

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

May, 1916.

The Month.

It is distinctly unfortunate that Nonconformity is not coming into the National Mission. That, at least, we take to be the meaning of the correspondence which has passed between Free Church leaders and the Archbishop of Canterbury. The letter from these Nonconformists was very kindly worded; they assured Churchmen of their cordial sympathy and goodwill, and expressed the hope that the movement may be eminently successful. Since the correspondence the Executive of the Free Church Council have passed a resolution reiterating the expression of fellowship, and counselling their own members to abstain from undertaking any special meetings or effort which might divert attention from the National Mission. But beyond this they do not go. Their sympathy is sincere, but it is sympathy from afar, while what is needed is co-operation within. What is the meaning of it all? No one supposes that Nonconformists are less anxious than Churchmen for the moral and spiritual regeneration of England, and when the idea of a National Mission was first mooted it was certainly understood that "other religious communions" would "make arrangements in their own way for an independent effort of a similar character." It may be that a more distinct and definite interpretation was placed on the words we have quoted than they can legitimately bear, but they were widely held to mean that in connexion with the National Mission, but on their own independent lines, other religious bodies would make their own appeal to the Nation. Apparently nothing of the sort is now contemplated, and the Church alone is to undertake the great work. Who is responsible? The Nonconformist leaders?

Undoubtedly they must bear their share of the blame. But are the leaders of the Church altogether free? We cannot say, because we do not know, but there are rumours going round that Nonconformists would gladly have joined in the effort if they had been officially approached, but the Church made no sign, and, therefore, they had to content themselves with offering the Church an assurance of their goodwill and their prayers. The whole business is much to be regretted from every point of view.

For what is the purpose of the Mission? As far
What is the
Mission? as we understand, it is to be a Mission of Witness
 for God and Righteousness. It is a Mission of Repentance and Hope, calling the nation to forsake its sins and to turn back to God Who is our one Hope. These are not exclusively Church aims, or Denominational aims. The message of the Mission is essentially a Christian message; its witness is essentially a Christian witness; its message and its witness belong to the whole Christian body. Why then should the Mission be left to one section of Christians only? If the object of the Mission were to draw people into the Church, then of course it would be right that it should be a Church Mission. But this is not the main purpose. Its primary object is to bring the nation to God, and such a task belongs to all sections of the Christian Church. They would not all perform it on the same lines; the witness each would bear would carry with it its own distinctive characteristic, but it would have the same end in view—that of the regeneration of the nation, the building up of a new England, an England which has forsaken its sins and turned in repentance and hope to the God of our Fathers. If the Church and other religious communions would unite in this one great purpose the witness would be immeasurably stronger than it can possibly be if the work is left to the Church alone. We talk of Christian unity and profess to have aspirations after closer fellowship, and yet we cannot unite in a purely evangelistic effort. The failure is too lamentable for words. What would the world, the ungodly world which we are seeking to influence, say about it if they knew all the facts? Let it not be thought we are blaming the Church only; Nonconformists must accept their share of the responsibility as well. What did it matter whether or not they were approached? Could not they have

come forward with an intimation of their readiness to join in the effort on their own lines? We cannot believe that such overtures would have been rejected. And if they had been, there was nothing to prevent the Free Churches from acting independently. This "day of God" is theirs, as well as ours; and if they refuse to use it for God theirs is the responsibility and the reproach.

Meanwhile we are sincerely glad that, although
 The "National Mission." it is to be mainly a Church effort, the authorities have resisted all attempts to induce them to change its title. It was planned as a "National Mission," and a National Mission it is to be. We hardly know whether to smile or frown at a body of clergy which with portentous solemnity passes a resolution emphatically protesting against the use of the title National Mission and urging its complete and immediate withdrawal. Has a Ruridecanal Chapter nothing better to do, at a time of national emergency as well as spiritual opportunity, such as this, than to find fault with those who are at least recognizing the nation's spiritual needs and are endeavouring to meet them? Happily other Ruridecanal Chapters are reading the signs of the times differently, and their members are seeking to prepare themselves—the hardest task of all—for the great effort to which they are called. In connexion with the question of title we may call attention to a very able pamphlet by the Master of Selwyn, the Rev. J. O. F. Murray, entitled *The Mission in its National Aspect*. It is one of the six "National Mission Papers" just issued by the S.P.C.K. "The National Mission," he says, "is a call to us as a Nation by the National Church to know the time of our visitation," and he goes on to show wherein it differs from a Parochial Mission:—

In a Parochial Mission the immediate aim is to bring back individual souls to their allegiance to God, and to build them up in His faith and fear. Incidentally, a successful Mission should draw the faithful closer to one another and leave the parish more conscious of its organic unity in the sight of God, and more efficient in its corporate witness to Him. But the main objective throughout is the individual.

In our National Mission, on the other hand, the main objective is the nation as a whole. The appeal to individuals is throughout subordinate and conditioned at every point by reference to that end.

The goal which it sets before us is nothing less than the regeneration of England. England means more to each one of us than it did before the war began. We are more conscious than we were how far England, as she is, falls short of the ideal England for which our bravest are shedding their

blood like water. We are filled with longing to hasten the coming of the new England which shall be less unworthy of the sacrifices made on her behalf. So we appeal to all Englishmen to make a united effort for the uplift of our country. We believe that God Himself is drawing nearer to us as a nation through the war, and that, if the heart of the nation can hear and respond to His call, His Kingdom will come in England with a reality and power hitherto undreamt of. The Mission is, therefore, from one point of view, simply a "Mission of Witness" to this converting and inspiring fact.

From this point of view it is difficult to see what other name could be chosen which would more adequately express the purpose of the effort than that of "The National Mission of Repentance and Hope."

It is generally conceded that one of the essentials
 to the full effectiveness of the National Mission is
 that the Church should be at unity within itself.

*The Plea
for Unity.*

We fear that in its widest aspect that is a counsel of perfection, but beyond all doubt there ought to be a truce—a truce of God as it is called—in regard to all controversial questions before and during the Mission. What will happen afterwards depends very largely upon the use that is made of the Mission itself, and we must be content to wait, although our own belief and hope are that the Church will be so revived and renewed spiritually that many of the things which now divide and embitter will then wear a very different aspect. But let that pass. For the moment we are content to utter a plea for a larger manifestation of Christian unity that the due preparation for the Mission and the work of the Mission itself be not hindered. Let us for the moment try to forget the things which divide, in order that we may concentrate upon the things on which we are agreed. This could well be done by both sides without either party surrendering a point of importance. As an illustration we may mention what happened at a Ruridecanal Conference a week or two ago. There were two selected speakers—one a clergyman of the most "advanced" views, and the other a layman who is closely identified with the work of a leading Protestant organization. Yet there was hardly a word in the address of either to which the other could not have assented. Let it not be supposed that the addresses were weak, or inconclusive; on the contrary they were strong and definite; but for the time the speakers sank their differences, and each offered what he had to contribute to the general cause. Cannot we have more of this

kind of co-operation? It will help the Mission immeasurably, and it will prove a blessing to the Church now and for long after the immediate effort which gave rise to it has passed away.

The Principal Service. But to return to the question of the truce. If it is to be effectual it must be binding on both sides and loyally observed by both sides. It is for this reason that we deprecate the attempts which are being made to secure a discussion of the proposal to make the celebration of the Lord's Supper the principal service of the Lord's Day. It is quite useless to suppose—as has been suggested—that it can be discussed calmly and temperately as an abstract proposition. It is impossible for it to be so considered. It is bound up with questions of such acute controversy—of which that of attendance apart from reception is only one—that it would be lamentable to raise it at this time, when it is of the first importance that the Church should not only cultivate the spirit of unity, but should also present a united front to the world. Yet it is being raised with some persistence by those who favour the proposal. The attempt was even made to introduce the Holy Communion as the Parade Service instead of that ordered by the King's Regulations. We do not intend to discuss the proposal now, although there is much that we should like to say about it. All we ask for is that those who are anxious for the change should hold their hands till after the war, when it may be discussed with greater freedom than is possible now. To force it forward at this stage would make the observance of a truce impossible, would provoke strong controversy and would endanger the usefulness of the National Mission. On every ground, therefore, we ask that the matter may be deferred. And not on this question only, but on all other matters of controversy, whether of ritual or doctrinal significance, we trust the truce of God may faithfully be observed. The Church has other business on hand, and we trust that when the Convocations assemble for their May session, the debates will leave us in no doubt that the leaders of the Church are anxious to get forward with the things that really matter, and to leave on one side everything else till a more convenient season. We venture to adapt the words of *The Times*. It is constantly insisting that the House of Commons should devote solely and strenuously every possible opportunity to the business of winning the war.

"Nothing else matters," it wrote the other day. In like manner the Church will be well advised to devote itself solely and strenuously to the business of seeking to win England for Christ. Until it has done that "nothing else matters."

A Stationary
Church.

The statistics which are published annually in that most useful of all handbooks for a Churchman, *The Official Year-Book of the Church of England*, always afford an interesting and a profitable study; and those which appear in this year's issue are no exception to the rule. The fact that both in regard to voluntary offerings and Church work the statistics show a decline gives rise to serious reflections. Attempts are made to explain—and even to explain away—the decrease on various grounds—war claims and war conditions being most frequently urged. It has also been contended that the difficulty of comparison is enhanced by the fact that the governing date, Easter of 1915, was so unusually early that the "year" consisted of only 50 weeks instead of 52. These considerations are weighty and should be allowed for, but, making every allowance for these things, we find it difficult to resist the conclusion that the Church is not advancing. If it is not going back it is stationary. We are multiplying buildings, we are increasing the machinery, but—are we winning the people? That is the most serious problem and it cannot be ignored by a living Church. The principal figures are these: Voluntary contributions amounted to £7,531,228—a decrease of £676,084 upon the previous year. The communicants at Easter were 2,359,599, or 85,515 fewer than in the previous year. Confirmees numbered 221,572, whereas in 1914 they were 241,820. The number of infants baptized for the year was 570,262, whereas in the previous year they numbered 590,138. The number of baptisms of those of riper years has also fallen behind, the number for 1914-15 being 14,782, against 16,278 in the previous year. The Sunday School statistics continue to show a steady decline. The number on the books has decreased year by year from 2,561,520 in 1911-12 to 2,481,999 in 1914-15. Similarly there has been a steady decrease in the numbers of males and females alike attending Bible classes, the figures being in 1914-15 277,102 males and 304,336 females, whereas three years ago they were 341,716 and 330,973 respectively. This is the situation the Church has to face.

The Decree of the First Church Council.¹

(ACTS XV.)

Acts xv. 20, " That we write unto them that they abstain from the pollution of idols and from fornication [and from what is strangled²] and from blood " (Ib. ver. 29) The decree, " These necessary things—that ye abstain from things sacrificed to idols and from blood [and from things strangled²] and from fornication, from which if ye keep yourselves it shall be well with you."

THE above enumeration of the " things necessary " for a Gentile convert probably perplexes many readers of the Acts. My footnote testifies to the antiquity of this impression. Even before the third century Christians were puzzled about the import of the decree issued *cir.* A.D. 50 by the Council at Jerusalem. In Alexandria and the East it was thenceforth usually interpreted as mainly a dietetic law. In Europe and Africa, on the other hand, it was regarded as a caution against certain deadly sins. Connected with this varying exegesis is a corresponding textual variation. The MSS. \aleph A B C P, etc., supported by the Alexandrian Fathers Clement and Origen, have the familiar decree of four clauses. Codex Bezae and several Western Fathers, along with some less weighty authorities, have a three-clause decree and supplement it with the Golden Rule.

My aim in this paper is to suggest a third alternative. Insuperable difficulties appear to obsess both (a) the theory of a food-law and (b) the theory of a decree levelled against three sins. By their exposure and by some constructive argument I hope to commend theory (c), viz. that the decree (which was probably one of three clauses) simply cautioned the new converts against " syncretism " or disloyal association with the cults of heathenism.

I. Theory (a) presenting the text as in our English versions, makes three-fourths of a four-clause decree deal with food, the Apostles' aim being to retain for the new converts certain of the " kosher "

¹ The subject of a paper recently read at the Seminar now working on the Acts at Jesus College, Cambridge.

² This clause is omitted in both verses in Codex Bezae, several cursive MSS. and the Latin Version, as also by Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian and other Latin writers. Jerome says it was to be found in some MSS. Codex Bezae and most of these authorities insert in both verses an additional stipulation, viz., " And do not to others what you would not that they should do to you," and in verse 29 have before the " Fare ye well " the words " being carried along by the Holy Spirit."

regulations of the Jews. Against this view I tabulate the following grave objections :—

(1) The ranking a deadly sin along with such practices as eating a shot bird or a coursed hare would have rather increased than diminished the new converts' difficulties of conscience, and tended to continued "subversion of their souls" (ver. 24).

(2) An Apostolic Council issues these supposedly dietetic mandates in professed plenitude of inspiration, and no subsequent Council suspends or qualifies them. Yet certainly they have been but little honoured by the Church. The early Christians often retained from the Old Testament or from Oriental custom a scruple against food not thoroughly bled.¹ But there is no evidence of their regulating their diet in deference to the Apostolic decree. Contrariwise the "Didaché," written only some fifty years later, makes all food except things "offered in sacrifice to idols" matter of private conscience ("Didaché," ch. vi.). Is it conceivable that its writer had ever heard that the Apostles absolutely prohibited "things strangled, and blood" ?

(3) The same remark applies to St. Paul himself, and further, theory (a) sets in startling contrast this Apostle's teachings and Luke's account of his actions. In Acts xvi. 4 Paul is represented as dutifully circulating this conciliar decree among his own converts. Yet only about eight years afterwards he asserts in Romans xiv. the utter insignificance of "kosher" diet. Worse still, at a later period he writes to the Colossians denouncing all trammelling the conscience with scrupulosities about meat or drink (Col. ii. 16 seq.). Inevitably, then, theory (a) either impeaches Paul's character for consistency or necessitates the conclusion pressed by destructive German critics, viz. that the whole story of the Council is a fable.

(4) Moreover, this theory really almost stultifies the argument of Peter which prepares the way for the decree (Acts xv. 7-10).

¹ That the scrupulosity about diet discussed by St. Paul in Romans xiv. long lingered is well known. But there is positive evidence for its *dissociation* from Acts xv., despite the natural tendency to connect the dietetic practice with the conciliar decree. Thus if Biblias, the martyr of A.D. 178, is represented in the letter from Lyons and Vienne (Eusebius H.E. v. 1) as alleging against the charge of cannibalism that the Christians were "not allowed to eat even the blood of irrational animals," Irenæus who transmitted and perhaps himself wrote this letter, evidently makes the decree treat of morals not of food, and includes the Golden Rule. Similarly though Tertullian repeatedly refers to this scruple, he makes the rescript a prohibition of the three deadly sins. Cf. Kirsopp Lake, "Earlier Letters of St. Paul," ii. Appendix.

For what is the intolerable "yoke" from which exemption is pre-
saged by Peter? Circumcision received by the Hebrew in infancy
was no yoke to him, and for the Gentile proselyte it would
only involve a short spell of pain far outweighed by the daily *gêne*
of Jewish kosher rules. Yet this latter yoke is on this hypothesis
riveted afresh, and apparently in heavier¹ form. Repudiation,
too, not retention, is suggested by Peter emphasizing "the cleansing
of the heart by faith," the foil to which is cleansing by purity of
diet. In fact but for theory (a) we should naturally infer that when
the Council disowned the Pharisaic busybodies who clamoured for
"circumcision and the law of Moses," the Gentiles were emancipated
from both, and that "kosher food" went the way of circumcision.
Such a sequel squares with instead of contradicting (1) Peter's
argument, (2) Paul's Epistles, (3) the actual practice of the Church.
And Luke himself seems to be preparing us for this wholesale
emancipation in his long and detailed story of Peter's vision and
its overriding his scruples about meats "common or unclean"
in Acts x.¹

II. Theory (a) being thus found unsatisfactory, we turn to its
rival. Are we in a happier plight if—adopting the Western text
and striking out the "things strangled" clause—we make the decree
forbid three special sins?

