

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

June, 1911.

The Month.

**Higher
Criticism.** WE are venturing to return to a subject which we have noticed once or twice since the Islington Meeting, because we feel that there are certain misunderstandings which need to be cleared up. In an Editorial paragraph in our March number (pp. 165, 166), we ventured to express our own attitude towards those who hold "Higher Critical" views. Similarly, in the April number we ventured to say that we believed that men who are loyal to the principles and traditions of the Evangelical School of Thought have a right to their place and school despite their critical views. By all that we have said we stand. But we want to say two things more.

Firstly, we for our part, in the exercise of our own judgment, do most definitely dissociate ourselves from the extremes of Dutch and German criticism, which, based on assumptions that we cannot grant, are frankly materialistic and destructive. We are told, for instance, that Abraham is a mythical hero, that Joseph was eponymous, a tribe and not a man, and many such-like things. We respectfully ask for proof, and we get none. Indeed, as the days go by, criticism of that kind finds it difficult to maintain its existence. For proof of this last statement we venture to compare the place which has been won by Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible" with that secured by

the "Encyclopædia Biblica." Criticism of this type must be met by the spade and by the pen. It is being so met, and the fearsome ghost is almost laid. But all this does not alter our general point of view. We may be conservative, frankly we are; we differ, and differ seriously, from many of our Evangelical Higher Critics, who hold views much less extreme than those to which we have referred, but we are entirely at one with Dr. Eugene Stock, who declines to condemn a brother because he believes that the Higher Critics have established some of their positions. Once again, we repeat, we want unity and we want liberty. We shall never gain the former if we heedlessly limit the latter.

The other point is this: We believe the extreme conservative is equally entitled to his place in our School of Thought. Complaint has been made, and made with justice, that the Higher Critics are often treated with grievous unfairness. We are equally clear that no such complaint must be allowed to become true in the case of those who oppose them. To us the attitude of the superior person is an attitude to be deprecated. We shall try to carry out our convictions in our work in this magazine. We have no space for articles that are uncharitable or unbrotherly. We have no space for imputation of motives or for cheap sneers at opponents. We shall gladly welcome articles from either side that are written in the spirit of charity and moderation. We believe that it is good for us and good for our readers that both sides should be heard, and so with the greatest possible pleasure we welcome to our pages this month the interesting article of the Rev. W. F. Kimm on the "Reformation under Josiah."

One of the outstanding events of the present month—an event of gravest concern to all readers of the CHURCHMAN—is the publication of the Annual Report of the Church Missionary Society with its announcement of a deficit of £48,000, and the subsequent resolution of the Society to make sundry and drastic retrench-

The Position
of the C.M.S.

ments. It is as well to realize clearly the significance of this state of things. It does not mean that the actual contribution to the funds of the Society is falling off. The income of the past financial year shows a considerable advance on that of ten or twenty years ago. But it does mean that the devotion and energy of the home Church has utterly failed to keep pace with the expansion of the work abroad, and the opening of innumerable doors for further Christian work. The supply of effort on our part has not been equal to the demand made by our God-given opportunities. It means, too, that the responsibility lies at the doors of us who live and work at home in England. The crisis is not brought about by lack of volunteers to go abroad on foreign missionary service. It is through lack of means to support them. They are prepared to leave home, to live, and, if necessary, to die, in the service of Christ abroad. We have foiled their aspiration and checked their heroic purpose by withholding the necessary means for carrying them into effect.

It seems at first sight paradoxical that in view of this failure to provide supplies, the Committee should decide to make no special appeal for a clearing of the deficit. In this, however, they have shown a full grasp of the true inwardness of the situation. The inadequate provision of money is only an external symptom. What is needed on our own part is a clearer vision of God and a fuller consecration to His service. If only these things be vouchsafed to us, many details of method and organization will fall into their proper places. The crisis—if we take it rightly—should force on us both as a Church and as individuals many painful ponderings. Have we, after all, been gravitating, perhaps all unconsciously, to a wrong point of view? Have we been more occupied with the idea of what we can do for God than of what He can do through us? Have we been so obsessed by Conferences, schemes, plans, methods, as to become immersed in them, absorbed in them, so interested in the details of our machinery, that we tend to be forgetful of

Our Present
State.

