

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 Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

or rather to vanishing point. He takes it, as Professor Burkitt writes in the Preface, 'as an axiom that modern investigation and discovery has revolutionised our ideas about external nature and the course of ancient history. . . . How did this apparently insignificant episode become the starting-point of so great and persistent development? It is not enough for the Modernist to reject the Catholic view : if his view is to supplant the Catholic view, it must be because it is more adequate, because it is more nearly in harmony with all the facts, the facts not only of the "Life of Christ," but also of the enthusiasm and persistence of the Christians. And here, as it seems to me, comes in the value of Dr. Warschauer's actual achievement.'

Among the ever-increasing number of studies of the Life by laymen, that of J. Middleton Murry has taken a prominent place. This writer does not hesitate to ascribe sinfulness to Jesus, alleging that his submission to baptism could not have been undertaken without consciousness of guilt. The book may be somewhat inchoate and frothy, but it has the great merit of provoking and disturbing the minds and souls of a group of readers who find a more formal theology distasteful. Then there is the *Jesus of Nazareth* by Klausner, the Jewish author. The book is, on the whole, sympathetically written, but it is critical of certain of Jesus' points of view, particularly of His attitude to the scribes and Pharisees of His day, an attitude which Klausner considers was too radical in its condemnation.

We have said nothing of the large number of contemporary plays and novels, more or less based upon the gospel story. Some of these have merit,

notably, among the historical works, George Moore's *The Brook Kerith*, though here neither the psychology nor the history is good, only the beauty of the style is outstanding. Good also is Sudermann's *John*, Rostand's *The Samaritan Woman*, Andreyev's *Judas Iscariot and the Others*. Among the works which attempt to reincarnate something of Jesus' bearing and power there stand out Fogazzaro's *Saint*, Dostoevsky's *Idiot*, Kennedy's *Servant in the House*, Jerome K. Jerome's *Passing of the Third Floor Back*, Gerhart Hauptmann's *Fool in Christ*. But very often the portrait of Jesus which has been painted in plays and novels is nothing more than a picture of the writer's personal ideal man, set against the Galilean background, or, if the hero is modern, endowed with some of the more conventional trappings of Divinity.

Contrasting with these, and of far more value, is a group where there is an imaginative attempt to live out, or think out, the life of Jesus amid the social conditions of our time. Among these there stand out Tolstoi's *Confessions*, Florence Converse's *Children of Light*, Rosegger's *God-Seekers* and his *I.N.R.I.*, Paul Heyse's *Children of the World*, Frenssen's *Hilligenlei*, and Selma Lagerlöf's *Miracles of Anti-Christ*. This last is a fine study of the relationship of Socialism and Christianity, or rather, we might say, a moving revelation of the narrowness of the awful gulf which separates every dream of an earthly Paradise from the Christian vision of the Kingdom of God. Socialism, the author maintains, is Anti-Christ, and the task of the Church is not to demolish this great ideal, but to remould it into the heavenly pattern.

The Origin and Growth of Religion.

BY THE REVEREND CANON J. BATTERSBY HARFORD, D.D., RIPON.

THE history of religion provides us with a study, which is fascinating, but also of great difficulty. Thinking men must always have had times when their thoughts turned back to the past and they asked themselves: What was the form which religion took at the beginning of our human race? But it was only towards the end of the eighteenth century that the comparative study of religion took scientific shape. Following upon the discoveries of new continents in the sixteenth and

seventeenth centuries, and of peoples and religions hitherto unknown, men, seeing the immense number of forms in which religion had taken shape upon this earth, were compelled to ask: How came religion to take so many forms? What can it have been like at the beginning?

It was natural that at first Christian scholars should turn to the Old Testament, and that some should have thought that whatsoever was good in pagan religions must have been borrowed

from the Jews. But as time went on, the study of Hebrew religion broadened out. The more the religions of the Semitic world round about Israel were studied, the more clear it became that certain elements in Hebrew religion were common to all early Semites, nor could stop be made there. Further study showed that certain elements were common to early mankind as a whole.

