

# 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

November, 1914.

## The Month.

The All-  
Engrossing  
Topic.

THE war continues to engross public attention to the exclusion of every other subject. Even those who affect to be "heartily sick of it," and to be anxious to give their mind to anything else, find it more difficult than they imagined to take up seriously any other topic which under ordinary circumstances would appeal to them. It is well that it should be so, for this great crisis in our nation's history must be faced resolutely and sternly by the whole nation. The progress of the war is of the greatest possible moment to every man, woman, and child in the kingdom, and nothing but good can come to those who carefully and systematically endeavour to understand the exact position from day to day on the various fields of battle. None need fear that they are giving too much attention to the war. An intelligent acquaintance with the operations of our forces, and of those of our Allies, has many advantages. It serves to stimulate and to strengthen patriotism. When we read of the splendid gallantry, the dauntless heroism and the superb devotion of our sailors and soldiers on sea and land, it thrills us with a righteous national pride that we have men, serving their King and country, who are joyfully ready to pour out the last drop of their life's blood in upholding those eternal principles of justice and truth which are at stake in this conflict, and in vindicating the cause of right against might. It serves,

also, to call forth all that is best and noblest of human love and human sympathy with those on the field of battle. Who has not felt his heart riven through and through when reading of the awful hardships our men have had to undergo and of the piteous sufferings of the wounded? Nor has this sympathy expended itself in sickly sentiment. The glorious response made to the Prince of Wales's appeal for the National Relief Fund, and the ready support given to the many and varied efforts made for providing comforts for the troops, are indications that the nation's sympathies have been moved as never before. It serves, again, to sober and to steady the life of the nation. Before the war broke out we were given over to the love of luxury, pleasure, and worldliness, but now the nation is learning as it has never learnt before the seriousness of life, and with that knowledge has come greater simplicity of living, more self-denial, and higher aim and purpose. We do not say that in these respects all is yet well with us. We know, indeed, that there are still thousands of people who are as feather-brained and as flippant as ever; but we are profoundly convinced that to the great mass of our people has come a new vision and a new inspiration. It serves, once more, to turn the mind of the nation to the value and importance of prayer. As men and women contemplate the vastness of the forces now arrayed in battle, they realize, as they have rarely done, the absolute need of God's protecting mercy and care. We justly pride ourselves on our Dreadnoughts, we are deeply thankful for the skill and endurance of our men in the field; but the heart of the nation is learning afresh that its abiding strength is in the Lord Jehovah; and day by day thousands and thousands of people are committing our cause and all that it represents to God in prayer. It will be a great purpose accomplished when all men shall recognize that "the Most High ruleth in the Kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will." The more constant our prayers the firmer will be our resolve to hold with the Psalmist, "Some trust in chariots, and some in horses; but we will remember the name of the Lord our God."

War is one of God's sore judgments, and, whilst  
 Humiliation and Intercession. it may thankfully be recognized that a great change  
 has been wrought in the life of the nation during  
 these last two months, it rests gravely upon our leaders to consider whether the time has not come for a great act of national humiliation and intercession before God. Dr. J. Wilbur Chapman, the well-known Evangelist, has given a "Message to London" in these terms :

" This is the day of days for London. Commercial prosperity, the pursuit of pleasure, the glamour of the world, have turned men's thoughts from God to matters of comparatively small importance. Now, like a bolt out of a clear sky, there is a change. Peace has given way to warfare, and in the midst of life we are in death. This is a day when God is calling for surrender to Him, for enlistment in the service of His Son, and for our best effort to be put forth in the interests of our fellow-men. This is the day when the unsaved may be won to Christ, when the indifferent are willing to listen. God expects every man to do his duty—and to do it now. This is the day for prayer. I submit that if the Government should call for a day of fasting and prayer, the victory for which we long would be more easily won."—*Times*, October 17.

If it seem strange that the first public request for the appointment of such a day should appear in the advertisement columns of the *Times*, it ought to be remembered that the matter has been under consideration by leading Churchmen, and it is stated that the matter was formally discussed at a recent meeting of the Bishops. At the moment of writing the result of their deliberations is not known, but if such a day could be appointed, we believe it would have a solemnizing effect upon the nation. We need to humble ourselves before God and to approach Him in penitence and prayer. Only so can we look to Him for a blessing upon our arms. It would be a great mistake, however, to suppose that the mere conventional observance of a Day of Humiliation would avail much ; that would be to draw near to God with the lips, whilst the heart is far from Him ; but if the nation is prepared—and we trust that it is—to turn to God in sincerity and truth, He will hear and He will save.

Queen  
Victoria's  
Views.

The proclamation of a General Fast Day would be no new thing. It may be recalled that one was appointed at the time of the Famine in 1847, and by Her Majesty's special command there was issued "A Form of Prayer to be used in all Churches and Chapels throughout those parts of the United Kingdom called England and Ireland, on Wednesday, the twenty-fourth day of March, 1847, being the day appointed for Proclamation for a General Fast and Humiliation before Almighty God, in order to obtain Pardon of our Sins, and that we may in the most devout and solemn Manner send up our Prayers and Supplications to the Divine Majesty : For the Removal of those heavy Judgments which our manifold Sins and Provocations have most justly deserved ; and with which Almighty God is pleased to visit the Iniquities of this land by a grievous Scarcity and Dearth of divers Articles of Sustenance and Necessaries of Life." Another such day was proclaimed at the time of the Crimea, not, however, without some hesitation on the part of the Queen. At first Her Majesty was stoutly opposed to it, "as she thinks," so she wrote to the Earl of Aberdeen, "we have recourse to them far too often, and they thereby lose their effect." The Queen asked that "a *prayer*" should be "substituted for the *day of humiliation*." Her objection was twofold : first as to the character of the services. "Were the services selected for these days of a different kind to what they are, the Queen would feel less strongly about it ; but they always select chapters from the Old Testament and Psalms which are so totally inapplicable that it does away with all the effects it ought to have." But the Queen's objection went deeper still. Her second point raised the question whether the war called for humiliation, and the words she used seem so exactly to fit the present circumstances that they should be quoted in full. "Moreover," wrote Her Majesty to Lord Aberdeen, "really to say (as we probably should) that the *great sinfulness of the nation* has brought about this War when it is the selfishness and ambition of *one* man and his servants who have brought this about, while our conduct

has been throughout actuated by unselfishness and honesty, would be too manifestly repulsive to the feelings of everyone, and would be a mere act of hypocrisy. Let this be a prayer expressive of our great thankfulness for the benefits we have enjoyed, and for the immense prosperity of this country, and entreating God's help and protection in the coming struggle. In this the Queen would join heart and soul. If there is to be a day set apart, let it be for prayer in this sense" ("Letters of Queen Victoria," vol. iii., p. 25). It will be recognized that there is a great deal of shrewd common sense, as well as of genuine religious feeling, about this letter, and the caution it contains deserves to be held in remembrance by those who will have the responsibility of drawing up the Service which it is desired to hold in connection with the present war. It ought not to be forgotten that in this respect our hands are quite clean, but there is much in our national life which should humble a Christian nation to the very dust. These sins must be acknowledged and repented of, and it may be that this war is God's call to us as a nation to return unto Him. In 1857, in reference to the calamitous state of affairs in India, it was again proposed to hold a day of National Prayer and Humiliation, and the Queen reminded Lord Palmerston of her former objection. She suggested "its being more appropriately called a day of prayer and intercession for our suffering countrymen than of fast and humiliation." The Queen also advised it being on a *Sunday* and not on a week-day, as "on the last Fast-day the Queen heard it generally reported that it produced more harm than good, and that if it were on a Sunday it would be much more generally observed." In this matter, however, the Queen evidently modified her request, as the day was observed on *Wednesday*, October 7, 1857. It may be that the appointment by Proclamation of a general Day of Humiliation is not without its difficulties and dangers, but with due care on the part of those responsible and with the hearty co-operation of Christian leaders of all denominations—an essential factor in a successful issue—these difficulties and dangers may be overcome.

To those who are troubled about the problem—  
Christianity  
and War. and problem it is—of Christianity and war, we may commend the very striking article by the Dean of Durham in the new issue of the *Church Quarterly Review*. He shows, in connection with such questions as “Can a Christian man escape from the plain language of the New Testament, or deny the obvious inconsistency between war and those principles of action which received supreme exposition in the life of Jesus?” that the variety of opinion which marked the earlier patristic period was replaced by a general acceptance of St. Augustine’s doctrine, that war “in obedience to the Divine command, or in conformity with His laws,” implies no breach of the Christian law. It is this doctrine which still holds the field. It is sustained by a twofold argument—practical and Scriptural. The Old Testament, it is admitted, carries the legitimacy of war on every page, and Dr. Henson cites a passage from Maurice to show that the New Testament presupposes the Old, and must not be supposed to disallow its witness, save where such a disavowal is specifically stated. The Dean, however, points out that the fact that the Christian conscience tolerated war in the past is no reason for thinking that it ought to tolerate it in the future. Von Bernhardt’s attempt to claim Christian sanction for a doctrine of war which has certainly shocked the conscience of the civilized world is shown to be based on strange reasoning and stranger exegesis, and the Dean contends that as against the German militarist the founder of the Quakers holds an impregnable position. The Quaker doctrine is carefully examined by the Dean, who also refers us to the fact that whilst within the last few years a section of Christian divines, mostly Nonconformist, have set themselves to preach a species of international Quakerism, “the most conspicuous of these preachers of peace, Dr. Horton, has found himself compelled to abandon his doctrine at the first crisis.” What, then, is the Dean’s own conclusion? He states it with characteristic exactness :

“Armies and navies have precisely the same title to exist in a sin-disordered world as policemen, judges, and clergymen. All, we hope, will

be dispensed with in that future, which faith can discern even now, when the kingdom of God shall have been finally established on the earth, and no man shall teach his brother, saying, ' Know the Lord, for all shall know Him ' ; and ' the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea.'

" In the meantime the Church works towards the abolition of war in two ways : First, by constantly raising the moral standard which determines the occasions of fighting ; next, by continually raising the standard of humanity in warfare. We may add yet a third. The Church upholds before mankind the ideal of universal peace resting on the basis of justice and love. This threefold activity of organized Christianity proceeds with ever more energy and effect as mankind is brought within the fellowship of Christ's Church, and in ever larger proportion accepts the government of His just and merciful Law. The action of nations will be finally shaped by the principles and standards of conduct which are accepted by the individuals which compose them. That the process of change must be gradual and slow is evident ; that it will be continuous and in the end triumphant no Christian can doubt."

The Appeal of German theologians and Missionaries addressed " to Evangelical Christians abroad "

A Decisive Reply.      was not calculated to carry much weight in this country. It was too partisan and too palpably at variance with acknowledged facts. Still, we are glad that leaders of religious thought and life amongst us felt it right to put out a detailed reply, and, as an answer to the allegations made, it could not be more convincing or decisive. The Reply bears the signatures of the Archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Armagh ; the Primus of the Episcopal Church in Scotland ; the Bishops of London, Winchester, and Ossory ; the Deans of Durham, St. Paul's, Wells, Westminster, and Christ Church, Oxford ; Professors Burkitt, Scott Holland, Moulton, Paterson, Peake, Sanday, and Swete ; Dr. Clifford, Rev. R. J. Campbell, Principal Forsyth, Dr. Horton, Dr. Scott Lidgett, Dr. Meyer, Dr. Campbell Morgan, Sir William Robertson Nicoll, and Principal Selbie ; Lord Balfour of Burleigh (President of the Edinburgh Conference, to which special reference was made in the Appeal), Dr. Eugene Stock, and many other distinguished men. The Reply traverses almost every statement of the Appeal, resisting as " wholly baseless and untrue " the wicked allegation that Belgian territory was only violated after the Belgians had

agreed to allow the French to march through. The facts are, of course, incontestable, and the Reply in simple charity can but suppose, "incredible as it seems, that those honourable and gifted men who signed the German Appeal were unaware of the obligations by which we were bound, and also of the story of the negotiations." The Reply also reminds the German theologians of the teachings of Treitschke and Bernhardi, which were strangely ignored in the Appeal. Finally, the Reply, whilst deploring the disastrous consequences of the war, reasserts in unmistakable language the British position. "Dear to us as peace is, the principles of truth and honour are yet more dear." The Reply is wonderfully effective, but we have reason for doubting whether the full text—with the weighty list of signatures—has been published in Berlin.

We commend to the careful attention of the Bishop of Salisbury a volume which has just been published by one of his clergy, "The Priest as Confessor," by the Rev. A. H. Baverstock, Rector of Hinton Martel, Wimborne. It is one of the most audacious attempts to secure recognition within the Church of England of the practice of Auricular Confession ("voluntary, but not optional") that we have ever read. It is not necessary here to traverse the extraordinary statements in this volume, but we may be permitted to refer to one chapter which we have read with the utmost astonishment. It is on "Getting People to Confession." Mr. Baverstock apparently recognizes the immense difficulties in the path of the advocate of the Confessional, and significantly quotes as the motto of this chapter the words of St. Francis of Sales: "More flies are caught with a teaspoonful of honey than with a pint of vinegar." What is the "teaspoonful of honey" that he has to offer? First from the pulpit:

"It will be well often to dwell on the inducements to a good confession; to speak of the joy which a good confession brings, the fears from which it delivers. When we preach on heaven, we should remind our hearers that its joys are forfeited by one mortal sin, and that this barrier to heaven is removed by the simple expedient of making a good confession. We can

preach on hell and point the same moral. Speaking to children, especially, we can dwell on the joy a good confession brings to our guardian angel and our friends in heaven."

Among the obstacles "which prevent sinners from presenting themselves at the Confessional" is shyness, and whilst nothing else will break it down but intercourse with individuals, "something may be done from the pulpit by familiarizing people with the business of confession":

"The confessional can be shown, and the people told exactly what happens—how the priest sits in this place and the penitent comes and kneels there; how the priest gives a blessing and the penitent says the *Confiteor*. It is even a good thing to sketch an imaginary confession. How a person might say, for instance: 'I confess to Almighty God, to Blessed Mary and all the saints, and to you, father, that I have sinned very much, in thought, word, and deed, by my fault, my own fault, my own grievous fault. I have often neglected my prayers, not saying them at all, or not saying them properly; I have spoken against religion; once I tried to set someone else against what I knew was right; I have stayed away from church on Sundays; as a child I was often disobedient and disrespectful to my parents; I once struck my mother,' etc. A description of this kind gives valuable opportunities of teaching some who already go to confession how to make better confessions."

Another deterrent is fear, or the sense of shame, and Mr. Baverstock has his remedies for this difficulty also; but he is frank enough to affirm that "in the attempt to establish regular habits of religion, and especially the habit of confession, the children are our greatest hope." As one "who has had a good deal of experience in hearing the confessions of quite small children," he "can testify to the really wonderful effects of this sacrament upon them." What, may we ask, does the Bishop of Salisbury think of the idea of "quite small children" being familiarized with the confessional?

Children  
and the  
Confessional.

Mr. Baverstock so entirely believes confession to be for the children's welfare that he is willing apparently to receive them even if their parents object. Here is what he says—the quotation is a long one, but it will repay perusal:

"It is, of course, desirable that children should go to confession with the knowledge and consent of their parents. But are we to say that such

knowledge and consent are necessary, and, as some priests have done, refuse to hear the children's confessions without them? I must confess that I feel strongly that we have no right to refuse any one of the Sacraments to a child on account of the withholding of consent by the parent. To begin with, every parent who has brought a child to the font has virtually consented to the child's undertaking to believe the Christian faith and live the Christian life; and these, as interpreted by the Church, include the belief in Penance, and its use when required. We should, I think, be prepared to deny strenuously the right of the parent to forbid what God and the Church allow and sometimes require. And I, for one, have no hesitation in saying to a child, forbidden confession by his parents, that he must hearken to God rather than to man. In this matter the priest has to contend for the liberties of the Christian child, and we have surely no right to acquiesce in any interference with these liberties on the part of the parents. We should, I think, decline to prepare children for Confirmation unless it is perfectly clear that they are to be left free to follow their own consciences in the matter of confession. Nor does it seem to me at all necessary in every case, although desirable in many, that children should tell their parents they are going to confession. Of course, there must be nothing like deceit. Confession should be so openly preached and practised, that all who come to the Church should know it is the custom. And those parents who never come, although they send their children, can scarcely expect to be consulted on matters in which they show so little interest."

Mr. Baverstock proceeds to offer counsel concerning "the preparation of children, whether before Confirmation or earlier, for first confession." We quote one more passage:

"Great care must be taken in dealing with the question of purity. In many cases the priest, from his experience in the confessional, knows how much in the way of evil is common knowledge among the children who attend his schools, and how far it is safe to talk about such matters. But he must reckon on the certainty that many children will require help to confess sins against purity, and he must tell them to say in the confessional if there is anything they find it difficult to confess, when he will be able to help them. All authorities are agreed nowadays on the necessity of facing this matter, where the welfare of souls is so much at stake; and the priest who brings to his task a reverence for the innocence of childhood and a love of holy purity is not likely to mishandle the subject."

We do not propose to comment upon these passages, but we think the parishioners of Hinton Martel, who are having this kind of teaching given to them and to their children, are entitled to be told whether their Bishop knows about it, and whether it has his approval, and we venture to express the earnest hope that the Bishop of Salisbury will not be long in letting his opinion be known.

## German Christianity (?) and the Great War.

BY THE REV. W. EDWARD CHADWICK, D.D., B.Sc.,  
*Vicar of St. Peter's, St. Albans.*

WE have learnt much during this terrible war, but possibly the most painful revelation we have received has been with regard to the moral standards of those German leaders who are ultimately responsible, not only for the war itself, but for the methods by which (on their side) it has been conducted. Here we have not to deal only with theories or principles, as these have been embodied in a great number of books and pamphlets; we have to deal with these principles expressed in conduct, such conduct as has produced nothing less than horror and loathing throughout the civilized world, even we believe (if the truth were known) among a very large number of Germans themselves. We are quite prepared to make large deductions for unpremeditated actions done in the heat of battle, also for exaggerated statements due to second or third hand information. But after all possible deductions have been made, there is left a simply appalling list of crimes for which not only German soldiers but German statesmen and military leaders must be held responsible.

