M.A.,

*Principal of Warrington Training College.*

IN July, 1780, Robert Raikes, a printer in the city of Gloucester, in conjunction with the Rev. Thomas Stock, opened a Sunday-school in the parish in which he lived. Individuals had made tentative efforts in the same direction before this, but it is from this date that we can trace the continuity of the Sunday-school in our country. An account of the school published in his paper in 1783 brought him many inquiries from all parts of the country. The movement spread very quickly. Wesley remarks in his Journal of July, 1784, that he finds these schools springing up wherever he goes. They were introduced into Wales by Thomas Charles, of Bala, in 1789, and spread into Scotland and Ireland.

In 1785 the Sunday-school Union was founded. The Committee consisted of Churchmen and Nonconformists. The children were gathered together without any reference to the religious body to which they belonged, and were taught the great truths of the Christian religion. The effort was intended to reach those who were growing up in complete ignorance, and were likely to form the criminal class of the future. The hours of instruction were from four to seven.

Notwithstanding opposition and difficulties, Sunday-schools spread rapidly, and at the beginning of the nineteenth century the Sunday-school had become a regular part of Church organization. Where there was no week-day school it supplied secular as well as religious instruction to the children.

It would be invidious to select any individual Sunday-schools for special comment, but there was one of so exceptional a character and of such an interesting history that some account may be given of it without any fear of awakening the jealousy of others. I mean the famous Jesus Lane Sunday-school at

Cambridge. The history of its foundation is thus given by its historian, the Rev. A. C. Jones :

“In 1827 a small party of undergraduates, chiefly members of Queen’s College, used to attend the Sunday and Thursday evening services at Trinity Church, and they often returned together to the rooms of one of their number to talk over Mr. Simeon’s sermon. . . . One bright Sunday morning in spring, Wright and five others were in a summer-house at the back of 7, Tennis Court Road, where Wright lodged, and he remarked, ‘It seems a pity that we do not spend some part of our time in Sunday-school teaching,’ and he put it to the others whether there was any parish in the town where teachers were required. One replied in the negative, adding that he had gone round to all the Churches, offering his services, but they had been declined. It was then remarked, ‘Barnwell is a sadly neglected place, and near enough, why not try to do something there?’ It was then determined that a school should be held in Cambridge, and the Barnwell children invited to attend. A meeting-house belonging to the Society of Friends in Jesus Lane was mentioned as a suitable place, if it could be obtained. One of the original teachers writes of the parish which the school was intended to benefit : ‘It was in a most neglected state ; there were no schools whatever, except, I believe, a very small one in connection with the Methodist chapel in Wellington Row.’ A number of zealous undergraduates, several of whom were more than usually advanced in life, occasionally heard of and visited cases of unheeded sickness and distress. The heathenish and dissolute state of the parish was thus forced upon their notice. The young men went out, two and two, to canvass Barnwell for scholars. The University was canvassed for teachers, and the school commenced with two hundred and thirty-two children ; the number of teachers soon increased to thirty-two, the majority being supplied by Queen’s College.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> “The English Church in the Nineteenth Century,” pp. 249, 250. By T. H. Overton.

From that day to this the school has been a power for good, and has maintained the reputation of being one of the best of Sunday-schools.

In 1843 the Church of England Sunday-School Institute was formed in consequence of the exclusion of the Church Catechism from the catalogue of the Union. The object of the Institute was to extend the Sunday-school system in connection with the Church of England and to improve the schools. The means employed have been the foundation of local associations, the publication of courses of lessons and other literature helpful to teachers, the organization of meetings for discussion, model lessons, the examination of teachers, the establishment of days of intercession, etc. In these and in other ways the work of the Institute has been invaluable to the Sunday-schools of the Church.

Coming to our own days, we find the Sunday-school system still in our midst and carrying on a much-needed and most helpful work. According to the latest available statistics there are now in Church of England Sunday-schools 220,290 teachers and 3,234,209 scholars.

Certain changes in our day-school system have enhanced the importance of the Sunday-school and rendered it more necessary to make it as efficient as possible. Until the year 1870 education was not compulsory, and every school was attached to some religious body, which determined the character of the religious instruction to be given in it. By the Act of 1870 education became compulsory for all, and where schools could not be provided by some religious body, they were to be built out of the rates. In such schools the religious instruction might be non-existent—though we thankfully acknowledge that this has been seldom the case—or it was to be religious instruction in which no formula distinctive of any particular denomination was taught. Such schools—council schools as we now call them—have steadily increased, and are bound to increase as time goes on. But the very neutrality of their attitude towards denominational religion prevents them, and rightly prevents

them, from seeking to attach the child to any particular religious body. Yet that by some means he should be so attached is most important, and thus comes in a special function of the Sunday-school, which is to take hold of the child on the Sunday and to say, "Come with us and we will do you good."

Again, no one can have lived through the last forty or fifty years without noticing the enormous advance which has been made in the day-schools. The buildings, equipment, staff, and methods have improved almost beyond recognition; but the Sunday-school has not been able to keep pace with the breathless rapidity with which the day-school has passed from one improvement to another, and the consequence is that children are beginning to draw unfavourable comparisons between the one and the other.

A crisis had arrived, and it was evident to those who could read the signs of the times that the Sunday-school must reform or close. It is at such times as those that one sees the manifestation of the power of the Holy Spirit in the Church of Christ. No one knew exactly how it happened, but there was a stir among the dry bones. Life and enthusiasm were in the air. The reform began. Churchmen and Nonconformists united together in a way which, alas! has seldom been the case in the past. On all sides courses of lectures, meetings for discussion, weeks of training were organized. New methods were introduced, new enthusiasm was kindled.

The Archbishop of Canterbury appointed a Committee to inquire into the Sunday-school system and the best methods of improving it. The Bishop of London's Council appointed a clergyman as Director of Sunday-Schools to devote his whole time to the work of strengthening and helping those schools. Let us consider some of the gains which have been won by this movement during the last five years.

The change which has passed over the educational methods of our day-schools is beginning to make itself felt in our Sunday-schools; and, indeed, this should be so, for educational method is one in principle, and the best method of

teaching one subject is *mutatis mutandis* the best method of teaching another.

Now, the radical change in our methods has been the substitution of experiment for memory.

A long time ago, when some of us were young, we learned our multiplication table by heart, with much sorrow and labour; the modern child builds up his bricks, plays with his beans, and constructs his own multiplication table. In our geography we learned the definitions of an island, a river, and so on; the modern child, with his clay and water, makes his island and his river. We learned our propositions in Euclid; the modern child measures and cuts his geometrical forms. The definition comes as a result achieved by thought. We do but put the scholar in the way of acquiring experience for himself.

In doing all this we carry with us the interest of the scholars, and we adapt the subject-matter to be learned to the changing needs of the children at the varying stages of their development. Until recently religious education as given in our Sunday-schools was not affected by this development in educational thought. Hundreds of teachers even now are trying to convey to the young child such spiritual truths as are really only suitable for the assimilation of the adult. Still, the change has begun.

“In the best Sunday-schools hymns and prayers are now carefully chosen and introduced to the scholars in such a way as to lead both to intelligent and responsive worship and to permanent appreciation and recall. The truths of religion are brought before the scholar’s mind by methods in line with that scholar’s fundamental interests. Our tiny children look at pictures and flowers and shells, and learn of the Fatherhood of God through their love for the bright and beautiful things which He has made. A little later the teacher’s vehicle for religious truth is found in the story drawn from the Bible or the mission field. As the child grows and develops, further foundations for faith are laid through vivid narrative and fascinating biography as the scholars become increasingly interested in the life of our Lord, in the heroes of the Christian Church in all ages, and in

God's witnesses in olden time. Meanwhile there is slowly growing up in the child a deepening interest in the development of his own character, an increasing consciousness of his own failings, and a gradual heightening of his ideals. All this has been stimulated by the stories and biographies presented to him, which have been wisely suffered to carry home their own moral, without any formal application. At this period, then, will follow instruction in the great truths and doctrines of Christianity, which can alone supply the spiritual needs of which the scholar is now conscious."<sup>1</sup>

Thus instruction is graded to suit the age of the scholar. We no longer try to teach the same subject-matter to the whole school, taken in its full strength by the older scholars and diluted for successive ages till it reaches the younger. We now suit the subject-matter to the age of the scholar. This simple but important reform is slowly but surely winning its way in our schools, and those who have adopted it testify to the excellent results obtained from it. The Sunday-School Institute, the National Society, the Bishop of London's Council, and others are issuing books suitable for graded schools, and it is to be hoped that ere long all our Sunday-schools will fall into line in this matter.