Him from Whom all power and impulse comes? It may be that we have been drifting into the position of her who "was cumbered about much serving," and that the Father has chosen this way of recalling us to "that good part" chosen by her who "sat at Jesus' feet, and heard His Word."

Our greatest need at the present time is that of
Our Present the vision of God and faith in God. The sacred
Need. record of revelation seems to show that God's readiness to do great things for us, is conditioned by our faith in Him. We read that, when Christ was met by a spirit of sceptical criticism, "He did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief." And when His disciples were perplexed by a manifestation of Divine power that transcended their conception of the wonted routine of affairs, His answer was: "Have faith in God." He then went on, as in terms of Eastern imagery, to declare that there are no limits to what God will do for those who see Him clearly and trust Him fully. It may be that such vision and such faith will only come to us after much prayer, much self-discipline, and much search. But these will be well expended if they bring us to His feet and make us the more willing and docile instruments of His will. "Without faith it is impossible to please Him; for he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." It is as true to-day as when Christ miraculously cured the impotent man at Bethesda that: "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work."

It would be very helpful at this time and in view
Wendland on of these events if a recent German book, "Der
Miracles. Wunderglaube im Christentum," by Professor Wendland could be translated into English and so made available for a larger circle of readers. A good account of it is given by Professor Mackintosh in the *Expository Times* for May. This, however, will only reach a limited circle and the usefulness of the book might well be extended to a wider area. Many of the

older, time-honoured and now somewhat hoary arguments against the possibility of the miraculous are disposed of in clear and convincing fashion. The view that miracles are contrary to the laws of Nature, the conception of Nature as a closed mechanical system, even the view that miracles would be a contradiction of God's own unchangeable order of the world—all receive full discussion and adequate criticism. Science may rightly reduce her observations of external phenomena' to "natural laws," but then "natural laws" are no exhaustive description of reality. As for an "unchangeable" world order, do we not speak hastily in using any such term? If God be not only immanent but transcendent, He who has done great things in the past may have in store greater and undreamed of possibilities for the future.

**His Message
for Us.** The book, however, is not merely a refutation of well-worn objections. The positive side of its teaching is strong and peculiarly appropriate to our present needs. Faith in miracle, says Professor Wendland, is simply faith in *the living God*. From this point of view he defines miracles as "acts of God producing a condition of things not already latent in the existing texture of the world." A further consequence follows. If God lives and works, and if the "uniformity of Nature" as an ultimate metaphysical postulate is purely mythical, then it is impossible to limit the era of miracles to a distant past. The present and the future may reveal to us the intervention of God in His creation in ways more striking than any records of the past can show. Again, a further consequence is the marvellous illumination cast upon the possibilities of prayer. It may be that the faithful prayer of the children is the necessary condition which the Father awaits in order to display in ways unheard of yet, the wealth of His power of love. Professor Wendland's book is a message to us that as Theists and as Christians, we have every right to look for God's miraculous power to-day, if only we on our part not only "believe

that He is" but also that "He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him."

We have received, from the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, a small booklet explaining the Edinburgh findings with regard to Jewish missions. Great stress was laid on the fact of the enormous influence which the Jew is wielding throughout Christendom. It is entirely true that missions to the Jews are too often looked upon as merely a side issue, or even as the hobby of the few. The brotherly love which should characterize our Christianity has never quite extended itself to the Jew, whilst so-called liberal thought has tended to leave them alone as possessing a pure morality and an almost sufficient revelation. We are not pleading. We do not plead here for money, but we venture to suggest that as in the months to come the missionary problem is put from our pulpits, a proper place should be given to the Jewish factor in the whole situation.