This study of religion was not, however, confined to men whose chief interest was religious. It was taken up by other men, who approached it from a more purely scientific point of view.

In this article it will only be possible to give a very brief sketch of the successive theories claiming to give an account of the origin and growth of religion which arose one after the other during the nineteenth century. The main body of the article will be given to an exposition of the latest theory, which has come to the front in this twentieth century, and to show how it has been arrived at.

1. In the attempt to evolve a reasonable theory of the origin of religion, the first steps were taken by a school of thinkers who regarded religion as arising from the observation of Nature. Natural objects, especially the principal heavenly bodies, were, they said, personified and myths evolved. Max Müller, for many years Professor of Sanscrit, at Oxford, was, in England at any rate, the most popular apostle of this school.¹ This theory of Nature myths was largely founded on the discovery and investigation of the Indo-Germanic religions which had been brought to light in the latter half of the eighteenth century. We now know that this whole culture was neither simple nor primary, but Nature myths did play an important, often a dominant, part in the religion of these peoples. A supreme Sky-God was recognized in them all and was called Father; *Zeús πατήρ*; Juppiter, in Sanscrit Dyauspitar. In the Vedic Age Varuna supplanted Dyauspitar. 'In his whole nature,' writes von Schroeder, 'in the exalted dignity and majesty of his appearance, in his attributes as Creator, Orderer, Upholder, and Governor of the world, in his spotless purity and cleanness, in the holy anger with which he judges and punishes the wicked, in his grace and mercy towards the penitent' he appears as a real Supreme Being.

2. The far-reaching importance of Nature myths of Indo-European peoples is undoubted, but in Max Müller's own lifetime it was overshadowed

¹ His Hibbert Lectures on *The Origin and Growth of Religion* were published in 1878.

by new discoveries of the history and pre-history of mankind. *The Origin of Species by Natural Selection*, by Charles Darwin, was published in 1859, and, as time went on, the theory of development was applied to the history of religion, and evolutionism was born. Auguste Comte expounded the theory that Fetishism (*i.e.* as he used the word, the worship of all objects in Nature as such) was the original form of religion, and Sir John Lubbock twenty years later invented a whole series of stages from Atheism, through Fetishism, to God as Creator and ethical religion. But their views were soon shown to be incorrect by Roskoff and others.

3. It was Herbert Spencer who, in 1872 and following years, produced the next leading theory of religion, namely, Ghost-worship. He based his view upon the phenomena of Ancestor worship. Some remarkable man, regarded with awe during his life, was regarded, he said, with increasing awe after his death, and the propitiation of his ghost developed into an established worship. This was worked out at great length, but without the least attempt to ascertain by genuine historical methods the chronology of the various kinds of Ancestor worship. These were arranged in an order determined solely by their apparent evolution from a psychological point of view. Later research shows that Ancestor worship is not the origin of religion. It is found to be very feebly developed in the oldest cultures, while a monotheistic belief is already clearly found there.

4. A new school arose, side by side with that of Spencer, as the result of the work of E. B. Tylor, whose book *Primitive Culture* was published in 1872. His theory was called Animism. Primitive man, he said, meditating on his experiences of sleep, ecstasy, illness, and death on the one hand, and those of dreams and visions on the other, arrived at the concept of a soul. Tylor traced this conception of a soul through dead ancestors, Nature and polytheism up to monotheism. Thus we come last to the Supreme Being. Like Spencer, Tylor worked in the heyday of evolutionism, and assumed an upward development of mankind along a single line. But, as with Spencer so with Tylor, no proof is forthcoming in his works that the single stages of this process had any historical connexion with one another. Animism for a long time enjoyed undisputed predominance, but—