There are difficulties, of course, such as the lack of separate rooms and the necessity of conducting separate preparation classes for the teachers of the different grades, but difficulties are made to be overcome, and the importance of the reform is so great that we must not let difficulties interfere with its introduction.

Akin to this subject is the method of treating the infants' school. It is not too much to say that the publication of Miss Hetty Lee's "The Reformed Sunday-School" in 1907 marked an epoch in the movement. The kindergarten methods introduced into the Sunday-schools have transfigured them beyond recognition. It is true that the plan has been severely criticized. The use of drawing materials, sand-trays, etc., have seemed to

<sup>1</sup> Miss Hetty Lee.

some inconsistent with the ideas of a Sunday-school. It has been said that nature-study was taking the place of the Bible, and so on. But even if the details require careful watching, the principles are sound, and we may look hopefully for good results, and feel confident that the infants will develop an affection for the Sunday-school of the future which they rarely felt for the Sunday-school of the past.

Very early in the movement attention was rightly turned to the training and helping of teachers. Courses of lectures have stimulated, encouraged, instructed, and helped Sunday-school teachers in the many centres in which they have been given. Of even greater value have been the training weeks for teachers. Within my own knowledge eighteen of these were held in 1912, and there may have been others of which I have not heard. The testimony of the teachers who have attended them is unanimous as to the gain, intellectual, educational, and spiritual, which they have received.

It has been abundantly proved that Sunday-school teachers are ready to take every advantage of the helps that are placed in their way.

The foundation of special colleges for Sunday-school teachers is another significant fact. St. Christopher's College at Blackheath opened in 1909 with three students, and it was doubted whether the college would fill. Within two years the available accommodation was fully occupied, and the Sunday-School Institute had to hire two additional houses. During the past year there have been forty-six residential and six non-resident students. The students of this college go forth not only to work as Sunday-school teachers themselves, but to hand on to others the methods which they have been taught, and thus give to those who cannot go to colleges some of the benefit which they have received from them. For all this we thank God and take courage.

And now as we look forward into the future we ask, What is the work that lies before us?

First, we have to see that these reforms and improvements are brought within the doors of every school. That is by no

means the case at present. The work so far has been pioneer work. We must not rest content until the cords have been lengthened and the stakes strengthened.

Secondly, we must take serious account of the very large number of children who are at present outside any Sunday-school. By personal visiting and by the missionary activity of our own scholars much may be done. But as the schools become efficient, attractive, interesting, they will draw the children. Then there is the grave and perpetual question of retaining elder scholars. The record in some parts of England is better in this respect than in others; but it is of the greatest importance that the scholar should be kept in touch with school and Church during the critical period of adolescence and not be allowed to drift away, perhaps never again to be recovered. While on this question, can we not address ourselves to the ruinous and demoralizing rivalry of school with school in the matter of treats and prizes? The amount of money spent in this way, which is sorely needed for the better equipment of the schools, is lamentable. Fifty parishes in the London diocese taken at random, but including different types, report their general expenditure at £729 2s. 7d., in addition to which they spend £1,245 8s. 5d. on treats and prizes. Twenty parishes in an agricultural district spend on maintenance £47 18s. 3d., and on treats and prizes £142 8s. 9d. It is much to be hoped that the authorities of all schools, Anglican and Nonconformist, will confer together and enter into some agreement by which this wasteful expenditure may be stopped and the money spent on making the schools more efficient.

Lastly, in the midst of all this effort for the improvement of teaching, methods, organization, and equipment, we must not forget the spiritual life of our teachers. It is only by the deepening of our spiritual life that we can bring to our scholars that all powerful influence which emanates from those who are guided and ruled by the Holy Spirit of God. Such agencies as "the quiet day," the meeting for prayer, the devotional service, should form an essential part of our Sunday-school equipment. The life of our Lord Jesus Christ was a fuller and more occupied life

than ours ; but it was carefully punctuated by intervals of retirement for prayer and communion with the Father. How much greater is our need for this source of spiritual strength. It is too fatally easy to become immersed in busy activity, in religious work, in multiplied calls, till the spiritual life, deprived of its proper nourishment, sinks lower and lower, and the spiritual force is no longer powerful for good. The teacher must seek inspiration for his teaching, holiness for his life, and power for his weakness from the Holy Spirit, who alone can teach, sanctify, and strengthen.



### Studies in Texts :

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR SERMONS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.

BY THE REV. HARRINGTON C. LEES, M.A.

#### V.—DIVINE STANDARDS.

*Text* :—"The ark of the covenant, wherein was a golden pot holding the manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant, and above it the cherubim of glory."—Heb. ix. 4.

[Book of the Month: "EGYPT AND ISRAEL"<sup>1</sup>=E. Other references: Hastings' Dictionary = HDB.; Conder's "Bible and East" = C.; Kellogg's "Leviticus" = K.; Macalister's "Civilization in Ancient Palestine" = M.]

"WE read that contents of ark were a rod, a vase of one omer, and two stones. These might well be used as standards of length, capacity, and weight" (E. 62). "Hebrew weights of stone" (HDB. iv. 904 and Heb. in Lev. xix. 36, etc.). Rods used for measurements (Ezek. xl. 3). The rod must have been fairly long, said to be comparable to a serpent (Exod. vii. 12; Num. xvii. 10). "Vase stated to be an omer. Ten commandments easily engraved on even one stone size of hand" (E. 62 and *cf.* C. 64, confirmatory). Business

<sup>1</sup> "Egypt and Israel." By Professor Flinders Petrie, D.C.L., F.R.S., etc. Published by S.P.C.K. Suggestive, illuminating, sane, and on the whole conservative.

standards must be Divine (Lev. xix. 35, 36; Prov. xi. 1, xvi. 11). "In Syria, weights preserved in temples; in Egypt (Roman times), in the Serapeum at Alexandria (E. 62). "Not improbable that Jewish standards kept in Ark under guardianship of figures of Truth" (E. 62). (Petrie thinks cherubim known popularly as "Mercy" and "Truth," on analogy of Egyptian arks, were both figures called "Truth" (E. 61), and passages like Ps. lvii. 1, 3; lxxxiv. 14; *cf.* lxxxv. 10). Necessary to insist on business honesty in religious people (Deut. xxv. 13-15; Prov. xx. 10; Hos. xii. 7; Amos viii. 5; Micah. vi. 10; Ezek. xlv. 9-11). "A weight which is correct multiple of any standard is one of rarest things to excavator" (M. 44). "It is of no account, therefore, to keep the Sabbath (in a way) and reverence (outwardly) the sanctuary, and then on the weekday water milk, adulterate medicines, sugars, and other foods, slip the yard-stick in measuring, tip the balance in weight or measure and sell with another, 'water' stocks, and gamble in 'margins,' as the manner of many is. God hates, and even honest atheists despise, religion of this kind" (K. 415).

Suggestive sidelight in above for spiritual life. Here three Divine demands supplied by three manifestations of God—Heaven's fulness in earth's emptiness (Exod. xvi. 33); Heaven's blossom on earth's barrenness (Num. xvii. 8); Heaven's message on earth's hardness (Exod. xxxi. 18).

I. STANDARD OF CAPACITY.—Measure of fulness (*a*) received, Matt. vii. 7; (*b*) given, Luke vi. 38; and *cf.* Exod. xvi. 18, 21, 22; John vi. 11, 32-35; Eph. iv. 7.

II. STANDARD OF LENGTH.—Measure of growth, Rev. xxi. 15; Matt. vi. 41 (compliance); xviii. 21 (forbearance); 1 Cor. i. 8 (strength); 2 Cor. x. 13-15 (RVM); Phil. iii. 16 (Gk.); Gal. vi. 16 (Gk.); Heb. iii. 6, 14 (service).