Readers of Professor Lake's most valuable work on the "Earlier
Epistles of St. Paul" will recollect the weighty arguments for his
conclusion that the clause thus elided is no part of the original decree
but merely an edifying elucidation connecting the word "blood,"
with an interpretation of the decree as a food law. This conclusion
I accept. An original three-clause text appears to have been
touched up by two rival schools of exegesis, the result being in some
quarters the appearance of the decree in the four-clause form of our
textus receptus; in others its embellishment with the Golden Rule
of Codex Bezae and the Westerns. Mr. Lake does not accept the
Golden Rule as an integral part of the text. And with good reason,
for it is simply inconceivable that, had it been there, any one would
have succeeded in expunging such high teaching in the interest of

¹ There is no prohibition of "things strangled" in the Levitical law.
It is even possible that it was not as yet included in the Jewish "kosher"
regulations, cf. Lake, *op. cit.* p. 55. If so, the argument in favour of the
three-clause text of the decree is stronger still, and the "Food Law" inter-
pretation is correspondingly weakened.

religious dietetics. But it is disappointing to find him still maintaining that Western exegesis whose obvious insufficiency needed the insertion of this gloss. Following the Latin Fathers he interprets the decree as a caution against three special sins—idolatry, murder and fornication. And he conjectures that the Apostolic Council had a precedent in some Jewish practice of admitting converts without demand for fuller compliance with Old Testament ethics.

To this theory (b) there are the following objections, which I think most readers will find insuperable.

(1) The supposed Jewish precedent is quite imaginary. Mr. Lake cites the case of King Izates and certain passages in Philo, and a liberal view of the ceremonial law in certain quarters is doubtless thus sufficiently attested. But there is no evidence whatever for the supposed reduction of the moral law to these three essentials.¹

(2) "Blood" (*αἷμα*) in the decree could hardly have meant "murder" (*ἀφάρτα*) to the Greek-speaking recipients of the decree, despite its afterwards receiving this interpretation in the West. I have examined all the passages in Biblical Greek cited by Resch and Professor Lake in support of such a use of the term. The best, perhaps, is Matthew xxiii. 30—"partakers in the blood of the prophets"—which does not take one far. In all such supposed parallels the context or the verb makes the meaning unmistakable. Such is certainly not the case in the decree of Acts xv.

(3) Even supposing objection (2) met, can we conceive of the ethical demands of Christianity being reduced to abstention from idolatry, murder and fornication? In the age of Charlemagne such an emasculation of moral requisites might pass. But we are at once conscious of its incongruity in a decree emanating from Apostles. What a contrast to St. Paul's catalogue of the things which "if a man do he shall not inherit the Kingdom of Heaven." Or to the stringent distinctions in the "Didaché" between the "Way of Life" and the "Way of Death." Or to Pliny's record of the pledge taken by the Bithynian Christians, "ne furta, ne latrocinia . . . committerent, ne fidem fallerent."

¹ Singularly enough the two passages from the "Sibylline Oracles" adduced by Mr. Lake, viz., iv. 24-34 and iv. 162-170, themselves confute this assumption. In verses 31, 32 the poet demands abstention from dishonest dealings in trade: in verses 166-168 he demands, besides repentance, the same pious practices that Luke attributes to Cornelius in Acts x., viz. prayer and almsgiving.

I have somewhere come across a story of an African convert, who when told by the missionary about the eighth commandment ejaculated, "O! no Massa! Sure good man Moses never gib such silly rule as that." But it was not related that the missionary left him under the impression that he need not include the duty of honesty among "necessary things." Obviously the meagreness of the moral demand made the embellishment of the decree with the Golden Rule imperative. Therefore the admission that this Western reading is a gloss really pronounces sentence on interpretation (b).

III. By this process of exhaustion I come at last to (c). The decree is one of uniform tenor, cautioning these new converts against contamination from the cults of heathenism. The Council, in fact, after relieving its questioners from the "troubling words" of the Judaizers, points out that in another direction scrupulosity is necessary. It cautions against all approach to "syncretism." The transition of thought is natural. We find St. Paul dealing with the same subject in 1 Corinthians. Just such cautions against the dangers of a heathen entourage are continually found necessary in the Mission Field to-day.

Let us take the decree as one of three clauses, though this is not essential to my thesis. In two of them a passage so obviously suggests itself as explaining their collocation that I wonder it generally escapes attention. I refer to Revelation ii. 14-24. "Eating things sacrificed to idols" and "fornication"—this is the *conjoint* charge of St. John against two separate communities, *viz.*, Pergamum and Thyatira (*vv.* 14, 20). In *three* instances, then, "fornication" is associated closely with "idol sacrifices." Surely this cannot be fortuitous. We see at once that the "fornication" stigmatized is not the ordinary sin against Christian ethics considered apart. It is something involved, or at least risked, in all participation with idol sacrifices.

John after reprimanding the Church of Thyatira concludes thus: "I cast upon you none other burden (*βάρος*)" (verse 24). Now nowhere in the New Testament save here and in our decree has the expression *βάρος* this peculiar meaning, and the cheering epilogue "Howbeit that which ye have held fast till I come," is not unlike in tone to that of the decree, "From which if ye keep yourselves it shall be well with you." It is conceivable perhaps then that a reminiscence of the Council and its rescript actually suggests John's

choice of expression. If so, it would be a valuable attestation to the historicity of both. But be this as it may, Revelation ii. sufficiently shows that in Acts xv. not ordinary social immorality is meant, but contamination by way of religious syncretism.

It may be that these Christians at Pergamum and Thyatira attended idolatrous gatherings to which obscene rites were sometimes accessory and that it is precisely this feature in the heathen cults that is contemplated in the conciliar rescript. It is addressed to Syria, Antioch and Cilicia. The notorious obscenities that characterized some of the Syrian cults at once occur to us. "Nulle part" (says Cumont) "l'impudeur ne s'étalait aussi que dans les temples d'Astarté." "Les prostitutions sacrées n'ont été en aucun pays aussi développées qu'en Syrie." Nor is this literal interpretation much less relevant in the cases of Cilicia, or of John's Pergamum and Thyatira, despite the greater spirituality of the Anatolian cult of the Magna Mater. Ramsay has shown how in this religion the central thought was the mystery of the "succession of life," and how one of its accessories was a realistic drama which—however innocent in intention—might well have a demoralizing effect on the spectators, and tend to general licentiousness.¹

I submit it, however, that in all three passages the "fornication" deprecated is more probably not literal, but spiritual. The coquetting with the heathen rites, whether obscene or not, is stigmatized as "fornication," the harsh and familiar Old Testament metaphor being deliberately appropriated both by the Council and St. John in order to present such syncretism in the blackest colours. This may seem at first a bold postulate. But we have seen that the interpretation of Revelation ii. is determinative of the phraseology of our decree, and in the case of Thyatira one can speak almost decisively. For we note that the "fornication" to which the person or party designated "Jezebel" tempts the Thyatira Christians in verse 20 has become "adultery" when we reach verse 22. The variation is intelligible enough in view of the common interchange of the two figurative terms in Old Testament denunciations of apostasy or syncretism²; but it is unaccountable if we interpret John's language literally. The figure is undeniably of rare occurrence in New Testament idiom. But we find St. James denouncing

¹ Hastings' "Dict. of Bible," s.v. "Religion of the Greeks, etc."

² E.g. in Jeremiah iii., v.; Ezekiel xvi., xxiii.; Hosea i., ii.

those who would fain always have the favour of the world as "adulteresses" (James iv. 4). St. Paul, too, in cautioning against the ethos of heathenism—and not without this very subject of idol-sacrifices in mind—adopts the yet harsher figure of "incest"¹ in 2 Cor. vi. 14.

The prominence and the sacramental import of "blood" in the heathen religions explains the other clause in the decree. If we connect it with the cult of Cybele it is an instructive fact that only a few years earlier Claudius in his zeal for the revival of this religion had the name "Sanguis" attached in the Roman Kalendar to March 24, in connexion with the resurrection of Attis from the dead, *i.e.* the return of spring. On this day the Manes of Attis were to be propitiated with large libations of blood. In the Syrian cults this mode of propitiation was evidenced habitually in more horrible forms. Children and even adults were sacrificed to Astarté or the Baalim, and these practices long survived Hadrian's attempt to prohibit them.

But to no religion does a decree to be sent to Cilicia seem more relevant than to Mithraism, the future great rival of Christianity. For Mithraism, which, favoured by much Imperial patronage, subsequently travelled as far West as our Wall of Hadrian, had begun its vogue in Cilicia as early as 66 B.C. with the defeat of Mithridates. Cumont in his "Worship of Mithras" tells us how "the fugitives flocking in from the Orient disseminated the Iranian mysteries specially in Cilicia." . . . "Mithra became firmly established in this country, in which Tarsus continued to worship him until the downfall of the Empire." In no cult, moreover, would "blood" be so necessarily in evidence as in Mithraism, where the regenerating "taurobolium" played the same part as the Sacrament of Baptism in Christianity. Prudentius the poet witnessed this revolting initiatory rite. His account is thus presented by Cumont in "Les Religions Orientales," pp. 81, 82.

"Le myste couché dans une excavation recevait le sang d'un taureau

¹ Μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτερογενεῖς ἀπλοῖς. It is not unequal yoking of animals that is in St. Paul's mind but the sin of causing procreation between diverse genera. Cf. Leviticus xix. 19. Hebr. *Ló tarbia kitayim*; Sept. *τὰ κτήνη σου ὄν κατοχεύσεις ἑτερογένει*; R.V. "Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind." St. Paul here warns against unrestrained association with unbelievers (not against intermarriage with them) and its probable result—religious syncretism.

érogé au dessus de lui sur un plancher à claire voie. A travers les milles fentes du bois (dit le poète) la rosée sanglante coule dans la fosse. L'initié présente la tête à toutes les gouttes qui tombent. Il y exposé ses vêtements et tout son corps qu'elles souillent. Il se renverse en arrière, pour qu'elles arrosent ses joues, ses oreilles, ses lèvres, ses narines. Il inonde ses yeux du liquide. Il n'épargne même pas son palais, mais humecte sa langue du sang et le boit avidement. . . . Après s'être soumis à cette aspersion répugnante le célébrant, ou plutôt le patient, s'offrait à la vénération de la foule. On le croyait par ce baptême rouge purifié de ses fautes et égalé à la divinité."

How weak-kneed Christians might incur risk of association with the blood of the heathen cults must be left to conjecture. The reference in the decree will obviously be to its supposed virtue, whether propitiatory or regenerative. Accessory to the rites of Cybele and Mithras were probably divers popular practices of asserting faith in the efficacy of the medium. Blood from the Temple may have been employed as a charm or prophylactic. Or it may have been used at the feasts much as holy water is used in the Roman Church. From all such deference, then, whether by way of joining in the feast or honouring the supposedly sacred blood, the decree aims to divert the new converts of Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia, branding it as spiritual fornication.

St. Paul says nothing about "blood" in connexion with the topic of meats sacrificed to idols, and this omission in 1 Corinthians perhaps confirms my reference above. Greece never took to these repulsive sanguinary rites when imported from the East. The vogue of Mithraism outside Asia Minor is indeed scarcely earlier than the Antonines, and though their last representative, Commodus (A.D. 180), greatly stimulated this religion by his own initiation, only a single find at the Piræus has as yet attested its acceptance in Greece proper. It is easy, however, to conceive of this Apostle dutifully executing the mandate of the Council in his own Cilicia as Luke tells us he did (Acts xvi. 4), and indeed the protest against the propitiatory or regenerative symbols of these cults may well have suggested some of the most characteristic terms in the Pauline theology. Nor perhaps is it quite accidental that we encounter these most often in letters addressed to Christians in Asia Minor. On the other hand, Paul as a conveyer of "kosher" regulations is to me at least a figure simply inconceivable. And not much more attractive is the idea that the great missionary Apostle ever reduced the ethical demands of the Gospel to the modicum presented in

Professor Lake's interpretation, viz., abstention from idolatry, murder and fornication.

ARTHUR C. JENNINGS.

P.S.—To simplify this thesis I have postulated the exclusion of the "things strangled" clause. Much, however, may be said for the authority of the great uncials, and many will be reluctant to defy the principle *Proclivi scriptioni præstat ardua*, in spite of the arguments for a three-clause text so ably presented by Professor Lake. Those who prefer to retain the four-clause text of the decree will find little difficulty in adapting to it the above interpretation; but in this case the emphasis will be on the sacrifice rather than the blood, and the regenerating Mithraic rite noticed above cannot be in the Council's mind, whatever its effect on the diction of St. Paul. The direction will then be—shun the idol sacrifices, alike when these are propitiatory blood offerings and when they are offerings of birds, game, etc., all association with such rites being spiritual fornication.



Authority and Authorities in the Church of England.

THE Church of England is a form of organized Christianity. Hence, in discussing authority and authorities within it, two avenues of thought are opened up according as we think of it chiefly as organized or as Christian. If we dwell on its organization, we are on the human and legal plane, and our pathway invites us to enter upon the thorny subjects of the origin of the ministry of bishops, priests and deacons, or of the relations of Church and State, and consequently of Canon Law and Statute Law, or of the sometimes conflicting claims of Incumbents, Bishops and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. If, however, we dwell on the fact that the Church of England is Christian, our thoughts are moving in a higher and heavenly sphere. We are concerned rather with faith than with discipline. We remember that Christianity belongs to the genus religion, and we have to ask ourselves what we mean by religion. We ask further what we mean fundamentally by authority, and how authority stands in relation to conceptions of individual liberty. Then we have to inquire what is the ultimate Christian authority in matters of faith, and how we recognize it, and, further, whether there are any subordinate and partial authorities, and, if so, what are their nature and limitations. In the present essay an attempt is made to deal mainly with the latter group of questions, and roughly in the order which has been just indicated.

What is religion?

Sometimes an attempt has been made to find an answer by resorting to etymology. Cicero adopted this method. There is a passage in his book on the "Nature of the Gods," in which he derives religion from a verb meaning to "travel over," whether literally by physical movement or metaphorically in reading, speech, or thought. From this point of view a religious man is one who is constantly dwelling on the Divine. (Cic. N.D. 2. 28, 72, qui omnia, quae ad cultum deorum pertinerent, diligenter retractarent et tamquam relegerent, sunt dicti religiosi ex relegendo, ut elegantes ex eligendo.) Other ancient authorities, however, followed by

most modern ones,¹ seek a derivation from a word meaning to bind, and trace a connexion between religion and obligation. This view is supported by a phrase of the sceptical Lucretius, who spoke of delivering the mind from the knots of religion (*religionum nodis animos exsolvere*). We need not stay to decide between the two views. (In this particular case, as we shall see, the second derivation yields an idea which lies very near to the truth, but etymology is often quite an unreliable guide to the meaning of a word.) The etymological method of obtaining a definition was the only one open to Cicero and other ancient students, but it is not really satisfactory.