Possibly few of us, even those who knew something of the anti-Christian ethical teaching which has been at work in Germany, realized how far this teaching had penetrated, how thoroughly it had affected the German character. We knew of the wild ravings of Nietzsche, and of the way in which his teaching had been popularized in the stories of Sudermann and Gerard Hauptmann; we knew how Treitschke had taught his pupils what he considered to be the practical lessons of history, and how Bernhardt had shown what Germany might hope to gain from the application of these principles in a particular sphere of conduct; but until the publication of official documents revealing the methods of German diplomacy, and until the committal of the almost indescribable atrocities of almost every

possible nature of which Germany has been guilty in her campaign against Belgium and France, we little realized how far these anti-Christian principles had actually affected those responsible for the government of the German people.

The whole experience is a striking example of a very definite—indeed, an inevitable—process, one to which I should like to call the careful attention of my readers.

Bishop Westcott always used to impress upon his pupils the following truth: that doctrine is the fruit of history, and that it supplies or forms both the motive power and the guidance for action or conduct.

It was especially in Germany that certain historical facts upon which Christian doctrine is built up were first assailed and then discredited. It is largely due to German scholars that the Incarnation and the Resurrection as historic *facts* have been widely denied. The next step—an inevitable one under the circumstances, though perhaps taken with a measure of reluctance—was to censure the *doctrines* founded upon these historic facts. Here, probably, many of Germany's theological and philosophical teachers deceived themselves into thinking that it would be possible to stop. But one cannot maintain a superstructure from which the foundations have been withdrawn; or, to use a more exact simile, one cannot expect a process to continue from which the motive power has been taken away. The secret of perpetual motion in the sphere of ethics has not been any more surely discovered than in the sphere of physics. Of this fact the earnest Christian worker has, every day of his life, only too abundant experience. Take from the traveller both guidance and the means of sustenance, and there is little hope of his reaching his journey's end in safety.

Many examples among German teachers might be quoted to illustrate the process I have briefly indicated—first, the discrediting or denial of the miraculous historical facts of Christianity; secondly, the ceasing to believe in the doctrines based upon these; and, thirdly, the weakening of the moral motive, or rather the moral imperative, deduced from these doctrines. But

as my space is limited I will confine myself to one of these teachers—namely, Rudolf Eucken: for Eucken has not only for a long time held a foremost place among German teachers, but through a recent notorious utterance he has, at least in name, become known to a still far wider circle.

One of Eucken's most recent works is that entitled "Can we still be Christians?" (*Können wir noch Christen sein?*) The answer which Eucken gives to this question is as follows: "We not only can but must be Christians—only, however, on the one condition that Christianity be recognized as a progressive historic movement still in the making, that it be shaken free from the numbing influence of ecclesiasticism and placed upon a broader foundation" (p. 218). It is surely unnecessary to point out that this answer to the question must be taken as a whole, that when Eucken uses the term Christianity he uses it with a certain definite meaning, one which he has at least to some extent explained in the latter or conditional part of the answer before us. For a fuller, indeed a fairly complete, explanation of what Eucken understands by Christianity, we have only to study the book from which I have just quoted. Such a study will, I am sure, convince every unprejudiced reader that what Eucken means by Christianity is certainly not what the writers of the New Testament—who, we believe, wrote under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit—meant by it.

We will begin with the fact and doctrine of the Incarnation. Upon this fact and this doctrine the teaching of the first eighteen verses of St. John's Gospel is, if extraordinarily profound, yet perfectly clear. We now turn to Eucken's view: "The doctrine which teaches that God, at one particular point of history, assumes a human form—that a person is at once very God and very man—implies conceptions of God and of man which are and must be repellent not only to the scientific spirit of the modern man, but also to his religious conviction" (p. 30). A few lines farther we read: "The Church could of course decree that the two natures were one, but it did not thereby make the doctrine conceivable (*denkbar*), or invest it with any

vital power" (*Lebenskraft*). By the way, we may remark that the New Testament has never asserted that the doctrine of the Incarnation is "conceivable," if by that we mean what can be explained by the unaided human powers of reasoning. We may also notice that, if there is one fact more clear than another from the records of Christian history and experience, it is the "vital power" of this doctrine over the conduct of those who have whole-heartedly accepted it.

Of another great Christian fact and doctrine Professor Eucken writes: "The conception of an atoning, vicarious suffering is repellent and distasteful to our modern minds. . . . To our scientific, and still more to our religious temper (*Denkart*), there is something impossible in the idea of a God who is wroth with our sins and demands His Son's atoning blood before He can again become gracious to mankind" (p. 31). It is almost unnecessary to notice that this last sentence is more than a travesty, is in fact a direct contradiction, of the teaching of the New Testament, which asserts that "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son," surely an act of infinite graciousness and one of bestowing rather than of demanding! Upon the combined facts and doctrines of the Incarnation and Atonement—as these have been received from the New Testament and held and taught by the Church—Eucken's comment is: "No power on earth can force us to respect as religious a conception which we once perceive to be of the nature of a myth" (p. 32). Does not Eucken here go far beyond the denial of what we have been accustomed to call "Christianity"? Does he not actually overthrow the highest spiritual teaching of the noblest teachers of the ancient heathen world?

Now we come to the next step. Eucken knows the age in which he lives, and so he reminds us that, "The loosening of this complex of metaphysical assertions led modern Christianity to turn with gladness to that other assemblage of facts which, as belonging to history (which apparently the Incarnation and Resurrection do not), is so much nearer and simpler, and

seemed so much less debatable. We refer to the personality and life work of Jesus, and to His doctrine that the kingdom of heaven is at hand and that man is a child of God. The irresistible force and freshness of this preaching, its wonderful earnestness, its joyous, childlike confidence, were so purely human, and so free from all taint of dogma, that they seemed to offer a sufficient compensation for the weakening of the old metaphysical belief" (p. 33). Though Eucken does not mention his name, the position here indicated is surely not entirely different from that held by Harnack, one of Eucken's co-signatories to the letter which has now become so famous. At any rate it is a position which many German, and we fear not a few English, scholars, who still call themselves Christians, have flattered themselves they could maintain. Eucken well describes the feelings of those who think thus: "Let us rejoice in the life of Jesus as a valuable possession for the human race and an inexhaustible source of genuine power and sentiment" (p. 34). But Eucken is far too acute a thinker not to see how untenable this last position really is. He sees that it is a superstructure from which the foundations have been withdrawn, and therefore he quite rightly asks, "Can the personality of Jesus, once its metaphysical foundations are shaken, continue to hold that central, regulative, controlling position (*normierende und beherrschende Stellung*) which ecclesiastical Christianity assigns to it?" Eucken freely admits that "that position rested after all upon the unique (*einzigartigen*) relationship to God involved in the belonging to the Divine nature: only from this point of view can Jesus rank as the unquestioned lord and master to whom all ages must do homage. . . . In this case we should no longer see in Jesus the type and standard of what all human life should be" (p. 34).

It must surely be admitted that nothing could possibly be clearer than the process here delineated. First, the facts, at once historical and metaphysical, are denied, and together with these go the doctrines, the working principles of life which faith in the facts involves, then inevitably also go the motive power

and guidance for conduct which these doctrines contain. We would certainly commend a study of Eucken to those who still flatter themselves that a "moral" apart from a metaphysical Christianity is possible. Yet we fear there are many such. We should not put Eucken in the first rank of logical thinkers, but he is far too logical, far too clear-sighted, to be misled into such a position as this. Eucken knows well how "this dis-severance of Christian thought from both historical and metaphysical statement has been regarded as a triumph for breadth and freedom,"<sup>1</sup> but he is perfectly convinced that, however attractive the position may be, it is a perfectly untenable one; in his own words, "Christianity is left without any solid foundation of fact whatsoever, and at the same time is deprived of any sure central truth to bind together all its individual convictions and give them an unshakable certainty" (p. 35).

The question before us therefore is, Christian facts having gone, and with them Christian doctrines, what is to become, or rather what has become, of Christian ethics or morality?

The manner in which German diplomacy was conducted during the period previous to the outbreak of the war, and the behaviour of German officers and soldiers during its course, is one, and a very practical, answer to this question. Bearing these in mind, people have come to the conclusion that this conduct was due simply to the influence of avowed anti-Christian teachers like Nietzsche and Treitschke, and to strategists like Bernhardt, who would put this teaching into practical application. This conviction reminds us of that which was held until a few weeks ago—that this war was in Germany simply the war of a dominating minority, and was not the war of the nation as a whole; but few, we fancy, now hold this to be the case.

In the present paper I have no intention of dealing with the moral teaching of either Nietzsche or Treitschke, I simply desire to consider the position of those who, like Eucken, have given up the "metaphysical and historical facts" of Christianity, but who at the same time would give to the question, "Can we

<sup>1</sup> "Can we still be Christians?" p. 35.

still be Christians?" the same answer which Eucken himself gives—"We not only can, but must be Christians." Reading between the lines of those pages which deal with the subject in the book before us, as also in the chapter of his "Main Currents of Modern Thought" ("Geistige Strömungen der Gegenwart"), which is entitled "The Problems of Morality," I cannot feel that Eucken himself is altogether happy concerning the moral question at the present time. The opening words of the chapter to which I have alluded are as follows: "To-day our conception and our valuation (*die Schätzung*) of morality are alike extremely unsettled." Eucken admits that "from one point of view morality seems to offer a solid foundation in the midst of the upheaval of philosophical and religious convictions. . . . If all else be insecure, there still remains man and his relationship to man; our social life offers us tasks the reality of which is beyond dispute."<sup>1</sup> But Eucken sees that a morality which "is practically synonymous with altruism"—the placing of other people's interests before our own—"and which has no higher motive or stronger foundation than this—is at least in a somewhat insecure position; it may be," he says, "that men so readily unite on the basis of altruistic morality because it places the deeper moral problems in the background, if not actually denying their existence."<sup>2</sup> One or two further remarks of Eucken's upon this subject may be quoted: "Our age," he says, is "without a characteristic morality capable of satisfying its most inward necessities. Regarded from the point of view of its innermost nature, morality is to-day at least as insecure as is religion. . . . How greatly the fact that we have no morality of our own reduces the power of morality in the present age . . . is made abundantly clear by numerous observations of modern life."<sup>3</sup> Certainly this last sentence might easily be thus applied: The fact that the section of the German people responsible for the cause and for their conduct of the present war do not possess what we have been accustomed to call morality is made only too "abundantly clear."

<sup>1</sup> "Main Currents," p. 385.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 387.

The next section of the chapter from which I have been quoting—an extremely interesting one—is entitled “Morality and Metaphysics.” Here Eucken plainly confesses that the moral cannot be separated from the metaphysical; to attempt to do so is “unavoidably to reduce it to a state of lamentable superficiality.” Then follows this—considering all that has gone before—almost startling assertion: “It is our conviction that all morality sinks to a mere appearance (*zu einem blossen Schein*) if the spiritual life—the appropriation of which is the object of morality—does not form the kernel of morality.”<sup>1</sup> But this is just what Christian teachers have always asserted; only, instead of saying that the appropriation of the spiritual life being the “object” of morality, they would say that the appropriation of this life gave the power to “do righteousness.” To put the matter quite briefly, it seems as if Eucken, having denied the metaphysical basis of Christianity, now proceeds to assert the necessity for a spiritual basis of morality. This “metaphysical basis,” consequently, cannot be Christian. Then what does Eucken mean by his assertion that “We not only can, but must, be Christians”? Does he not show himself here an example of those who deny the Christian explanation of life and its phenomena as too difficult, and then immediately proceed to demand our acceptance of another explanation which is infinitely more difficult?

In the first work of Eucken's from which I quoted the subject of Christian morality, is treated with greater fulness. But if the treatment is full, it is in places extremely one-sided, and shows a strange blindness to the facts of experience. For instance, he states that “Christian morality has been influential in controlling the individual disposition rather than in transforming general conditions.”<sup>2</sup> But by what means, we would ask, have “general conditions” (*die allgemeinen Verhältnisse*) usually “been transformed”? Has not one man, or a small group of men, influenced other men, who, in their turn, have convinced a still wider circle that the relationships (*die Verhältnisse*)

<sup>1</sup> “Main Currents,” p. 391.

<sup>2</sup> “Can we still be Christians?” p. 36.

between individuals and groups within society needed reform? Is Eucken entirely blind to the changes produced by Christianity during the first three centuries of its existence, or to what it has done towards ameliorating social conditions during the last fifty years? Again, when he says that "it seems as though Christian lore were limited to private relationships and were not equal to grappling with general" (*allgemeinen*) "problems," it almost appears as if in these "general problems" he would ignore the personal relationships. We know from history how often this method has been attempted, we know how frequently the human factor has been ignored—possibly never more egregiously than by Germany in the present war—but we also know how fatal the forgetfulness of this element in the problem has always been. We fully admit that "the status of morality in Christianity was [we should say *is*] conditioned and determined by the fact that Christianity regarded [regards] the relationship of spirit to spirit, of personality to personality, as constituting the kernel of life," but we should add that Christianity does not consider merely the relationship of one personality to another, but also of each personality to an Infinite Personality which is at once human and Divine.

A little further on we arrive at what appears to be the key to the position we are attempting to examine. We are told that "the concept of the Personality of God cannot be regarded any longer as a symbol of ultimate truth, but merely as unseemly anthropomorphism." We have already found the denial of the Divine Personality of Christ, now we come to the denial of the Personality of God—in spite of both we are told we "must" still be Christians; then what, we would ask, is left to us, as either the motive power or as the ideal of morality or conduct, especially as altruism or love to one's neighbour has also been thrown overboard? And, it must be carefully remembered that we are not engaged in considering the wild ravings of a Nietzsche, but the calm and dispassionate reasoning of one whom Germany regards as one of her most spiritually-minded teachers, and who bids us "still be Christians"!

It may be thought that I should now proceed to show what Eucken does mean by "Christianity," what he implies when he asserts that "we not only can but must be Christians." But an adequate examination of his positive teaching, besides demanding far more space than is at my disposal, would be foreign to my present purpose, which is to show that one logical conclusion of dethroning the unique supremacy of Christ—of His example, His teaching, and His spirit—has issued in the absolutely contrary doctrine, that "might is right," a principle which, in the present war, Germany has expressed in action, in such a way as it has rarely, if ever, been expressed before. I have, of course, made no attempt to prove the truth of the Christian position, the truth of those facts and doctrines which Eucken denies, for this has been done in many an excellent English treatise on Christian Apologetics. The task I have set before myself is thus a strictly limited one—namely, first to remind my readers of certain very recent experiences—the diplomatic methods employed by Germany previous to the outbreak of the war and the way in which the war itself has actually been conducted by Germany—both of which may, I think, be regarded as expressions of conceptions of morality held by an influential section of the German people; secondly, by taking Professor Eucken as an example—and he is certainly one of the most highly and most widely honoured of German philosophical and religious teachers—to draw attention to the nature of the religious and ethical teaching which of recent years has been given in Germany. What I would now ask my readers to do is, to put the conduct of the war on the part of Germany side by side with this teaching, and to consider them together. Everyone must surely admit that this conduct has been marked by an extraordinary absence of what we have been accustomed to regard as Christian morality. It must equally be admitted that from the teaching there has been withdrawn practically everything which we have been accustomed to regard as the essential foundation and also the essential motive of Christian conduct. Can we dissever the behaviour of Germany in connection with the war

from the teaching which apparently Germany has been widely receiving? Is the former wholly independent of the latter? Are we not rather driven to the conclusion that the conduct is the logical issue of the teaching?

May I, in conclusion, very briefly refer to the influence of another great religious and, at the same time, great philosophical teacher—an English teacher, the late Bishop Westcott? In England we have for the last hundred and fifty years been engaged in a great warfare; I refer to the industrial conflict. That the conditions under which, and the spirit in which, and the weapons with which, this warfare has for the last five-and-twenty years been waged are far more truly and more loftily moral than they were previous to that time, has been chiefly due to the influence of Christian teachers who, like Bishop Westcott, began their teaching with a clear statement of the fundamental facts and doctrines of Christianity—*e.g.*, the Incarnation—and then showed the inevitable issue of a real belief in these upon the conduct of the struggle.

One thing the present war has clearly proved: That it is impossible to exaggerate the power of ideas, which are really the motive powers which govern conduct. It has been said that this war is largely due to the influence of German professors, that is, to the ideas so persistently disseminated by these, and the influence of Treitschke is generally held to have been especially powerful. What, we would like to ask, has been the influence of the professors of theology and of philosophy in Germany? If Eucken's teaching upon ethics may be taken as a fair example of this, we cannot say that this influence has been exerted either in the highest direction or towards the purest ideals.

I trust I have made quite clear the process which, when once the first step is taken, seems to be an inevitable one. First, the *facts* of the Christian revelation are denied—Christ is no longer a Divine Figure or Personality; consequently, neither His example, nor His spirit, nor His words have a Divine authority. The *doctrine*, which is, of course, founded upon the

facts, must vanish when the facts vanish. The third and final step is as inevitable as the second. We can no longer be called upon to put into action principles for which authority no longer exists. Hence, having once denied the Divinity of Christ, we cannot be called upon either to obey His teaching or to copy His example, or to cultivate His spirit. But more: even if we would do all these, the Divine help whereby to do them has been removed. The faith which is the channel of the power through which the lower impulses of our nature should be subdued exists no longer.

Germany has, of course, set before us both an ideal and a power to realize it in the place of the Christian ideal and of the strength of Christ. What is this ideal and this power? The ideal is the self-determined object of the covetousness of the nation, or of the military leader, or even of the common soldier. The power to obtain it is absolutely unrestrained force, whether that of an intellect which uses truth or falsehood just as either best suits its purpose, and then, if this proves unavailing, employs, without regard to any feeling of justice, pity, or reverence, every instrument of destruction which modern science has invented. The tiger in man is let loose against every form of human prey whose cunning or whose weapons are weaker than its own.

The result is seen not only in the wholesale massacres of Belgian peasants—old men, defenceless widows, and little children; not only in the burning and looting of unfortified towns and villages, and the absolutely wanton destruction of some of the noblest monuments of medieval piety; but in the fact that in hundreds of thousands of homes in seven countries of Europe to-day there is found the bereaved parent, the broken-hearted widow, and the fatherless children.

This is what is offered us as a substitute for a true faith in the Divine Son of God—the Express Image of the Eternal Love.