5. It was eventually challenged from two sides—on the one hand by students of Nature mythology in general, and on the other by students of the newly discovered world of Assyria, Babylonia, and neighbouring lands. The two movements soon

coalesced. The star myth line was led by Siecke and others. Siecke showed that the Nature myths were always based on something seen in the sky. They are childlike deductions from the marvels of the world around, and especially the movements of the heavenly bodies. They had nothing to do with belief in a soul, nor with dreams and nightmares. A special branch of the star myth school is that which is known as Pan-Babylonianism, and is represented by Winckler and Jeremias (1900-1913). All myths, they said, were concerned with the phenomena of the heavens. The heavenly bodies and their movements were to the Babylonians the principal revelation of the power and will of the Deity. The priests read these and set forth their doctrines in dramatic performances. The whole arrangement of Holy Days on earth was decided by the revolutions of the heavenly bodies. The myths of every people on earth were said by Winckler and Jeremias to be influenced by the system which was fully developed in Babylon by 3000 B.C. and which spread with the spread of mankind. But, in fact, there is no such agreement between the star myths of savage peoples and those of Babylonia as would justify us in declaring that there has been any historical connexion. Those of primitive peoples are not above the level of the rest of their culture, and the idea that astronomy and astrology were so developed in Babylonia by 3000 B.C. is declared to be quite untenable by Kugler, a scholar equally eminent in Astronomy and in Assyriology.

6. A new factor in the science of religion, namely, Totemism, was introduced by J. F. M'Lennan in 1869, and was taken up for a time by Sir J. G. Frazer in 1887-1910. Totemism is the name given to a belief of certain peoples that their families and clans stood in a definite blood-relationship to particular species of animals. W. Robertson Smith, a former pupil of M'Lennan's, made Totemism the starting-point of religion, and especially of Hebrew religion. The sacrificial victim was the totem-animal. Later researches on historical lines seem to have made this quite untenable.

7. As early as 1892 J. H. King put forward the theory that magic came before Animism, but it was not until 1900 that R. R. Marett introduced the theory of magic as the origin of religion, while Sir J. G. Frazer became its great exponent in his *Golden Bough*, with its sub-title 'A Study in Magic and Religion.' Similar views were set forth by a number of writers in Germany, America, and England. All these writers almost entirely lacked any objective evidence as to the order of develop-

ment of the various phases of magical ideas. With some peoples the belief in magic is much stronger than with others. Here the most modern method of study comes in and shows that only to a comparatively small extent do the most primitive races of to-day have magical beliefs and practices, while at the same time they most definitely worship a personal and moral Supreme Being. Religion accordingly is not later than magic, but in all probability has preceded it.

8. We thus come finally to the Pastoral Nomadic culture, and there we find the belief in the supreme Sky-God, which persists in its full force amongst these great cattle-breeding peoples. This culture is found in its natural state in the Ural-Altaiic and Hamitic peoples, but all the Indo-European and nearly all the Semitic peoples belonged originally to this culture. This belief in a Supreme Sky-God has only lately been made the starting-point of a theory of the origin of religion. In 1920, however, an article by G. Foucart on 'Sky and Sky-Gods' appeared in Hastings' *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*. And Professor A. B. Cook, author of the monumental work, *Zeus*, shows that classical antiquity points to belief in this Supreme Being of the sky as the starting-point of religion in the Greek world. 'It would seem,' he says, 'that at first Zeus was conceived, not anthropomorphically as the bright Sky-God, but as the bright sky itself, credited with an impersonal life of its own. . . . When those who first used the word *Zeus* went out into the world and looked abroad, they found themselves over-arched by the blue and brilliant sky, a luminous Something fraught with incalculable possibilities of weal or woe. It cheered them with its steady sunshine. It scared them with its flickering fires. It fanned their cheeks with cool breezes or set all knees a-tremble with reverberating thunder. It mystified them with its birds winging their way in ominous silence or talking secrets in an unknown tongue. It paraded before men's eyes a splendid succession of celestial phenomena, and underwent for all to see the daily miracle of darkness and dawn. Inevitably, perhaps instinctively, they would regard it with awe—that primitive blend of religious feelings—and would go on to conciliate it by any means in their power. . . .' J. G. Frazer argued that man in due course sought to control its actions by the naïve arts of magic, but that eventually the supreme medicine-man became the sacred King, his magical functions gradually giving place to priestly or even divine duties, as magic was slowly ousted by religion. Frazer urged that