III. STANDARD OF WEIGHT.—Measure of obedience, Matt. xxii. 37, 39; Ps. xv. 4 (PBV); Acts v. 2. In 2 Chron. xxv. 2, "not perfect" = "short weight." Same word in Deut. xxv. 15.

Fulness realized; growth maintained; obedience possible under the shadow of His wings.

## The Apocalypse.

BY THE REV. B. HERKLOTS, M.A.,

*Vicar of St. Thomas's, Kendal.*

THE perplexity which at the very outset confronts the student of the Book of the Revelation as to which of the four schools of interpretation to follow, accounts for a great deal of the neglect which it has suffered. Not only are the main outlines of the four methods of explanation widely different, but on many points there are marked varieties of interpretation by members of the same school. And, further, the selection of the particular method to adopt is rendered still more difficult by the attractiveness of each of the four.

If the study of the Canonical Apocalypse is prefaced by some acquaintance with the Apocalyptic literature of the same age—*e.g.*, the Apocalypse of Baruch, the Book of Enoch, the Assumption of Moses, the Sibylline Oracles, etc.—the many points of similarity which he discovers will attract the student to the Preterist view of the book. He observes that the Johannine Apocalypse is one of a kind, though immeasurably the highest of its kind. There is in them all the same background of persecution, the same general purpose—to justify the dealings of God—the same prospect of deliverance held out, and the same counsel to patience enforced. The same prominence is given to the personality of Satan, and the certainty of his speedy overthrow. There is the same general type of symbolism—the strange, grotesque, mysterious figures, portrayed in vivid colouring—and the same style of visions introduced and partially explained by angels. With these strongly-marked resemblances to contemporary Apocalyptic literature in mind, it becomes only natural to assume that the Book of the Revelation should be viewed as a document chiefly concerned with the times in which it originated. A century of Roman history will then suffice to cover the fulfilment of five-sixths of the book,

and the mysterious personality of the Wild Beast will be taken to be, "beyond all shadow of doubt or uncertainty, the Emperor Nero." The Preterist method will appeal to many as the simplest and most natural interpretation of the book. It is certainly the easiest. And the difficulty of finding a fulfilment to many of its prophetic visions is easily shirked by the plea of ignorance of the details of European history between the years A.D. 50 and 150.

Approaching the subject from a different standpoint, the student of the Historical school finds himself wholly dissatisfied with the narrow, local, and uninteresting explanation of the Preterist. Accustomed as he is to take broad views of the dealings of the Almighty with the human race, to survey eras and cycles and ages and dispensations, to trace the evolution of the Divine revelation from its primeval and primitive inception to its culmination and consummation in the Person of the Incarnate Word of God, he looks to the Apocalypse of St. John the Divine to provide a splendid programme of the entire Christian Dispensation. He sees in it a continuous prophecy exhibiting the main features of the world's history. He identifies its symbolic figures and visions with personages and events which are notable in European history. In the Wild Beast and in the mystic Babylon he is convinced that he sees the Church of Rome. And the visions of the book he considers to be mostly fulfilled, some more in course of fulfilment, a few still waiting to materialize in the course of the twentieth century. To the student of history this view of the book is fascinating. This broad method of treatment appeals to his broad outlook on men and things. If he should shrink from an ultra-Protestant treatment of the book, his Catholic sympathies will devise a variety of concurrent and interchangeable, though still historical, explanations. He has nearly nineteen centuries of European history within which to roam about for his interpretations and fulfilments. The study of the book becomes one of absorbing interest, and the variety of the methods which are accessible for explaining the visions is only limited by the extent of his

acquaintance with the ancient, medieval, and modern history of Europe.

But all students of the Bible are not authorities on European history, and the vivid imagination and eager expectation of a large number of earnest Christian people gain the greatest possible stimulus in the Futurist interpretation of the book. Here they find all the materials for the construction of a magnificent and exciting programme of events which are shortly to take place. It seems to them the most natural and reverent way to take the symbols and the visions as literally as possible. The book becomes intensely realistic. The rise and fall of superhuman personages, the clash of colossal forces in a portentous military engagement, the terrorizing display of the forces of Nature in cataclysmic onslaught, fire the imagination, excite the emotions, and arouse the keenest enthusiasm. Not by any means all of the advocates of the Futurist school commit themselves to the excesses and the "vicious literalism" of some of their leaders. Many sane and scholarly men, finding themselves disgusted with the narrowness of the Preterist view, and unable to follow any of the varied explanations of the Historical school, adopt in the main the Futurist position. They may not be adepts at the moral analysis of the history of the past centuries, but they are keenly alive to the conditions and tendencies of their own age. They view with alarm the spirit of the present age—the growth of militarism, the spread of democracy, the prevalence of materialism, the vast changes which are taking place so rapidly in different parts of the earth and affecting so profoundly the future of myriads of its inhabitants. They believe—and much they find to justify their belief—that the present period of transition will not merge into one of millennium without political, social, and religious upheavals on a scale which the world so far has never witnessed. And the visions of the Apocalypse suggest to them the lines on which these upheavals are likely to issue, and the manner in which the wrath of man will at last be subjected to the triumph and the glory of God.

Yet other minds there are which find it impossible to construct either out of the materials of the past or the present, or out of their conceptions as to what the future has in store, any satisfactory solution of the difficulties, or any conclusive interpretation of the symbols and visions of the Apocalypse. In the desire to avoid the literalism which more or less pervades the teaching of each of the three preceding schools, they find more satisfaction in following the spiritualizing method of interpretation. They see in the book symbolic representations of good and evil principles common to every age. They find in it pictorial unfoldings of certain great principles in constant conflict. Under different forms and a varying symbolism they find a progressive exemplification of the same great fundamental truths. They seek and they find a spiritual meaning. They do not deny that the book had its primary reference to the years that immediately followed its production. They do not condemn the researches of the historical interpreter, who finds the fulfilment of the book in the nineteen centuries that are past. They do not throw a wet blanket on the vivid expectations of the Futurist. But they contend that the lessons of the book are not so much historical and eschatological as permanent and spiritual; that the book is rather a mine of spiritual truth underneath thick layers and strata of allegorical figurism, than a diagram of ancient and modern history, or a chart and key to the cycles of the future. Unfettered by limitations or postulates or "methods" of any kind, they patiently ponder over the book; and though they do not pretend to find, or perhaps do not even seek, the solution to its many problems or the explanation of its many mysteries, they yet obtain pure gold out of the sacred mine, and bring forth things new and old out of the ancient treasure-house.

Whatever view is taken of the book, its dramatic power cannot but make its appeal to the thoughtful mind. There is a symmetry about the arrangement of the several dramas, but their succession is not always progressive, and sometimes the reader seems to be taken back again over old ground, though

with a new series of symbols and visions. Yet the absence of chronological order does not seem to impair the dramatic force of the book. There is a dignity throughout its pages which the strangeness and grotesqueness of some of its figures never destroys. From the first three verses of neat and graceful introduction, the reader is at once introduced to the majestic vision of the Christ. Twice at the beginning of the book, as twice at the end, the Almighty is presented under the sublime titles of the Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End of all things. An elevated plane of thought is reached, and an atmosphere of reverential awe ; and that level is never lowered, or that atmosphere attenuated, throughout the book. The letters to the seven Churches are solemn and dignified. The vision of the Throne of God is serene, sublime, and magnificent. The visions of the conflict follow with their lurid imagery, the seven Seals, the seven Trumpets, the silence of the seven Thunders (for their messages are not disclosed), the tragedy of the two Witnesses, and the tragedy of the Woman and her Man-child in her struggle with the Dragon. Then the Trinity of Evil—the Dragon, the Beast, and the False Prophet—that great parody and travesty of the Holy Trinity, is portrayed. The seven Angels utter their messages, the seven Plagues are outpoured from the seven Vials of Judgment. The tragic drama follows of the mystic Babylon, and a haunting dirge full of melancholy splendour is sung as a lament over her fall. The rise and fall of the seven Kingdoms are introductory to the last great events. Finally, the awe and solemnity of the book culminate in the vision of the Judgment Day, with its Great White Throne, and its grave and irrevocable sentence. Then the thunders cease, and a picture of serene and delicate loveliness emerges ; the clouds and mists of earth are for a few brief moments dissolved ; the New Heavens and the New Earth appear in their unrivalled loveliness ; the tears and sorrow and pain are banished ; there is no more sea ; there is no more night ; there is no more sin ; there is no more death ; the Paradise which was lost is as nothing compared with the

Paradise which is regained ; and, as the Sum and Centre and Mainspring of all, is revealed the Almighty Father, the Lamb Who was slain but Who lives and reigns, and the Eternal Spirit Who bids us "come."