## The Church of England and Episcopacy.<sup>1</sup>

A REPLY TO CANON A. J. MASON.

BY THE REV H. A. WILSON, M.A.,  
*Vicar of St. Peter's, Norbiton, Kingston-upon-Thames.*

THERE has been a loud call lately for a restatement of the High Anglican position on the Christian Ministry. A shrewd observer must have noticed that Apostolical Succession has fallen upon very bad times. Only a few months ago the Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson stated in "Foundations" that, "with regard . . . to the sense, if any, in which what is called Apostolical Succession may legitimately be asserted as a literal fact of history, the evidence is almost, if not quite, non-existent." It is scarcely possible to exaggerate the significance of these words, coming as they do from one who was then a tutor of Keble College. It is as if one in the immediate entourage of the Sultan of Turkey were to express doubts as to the existence of Mahomet, or a member of the Papal College suspicion as to the Episcopate of St. Peter. Doubt as to the very fundamental essential of High Anglicanism has invaded the college founded for the express purpose of fostering and preserving those views! This is but one of many indications that the need is great for believers in the High Anglican view of the ministry to present their case forcibly in the light of present-day historical criticism.

To English Churchmen, one of the most impressive branches of the evidence naturally is, what is the position for which our own Church stands? It is to this question that Canon Mason has applied himself in a book which is a monument of industry and painstaking care. We shall have occasion to examine his book candidly, and we hope without bias; but we should like to say at once that we believe it would not be possible to marshal the evidence with which it deals more favourably to High

<sup>1</sup> "The Church of England and Episcopacy," by Canon A. J. Mason. Published by the Cambridge University Press.

Anglicanism than it has been done by Canon Mason. We are acquainted with several volumes which have dealt with this evidence, but we know none so exhaustive as this. If it is possible to fasten Apostolic Succession on the Church of England, Canon Mason has done it; and if he has failed, we are quite confident no one else has a chance of success.

The book was written in view of the conference of Bishops held last July in connection with the situation which has arisen over the Kikuyu controversy.

We have read the book, and are confident that the case has been put in the strongest way by an author who is as conspicuous for his scholarship as for the respect and affection with which he is regarded in the Church; but we have put it down still utterly unconvinced and entirely unrepentant. We have not found adequate evidence to make us waver in the conviction that our Church's attitude, as expressed in its formularies and by the actions and words practically of all its great divines, was one of brotherly regard and Christian courtesy towards non-Episcopal Churches. We shall express this even more forcibly by-and-by.

The book is almost entirely filled with a series of quotations from the writings of leading Anglican divines from the Reformation to modern times. In our judgment a book planned on this line is unsatisfactory. This is no fault of Canon Mason's. We believe that he has wished to give the evidence fairly, although he confesses in the Preface that he does not profess to be impartial; but a catena of quotations from various authors is in itself an exceedingly unsatisfactory thing. For one reason, because serious omissions are inevitable, and, in the second place, because a naked quotation, apart from its historical context, is often gravely misleading.

To illustrate our first point we will take but two cases. Canon Mason gives a number of extracts from Whitgift's writings in which the Archbishop makes extreme claims for the Episcopate; *e.g.*, in writing to Beza, who had criticized Episcopacy sharply, Whitgift says "that the Bishops were appointed

as successors to the Apostles." Fortified by parallel passages, it looks as if in Whitgift we have a very uncompromising Episcopalian. But when we put side by side with them the following quotations, we get a vastly different light thrown upon his views: "That any one kind of government is so necessary that without it the Church cannot be saved, or that it may not be altered into some other kind, thought to be more expedient, I utterly deny." And again: "I deny that the Scriptures do set down any one certain form and kind of government of the Church, to be perpetual for all times, persons, and places, without alteration."<sup>1</sup> These passages have been overlooked by Canon Mason, and he has therefore given us, unintentionally no doubt, a wrong view of Whitgift's opinions.

Or, again, several times Jewel is referred to as a stiff upholder of Episcopacy as an integral part of the faith. Extracts from Jewel's works in which he defended our position against the Romanists are quoted, extracts which are fairly strong.<sup>2</sup> But we are not given the passage from the "Defence of the Apology" in which Jewel declares that if all the Bishops of the English Church were cut off, it would be no vital matter, she would not have recourse to Rome for a new succession—which reminds us of a well-known High Anglican who, in lecturing upon the Diocletian persecution, remarked that at one time Diocletian had all the Bishops of the Church in his clutches, and, had he known it, by cutting off their heads he could have severed the Church from the channels of Divine grace. Happily, however, the Emperor did not hold High Anglican views upon the ministry!

This phenomenon we could illustrate in many cases. It proves that the giving of strings of quotations is a radically unsound plan.

The second reason why we dislike the scheme of this book is because it takes no count of the circumstances under which

<sup>1</sup> Whitgift's "Defence of the Answer," ed. 1574, pp. 81, 84.

<sup>2</sup> We remember reading much stronger opinions expressed by a member of the Church Association (!) when defending our Episcopate against a Roman onslaught.

the works quoted were written. For instance, Hooker, Whitgift, Cooper, and others, must be read in the light of the conditions under which they wrote, and with a constant recollection of the position they were attacking. Under their particular circumstances, they would have shown themselves to be singularly incompetent to fulfil their task if they had not been able to put the case for Episcopacy strongly against people like Cartwright and "Martin Marprelate." There is little, if anything, they say which those of us who hold liberal views upon the ministry to-day would not agree to, especially under similar circumstances. Their adversaries were bitter and narrow men, who saw in Bishops the "mark of the beast" and the Woman of Babylon, who maintained that our Church had barely taken the first step to Reformation, who used vile and coarse abuse of every Bishop. When we remember this, we get the right perspective in which to view the words of our defenders, and the same applies, with some necessary qualification, to the works of Caroline and post-Restoration writers.

They were required to defend our system against malicious opponents, and it is significant to note their temperate language; to estimate their position accurately we ought to emphasize every tolerant expression, and, if anything, minimize their insistence upon Episcopacy. They would be eager to state their case as forcibly as possible, and would concede as little as ever they truthfully could. Consequently, when we find them in the midst of a bitterly hostile atmosphere admitting that necessity justified a non-Episcopalian ministry, which practically every one of them did, it is a fact of the greatest import.

So much in criticism of the general plan of the book. Now we will come to a more detailed examination.

Canon Mason remarks, on p. 482: "We have considered to some extent the formularies in which the collective mind of the Church has been expressed." Now, we must plainly ask, with becoming respect, can any author claim to have examined our formularies to *any* extent when he passes over the Articles of Religion without mention? Canon Mason bases his estimate

of Cranmer's opinions upon the Episcopate upon the Preface to the Ordinal and a footnote quotation. The former, Dr. W. H. Frere has admitted, "may certainly be pressed too far in the High Church direction"; space forbids us to examine it at length, but we maintain that the Articles generally express, not only the views of the Archbishop, but also of the Church of England as a body. Their witness, therefore, is primary and fundamental.

Why, in giving the notes of the Church, does Article XIX. studiously avoid all reference to Episcopacy? Why, in Article XXIII., instead of using the one word "Bishops," is this circumlocution employed: "those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard"?

Bishop Gibson of Gloucester, with reluctance, we fear, has told us why. It is because the Articles go no farther than to state that "Episcopacy . . . is an allowable form of Church government, and" leave "the question open whether it is the only one."<sup>1</sup> It would need far weightier evidence than is forthcoming from every quarter to neutralize the witness of the Articles. But why has Canon Mason ignored them?

Again, he passes over quite without mention, or in the most cursory way, all the pre-Elizabethan transactions. The fact that in the compilation of the Prayer-Book the Continental Churches were consulted, and their advice often acted upon, has apparently no significance for him. The fact that refugees from England at the time of the Marian persecution communicated freely with Continental non-Episcopalians is unmentioned, as also is the fact that, when the exiles from the Continent fled to England, they were given churches to worship in, and minister their sacraments to the present day in those churches. Bishop Gore once said that the Church of England would be rent asunder the day non-Episcopalians ministered at Anglican altars.

<sup>1</sup> "The Thirty-Nine Articles," p. 744.

This practice began in Elizabeth's reign, and is going on now in the Dutch Church in Austin Friars! A Huguenot congregation worships to-day in the crypt of Canon Mason's own cathedral.

No doubt he may fairly urge that the plan of his book precludes him from mentioning these things, full of significance though they are. If so, it is a confession of a serious defect in the scheme of the book. These things witness in the clearest fashion that our Church was aware of no disability which affected the status of the Continental Reformed Churches: they were sister Churches. A cursory glance at the "Zurich Letters" (which Canon Mason has overlooked) proves the jealousy with which our Church maintained its doctrinal identity with the non-Episcopalians of Europe. On February 7, 1562, for instance, Jewel wrote to Peter Martyr pointing out that the English Church did not "differ from your doctrine by a nail's breadth." Jewel was too good a theologian to overlook the difference in Church government, so, clearly, he regarded it as a mere non-essential.

The root question to ask is this: Did the Reformation, Elizabethan, and Carolinè divines regard the foreign Protestant bodies as Churches or not? If they did so regard them, then the obvious and inevitable conclusion is that they did not consider Episcopacy as essential to the existence of a Church. We maintain that the evidence mentioned proves that they not only admitted freely and fully the status of the Continental Churches, but acknowledged their equality with the Church of England. The farthest the old High Churchmen generally would go was to regard the Continental Churches as not so perfectly organized or so fully blessed as their own Church. A High Churchman like Andrewes could write that a man "must be stone-blind that sees not Churches standing without" Episcopacy; and a stanch Laudian like Bramhall was of opinion that "there is great latitude left to particular Churches in the constitution of their ecclesiastical regiment."

The part we like least in the book is the Appendix, in which

Canon Mason deals with the question whether or not non-Episcopalians were admitted to benefices with cure of souls from 1559 to 1662. The whole section has a distinct tone of special pleading about it. Much of the evidence for this interesting fact is, naturally, the testimony of contemporary divines and laymen. Why should Canon Mason speak contemptuously of this evidence as "certain stock quotations"? Surely such men as Bishop Joseph Hall, Bishop Cosin, Lord Clarendon, Bishop Burnet, and Bishop Fleetwood, are respectable enough authorities? In this section Canon Mason largely relies upon the Rev. E. Denny's pamphlet upon this subject. We are familiar with this work, and would remark that its author was *careful to omit the evidence* of Hall, Fleetwood, and Clarendon; that he speaks slightly of Cosin's evidence, and apparently was unacquainted with the "stock quotation" from Burnet, as he attempts to make him an advocate of the position he would fain substantiate.

We do not like the way Canon Mason deals with these "stock quotations." Much against our inclination, we feel that he is conscious that their evidence is very damaging, and must be explained, or shall we not say, plainly, explained away? Burnet is disposed of by the simple remark: "Burnet is probably dependent upon Clarendon." There is not the slightest evidence given for this statement, highly improbable though it is, for we can imagine no two men with an outlook on life so different from one another as Burnet and Clarendon. Fleetwood's evidence is demolished in a similar off-hand way. Cosin, so often advanced as a very paladin of High Anglicanism, is dismissed as a special pleader. Again: "It is possible that Hall may have been mistaken about the facts." Still, Canon Mason admits that there were a "few instances," "probably," of non-Episcopalians occupying benefices, with cure of souls, in our Church in those days. We can, however, claim Keble's support for a much larger estimate: "Nearly up to the time when Hooker wrote, numbers had been admitted to the ministry of the Church of England, with no better than Presbyterian ordina-

tion.”<sup>1</sup> The same authority differs from Canon Mason regarding the famous statute 13 Eliz., cap. 12. The latter says that this law, which appears to sanction the ministry of any ordained person, however ordained, on subscription to the Articles, applied only to those in Roman Orders, and that Travers did not appeal to it as affecting his case. Keble is not of this opinion. We will, however, give Travers' own words, and leave the reader to judge who is right :

“I have heard of those that are learned in the laws of this land, that by express statute to that purpose, anno 13 of Her Majesty's reign, upon subscription to the Articles agreed upon, anno 1562, that they who pretend to have been ordered by another order than that which is now established, are of like capacity to enjoy any place of ministry within the land, as they which have been ordered according to that which is now by law in this established. Which comprehending manifestly all, even such as were made priests according to the Church of Rome, it must needs be, that the law of a Christian land professing the Gospel should be as favourable for a minister of the Word as for a Popish priest . . . which if it be understood so, and practised in others, why should the change of the person alter the right which the law giveth to all others ?”<sup>2</sup>

We admit that the meaning of the Act is a disputed question, but there is little doubt it was commonly appealed to by non-Episcopalians, and none whatever that Travers did so.

There are a number of other detailed points which call for criticism, but space forbids, and the above must serve as samples. But before we come to the main question, one last word must be said. Canon Mason says (p. 21) that it would be absurd to maintain that our Church looked upon the question of ecclesiastical polity as one of indifference, or even of minor importance. We are not afraid of hard words, and, at the risk of being called “absurd,” it is just this which we do maintain. We admit that,

<sup>1</sup> Keble's Preface to Hooker, p. lxxvi.

<sup>2</sup> Travers' “Supplication to the Council” in Hooker's Works, ed. 1820, vol. iii., pp. 380, 381.

in combating blind bigots and narrow-minded vilifiers of Bishops, our divines carried their case for Episcopacy very far, but they never went so far as to make this an essential mark of a Church. We remember that these Presbyterian bodies were regarded in the most tender way by our Church; that Edwardian, Elizabethan, and Caroline divines did not scruple to communicate freely with them; that their advice was asked, and often taken, in drawing up our Liturgy; that men ordained by them held benefices with cure of souls in our Church; that many of our divines made the boast that our Church was in doctrinal agreement with theirs; that nowhere in the Prayer-Book is there any statement of the necessity, or even of the *desirability*, of Episcopacy for *every* Church. And remembering these things, we are not afraid of being called absurd.

We admit that many of these old divines spoke of non-Episcopal Orders as irregular; so do we liberal and evangelical Churchmen to-day. We admit that they spoke of a Divine Right of Episcopacy, and, in the same sense as, at any rate, the vast majority of them used the term, we would assent to it to-day, though we would use a provocative expression of this kind with great caution and qualification. We believe in the guidance of the Church by the Divine Spirit, and we have no difficulty in regarding the process by which Episcopacy grew up and spread as Divinely ordered, and the system itself as possessing a Divine Right, but not necessarily an exclusive Divine Right. We have no uneasiness whatever as to the desirability of Episcopacy. We rejoice to know our Church possesses it; we value and love it for its own sake, and we have not, nor ever had, any intention of dispensing with it, or even "tampering" with it. But we steadily refuse to base our adherence to it upon grounds wholly fictitious. This brings us to our final remark.

Canon Mason says (p. 449): "Enough has been said to show that a belief in the Divine institution of Episcopacy was no invention of the Oxford Movement, and no medieval theory dug out of the forgotten past."

Well, we have read Canon Mason's book with care, and the most favourable comment we can make is that he has not reconciled the Tractarian conception of the ministry with the formularies of our Church and the writings of its great divines, and much less has he established any legitimate connection between it and them.

We venture to suggest that the original Tractarian view of Episcopacy finds as little support in our old divines as it would from High Anglican authorities to-day. In 1869, A. W. Haddan, a prominent Tractarian, published a learned historical work on "Apostolical Succession in the Church of England." We will give his amiable definition of the doctrine; on p. 14 of this book he writes:

"It means, in a few words, without Bishops no Presbyters, without Bishops and Presbyters no legitimate certainty of Sacraments, without Sacraments no certain union with the mystical Body of Christ—viz., with His Church—without this no certain union with Christ, and without that union no salvation."

We maintain that this perfectly horrible doctrine would have been repudiated by our old divines with the same loathing that we ourselves—and we are sure every High Churchmen to-day—would display. Possibly hints of such an appalling view might be found in the vulgar pamphleteers of old time, but we find no trace of such a thing in any respectable Father of our Church. Bishop Gore, extreme though his views on the ministry are, does not hesitate to say that such extravagance seems to him "to approach to blasphemy against the Holy Ghost."<sup>1</sup> He speaks of the non-Episcopal bodies in this passage, and sometimes in other places, as "Christian Churches."

There are, happily, not a few indications that High Churchmen to-day are cutting themselves loose from the extremes of the old Tractarian view. What scholarly High Churchman to-day would, for instance, agree with J. M. Neale's couplet?—

"His twelve Apostles first He made His Ministers of Grace,  
And they their hands on others laid to fill in turn their place."

---

<sup>1</sup> "Orders and Unity," p. 184.

Is there not a general disposition among them to regard the Episcopate as an evolution, as the result of a slow process rather than the outcome of a specific Divine or Apostolic enactment?

Canon Mason (p. 453) is speaking for the vast proportion of scholarly High Anglicans when, commenting upon Hatch's contention that the Episcopate was a development, he says: "There is nothing derogatory to the Church in this teaching. It is compatible with the loftiest conceptions of the Christian ministry." But we suggest that the leaders of the Oxford Movement would have angrily repudiated such a view, and that Archdeacon Wirgman is a much truer representative of these views when he says, also commenting upon Hatch, "When an author asserts that the Church and its ministry 'is Divine as the Solar System is Divine,' it logically follows that the Head of the Church is Divine as Buddha is Divine, and that the Catholic Faith in the Incarnate Christ is 'a fond thing vainly invented,'" and then passes on to stigmatize evolution of the Episcopate as "heretical."<sup>1</sup>

We do not wish to attempt to fasten upon High Anglicans to-day the *damnosa hereditas* of the Tractarians. We believe that a loving allegiance to Episcopacy as essential to a perfectly ordered Church can find a sure basis in Scripture, history, and past and present experience of its utility. But when an attempt is made to prove that union with Christ apart from membership of an Episcopal Church is precarious, that the Sacraments of non-Episcopalians are no Sacraments and their Churches no Churches—when, we say, an attempt is made to fasten this view upon our own dear Church, we will repudiate it with scorn, as absolutely and entirely baseless.