shrewder intelligences, realizing the frequent failure of human magic, ascribed this to the more powerful magic of great invisible beings—*i.e.* the gods—and thus escaped from the troubled sea of doubt and uncertainty into 'the quiet haven of religion,' thus putting magic first and religion second in order of time. But as Professor A. B. Cook pertinently asks, 'Why should these shrewder intelligences—indeed, how could they—assume a Sky-God, unless the sky was already regarded as a Divine Potency?' And, if this was the case, then religion was not subsequent to magic but either prior to it, or at least coeval with it.

'Personally,' Professor Cook went on, 'I should not refuse the term religious to the attitude of religious awe with which I suppose early man to have approached the animate sky. Indeed, it would not be absurd to maintain that the pre-anthropomorphic conception was in some respects higher, because truer, than later anthropomorphism. After all, "God is not a man," and early thought could hardly be drawn nearer to the idea of the Infinite than by contemplating the endless blue of heaven.'

'Nevertheless the shift from Sky to Sky-God was a momentous one, a fact which modified the whole course of Greek religion, and its ultimate consequence was nothing less than the rise of faith in a Personal God, the Ruler and Father of all.'

So far the student of Greek religion. Alongside this we must now place the evidence which is forthcoming, when we consider the religious beliefs of the lowliest living races. In 1884 to 1886 A. W. Howitt published the results of personal investigations obtained by actual residence among tribes in south-east Australia. He testified to the existence among these tribes of a belief in a High God, known by different tribes under different names, but essentially the same in all, and of the evidence for this belief afforded by the initiation ceremonies at puberty of the young members of these tribes—ceremonies to which he himself had been admitted. E. B. Tylor at once fully admitted as proved the existence among these tribes of a belief in High Gods, but in 1891, in an article on 'Limits of Savage Religion,' he sought to prove that this belief was not native, but was due to missionary influence from Europe. He was obliged to do this, for one of the axioms of his animistic theory was that monotheism was comparatively modern and had everywhere developed out of a lower animistic form of belief. Howitt, however, directly countered Tylor's suggestion by definite and circumstantial proofs that the belief in High

Gods was really native and was not due to any outside influence, and N. W. Thomas and Andrew Lang decisively supported Howitt by further proofs. Andrew Lang was at first a follower of Tylor, but after Howitt's accounts of savage beliefs in Australia he took his stand against the *a priori* view that monotheism must everywhere have developed out of an earlier animistic form of belief. In 1898 he published *The Making of Religion*, and he followed this up by extensive revisions of his earlier works. Lang's argument was acutely reasoned, but at his date the relevant material was only partially available. The more complete form of the argument has been developed by Professor W. Schmidt of Vienna in a book which was published in 1930, and which has been translated by Professor H. J. Rose of St. Andrews (1931). This book provides the basis of this article. On page 258 of the English translation, Professor Schmidt's Table of the Groupings of existing Cultures is to be found. It may be summarized as follows:

I. PRIMITIVE CULTURES (Food Gatherers).—In these races man does not yet assist Nature to increase her productivity; he contents himself by gathering from her what she has to offer of her own accord. At this stage the men get food by hunting, and the women by collecting plants. We can differentiate three (or four) cultures at this stage.

II. PRIMARY CULTURES (Food Producers).—There are three divisions. (1) Pastoral Nomads (cattle breeders). (2) Higher Hunters (town culture, founders of art, craftsmanship, and trade). (3) Horticultural (founders of village culture). These divisions took place independently, although later each one tended to take up elements of one or both the others.

III. SECONDARY CULTURES (results of crossings of the Primary Cultures with one another, or with Primitive Cultures).—Two divisions exist which are found here and there as late as historical times in West Asia and in Europe.