It will be noticed that the drama of the book pursues its varied course till it ends, as it cannot but do, in tragedy ; and the tragedy having attained its climax, passes off the scene to make way for the matchless serenity of the final scenes—the New Jerusalem, the Marriage of the Lamb, and the eternal association in fellowship and service of the Heavenly Bridegroom with the earthly Bride, whom He presents to Himself spotless and undefiled, to share the kingdom, and to enter into the joy of her Lord.

The object of our study, however, will fall short of its attainment if it carries us no further than an appreciation of the book as a grand historical drama. The blessing promised to the reader of the volume is conditional not only on "the hearing of the words of this prophecy," but also on "the keeping of those things which are written therein." The Apocalypse has its practical meaning and message for every age—its message to the early Christian, to the medieval saint, to the living militant members of the Church Catholic, and it may be to generations of Christians yet unborn. It may have its varied meaning to its different schools of interpreters, for the truth of God is always larger than any one mind or school of thought can grasp, and a general recognition of this elementary fact would have saved the Church from the distressing spectacle of the unlovely and bitter dissensions of which some of its interpreters have been guilty. But without committing ourselves to the detailed methods of any one school, it may yet be possible to distinguish certain broad lines of teaching which are independent of any one theory, and yet common to them all.

In the first place may be mentioned its *doctrine of God*. Mention has already been made of the dignity, the sublimity, and the grandeur of the whole conception of the Deity. The limits of human language seem to have been reached, and the

resources of earth's symbolism seem to have been exhausted in the effort to convey to the imagination of mankind the might, the majesty, and the ineffable glory of God Almighty. Vision succeeds vision of the Eternal Father—Alpha and Omega, of the Lamb who was slain, Redeemer and now King, and of the Holy Spirit before the throne, in His sevenfold perfection.

“Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come,” is the grand central ascription. There is no elaborated doctrine of the Trinity, yet there is a constant recurrence of the underlying idea of a Triune Personality, a Trinity in the unity of the Godhead. There is no question as to the need of this generation for an elevated conception of the being of God. There is no doubt that an exposition of the book from any standpoint will conduce to a more reverent and exalted conception, and a more humble and adoring worship of Almighty God.

The Apocalypse has well been called “a book of contrasts” and it is only natural that over against the splendid conception of God which it presents, there should be a striking *portrayal of Satan*—His great rival and adversary. The teaching of St. John as to the personality of Satan is as clear a reflection of our Lord's own teaching as is that of St. Paul and St. Peter. Under the form of the dragon, Satan is depicted as a personality inspired by tremendous malignity, hatred, cunning, and power, all of whose varied gifts are directed to the organization and management of a vast campaign against God. As St. Paul has also described him, he is viewed as the head of a great organized confederacy. Assisted by the allies which he finds in the world, the Beast, whose power seems now on the wane, and the False Prophet, whose influence appears to be now at its height, he aspires to usurp the throne and kingdom of God. The Atonement of Christ for sin, and the widespread proclamation and acceptance of the Gospel message, have given him a deadly wound; but the wound is healed, and he is more potent than ever. Now in this age he is actually, as St. Paul calls him, the god of this

world. The Church of Christ repudiates him, denounces his claim, and cleaves with loyalty and devotion to her Lord.

But outside her ranks, either explicitly or implicitly, directly or indirectly, Satan is acknowledged as god. The very idea of a personal Satanic being may be ridiculed by unbelievers whose eyes he has blinded; but the Christian at least ought not to be ignorant of his devices. The Apocalypse is a standing warning against disbelief in the Devil. It tells us of his malignant power, of his allies and confederates, and of their nefarious schemes and policy. "Woe unto you," it says, "for the Devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time."

From the doctrine of Satan it is but a step to the *doctrine of sin*. Sin is here presented as the attitude of opposition to God. Running throughout the book is the idea of conflict, a fierce and inevitable conflict between the forces of good and the forces of evil. The characters in the drama are all ranged on one side or on the other, either for God or against Him. And throughout the book sin is almost invariably looked at in its God-ward, and not in its man-ward, aspect. The question of a man's sin against his brother man is scarcely entertained. The lists of heinous sins comprise many sins which are done directly between man and man. The liar, the thief, and the murderer, sin directly against their brother men. But this idea of sin is altogether swallowed up in the greater thought, that every such sin is a grievous offence against God. It is this fundamental conception that accounts for the grouping together of sins that are generally regarded as vulgar, gross, and criminal, with those whose sinfulness a *fin de siècle* civilization would scarcely admit. Yet from the view point of God the fearful and unbelieving are classed with the murderers and the fornicators. The moral cowardice which dissuades men from following Christ for fear of ridicule and social ostracism, the unbelief which exalts the material and the temporal, and which paralyses the whole conception of the spiritual and the eternal, the sins which, like these, are wholly between man and his God, are shown to be as damnable as any

of the vulgar crimes against society which are the only offences which are punishable by law. Sin against a man's own person equally with sin against his neighbour is in reality sin against his God.

In these days it is of pressing importance that this truth should be taught. The modern view of sin leaves God out of account. Sin is spoken and thought of as little more than an unfortunate and unpleasant occurrence, even if not, as by some, an inevitable stage in man's upward climb to perfection. And the Christian soldier, unless he chooses to doff his uniform, and receive the brand on his forehead of the mark of the Beast, must range himself unmistakably on the side of God, and maintain that the primary and paramount consideration in all question of human transgression, is the manner in which it is related to the law and will of a holy God.

In the fourth place we come to the teaching of the Apocalypse concerning *the Church*. Most beautifully and suggestively is that teaching set forth. The two familiar divisions, the Church militant and the Church triumphant, are much in evidence; and though the names are absent, the ideas which they connote are always latent, if not always apparent. There is the Church militant, fighting its way through life and death to glory. It is engaged in relentless conflict with all the powers of darkness, struggling to hold its own against the strategy and might of the confederate forces who do battle in the spiritual realm on behalf of the trinity of evil—the Dragon, the Beast, and the False Prophet. Hour by hour there are passing from the battlefield of human life great contingents of seasoned veterans on their way to join the ranks of the Church triumphant. Yet hour by hour their places are filled, and more than filled, by the battalions of recruits who are hastening from all quarters to range themselves under the banner of the Cross. Throughout the book there is a constant transference of scene, effected by sudden and abrupt transitions of thought. Now it is the Church at warfare which occupies the stage; and the picture is full of the din and confusion and smoke of the battle. Now it is the

Church at rest which is depicted in language full of delicate charm, reflecting the serenity, the purity, and the calm of heaven. Every new stage in the earthly conflict is paralleled by a further revelation of the glory of its final issue. At last the vision of the fury of the spiritual warfare gives place to the vision of the multitude which no man can number, whose voices are like the sound of many waters, the bride preparing for the Heavenly Bridegroom, the New Jerusalem in all its matchless symmetry, and finally the symbolism of the closing paragraphs, so suggestive of the security, the permanence, the society, and the restful, joyous activity of the Eternal City home, where earth's luminaries are no longer needed, for "the glory of God doth lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof."