It is a matter for devout thankfulness that we may hope soon to see the total disappearance of the opium traffic between India and Chinese ports. The existence of this traffic has been a dark blot on the British control of India, and all who have a worthy conception of our Imperial responsibilities will rejoice at its extinction. We must not, however, in our philanthropy, forget the claims of justice. We must be prepared to bear the burden of our own good deeds. The impending stoppage of revenue from the export of opium will have a serious effect on the Indian budget. Some of the Native States, which have been largely devoted to the cultivation of the poppy, will be brought to the verge of bankruptcy. The rulers of these States will have but a poor idea of British justice, if they are left to grapple unaided with the difficulties into which this Opium Agreement, signed on May 8, will plunge them. When we freed the West Indian slaves, we faced the consequences and paid the cost. In this case, too, we must not

“offer burnt offerings unto the Lord our God of that which doth cost us nothing.” If the doing of this great act of righteousness means sacrifice, we must see to it that the sacrifice is ours and not that of those who may be impoverished by our policy.

If a scheme can be evolved which will mitigate
State
Insurance. in the lives of thousands of our fellow-countrymen the effects of sickness and involuntary unemployment, it ought to meet with a welcome from every Christian man. None know better than the working clergy what it means when the bread-winner is sick or out of work. Politics apart, entire agreement perhaps apart, we are grateful to the Government for the evolution of their scheme, and thankful that it has met with a cordial reception from all political parties. It will require the most careful consideration ; many changes and modifications will have to be made, but it is aimed to meet a need of extraordinary magnitude, and we must all conspire to carry it through in its most effective form. The criticism of the *Spectator* suggests that it will cost double the money that is estimated, and asks where will that money come from. It will be costly, doubtless. We shall all have to contribute ; the taxpayer will pay part ; the consumer will pay a larger part, and the man with a fixed income, both through tax and cost of living, will feel his contribution most. But there is a patriotism and there is a Christianity which can gladly pay a large contribution to the common welfare, if it be justly exacted, and if it bring a real boon to those most in need. We hope that the voice of the Church of England will be heard only on the side of that patriotism and that Christianity.

In the April number of the *Interpreter* there is
A New Theory
of the
Third Gospel. an interesting article by a layman, Mr. George MacKinlay. He has a new theory of St. Luke. He notices that sometimes St. Luke records the same event three times over—*e.g.*, the conversion of St. Paul and more doubtfully the vision of Peter and his visit to Cornelius.

He then proceeds to argue, that the main body of St. Luke's Gospel, from chapter iv. onwards until the story of the Passion is reached, is a threefold account of the last journey to Jerusalem. The first account is contained in the section, iv. 31 to x. 42. Then he harks back to the same point and tells the story of the same journey again until xiv. 24. Then he begins again for the last time and completes the triple account at xx. 18. We are interested, but we are not convinced, nor are we sure that Mr. MacKinlay's theory warrants the deductions that he draws from it. He imagines that it settles the difficulty as between St. John and the Synoptists. We rather incline to think that it complicates that difficulty. St. John seems to speak of several visits to Jerusalem. If Mr. MacKinlay be right, we are inclined to ask why St. Luke confines himself to one. We can understand the Synoptist mainly dealing with the Galilean ministry and St. John with the Judean, and we believe that there are indications in each of the ministry dealt with in the other, but we cannot help but feel that Mr. MacKinlay's theory renders an already complex problem more complex still. At the same time we are glad to notice his article as a piece of careful study and an effort at a new solution.

A tragic interest is attached to the fifth article W. Heneage Legge. in our present issue—that by Mr. Heneage Legge on “The Archbishops of Canterbury as Lay Lords.” A proof of this article was sent, in the usual way, to Mr. Legge a few weeks ago. It was returned to the Editor by his son, with the news that Mr. Legge had just passed away. The article is therefore printed without any revision on the part of the author. Mr. Legge's writings have appeared before now in the pages of the CHURCHMAN. We record here with sorrow his loss, and offer our respectful sympathy to his relatives on whom the shadow of bereavement has fallen.