It would have cleared the ground a good deal if Canon Mason had told us what exactly we are to understand when he speaks of a Divine Right of Episcopacy and of the validity of Sacraments. We believe we are not alone when we say that we feel that there is a general haziness about these terms even

<sup>1</sup> Wirgman, "Constitutional Authority of Bishops," ed. 1904, pp. 3, 5.

in the minds of High Anglicans. Canon Knox Little apparently regards Bishops as an intolerable nuisance, and the only thing that reconciles him to their existence is that they are a Divine institution. "Bishops," he candidly remarks, "are either a Divine institution or they are an expensive luxury. *Expensive* not only in £ s. d., but in much more. If they are not a Divine necessity, their existence is not merely a sin—nay, one may say it is a crime. . . . If Bishops are not a Divine necessity—let it be remembered and repeated—they ought not to exist. They are not, *obviously*, for the *bene esse* of the Church."<sup>1</sup> Of course, we do not know what Canon Knox Little has suffered at Episcopal hands, but this strange language is evidence that he regards Episcopacy as the outcome of some specific Divine or Apostolic command.

We, on the other hand, are not only unacquainted with any evidence for such a definite ordinance, but even if there were no Divine sanction for it of the most attenuated kind (though we are quite sure there is), we should still adhere to the institution for its intrinsic value; for even on the low basis of £ s. d. we regard it as more than justifying its existence.

What, too, does "validity" mean as applied to Sacraments and Orders? We are often forbidden by High Anglicans—Dr. W. H. Frere, for instance—to use it as equivalent to "operative" or "effective"; and Mr. Rawlinson has repudiated, in language no stronger than we should use, its merely forensic meaning.

We repeat that Canon Mason's book is the best we have read upon this phase of the subject—the most comprehensive and exhaustive; but we have put it down with the feeling only stronger than ever in our minds, that the Tractarian view of Episcopacy is contrary to the formularies and genius of our Church, and that its advocates have, so far at any rate, failed to prove their case from our past history; and that from this particular branch of the evidence, as from the entire evidence on the question of the ministry as a whole, they have yet to produce an apologia which will be convincing in the light of Scripture, history, and present-day experience.

<sup>1</sup> "Conflict of Ideals," p. 105.

## Impressions of a Planters' Padre.

BY THE REV. W. A. PURTON, B.A.,

*Vicar of Teynham, Kent.*

ROME used to be called, it is said, the *sentina gentium*. I was sometimes inclined to think that Ceylon could be termed the "sink of religions," so many and various are the forms of belief which are compressed into that little island, and which are held so fanatically as almost to preclude any possibility of proselytism, so much so as to produce a species of grudging respect for each other that springs from the knowledge of total independence for each. Many causes have contributed to this state of things. The Church of England is disestablished in Ceylon, though it is not in India. The fanatical propagandism of the Portuguese, the earliest European settlers, has left an abiding trace in the flourishing condition of the Roman Church, while, on the contrary, the Dutch Reformed Church has made no impression. Into the island, formerly the home of the Sinhalese and Veddas, have come Tamils, once for conquest, now for cultivation; Arabs, or so-called Moormen; Malays, who make such good police; Afghans, those peripatetic money-lenders; and living among all these, but not mixing with them, the Burghers, as Eurasians are styled in Ceylon, whether of Portuguese, Dutch, or English descent. So far, Chinese and Japanese are unknown; but who can say what may not come to pass, if labour troubles continue, and the all-important tea and rubber require fresh hands to tend their sacred stalks?

Hence it follows that amid this clash of rival tongues and the ever-moving, fugitive impression of different countenances and costumes, the English visitor is constantly stimulated by the sight of some religious ceremony.

Ceylon is the Italy of Buddhism, and Kandy its Rome. So perhaps a visit will be paid to the capital of the hill-country to see the "perahera," that moving picture of chiefs, priests, and elephants. Or even when one is not bent on any particular

excursion, but merely on the road, how often the sound of weird percussion instruments in the distance gradually ushers into view the banners and band of a Buddhist procession, with its two or three monks in the midst, clothed in yellow, carrying the fan to ward off evil spirits, and having faces, some benign and intellectual, others heavy and depraved in appearance.

Then, again, up-country, where the Tamil coolies bury their dead, sometimes in the evening, and the funeral cortège, with torches, garlands, and tomtoms, winds slowly down the hill-sides, to gather round the grave amid the tea-bushes; or when, to exorcise the devil from some brawling stream, the ceaseless roll of the tomtoms mingles with the yells of mouthing coolies; or when the passer-by sees the chicken sacrificed before one of the innumerable white cones that speck the country-side; then one reflects on the degeneration of religions as exemplified in the Hinduism of the tea districts.

And every visitor to Colombo has seen the long line of mats, at the right season, spread along the Galle Face sea-front, each with its swaying tenant, bending and genuflecting, persistent and untiring, as the Afghan Mohammedans worship their God. What was it Mahbub Ali, the red-bearded Afghan horse-coper, said in "Kim"—"unbelievers and idolaters will end their meditations upon the sultry side of Hell." How little the globe-trotter knows of the thoughts of these men whom he watches with such patronizing interest!

But let us also visit a Roman Catholic festival, say that of Palm Sunday, at Hatton, or some other up-country centre, and notice the hundreds of coolie men and women, many of them Hindus—for the Tamil believes in being on good terms with all religions—swarming into the church, hung about with pictures far more tawdry than even those of any Italian village. Presently they will issue forth in streams, each one carrying the little cross of palm-leaves to be fixed over the door of the hut for the coming year. Many burghers you will see, too, some scarcely distinguishable from the natives, but remote and alien from both white and black. My motor-boy's grandfather was

an English soldier, his grandmother a Sinhalese woman. Their offspring married a burgher of remote Portuguese descent, and their son, my servant, undersized, unprepossessing, and of vague morality, could speak Sinhalese, Tamil, English, and that debased Portuguese which even now is a patois of many lower-class burghers. Like all of his particular class, he was a devout Roman Catholic, and would not for worlds have missed attending at any festival.

What of the Anglican Church? Come and see a Confirmation for natives in a little church up-country. It is packed with candidates and their friends, all very reverent and quiet, neatly dressed and proper. Better caste Tamils these, evidently. The native clergyman, an Indian from Tinnevely, his broad, honest face aglow with expectation, marshals his flock and makes his final arrangements for the arrival of the "Peria Padre," the big clergyman. And when the Bishop gives his addresses, the native padre translates them sentence by sentence—the Bishop is not an expert at Tamil, though very ready in Sinhalese. Everything is, with that exception, almost startlingly like a service at home—a bit of the *Via Media* set down in the country of extremes.

I have no space to record impressions of other things—of Wesleyan services, of fights by the Salvation Army against powers of darkness in Colombo, of devil-dancing and Pleasant Sunday Afternoons, or of the little schools where fifty native children may have among them half a dozen languages, as many religions, and goodness knows how many nationalities. "Have at thee, Legion!" says the native Catechist, in deeds, if not in words.

My own work lay in none of these directions. It was to hold the English Church service for the superintendent planters, their wives, and their assistants, to visit them in their bungalows, and mingle with them in their social life.

At different times a great deal of hysterical nonsense has been written about the beauties of Ceylon, and the joy of living in such a paradise. The tourist who has been tossed about at

sea and liquefied in Colombo, runs up for a night or two to Nuwara Eliya, where he can wash in quite cold water, and get bitter beer on draught, and goes into ecstasies. He does not think, perhaps he does not know, of the discomforts that the planter has to encounter—the leeches, mosquitoes, and snakes; the months of almost incessant rain, when books, boots, and other belongings are mouldering in the bungalow; the enervating heat in the fine weather season; and the constant association with coolies of a degraded type. Moreover, the planter is not often free from labour and business worries. The old days of the proprietor-planter have almost disappeared. The superintendent is now generally working under a company, subject to periodical visits from an inspecting agent, and almost obliged to produce a certain dividend. In my opinion, he is often a greatly harassed individual, who deserves the greatest respect for the skill with which he accomplishes a difficult task. Now, Sunday is practically his only free day, and one has to make every allowance if, especially during the monsoon, churchgoing is not so regular as perhaps the padre would wish. I have often had to comfort myself in the wet season with some such reflection as this :

“ ‘Wicked weather for walking,’  
Said Eddi, of Manhood End.  
‘ But I must go on with the service  
For such as care to attend.’ ”

But I may sum up my experience by stating that there are very few who never go at all, many who attend regularly, and that nearly all attend occasionally at least. The early morning in the fine weather is unspeakably delicious, the air is so fresh and cool; and when the padre has done his nine miles on the bicycle—that steed of the modern ecclesiastical knight-errant—through some of the loveliest scenery in the world, and has come to the little clean church set among the tea-bushes, he gives thanks to see the motor-cars, bicycles, rickshaws, and horses tearing up in different directions, and bringing the planters and their wives and the younger men, who will

presently be joining in those familiar words which express the worship of the Empire. The Anglican, the Presbyterian, and the Wesleyan, alike find comfort in the prayers of the English liturgy, and when soon they kneel down side by side, and I give them the Body and the Blood, who is there to say me nay ?

“ He took the Wine and blessed it ; He blessed and brake the Bread.  
With His own hands He served Them, and presently He said :  
‘ Look ! these Hands they pierced with nails outside My city wall  
Show Iron—Cold Iron—to be master of men all ! ’ ”

Easter and Christmas are of course *the* days. Then the churches are hung about with arum lilies and packed with people.

I cannot refrain from mentioning the great respect that planters have for missionary work. It is true they see its difficulties very clearly, and are often not so sanguine regarding its success, for they are well versed in the moral intricacies of the Tamil coolie ; but they never fail, I think, to welcome the missionary, to give him opportunities for addressing their labourers. I believe that one of the most popular personages in the island is the venerable missionary, who, if he had lived in the Middle Ages, would doubtless have been called “ St. William of Haputale ” ; and if he is now only familiarly known as “ Old Padre R——,” the title conveys as much respect, and probably far more affection.

Of course, a great deal, perhaps most, of the tea-chaplain’s work is done outside his churches. He must take long bicycle rides, or walks, to outlying bungalows, where he will receive the warmest of welcomes. He must be prepared to be away from his own bungalow two or three days at a time, to spend the night on remote estates. Then confidences are made, difficulties discussed, and impressions shared. There is a comradeship amongst the few white people surrounded by seething swarms of Orientals that is quite impossible in England, whither, nevertheless, the thoughts of all turn, even if the white blood is only diluted ; so that it is pathetic to hear

the burgher speak of "going home" when he plans his first visit to England. Even if our watches are not set by Greenwich time, our thoughts are. Then there are the matches, athletic sports, and tennis tournaments, which are such a welcome break in the monotony of estate life, and where the wholesome medicine of publicity and intercourse with one's equals is to be found. Everyone sends lunch, which everyone shares. The grinning coolies watch their incomprehensible white masters throw each other about. For the time the superintendent forgets his labour troubles, and his wife her bungalow preoccupations. A holiday sun shines over all.

I dare say the work is not so magnetic as that of the missionary. Yet it has its importance—to minister to this white fleck on the far-flung wave of Empire—and assuredly it has its difficulties. The Bishop knows them, he and his handful of English helpers who battle so strenuously. More men are needed for the planting districts, and there is good work to be done for his brothers by any man who is not too young to be without some knowledge of the world, and not too old to be unfit for the severe physical labour that is involved. It is a great thing to see to it that in that clash of discordant tongues God is worshipped in English also.



## The Doctrinal Teaching of the Apocrypha.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D.,

*Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London ; Warden of the " Society of the Apocrypha."*

THE books of the Apocrypha contain only part of the doctrinal teaching of the literature from which they have been quite arbitrarily distinguished. It is not possible here to consider all the works which must be consulted for a complete study of the period with which we are dealing ; but in restricting ourselves to the Apocrypha there is this compensation—that the more important of its books were recognized by official Judaism as containing good orthodox teaching, so that they supply a useful foundation for further study of the development of doctrine. In some cases, however, recourse must be had to the Apocalyptic Literature, for though the books of the Apocrypha afford a general criterion as to orthodox Jewish teaching from 200 B.C. to A.D. 100, they are in some respects inadequate.

It must be emphasized that the Old Testament is not the sole background of the Apocryphal books in the domain of doctrine ; there have been marked Persian and Greek influences in certain directions. The main current of Palestinian Judaism was affected by these, while the Judaism of the Dispersion in its turn was influenced by both Persian and Greek thought, and the effect of all this is traceable in the Apocrypha. The teaching of the various books must also be followed in chronological order. There are differences of opinion as to actual dates, but there is approximate unanimity as to the centuries to which the books, in almost all cases, belong. In some instances different parts of a book belong to different times.

The doctrine of Wisdom must be considered separately. Here we have to deal with the doctrines of God, of the Law, of Sin, of Grace and Free-will, of the Messiah, of the Future Life,

<sup>1</sup> A summary of the chapter on "The Doctrinal Teaching of the Apocrypha" in an important volume ("The Books of the Apocrypha") just published by Mr. Robert Scott. Price 16s. net.

of Angels, and with Demonology ; these cannot always be kept separate, as one leads into another. Only cursory mention will be made of those points where the teaching is identical with that of the Old Testament, though even in these cases the characteristic form in which a doctrine is exhibited will be noted. The main object is to show in what respects the books of the Apocrypha show an advance, or it may be a retrogression, in doctrine as compared with the Old Testament.

(a) THE DOCTRINE OF GOD.

Ecclesiasticus treats of the Unity of God, the Creator of all ; His eternity and omnipotence ; His activity in nature ; His wisdom, holiness, justice, loving-kindness, and mercy ; His Fatherhood of Israel, and sometimes of all flesh (see xlii. 15 to xliii. 33). Here the inspiration is drawn largely from the Psalms ; but in xlii. 16 and xliii. 28-32 Ben-Sira seems to go beyond anything to be found in the Old Testament. No book of the Apocrypha has such a variety of names for God as Tobit, which is also distinguished by a doctrine of angelic mediation and a universalistic spirit which is in marked contrast to Judith. In the Prayer of Manasses great stress is laid on the Divine compassion. In the secondary text of Ecclesiasticus, which is a Pharisaic recension of the work, the great characteristic is that religious individualism which did so much to foster spiritual worship. The heightened expression of the close relationship between God and His pious ones, which the more ardent religious temperament of the Pharisees demanded, can be illustrated by a comparison of i. 12 and xvii. 20 with the lines which immediately follow in either instance. This spirit reappears in the Psalms of Solomon.

In the original text of 1 Maccabees all mention of the name of God is deliberately avoided ; once or twice, as in iii. 18, a true faith in the omnipotence of God is expressed, and not infrequently there is trust in God as the God of Israel, Who will help His people against their foes. In all three of the documents which make up Baruch stress is laid on God's guidance

of Israel's destiny, and in the portion, iv. 5 to v. 9, the Divine compassion is constantly recalled. 2 (4) Esdras represents the best of the Old Testament teaching concerning the doctrine of God: the Unity of God, His Creatorship without any mediatorial agency, Israel as the chosen nation with which God has entered into a covenant relation, are all insisted upon by the writer, whose faith in God, and conviction that His love is for His people, remains, though he is presented with problems which are insoluble for man. In the Book of Wisdom the religious atmosphere is to a large extent alien to that of Palestine; the presentment of the doctrine of God is entirely different in its two parts, whether these are by two different authors or by one writing at different times in his life. The first part (ii. to xi. 1) is more Greek than Jewish. The idea of God is that of Greek philosophy: a transcendent God Who has no immediate contact with the world, but performs His will through an intermediary, who is Wisdom. In the second part God is again and again spoken of as interfering personally in mundane affairs; and in other respects also the Old Testament doctrine is represented, as in the need of right worship, and the mercy and justice of God.

#### (b) THE DOCTRINE OF THE LAW.

The stress laid in Ecclesiasticus on the importance of the Law, from both ethical and ritual points of view, shows this work to be a valuable link between the Judaism of post-exilic times and Rabbinical Judaism. The Law is eternal and Divine, and its pre-existence is implied in its identification with Wisdom. So far as is known this identification occurs here for the first time, but the way it is taken for granted shows that it cannot have been wholly new. The insistence on the need of observing the Law is characteristic of this book, as is the teaching on the spirit in which the precepts are to be carried out. In chap. xxiv. 7 *et seq.* the Law is only for Israel. In Tobit an earnest zeal for the Law is combined with deep devotion. This book indicates a development of legal observances;

prayer, almsgiving, and fasting, are strongly advocated, particularly almsgiving. The laws of tithe, marriage, honour to parents, keeping the feasts, purifications, and others, are inculcated. This love for the Law, combined with worship, offers a fine illustration of the truly pious Jew at this period. The teaching concerning the Law in Judith is strongly Pharisaic; while everything depends upon trust in God and obedience to Him, both are shown by keeping the Law. Only the practical observance is taught; there is no abstract conception. The observance of Sabbaths, new moons, and feasts, is emphasized. Reference is made to the sacrificial system and the gifts of the people, and in the poem xvi. 2-17 the right spirit in offering is the really important matter. In 1 Maccabees there is reflected the earnest zeal for the Law on the part of the patriots. In 2 Maccabees much stress is laid upon legal observances, and the whole attitude towards the Law is that of the Pharisaic school of about the first century B.C. onwards. This also applies to 1 (3) Esdras.

In the document Baruch iii. 9 to iv. 4, where the Law and Wisdom are identified, exiled Israel is told that the reason of his punishment is the forsaking of the commandments of life—*i.e.*, the Law. The Law endures for ever, and is apparently for Israel alone. Of the different portions which make up 2 (4) Esdras the most important in the present connection is the "Salathiel Apocalypse," which forms the bulk of the book (iii.-x.). Here it is said, in accordance with later Rabbinical teaching, that the Law had originally been given to other nations, by whom it was rejected, while Israel alone had accepted it. In the other portions of the book the main stress is laid on veneration for the Law. In the Book of Wisdom there is very little on the subject to be noted, but the foreign rulers are denounced for not keeping the Law.