IV. TERTIARY CULTURES (oldest civilizations of Asia, Europe, and America).—Ethnology thus provides us with a chronological chart of Cultures. For our purpose we must now concentrate on the group of Cultures, which form the primitive group. They are clearly older than the Primary group. The proof of their higher antiquity rests mainly on three positive considerations and one negative.

(a) Their geographical positions.—Their habitats are extremely remote, in such isolated regions as betray their character as the last refuges of fugitives.

They are hardest of access and the least attractive. In such regions these races are the only inhabitants, and no traces of an earlier population are to be found. Such are the Pygmies and Pygmoids of Asia and Africa, the oldest tribes of the extreme south-east of Australia, the Samoyeds, Ainu, and the Cariboo Esquimaux, and in North America the Algonkin tribes.

(b) Their economic conditions.—These peoples (with a few small exceptions) are all in the initial stage. They are food gatherers.

(c) The primitive state of their houses, clothing, tools, and weapons, and the simplicity of their social arrangements, in which the individual family plays the fundamental part.

(d) Negatively, these people do not exhibit the characteristics of the Primary Cultures (or at best exhibit them only in a sporadic, superficial, and late form). They have neither the higher hunting nor Totemism, neither agriculture nor mother right, neither cattle breeding nor the undivided family; they lack the more developed forms of houses, pottery, weaving, and of course metallurgy.

Now the religious concepts of these races are our principal base for attacking the problem of the origin of religion, for, comparatively, they are the nearest to that origin. We must, however, realize that these peoples have stood still in religion as in all else and therefore exhibit an inevitable fossilization and a loss of inner vitality, which is especially fatal to anything so essentially spiritual as religion. And secondly, even in this earliest stage of culture we find at least three, perhaps four, completely different types of culture with different religions. This shows that there must have been a long interval between the first original state and the date of these differentiated cultures. We cannot immediately from them derive the original form of religion, but we can by working out the common elements in these primitive religions come a long way nearer the original form. Moreover, some later forms may have preserved original elements which have been lost by the primitive peoples, who are only insignificant fragments of races and who probably never were important. Our picture of the primitive religion must therefore be somewhat fluid. Not only may later cultures have retained certain elements of the original religion which must be added, but the most primitive tribes may have received contaminations from later sources which must be subtracted. Some such can already be seen. Meantime already the knowledge of the primitive peoples has grown so much more exact during the

last few decades that it has done away with a whole series of earlier hypotheses concerning the origin of religion.

The first point brought out by the study of the most primitive cultures is the clear, vivid, and direct belief in a Supreme Being which is found in them. This belief is to be found in a dominant position among all the primitive peoples. It must have been deeply rooted in this most ancient of human cultures at the very dawn of time before the individual groups separated one from the other. A number of writers have, however, questioned whether this belief was genuinely monotheistic. The reply is that a sufficient number of tribes do hold a really monotheistic belief in a Supreme Being. It is true that the fact of their monotheistic belief has in many cases been obscured by later importations, but exact analysis enables us to separate these later accretions. The most primitive races never think of the Supreme Being as having wife or children. We do find in some cases other superior beings—a First Father, an Originator of Evil, a Divine Protector of beasts—but they do not deserve the title of gods. They have been created by the Supreme Being and have obtained their powers from him, and in many cases he still superintends their occupations and functions.

The Habitation of the Supreme.—He is not so closely associated with the sky as he is in the later cultures, especially among the Pastoral Nomads. Most primitive races say that he originally lived on earth with men and that he taught them all manner of good and instructed them in social and moral laws. The North American primitives, however, say that he originally came down to earth from the sky, while practically among all the primitives it is agreed that he left the earth, generally because of some evil behaviour of mankind and that he now lives in the sky.

The Form of the Supreme Being.—There seem to be two groups. According to the one he cannot be perceived by the senses; according to the other he has human form but of an exceptional kind—as 'shining white,' or 'like fire,' and so on. No image of him is anywhere made save where he has come to be regarded as one with the First Father.