Modernism and the New Testament.

BY THE REV. G. FOSTER CARTER, M.A.,

Rector of St. Aldate's, Oxford.

FOR authority in religion, the old cry of "Back to the Bible" has in recent theology been modified to the truer cry of "Back to Christ." But Modernism, judged by its most prominent exponents, would take the cry back farther still. "Back," it says, "to the formal religious sense." "Back to the religious idea common to mankind."

It is the almost entire reliance on subjective authority, the undue depreciation of external fact, which marks the Modernist position, that we should venture to consider an almost grotesque exaggeration, and a hasty rush from a perhaps too great tyranny of Church or Bible to a want of recognition of any external authority, without which no system, religious or otherwise, can possibly for long survive. We have to ask: "Is spiritual authority entirely subjective, fluid, in the making? or is there any part of it which is objective?"

To this latter question the Modernist would return an uncompromising "No." But in an age when scientific research is leading its students to believe in some objective spiritual reality to which all the manifestations of natural law must be referred, we may with the more certainty believe that there is some real objective truth for the soul of man to which it may appeal as authoritative; and, further, because as Christians we must, so, upon the basis of historic fact, we may, appeal to the life and teaching of Jesus Christ as such objective authority.

We cannot be satisfied with thinking of Him as merely the highest embodiment of human conscience or an idealization of human faith. Yet that is all that Jesus means to the Modernist, who refuses to admit objective facts in His life, and cannot see, except in the dimmest manner, any permanent authoritative teaching in His words, for those, in so far as we have them, are in Modernism's view almost entirely concerned with a

conception which was not even His own, but borrowed from contemporary Jewish thought, of the nearness of a catastrophic end of the world.

To us the central fact of the life of Christ is that He really rose again from the dead. But for the Modernist the Resurrection is truth in faith, not in fact. "The Resurrection," says Father Tyrrell, "is a visionary presentment of spiritual immortality. What the Apostles saw was a vision of their own faith in His spiritual triumph and Resurrection in the transcendental and eternal order, a vision externalized by the very intensity of their faith, a vision that was Divine just because the faith which produced it was Divine."

So the other events in Jesus Christ's life are not to the Modernist objective realities at all, but the creations of the faith of the early Christians.

And to the Modernist no particular dogma as to Jesus Christ is true or untrue. "Do you ask," says Mr. Lilley, "whether the Modernist really believes in the Divinity of our Lord or in miracles? The habit of mind out of which such questions can arise is too obviously obtuse to the whole Modernist position. Modernism is, above all things, a denial that dogma is a sum of truth. It insists that it is a body of truth, fashioned by the soul of truth which inhabits it, and *in time* providing that soul with a means of expression."

To the Modernist there is, indeed, a transcendent world of ultimate realities, and a Divine power which works therein. Nor is it without effect upon this world in which we live: it makes for righteousness, and without it all human moral progress would be impossible. But it cannot really express itself. Each age adopts a symbolism of it suitable to its own particular mind and needs. And the age of the New Testament certainly did not adopt an authoritative symbolism of this transcendent world, because the symbols it used—the kingdom of God, hell, heaven, Satan—teach rather eschatology than morality.

But when we say "Christianity is Christ," we mean belief in an historic Jesus of Nazareth who was the Christ, trust in an

objective Divine revelation made by Him—in symbols certainly, because language - communication means symbolism (but no other expression of truth is possible), yet, in enduring symbols, which contain in them, although they are perhaps even yet largely unexplored territory, all that the material world can know of the transcendent, and sufficient to link the two together.