#### (c) THE DOCTRINE OF SIN.

In Ecclesiasticus the prevalence of Sin in one and all is often noted, and there is much said about its origin. Here

Ben-Sira finds a problem too difficult for him. He implies, though he hardly goes so far as to make the definite assertion, that the origin of sin is due to God (xxxiii. 13-15), but in one important passage he strongly combats this (xv. 11-13). He traces it back to the fall of Eve, but no further. He speaks sometimes of Sin as originating within man, sometimes as being external to him. Like the later Rabbis, he becomes involved in inconsistencies as soon as he tries to construct a working theory on the subject. In his teaching on the atonement for sins he shows a great advance on the Old Testament, adding almsgiving and fasting as means of atonement, and foreshadowing the idea that Death also may be one. This last idea became of ever-increasing importance with the growth in later Judaism of the belief in the Resurrection. There is little that calls for notice in Tobit except a reference to the atoning efficacy of almsgiving; and nothing in Judith, or the Additions to Daniel; but in the Prayer of Manasses we find the thought that the Patriarchs were sinless—an idea developed in the later Rabbinical Literature in connection with the "Treasury of Merit" of the Fathers—and a deeper realization of sin than is to be found in any other book of the Apocrypha. In 2 Maccabees there is a strangely particularistic doctrine of retribution for Sin. The teaching in 1 (3) Esdras and Baruch is that of the Old Testament, but the doctrine as to the merits of the Fathers is expressly repudiated in Baruch. 2 (4) Esdras is important; especially, again, the Salathiel Apocalypse. Here the origin of sin is traced to Adam, though its connection with him is not explained; but Sin is regarded as universal, each man clothing himself with the evil heart. In the Book of Wisdom there is a belief in an original state of good, which is so decidedly contradicted by a later passage (xii. 10, 11) as to emphasize belief in a different authorship for the two parts of the Book: on this point, as on the subject of Death, it is the first part that is important for us, the second offers nothing new.

*(d)* THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE AND FREE-WILL.

A true balance between these two is kept in Ecclesiasticus ; they are shown as complementary, not contradictory, thus continuing the teaching of the Old Testament concerning the omnipotence of God and the responsibility of man. Similar teaching is found in Tobit. The rest of the books belonging to this century have nothing that calls for particular notice, but in the secondary text of Ecclesiasticus the same balance is found as in the first. In 1 Maccabees much more emphasis is laid on Free-will than on Grace, owing to a growing disinclination to ascribe action among men directly to God, because of His inexpressible majesty. In the Additions to Esther, on the contrary, there is throughout insistence on the Divine activity, while human free-will is scarcely taken into account ; there can be no doubt that the one-sided emphasis in either case was prompted by the particular subject-matter of the book. In 1 Maccabees there is very little to note under the present heading, though stress is frequently laid upon the idea that the Jews are under special protection and guidance. In 2 (4) Esdras it is again only the Salathiel Apocalypse that claims attention ; here the writer is driven by his deep sense of sinfulness and his conviction of man's inability to acquire justification by the works of the Law, to look to Divine Grace where human will-power was helpless. In the Book of Wisdom the main emphasis is on Free-will, though the other side of the truth is not left out of sight.

*(e)* THE DOCTRINE OF THE MESSIAH.

The didactic character of Ecclesiasticus accounts for the meagre reference to this doctrine ; there is belief in a Messiah who is to be purely human and of the House of David, but it is vague in the extreme. The conceptions of a Messiah were largely regulated by the historical circumstances of any given period, and during the time of Ben-Sira these were not of a nature to call forth Messianic hopes. In Tobit the Messiah is never mentioned, but the renovated Jerusalem and the ingather-

ing of the dispersed Israelites, and also of the Gentiles, give a picture of what corresponds to the Messianic Kingdom. No other books offer teaching on the subject until we come to 1 Maccabees, where "a prophet" is looked for; in one passage he is to be of Hasmonæan lineage. In 2 Maccabees there is no reference to the Messiah, though there is to the Messianic Kingdom. The only other book is the important apocalypse 2 (4) Esdras, and here the teaching is full, and, as the book is of composite authorship, various. In the Salathiel Apocalypse (iii.-x.), the Messiah is regarded as purely human, and only in this portion are the signs which are to precede the Messianic Kingdom mentioned. In the eagle vision (xi.-xii. 29), and the vision of the man rising from the sea (xiii.), and in the Ezra legend (xiv.), the pre-existence of the Messiah is taught. The Messianic Kingdom itself is to be of limited duration, and, in the eagle vision, Gentiles as well as Jews are to enjoy it, but in the vision of the man from the sea the Gentiles are to be wholly destroyed by the Messiah, and His kingdom is only for His own people. In the Book of Wisdom there is no doctrine of the Messiah, nor is there a belief in a Messianic Kingdom in the Jewish Palestinian sense, but the traditional Jewish eschatological conceptions are utilized by the author and a glorious future is believed to be reserved for the Jews.

#### (f) THE DOCTRINE OF THE FUTURE LIFE.

In Ecclesiasticus the teaching on this subject is substantially of the normal Old Testament type; the corruption of the body is looked upon as the end of man, though the annihilation of the spirit as well is evidently not contemplated.

Once or twice death is spoken of as a rest. The development in this doctrine which is known to have taken place during the second century B.C. is reflected by some additions. It is of particular interest to note that in one or two cases the Greek shows signs of some development of conception where in the Hebrew the normal Old Testament position is maintained. It is very noticeable that a kind of technical sense has become

attached to the word "worm," as in Mark ix. 48. In Tobit the normal Old Testament doctrine is taught. In Judith the only reference is an important one, as it witnesses to a development of the thought of Hades as a place of punishment. There is something similar to this in the Prayer of Manasses. In the Pharisaic recension of Ecclesiasticus words added here and there show a development of thought as to the Future Life. The next book which contains references to this is 2 Maccabees, and here an immense development has taken place; Hades is a place of punishment for the wicked; but only a temporary abode for the righteous, since the Resurrection is reserved for them; and the Resurrection is not only of the spirit, but of the body also. For the wicked there is no resurrection. In Baruch there are two isolated references; and in both the teaching is that ordinarily found in the Old Testament. In 2 (4) Esdras there is an extraordinary wealth of material, mostly confined to the Salathiel Apocalypse. Here the doctrine of the resurrection is not altogether consistent, and the writer's thought is not quite easy to understand; he seems to have believed that the material body became wholly annihilated at death, but the soul, when released from it, assumed a non-material body in the Intermediate state, and that this, being incorruptible, did not undergo any further change at the Judgment. The Resurrection apparently takes place immediately after death. It is uncertain whether the wicked rise as well as the righteous. Minute details are given as to the lot of the wicked and that of the righteous in the Intermediate state, but none as to the duration of this. At its close comes the Judgment. Here there is the same ambiguity; the writer's mind is not clear whether the age of incorruption and eternity is to begin immediately after death, or only at the Judgment. But there is no want of definiteness as to the happiness of the righteous and the torment of the wicked; both will be enormously increased at the Judgment, and then no intercession of the righteous for the wicked will avail. In those portions of the book which have probably been added by the Redactor there is some important teaching as

to a general resurrection and a reunion of soul and body, which is to take place at the beginning of a new age seven days after the close of the Messianic Age. This is part of a new eschatological scheme, quite different from that of the Salathiel Apocalypse, and seeking to combine the eschatology of the individual with that of the nation. In the Book of Wisdom there is no resurrection of the body; the only immortality is that of the soul, and it begins on this earth. Judgment takes place immediately after death, and there is no Intermediate state. The bliss of the righteous and the torment of the ungodly are of a purely spiritual kind. It seems as though the author were acquainted with more than one Jewish eschatological scheme, and used them without recognizing their inconsistency. He says nothing as to where the scene of the Judgment will be laid; he is not ignorant of the Palestinian Jewish belief, but, being of an Hellenic cast of mind, he cannot accept it.

#### (g) THE DOCTRINE OF ANGELS.

In Ecclesiasticus there are but few references; in xlii. 16 the "holy ones" are unable to recount God's marvellous works, though strength is given them to stand in His presence. In Tobit the angel Raphael plays an important part; he binds Asmodeus, and appears as guardian angel to Tobit on his journey. The angelic host is referred to in viii. 15. There is no mention of angels in Judith, but in the Additions to Daniel the angel of the Lord appears in each of the stories. The angelic host is spoken of in the Prayer of Manasses, and a guardian angel in the Epistle of Jeremy, and there is an incidental reference to angels in the Additions to Esther. A somewhat fantastic representation of the activity of angels is given in 2 Maccabees in the stories of Heliodorus and of the rider leading Israel to battle and of the "reliable dreams" of Maccabæus. No other books refer to angels till we come to 2 (4) Esdras, and here in the Salathiel Apocalypse a greatly developed angelology appears. At the head of the angelic host stand seven archangels, and God communicates with the seer by

means of the angels. In the Book of Wisdom the place of these is taken by the Word or by Wisdom, the development of doctrine having here eliminated angelology altogether.

(h) DEMONOLOGY.

It is doubtful whether there is any reference to demons in Ecclesiasticus ; there may be one in xxxix. 18 to 31. In Tobit there is an evil demon who slays men. The only other reference is in Baruch ; but in the Book of Wisdom, though there is no demonology in the ordinary sense, there is a belief in the devil.



## The Preparation of the Gentiles.

BY THE REV. M. LINTON SMITH, D.D.,  
*Vicar of Blundellsands, Liverpool.*

NO side of ancient life has received fuller illumination in recent years than the side of popular religion; and evidence has accumulated to show what an important part was played in the thought and practice of the common people by the Mystery religions, mostly of Oriental origin. It is increasingly recognized that their strongest hold was among those classes in which Christianity spread most rapidly. Consequently, men have begun to realize that these faiths formed part of the environment in which Christian doctrine and practice took shape; and the similarities which these cults present in certain particulars have from time to time been pressed unduly, as if they were evidence that the Church had borrowed both belief and practice from its earlier rivals. A closer and soberer study will show that this is not the case to any great extent. Their relation to Christianity will be found to be, *not* that of parent, but rather that of pioneer. It is not so much that they supplied either the material out of which the Church built, or the pattern and model by which she worked, as that they prepared the way for her advance by breaking down certain barriers of custom and creed, by accustoming men to new views of the unseen and their relation to it, and by rousing in them hopes, longings, and desires, which they could stimulate, but not satisfy, and which found a lasting satisfaction in the Church and the Church's Lord.

The old State religions of Greece and Rome had gradually lost their hold on the minds of men. That of Greece, with its æsthetic beauty of myth and statue and building, belonged to a period of childhood both in the intellect and morals. The world had outgrown it; it could satisfy men's senses, but not their mind or conscience. Its stately ceremonial and glorious temples lacked a soul, and had no answer to the awakening individuality

of man. "Cujus regio ejus religio" was of its essence, and a man professed a creed not because it appealed to him or satisfied him, but because it was part of his duty as a citizen. On other lines the old Roman religion, with its childish deification of every event of life or feeling and capacity of man, and its meticulous ritual, cramped the soul, and at the same time failed to supply any real sanction for the civic morality which it undoubtedly attempted to foster. The philosophy of the day, on the other hand, which had discarded the childish and barbarous elements of the established faiths, and moved on a higher plane, lacked the power to stir the masses, and touched only the leisured few. Plato's words in the "Timæus" give the coldly intellectual nature of the purest of Greek beliefs: "To find, however, the Maker and Father of this universe is a serious task, and when one has found Him it is impossible to tell of it to all men" ("Timæus," 28 c).

But there existed in Greece, side by side with the State religion and the Olympian deities, another expression of the religious life—the cult of the Chthonian gods (gods of the underworld) and the mysteries, the best-known of which are those celebrated at Eleusis. This side of Greek life probably represents the religion of an earlier race, which survived in an inferior position, when the pantheon of the conquering peoples became the object of national worship; and gradually it became increasingly prominent, just because it met in some measure the needs which the State religion failed to supply.

The myth round which these mysteries centred was a nature myth. Demeter, the corn goddess, lost her daughter Persephone, who was carried off to the underworld by its god as his bride. Ultimately she was restored to her mother, who sought for her with wailing and tears for six months of the year. It was the death of vegetation in winter and its rising to life again in spring which this story summed up, and the secrecy with which the sacred rites were performed and the dramatization of the story, with its alternations of sorrow and joy, gave to men, as Aristotle says, "impressions and emotions, rather than

definite instruction." That which the native genius of Greece supplied in the mysteries of Demeter and Dionysus, the Romans, with their lack of inventive imagination, drew from the Oriental religions, which in many respects closely resembled the Greek mysteries. The worship of Cybele and Attis, the mother-goddess of Anatolia, and her son, was the first to reach Rome, by official invitation, in 205 B.C.; and soon the grave Roman patricians found that their invited guest was one who repelled and shocked them just in proportion as she impressed and attracted the masses. The splendour of the processions, the savagery of the votaries' self-mutilation, the barbarism of the baptism by blood, and the promises of future welfare beyond the grave, stirred feelings of awe and wonder and hope which the old Roman faith had never touched. The same may be said of the next invasion, which came unbidden and unwelcome, which was repressed even to blood—the worship of Serapis, the Hellenized form of the old Egyptian religion. Whatever be the origin of the name Serapis (whether Osirapis, or Sar-apsu from Babylon, or a local god of Sinope on the Euxine), the Greeks had seized on the touching nature myth of Isis' search for her dead husband, Osiris, who had been foully murdered by Set or Typhon, a myth in origin having close resemblance to the preceding ones. It dealt in picture and allegory with the continual dissolution and reconstruction going on in nature, and argued from the analogy of this to a similar experience for the individual. The genius of Hellas laid hold of this suggestive theme, took from it the crudities and inconsistencies of its native forms, clothed it in the Greek language and in beauty of expression, and sent it forth on a career of conquest through the whole Mediterranean basin. It appealed particularly to women, and its lustrations, its impressive ritual, its daily services, its general air of mystery, and its insistence on the life beyond the grave, made it, at least in the first century, perhaps the most successful of all these rival creeds which jostled one another in the ports of the inland sea. Its language still finds an echo in the prayer for "abodes of refreshment" (*sedes refrigerii*) in the

burial office of the Roman Church and in the very Canon of the Mass itself.

The absorption of Syria into the Empire during the first century B.C. introduced yet another element into the seething ferment of the religious thought of the time; Syrian slaves poured into Italy—"Jam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes"—and brought the Semitic ideas of religion with them: the god and goddess, representing the male and female principles in nature, the ideas of tabu and impurity, familiar to us from the Mosaic legislation, and, under the influence of the more distant Babylonia, the belief in the influence of the heavenly bodies on the lives of men, which we term astrology. Gradually these ideas were clarified, and we get the various local Baalim regarded as different manifestations of the One God most high, *Zeὺς Ἱψίστος*. Some of these manifestations became famous in the West; Jupiter Dolichenus, the local Baal of Duluk, near Aintab, in North Syria, has his dedications along the line of the Roman Wall between Newcastle and Carlisle; and in the last stages of the struggle between Paganism and Christianity the acknowledgment of the "One God Unconquered," to which the Syrian Baal had contributed, along with the Persian Mithras, was the last and strongest position held by the dying creed.

All these cults, containing, as we shall see later, elements of real value for the religious development of man, had a fatal weakness. Taking their origin in nature myths which dealt with the mysteries of fertility and reproduction, they were all of them tainted, and more than tainted, with sensuality and impurity. Faiths which were based upon immoral fables could not stem the tide of licentiousness which was threatening to engulf Græco-Roman civilization; they might preach purity and practise asceticism, but their very basis prevented them from denouncing the opposite vices. Nor is it true to say that this charge is due to the hostility of the Christian fathers, from whom we draw much of our information with regard to them. The witness of Juvenal, and of Apuleius, with regard to the

worship of Isis, that of Lucian concerning the Syrian goddess, and the police measures of the senate in the case of the Mother-goddess of Anatolia, supply ample evidence on this point, without drawing on Christian testimony.

One cult alone, and that not very prominent till a slightly later date—that of the Persian sun-god, Mithras—was free from this stain, and it is not without significance that it was Mithraism which alone of all these worships seriously contended with Christianity for the mastery of the world. At the end of the second century the religious fate of the Empire was trembling in the balance; for, as M. Renan has said, "If Christianity had been checked at its birth by some fatal malady, the world would have been Mithraist" (Marc Aurele, p. 579).

It came to Rome apparently in the time of Pompey from Cilicia, and gradually grew in influence, largely through the attraction which it exercised over the army. M. Cumont's map of its distribution is in this respect most instructive. Apart from Italy, its greatest hold was along the frontiers of the Danube, the Rhine, and the Tyne; its discipline was military in character, and it used military metaphors even more freely than Christianity. Its insistence on the manly virtues of truth and courage, its emphasis on the brotherhood existing between all those who had passed through the stages of initiation, which was expressed by common sacramental meals, and its active propaganda, all drew men under its sway. Its weak side lay, *first*, in its unattractiveness to women, who had to go elsewhere for satisfaction to their more emotional natures; *secondly*, in its close alliance with the Imperial throne, to the support of which it lent a strong doctrinal basis, for it was always ready to recognize in the ruler of the Empire an incarnation of the sun-god; and, *thirdly*, in its readiness to recognize other creeds of a lower polytheistic type. These failings, along with one fundamental weakness which it shared with the other mystery cults, brought about its final extinction.

Let us try for a few moments to estimate the part which these cults played in the great process of preparation. Remember

the main characteristics of the old Græco-Roman religion ; it was a state affair, a matter of nationality rather than of conviction. So far as it was not civic it was individualist ; no such thing as voluntary congregational worship was known. It had no satisfaction for the intellect, and little for the conscience—for these, men had turned to philosophy—and it was singularly unemotional. Now, in every way these foreign cults were a great contrast. They were for the most part independent of the State, and dependent on their power of attracting the individual by conviction ; they made, as we have seen, a strong appeal to the emotions ; and this was due partly to their congregational mode of worship, which aroused those strange waves of feeling of which men seem capable only in the mass. Their origin as nature and solar myths left room for speculation and inquiry as to the origin and nature of the world, which occupied, if it did not satisfy, the mind ; and, for all their moral failings, they connected religion and conduct as they had never been connected in the West before, by their insistence on certain moral requirements from their initiates ; so they aroused conscience. Even more directly they prepared by familiarizing men with the idea of sin and the need of atonement, by their conceptions of union with the deity whose experience they shared (“ Be comforted, mystæ ; since your god is saved, you, too, shall be saved from all your pains,” ran a couplet which has been preserved), and by sacramental meals in which this union was expressed and strengthened. Further, their speculations and promises with regard to the life beyond the grave met without satisfying man’s questionings about his personal future. Their likeness to Christianity was often noted. “ Habet ergo diabolus Christos suos,” said Firmicus Maternus, a Christian apologist. Nor do we gain anything by denying the similarity ; for it but points to the irrepressible longings of a struggling humanity, which were met by the coming of the Son of Man. But the contrast between them lay deep, and in it we may find the explanation of the failure even of the best of them, and of the success of the Christian faith. In the long run they were based on myths,

stories which expressed in allegorical form the processes and phenomena of nature ; their deities and heroes were personifications of natural forces ; and so they tried to explain man, and to satisfy man from below, from the physical world ; and they failed to meet the needs which they undoubtedly aroused and encouraged. Christianity claimed, and claims, to be based on facts of history ; its first missionaries and their successors, however high ideas they might have formed about their Founder, always proclaimed Him as a *Man*. And the presence of that curious phrase "under Pontius Pilate" in the shortest summary of the faith is evidence of the value set by the Church on this historical foundation. It was a *Man* who had been born, and suffered, and died ; it was a *Man* who had risen from the dead, the first-fruits of them that slept ; it was because Christianity was based, not on a Personification, but on a Person, that it finally triumphed. It explained man from above ; it declared that the highest possible revelation of God was given through a perfect Man ; and asserted that manhood found its explanation in the Divine. The Mystery religions, if you will, prepared the "sick souls," to use a modern psychologist's classification, to whom the Man Christ Jesus was to give health and life, because, God as well as man, He was the one true Mediator.