The Name of the Supreme Being.—Father is that most widely distributed and is clearly primæval. Less often he is called Creator, but this is widely used by North American Indians. Sometimes he is called 'he that is above' or 'is in the sky,' and occasionally as 'the old one,' 'the primæval, the Divine Sky-Lord,' etc.

The Qualities of the Supreme Being.—(i) 'Eternal.'

He 'existed before all things,' 'never dies,' has always been and always will be. Only where there has been a crossing with the First Father is his death ever spoken of, and that only in two or three cases. (ii) Omniscient. He supervises the conduct of mankind. In some cases the stars are God's eyes. (iii) Beneficent, altogether good. All good and only good comes from Him. (iv) Without exception he is unalterably righteous. He is the giver of the moral law (the only exceptions being the Bushmen, Koryaks, and Esquimaux). His commands are especially impressed upon the young men at their initiation. The obedience of the primitives to the Supreme Being is in strong contrast to their freedom from authority in social and political matters. (v) All-powerful. He creates 'out of nothing' according to many North American primitives, he rewards obedience and punishes the morally bad, either personally or through subordinate beings. These punishments are inflicted on earth and, according to the great majority, also in the world beyond. All believe in a future life, and almost all in a distinction between good and bad, and especially of reward to the good, who usually go to the sky. Even after his departure from earth, the Supreme Being is regarded as influencing men by reason of his omnipotence and goodness, his oversight and his future judgment. He is not idle and remote from men. Primitive man shows in many ways his sense of dependence upon the Supreme; he seeks to set up a personal relationship with his god by prayer, sacrifice, and ceremony. (a) By Prayer. Unspoken prayers and gestures and spontaneous informal prayers are often undiscovered, when investigators do not know the native language or do not live patiently among them. Some people pray, but only at rare intervals. (b) By Sacrifices. These are found among a number of tribes, but seem to be entirely lacking among South and East Australians and one or two other tribes. Pygmies, Bushmen, and Arctic primitives offer first-fruits and food in recognition of the sovereignty over the necessities of life. This custom was not derived from the feeding of the dead. This is practically unknown in any tribes of primitives. (c) By Ceremonies. These, especially where there is no sacrifice and little prayer, are regarded as founded by the Supreme himself, and many last weeks and even months. The initiation ceremonies of the youths make them capable of founding families, and are the occasions for imparting to them the tribe's wisdom and virtue. In central California, etc., the ceremonies take the form of

sacramental commemorations. They enact the creation of the world and of men, and aim to bring the help of God upon the family, tribe, and world. Where the best and most thoroughly trained observers have been at work these festivals are found, and similar discoveries may yet be made in other areas.

The results of our study of the most primitive peoples, brief as it has been, seem to justify us in the conviction that religion began with the belief in a High God. This belief met their human needs. It gave them a rational explanation of the world in which they lived. It met their social needs by belief in a Supreme Being who was the Father of mankind, who founded the family, and to whom all owed allegiance and obedience. One who was lawgiver, judge, and overseer, who was himself wholly good and who was supreme and omnipresent, met their moral needs and assured them of protection. Only through their conception of this Supreme Being was primitive man enabled to struggle onward and upward.

But, if so, 'how,' as Menzies asked in his *History of Religion*, 'could all mankind forget a pure religion?' How could this Supreme Being be superseded in practical regard in the later cultures by a host of inferior and often immoral gods? Andrew Lang's answer was: It is accounted for by the attraction which animism and ancestor worship, when once developed, possessed for the natural man. The equal Father of all men cannot be 'squared' and declines to make himself useful to one man rather than another. The ancestral spirit, on the other hand, can be 'squared' by people in whom he takes a special interest for family reasons. A moral Creator in need of no gifts will not help a man who wants love spells or the destruction of his enemy by witchcraft. Ghost-gods, on the other hand, in need of food and blood, afraid of spells and binding charms, are to such a useful constituency. The natural man, being what he is, was certain to go a-whoring after such apparently useful ghost-gods, to neglect the idea of a moral Creator, and eventually to reckon Him either as indulging in epicurean repose in disregard of human affairs, or as only one, if the highest, of the rabble of hungry gods, and who therefore must be sacrificed to as well as they. Where the latter opinion prevailed, the well-being of the State and, still more, the interests of the priests or magicians were involved in the maintenance of the animistic system, and only the moral monotheism of Hebrew prophets, and later of Christianity or Islam, could sweep it away.