And to say that we believe in an historic Jesus of Nazareth brings us immediately to the claims of the New Testament. The Modernist's thought of the New Testament is the corollary of his thought of the person and work of Christ. To him, of course, it is only a first century (or, more truly, largely a second century) Christian presentment of the ideas of the general religious sentiment of mankind which justified themselves to the needs of the humanity of that time. It presents, therefore, to him only a temporary phase of thought and a particular systematization of knowledge, and is an interesting survival of the beliefs of a long-past age. But it can thus be of no permanent value to the Christian of other ages than its own, except in so far as it corresponds to the mind and needs of the particular age and his own conscience and reason.

In itself, moreover, to the Modernist the New Testament presents few features which he wishes to regard as permanently authoritative. Obsessed by the thought of apocalyptic as the sole characteristic of the New Testament age, he regards the Fourth Gospel (just because it contains less of it) as a second-century work, as a construction of faith rather than a record of fact; and in the Synoptists themselves, which he dimly sees to be not wholly eschatological, he finds the theological and ecclesiastical preoccupations of the second Christian generation.

It is thus in virtue of his religious sense that the Modernist rejects the claims of the New Testament to be anything more than a tolerably correct picture of what that same religious sense was some eighteen centuries ago.

It is also in virtue of something subjective which we recognize as of Divine authority—i.e., the virtue of reason and conscience

within—that we take the exactly opposite point of view as to the claims of the New Testament. We claim that, as Arthur Hallam said of his own experience, so eighteen centuries of experience, and not least the experience of the present time, has said about the revelation of Jesus Christ in the Bible: “It fits human hearts as a key fits a lock.”

We do not recognize the Bible as authority simply because it has been made to pose as such.

We quite agree with the Modernist that any external authority can alone be appreciated as valid, and obtain our obedience, as Christian men, when it corresponds with spiritual experience and wins the sanction of our conscience and reason. We certainly do not claim for the Bible that it is to be accepted as an authority from the outside, irrespective of its appeal to our reason and conscience. But we claim, because of the Divine element present in the Holy Scriptures, that where they do not so appeal either to a generation, a race, or an individual, the fault is not to be attributed to the temporary nature of the revelation itself, but to the limitations of human knowledge combined with the pride of human intellect, and to the warp of human will caused by sin.

Moreover, frankly, we think that the reason why the Modernist finds in the New Testament only a contemporary photograph of a long-past religious sense springs from a view of the documents which compose it, which is historically defective.

The fact of Christianity is too great a miracle for our credence, if in the Gospels, the sole records of the life of its founder, there “remains,” as Loisy says, “but an echo, necessarily weakened and a little confused, of the words of Jesus, the general impression He produced upon hearers well disposed towards Him”—and this in an early second century dress.

We say that such a view negatives any idea of inspiration which is worthy of the name. And for us without some inspiration the appearance of such a character as the Jesus delineated in the four Gospels is unbelievable. What else has the early

second century Christian imagination produced that we should think of it as capable of such a superhuman *tour de force*? The Shepherd of Hermas, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Epistles of Clement and Ignatius! The early second century Christian literature—all the Christian literature before A.D. 200—is most meagre in quantity, and oftentimes puerile in quality. The greatest gulf is fixed between it and the New Testament. And yet we are asked to believe that it produced entirely the marvellous Fourth Gospel (and the Modernist admits the marvel of its composition as much as we do) and gave their distinctive character to the other three. And this conception of a second-century origin of our central documents—this old Tübingen hypothesis dished up again, merely with its fatuous differentiation between Paulinism and Petrinism taken away—we are asked to accept at a time when criticism itself is distinctly swinging back to a more conservative position, when Harnack defends the Lukan authorship of the Third Gospel and the Acts, and Johann Weiss urges, in a recent book, the personal knowledge by Paul of our Lord Himself, and the close connection between the two.