Thanks to our greater knowledge of the world and its races, we are able to call to our assistance the results of the modern comparative study of religion. Yet even here we need not enter into the merits of the rival theories of the origin of religion. Truth may be on the side of Dr. Frazer, who propounds in his "Golden Bough" his animistic theory that primitive man, failing in his own efforts to influence nature by magic, was constrained to believe in the existence of stronger Beings who "made the stormy wind to blow, the lightning to flash, and the thunder to roll."² Or it may be on the side of Herbert Spencer, Grant Allen, and other members of the Humanist or Euhemerist school, who think that all religion rose from the worship of dead men—a theory sometimes more popularly called the "ghost" theory. Or it may be on the side of some who still find ground for believing in a very primitive revelation of God suitable to the undeveloped state of primitive man. These are all theories which, at this distance of time from the point in the development of the race when Religion took its beginning, must at best be very speculative. Happily for our purpose, what we want is some idea of what religion is after it has come into being. We want to discover what are the elements, if any, which are common to all religions. It will be a help to this to transcribe and to compare certain definitions by well-known authorities.

Frazer³ understands by religion "a propitiation or conciliation of powers superior to man, which are believed to direct and control the course of nature and of human life," and again he says :

¹ Cf. Liddon, "Some Elements of Religion" (ed. 1904), pp. 18, 19.

² "Golden Bough," 2nd ed., i. 77. ³ "Golden Bough," i. 63 ff.

"Religion everywhere assumes the world to be directed by conscious agents who may be turned from their purpose by persuasion." Andrew Lang¹ gives as the "two chief sources of religion: (1) the belief, how attained we know not, in a powerful, moral, eternal, omniscient Father and Judge of men; (2) the belief . . . in somewhat of man which may survive the grave," and he adds that by the second belief man "becomes the child of the God in whom, perhaps, he already trusted." Jevons² says: "In every cult there are two tendencies or impulses, the mystic and the practical, the need of the blessings which the supernatural power can bestow and the desire for communion with the author of those blessings." These three writers are anthropologists. The next two are philosophers. Pfeleiderer³ writes: "The essence of religion is that reference of a man's life to a world-governing power, which seeks to grow into a living union with it." Edward Caird⁴ says: "We may begin by asserting that religion involves a relation, and indeed a conscious relation, to a being or beings whom we designate as divine." Turning finally to a psychologist, we find that William James⁵ quotes with approval a definition given by Auguste Sabatier, and adds to it a very similar one of his own. "The religious phenomenon, studied as an inner fact, and apart from ecclesiastical or theological complications, has shown itself to consist everywhere, and at all its stages, in the consciousness which individuals have of an intercourse between themselves and higher powers with which they feel themselves to be related. This intercourse is realized at the time as being both active and mutual."

If these definitions be examined, it will be seen that each of them contains two elements which are common property. The first is a consciousness in man of the existence of a something distinct from man himself. The second is a desire, however rudimentary and instinctive, to be at one with this something. If we express these elements in the language of the higher forms of religion, we may say that religion always involves a belief in the existence of God (it is not intended here to imply any particular definition of the nature of God) and a desire for communion with Him. There

¹ "Making of Religion," 301-2.

² "Introduction to the History of Religion," 249.

³ "Religions Philosophie," p. 327, 3rd edition.

⁴ "Evolution of Religion," i. 53.

⁵ "Varieties of Religious Experience," 464-5.

can be no objection to our expressing the definition in these higher terms, on the ground that in savage religions neither the sense of the existence of God nor the desire to approach Him is always very clear, for as Edward Caird ¹ remarks: "It would be as absurd to say that the idea of religion is to be confined to that which religion shows itself to be among savages as to say that the idea of language is to be confined to that which is revealed in the speech of an infant. The principle of development makes such imperfect forms intelligible, for it teaches us to expect that in the first steps of the evolution of any form of consciousness its expression will be indistinct and uncertain, and will least of all show what it really is."

There is, perhaps, one objection to the definition now given which must be noticed, viz. that it does not cover Buddhism and Comtism, for in neither of these is there a recognition of a God. An examination of this objection, however, merely provides an excellent illustration of the soundness of our definition, for the history of Buddhism and Comtism alike shows how deeply the religious instinct is fixed in human nature. Buddhism may have started without a God. If it did, it had then to be classed as a philosophy, not as a religion. But Buddhism very soon took to itself gods and became a religion. Of the more orthodox Southern Buddhists of modern days in Ceylon it has been said: "They ² imitate Christian phraseology; for example, they speak of 'our Lord and Saviour Buddha.' They observe Buddha's birthday." But the really flourishing followers of Buddha, to wit, the Northern Buddhists of China, Japan and other countries, have all along had a theistic bias, and have given divine honours and worship to supposed manifestations of the Buddhahood.³ For example, in Japan there is the celebrated cult of Amida the Creator, the merciful Father. The Comtist "Religion of Humanity" is not fairly adduced as an objection, for it is a purely manufactured article. Nevertheless, even Comtism ⁴ had to find space for the religious instinct, and men were bidden to adore collective humanity as the "Grand Être," along with space as the "Grand Milieu," and the earth as the "Grand Fétiche."

¹ "Evolution of Religion," i. 54.

² "Edinburgh Missionary Conference Report," i. 164.

³ Cf. G. H. Moule, "The Spirit of Japan," 75 ff.

⁴ On Comtism, cf. Orr, "The Christian View of God and the World," p. 385, with the references there given.

We may then confidently say that religion includes a consciousness of God and a desire for communion with Him. An important consequence follows from this. It will be the object of every true man to know the nature and character of God, and to order his life so that he may best realize and enjoy communion with Him.

What is authority?

It is very difficult to know where to begin a discussion of this subject, but it may help us if we first take two examples of authority and examine them. We can then make an attempt to state in general terms the meaning of authority, and the position of the individual in relation thereto.

A. The two examples shall be from the spheres of law and of the sciences.

i. Take first the case of *civil authority*. Authority in a State is commonly divided into three kinds: executive, judicial, and legislative. Executive authority is that which is most commonly in evidence. It is this, for instance, with which evil doers come into contact. But it merely exists to carry out instructions, and both its own existence, its instructions and the power to execute them are derived from a higher source. Judicial authority is similarly derived. A judge receives power from a higher authority to interpret its laws in their application to particular doubtful cases. The highest type of civil authority is the legislative, and the question of supreme interest in any State has reference to the seat of legislative authority. In a modern democracy there can hardly be much doubt about the answer to this question. It is loudly proclaimed by all political parties that ultimate power lies with the people, and the selected body of law-makers in every modern democracy constantly has the people in its thoughts, and seeks the popular approval for what it does. It is, however, of interest to inquire what answer was given to this question by the jurists of ancient Rome, partly because the Roman empire appears at first sight to have been based upon a different conception, and partly because we are accustomed to think of the Romans as the great tutors of the world—at least of the West—in legal matters.

In the Digest of Justinian there is a striking quotation from Julianus, a jurist of the period of Hadrian and the Antonines, on the authority of the people in making and unmaking laws by force

of custom: "Inveterate¹ custom is not undeservedly regarded as law, and that is Right which is said to have been established by custom. For since the laws themselves bind us for no other reason than that they have been received by judgment of the people, deservedly also will those things, which the people have approved without any writing, bind every one: for what does it matter whether a people declares its will by vote or by affairs and actions? Wherefore this view also has been quite rightly held, that laws are repealed not only by vote of the legislator, but also through neglect by tacit consent of all." A little farther in the Digest is a very familiar citation from a later jurist Ulpian:² "What has pleased the prince has the force of law, because along with the royal law which was passed about his ruling, the people conferred upon him all their power and authority." And in the sixth century Justinian³ himself remarks: "For with the ancient so-called royal law, all the right and all the power of the people of Rome was transferred to the imperial power." These quotations express the universal opinion of the Roman lawyers from the second to the sixth century that the ultimate source of political authority was the people. Exactly the same view⁴ was taken by the jurists of the eleventh and following centuries, headed by Irnerius, the founder of the great law school at Bologna in the eleventh century. These also discussed a subsidiary question, whether the people had parted with their legislative authority finally, or whether they still held it in reserve and could re-assume it at will. Opinion was divided, but at least some great names can be adduced in support of the view that it was always held in reserve; and we may note that this is the only logical result of a belief in the enduring power of custom to establish law. At the risk of multiplying quotations we will refer to Irnerius's statement that the "universitas,⁵ that is, the people, has this duty, namely, to take thought for individuals as for its members," and to a remark of Bulgarus, an eleventh-century commentator on Justinian's Digest, that the power of making laws is reserved to "the universitas, or to him who stands in the place of the universitas or people, namely the magistrate."

At the same time it is recognized that the people cannot be

¹ Quoted in Carlyle, "Mediæval Political Theory in the West," i. 65.

² Carlyle, *op. cit.*, 64.

³ *Op. cit.*, 69.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, ii. 66-7.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, ii. 57.

entirely arbitrary in the things they do, whether directly or by delegate. There is a passage in a Prague fragment ¹ of about the tenth century which well expresses the connexion which was generally felt to exist between law and the principle of justice: "Law has its beginnings in justice, and flows from it as a stream flows from its source. But justice is a will which assigns to each man his due. This indeed is full and perfect in God, but it is called justice with us because it partakes of the Divine justice." There is in this quotation another point besides the connexion of law and justice. It is the reference to an ideal standard in God. Perhaps this is really the thought which lies behind a certain number of passages ² in Justinian's Digest which ascribe the origin of law to God. The thought is of course perfectly familiar to us from St. Paul,³ but it is interesting that St. Paul's view is supported by the opinion of the Roman lawyers, though they did not express themselves so clearly.

We may now sum up the views of these Roman lawyers upon ultimate political theory in some such propositions as these: Normally authority in a state is exercised by a body of legislative experts, and the ordinary citizen, immersed in his pleasure and his business, is quite content to leave the matter to them. But he reserves to himself the right to criticize what they do, and he is only content to leave legislation to them so long as their laws meet with the general approval. Failing this, he is quite at liberty, in concert with his fellow citizens, to withdraw the authority which he has delegated to them. Further, in his criticism of laws, he has in his mind a standard of reference in the abstract conception of justice, and this stands in some relation to the Divine character.

2. For our second illustration of an authority let us go to *the sciences*. No statement is more commonly heard than that some person is an authority upon this or that department of science. By this we understand that he has studied deeply the literature of the subject, and consequently is assumed to have a better acquaintance with it than the average man. Therefore the average man very wisely is content to ask his opinion when he wants any information, and usually accepts the opinion without further question and acts accordingly. So far the case is exactly parallel to that

¹ *Op. cit.*, ii. 13.

² *Op. cit.*, i. 69.

³ Rom. xiii. 1; cf. Wisdom of Solomon vi. 3.

of the average citizen who cheerfully acquiesces in the laws laid down by the Government. But as in the case of the citizen the matter may not always end in acquiescence, so it is here. There is a right of criticism. If an average man found time to rise above the average and to specialize in some department of science, he would look to the expert to present him with facts and arguments which would convince him of the correctness of the opinions which hitherto he had been content to accept upon trust. It is always advisable to have such critics of experts. If the experts survive the test, their reputation is justly enhanced, and men are the more prepared to trust them. But if they are convicted of error or misrepresentation, they are regarded as authorities no longer. The average man must seek a guide elsewhere. It follows that an authority in science is an authority only for those whom he does or can at will convince of the truth of what he says. And the ordinary man has in himself a standard by which he examines the views which are presented to him, the standard of his reasoning powers together with whatever body of knowledge he may already possess.

B. Two conclusions clearly emerge from our study of these illustrations. The first is that there is such a thing as authority; and the second is that authority has to convince those for whom it is authority. Neither point can be omitted without serious error. We will define authority in the words of Mr. Edward Grubb¹ as "control of the individual, of his thoughts and his activities, by a knowledge larger than his own." And no better statement of the necessity that authority shall convince can be found than that of Martineau.² He is speaking of authority in religion, but his words are of general application: "If to rest on authority is to mean an acceptance of what, as foreign to my faculty, I cannot know, in mere reliance on the testimony of one who can and does, I certainly find no such basis for religion: inasmuch as second-hand belief, assented to at the dictation of an initiated expert, without personal response of thought and reverence in myself, has no more tincture of religion in it than any other lesson learned by rote. The mere resort to testimony for information beyond our province does not fill the meaning of 'authority,' which we never acknowledge till

¹ "Authority and the Light Within," p. 11.

² "Seat of Authority in Religion," pp. vi., vii.

that which speaks to us from another and a higher strikes home and wakes the echoes in ourselves, and is thereby instantly transferred from external attestation to self-evidence."

This passage, while it admirably illustrates the important principle in support of which it was quoted, must at the same time be read in the light of two further considerations, which go some way towards modifying its tone.

1. The first is that Martineau is speaking of an ideal state of things, without any such qualification as is demanded by the facts of normal experience. We all begin by a stage of bondage to authority. This is emphatically true in religion. The child receives its earliest teaching about God and His self-revelation to men from the lips of its mother, and receives it for no other conscious reason than that "mother says so," an instinctive tendency to depend upon others being confirmed by a half-conscious deduction from mother's love to mother's truthfulness. But the remark applies also in every department of knowledge. The student begins by accepting the results of the research of his predecessors, and when he has digested their conclusions and learned, as it were, the geography of his subject, he is in a position to advance beyond his predecessors and even to correct their results in the light of fuller knowledge.

Following upon this stage of bondage to authority comes what may be called a stage of abstract freedom—a stage in which we assert the right to criticize. This stage is most commonly passed through when the child is growing into the man. At this period of life there is universally seen a tendency to throw off all the authorities of childhood: in the moral sphere sometimes unfortunately to let dawning freedom degenerate into licence, and in the intellectual sphere to seek to know the reason of everything. It is a critical stage, but it is a necessary one. It should be finally followed by a period in which we voluntarily assent on grounds of reason or experience to what we formerly accepted on authority. Now at length, as Martineau says, authority strikes home, and external attestation becomes self-evidence. Every one will agree with him that this is the only ideally satisfactory state to be in on any subject whatever. Most men, however, will and must continue to be in bondage, more or less absolute, to authority on every subject except the very few of which they can claim to be masters. Nevertheless,

every one ought to be pressing on, as far as in him lies, to the stage of voluntary assent. This alone can endure. The whole problem in the religious education of the young is to secure that the third stage shall follow immediately upon, or better still even precede, the ending of the first.

2. The second consideration arising from Martineau's statement has reference to the recognition of authority. If authority, to borrow his phrase, is to "strike home," there must be some plectrum upon which it can strike to cause "the echoes." Or, to change the metaphor, there must be a court of appeal within the man, a logical prius. Now there are important differences in the way in which appeal to this prius is made and answered, according to the subject under consideration. The simplest case is the intellectual one. That early professor of mathematics called Euclid is our primary authority for the statement of his famous fifth proposition that the angles at the base of an isosceles triangle are equal to one another. His authority is accepted because his arguments appeal to reason, and are thereby recognized to be sound. The logical prius is the reason possessed by every man. The case is simple, because every man of ordinary ability can feel the force of the arguments. Just in so far, however, as certain very dense schoolboys or certain (surely imaginary) brilliant classical scholars are apparently incapable of appreciating Euclid's reasoning, so far does this intellectual case become more nearly like the artistic case which must next be considered. It is a familiar fact that people do not always appreciate a great painting, or a great poem, when first it is brought to their notice. Indeed, it is doubtful whether ordinary people ever really appreciate great paintings. An hour or two spent in watching the crowd in a municipal picture gallery will provide evidence enough in this direction. Only a trained artist really appreciates a great painting. And there is more to be said than this. A new painter, inaugurating a new style, frequently fails to be appreciated at first, but after an interval his works begin to receive more serious attention, and gradually he is accorded his due place. What has happened? We say that he has created a taste for his works. He has himself created in men the power by which he is appreciated, by which he is recognized as an authority. It must be noticed that we have used the word "power" rather than the word "prius." The "prius" to

which an artist makes appeal is the artistic faculty, and this is part of human nature and cannot be created. But it is not always active, any more than in the dense schoolboy the intellectual faculty is active. It is rather a possibility or potentiality in our nature, which needs to be evoked into active existence. The artist presents his painting to the dormant artistic faculty, and thereby calls it into active life. He then receives from it a recognition of his authority.