The *seven anthems of the Apocalypse* form a study by themselves, for each has a setting and a character and a meaning all its own. There is first the *Anthem of the Living Creatures*, the representatives of the created universe, in chap. iv., to which the Church adds her Doxology. In the next chapter follows the *new Song of Redemption* to the Lamb, who is worthy to take the book and to open its seals; and in this song the Church joins her voice to that of Nature, because both are affected by the work of redemption; and while Nature, through her representatives, chants her solemn "Amen," the Church is seen to prostrate herself in silent and adoring worship. In chap. vii. is set forth the loud *Anthem of Salvation*, and the "Gloria" is rendered by the angels round about the throne. Chap. xi. is the *Anthem of the Coronation*. Chap. xiv. opens with the *New Song of the Sanctified Church*. Then follows in the next chapter the *Song of Moses and of the Lamb*—the song, that is, of thanksgiving, not only for the salvation which has come to the Church through the Atoning Sacrifice of the Son of God, but also for all the long way, from first to last, by which God has led His Church to that glorious issue. The seventh and closing anthem, with its fourfold "Alleluia," is the *Grand Pæan of Triumph* when the apostate Church is defeated, and the true Church is ushered into the presence of the Lamb.

In the last place, we come to the teaching of the book in regard to the *Second Advent of Christ*. Visions are unfolded to us—great, solemn, majestic, magnificent—of that

“ Great far-off Divine event  
To which the whole creation moves.”

It is the Saviour who is to come again—the Lamb that had been slain, the same Jesus who lived on earth, was crucified, and buried in Joseph's garden, who rose triumphant, and in the presence of His disciples ascended to glory. It is the same Lord Jesus, and none other—still one with us in His manhood, through all eternity Man as well as God. We shall see Him! We shall know Him! For Jesus Christ is the “same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.”

It is Christ the Judge who is to come. Our earthly tribunals hold their petty courts, and modern public opinion listens to its earth-born witnesses, pronounces its little sentences, and inflicts its short-lived penalties. But the whole thing is ephemeral. Like a panorama it passes across the stage. Yet all the while the great assize of heaven is being prepared; the Judge of all the earth is making ready His august decrees; the proclamation is preparing to issue which shall summon all mankind to stand before the judgment-seat; and He who is to be man's Judge is none other than the Man Christ Jesus.

Who is He that is to come? The Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords—He it is who is the Coming One. The last and final trump must peal its warning summons. The roll of the elect must be completed. The four-and-twenty elders fall upon their faces, saying: “We give Thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and which wast, and which art to come, that Thou hast taken to Thee Thy great power and hast reigned.” And the trumpet-blast blares forth the message to the utmost bounds of the realms of the universe: “The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever.”

## The Missionary World.

THE "May meetings" now press backward into April and forward into June. They make a visible mark in London, second only to that made by "Assembly week" in Edinburgh. This year there has been, at any rate in the larger gatherings, a note of thankfulness and hope. Whether the marked financial relief which has come to many societies on the Continent and in America, as well as in Great Britain, has any direct relation to the better conditions of trade, it is difficult to decide; it is at any rate certain that there is a widespread spiritual movement which is finding expression partly in the increase of gifts. The C.M.S. alone has received upwards of half a million within its financial year, a record income for any missionary society. The speeches at the anniversary meetings—so ably reported in the *Record*—and the Committee's *General Review of the Year*, are stimulating reading. Thousands of friends all the world over will rejoice, most of all the faithful missionaries in the field.

\* \* \* \* \*

The responsibility of guiding so great a work and of administering so large an income are very heavy. Those on whom the burden falls need, in no common measure, our prayers. The affairs of a great society need the service of many minds and of many types of men—the optimist who attends to our eyes, and the pessimist who attends to our feet, to quote the Rev. T. Wood's story at the Albert Hall. Vision and organization need to be combined. Mr. Bardsley, we note, has been obliged to leave his post for a month's complete rest. He will have gone with the memory of a great anniversary, with its seal upon the work of the Swanwick Conference, to encourage him. Much of the present uplift in the C.M.S. is due to his faith and spiritual leadership. Many will pray that renewal of health may be speedily and completely given; not only the C.M.S., but the Church has need of him.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Student Volunteer Missionary Union looms large in the missionary outlook of the Church. Many of us are moved by its splendid ideals; we adjust our other plans to attend its great conferences; we count on its members as the largest asset for the evangelization of the world; we draw inspiration and courage from the youth and faith and hopefulness which it embodies. But few of those who love the S.V.M.U. realize the policy by which, far back in the colleges, it prepares for great results. It is not merely a net to gather outgoing missionaries together, but part of a long course of husbandry—patient, tactful, wise—leading to a hard-earned harvest. Behind the S.V.M.U. is the Student Christian Movement, of which it is a part, cultivating missionary life by deliberate spiritual processes through the Christian Unions in the colleges. An article in the May number of the *Student Movement*, addressed by the Rev. W. Paton, Assistant Secretary, to student readers, lets us into the secret of student methods; we find in them a living application of principles which are equally potent to quicken the missionary service of the whole home Church.

\* \* \* \* \*

In order to show what "careful planning can do for missionary interest in college," Mr. Paton urges that the Christian Union—the student parallel to our ordinary parochial agencies—can "become a valuable instrument for aiding the missionary enterprise." "The burden of missionary policy," he tells the students, "should fall on the Union as a whole, and not on the student volunteers alone;" foreign missions are second in importance only to Bible study. "Missionary interest ought to be at the heart of the Christian Union." At bottom this is not a question of organization, but of belief—"that driving conviction which can alone be dignified by the title." "Christianity is either missionary or nothing." It is Mr. Paton's experience that to gain this conviction retreats for united study, meditation, and prayer are markedly useful. "A systematic campaign of education" must follow by means of general meetings, social gatherings ("squashes," in student parlance) to meet missionaries, and

missionary study—study circles of the orthodox type being supplemented by private reading with opportunities for discussion, and the introduction of missionary literature, “especially, perhaps, biographies.” “If we really know what we want to do, there is always a way to do it.” The daily or weekly prayer-meeting, almost universal in college Christian Unions, should be planned to include prayer for missions. “Missionary work is never merely ‘facts’; it is rooted in human destiny and Divine love, and to understand it must be to pray for it.” Knowledge and prayer will thus inevitably lead to personal service, which is the great end of the endeavours of the Christian Union.

“In some way or other the knowledge we have gained must be carried out in action. Whether it be in helping the home propaganda of the missionary societies, in filling a congregation with missionary enthusiasm, in teaching children about missions, or in service on the mission field itself, we are bound to discharge our debt if we have once *known*.”

Here the Student Volunteer Missionary Union steps in to help and to harvest.

\* \* \* \* \*

The closing paragraph of Mr. Paton’s paper has a message wider than that of the student circle to which it is addressed.

“Finally, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the whole success of any missionary policy depends upon the spiritual life of the Christian Union. We would dare to hope for unions where it would be hard for a man or a woman to choose a life-work selfishly, where knowledge means service, where there is—let us not shrink from the word—consecration. Without this, organization accomplishes little; but if there be this life of the spirit, there is an end of deadness and dryness, and the great issues of life and the will of God stand out plain and clear.”

\* \* \* \* \*

Looking more widely into the student world, we find the student movements not only in Great Britain and Ireland and the Colonies, but also in North America, various countries in the Continent of Europe, Japan, China, India and Ceylon, and South Africa, welded into a great World’s Student Christian Federation, of which Dr. John R. Mott is General Secretary, and Miss Ruth Rouse Secretary for work amongst women students. The organ of the Federation is a quarterly called the *Student*

*World*, published in New York. It is always eagerly read by the writer of these notes, but too seldom finds mention in them. The contents of the April number give an idea of the width of its scope. The opening paper is on "Oriental Women in American Colleges;" a striking study of the little-known conditions of student life in Belgium comes next; then the Student Secretary at Buenos Aires tells the story of a recent international student conference held in Uruguay; a Chinese Secretary reviews the conference of Chinese students—130 in number, both men and women—held during the great Student Volunteer Conference in Kansas City last January; the woman student in France is described in a short paper characterized by knowledge and insight; a diagram prepared by Chinese workers shows the wide programme prepared for work among Chinese students by the Y.M.C.A. in Foochow during 1913-14; twelve pages of editorial notes and news from the student world completes the number.