We do not and cannot admit that all we get in the New Testament is the early second century Christian idea of Christ, or even the first-century idea. The figure of Jesus of Nazareth is so infinitely above any other creation of the highest literary genius that we emphatically disbelieve in such a colouring and adaptation of it as amount to a creation, at the hands of a community of men who by their history, their environment, and by their other records which have come down to us, have shown themselves conspicuously unendowed with literary skill or the power of artistic conception. And yet can anyone, with the records before him and the history of the Christian centuries behind him, doubt the skill, the grace, the power of the conception of the Jesus of the Gospels?

Yet to believe that in Jesus Christ, as conceived in the New Testament, we have an objective authority for all time, does not mean that there is no room for the principle of *development*, for

which the Modernist stands. For we may agree with him that the setting of the portrait of Jesus Christ in the New Testament is of the first century—is Eastern, is at least in part Judaic.

There is change of taste at various epochs as to the kind of frame which suits a picture. In the differing aspects of Christ's person and work given us by the Synoptists and by St. John we find an early instance of such a change of taste.

In the setting, then, of the central picture of the New Testament there is room for and need for development. This is surely suggested in the mission of the Holy Spirit, "to take the things of Christ and to show them to men"; "to guide into all truth." Does not this imply that the form in which the Divine Revelation is conveyed will differ and develop, while its substance does not change?

Let us take, for example, two parts of the framework in which alteration and development has lawfully taken place.

1. THE ESCHATOLOGICAL TEACHING OF JESUS CHRIST.

We disclaim the Modernist contention that the Apocalyptic elements in the teaching of Jesus were essential and the moral only subordinate.

We deny that the *whole* teaching of Jesus as to the "kingdom of God" represented it as a speedy and catastrophic upheaval entirely apart from all human life and conditions, for we know that sometimes, as in the Parable of the Mustard Seed, it is represented as a natural evolution from within. Moreover, we do not feel that the permanent import of the revelation of Jesus is affected by the very extensive amount of eschatological teaching which we allow His words contain; for that teaching, so far from being falsified by events (as Modernism says), found its justification in the destruction of Jerusalem, the bankruptcy of the old creeds as evidenced by Emperor-worship, the setting up of the Church. In very truth these were, and though not in the whole sense in which first-century Christians

imagined such an end and coming, an "end of the age" and a "coming of the kingdom."

Yet, nevertheless, we recognize that the New Testament, as written at a time when social and moral conditions were so bad that a remedy for their ills seemed likely to be found rather in a catastrophic change from without than in a gradual evolution of the best from within, laid more stress on eschatology, on the immediacy of the end, than most subsequent centuries have, and than the present century either can or ought to.

We recognize that there has lawfully been a development in the way in which the New Testament eschatology has been appreciated. We may rightly allow that in the application of Jesus Christ to the modern world, when the revolution in physical science makes men look both at the beginning and the end of created things rather as gradual evolutionary processes than as single catastrophic acts, greater stress should now be laid on that other part of the teaching of Jesus Christ which tells us that God's sickle will be only put in when the corn of the earth is fully ripe.

2. THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF JESUS CHRIST.

In the framework in which this, too, appears in the Gospels, we recognize that there are parts which apply to the age for which the New Testament was written, and which, by lawful development, have given way now to something larger and more elaborate.

We might take, for example, the social status of womanhood, especially in the Pauline conception. But I prefer to take the question of slavery. Not only the Old Testament, but the New Testament condones slavery. There is not the faintest suggestion there that the present absolute duty of Christian slave-owners is to free their slaves. Nor can it be pleaded that in kind the slavery of the first century was less a socially degrading thing than the slavery of the American or West Indian plantations. But Jesus Christ's social teaching adapted itself to the state of society in which it arose.

And many centuries had to elapse before there came that view of the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man, and the worth of the individual which led to the abolition of slavery in the name of Jesus Christ.

That was plainly a development—a lawful development, a development which everyone now sees to be in accordance with the Spirit of Jesus. But, notice, it has meant an alteration of the social framework of the Christian Gospel. The New Testament writers did not see the question as we see it, and could not.