## The Missionary World.

WEEK by week the absorption of the world in the war becomes more impressive. The very forces which in one sense separate, in another sense draw us closer together. India, Japan, and China are directly concerned; the islands of the Pacific, great and small, have become centres of defence or of assault; the most living factor in Africa to-day is the extension to vast territories in west and east and south of the antagonisms of Christian Europe. With the exception of some of the monthly magazines issued by American Societies, which stand entirely aside, all the October periodicals deal with war questions at greater or lesser length. Some merely discuss consequences as they subvert autumn plans or threaten financial outlook; a few admit a combative tone or purely political comments which jar as being out of place; but for the most part what is written contributes to the awakening of national conscience and the maintenance of Christian love. Specially timely is the plea in *China's Millions* that thoughts and words should be brought into captivity to Jesus Christ while feeling is being so intensely expressed. Certain judgments in connection with the war are necessary, others are the prerogative of Him Who alone can discern the thoughts and hearts of men. He has said, "Judge not, that ye be not judged."

"Much, very much, depends upon the obedience of God's people to this command during these days. Obedience or disobedience will not only have their influence upon the national temper, and affect the national settlements when made, but will inevitably help or prevent that much to be desired unity of the Spirit between the Christians of this country and of Germany. Whatever happens, God's people, who are one in Him, must not be divided."

An expression of this fellowship which rises above national barriers into the unity of the Kingdom of God is found in one of the Minutes of the Synod of the British Province of the Moravian Church which met just as the war broke out :

“The Synod of the British Province of the Moravian Church sends hearty and brotherly greetings to the Brethren in the German Province, mindful of the fact that hate cannot exist between members of the Body of Christ, nor war between the members of the Brethren’s Church.”

\*                    \*                    \*                    \*                    \*

Specially noteworthy is a paragraph by Canon Robinson in *The East and The West* on the work of the “devoted and self-sacrificing” German Protestant missionaries, of whom there are over 1,000, supported at a cost of £400,000 per annum:

“Any help which we can give to those who are nominally our enemies, but who are our fellow-workers in Christ in the Mission field, will afford a convincing proof both to them and to their converts that Christian love is a more potent force than the antipathies and prejudices which are begotten of a one-sided and imperfect patriotism.”

The special number of *Evangelical Christendom* also emphasizes the reality of international fellowship, the extreme value of which grows in direct ratio to its difficulty. Two articles in the October magazines dealing with the war call for careful study: one by Professor Cairns, in the *Student Movement*, treats of the war as a “tremendous apocalypse of the human soul,” which should lead us to penetrate into the heart of Christ and renew our faith in “the practicability of the Kingdom of God”; the other is in the *International Review of Missions*, where Mr. J. H. Oldham discusses the whole subject in an atmosphere where national bias finds no place.

\*                    \*                    \*                    \*                    \*

The phrase “Business as usual,” which is current in missionary circles just now, contains both a truth and a fallacy. It is true, as every missionary periodical urges, that undertakings must be vigorously carried forward, and that emergency work for the war does not release us from the steady support of foreign missions. But it is a fallacy to urge that missionary work this winter should be dissociated from the great common interests which press on us all. The war not only shatters the outer fabric of missions, but raises questions which go to the heart of the whole missionary enterprise. At the close of the

war we shall have missed our opportunity if we can show only a maintenance of pre-existing undertakings; we should expect to see rather a new Home Base. The Church should be herself purged and quickened and should have come into new relations with national life and world-wide enterprise. Lines for this should be laid in the missionary work of every parish and of every organization from to-day. All work should be related to the great issues involved. Men and women are keenly responsive on these lines, but turn with distaste from meetings that would in other years have been attractive.

\* \* \* \* \*

The two agencies, which most need to be captured, and which will yield perhaps the largest return, are missionary prayer meetings and mission study circles. The former offer an unparalleled opportunity of shaping the minds of Christian people towards the true issues of the war. Prayer for individual missionaries and their work, for local and central organizations, for supplies of men and means will still have place, but the leader should see that all is set in the light of the greatness of the present peril and the living possibilities of the hour. Great thoughts such as those presented in the articles referred to in the *Student Movement* and the *International Review of Missions* should be the basis of intercession, in view alike of the possible continuance and uncertain issue of the war, and of the great reconstruction which lies beyond it. The preparation of our people for truer living and clearer thinking is of vital importance. It would be only too possible for the Church to come through the time of trial, safely perhaps and bravely, and yet to miss the great destiny which lies before her in controlling the issues of the war. Those who desire to utilize intercession meetings for these greater ends will find that the most familiar spiritual truths becomes new if examined in the light of the war. Take, for instance, the Lord's Prayer, clause by clause, week by week, in an intercession meeting, studying it in view of the fratricidal strife in Europe, and it will be found to pierce to the heart of every problem of the hour.

\* \* \* \* \*

A desire to study any subject except war news is evidently lacking this winter, yet we cannot afford to have a single Study Circle dropped. The members with their keen desire to "do something useful in connection with the war" can readily be shown that the Study Circle provides an outlet on the best and highest line. Right thinking lies behind right living, and even activities for our forces at the front cannot usurp the place of thought on the causes and issues of the war. The special textbooks for 1914 deal with China, and in literary form, in compelling interest and in varied appeal, they are at least as good as any of former years. Circles working upon them can keep the war and its problems in view, but in order to make a more direct connection between missionary Study Circles and current thought the United Council for Missionary Education, who prepare these books for the Missionary Societies, have issued a 2d. pamphlet with four outline studies on "The War and the Kingdom of God," which will be found highly suggestive and stimulating. The four questions proposed for discussion at successive meetings are: (1) How is the war hindering the spread of the Kingdom? (2) What change must take place in Christendom if the Kingdom is to come throughout the world? (3) How is the war enabling us to understand God's presence and purpose in the world? (4) What are our immediate tasks in the service of the Kingdom? Notes are provided for the guidance of the leaders. In many places these four studies will be taken before Christmas as a preliminary to Study Circles on the China textbook in the New Year. One Missionary Society has already arranged to put several thousand copies of these outlines into circulation. Copies can be procured from the offices of the leading Missionary Societies, or from the United Council for Missionary Education, 8, Paternoster Row, E.C.

\* \* \* \* \*

The missionary quarterlies are so full of interest that there is little danger that they will lie unread. The *Moslem World*, with no one outstanding article, is good throughout, the variety of its contents illustrating the wide area embraced in its special

topic; *The East and the West*, which is also above its own high average, opens with a paper on the Anglican Bishopric in Jerusalem (written before the welcome appointment of Canon McInnes was announced), and contains among other papers a statement concerning "The Native Pastorate and Lay Agency in Uganda," by the Rev. J. Roscoe, and a searching article on "The Plain Man and Foreign Missions," by the Rev. J. H. Horsburgh, which makes many true points and yet unintentionally does some measure of injustice to foreign missionaries as they are to-day. The *International Review of Missions*, in addition to the article already referred to, has a valuable study of the census of 1914—"Causes of the Expansion or Retrogression of Religions in India"—by Dr. Ernest Datta; a discussion of "Vestiges of Heathenism within the Church on the Mission Field," by Professor Joh. Warneck, which should be of singular value to missionaries; an article on "The Present Attitude of Moslems towards Jesus Christ and the Scriptures," by Dr. S. M. Zwemer; and a most interesting survey of "The Influence of the Keswick Convention on Missionary Work," by Mr. Walter B. Sloan. The veteran Dr. Andrew Murray contributes "A Call to Prayer on Behalf of Missionaries," which will stir many.

\*                     \*                     \*                     \*                     \*

The larger monthlies for October are also good. Mr. G. B. Durrant's paper on "The Authority and Grace of Vocation," in the *C.M. Review*, is thoughtful and stimulating, as is everything that comes from his pen. The Rev. C. D. Snell contributes an admirable summary of an inquiry recently instituted into the practice of "Female Infanticide in China." The *Missionary Review of the World* has an illustrated article on "The Moslem Menace in South Africa," by Dr. S. M. Zwemer, and interesting papers on "Constantinople College and the Women of the Near East," by Principal Mary Mills Patrick, on "The Future of Mesopotamia," and on a mission to Arabia, initiated and supported by the University of Michigan.

\*                     \*                     \*                     \*                     \*

It was suggested somewhere not long ago that we were too apt to look at our mission fields from a home base angle, estimating the growth of Christianity in groups related to the various societies, instead of in totals of the whole Christian Church in a land. In other words, the unit of our missionary thinking is apt to be, say, C.M.S. or S.P.G. work, rather than the Church in India or in China. Mission study textbooks, by their inter-society work, have done something to remedy this. But for real inclusiveness nothing equals the year-books produced by the missionary bodies in some of the larger mission fields. The *Christian Movement in Japan*, for 1914, for instance, which can be procured from the Religious Tract Society (St. Paul's Churchyard, London, E.C.) for 5s., is quite indispensable for all who are interested in the welfare of our allies. It contains a survey of all great movements in the Empire—religious, social, and political—brief accounts of each mission and each agency at work, numerous excellent statistical tables, and a very full treatment of mission work in Korea. This twelfth annual issue of the year-book is far in advance of its predecessors, and cannot be too warmly commended to all students of missions in the Far East.

G.



## Correspondence.

## LECKY'S "HISTORY OF RATIONALISM."

To the Editor of the CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—I have read with much interest the Rev. C. L. Drawbridge's important paper on Rationalism, in which he effectively quotes from Lecky's "History of Rationalism." I do not think he will deem it irrelevant if I call attention to some of the closing words of that book. "At present [I think the book was published in 1865] the tendency towards the latter [*i.e.*, materialism, as opposed to the metaphysical and spiritual view of life] is too manifest to escape the notice of any attentive observer. That great reaction against the materialism of the last [eighteenth] century, which was represented by the ascendancy of German and Scotch philosophies in England and by the revival of Cartesianism in France, which produced in art a renewed admiration for Gothic architecture; in literature the substitution of a school of poetry appealing powerfully to the passions and the imagination for the frigid intellectualism of Pope or of Voltaire; and in religion, the deep sense of sin, displayed in different forms both by the early Evangelicals and by the early Tractarians, is everywhere disappearing. In England, the philosophy of experience, pushed to the extremes of Hume and represented by the ablest living philosopher in Europe [Comte?], has been rising with startling rapidity to authority, and has now almost acquired an ascendancy in speculation. In France the reaction against spiritualism and the tendency towards avowed materialism, as represented by the writings of Comte, of Renan, and of Taine, are scarcely less powerful than at the close of the last [eighteenth] century; while under the guidance of Schopenhauer and of Büchner, even Germany itself, so long the chosen seat of metaphysics, is advancing with no faltering steps in the same career. *This is the shadow resting upon the otherwise brilliant picture the history of Rationalism presents*" (pp. 135, 136, of Lecky's "History of the Rise and Influence of Rationalism." Edition 1910. Published by R.P.A. 1s. net). (The italics in the closing words are mine.)

What was a *dark shadow* in the judgment of Mr. Lecky is the *rising sun* of the R.P.A. But does not the increasing influence upon the thought of the world of writers like Eucken and Bergson, as Mr. Drawbridge suggests, indicate a reaction against the philosophy of materialism, and raise the hope that the time may come when, to adopt the words of Pascal, it will be acknowledged that "there are but two sorts of persons who can properly be styled reasonable (rational)—those who serve God with all their heart because they know Him, and those who seek Him with all their heart because as yet they know Him not" ("Thoughts on Religion"). It is surely not irrelevant to add that, more than to any other source, this fierce and devastating war may be traced to the teaching of the most anti-Christian materialism that Germany has produced—namely, that of *Friederich Nietzsche*.

G. S. STREATFEILD.

## "REUNION AT HOME AND ABROAD."

To the Editor of the CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—May I state at the outset that I was trained as a Baptist minister? My thoughts being turned to the question of New Testamental Reunion, I found a denominational position no longer possible for me. I have been a Communicant of the Church of England for over ten years. Dr. Moule's article in your September issue has interested me. He specially refers to the Baptists. Will you allow me, knowing the Baptist position from the inside, to point out difficulties to reunion his article does not touch, or apparently even recognize?

I was myself received as a Communicant of the Church of England upon Episcopal advice, without Confirmation, on the strength of my standing with my previous Communion. I have since attended Confirmation Services. I have continually been asking myself: What spiritual gift or blessing may I expect to receive, if I submit myself to Confirmation, which I do not already possess? For practically, I find—*pace* Dr. Moule—that lack of Confirmation is *a*, not to say *the*, barrier to the exercise of my ministry, either regular or occasional, in the Church of England. The point, then, to which I ask to be allowed to bring Dr. Moule's article down to is: Why is Anglican Confirmation a barrier to union, and is the barrier justified?

I ask to be allowed to put one side of the case, and I say that if it can be shown that any spiritual advantage not already possessed would come with Confirmation, I would apply for Confirmation without delay. To apply for it simply as a step to secure recognition or opportunity for ministerial service no honest man would expect.

Some may object to Confirmation as simply unnecessary. My point is that real and important blessings are secured in Confirmation, but that those blessings are secured in other ways—I write especially with knowledge of Baptist practice—which, *pace* Dr. Moule again and his claims for the Church of England (*vide* CHURCHMAN, p. 689), are more direct, effective, and New Testamental.

If the Baptists are recognizing more and more a place for a dedicatory service for infants, I think I am not wrong in saying that Anglicans insist more and more upon the Confirmation Service, because they have felt the force of the Baptists' arguments against their Baptismal Service taken by itself, and now urge that the Baptismal Service is only of effective value when crowned and completed by Confirmation. The Baptismal Service and Confirmation have to be taken together as forming one complete whole. Why is this? The reply I find given is: That in Confirmation the active response of the candidate comes into play, and that only as that personal responsibility is exercised do the benefits of Baptism operate. In a word, the effectiveness of Baptism depends upon the personal and conscious faith, love, and obedience of the baptized.

But that is the Baptist position. Only they go a step farther and say that that personal response is, according to the New Testament, a *pre*-requisite of Baptism. So far, then, as Confirmation stands for the blessings

that come with the response of personal and conscious faith, the Baptist requires as a condition of Baptism what the Anglican requires as a condition of Confirmation, in order to make Baptism effective. On this point I ask myself: What has Confirmation to add to me I have not already, having been baptized according to the Baptist faith and order? I cannot see that it adds anything. Yet lack of Confirmation is a continual barrier to ministerial activity.

I had thought of referring to another point, but this letter is already long. If you can allow it to appear, as a contribution to the discussion of the real difficulties of reunion, I shall esteem it a great favour and courtesy. Nonconformists need to understand Anglicans; Anglicans equally need—pardon the plain thrust—to understand Nonconformists. Dr. Moule's article plainly fails to understand Nonconformists and the grounded reasons which make his plan, as it stands, simply hopeless.

But discussion will help to clear the way.

E. JUDSON PAGE, A.R.C.Sc.

October, 1914.



## Studies in Texts:

### SUGGESTIONS FOR SERMONS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.

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

#### X.—GOD AND OUR BATTLES.

*Texts*:—My lord fighteth the battles of the Lord. And the souls of thine enemies shall He sling out.—1 Sam. xxv. 28, 29.

“The battle is the Lord's. So David prevailed with a sling.”—1 Sam. xvii. 47, 50.

[Book of the Month: “ANATOMY OF TRUTH”<sup>1</sup>=AT. Other references: Blunt's “Undesigned Coincidences”=B. “Speaker's Commentary”=S. Robinson Lees' “Village Life in Palestine”=RL.]

ABIGAIL pleading for her husband uses an argument which appeals not only to the principle of David's whole life, but to his memory of the most dramatic illustration of it. The principle is “the present-worth of God-reliance” (AT. 157).

I. ABIGAIL'S ALLUSION. — Indirectly, but definitely, “the

<sup>1</sup> “Anatomy of Truth,” by F. Hugh Capron. Published by Hodder and Stoughton. See October number.

battles of Jehovah" = 1 Sam. xvii. 47. The slinging out of the foe = 1 Sam. xvii. 50. "What mode could have been more exquisitely dexterous" (AT. 173, S. ii. 348)? The power of a noble memory is strong ground of appeal. In those days David was undistinguished ("slings were the weapons of the common soldiers," RL. 165). He was trustful. He was successful. Days of early piety stir the pulse of memory.

II. The HISTORIAN'S INFERENCE.—It would be difficult to find a more subtle and convincing proof of the truth of the story of Goliath. "Just the essential element of obliqueness required to constitute an undesigned coincidence" (AT. 169 and *cf.* B. 118, 119. "Num. xiii. 32, 33, Josh. xi. 21, 22, and 1 Sam. xvii. 4 concur in manner most artless and satisfactory"). No point in allusion if story untrue, and allusion would have been much more definite if historian inserted it for his own purposes.

III. The DIVINE LESSON.—A. *For David.* "It is not necessary for you to take vengeance: God will do it for you. Trust God to punish your adversary." David acknowledges in his reply that he has learned it (xxv. 33, and see AT. 174).

B. *For Us.*—"God-reliance must be brought into play in every contingency that life presents" (AT. 175). We can trust God with our battles. "Unequal odds! Yes, for they were all on the shepherd's side" (AT. 180).