\* \* \* \* \*

Few missionary periodicals record more living work than *China's Millions*; even its shorter papers are often rich in their suggestion of possibilities. A case in point is the account given in the May issue of work for students in Government schools in Chengtu carried on in a Sunday afternoon English Bible-class in the home of a missionary. The leader, Mrs. Hampson, reports a membership of over thirty at the end of only four months' work. The men come from official families, some of them very wealthy; they are students in the Foreign Office, the Government Law School, the Foreign Language School, and in various Government High Schools. Details of great interest concerning individuals are given. Of the class as a whole the leader writes:

"They have been studying the Gospel of Mark in English. . . . They usually come very early, and are never in a hurry to go. . . . They ask many questions, and most of them are intensely interested in following the life of our Lord as we read from week to week. Some study the New Testament at home quite diligently. . . . They are quite free to visit us whenever they wish; many of them bring their difficulties to us and ask us to pray

with and for them. Some are learning to know the value of prayer. . . . Many have brought their families and friends to visit us, and we have visited in their homes. . . . We would ask for an interest in your prayers."

\* \* \* \* \*

Space does not allow of more than passing reference to other articles in the May magazines. In the *C.M. Review*, those who heard the Bishop of Madras at the C.M.S. annual meeting will welcome "A Suggested Policy for Mass Movements," by the Rev. C. F. Hall, and the Rev. G. H. Cranswick's paper on "Six Months in the Doonakal Diocese." In *India's Women*, Dr. Fletcher Moorshead finds in "Women's Medical Missions" the call of a great opportunity. Another good paper on medical missions—one of a series—is found in the Wesleyan *Foreign Field*. The *L.M.S. Chronicle* publishes a vivid account of a hurricane by a missionary in Raratonga, and a charming little record of a meeting of the Literary and Debating Society at Tiger Kloof, South Africa, showing extraordinary mental growth among the students. The *S.P.G. Mission Field* has, amongst other papers of interest, a long account of Miss Riddell's work among the lepers in Japan. The story of "A Japanese Criminal's Repentance," in *The Bible in the World*, is very striking. In *Our Missions* (F.F.M.A.) we notice a summary, translated, of a graphic account of his recent visit to Madagascar, by M. Couve, Director of the Paris Missionary Society, and a thoughtful study of "The Missionary Motive," by Robert Davis. Lastly, the *B.M.S. Herald* is a report number, surveying the work of the Baptist Missionary Society "Under Six Flags"—Britain, Italy, France, Portugal, Belgium, and China. G.



## Notices of Books.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION. International Theological Library. By George Galloway, D.Phil., D.D. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 12s.

The reader into whose hands Dr. Galloway's book happens to fall will perhaps be tempted, as he surveys in the introductory chapter the wide field to be occupied, to abandon so large a task. But if, allured by the author's singular lucidity of expression, he shall determine to proceed, he will find himself well rewarded by a fulness of instruction, a wealth of detail, and a richness of allusion which will greatly assist him both in the confirmation of faith and in labours to remove the doubts of others. We cannot hope in a short review to do justice to so serviceable a volume, and if we venture to offer a few criticisms, it is because the words which Dr. Galloway uses of the physical sciences are equally true of philosophy—that "inability to state a connection is a challenge to thought and never an indication of incoherency" (p. 189).

I. The first section deals with the phenomena of religion. The sense of need is the basis of all religious life. "Were a man a being spiritually complete, or were he doomed to remain for ever unconscious of his own defects, then in neither case would the motives which lead to religion be present" (p. 58). The demonstration that religion is the outcome of emotion, volition, and cognition is decisive, and the sections which illustrate the relation of Religion to Science and to Morality are particularly valuable. An interesting epitome of the beginnings and growth of religion is also presented to us.

Following the best lines of modern thought, Dr. Galloway studies the facts of religion historically, but is apt to speculate a little prematurely on its origin. Spiritism, or the idea of a free spirit capable of separation from the body in which it is usually found, is the lowest form of religion known to ethnology (p. 93). By a too rigid adherence to theories of evolution, though Dr. Galloway certainly admits "new beginnings within the developmental process" (p. 537), he assumes the precedence of animism, in which the soul was inseparable from the object (p. 91), and of a still earlier stage of veneration and awe as "not unlikely" (p. 90). But as the first movements known were a deterioration from spiritism to fetishism (p. 94), as the next developments to ancestor-worship and totemism were independent outgrowths (pp. 95-97), as rude conceptions of a Supreme Spirit are found amongst the earliest peoples (p. 98), as magic (a sceptical tendency) existed side by side with the first tribal religions (p. 99), and as "there are no instances of the evolution of an ethical religion by a tribal group" (p. 108), the facts are patient of a theory that the origin of religion is to be found in a sense of a fall or a loss which different men met in different ways.

Attention is drawn to the comparatively brief period from the eighth to the sixth centuries B.C. (p. 133), in which prophetism arose in Israel, Zoroastrianism in Persia, Confucianism in China, Buddhism in India, and the Orphic movement and the mysteries in Greece. Religious environment

cannot explain these, and there remains "a unique and inexplicable element in the depths of personality" (p. 137). But their practical synchronism, and the birth of the ideas of a universal religion on the value of the soul and the life hereafter, demand a wider and deeper cause. In their ethical and spiritual value we perceive a God who "at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past." Such events are of great importance to a consideration of the validity of religious knowledge.

II. The second section of the book is concerned with our sources of knowledge in experience and activity of mind, and with the question whether we are capable of knowing ultimate realities. The methods of Empiricism are incomplete. Rationalism, as taught by Descartes, Spinoza, or Leibnitz, too readily ignores experience. Kant's philosophy is too narrow. But the historical treatment suggested by Dr. Galloway (p. 282) appears to us impossible. I can only inspect the mental processes of another by the reflection of my own. To waylay a primitive man and analyze the working of his mind is only to read myself into bygone conditions. The starting-point, as Descartes taught, must be one's personal consciousness. *Cogito, ergo sum*. But can I know my own mind? I cannot raise my body in my own hand. The most skilful anatomist cannot dissect his own body. Can the mind stand outside itself in order to examine itself by some analytical microscopy? Either we must postulate in our definition that the mind was made for knowing and is capable of ascertaining the real and true, or we must maintain that this subject is outside the province of Reason and within that of Faith, where rational argument is not available, and conclusions can only be reached by the pragmatism of experience—do they work? Satisfactory results attest the reliability of the discerning wisdom.

A man of science sees water: he observes, experiments, and discovers the components of hydrogen and oxygen. He shows what water *is*. The thirsty man finds water, appropriates it, and ascertains that it is thirst-quenching. He shows what water *does*. To both the water is real. Religion works in the latter way. "The idea of God is developed in the medium of religious experience, and we can have no direct knowledge of Deity as He is in Himself. God is for man what he experiences Him to be" (p. 361). We must not dethrone Reason, but it has no absolute sovereignty. Where it fails, faith steps in, and pragmatism becomes the guide. The utmost care is needed to eliminate every one of many sources of error. But we are on the right lines, pursuing a journey which can and will reach the goal.

III. We have little space to refer to the third division of the book—the problem of Reality and the ultimate Truths of Religion. Philosophy enters the sphere of paradox when it discusses the nature of things in themselves. The realism of ordinary men is theoretically untenable. Berkeley's idealism approaches the absurd. Rational criticism exposes the insufficiency of Kant. Dr. Galloway perceives, but scarcely avoids, the danger. The plain fact is that we cannot know the nature of anything in itself—*i.e.*, apart from our knowledge of it. This table measures  $4' \times 3' \times 2\frac{1}{2}'$ . There may be a fourth dimension of which we know nothing. Algebraic geometry is prepared for it. But if there is, it makes no difference to the accuracy of the measurements we have made. All Truth is for us necessarily qualified by our

experience and consciousness. But it is none the less true—not the whole Truth perhaps, but still true.

All attempts to prove by reason the existence of God have failed, but they serve to show that this belief is not contrary to reason. The chapters on the attributes and Personality of God are excellent. On the problem of evil we rather demur to the term "natural evil" in distinction to "moral evil." It is question-begging. No one would speak of the decay of plant life as evil; yet by utilizing this destructive agency human culture is able to grow ever fairer blossoms. It is conceivable that originally the feelings of distress and fear of death which haunt animal life were without trace of evil and the means whereby a Divine Will was producing ever higher forms of life. This thought may help to clearer and more satisfactory ideas of the commencement of evil and of man's sole responsibility for it.