This distinction between the prius and the power, between the faculty passive and active, becomes of the utmost importance in the sphere of religion. Every one has the religious faculty. It is part of human nature. But it is not active in all men. In some it appears (though the appearance is deceptive) to be crushed beyond the possibility of revival. Again, there is a precise parallel in religion to the creation by a new artist of a taste for his work. St. Paul remarked that spiritual things are spiritually discerned, and meant thereby that certain of his readers were incapable of understanding the excellence of his teaching. To anticipate for a moment what will be stated later, the teaching of Christ does not always take its place immediately as authoritative in a man's mind and heart. The Spirit of Christ has to create an appreciation of Christ. It is as the Spirit does His creating, or, if the expression be preferred, His revivifying work, that Christ is appreciated, is recognized and accepted as authoritative in matters of religion. Then, as Martineau said, external attestation becomes self-evidence. The religious authority comes to be within the soul.

C. Before we finally leave the subject of authority in general, it will be perhaps advisable just to allude to its relation to the rights and independence of the individual. The question may be raised whether the whole conception of authority is not opposed to liberty of thought, that cherished modern possession, and to the right of private judgment, that dearly won prize of the Renaissance and the Reformation. In attempting to deal with this question, it will be convenient to draw a line between two loosely defined classes who, for the moment, and in relation to any particular subject, may be described as the educated and the uneducated layman.

1. When a man who is uneducated in any subject ventures to press his private opinion against the utterances of real author-

ities in that subject, the consequences are usually disastrous. The modern craze for freedom has its Nemesis. It is fatal to the development of real and cultured personality for which the discipline of authority is necessary. As Forsyth ¹ has said: "An individualistic age is one in which at last men tend to be as like as blackberries, and as cheap." It is good to find this fact amply recognized by one who is so destructive of historic authorities as Auguste Sabatier: "Authority ² is a necessary function of the species, and for very self-preservation it watches over that offspring in whom its life is prolonged. To undertake to suppress it is to misapprehend the physiological and historic conditions of life, whether individual or collective. Itself both pedagogic method and social bond, it may be transformed, it cannot disappear. Pure anarchists are unconscious dreamers." Nevertheless, while this is true, there is also truth in another remark of Sabatier in that excellent discussion of the relations of authority and autonomy from which we have already quoted: "Like every good teacher, authority should labour to render itself useless." The aim of all law is the abolition of law. Control by an external power is a tutor to instruct us in the principles and practice of self-control. It should do this, as we have already hinted, by developing a true personality. "We are ³ in this world to acquire for ourselves and promote in others a moral personality, in which freedom is an element, but only one. And the effect of a real authority upon personality is the most kindling and educative influence it can know. In the interior of the soul authority and freedom go hand in hand." It is only a good authority who can make us really free from the slavery of individualism—a slavery none the less destructive because it is largely unconscious. Acute thinkers have pointed to its existence. Bacon spoke of the "idols" of the market place and the theatre. Deliverance from these and admission to true freedom can only come by way of submission to authority.

2. There remains the case which we have called that of the educated layman. And here it must be remembered that liberty of thought is an inalienable privilege of every man, and it is none the less such because it can easily degenerate into licence. By

¹ "The Principle of Authority," 324.

² "The Religions of Authority," p. xxx.

³ Forsyth, *op. cit.*, 322.

an educated layman we mean one who has sat at the feet of those who profess to be authorities in his subject, and has allowed their actions or statements to make appeal to the proper faculty within him. Now what is to happen if that faculty does not make its approving response, and he finds himself in disagreement with the authorities? Such a man has, in truth, become an authority himself in virtue of his prolonged study of his subject. He puts out his views for general consideration. He may convince others. In that case his opinion holds the field, and others abandon the contrary opinions which they have previously held. But he may not convince others. We then have the case, so common in everyday life, when "doctors differ." The case is ultimate. Liberty to differ has to be allowed, and ordinary men choose between the rival authorities as best they can—usually by the light of quite alien considerations.

Meantime progress in human knowledge is not uncommonly made by the successive revolts of educated private judgment against authority.

(To be continued.)

C. H. K. BOUGHTON.



The National Mission and the Need of Instruction in a Method of Prayer.

THE war has brought to many of us a realization of the state of religion amongst the ordinary men who compose our armies at the front such as we hardly grasped at all before. What we have come to see is that for the most part they know little of the facts of our Lord's life. The instruction they received in Day and Sunday Schools has been almost entirely forgotten, they passed the Diocesan Inspector, but the teaching never awoke personal religion, never entered into their lives ; it began and ended with their lessons, and naturally faded away from them when they left school and went to work, just as their Churchgoing came to an end at the same time. It is true that they still vaguely believe in God, but they have no idea that it is necessary for men to approach Him in prayer. They think that it is sufficient, as they say, to do no harm to any one, though this has been a good deal upset by their having to fight. Many a man has said to me that he could not be religious when he is trying to shoot Germans. Churchgoing is not considered as a duty, but as a means of passing away a spare hour happily, and, since they could not understand the service, they found it dull and gave it up.

And I think we may see how this state of things has come about in spite of all our teaching, catechizing, and church activity. In spite of all our Religious Education we have never been able to teach these men to pray in such a way that they might learn to believe in and dwell upon Christ, and to plead with God through Him. The Collects which we taught them have never opened for them the one Way in which we may approach God, the Way which is Jesus Christ, but have tended rather to fix their minds on themselves, their sins, their failings and their weaknesses, and to leave them there.

Compare the result of our teaching and the teaching of St. Paul. In 1 Corinthians i. 2, we read that the Christians were known as those who "*in every place call upon the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ,*" which seems to mean that when they prayed their minds were filled with all that Christ is, all that He has done, and still does for us now in Heaven. And they pleaded with Him by the

merits He won for us by each event of His life, from His Nativity in Bethlehem to His Agony in the Garden, His carrying of the Cross up Calvary, His precious Death and Burial—to His Resurrection, Ascension, and prevailing Intercession for us in Heaven. The result in the case of those early Christians was that they gained such love to our Lord in their Prayer, that rather than forsake Him they were enabled to endure the terrible persecutions of which we read in history, and at last conquered the Roman Empire which had done all in its power to stamp them out. I believe that we shall never get our people to grasp that our Religion involves a real approach to God in prayer, and that they need salvation through Christ, until, like St. Paul, we teach them to “*call upon the Name of the Lord.*”

There is a method of prayer which has been used in the Church for hundreds of years, by which I think we may best do this. According to it we repeat in order the principal events of the life of our Lord, and turn them into prayer. We may say each petition either three times, as our Lord said the same words three times in His prayer in Gethsemane, or even ten times, followed by the Lord’s Prayer, in order that we may gain more time to ponder on each event as we plead it. Thus—

“By Thy holy Nativity in Bethlehem, save us and help us, O Lord.”

“By Thy carrying of the Cross, save us and help us, O Lord.”

“By Thy precious Death and Burial, save us and help us, O Lord.”

“By Thy glorious Resurrection, save us and help us, O Lord.”

“By the sending of the Holy Ghost, save us and help us, O Lord.”

And so on, “save us,” that is, from sin, from our enemies, from all that would harm our soul or body, and from eternal death.

I believe that in such a simple recollection in prayer of the Gospel mysteries we should find a return to the prayer of the early Christians, when they called upon the Name of the Lord. We should plant more deeply in our hearts and memories the knowledge of our Lord’s life. We should be pleading His merits as our one ground of acceptance. Such a prayer as this we can use anywhere, or at any time, for it can easily be remembered, since it leads us through the life of our Lord in order. It can never be outgrown, for we can never exhaust the significance of each of the sacred mysteries which we plead. Hence the child, or the newly con-

verted man or woman, can use it side by side with the saint far advanced in the spiritual life. It will be found to create an atmosphere of religion enabling us to withstand the constant depression of the world's atmosphere.

Perhaps the same events in our Lord's Life that we follow in order in our prayer might be made also the basis of the teaching in the Mission—thus: The Annunciation—the secret impulses given us by the grace of the Holy Spirit, only partially understood at the time. The Visitation—the sympathy and help we get from those older than ourselves, and more advanced in the spiritual life. The Nativity—Christ's personal coming to us at a definite time. The Presentation—our offering of ourselves to God. The Finding in the Temple—Christ lost in the sin and turmoil and criticism of the world, and found again in His House of Prayer. And so on, to the Cross, with its teaching of the sinfulness of sin, and its consequence, and remedy. The Resurrection—the new life we must find and live while still in this world. The sending of the Holy Ghost to guide and strengthen us, and the continual Presence of our Lord with us, alway even unto the end of the world. At the conclusion of each sermon on one event or other of our Lord's life we should turn the thoughts elicited into prayer; and so by our recollection of the mysteries of the Incarnation we should be *calling upon the Name of the Lord*, sure of our acceptance with Him as we do so. My own experience assures me that in this way, as I explain in my little book "A Chaplet of Prayer," a habit of prayer might be built up, begun in the preparation for the National Mission, that would not be lightly given up after it is over. I believe it would be found the means by which many a man would be enabled to hold on to Christ in the dark days we have all of us at some time or other to go through, who without some such method might all too easily drift away, and be lost.

M. W. T. CONRAN, S.S.J.E., C.F.



What Do We Expect from the National Mission ?

“WELL, I suppose that during the Mission the clergy will have more services, preach more sermons, perhaps in each other’s pulpits, and those who always go to church on Sunday will go on weekdays also if they are leisured folk, while now and again a noted name will attract a non-churchgoer to some service. And afterwards everything will go on much as it did before.” If any churchman says, or even thinks this, let him ask himself quite frankly, “What right have I to declare publicly and solemnly that I believe in God Almighty, in Christ whose kingdom shall have no end, in the Holy Ghost, Author and Giver of life ? ”

It is because they really believe the Creed that our leaders are organizing an effort, cradled in constant united prayer, to bring home to the nation a message concerning Repentance and Hope that comes to us all from God Himself through the War, a message saying first to the Church “The world’s godlessness is your reproach,” and secondly through a repentant Church to the world, “We have known and believed in the Hope of mankind, and we cannot rest until our Hope is yours also.” Bishop Phillips Brooks used to say that the measure of a man’s life lies in the amount of his expectancy. It is certainly true that in the spiritual realm, results are determined by expectations, which is only a clumsy modern way of stating that according to our faith it will be unto us. “What do I expect from the Mission ? ” is no bare personal question, for every one who expects little is hindering, and every one who expects much is helping a movement from which we are justified in expecting results so great that they will have to be acknowledged as miraculous, even a transformed Church, a transformed nation, and a transformed world.

We are justified because it is the will of God the Father that all men should be saved, because all power is given to God the Son, because there is no limit to the possible achievement of men filled with God the Holy Ghost. And on the human side, we observe four conditions promising to prepare the way of the Lord coming in power to all who will to receive Him.

Under a burden of sorrow and suffering, of disappointment and loss, more widespread than the world has ever before known, men

are everywhere restless and spiritually hungry, and only to be satisfied by the Gospel of Christ, the good news from God in all its simplicity. "Never go into the pulpit without speaking of man's great need and of God's great love," said an old man once to a young man whose whole fruitful ministry was influenced by these few words. Christians calling themselves by many different names have overlaid this Gospel with many extraneous matters. They have uttered learned critical disquisitions, rambling emotional appeals, polished literary essays, arguments about ecclesiastical questions, arid moral exhortations, and then wondered why they preached to empty pews. The hungry sheep look up and are not fed, because, however important instruction about the Church, or the Bible, or Christianity may be, they are longing, sometimes unknown to themselves, not for that, but for Christ Himself, set before them by men who know what He is, not as a tradition of the past in other lives, or even in their own lives, but as an actual fact of present experience. The Mission is to bring us all back to the great fundamentals, and incidentally to demonstrate that living relation to Christ is not the monopoly of any particular set of Christians. "We dare not say this at home," remarked a Roman Catholic priest at the Front lately, to a C.M.S. missionary serving as an Army chaplain, "but out here we are all one. You want to lead men to Christ, and so do I."

This brings us to the second condition. It has been well said that it is because we distrust each other's intentions that we stand aloof from one another. We honestly believe that only our own type of Christianity is really true to the faith once delivered to the saints, and so we fence ourselves in ecclesiastically from fellow Christians of other denominations by a hedge of suspicions, as we used to fence ourselves in nationally from fellow men of other lands. This greatest of Wars has bound together in closest offensive and defensive alliance men of most diverse races and tongues and antecedents and character, with conflicting ideas of political organization, through a common assertion of two principles—championing the weak and keeping one's word at all costs. Britain and France are one to-day. And Britain is not disloyal to her King and to monarchy, because for a practical, urgent purpose she identifies herself with a Republic. So Germany's cynical repudiation of those principles and of all the laws of civilized warfare—ultimately *Christian* principles and

laws—has shocked Christendom into perceiving that Christianity is more than a dogma as to the Unseen, it is a unique, vitalizing force on which the highest welfare of men and nations depends. So Christians of many races and tongues and antecedents and character, with conflicting ideas of ecclesiastical organization, unite to uphold righteousness through common devotion to the Incarnate Son of God and only Saviour of men. And they are perceiving that this union in sympathy and aim involves no disloyalty to their particular convictions, and that these will gradually cease to be causes of contention and means of alienation. For after all the things that all Christians agree about are more numerous and more important than those about which they differ.

For practical reasons, the National Mission is not wider than the National Church, though all its leaders would hear with joy and sympathy of a similar and simultaneous movement of Christians not of our communion. It is, however, as wide as our Church; it is planned to embrace all the different schools of thought which are traceable, not only in our Church but in the whole Church, from the earliest ages. And we may well believe that this common action for a common end is going to promote unity in a way that no argument and no deliberate attempt to ignore or to minimize differences could ever have done, and that a united Church of England may one day contribute to a union of Christendom of which we hardly dare dream yet. In their *entente cordiale*, against the common foe of indifference and unbelief, "High," "Low," "Broad"—"Catholic," "Evangelical," "Liberal"—are appropriating each other's phrases and entering into each other's thoughts, as they never did in the old, easy-going, normal conditions. Some day they will suddenly ask, "What were we actually at issue about before the War?"

"Conversion" and "Revival," for instance, words once shrunk from by two of the three schools of thought, are now becoming common property. They were avoided because, in spite of the grand record of unselfish work for the good of the community which those who used them have, they seemed associated with a type of teaching that made religion a matter of reading one's own title clear to mansions in the skies, and that deserved the reproach of selfish "other-worldliness." But the Mission which begins by trying to lead the individual to Christ will go on to show him that

he has been saved to serve, that he belongs to the Church not for what he can get, but for what he can give. Christians whose religion is no inherited convention, and who have ceased to wrangle with each other, will be able to bring a new, irresistible force of public opinion to bear upon the purification of our social and industrial and political life. Of this all who took part in the remarkable Conference of February 22 at Sion College had an earnest. Representatives of twelve denominations, under the leadership of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Bourne, Principal Selbie, and the head of the Salvation Army, met to consider, not as philanthropists, but as Christians, how our great national sin and curse of Intemperance can be done away, how the emergency legislation which is already emptying our prisons and asylums can be rendered permanent and strengthened, how the opportunity which makes the drunkard even more than it makes the thief may be curtailed.

So the third condition that fills us with hope for the Mission is that living Christian faith, spreading from the few to the many, must eventually solve most of our problems by uplifting our whole national life.