This principle is (i.) available for all contingencies. (ii.) Absolutely trustworthy. (iii.) Conditioned by receptivity. (iv.) Welcomed with humility (see AT. 178). We, then, will trust and not be afraid. Not heavy weapons, but believing hearts, are the precursors of victory.



## Notices of Books.

PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM. By the Rev. D. C. Simpson, M.A. With an Introduction by the Right Rev. H. E. Ryle, C.V.O., D.D., Dean of Westminster. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

The Higher Criticism has of late been subjected to so rigorous and hostile examination at the hands of Dahse, Wiener, Naville, Orr, and others, that rejoinders by its advocates must be expected. The volume before us, originated by a suggestion of the late Dr. Driver, and issued with the commendation of the Dean of Westminster, is of this controversial character, but largely evades the true nature of the contest.

One effect of this literary cannonade is visible in the preparedness of the advanced critics, as represented by Mr. Simpson, to abandon, as soon as they can find another entrenchment, the contention that the early books of the Bible may be divided into component parts of different date and authorship in accordance with the use which is made of the Divine titles. Astruc's hypothesis, we are informed, does not constitute a "base" or "foundation" of the critical view; was a "sorry guide" as long as it stood virtually alone; "might hold good as a reliable criterion in Gen. i.-xix., . . . failed to reveal the distinction of authorship *within* the sections in chaps. xx.-l."; and "fails after Ex. vi. 3 as a real clue in any true sense of the word." Indignation is frequently expressed that the critics should be regarded as deeming this test to be one of supreme importance. Yet with a singular pertinacity they continue to label their ultimate sources J and E, and lose no opportunity of insisting that no adverse comment has affected the position. To say the least, this particular contention is in danger of being shipwrecked on the rocks of textual criticism. The first principles of this science have not been adequately discussed or finally settled. The onus of proof that their text is the purest lies upon those who seek to build upon it elaborate theories of the origin, with consequential bearing upon the historicity, of the narratives. The relegation of this subject to an Appendix, with a brief and inadequate discussion, is not satisfactory. Apart from the question of the Divine titles, the condition of the text is of vital concern to every argument in support of the documentary theories.

The crucial point is not whether the author of the Pentateuch in its present shape used anterior sources, but whether it is possible to separate these sources in such a manner that we can safely hypothecate for each an independent existence and assign to it a provisional date. So conservative a writer as Dr. Orr admits that, if JE and P are now divisible, P is the later in date. But his position is not fairly represented by the statement that, "with regard to the relative ages of P and the non-priestly source, Dr. Orr, who is far from accepting the critical hypothesis in its entirety, writes, 'it is difficult to resist the conviction that P must be regarded as relatively later than JE, for whose narratives, in Genesis at least, it furnishes the framework.'" For Dr. Orr explicitly denies the possibility of separating the sources. "In so far as a documentary hypothesis is to be accepted at all, it is difficult to resist the conviction that P must be regarded as relatively later

than JE, for whose narrative, in Genesis at least, it furnishes the 'framework.' In agreement with Graf, however, we do not suppose that *at any period* it ever formed a separate, independent writing." Dr. Orr admits certain peculiarities of style, and concedes that they "justify the critic in distinguishing a P hand in Genesis from that of JE." But he is far from thinking that they demonstrate this result; they do not lead up to the critical theories, and only after acceptance of these theories on other grounds could they be esteemed as confirmatory. The issue remains as to the divisibility of the sources.

Further evidence in support of the critics is found in "(1) diversity of style, phraseology, and language; (2) diversity in the representation of facts; and (3) diversity of theological, general, and mental attitude." In the argument care is requisite to avoid a circular type of reasoning, which is worse than inconclusive. Many of the illustrations adduced by Mr. Simpson have little force. The word "kind" occurs ten times in Gen. i, and seven times in vi. 9-22. This fact is quite without value unless and until it is shown that the word could have been frequently used in the intervening section, but that another was preferred. "Male and female" in Gen. vi. 19, vii. 16, is in the Hebrew *zāḥār ūneḳēbāh*, but in vii. 2, *'ish we'ishtō*. But it remains to be proved that the same author may not use two different expressions. Amongst ourselves many would endeavour to do so. The apparent repetitions, variations, and inconsistencies, require explanation, and are variously accounted for. Their dialectic value lies in their number, which must not, therefore, be needlessly increased. "It is urged, and rightly so, that the representation in different parts of the narrative varies. Thus, in chap. xliii., when the brothers report to their father their interview with Joseph, they do not say that Joseph charged them with being spies, but merely that he asked them whether they had a brother (vers. 6, 7; cf. xliv. 17); whereas in chap. xlii. it is narrated that Joseph's brethren were definitely accused of being spies, and that they themselves volunteered the information, not specifically sought, that they had a younger brother (vers. 7-13, 30-32)." The "variations" give to the story a truly human touch. Do men never modify a story against themselves? Were the brethren of all men the least likely to have recourse to such a subterfuge? We cannot here examine all Mr. Simpson's instances. We admit that there are peculiarities of style and of representation of facts. Some are explicable; for others an inexact copyist is an easier suggestion than an incompetent redactor. But still difficulties remain. They are due to a diversity of subject-matter. History and prophecy, moral and ceremonial law, are intermingled in the Pentateuch. Both brevity and prolixity characterize the narratives. At times God is contemplated as the Absolute, at others in His covenant relationship to man or to Israel. Here we study human nature, there ethical principle—the sin of man, the moral requirement of God.

The higher critic imagines that, through the guidance of phrase and vocabulary, of attitude and representation, he has been enabled to discover the alternations of subject; thence division of authorship is easy. His opponent maintains that the differences of topic and treatment are obvious to every reader, that they are naturally accompanied by some divergencies

of style and language, but that unity of authorship is not substantially impaired. Which approaches the books in the right manner? This is the real issue, and we do not find that Mr. Simpson discusses it. Either side has its own difficulties. But for the solution of the modern problem controversialists must fix their attention upon the exact point where the dispute arises. The higher critic in pursuit of one method of investigation appears to be often unconsciously guided by the other. E. ABBEY TINDALL.

THE CATHOLIC CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH. By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. London: *Robert Scott*. Price 5s. net.

This is a comprehensive and well written book, and forms a valuable addition to Mr. Scott's Library of Historic Theology. We desire to emphasize this at the outset, and to bespeak for the book careful reading and study. No one can fail to derive much profit from it, whether he be an amateur in theology or a more advanced student. But having said this, we are constrained to say that we found ourselves in constant disagreement with the author, and marked a good many passages with a query. It is impossible to allude to all of these; a selection must be made.

But first, here is a summary account of the contents of the book: Chapters I. and II. deal with our Lord's conceptions of the Kingdom, the Church, and the Twelve. III. to VI. are mainly on the teaching of the rest of the New Testament on the same subjects. VII. to X. and XII. examine the views of Clement, Ignatius, Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine on the Church. XI. is an extremely important chapter on the development of the Christian ministry. XIII. to XVIII. are on Eastern, Roman, and Gallican conceptions of Catholicism. One remark may be made here. Dr. Simpson's account of Catholic conceptions of the Church is no doubt complete if one accepts his argument and interpretations and the definition they imply. But it will be noticed that the conception of the Church held by the Reformers and implied in the Articles is ruled out as non-Catholic. "For all who believe in the existence of a Holy Catholic Church in the traditional meaning of the name—that is to say, as a Visible Institution, an organic community here on earth—the ultimate alternative must inevitably be between the Episcopal and the Papal conception." No doubt our Reformers valued and held firmly to their episcopacy; but they would not have used the word "inevitably" even of the visible Church, and they also believed that the true Church was otherwise defined.

The quotation just given is from the conclusion. It is the natural result of all the preceding argument, and the fallacies of that argument are responsible for it. On page 26 Dr. Simpson breaks a lance with Dr. Hort's "Christian Ecclesia." Hort, alluding to the fact that only Apostles were present at the Eucharist, wrote that since the whole Church appropriated the Eucharist as its own, "the twelve sat that evening as representatives of the *Ecclesia* at large. They were disciples more than they were Apostles." Dr. Simpson will have it that "the Eucharist was intended for the Apostolic order alone; in the sense, that is, that it was entrusted to their keeping, and that they were the only agents in its administration." The *Ecclesia* only shared it as recipients. Now, Hort's is surely the fairer deduction from the passage. Our author's is read into it, and we discover the reason when we

come to page 30. There we read: "In three distinct ways Christ determined beforehand the character which His disciples were to assume in history, a form of incorporation, a form for the social worship among members only, a form of organization in the distinction between Apostles and disciples. These may all be considered as, in a sense, elementary; but potentially they included and determined the subsequent development. They show us the institutional character of Christ's work." The point to be observed here is the distinction asserted between Apostles and disciples. No doubt such a distinction existed in the evangelistic sphere. The Apostles were a body of men who had been specially selected and trained that they might take the lead in preaching Jesus and the Resurrection. But this distinction does not apply so readily when it comes to the question of Church organization. We still hold with Hort that there is "no trace in Scripture of a formal commission of authority for government (to the Apostles) from Christ Himself" ("Ecclesia," p. 84). Bishop Gore, and now Dr. Simpson, contest Hort's conclusion, but we cannot feel that it has been shaken.

The institutional ideas which Dr. Simpson has found in Christ he proceeds to find also in St. Paul and St. John. St. Paul "clearly did not regard union with Christ as the means of acquiring union with the Church. He did not consider the Church as the creation of individuals already in union with Christ. To St. Paul union with the Church is the medium of union with Christ." In support of this is alleged St. Paul's institutional training in Rabbism, and his argument about the Jews as a nation in Rom. xi. The latter is quite beside the point; and as to the former, Dr. Simpson ought to know that Christian teachers took up, not the Law, which is institutional, but the Prophets, who formed a Church within the nation, a non-institutional body within the institutional; a body whose members were a unity because of their common faith in their teacher. And we may further ask whether this institutional interpretation of St. Paul can possibly be harmonized with his teaching on salvation by personal faith. The argument about St. John is ingenious, but hardly ingenuous. "That they may also be one in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." Now, says Dr. Simpson, you must have a visible reality to be an evidence to the world; therefore the Church is institutional. It is open to remark that mutual love might be and was good evidence to the heathen of the day. But a reference to St. John xvii. 21 shows that the full text is: "That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." The unity of the Church is to be similar to the unity of the Trinity. Does Dr. Simpson suppose that this is institutional?

We can only refer further to Chapter XI. on the ministry. This simply accepts and summarizes what Mr. C. H. Turner has recently been writing in the "Cambridge Mediæval History" and in his "Studies in Early Church History." Mr. Turner's work is confessedly an attempt to restate the doctrine of Apostolical Succession in view of the heavy fire of historical research. It requires an article to itself. But its salient point is this: In the early Church there was a hierarchy of presbyters and deacons, and a hierarchy of Apostles, prophets, and teachers. In due time they coalesced,

so that the Bishop is the successor both of the Presbyter-Bishop and of the Apostle; and the fusion was made easy because both elements were hierarchical. The obvious criticism is that the members of the charismatic or non-local ministry, Apostles, prophets, teachers, were not hierarchical. They were not in well-defined grades. Function had not hardened into office, and one man might well discharge all three functions. To talk of a charismatic hierarchy is an anachronism.

It is thus apparent how profoundly, and at all points, the book provokes criticism. But we are grateful to the author for having written it, and cannot end without saying again that it deserves and will amply repay careful study.

C. H. K. BOUGHTON.

THE UNIVERSAL BIBLE DICTIONARY. Edited by the Rev. A. R. Buckland, M.A., assisted by the Rev. Canon Lukyn Williams, D.D. London: *Religious Tract Society*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

The ever-increasing stream of big-volume dictionaries which this generation is finding so valuable is likely to flow past very large numbers of non-expert Bible students and class teachers who are able neither to buy nor to understand the larger works. What are you to give such to help them intelligently to understand what they read and do? Many of the small cheap Bible dictionaries are out of date and quite unsatisfactory. Here is a 3s. 6d. book with 4,500 articles on over 500 pages which really meets the need. The text of the Bible, the books of the Bible, the history of the Bible, the doctrines of the Bible, are all dealt with, and sometimes at good length. Everything is carefully proved by exact Scriptural references, which indeed provide one of the features of the book. Problems of authorship are not avoided, arguments fairly summarizing all sides being given for the reader to choose from himself. There is a strong leaning to the more conservative point of view, and a qualified verbal inspiration is maintained; but the possibility of a later authorship for parts of, *e.g.*, Isaiah and Daniel is not denied. Doctrinal questions are explained in such articles as those on "Justification" and "Regeneration," while under the heading of "Lord's Supper," there are careful explanations of "This is," "This do," and "We have an Altar." The life and ministry of our Lord is given in the form of a tabular harmony of the four Gospels, an extremely useful piece of work, as also is the complete table of the parallel Kings of Israel and Judah. It seems as though nothing which the ordinary reader of the Bible will want to know has been omitted, and the editor and those who have helped him are to be congratulated on so useful a work. Among the contributors are Professor Green, Professor Griffith Thomas, Principal Guy Warman, and Canon Lukyn Williams.

THE PRAYERS OF ST. PAUL. By W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 2s. net.

This is one of Messrs. Clark's "Short Course" series, meant to give scholarly but practical expositions for teachers and others. The volume is marked by all Dr. Thomas's characteristics, spiritual insight, lucidity of analysis, and careful study of words. Perhaps he will pardon us for saying that we are glad to see less alliteration than usual! The writer heard the

substance of most of these nine studies given several years ago as a course of addresses, and can bear testimony to their helpfulness.

THE CHRISTIAN SANCTION OF WAR. By Henry Wace, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. London: *C. J. Thynne*. Price 1d.

In his clear and incisive style, Dr. Wace shows that war is justifiable, providing that the object is to punish injustice, and not to gratify ambition or pride. Passing from the question of war in general to the present war in particular, the Dean conclusively shows that we may have a clear conscience. If there exists anywhere an Englishman whose mind is not made up on this point, this sermon will surely convince him.

THE REGENERATION OF NEW CHINA. By Nelson Bitton. Price 2s. net.

THE NEW LIFE OF CHINA. By Rev. E. W. Wallace, B.D. Price 1s. net. *Church Missionary Society*, Salisbury Square, E.C.

Two fascinating and important works on the China of to-day. Of the first—which has an introduction by the Rev. Lord William Gascoyne Cecil—the Rev. W. E. Soothill, Principal-Elect of the University for Central China, says: "The book should be read by every missionary to and in China, by every member of our missionary committees, not least by their respective secretaries, and be studied by every missionary circle." It is a complete review of the present situation, and a powerful plea for the evangelization of "this most worthy people, whose present need is so urgent, and whose future importance for the history of the world is so incalculably great." The second volume covers much ground. It is pleasantly written, and, like Mr. Bitton's book, is full of excellent illustrations—in fact, the general get-up leaves nothing to be desired in either case, and entitles these books to rank with more pretentious works.

SEED SCATTERED BROADCAST: INCIDENTS IN A CAMP HOSPITAL. By S. McBeth. London: *C. J. Thynne*. Price 1s. 6d. net.

The reissue of this record of work and witness among the wounded and sick in the American Civil War is opportune at a time when many, at home and abroad, are ministering among those who have been the victims of the war now raging. It contains accounts of conversations with men with all kinds of difficulties. Their perplexities are dealt with in a sympathetic, sane, scriptural, convincing way.

ROADMAKING FOR THE KING. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* Price 1s. 6d. and 2s. net.

The story of a "Mission" at Hammersmith, carried on by a capable and devoted woman, Sister Lizzie. We do not profess to be in love with undenominational efforts of this kind. It seems a pity, when there are so many Churches and Chapels, that the promoters should not be able to associate themselves with some organized body of Christians instead of forming what is apt to look like a new sect. The fact that there is a Sunday morning "service for worship" suggests "brethrenism," though there is no mention of the "breaking of bread." Apart from this, the book, which is attractively got up and in its second edition, tells of the triumphs of redeeming grace, over which we rejoice with Sister Lizzie, whatever her opinions may be!

## Modern Biblical Criticism.

### SOME THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY A RECENT BOOK.<sup>1</sup>

It is, we think, to be lamented that those who themselves adhere to a tradition which was long universal in the Christian Church, and which has lasted for nineteen centuries without being disproved, should feel compelled to lavish words of undue appreciation on the works of those who seek to overthrow that tradition. There are, no doubt, various reasons for this course. First of all, the critics of the critics feel a little daunted by the positive way in which the modern critic enunciates his dogmas. Just as the medieval world of the West—and also of the East sometimes—fell down abashed before the voices of Councils and Popes, so are men of less courage than sincerity inclined to make needless submissions to men who speak authoritatively in the name of the “irreversible conclusions of modern scientific criticism.”

It is, of course, a bold thing to fly in the face of that science which is now everywhere triumphant, and a modest man who is not a great scientist naturally shrinks from the conflict. Yet on the threshold of this inquiry a question lies which ought to be oftener asked. Is the boast justified that the critical conclusions of the hour are really scientific at all? Has not the habit of dogmatic pronouncement passed over from medieval Popes and Councils to the modern critic? And is it not the Church which, happily for us all, has now come to prefer the course of modest, reasonable, and impartial inquiry?

There lies before us as we write the Romanes Lecture of the year, delivered by no less a master in science than Professor J. J. Thomson. He quotes Roger Bacon as saying: “Argument may conclude a question; but it cannot make us feel certain, *except the truth be also found to be so by experience.*” In other words, no method of research can be regarded as truly scientific unless its results can be tested by observation. Therefore, before the critic can impose the results of processes upon us, he *must apply them to given cases.* Till he has thus shown that his methods are satisfactory, he must refrain from representing them as proved.

Now, this is just what the modern critic does *not* do; and until he has done so he has no right to represent his methods as scientific. The Old Testament critic, before he can authoritatively assign passages, verses, and fractions of verses to “J E” or “P” or “D,” or any other of the creations of what may, after all, prove to be his imagination, must apply them to given cases, such as Beaumont and Fletcher, to Erckmann and Chatrian, to Dickens and Wilkie Collins, and to the King’s Speech. When, and not before, he can separate into their constituent elements the various “sources”

---

<sup>1</sup> “The New Testament in the Twentieth Century.” A Survey of Recent Christological and Historical Criticism of the New Testament. By the Rev. Maurice Jones, B.D., Chaplain to the Forces. London: Macmillan and Co. Price 10s. net.

of these "documents," he may come to us with confidence, and insist on our acceptance of the very intricate and involved critical scheme of the Pentateuch which he has placed before us.