But we desire to close with appreciation. Dr. Galloway's book is always thoughtful, never dull. Its sober and reasonable treatment of a difficult subject will serve to restrain modern thought from many excesses which beset it. This is pre-eminently a book which should be read. We heartily thank Dr. Galloway for it.

E. ABBEY-TINDALL.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT. A paper read before the Victoria Institute.

THE REFORMATION AND THE MODERN MAN. A lecture delivered at Queen's College, Cambridge. By the Rev. H. J. R. Marston, M.A.

When Mr. Marston speaks, he is worth hearing; when he writes, his work is worth reading, for his precise and delicate style presents in a refreshingly cultured manner the patient and careful thought of the scholar. For this reason, not less than for another soon to be mentioned, we welcome these two brief publications of his recent utterances. The other reason we mention with some diffidence, owing to its triteness. The addresses on "The Christian Doctrine of the Atonement" and "The Reformation and the Modern Man" are valuable mainly for their suggestiveness. We do not make this observation with the easy superiority of the critic; we feel indebted to Mr. Marston for valuable warnings and illuminating hints, and regret that the limits imposed upon his spoken utterances prevented a complete working out of the points he sketched in outline. Happily, the Doctrinal Address before the Victoria Institute is "part of a book on the subject in course of production." Mr. Marston in this address pleads mainly for a fresh and full treatment of the Biblical teaching on the Atonement. His emphasis on the importance of this is illuminated by a phrase of tantalizing suggestion. He speaks of "the charisma of inspiration." That phrase well worked out would clear away not a few difficulties felt on this topic of paramount importance. But we feel that his charge of neglect of Scriptural authority on the part of writers on the Atonement is less than fair. The present writer remembers two professorial courses on the Atonement at the University of Cambridge within the last few years, on which the lecturers dwelt almost entirely on the Scriptural authorities. Mr. Marston also pleads for fresh emphasis on the Doctrine of the Blood of Jesus, with which, as he

justly observes, the entire New Testament is penetrated. Mr. Marston's treatment of it is far too brief. It is most unfortunate that a brochure of twenty pages is more than half taken up with an almost entirely valueless discussion which followed the paper as originally delivered.

In the lecture on "The Reformation and the Modern Man," Mr. Marston sets down four propositions—that the Reformation contributed to the modern world four elements—the Rights of Culture, the Service of Man, the Adapting of Public Worship, and the Knowledge of the New Testament. We believe that these propositions can be substantiated, but we hesitate to say that the lecturer did, or could, fully substantiate them in his lecture at Cambridge. They are worth fuller treatment, and we hope Mr. Marston will find time to give it to them. He seems to have felt the need of fuller explanation, for a postscript is added; but, to make his point, the author introduces us to the little known Rector of the University of Paris in the fourteenth century, Marsiglio of Padua, and the introduction takes up more space than the information derived.

We thank Mr. Marston, therefore, for most valuable hints, and hope to receive in time a fuller working out of the motifs thus stated. J. R. D.

THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL REFORM. By James R. Howlerton, Professor of Philosophy in Washington and Lee University. London: *Fleming H. Revell and Co.* Price 2s. 6d.

These lectures, delivered before the students of the New Brunswick Theological Seminary, form a scholarly, sane, useful contribution to the consideration of one of the problems of the day.

The first lecture consists mainly of a review of the movements which have, in the past, made for civil and religious liberty, for Dr. Howlerton believes that a revival of the motives that actuated the patriots and martyrs in these conflicts, will stimulate us to the discharge of our duty to our own times. He discusses frankly and fully the present social unrest and "the new despotism" of wealth. Of the latter he says: "Human selfishness is the real tyrant. In a savage state of society he uses a club; in a more advanced state he uses the sword and the cannon; in a still more advanced state he uses the dollar." He proceeds to show that the tyrannical use of money has been made possible by the conditions of the age, and he very truly observes that "the man who has lived through the last three-quarters of a century, has lived a life equal to any previous thousand years in the history of the world, in the opportunity it has given him to see the progress of science, of invention, of discovery, and of the consequent development of the sources of wealth." He faces the facts of the inequality of the distribution of wealth and the use that is made of it, nor can he be charged with overstating his case when he says that "making all due allowance for contributions to churches, schools and colleges, hospitals, art galleries, libraries, etc., these gifts, though they amount to hundreds of millions, are but a fraction of what has been flagrantly abused for selfish ends, even at the expense of the promotion of sin and vice and misery of every kind." He has some plain things to say about the blind optimism that will not look the evil of the times in the face. The last lecture is devoted to the Church and the social

reforms of the day. He is a firm believer in the mission of the Kingdom of Christ. He is insistent on the call to service.

Let one further quotation serve to show the writer's position :

"What makes the dream of Jesus impossible is that men believe it to be impossible. Yet faith never creates conditions of success where they do not exist. Faith makes no facts. Faith never created a physical force or a spiritual power. Faith, however sincere and earnest, never can convert error into truth. But faith can discover and release forces, physical and spiritual, which ignorance or unbelief has long suppressed. All the wonderful forces of nature which men have utilized in our own age, existed when man was yet in the ages of stone. By their discovery it has become possible to flash messages across the mountains, underneath and over the seas; to send great masses of steel and iron through the heart of the Alps across which Hannibal toiled so painfully; to send our floating palaces across the seas which Columbus explored at such risk; to soar above the eagles in the clouds. . . . The history of all scientific progress has been that of the scepticism of the many conquered by the faith of the few. . . . Another half century will witness the abolition of many evils now deemed ineradicable. May it not be that for these two thousand years Jesus has been telling men of the existence of spiritual powers which would make His dream a reality even here in this world, if men would only believe in these powers and use them?"

We commend this little book to those who would understand the present need and the Church's opportunity.

**THE INTERREGNUM.** By R. A. P. Hill, B.A., M.D. *Cambridge University Press.* Price 4s. 6d. net.

This is a volume consisting of twelve essays from the pen of one who is apparently a medical missionary in China. The subject is religious doubt, and the interregnum is "that stage in a man's mental development when the old beliefs and sanctions of childhood are lost, and he has not yet had time to form views of his own." A most useful book to put into the hands of those who are beset with doubts. It is to be hoped that when it reaches its second edition it will appear in a cheaper form.

## Publications of the Month.

[Insertion under this heading neither precludes nor guarantees a further notice.]

### BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

MACMILLAN'S SHILLING THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY. *New Volumes* :—

**CHRISTIAN CHARACTER.** Lectures on the Elements of Christian Ethics. By J. R. Illingworth, M.A., D.D. (1904).

**CONVERSATIONS WITH CHRIST.** A Biographical Study. By Bernard Lucas (1905).

**KINGDOM OF GOD, THE.** Four Lectures delivered under the auspices of the Cambridge Christian Evidence Society. By William Temple, Headmaster of Repton (1912).

**CHRISTIAN ECCLESIA, THE.** Course of Lectures on the Early History and Early Conceptions of the Ecclesia. By F. J. A. Hort, D.D. (1897).

**DIVINE LIBRARY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.** Its Origin, Preservation, Inspiration, and Permanent Value. By the Very Rev. A. F. Kirkpatrick, D.D. (1891).

**TRUE WORDS FOR BRAVE MEN.** A Book for Soldiers' and Sailors' Libraries. By Charles Kingsley (1890).

**GREAT TEXTS OF THE BIBLE, THE.** Edited by the Rev. James Hastings, D.D. Psalms xxiv.-cxix. (*T. and T. Clark.* 10s. Subscription Price 6s. net.) A further volume of a work absolutely indispensable to the preacher who would keep abreast of the times.

**GREATER MEN AND WOMEN OF THE BIBLE, THE.** Moses—Samson. Edited by the Rev. James Hastings, D.D. (*T. and T. Clark.* 10s. Subscription Price 6s. net.) "Every preacher will want this series," was the CHURCHMAN'S comment on the first appearance of this work, and succeeding volumes only deepen our sense of its immense value as an aid to scholarly pulpit work.