And the fourth and last condition is that the National Mission looks beyond our own nation. For in the van of its organizers are some of the trusted leaders of our greatest missionary societies. They know that the effectual evangelization of Britain would be the grandest step ever taken towards the evangelization of the vast non-Christian world, whose still unenlightened state is the great reproach of Christendom to-day. Missionary enterprise has indeed accomplished much in the past, but if it is to be in any degree commensurate with present opportunity, it must be enormously extended in the immediate future. For as Asia and Africa inevitably drift from all their old moorings their ancestral religions conspicuously fail them. Unconsciously, and sometimes consciously, they are feeling after the treasure which the Church holds in trust for the world. Why do "heathen" parents deliberately prefer Christian schools for their children? Why does a lecture on Christianity always draw a large audience in China? Why are multitudes in India clamouring for Christian teaching? Because as old conditions pass never to return, they are faced with the alternative of a new secular civilization, or of a spiritual regeneration. It is for the Church to say whether they shall find *Kultur* or Christ.

When we have fought out the present awful fight for all that we believe in, for all we esteem of most value in our national life, we must guard that and share it as we have never done before. And we look to the National Mission to equip us for this tremendous task by making every Christian a better Christian than he is now, and by bringing many to confess Christ for the first time.

Where could we find a more instructive parable of the existing state of affairs than in the familiar story of the one miracle of which there is a fourfold record? "Send them away that they may buy themselves somewhat to eat," says the incompetent, unthinking Church of the swarming multitude. "Give ye them to eat," comes the Master's first command. "But a far larger sum than we possess would not be enough to get it," says the bewildered Church. "Find out what you really have," comes the second, followed by the third command, "Bring it all to Me." He blesses it, He gives it back, made more than sufficient; they distribute it, every one eats, all are satisfied, and the Church which has received from Him and given, is left with abundant provision for its future needs.

MARY L. G. CARUS-WILSON.



The War and the Other World.

3. WHAT CAN BE KNOWN ABOUT THE OTHER WORLD ?

OUR position with regard to this question is very different from our position with regard to the one which has just been discussed. We saw that, with regard to the problem whether there is any other world beyond the grave, those who accept the authority of Scripture find there a complete and decisive answer. Somewhat scantily, and often obscurely, the Old Testament reveals to us that there is a future life in which men are rewarded or punished for what they have done in this life: those who are called "the dead" are still alive. In the New Testament this doctrine is taught with absolute sureness and clearness, and it has the emphatic and supreme authority of Christ Himself. We saw also that even for those who do not regard the witness of Scripture as final, or the teaching of Christ as more authoritative than that of the noblest of human teachers, there exist reasons which render the hypothesis that life and consciousness are continued after death more probable—and indeed we may say much more probable—than the contrary hypothesis. But in discussing the question before us we have no such advantages. Even with the help of Scripture we cannot learn very much that can be regarded as certain respecting the other world; and apart from Scripture our estimates of what is possible and probable are for the most part less trustworthy than in the other case. Hence the frequent designation of all that lies beyond the veil of death as "the unknown." It would seem as if, in this intensely interesting subject, with regard to which all conditions of men in all ages have exhibited a deep craving for information, only the very minimum of information has been granted to us. We have had revealed to us just enough to enable us to shape our lives with propriety, and nothing more. Nothing has been revealed with a view to gratifying what is a natural, and almost an inevitable, curiosity. We have been clearly told that there is a future life, and that our condition in it depends upon our behaviour in this life; and it is intimated that the rewards for loyal service, and the penalties for wilful disobedience, are alike beyond our comprehension. Over and above this all is uncertain and obscure, and we may reverently believe that a clear and decisive

revelation of answers to the numerous questions which have been raised respecting the condition of those who have passed out of this world by death would do us no good, and in some cases might do us harm.

The cause of this obscurity and uncertainty is not that Scripture is almost silent on the subject ; the passages which bear on it are fairly numerous, and not a few of them are utterances attributed to our Lord. We may find a group of passages which seem to teach one doctrine fairly clearly, and yet we dare not adopt this as correct, because another group of passages seems to teach something quite different. For instance 1 Corinthians xv. 28, Romans xiv. 11, Philippians ii. 10, 11, Revelation v. 13, seem to teach the ultimate triumph of good over evil and the final salvation of all. On the other hand, Matthew. iii 10, 12, xiii. 30, 40-42, 49, 50, John xv. 6, Hebrews vi. 8, Revelation xix. 20, xxi. 8, seem to imply the final destruction of the wicked ; evil is to be abolished, not by being converted, but by being annihilated. Yet again there are passages which have been supposed to imply that the fate of the wicked will be endless torment ; Mark ix. 43, 48, Matthew iii. 12, xiii. 42, xviii. 8, xxv. 41, Luke iii. 17, Revelation xiv. 11, xix. 3, xx. 10. One of the causes of this apparent inconsistency is that hardly anywhere have we our Lord's exact words. Although He sometimes spoke Greek (as probably with the Syro-phenician woman and almost certainly with Pilate), yet He habitually spoke Aramaic, of which we have only a more or less accurate translation. Even where the translation is accurate the original Aramaic may have become blurred in transmission before it was translated. In every one of the few cases in which St. Mark endeavours to give us the Aramaic original there is difficulty in believing that it is exactly what was said. Moreover, a study of our Lord's words, when the four Gospels are placed in parallel columns, shows that the Evangelists allowed themselves considerable freedom in reporting them. Sometimes they give us their own interpretation or expansion of what was said rather than the words that were actually spoken. This is specially true of the First and Fourth Evangelists. And there can be little doubt that there has been a certain amount of confusion between the Destruction of Jerusalem and the Day of Judgment, words which were said with regard to the one being transferred to, or being mixed up with, what was said with regard

to the other. All this shows, not that we have lost the substance of Christ's teaching, but that we must be cautious in interpreting and drawing inferences from the language in which it has come down to us. The substantial harmony between the four reports, and their agreement in tone, and sometimes even in wording, with what we have in Acts, in the Epistles, and in the Apocalypse, is sufficient guarantee for the general truthfulness of the record of our Lord's language. Moreover, there is a great deal of it that is quite beyond the Evangelists' powers of invention. A perusal of a few chapters of the Apocryphal Gospels will convince us of that. There we see the kind of things which early Christians, even with the canonical Gospels to copy from, imagined when they tried to invent what Christ might have said and done on occasions which have not been recorded in the canonical Gospels.

There is another reason for caution. Any teacher who tries to instruct others respecting the unseen world must use terms expressive of human experience in this world, because a report of human experience in the other is lacking. He must speak as if men and women there are very much as they are here, *viz.*, under the conditions of space and time, and with bodies similar to those which they had in this life. Christ Himself was under this necessity. We see this plainly enough in the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. Consequently a great deal of the language used is symbolical and must not be understood literally. Even that which might possibly be literal need not be such; and we may fall into grievous error by making a literal interpretation and then proceeding to argue from it.

When we pass from the teaching of our Lord to that of St. Paul respecting the other world we are not free from all these causes of uncertainty. It is true that we have (with the exception of a few doubtful readings) the exact words which he dictated, or (on rare occasions) wrote with his own hand. Nevertheless, so far as language goes, his teaching is not always harmonious. One general characteristic of his theology is its want of system. Each time that he treats of a topic he tries to make his meaning clear to those whom he is then addressing, and he does not seem to care whether the language which he uses then agrees with what he has said in some previous letter. Possibly he did not always remember the exact words which he had used before; certainly he was not afraid

of saying now what was verbally inconsistent with what he had said before. This is specially true of his language respecting the Last Things. Sometimes he speaks quite distinctly of a Judgment (2 Cor. v. 10); sometimes there does not seem to be room for one (1 Thess. iv. 16, 17). Sometimes God is the Judge (Rom. xiv. 10), sometimes Christ (1 Cor. iv. 4; 2 Cor. v. 10). In 1 Corinthians xv. the spiritual body, suitable to existence in eternal life, seems to be given at the resurrection: in 2 Corinthians v. it seems to be given at death. The *How* of the future life he does not attempt to define. The spiritual body will be *our* body, however much it may differ from the material body which dies and is dissolved; personal identity will not be broken. And union with Christ will not be broken; death has no power to destroy that. He says very little about the future condition of the wicked, whom he calls "those who are perishing" (1 Cor. i. 18; 2 Cor. ii. 15, iv. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 10), which perhaps means eternal loss rather than absolute destruction.

These surprising differences in Scriptural language respecting a future state, which sometimes seem to amount to real inconsistency, prepare us for a considerable variety of opinions respecting this difficult subject, according as one or other of the Scriptural expressions be adopted as giving the correct view. But, in fact, the opinions, in their variety, go beyond that which is found in Scripture, and of some of them one could hardly say more than that they are not expressly contradicted by anything in the Bible, and that they must stand or fall by their own intrinsic probability. Among the points which are in dispute are these. (1) Is there an intermediate state or not?—a question which is closely connected with the question whether there is to be a general Resurrection and a general Judgment or not. Here we have a triplet of questions of serious moment, and in each case one of the alternatives must be false. Many persons suppose that each soul is judged at death, and then receives the spiritual body in which its existence is continued. (2) If there is an intermediate state between death and the final Judgment, are those who are in this condition conscious or unconscious? To suppose that they are unconscious is practically much the same as supposing that there is no intermediate state. (3) Assuming that they are conscious, is a change in their condition possible? Do the good improve in goodness, and do the

bad have another opportunity of reformation? Or do both remain in the condition in which they were when death took place? If the latter is correct, the value of the intermediate state does not seem to be great. (4) If a second probation is allowed to the bad, will it be granted to all of them, and be continued until all are saved? Or will it be confined to those who have never had a fair opportunity in this life of knowing and doing God's will? (5) Assuming that the punishment of the bad does not merely consist in their having no share in the life to come, in what does it consist? Are they subjected to torture similar to that of being burned alive in this world, and is this torture endless?—an atrocious view which has been prevalent for centuries and perhaps is not yet extinct. Or does it consist in mental suffering, which ends, when it has done its work, either through the annihilation or the conversion of the sinful soul? Or again, does it consist in loss rather than in suffering, and in a loss for which there may be no remedy? It will be observed that the alternatives grouped under these five heads admit of being united in different combinations, so that the sum total of possible opinions is very large indeed.

It does not lie within the purpose of this paper to discuss these various combinations, or even all the different elements which are capable of combination. That would require a lengthy treatise. But a few remarks are necessary about one or two of them. Remembering how much of the language of Scripture is metaphorical and symbolical, it may be asserted that nowhere in the Bible is it stated that the punishment of the wicked will consist in endless *suffering*, and perhaps it is nowhere said that it will be *endless*. It is said that there will be "eternal punishment" (*κόλασις αἰώνιος*), but the *κόλασις* may be some kind of deprivation, and *αἰώνιος* does not necessarily mean "everlasting." This important epithet is never attached in Scripture to any word which necessarily implies suffering, such as *βσανος*, *κόπος*, *λύπη*, *ὀδύνη*, or *ὠδίνες*. Nor does it occur with terms which denote the expression of suffering, such as *κλαυθμός*, *ὄδυρος*, or *δάκρυα*. "The weeping and gnashing of teeth" is never said to be *αἰώνιος*, and Christ is never represented as saying anything as to the duration of the pains with which rebellious servants are punished. Even "till thou have paid the last farthing" leaves it open to us to hope that the payment can be made in the prison, or that the prisoner will be freed by death.

It is one of the gains of the Revised Version that *αἰώνιος* is not translated "everlasting" but "eternal," and all that we know of "eternity" is that it is not time and cannot be measured by clocks and calendars.

The large majority of Christians think that they are bound to believe in "the heathen guess of the immortality of the soul" (Westcott, "Gospel of Life," p. 55), a doctrine which is nowhere taught in Scripture. The soul can win immortality, but it does not naturally possess it. On the contrary we are told that it can "die," "be destroyed," "perish."

Of course, if the soul is by nature immortal, much support is given to the hypothesis of unending misery, which seems to be the inevitable fate of a soul which cannot die and has failed to win eternal bliss. But we owe this superstition to interpreters of Scripture who on this point paid more attention to the speculations of Greek philosophers than to the sayings and silences of the sacred writers. If all souls are immortal, the only alternative to endless suffering is that all will at last be saved, and (as Origen said) this logically includes Satan. If souls are not by nature immortal, annihilation is a possible alternative, either at the time of physical death, or after adequate punishment for sins committed in this life has been inflicted in the other world.

The common belief that we are taught in the Bible that the human soul is by nature immortal is one of many traditional misinterpretations of Scriptural language—perhaps we may say one of the strangest, for the passages which state or imply the contrary are so numerous and so varied in wording. The alternatives which are again and again put before us, in order to help us to shape our lives aright, are not life in happiness and life in misery, but life and death. We are told that "God gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life" (John iii. 16). Christ says of His sheep, "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish" (John x. 28). He is "the bread which came down out of heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die" (John vi. 50, 51). "The wages of sin is death; but the free gift of God is eternal life" (Rom. vi. 23). "We have passed out of death into life . . . he that loveth not abideth in death" (1 John iii. 14). It is possible for one to save the soul of another from death (James v. 20). There is "a sin unto death" and "a

sin not unto death" (1 John v. 16). There is a Judge "who is able to save and to destroy" (James iv. 12).

Perhaps human vanity has had something to do with the fact that the Platonic doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul has for centuries been regarded by so many Christians as almost axiomatic. The doctrine seems to add enormously to the dignity of man. But, as has been pointed out already, those who hold the doctrine have to face a serious dilemma. If impenitent sinners pass after death into an eternity of sin and suffering, then sin is eternal. The only alternative to this is that all immortal beings will eventually, by the grace of God, be rescued from sin and receive eternal life.

Let us not forget that "eternity" is really a negative term; it expresses the "absence of time," and what the absence of time may be is beyond our comprehension. It is therefore quite possible that to ask whether eternal punishment is everlasting is as meaningless as to ask whether it is coloured.

For all these reasons it seems to be wise not to go beyond the plain statement suggested above, that there is a future state in which the reward of righteousness and the punishment of unrighteousness are alike immense, quite beyond our understanding. Also, that when we endeavour to go beyond this simple affirmation we have need to be very cautious as to what we affirm, and very diffident in affirming it—still more cautious and diffident, perhaps, about what we deny. We know very little about what is impossible in the other world. It is God's world, and therefore justice and love prevail there. This consideration suggests possibilities respecting relations which may exist between the inmates of this world and the inmates of the other. Both worlds are His, and the inmates of both are His creatures, creatures for whom His Son became man, died, and rose again; and, in the case of Christians, the inmates of both worlds are members of Christ. These possibilities will be considered in the next paper; not with a view to arriving at any dogmatic conclusion respecting them, for which the evidence that is available does not supply sufficient material; but in the hope of showing that the probabilities are distinctly on one side rather than on the other, and of inducing some of those who refuse to admit the probabilities to abstain from attempting to limit freedom of belief and action for those who do admit them.

(To be concluded.)

A. PLUMMER.

Dr. Johnson and his Times.

I.

DR. JOHNSON was a man—Carlyle would almost make us believe *the* man—of one particular century, the eighteenth. There was no inconvenient overlapping at either end in his case ; so it is easy to remember : he lived from 1709 to 1784, just seventy-five years—a large part of the Georgian era ; and was, at least in the world of letters, if we cannot travel quite all the way with Carlyle, undoubtedly King of his Company.