Huxley and Herbert Spencer had no doubt that Israel itself began with ghost-worship and passed through Ancestor-worship, Fetishism, and Totemism to reach the level of the God of the older portions of Judges and Samuel, and eventually to the higher level of the Jehovah of the Prophets. But was this the true course of events? If man began with belief in a throng of serviceable ghost-gods, would he be likely enthusiastically to welcome belief in a moral Creator, who could not be bribed and who only cared for obedience? May we not

rather opine that the moral element in Jehovah worship was the survival of the primitive, divinely taught ethics which we have seen to be known to primitive man. This primitive belief may well have been kept alive by men of religious genius, such as Moses and the Prophets and Psalmists of Israel, and brought to perfection (as we who are Christians believe) by our Lord Jesus Christ. This belief in a Supreme Being assures us that from the first God revealed Himself to man and taught him at last to worship in spirit and in truth.

In the Study.

Virginitus Puerisque.

The Power of a Name.

BY THE REVEREND DR. C. W. BUDDEN, M.A., CROYDON.

‘There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.’—Ac 4¹².

You have heard a wonderful story: how a poor cripple who had lain on his mat at the gate of the Temple of Jerusalem for years, begging from the people as they passed in and out, had been suddenly healed by Peter and John so that he could walk and run with the best of them. But how had Peter and John done this wonderful thing? That was the puzzle. Reports said that their own explanation of the matter was simply this: ‘And his name, through faith in his name, hath made this man strong.’ Yes; but what was the name that had such power? That was what the rulers and the great ones wanted to know, and so they summoned Peter and John before them, and asked, ‘By what power, or by what name, have ye done this?’—and the Apostles had made answer that it was the name of Jesus Christ that had effected the miracle, and then they added: ‘There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved’—and that is my text.

Now every one wants to be safe. It is one of the great blessings of our own land that we live in safety, so different from a country like Spain, where no one seems safe. And we know that many people seek our country as a place of refuge—a sanctuary. Even a murderer is protected by the Law until he has been tried and found guilty, and when a man commits a crime he does not hide from the

vengeance of those he has wronged. The man he is terrified of is a policeman. But this was not always so. In olden days, before Law and order were established, personal vengeance followed the criminal. But personal vengeance is a bad thing. ‘Vengeance is mine,’ saith the Lord, ‘I will repay it.’

In the Middle Ages churches were used as places of refuge into which fugitives could enter and enjoy at least temporary safety. At the north door of Durham Cathedral there is a large knocker which was sounded by a person claiming sanctuary. In the sacred building two men were on duty day and night ever ready to open the door quickly and let the fugitive in. And in the East, where blood feuds were carried on from father to son, these places were numerous. We recall the old cities of Refuge that were established in Palestine. But there were other methods of taking sanctuary, some of which survive to-day. A man, pursued by the avenger of blood, may seize hold of the dress of a woman and find temporary safety—that law holds good to-day among the cattlemen on the western ranches of America. Or a man might take refuge in the house or tent of a person. No matter what trouble or inconvenience might be caused by the presence of the uninvited guest, it is thought very disgraceful to refuse such an asylum if it be sought. Many lives are saved every year in Bible lands to-day by these means.

But perhaps the house or tent is not accessible. Then the fugitive may call upon the name of some person of power and rank, and this appeal to the name is considered equivalent to entering his house. If the chieftain whose name is thus called upon be