Another feature of genuine scientific research is this: One of its most necessary characteristics is that its conclusions are never "irreversible." They are perpetually being modified. Every genuinely scientific inquirer eagerly invites fresh information in order to make his conclusions more certain. Thus little boys and girls were authoritatively told, years ago, how the earth was ninety-five millions of miles distant from the sun. That was the nearest approach to the truth that was then possible. Now we know that that distance was three million miles too great. We all of us in past days, again, recognized that the longest day had long been declared to fall on June 21. We now allow that the precession of the equinoxes has lately put June 22 in its place. And Sir J. J. Thomson tells us how recent discoveries have dethroned the molecule and the atom from their position as the most minute particles in the universe, and have put the electron in their place. Instances can be given when the critical world was far less serenely calm than the world of genuine science when its conclusions appeared to clash with recent discoveries. And the day before this review was written we were told of an early Babylonish document which certainly ought, if correctly described, seriously to modify the critical conclusions in regard to the *genesis* of the Pentateuchal narrative. Will our critics welcome, as Sir J. J. Thomson most cordially does, such revolutionary discoveries? Or shall we have another outburst of bitterness and violence in consequence of their appearance?

Another characteristic of true scientific research is its determination to welcome every conceivable mode of approaching a subject. The modern Biblical critic does exactly the reverse. He persists in ignoring every line of inquiry but his own. He approaches every question from the standpoint of subjective analysis. Archæological discovery, the laws of historical probability, the researches of competent scholars in days past, are sometimes quietly ignored, and sometimes absolutely and authoritatively superseded by the canons of criticism which the latest school of critics evolves and employs. Thus the argument from undesigned coincidences, so ably urged in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by Paley, Lardner, and Blunt, as putting the writers of the New Testament into the witness-box and testing their veracity, is never even mentioned by the modern critical "scholar." So, too, the long and learned historical inquiry, backed up by investigation of internal evidence, examination of style, and so forth, which has been going on during nineteen centuries, from the days of Irenæus, Dionysius of Alexandria, and Eusebius to those of great scholars such as Lightfoot, Westcott, and Salmon in England, whose ashes are scarcely cold among us, and in Germany of the learned Theodore Zahn, is often as entirely ignored at this moment as if such men had never lived. It is no better to quote, as Mr. Maurice Jones does, an authority such as Irenæus on behalf of St. John's Gospel, and never to tell us that Irenæus testifies to his having known Polycarp in his youth, and that Polycarp was the disciple of St. John. It is a matter of course that the palpable fact of the appearance in every one of

the Epistles of the doctrine of the indwelling in man of the Incarnate God, which was generally well known, though never written down until St. John's Gospel appeared, is equally ignored, though it proves that the silence of the Synoptists in regard to this great doctrine can only be accounted for on the ground that they desired to lead the world step by step from the Man Christ Jesus to the Eternal Word of the Father, who took our nature upon Him "for us men and for our salvation." Clement of Alexandria tells us—and Clement, beside being himself a competent judge on such points, had sources of information which are lost to us—that it was the fear lest the Church should allow the evidence for the basis of the Gospel message to perish which led the disciples to urge St. John to put the Lord's esoteric teaching on record before he died. Happily for us, he consented to do so.

Finally, the question of the possibility of foisting writings on the Church which, if they were not genuine, were impudent forgeries and nothing less, is an important element in the inquiry. Now, documents such as the Acts of the Apostles and the various Epistles have been handed down to us, which depict to us a body of men connected by the closest ties, and constantly circulating intelligence in all the cities of the Eastern Mediterranean, beside a steadily increasing number of similar communities in the West. Heathen authorities corroborate the statement that such communities existed, and the writings of the numerous Gnostic sects attest the vast intellectual ferment which the doctrines contained in St. John's Gospel had made in the philosophic circles of that day. Can any impartial person contend that it would be easy to obtain credence for forgeries so shameless as the Gospel of St. John and the Second Epistle of St. Peter must have been on the hypothesis of the modern critic, in a community which eagerly sought for authentic information about One whom they had been taught to worship as Divine, and which had such excellent opportunities of verifying it when given? As those who in the past have dealt with the evidences for Christianity have reminded us, those evidences are cumulative. Can anyone venture to call that criticism "scientific" which ignores every line of research but one, and that one the utterly unsatisfactory one of internal criticism, backed up by a bold endeavour to discount the value of the testimony we have by denying the genuineness, as one critic or other does, of every Christian treatise of the first century which has come down to us? If the history of any other nation or religion were treated as that of Christianity has been by the modern school of criticism, all history whatever must long since have disappeared.

The partisans of the modern German school of criticism will no doubt defend Mr. Jones on the ground that he does not necessarily endorse the conclusions which, as a historian, he records. This is true. But if they go on to contend that there is no need to notice the sound and sober criticism of the great thinkers and divines mentioned above, because the author's work is confined to the first fourteen years of the twentieth century, we are unable to agree with them. The mere fact that a wave of hostile criticism has set in at the beginning of the present century does not entitle its historian to treat his subject as though the consistent traditions of nineteen centuries, and the able summaries of them which appeared during the two last of these

centuries, could fairly be ignored. Mr. Jones calls his history a "survey." But in a "survey" a writer is bound to tell his readers how these novel ideas stand when compared with the universal verdict of the ages before they appeared. He is not entitled to treat them as discoveries. They are nothing of the kind. They are mere surmises, which are loaded with a heavy weight of improbability from the fact that they are directly opposed to the unwavering decisions of the Catholic Church. No article of the faith of that Church is so firmly established as that of the authority and accuracy of the documents which have handed down the history of the Old Covenant, and of those which contain the foundations of the better Covenant which was revealed by Jesus Christ. Nor can Mr. Jones escape blame if, while maintaining, as he does, the genuineness of most of the books of the New Testament, he does so, not as profoundly convinced that the criticism he records is unsatisfactory, but as the sentimental advocate of what he mournfully confesses to be almost, if not quite, a lost cause.

Take, for instance, the sentence with which he concludes his history of the current theories of the "Fourth Gospel." He says: "After weighing all the arguments very carefully, I must confess that the authorship of the 'Fourth Gospel' still remains for me an open question, but that what little bias I may have is on the side of St. John" (p. 389). Is this the sort of vindication of a tradition of nineteen centuries which should come from one who has duly weighed the evidence in its favour to which we have already called attention? If the "Fourth Gospel" be not genuine, what becomes of all the doctrinal portions of the Epistles? Even if his subject strictly confines him to the first fourteen years of the present century, Mr. Jones ought to have found some place for a protest against the tendency of modern criticism to rest on one-sided and insufficient premisses. Step by step those who used to insist with an utterly unwarrantable affectation of infallibility that the "Fourth Gospel" was a product of the second half of the second century, borrowed entirely, and none too ably, from Philo, have been driven to the admission that the Gospel was written at the latest within ten years of the death of the Apostle St. John. Is it *quite* beside the point if an inquirer be asked to consider the question how a spurious writing, professing to emanate from the "disciple whom Jesus loved" with a special and peculiar love, and who leaned on the Sacred Breast of his Master at the Last Supper, could have been received by the members of a society bound together by such ties as St. Luke, in the Acts, represents the Christian Church in his day to have been bound, or how men in the position of Polycarp and Irenæus could have been induced to accept it? Thousands of Christians must have seen the Apostle in his later sojourn at Ephesus, have eagerly drunk in his reminiscences of the Person and doctrine of the Eternal Word, made flesh "for us men and for our salvation." And are we to be asked to give up such evidences as this—or even, with Mr. Maurice Jones, to let the genuineness of the Gospel remain as "an open question"—in consequence of a criticism which palpably, on the face of it, "ministers questions rather than godly edifying which is of faith." Can we excuse the author of a "survey" of the latest utterances on an incomparably great question, if he tries feebly to rest in a half-way house between God's truth faithfully handed down in the

Divine Society which He has created, and the latest denial of the doctrine which that Society has ever been the appointed "witness and keeper" ?

Mr. Jones does not himself always deal fairly with the traditional critic. Take the Second Epistle of St. Peter as an instance. Mr. Jones *does* just refer to Zahn in a footnote. But he does not even remotely allude to the strong argument of Zahn that the Epistle is either genuine or a deliberate forgery (see 2 Pet. i. 13-18, and the reference, most natural on the part of the Apostle of the Circumcision, to the letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles; and *cf.* Gal. i. 18-ii. 21). Mr. Jones is not afraid to say that "in the matter of style the contrast between the two letters is complete." This is a very bold assertion, and rests on no ground whatsoever. There is doubtless a difference of style between parts of the two Epistles, but it is due to the difference of subject. It would be impossible for anyone to pen the severe invectives in the Second Epistle against the false disciples, and the vigorous and forcible account of the end of the world, in the same language as that found in the rest of the two Epistles. The argument, if it proves anything, proves too much; it proves that the Second Epistle is the work of two authors. The same difference of subject has led some critics to the *tour de force* which attributes St. Paul's two Epistles to the Thessalonians to two different hands. But a really careful study of the Greek of the two Epistles of St. Peter and that of St. Jude shows that the order of the Greek in all three of them is far more artificial and inverted than in any other book in the New Testament. We venture to commend this view of the subject to the attention of scholars. It has hitherto attracted far less attention than it deserves.

The chapter on St. Paul and the mystery religions speaks of the "valuable results" of "the study of comparative religions." This age is greedy of novelty, and we are of opinion that the value of these "results" has been as much exaggerated as the labours of authors of past days have been underrated. And the list of "literature" on the subject is characteristically reticent about contributions on the traditional side—such, for instance, as those of that competent scholar, Dr. St. Clair Tisdall.

In what we have said, we have never charged Mr. Jones with going all the way with the twentieth-century critics. He often gives a very fair résumé of the arguments on both sides. And, of course, the critics mentioned above as taking an altogether different view of the situation are all dead, except Zahn. But this shows the absurdity of isolating fourteen years of a century from everything which has gone before. The dead are not always wrong; and Mr. Jones ignores a good many living scholars. Moreover, progress in research must build on the past, not dig it up and fling it away. And if Mr. Jones sometimes says things such as "If the 'Christ myth' theory is true, and if Jesus never lived, the whole civilized world has for 2,000 years lain under the spell of a lie," or expresses a doubt whether St. Paul could "have remained as one of the representatives of primitive Christianity" and "an honoured member of their community"; if he denies that St. Paul Hellenized Christianity, as some critics represent him as doing, Mr. Jones very often treats us to utterances far less reasonable. It is simply absurd to say, for instance, that St. Paul "knows nothing of the eating and

drinking of the Body and Blood of Christ; he *only speaks* (!) of the eating and drinking of the Bread and of the Cup" (p. 154). No one who had not culpably forgotten 1 Cor. x. 15-17, and xi. 23-29, could possibly have written as Mr. Jones has done on the subject. It is true that he is here contending that St. Paul is unjustly accused of supporting the doctrine of some Oriental religions that the believer was taught that he "ate the god." As no Christian theologian of repute, from St. Paul downward, has ever taught such a doctrine, it seems unnecessary to quote anyone to refute it. And it certainly cannot be refuted by misquoting St. Paul. The favourite notion, again, that an early historical document called "Q," apparently accepted by our author, has been disinterred from the débris of the Four Gospels, simply disappears in face of the fact, well known to missionaries in the East, that Christian converts unable to read or write frequently commit whole books of the Bible to memory, and that the "personal equation" will account for minor variations. Mr. Jones, once more, gives the arguments *against* the genuineness of 2 Thessalonians, but does not put the case fairly in the opposite direction. No one could carefully compare 1 Thess. iv. 13-v. 5 with 2 Thess. ii., or 1 Thess. iv. 9-12 with 2 Thess. iii. 6-12, without recognizing the close connection between the two Epistles. And generally it is impossible to help feeling that, while in this volume the twentieth-century position is always ably and clearly stated, the force of the traditional position is far too often more or less ignored.

J. J. LIAS.



## Publications of the Month.

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

### BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

COMMON OBJECTIONS TO CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. C. L. Drawbridge, M.A. (*Robert Scott*. 5s. net.) "Library of Historic Theology" Series. An evidential work of great value.

HOLY COMMUNION, THE. A Manual, Historical, Doctrinal, and Devotional. By the Right Rev. J. Denton Thompson, D.D., Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 1s. net.) Second edition of a most helpful work.

BIBLE READINGS FOR CLASS AND HOME. By the Rev. Canon Joynt, M.A. (*C. J. Thynne*. 1s. net.) Second edition of a very precious little volume, valuable alike in its devotional and practical aspects.

PRIEST AS CONFESSOR, THE. By the Rev. A. H. Baverstock, M.A. (*Cope and Fenwick*. 2s. 6d. net.) A book on "hearing confessions," a work which in the author's view "calls for a scientific equipment." [See "The Month," p. 808.]

### SERMONS AND ADDRESSES.

STUDIES IN THE SPIRIT AND TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. W. Temple, M.A. (*Macmillan and Co., Ltd.* 3s. 6d. net.) Twenty University and other sermons.

AUSTRALIAN SERMONS. By the Right Rev. A. V. Green, LL.D., Bishop of Ballarat. (*Macmillan and Co., Ltd.* 3s. 6d. net.) Forty-four sermons preached to country congregations. The Bishop modestly disclaims anything "new or remarkable" about them, "but," he adds, "they are Australian."

- SOWER WENT FORTH, A. Sermons by the Rev. T. W. M. Lund, M.A. Second Series. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 5s. net.) Fifty sermons preached in the Chapel of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Hardman Street, Liverpool.
- SLEEPING CARDINAL, THE, AND OTHER SERMONS. By the Rev. Canon McMillan, M.A. (*Robert Scott.* 1s. 6d. net.) Seven sermons preached in Malmesbury Abbey.
- SON OF MAN, THE. By the Rev. R. O. Shone, B.A., B.D. (*Robert Scott.* 2s. net.) Sermons preached during Lent at St. George's, Everton.
- VALUES OF THE CROSS, THE ; OR, THE THINGS THAT MATTER. By the Rev. Prebendary W. Yorke Fausset, M.A. (*S.P.C.K.* 1s. 6d. net.) Six addresses given in Lent at Bristol Cathedral.
- THINGS TO GRIP. By Charles Edwards. (*Robert Scott.* 2s. net.) Addresses in outline ; thirty-five in all—fresh, suggestive, pointed, and appealing.
- TEACHING BY ILLUSTRATION. By the Rev. J. W. W. Moeran, M.A., with Introduction by Bishop Ingham. (*Robert Scott.* 3s. 6d. net.) Bishop Ingham gives it high praise when he says that "next to my Bible, I should like to have this book near me when I am preparing a sermon." Preachers will find it a treasury of good things.

### GENERAL.

- MISSIONS, PAROCHIAL AND GENERAL. By the Right Rev. J. Denton Thompson, D.D., Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man. (*Robert Scott.* 2s.) A reprint, with considerable additions, of the Bishop's CHURCHMAN articles. This volume is, we believe, destined to become the leading handbook on the subject of Missions.
- LIFE OF ISAAC WATTS, THE. By Thomas Wright. (*C. J. Farncombe and Sons, Ltd.* 5s. net.) The third volume in Mr. Wright's excellent series of "Lives of British Hymn-Writers."
- HOW AND WHERE THEY LIVED IN BIBLE TIMES. By E. B. Trist. (*S.P.C.K.* 2s. net.) A most interesting volume, with numerous delightful illustrations.
- GREAT MISSIONARY PIONEER, A. By Mrs. E. M. Dunlop. (*S.P.C.K.* 1s. net.) The story of Samuel Marsden's work in New Zealand, written for the Marsden Centenary, Christmas Day, 1814-1914. A volume which should be in great request, for Marsden's work needs to be honoured.
- LITTLE SCHOOLMASTER, THE, by Mary Pakington (2s. 6d.) ; A STRANGE CRAFT, by John A. Higginson (2s.) ; AN AMAZING CONSPIRACY, by Herbert Hayens (2s. 6d.). Three rollicking story-books which will delight the heart of a boy, suitable for Christmas books or school prizes, published by the S.P.C.K.
- CITY OF SAFED, THE. By Archdeacon Dowling, D.D., with Introduction by Bishop Blyth. (*London Jews Society.* 1s. net.)
- CHURCHMAN'S ABC, THE. (*C. J. Thynne.* 6d. net.) New edition of "A Guide to Church Doctrine and Ritual," which should be in the hands of every Churchman.
- EXPLOITS OF BRIGADIER GERARD, THE. By Sir A. Conan Doyle. (*T. Nelson and Sons.*) A welcome addition to Nelson's "Sevenpenny Series."

### QUARTERLIES.

- QUARTERLY REVIEW, THE. (*John Murray.* 6s.) Contents of the October issue: *Chatham, North, and America.* Harold Temperley. *Gustave Flaubert.* T. Sturge Moore. *The Conditions of State Punishment.* E. Bowen-Rowlands. *Wild and Garden Roses.* Gertrude Jekyll. *The Soul of Queen Marguerite.* Mary Bradford Whiting. *Scharnhorst and National Defence.* H. C. Foxcroft. *The Origins of the Present War.* Sir Valentine Chirol. *The Classical Drama of Japan.* Ernest Fenollosa and Ezra Pound. *Organized Labour and the War.* *Art History and Criticism.* C. H. Collins-Baker. *The Home Rule Truce.* *Economic Aspects of the War.* Edgar Crammond. *The First Two Months of War. I. On Land.* Lord Sydenham. *II. At Sea.* Archibald Hurd.
- CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW, THE. (*Spottiswoode and Co., Ltd.* 3s.) Contents of the October issue: *Nature Miracles and the Virgin Birth.* Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, D.D. *Benjamin Webb and St. Andrew's, Wells Street.* Rev. C. E. Griffinhoofe. *Von Soden's Edition of the New Testament.* Sir Frederic Kenyon, K.C.B. *Religio Juventutis.* H. A. Strong, LL.D. *St. Gaudentius of Brescia.* Rev. C. R. Norcock. *German Thought: The Real Conflict.* Miss. H. D. Oakeley. *Christianity and War.* Dean of Durham. *Magic and Religion.* F. B. Jevons, D.Litt.