An eventful century ! But what century is not eventful ? Johnson did not live to see the most momentous of all the events of that century—its climax and catastrophe—the French Revolution, but he lived in the age which was the preparation for it, the age of Tom Paine, Rousseau, Voltaire—Rousseau and Voltaire, of whom he once said, in reply to the pertinacious Boswell, “ Why, sir, it is difficult to settle the proportion of iniquity between them.” In his own country, he lived to see the Jacobite conspiracy of 1715, and the more serious attempt of Charles Edward to regain the throne of his ancestors in 1745. He lived to see the gradual decay of the Jacobite cause, to which he himself made no secret of indulging some leanings, and the equally gradual triumph of the Hanoverian. He lived to see the conquest of Canada and of India—and the loss of America. His was the age of great scholars : Bentley, Porson, the Wartons ; of great writers : Burke, Gibbon, Goldsmith, Warburton ; of great painters, to name only Reynolds and Gainsborough ; and last, but not least, of great statesmen ; for was it not the age of Walpole, whom Johnson generously designated “ a fixed star,” Chatham, Fox, Burke—and of Pitt, though his star (“ meteor ” was Johnson’s term) was only just rising as Johnson’s was setting.

Johnson not only lived in these times, these stirring times ; he was, so to speak, part of them, a *large* part—they were *his* Times. He was not a Statesman, though he would have liked to be one ; but he wrote many important political pamphlets, and wielded considerable influence with politicians. He was certainly not a painter, but he was the intimate friend of Sir Joshua Reynolds. As a man of letters, whether scholar or writer, his place is unques-

tioned, though, according to some critics, his scholarship may not have been of the deepest, nor his style of the simplest: and as a wise man, a man of extraordinary conversational and argumentative skill, he stands without a rival—one might almost say, in any age. He, Samuel Johnson, “the English plebeian, and moving rag-and-dust mountain, coarse, proud, irascible, imperious,” as Carlyle, in his bland manner, depicts him, was all this—that is the marvel of it!

And now we must leave the Times alone, and stick closely to the Doctor.

Johnson's father was a bookseller at Lichfield, who also, on market days, used to open a shop in Birmingham, where, strangely enough, there was no regular bookshop in those days. Samuel, consequently, was, so to speak, cradled in books from his infancy; and, all his life, while, according to his own confession, not a steady, diligent, reader, was yet a voracious consumer of literature. “He knew more books than any man alive,” was Adam Smith's estimate of him; and, though he scarcely ever read a book through, if his own account may be credited, and always denied that anybody else did, he had a wonderful knack of getting at the heart of a book without the labour of entire perusal.

His school days, first at Lichfield, then at Stourbridge Grammar Schools, need no special comment. It is enough to record that Johnson always spoke appreciatively of his schoolmasters, though both were of the old flogging type; and once said to Boswell that Dr. Adams, afterwards Master of Pembroke, had told him that when he went up to Oxford he was the best qualified for the University that he (Dr. Adams) had ever known come there.

Johnson felt his poverty acutely at Oxford: and indeed, it seems to have been extreme. At one time he was unable to attend lectures because his toes were coming through his shoes. Some unknown friend placed a new pair outside his door, which Johnson promptly threw away! His pride was equal to his poverty. It might occur to us that at least Johnson could have had his shoes mended. But he had views on this point; for when Boswell once drew attention to a hole in his stocking and mildly suggested a darn, Johnson replied: “No, sir, a hole might be an accident, but a darn is premeditated poverty.” The remittances from Lichfield, always a matter of difficulty, gradually ceased, for his father became

insolvent : and Johnson had to leave Oxford—without a degree !

It was about this time, when Johnson was in his twentieth year, that the nervous malady, melancholy, or hypochondria, from which he suffered at intervals all his life, began to afflict him horribly, and at times almost to overwhelm him. He was frequently in terror of insanity, and quite incapacitated for mental effort. So then, if there were often periods of inertness—bitterly regretted, often examples of fretful outburst, of unmannerly retort (“ Sir, I perceive you are a vile Whig ” : “ Sir, you are impertinent,” and that kind of thing)—shall we not be willing to put them down to the baleful effects of disease rather than to vicious intention ?

When Johnson returned to Lichfield after leaving Oxford, it is difficult to understand how he managed to live at all, so straitened were his means. His father died soon after his return ; and it appears that £20 was all that he ever received from the estate—such as it was. But, here again, his unaccountable amiability seems to have served him in good stead ; for kind friends both at Lichfield and Birmingham rallied round this uncouth, melancholy, but always companionable scholar—notably a Mr. Gilbert Walmsley and a Mr. Hector, at whose houses he was always a welcome guest.

It was at Birmingham that he first began to earn a little—very little—by his pen : and here that he first became acquainted with Mrs. Porter—his future wife. This marriage excited the mirth of some of his friends, and still provokes a smile—Johnson twenty-seven, the widow Porter forty-eight. Yet it *was* a happy match on the whole. A bond of mutual esteem, real affection, and on Johnson's part—actual admiration, overcame all disruptive tendencies, and held this uncomely pair in close union. Johnson once told his gay young friend, Topham Beauclerk (a member of the celebrated “ Literary Club ”), that his marriage was “ a love marriage on both sides ”—a confidence which, of course, found its way to the ears of Boswell.

When Johnson, shortly after his marriage, kept a school at Edial, near Lichfield, his pupils—David Garrick and his brother George among them—used to make merry over their master's demonstrative attentions to his “ Tetty ” (as he called his mature spouse).

The school did not keep *him* ; and in March, 1737, the year of Queen Caroline's death, Johnson and his pupil, David Garrick,

set out for London to seek their fortunes—a memorable event for them, and for London. Both Johnson and Garrick were as poor as mice: and Johnson once in after life, at a large dinner-party, referring to some date that was being discussed, blurted out: “That was the year when I came to London with twopence halfpenny in my pocket.” Garrick, who was also present, and who did not relish such candour, interrupted with: “Eh, what do you say?” Whereupon Johnson replied: “Why, yes, when I came with twopence halfpenny in *my* pocket, and thou, Davy, with three halfpence in thine!”

And now that we have got our hero, at the age of twenty-eight, safely launched into London, I will cease to adhere to exact chronological order, and will regard phases of Johnson’s life rather than periods. These phases naturally resolve themselves into three: the personal and domestic; the social and club life; and the literary. Of what is usually regarded as public life, political, municipal, legal, oratorical life, he had little or none: and yet he was, and is famous! This is the riddle that requires solution.

It is as a Londoner that Johnson is best known. London became his home, and remained his home till the day of his death. “When a man is tired of London, sir, he is tired of life,” he used to say. His first lodgings were in Exeter Street, Strand; and he dined for eightpence at the “Pine Apple,” in New Street hard by. And now began in grim earnest the hunt for a livelihood, a hunt precarious, and sometimes unsuccessful, which, indeed, lasted till, at the age of fifty-three, he was rewarded by George III with an “old age pension” of £300. He was a little nervous about accepting this pension, seeing that he had been but a lukewarm adherent of the House of Hanover. Lord Bute’s magnanimity, however, disarmed him. “It is not given you for anything you are to do, but for what you have done,” he told Johnson: and Johnson was satisfied. It would appear that a pension granted is not always quite the same thing as a pension paid: for Johnson had to dun Lord Bute for his, as is evident from a letter of Johnson’s found among Lord Bute’s papers. It was only an oversight, of course: the “pigeon-hole” is evidently not a modern invention.

Mrs. Johnson was at first left behind at Lichfield, but soon rejoined her husband; and they lived at various places in or near London. Mrs. Johnson did not fancy London air, and sometimes

had to be provided with lodgings in the suburbs, if we may so stigmatize such spots as Hampstead, which, as far as accessibility is concerned, was then further from London than Epsom is now.

It was at these times that Johnson, when belated in London, used to tramp the streets all night with his wild, gloomy friend Savage; for he could not afford himself rooms in Town as well as the Hampstead lodgings—at least this is Boswell's justification of his hero's escapades. Savage, who has been immortalized in "The Lives of the Poets," was a strange sort of friend for Johnson, and certainly not a desirable one: but a cruel mystery hung round his birth, misfortune dogged his life, and tragedy concluded it. He was an unfortunate; and that was enough for Johnson. As Goldsmith once said of another of Johnson's friends: "He is now become miserable, and that insures the protection of Johnson." Goldsmith had reason for saying so; for Johnson had been a good friend to him. The incident of the sale of the "Vicar of Wakefield" always bears repetition. "I received," said Johnson, "a message from poor Goldsmith that he was in great distress. I sent him a guinea, and promised to come to him directly. I accordingly went as soon as I was dressed, and found that his landlady had arrested him for his rent, at which he was in a violent passion. I perceived he had already changed my guinea, and had got a bottle of Madeira before him. I put the cork into the bottle, and desired he would be calm" (the cork was, no doubt, a prudent but perhaps not a very soothing preliminary). "He then produced a novel that he had ready for the press. I looked into it, and saw its merits; went to a bookseller, and sold it for £60. I brought Goldsmith the money, and he discharged his rent, not without rating his landlady for having used him so ill."

Johnson, after his wife's death in 1752, when he was forty-three years old, made his house in Bolt Court and elsewhere an asylum, or, as Carlyle calls it, a Lazaretto, for invalid undesirables. "No one *loved* the poor like Dr. Johnson," said Mrs. Thrale, who had ample opportunity of knowing.

While Johnson loved all his species, he had, naturally, his particular friendships; and, among these, two names must always, I think, stand out most conspicuously—Boswell and Thrale. There were, of course, others of both sexes—Reynolds, Garrick, Langton, the Burneys, Burke, and many more; but Boswell, who worshipped

and I believe loved Johnson, and whom Johnson loved, but certainly did not worship; the Thrles, who provided a little "prophet's chamber" for the Seer, both in London and at Streatham, who hung on his conversation, bore with his manners and rebuffs, and intensely appreciated him—these are the two names that bulk the largest in any sketch of Johnson's private life.

Of Boswell, and his unique book, much has been written, and there is always much more to say. That Boswell's affection for Johnson was genuine and disinterested, no one but a cynic can doubt; and that Johnson, after a time, reciprocated this feeling in equally clear, notwithstanding an occasional rebuff. "You have only two subjects, sir; yourself and me—and I am sick of both."

Their first meeting—that momentous meeting as Boswell felt it to be—was at the bookshop of a Mr. Thomas Davies in Russell Street, Covent Garden—the same Davies whom Johnson afterwards described as a "successful author generated by the corruption of a bookseller." Boswell got one or two rattling snubs to start with, which he partly deserved. Johnson had been telling Davies that Garrick had refused him an order for the play for Miss Williams. Boswell, rushing on his fate, foolishly struck in with: "Oh, sir, I cannot think Mr. Garrick would grudge such a trifle to you." "Sir," said Johnson sternly, "I have known David Garrick longer than you have done; and I know no right you have to talk to me on the subject." Such was the not very auspicious beginning of a friendship which lasted till death, and stood many tests: the test of long separation, when "Bozzy" went on his travels; the test of companionship in travel, when they took that rough three months' tour in the Hebrides together; the test of many snubs and some doubtful compliments—as when Johnson said, "Sir, your pronunciation is not offensive," or began making other "nasty" remarks about Scotland, as was his wont. Mrs. Boswell never shared in her husband's idolatry. She could not get over Johnson's uncouth ways—such as turning candles upside down over her carpets, to make the candles burn better. He was not slow to perceive her disaffection, to which he would make sly allusions in his letters to Boswell. "She was so glad to see me go," he wrote once, "that I have almost a mind to come again, that she may again have the same pleasure."

There is no passage in Boswell more charming than the account he gives of two days he and Johnson spent together on their way to Harwich, whence Boswell was to set sail for the Continent. It was on this occasion that they talked about Bishop Berkeley's theory of the non-existence of matter; and Boswell hazarded the opinion that it was difficult to refute. "I refute it thus," replied Johnson, striking with his foot a large stone, till he rebounded from it. Their parting was quite pathetic—the sage of fifty-four, the young friend of twenty-three, embraced. Boswell said: "I hope, sir, you will not forget me in my absence." "Nay, sir, it is more likely you should forget me than that I should forget you." Johnson heartily disliked the sea, or would probably have accompanied his pupil. The day before, while wandering about Harwich, they entered the church; and Johnson took the opportunity of saying: "Now that you are going to leave your native country, recommend yourself to the protection of your Creator and Redeemer"—which Boswell at once did, on his knees.

And here may well be introduced what, indeed, it would be impossible to omit, if we are to form any just conception of Samuel Johnson's character—I mean his constant and sincere piety. No one ever doubted it in his lifetime; and probably—I think we may say certainly—it lay at the bottom of the respect and love with which he was regarded. People knew him to be learned and wise beyond other men: but they also believed him to be deeply religious—a man who feared God and followed after righteousness. I was about to add—in a sceptical and licentious age; for the eighteenth century is certainly often credited with the decay of religion and the growth of scepticism, corruption in politics, and profligacy in manners. But generalizations are frequently dangerous; and almost every age in turn comes under the lash of the censor. We must not forget that, while it was the age of Voltaire, Hume, Paine, and Wilkes, it was also the age of Butler, Paley, the Wesleys, Burke—and Johnson. Johnson's religion was not something apart from his life, not merely a matter of formal prayer, and Sunday attendance at St. Clement Danes; it was the very essence of his character, and the rule of his conduct. His wretched melancholy often aggravated his poverty, or marred his prosperity, rendered his own company formidable, and death a constant horror; but his ardent piety enabled him to surmount, or at least to support, every event with

fortitude and resignation. Johnson's failings—you might use a stronger term—were many. He never tried to disguise them, and always repented of them bitterly. Whatever may have been Johnson's sins of omission or commission, there is abundant and convincing evidence that he lived and died, in the truest sense, a Christian.

With the Thrales, as I have already hinted, Johnson, at the age of fifty-six, found a second home. They made much of him; and he fully appreciated their kindness, and the unfamiliar comforts with which they surrounded him. After Thrale's death Johnson soon discovered that his society was not quite so indispensable at Streatham as he had fondly imagined: and when Mrs. Thrale married the fiddler (as Johnson contemptuously called him), the cooling friendship—at least on the lady's part—naturally grew colder.

To lose the amenities of Streatham was a severe deprivation for Johnson at his advanced age, for he was now seventy-three. But he had not forgotten to practise his own doctrine of "keeping friendship in constant repair"; so that many pleasant houses were still open to him, and, indeed, not long before his death, he appears to have gone on a round of visits: to Lichfield; Ashbourne, to his friends the Taylors, where also he was pressed by the Duke of Devonshire to stay at Chatsworth, but "told them that a sick man is not a fit inmate of a great house"; Birmingham, where he was entertained by his old schoolfellow, Mr. Hector; and Oxford, where he stayed a few days with Dr. Adams, Master of Pembroke College—the same Dr. Adams who was one of the Junior Fellows of the College when Johnson first went up to Oxford. This was his last visit. Feeling the dropsy and asthma gaining upon him, he returned to Bolt Court on November 16, 1784, and on December 13 he was dead.

(To be concluded.)

B. BRAITHWAITE.



The Missionary World.

SOME term the May Meetings "religious dissipation"; others consider them real work. This year they are only justified for those who regard them in the latter light. It is a time when we are bound to be serious in all things and to cast out of our allowed expenditure of money, time and strength all that is not charged with real purpose and related to vital issues. Our fear concerning this year's meetings is not that men may take them lightly, but rather that because anxiety has been so keen concerning each separate society and efforts for the maintenance of its work have been so strenuous, we may narrow our outlook to the agencies—whether few or many—with which we are directly concerned, and see the various organizations in isolation rather than as part of a great Divine enterprise embracing all the world. It is the aim of these pages to suggest some wider thoughts which May-meeting-goers may do well to keep in mind.