**SCENIC STUDIES OF THE BIBLE BACKGROUND.** With maps and illustrations. By Sophie M. Nicholls, M.A., F.R.G.S. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 3s. 6d. net.) A valuable work charmingly arranged.

**ONE BAPTISM.** By H. F. M. With Foreword by Canon Barnes-Lawrence. (*Robert Scott.* 1s. 6d. net.) A simply-written and effective treatise upon one of the two Sacraments, "true," as the foreword has it, "to the essential principles of our Church and to the views of the compilers of the Prayer-Book in their maturest conviction, and, above all, to the general teaching of Holy Scripture."

### CHURCH HISTORY, ETC.

**PAPAL QUESTION, THE.** By George Bayfield Roberts. (*Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd.* 2s. 6d. net.) An important addition to the "St. Paul's Handbooks" series.

Mr. Bayfield Roberts one of the ablest controversialists on the E.C.U. side, and the object of this volume is to shatter the claims of Papal jurisdiction. It "does not profess to be a comprehensive treatise; it is merely a handbook." Its argument appears principally to be directed to those in danger of secession. "When an English Churchman has been received into communion by an intruded Bishop, he has not, as he fondly supposes, been 'received into the Church.' The unit of the Church, the Catholic centre of unity is not the Pope, but the lawful Bishop of the ancient See. To be in communion with the lawful Bishop is to be in the Church; not to be in communion with the lawful Bishop is to be out of the Church. To renounce the jurisdiction of the lawful Bishop, and to submit to that of an intruded Bishop, is not to pass from one Church to another, or to be 'received into the Church.' It is merely to go out from the Church by committing an act of schism."

**ENGLISH CHURCH LIFE FROM THE RESTORATION TO THE TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT.** Considered in some of its neglected or forgotten features. With photogravure portrait of Robert Nelson. By J. Wickham Legg, LL.D. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 12s. 6d. net.) An attempt to reverse the popular opinion of the condition of the Church during this period. "Something better than a complete indifference to duties, or a gross neglect of them, prevailed from 1660 to 1833"; and the author's way of establishing his case is to let the writers of the period speak for themselves, and to express their own opinions and to give their own facts. "This may be a dull way of writing history . . . but . . . may possibly be more satisfying and attractive to scholars than the eloquence of an advocate."

**INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH, THE.** By George Salmon, D.D. (*John Murray.* 2s. 6d. net.) A most welcome reprint of a really great work, making Dr. Salmon's lectures readily available to all.

### DEVOTIONAL.

**HOSPITAL PRAYERS.** Compiled by the Rev. T. R. Blumer. (*Marshall Brothers, Ltd.* 1s. net.) A very happily selected collection of prayers written by the Bishop of Durham, Canon Gouldsmith, Dr. Alexander White, Dr. Horton, Rev. F. B. Meyer, and others. Calculated to fulfil a useful ministry in the sick-room of private houses as well as in the hospital ward.

**A SOUL'S CRISIS.** By Robert A. Croll. (*Marshall Brothers, Ltd.* 6d. net.) An appeal to "men of the world"; a message to those who are conscious of their own sins. In it the writer answers the doubts and questions of his own heart by light through prayer, and believes his experience will be useful to others.

### NOVELS AND STORIES.

**THE GIRONDIN.** By Hilaire Belloc. (*T. Nelson and Sons.* Sevenpenny Library Series.)  
**CHÂTEAU BY THE LAKE, THE.** By Amy Le Feuvre. (*R.T.S.* 3s. 6d.) A really delightful story by this talented authoress. Full of incident, and bright, fresh, and entertaining throughout. Centres round a broken engagement and a mysterious chateau, yet elevating and inspiring.

A THIEF IN THE NIGHT. Last Chronicles of Raffles. By E. W. Hornung. (*T. Nelson and Sons*. Sevenpenny Library Series.)

### BIOGRAPHY.

GRAIN OR CHAFF? The Autobiography of a Police Magistrate. By Alfred Chichele Plowden. (*T. Nelson and Sons*. Shilling Library Series.)

### GENERAL.

LIFE AT THE ZOO. By C. J. Cornish. (*T. Nelson and Sons*. Shilling Library Series.) A collection of delightful "notes" on life and traditions at the Zoological Gardens, Regent's Park. Mr. Cornish's articles in the *Spectator* have shown us how much there is to interest us in the study of Zoology, and this volume is worthy of the writer at his best.

MARTYRDOM OF A PEOPLE, THE. By Henry Friedner. (*Drummond's Tract Depot, Stirling*. 1s. net.) An interesting history of the Vaudois of Piedmont.

### PAMPHLETS, ETC.

OUR NATIONAL FLAG. By "An Old Naval Officer." Cheap Edition. (*S.P.C.K.* 1d.) Full of information about "The Flag"—what it is and what it is not; with striking illustrations.

CHURCH IN UGANDA, THE. A Charge to Missionaries of the Uganda Mission, 1913. By the Right Rev. J. J. Willis, D.D. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 6d. net.)

ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND TOWARDS THE MINISTRY OF NON-EPISCOPAL CHURCHES, THE. By J. T. Tomlinson. (*Church Association*.)

### REPORTS, ETC.

SPIRITUAL HEALING. Report of a Clerical and Medical Committee of Inquiry into Spiritual Faith and Mental Healing. (*Macmillan and Co., Ltd.* 1s. net.)

### QUARTERLY REVIEWS.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA for April. (*Charles Higham and Sons*.) Principal Contents: *The Minister in Politics*. Karl F. Geiser. *The Jews and Race Survival (II)*. Edward M. Merrins. *The Pentateuchal Text, the Divine Appellations, and the Documentary Theory*. Harold M. Wiener. *Sociological Morals*. Henry H. Beach. *The New Testament Quotation of a Twice-Repeated Prophecy*. Henry A. Sanders. *Royce's Philosophy of Religion*. Edwin S. Carr. *Doctrine of the Catholic Church Touching Indulgences*. Hugh Pope. *Is the Documentary Theory Tenable (II)*. Johannes Dahse.

### MONTHLY MAGAZINES.

CHINESE REVIEW, THE. (42, Hillfield Road, N.W.) First number of a new monthly designed to promote a better and more enlightened understanding between the East and the West.

ENGLISH CHURCH REVIEW, THE. (*Longmans, Green and Co.*) Principal Articles in May number: *Scottish Episcopacy*. By the Provost of St. Mary's Cathedral, Glasgow. *The Sanhedrin and Jesus' Resurrection*. By the Editor. *A Note on the Revision of the Psalter*. By the Rev. T. Thompson, St. Anselm's House, Cambridge. *On Secession*. By the Rev. W. R. Johnson.

CHURCH MISSIONARY REVIEW. (*C.M.S. House*.) Principal Articles in May number: *Place of Prayer in Life and Work*. Rev. A. Daintree. *A Suggested Policy for Mass Movements*. Rev. C. F. Hall. *The C.M.S. in India*. Rev. C. D. Snell. *Six Months in the Dornakal Diocese*. Rev. G. H. Cranswick. *A Visit to Bulandshahr*. Rev. A. J. Harvey.

C.M. GLEANER. C.M.S. GAZETTE. MERCY AND TRUTH. AWAKE. THE ROUND WORLD. (*C.M.S.*)

CAMBRIDGE CHRISTIAN LIFE. A University Journal. (*Robert Scott*.)

LIGHT AND TRUTH. (*Spanish and Portuguese Church Aid Society*.)

WORK AND PLAY. A new monthly paper for boys and girls, imparting instruction in hobbies and home handicrafts, and providing stories and healthy reading generally. (*Nelson House*, 53, Fleet Street. 1d.)

INDIA'S WOMEN AND CHINA'S DAUGHTERS. (*C.E.Z.M.S.*)

SOUTH AMERICAN MISSIONARY MAGAZINE. (*S.A.M.S.*)

GREATER BRITAIN MESSENGER. (*C.C.C.S.*)

LONDON CITY MAGAZINE. (*L.C.M.*)

CHURCH AND PEOPLE. (*C.P.A.S.*)