* * * * *

The first fact that the May Meetings impress upon us is the enormous number of separate organizations for foreign missions. There are a growing number among us who feel that in due time some adjustment is needed here, and who look with desire towards the method of the Presbyterian churches which direct their own work through committees appointed by themselves. But the "due time" is not yet, and the apotheosis of the Missionary Society, either abroad by its absorption into the Church on the Mission Field or at home by its absorption into the direct activities of the whole Church at the home base, is an ideal which will be destroyed if hastily grasped at. It can at present best be sought after by an active, self-sacrificing and enlightened support of the many voluntary bodies—whether great or small—which hold their meetings this month. It is significant that the Continuation Committee of the World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh, 1910, has from the first regarded itself as the servant of the missionary agencies, and that all its work is done in conjunction with the Societies and Boards, or committees appointed by the Churches who act direct.

* * * * *

The practical question of the moment is that of co-operation between missionary agencies, not along lines of compromise but by

means of combination in the fulfilment of common tasks. The April number of the *International Review of Missions* contains a striking illustration of what is taking place. The new section opened for "Proceedings of Co-operative Bodies in the Mission Field" summarizes in seven pages the minutes of the National Missionary Council of India held last December. That influential body, which has amongst its members the Metropolitan of India, the Bishops of Bombay, Chota Nagpur and Dornakal, and men and women representing all the main missionary bodies in India, approved and issued a weighty statement on comity among missions; carried forward arrangements for a missionary survey of India; received reports from committees on the Indian Church, mass movements, Christian education, medical missions and the training of missionaries; and passed unanimously a resolution concerning German missions in India characterized by loyalty to the principles of Christian brotherhood and true citizenship. Many indications of the increase of co-operation at the home base of missions emerge also in the closing section of the *Survey of 1915* with which the April number of the *Review* opens. Every opportunity for co-operation between missionary bodies should be welcomed and supported to the full.

* * * * *

Another great idea which claims place in our missionary thinking is the national aspect of the work. We are beginning to see the home work of the societies grouped not only under churches but into great national units. Through the report of the Conference of Foreign Mission Boards we learn in the *International Review* what America has done in 1915; then, in the "Survey of the Year," we pass from one country to another, gradually focussing the record of a wonderful year of deliverance, till, on subsequent pages, Dr. Karl Fries leads us in a careful study of Swedish missions, showing the various agencies at work and the various fields occupied. The missions of Sweden are henceforth represented by a unified conception in our minds. The national aspect of missions is still more important on the foreign side. Here it is specially easy to fail to see the wood because of the trees. It takes time and careful study to get an inclusive view of the actual work of missions, in all its related parts, in a great eastern or African sphere, but at least one can set a background of the land itself behind the organization one

knows best, while one is slowly relating that organization to the work of all others.

* * * * *

Take, for instance, China: Dr. Robert E. Speer gives in the current number of the *International Review of Missions* a striking survey of "The General Environment of Missions in China at the Present Time," which, together with *The Times* leader of March 22 on "The Rebellion in China" and several subsequent telegrams, and a note in the current number of *China's Millions*, forms a background against which the work of some long known missionary stands out with new meaning. He and his station become part of a whole instead of being merely the whole of a part. The great problem of China weights every detail given about his work.

* * * * *

Or take India; focus upon the speaker at the May Meeting whose station we support the light from the article on "The Burmese Hermit" in *The East and The West*, in which Mr. Purser shows the gradual ingathering, with many followers, of a faithful soul from the partial truths of Buddhism to the full rest of Christian faith, and that from the article in the *International Review of Missions* where Dr. Macnicol so beautifully shows the seeking of "Hindu Devotional Mysticism" after God Himself; carry over into our listening the strong encouragement of Mr. Sherwood Eddy's record of "The Present Situation in India" in the *International Review of Missions*, linking with its moving record of the great united meetings of the Syrian Christians the account of the early C.M.S. effort "To Benefit the Syrian Church" given in the April number of the *C.M. Review*; add to this a realization of all that lies behind the good news of the abolition of Indian Indentured Labour reported in *The Times* of March 22, and again the work of the one man in his own station becomes part of the great age-long enterprise of the Church, and he marches not alone but as part of the army of God.

* * * * *

In like manner there will be at the May Meetings stories of work in Moslem lands as thrilling in individual interest as that in which Miss Marie Stuart in the *C.M. Gleaner* tells of her journey from Ispahan, but we need the setting provided for them by a careful study of the solid teaching on Islam in the *Moslem World*, and also by the fine paper by Dr. James L. Barton on the work of "American

Missions in Turkey." His statement of signs of encouragement in *The East and The West* is highly stimulating. He notes that the solidarity of Mohammedanism appears to be shaken; that there has been an unusual sale of New Testaments during the last two or three years in the countries surrounding the Mediterranean; that the Mohammedans of Turkey have awakened to the importance of western education; that the faithfulness of the Armenians under persecution has made a deep impression on the Moslems; and that repugnant and horrible as is the taking of Christian girls by force into Moslem harems, it is yet introducing the leaven of Christian truth into the very centre of the social life of Islam. A curious historical light on the relation of the Great Powers to Islam is cast by a short review in the *Moslem World* of a French book, "Bonaparte et l'Islam," showing that Napoleon's attitude to Islam was much the same as that of the present German Emperor; and with this one naturally links the counter balancing evidence discovered by General Smuts in German East Africa, showing that in its original colonizing projects Germany was more clear of complicity in the advance of Islam than other Christian governments, including our own, have been.

* * * * *

As one further suggestion for the larger thought behind the more individual aspects of the May Meetings, we would suggest a remembrance of the problem of the provision and preparation of missionaries. The "Survey of the Year 1915" in the *International Review of Missions* shows in land after land how missionary forces have been depleted, and still more how the student bases in all belligerent countries have been robbed of men. In the *Student Movement* the same fact is emphasized. This makes the full equipment of the men and women who in probably lessened numbers are sent out after the war a burning question for the Church and for the mission boards. In *The East and The West* and also in the *International Review of Missions* there are articles which amount to evidence that America has gone far ahead of us in Great Britain in this respect. We have no parallel to the Kennedy School of Missions at Hartford, nor has the British Board of Study for the Preparation of Missionaries yet laid hold of its great subject, and of the missionary body, as has the parallel Board in America. The broad bearings of this question are indicated in two further papers in the *International*

Review of Missions, one—"A Woman of France and A Woman of Scotland" showing the value of moral energy and force of character in the mission field, the other, by Mr. J. H. Harris of the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines' Protection Society, suggesting that some steps should be taken to acquaint intending missionaries with the forms of administration and government in the lands to which they go.

* * * * *

But after all, the great question concerning the May Meetings is not what we bring to them or learn at them, but what we do after them. Surely, if hearts are not cold, voices are not dumb, ears are not strangely stopped, there is a call in the present situation which demands a response out of all proportion, from the Church and from us as members of it, to anything given before. The closing words of that "Survey of the Year" to which we have already referred come home to our hearts—

"A miracle greater than that which has wrought material deliverance is needed, if the Church, purged from selfishness by the divine fire within her, is to give herself to bring healing and reconciliation to the world.

"God is able to work such a miracle. The cup of unmeasured sacrifice is in His Hand. Many have drunk of it for love of country. Christ drank of it for love of the world. In drinking of it the Church will find a life through which the kingdom of God may come with power."

G.



Notices of Books.

GREATER MEN AND WOMEN OF THE BIBLE. Vol. v. Mary-Simon.
 Edited by Dr. Hastings. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. Subs. price
 6s. net.

Those who have already secured the four Old Testament volumes of "Greater Men and Women" have been eagerly anticipating the publication of the first of the two New Testament volumes. The treatment of the Old Testament characters has been so fresh and stimulating that we have been not a little curious to see similar treatment given to the even more familiar people in the Gospel story. It has come now all in a flood, and we have a book which deals with eighteen Gospel characters, of which the larger spaces are given to the Virgin Mary, John the Baptist, Judas Iscariot, and Thomas, but which also include very interesting and fascinating studies of Martha and Mary, Herod, Nicodemus, and five more of the twelve besides Thomas and Judas, who have already been mentioned. Caiaphas, Pilate, Herod Antipas, and Simon of Cyrene are men connected in different ways with the Crucifixion, who all find a place here. The result is a volume of much attraction. The great names of Peter, John, and Paul are left for the later volume, as are those names which come before us only in the Acts and Epistles. The opening article deals with "Mary the Virgin," to whom thirty-four pages are given. Her life as told in the New Testament is first outlined, and the elements (five) of her character are then indicated. It is most beautifully and winsomely done, and there is abundant material here, as the writer has himself proved, for a very reverent and acceptable sermon on the Annunciation. The wide range of the book is fairly well shown by the fact that the next character dealt with is that of Herod the Great, who gets fourteen pages, in which the violence and viciousness of his nature is vividly set forth. John the Baptist with fifty-seven pages and Judas with fifty-five get the most attention, and these important characters are very carefully dealt with under the respective headings of (1) John and the Jews, (2) John and Jesus, (3) John and Herod; and Judas—(1) The Man, (2) The Apostle, (3) The Traitor and (4) The Example. The book is, of course, well worth buying and will stimulate many a jaded mind and set going many a helpful thought. Appropriate poetical quotations are still a feature of the series, as are extracts from a variety of allied literature and lists of suitable books on each "greater person" discussed.

W. HEATON RENSHAW.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON'S VISIT TO THE FRONT. By his Chaplain. London:
 Longmans, Green and Co. Price 2s. 6d. net.

As this is the seventh impression of this little book in less than a year, it is quite clear that it has met with a consistent demand. It is nicely bound and illustrated, and no doubt many who were privileged to meet and to hear the Bishop in France will keep a copy as a "souvenir." It was written by Mr. Vernon Smith, who accompanied the Bishop during the visit, and he has wisely given us a chatty and detailed account from day to day of the actual happenings and the impressions made at the time. The account was written immediately after the visit. It gives a most interesting view, from an unusual angle, of the conditions amid which our troops live and fight, rest and play, in northern France; and it shows, very attractively, the eager welcome which staff, officers, and men give to religious ministrations and to

such an evangelical message as that which the Bishop brought. The Bishop's energy and enthusiasm are easily felt as the story is read. It is natural that there should be something of hero-worship in the book, which is in any case marked by great courtesy and kindness to all concerned. The Russian Liturgy which the Bishop used is printed as an appendix, and a reproduction of the "Bishop's Souvenir" is also included.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN SOUTH AMERICA. By Bishop E. F. Every, D.D.
London: S.P.C.K. Price 2s. 6d. net.

It cannot be said that Churchpeople at home know as much as they should about the difficult and isolated "parishes" in South America, and the S.P.C.K. is to be congratulated and thanked for having published this useful handbook. Great Britain has commercial and financial interests in South America which the Bishop of St. Albans, in his preface, describes as "vast," and it is the Church's duty and clear call to shepherd the European populations which result from these interests. Bishop Every was Bishop of the Falkland Isles until 1910, when that astoundingly enormous diocese was divided, and he became the first Bishop in Argentina and Eastern South America. The book is furnished with illustrations, statistics, and details of many kinds. It gives information which will come as news to very many ordinary Church folk here in England. There are great problems to solve and large areas to cover, and there is a sustained demand for men of consecrated ability and for sympathy and support from the Homeland. The work of the South American Missionary Society and of The Missions to Seamen finds special and kindly mention, and particulars are given of work by the Brazilian Episcopal Church and other active American efforts. "American religious enterprise in South America is on a far greater scale than British." The British and Foreign Bible Society is doing a "wonderful work."

CHRISTIANITY AND POLITICS. By W. Cunningham, D.D., F.B.A., Archdeacon of Ely. London: *John Murray*. Price 6s. net.

The most troublesome questions of the Christian religion are not those of metaphysical theology such as harassed the Council of Nicæa, nor those of ecclesiastical doctrine such as perplexed the Council of Trent, the Westminster Divines, and the Lambeth Conferences, but those which arise in ever-varying aspects from the application of Christian truth to daily conduct. Eras of rapid development are ushered in by periods of great unrest. The conversion of the Empire in the fourth century, the rejection of a central authority at Rome by the rising aspirations of national life in the sixteenth, the industrial revolution of the nineteenth, not only caused a demand for the review of the theological formularies, but occasioned the relapses into unbelief of the apostasy of Julian, the pantheism of Padua, and the more ignorant and blatant infidelity of our own times. But in each case the paramount interest was ethical, the necessity of adapting to life the increased apprehension of the most vital truth. The great War now devastating some of the fairest portions of the world is the outcome of conflicting religious ideals striving to shape themselves in actual practice.

Dr. Cunningham considered the "bearing of Christian teaching on the life of the community" in the Lowell lectures of 1914, and reproduces here their substance revised and enlarged that the issues raised by the War might not be omitted. An historic analysis in the first four chapters of the various endeavours of the Churches of Rome and England, of Presbyterianism and Congregationalism, to determine the attitude which the Church ought to adopt towards the State, shows in the light of experiment the failures of the

past. The allusions to the War, and the appendix on *the attitude of the Church towards war*, are amongst the most forcible writings which the terrible disaster has produced. The later chapters are not quite so convincing. In the review of social movements by individual effort, legislative enactment, friendly-society labours, and trade-union hopes, the author has not sufficiently taken into account the religious principles at stake, and consequently becomes too political. The advocacy of a limitation of Christian teaching to a general encouragement of every man to fulfil his duties to others is too abstract. The abolition of the slave trade and the passing of humanitarian factory laws were not accomplished by such exhortations. The Christian principles of temperance and responsibility do not enable us to decide how Parliament can best cope with the evils of drink and lust, and it may be imprudent for the Churches to be too closely identified with any one of the suggested actions. Theoretical Christianity is conducive to pacificism, but unforeseen occurrences in August, 1914, have persuaded most of us that better preparations for war would have enabled us to more adequately discharge our obligations to Belgium. Some classification of the intricate puzzles of life, by which we would see more distinctly where the Church should dictate the course to be followed, where it should be content to assert moral principles and leave their application indefinite, and where the obscurity of present knowledge may give vent to an impracticable idealism, is necessary; and this has yet to be undertaken. But if Dr. Cunningham fails to entirely dispel the difficulties of centuries, his book is worthy of close study, will give a needful stimulus to thought, and will not be fruitless in the midst of existing anxieties.

THE CREED OF A YOUNG CHURCHMAN. A manual for Confirmation Candidates and other young Churchpeople. By H. A. Wilson, M.A. London: Robert Scott. Price 2s. net.

There are no two opinions as to the value of the period of preparation for Confirmation in winning our young people to Christ and to the Church. Literary helps in the exposition of the Catechism and the explanation of the baptismal vows abound, but suitable books for instruction in the position and doctrine of the Church of England historically considered are few. Mr. Wilson very successfully endeavours to supply the want. A readable account, pleasantly written, adapted to the intelligence of youths of sixteen, of what the Church of England is will appeal to many. Parents and godparents, as well as Bible Class teachers, will find here an excellent book to put into the hands of their charges, supplementing it wherever this may be possible with fuller oral lessons. The work is thoroughly Evangelical in tone, and with commendable tact and wisdom Mr. Wilson has given attention to simplicity and directness of statement rather than to originality in thought and expression. This volume has only to be known to be used.

THE CRADLE OF CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. S. P. T. Prideaux, B.D. London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd. Price 2s. net.

This is a short and excellent account of the times of Christ, written in a most readable manner, and specially useful to theological students, Sunday School teachers, and Christian workers. The writer holds that it is necessary for students of the New Testament, if they would acquire an adequate knowledge of the subject, to gain a clear idea of the conditions of life in Palestine in the time of our Lord; and gives a great amount of valuable information in the course of the eight chapters, which are the outgrowth from two courses of lectures delivered in the diocese of Winchester, under the auspices of the Society for Promoting Higher Religious Education. The book is marked by scholarship, lucidity, and compactness.

DICTIONARY OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH. Edited by James Hastings, D.D., with the assistance of John A. Selbie, D.D., and John C. Lambert, D.D. Vol. I (Aaron—Lystra). Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 21s. net.

This is the age of dictionary making and of dictionary makers. Dr. Hastings is *facile princeps*. He has already edited the "Dictionary of the Bible," the one-volume "Bible Dictionary," the "Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels," and eight volumes of the "Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics." Now we welcome Vol. I of his "Dictionary of the Apostolic Church." What other dictionaries he has in store for us, we must "wait and see." In making up the list of names of those "whom the King delighteth to honour," Mr. Asquith will be doing a graceful act by including that of Dr. Hastings, for the great services which he has rendered to students of religion and ethics.

Many who have been in the habit of using the "Dictionary of Christ and the Gospel" have felt the need of a companion volume dealing with the rest of the New Testament. The "Dictionary of the Apostolic Church" is intended to supply such a need. It carries the history of the Church to the end of the first century.

The present volume is uniform with the "Dictionary of Christ and the Gospel," but contains about 200 pages less than the first volume of that dictionary. In the "Literature" at the end of each article, the authors' names are printed in somewhat bolder type. This is a welcome departure from the former custom. Doctrine, history, biography, apocryphal and pseudo-epigraphal subjects all receive adequate treatment. There are several exceptionally long articles, e.g. Prof. J. Moffatt's article on the Uncanonical Gospels extends to twenty-eight pages, and Prof. C. Anderson Scott's on Christ and Christology occupies twenty-two pages. The Rev. E. C. Dewick, Vice-Principal of St. Aidan's College, contributes a masterly article on Eschatology. He must have condensed the contents of a large volume into some eleven pages of this Dictionary. Prof. Sanday's illuminative article on Inspiration and Revelation covers only six pages. Prof. Kirsopp Lake writes on Apocryphal Acts, Prof. A. Thumb of Strassburg on Hellenistic and Biblical Greek, and Prof. F. Platt of the Wesleyan College, Handsworth, on the Atonement. Space would not allow us to quote from these articles. Every one of them maintains a high standard of excellence. Of course, it is not to be expected that every reader will endorse every single statement in a dictionary. So far as we have been able to judge, the volume is singularly free from wild theories which, however one may tolerate them in a magazine, are altogether out of a place in a permanent book of reference.

Of the less lengthy articles we may note a few. Mr. G. H. Clayton, Fellow of Peterhouse, contributes a temperate and lucid article on the Eucharist. His explanation of 1 Cor. x. 16 ("communion of the body of Christ") is excellent. Dr. Alfred Plummer's articles on Apostle, Bishop, and Church are, as usual, exact, clear, and reverent. Dr. A. J. Maclean, Bishop of Moray, Ross, and Caithness, writes the articles on Ascension, Baptism, and God. Of the importance of Ascension for the practical life he says—

"The Ascension shows that the work of Christ for man has never ceased, but is permanent, although He has never needed to repeat His sacrifice. It has brought Jesus into closer touch with us; He has never ceased to be Man, and in the heavenly sphere is not removed far away from us, but is with us until the end of the world (Matt. xxviii. 20). He raises our ideals from earthly things to heavenly; and giving us through the Spirit the new life which enables us to follow Him,

by His Ascension teaches us the great *Sursum corda*: 'Lift up your hearts; we lift them up unto the Lord'" (p. 98).

Of Baptism the Bishop says—

"To say that God uses outward means or instruments as the normal manner in which He gives His grace is not to assert, on the one hand, that all who receive the outward means receive the grace, or, on the other hand, that God cannot give the grace otherwise. Hence the emphasis on the need of repentance and faith in those who are baptized" (p. 136).

There are few contributors from the Continent. Dr. Olaf E. Moe of the University of Christiania, writes on Commandment and Law. Dr. Pierre Batifol, Prêtre catholique and prélat de la maison du Pape, has an article on Ignatius, in which he strongly upholds the authenticity of his letter to the Romans, and, as béfite un prélat de la maison du Pape, he manages to squeeze in here and there an argument in favour of the primacy of the Roman See. Another Continental contributor is Prof. von Dobschütz of the University of Breslau. The articles on Communion, Fellowship, Hellenism, and Josephus are from his pen. He regards Josephus's "Wars" as "a carefully executed work"; his "Antiquities" reproduce "what his sources supplied." In the matter of chronology "Josephus is an unsafe guide," as "events from different sources and of different dates are thrown promiscuously together." Of Josephus's *testimonium de Christo*, Dobschütz seems inclined to accept the Slavonic version of it discovered by Brendt, but does not give the exact words of the Slavonic version. As to the relation of St. Luke to Josephus, we are glad to find that Dobschütz does not countenance, as Prof. K. Lake seems to do in his article on the Acts, the theory of some German critics, who would bring down the date of the Acts to the beginning of the second century, on the assumption that the author of the Acts has made use of Josephus's *Antiquities*, which were published A.D. 93-94. He says: "The two authors, in point of fact, are obviously quite independent of each other. Thus St. Luke (xiii. 1f.) mentions a Galilean revolt of which Josephus takes no cognizance, while the three revolts recorded by Josephus as having occurred under Pilate find no mention in Luke" (p. 653).

Altogether we are more than satisfied with this Dictionary and can heartily recommend it.

K. E. KHODADAD.

SIX LITTLE BOOKLETS FOR OFFICERS AND OTHERS. By Arthur Mercer.

Price *1d.* each, or *6d.* and *1s.* in leather cover.

We have read these booklets with much enjoyment and thankfulness—enjoyment, because of their sound, sane and sober presentation of saving truth; thankfulness, because, knowing how much young officers stand in need of spiritual help, we feel that here, at last, is something which will arrest their attention. Mr. Mercer writes as a man to men, and it is clear that he has a wide knowledge of men's spiritual difficulties and of their spiritual aspirations, but what makes these booklets so valuable is the warmth of his sympathy and the directness of his appeal. The little volumes (so beautifully printed and so tastefully bound that they are a pleasure to handle) were not all issued together, they followed each other in succession as opportunity offered, and the aggregate sale has now run to upwards of a quarter of a million copies. The series is as follows: No. 1. The Greatest of all Mistakes. No. 2. Undoubtedly He is Coming Again. No. 3. The Supreme Moment of a Lifetime. No. 4. The Inevitable Separation. No. 5. Is Real Peace Possible? No. 6. Does He Really Hear? The latest of the series, dealing with prayer, is valuable for its assured tone of confident hope. But they are all well worth reading, and we most cordially commend them to those who have officers among their relatives or friends. Copies and all further information may be obtained at "Rozel," Wimbledon, S.W.

BOOKS ON THE WAR

THE WAY OF THE CROSS. By Doroshevitch. London: *Constable and Co.*
Price 2s. 6d. net.

Mr. Stephen Graham tells us in his preface that this is probably the first piece of Russian war literature that has been translated into English. Doroshevitch is a Russian journalist who enjoys a great reputation and exerts considerable influence. His literary style, though quite out of the common, has a certain fascination about it. His work, as Mr. Graham points out, consists of "short sentences, short paragraphs, word-paragraphs, dashes and marks of interrogation," and in this strikingly characteristic way he has given us a vivid but terrible picture of the sufferings of the Russian and Polish fugitives in their flight before the Germans in the autumn of last year. It is the graphic picture of an eye-witness, drawn, too, by one who is a true patriot, and who is even more than this—a Christian with a sympathetic heart. There can be no doubt that this book will survive after the war as one of the most moving accounts of an experience from which may God in His mercy deliver us!

A LIFE WELL LIVED. By John Wood. London: *S. W. Partridge and Co.*
Price 1s. 6d. net.

The touching record of the life, and containing many letters, of a Rugby boy, 1st Lieutenant J. W. Colin Taylor, 2nd Batt. Sherwood Foresters, a devoted Church worker at Northwood, Middlesex, who fell in action at Hooge, Flanders, on August 9 last. The portrait and illustrations add interest to the pleasing life-story of a stalwart young Christian, actively engaged in work for the Master, and whose letters from the Front are an inspiration to read. Just the book to give a young Christian officer.

THE TEST OF WAR. By the Rev. J. T. Plowden-Wardlaw, M.A. London:
Robert Scott. Price 2s. 6d. net.

Verily there are sermons *and* sermons! When we read some that are printed we cannot help wondering what they have done to deserve it! No one who takes up this volume and looks over the careful synopsis of each sermon, given at the beginning of the book, is likely to have that feeling. When he reads the sermons themselves he will feel that they well deserve a larger audience. Even those who are not wont to read sermons will peruse these pages with real pleasure. There are twenty-four discourses, and they deal with the war from every possible standpoint. The appeal made in one addressed to soldiers waiting for orders, and preached in King's College Chapel to some nine hundred men, must surely have been productive of good and have been remembered by all who heard it, and the same applies to the sermon on "Home Influence." Amid so much that is excellent it is not easy to fix upon particular examples, but we accord the little volume a hearty welcome.

THE PROBLEM OF HUMAN SUFFERING AND THE WAR. By the Rev. F. H. Dudden, D.D. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. net.

Here are more practical, common-sense "War Sermons." They deal mainly, as the title indicates, with one subject—the greatest problem of human life—the problem of suffering. Dr. Dudden, in the first of these, wisely corrects notions which are current and which imply wrong conceptions of God. Those who are in perplexity will find much in these addresses to help them to discover "the clue of the maze."

FOR KING AND COUNTRY ; FIGHT FOR THE RIGHT ; PRAYERS AND THOUGHTS FOR THE TRENCHES. London: *Simpkin, Marshall and Co.* Price 6d. each net.

These delightful "Trench Booklets," as they are called, are attractively got up in a khaki wrapper with a gummed flap ready for posting, and without a letter they may be sent for a halfpenny. Containing uplifting messages they will be useful for sending to the Front, where they are sure to be welcome and helpful.

THE GLORY OF THE LIFE LAID DOWN. By the Rev. J. K. Swinburne, M.A., Vicar of Shifnal. London: *Elliot Stock.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

This little volume is addressed "to those in sorrow," and consists of sermons preached in Shifnal Church. Very suggestive and striking is one entitled "The White Hairs of God," based, of course, on Rev. i. 14: "His head and His hairs were white like wool, as white as snow"; but every page is helpful. Mr. Swinburne is a poet of no mean order, and eight of his poems appear in this book, reprinted from *The Sunday Companion*, and add greatly to the charm of the prose.



Publications of the Month.

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

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

RECONCILIATION BETWEEN GOD AND MAN. By W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 3s. net.) A careful, thoughtful and reverent examination of a great theme, along very distinctly sacramental lines. From the final chapter on "The Perpetual Offering of Christ" we take the following passage:—"The reason why people do not believe in the eucharistic offering is because they have no belief in the heavenly offering of Christ. And they have no belief in the heavenly offering of Christ because they think of redemption rather as an act than as a spirit, a solitary deed rather than a moral attitude. Could we but look beyond the outward expression to the inward state, we should surely acknowledge that Christ's offering is the offering of His inmost Self, and therefore must be an offering in perpetuity."

STUDIES IN THE TEMPTATION OF THE SON OF GOD. By J. O. F. Murray, D.D. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 2s. net.) A wonderfully uplifting book. Reprinted from the *Lay Reader Magazine*, these "Studies" will be welcomed in their permanent form.

SELF-TRAINING IN PRAYER. By A. H. McNeile, D.D. (*W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd.* 1s. 3d. net.) A devotional handbook of rich beauty directed to help those who find prayer a religious duty rather than a religious experience.

FOR SOUL AND BODY. By Harriette S. Bainbridge. (*W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd.* 9d. net.) A series of talks on spiritual healing, interesting but hardly conclusive.

WAR PUBLICATIONS.

IN THE HANDS OF THE HUNS. (*Simpkin, Marshall and Co.* 1s.) A volume which gives an account of fifteen months' imprisonment at Ruhleben by a British Civil Prisoner of War. With a restraining hand the Author briefly outlines the daily life and treatment in the Camp. There is evidence of the quiet British dignity under trying conditions. Several interesting extracts with illustrations are given from the *Camp Magazine* "In Ruhleben Camp." A book of absorbing interest.

- THE CHURCH AND THE CLERGY AT THIS TIME OF WAR. By the Archbishop of York. (*S.P.C.K.* 1s. *net.*) The full text delivered to the clergy of the Diocese at the Great Convention in the Minster, February 14 and 15. For its clear presentation of spiritual truth and the urgency of the spiritual call, this little volume is most stimulating and uplifting.
- WAR PRAYERS OF ONE HUNDRED YEARS AGO. (*S.P.C.K.* 3d. *net.*) A very timely reissue. In the crises of 1796, 1804 and 1811 it seemed the nation had a deeper grasp of the spiritual meaning of the wars, and the prayers of those days were stronger and more virile in their expression than those we are accustomed to to-day. The Bishop of London commends them to the attention of the Church at large, but he does not say specifically that he authorizes the use of any.
- WAR-TIME TRACTS FOR THE WORKERS. (*S.P.C.K.*) A capital series dealing pointedly and effectively with some of the more urgent spiritual questions raised by the war.
- A LETTER TO SICK AND WOUNDED SOLDIERS AND SAILORS. By Lieut.-Col. Seton Churchill. (*Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* 1d.) An excellent booklet. Its production has been planned so that it will be readily accepted by those for whom it is intended. The type is large and readable, and it clearly presents the great facts of the Faith.

GENERAL.

- OFFICIAL YEAR-BOOK OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND FOR 1916. Edited by the Rev. F. H. Burnside. (*S.P.C.K.* 2s. *paper boards*; 2s. 6d. *net.* See Note on p. 294.)
- JU-JITSU. By W. Bruce Sutherland. (*T. Nelson and Sons, Ltd.* 1s. *net.*) A treatise on self-defence; most useful for special constables—and others. The text is illustrated and explained by many diagrams.
- ADVENTURES ON THE ROOF OF THE WORLD. By Mrs. Aubrey A. Blond. (*T. Nelson and Sons, Ltd.*) A volume in the popular "Shilling Library" series which will appeal to all mountain-climbers.
- THE CAR OF DESTINY. By C. N. and A. M. Williamson. DONALD ROSS OF HEMIRA. By William Black—(*T. Nelson and Sons, Ltd.*)—two volumes of the excellent "Sevenpenny Series."

PAMPHLETS.

- SPIRITUALISM: A HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL SKETCH. By Canon Edmund McClure. (*S.P.C.K.* 6d. *net.*) A most valuable treatise, written with great ability and in a calm and reasonable tone. Yet it is absolutely decisive against the cult. We know of no work which gives the history of necromancy with such clearness and fulness.
- ST. LUKE AND A MODERN WRITER: A STUDY IN CRITICISM. A praelection delivered before the Council of the Senate of the University of Cambridge. By F. J. Foakes-Jackson, D.D. (*W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd.* 6d. *net.*) Dr. Foakes-Jackson having made a literary investigation into the story of one Elizabeth Kellest and found that the author had tampered with original letters so as the more vividly to convey the facts, says:—"Does not this comparison suggest a possible solution of some New Testament difficulties? It is almost impossible to believe, for example, that the speeches and epistles of St. Peter really represent the language of the Apostle; much less the Epistle of James, with its evident knowledge of the Greek wisdom literature of Judaism. And when one reads some of the correspondence of the Roman confessors in the collection of Cyprian's letters one sees how illiterate many Christians, even in prominent positions, were in the third century; and may we not suppose the possibility of genuine letters of apostles having been in existence which have come down to us in literary forms, in which some of the spirit, if little of the form, has survived?"
- CONFIRMATION CARD. (*S.P.C.K.*) Printed in red and black with spaces for name of parish, date and place of birth and baptism, names of Godparents, date and place of Confirmation and First Communion.