So we recognize that, in an age when a revolution in social science has taught us the essential solidarity of the race, it is a lawful development of Christianity that we should claim for Jesus Christ supremacy in the social law of classes and nations as well as in the spiritual law of the individual soul. We believe it is right to bring Jesus Christ into relationship with the social question, and we have faith to see that all social problems find their solution in a recognition of, and a gradual permeation by, His Spirit, although, in strictest truth, the New Testament does not deal with the social problems of the first century—the relations of capital and labour, for instance—such as we claim that Christianity must deal with to-day.

Then there is some common ground on which the Modernist and the Evangelical—for whom the Bible is the Word of God—may meet; viz., the belief in the action of the Eternal Spirit of God in altering the colour and the proportions of the framework in which the precious picture of the Life of God in Jesus Christ has come down to us. As far as that framework is concerned, we may believe, with the Modernist, that God meets the age where it is, especially because we also believe that in the development of physical or of social science through the ages the action of the Divine Spirit can be found.

But we differ *toto cælo* from the Modernist because we think that this development applies only to the framework, but that the essentials of the Bible presentation of God's revelation—the Fatherhood of God, the Historic Life of Jesus Christ, the

Incarnation, the Atonement, the Ministry of the Spirit—are objective realities, permanent and eternal.

We do not, cannot—were fools to believe that the Bible presentation of Jesus Christ is like the infant's swaddling clothes, which are dropped with the very beginnings of growth. We maintain, on the other hand, that we are not working outwards from that revelation, so as to cast it off like a slough; but that all lawful development works around it, sometimes one age regaining the ground which the last has lost, sometimes occupying for the first time one of its good and large lands untilled hitherto, but always finding that there, in the Bible-revelation still only partially appreciated, is the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

We recognize that it is the only line for the Roman apologist, who wants to gloze over, or to find normal development in, all the many puerilities of his creed, and the false and even contrary deductions which it has made in dogma from its assumed premises, to say that "the Catholic Church has no more need to be identical with the religion of Jesus than a man has need to preserve at fifty the proportions, features, and manner of life of the day of his birth in order to be the same individual." But we do not believe that the Jesus of the Gospels is but the starting-point of revelation. He is not merely revelation's cradle; He is its school, its college, its home, its rest. And He is found, in actual historic fact, only in the pages of the New Testament. And therefore for us, because the historic Jesus of Nazareth of whom alone it speaks, and to whom it testifies, is also the eternal Divine Christ, the Bible must be the touchstone for any development of faith which shows itself as the ages run, and such development must be appraised as Christian or condemned as contrary to the spirit of Christianity just as it is found or not found there.



Orders and Reunion.

BY THE REV. A. W. F. BLUNT, M.A.,
*Vicar of Carrington, sometime Fellow and Classical Lecturer of Exeter
College, Oxford.*

THE question of Christian Reunion deserves to be a first charge, not only upon the work and prayers of Christian people, but also upon their thoughts and study. That our Lord's intention was for His disciples to be united in one visible fellowship is a truth which we must incessantly bear in mind, and from which all our interest in ecclesiastical matters should derive its inspiration and its ideal. But the besetting danger in this, as in so many other matters connected with religion, is not the lack of earnestness nor the lack of enthusiasm for an ideal, nor even, perhaps, the lack of study, but the lack of scientific study—the lack of a really scientific appreciation of the problem set before us. It is not enough to be keenly interested in such a topic; it is not enough to be ardently zealous for such an ideal; we must also be methodical and scientific students of the situation, of its difficulties and its possibilities. We must face facts and we must study history, if our interest is to be more than mere emotion and sentiment; and the chief defect underlying the modern conduct of denominational controversies is probably to be found in these two directions. It is the rank and file of parties and schools who are usually most talkative, or, at least, most positive; it is also they who study least, and least widely. It is probably useless to require that our minds should not be to some extent clogged with prejudices; but we may at least seek to temper our prejudices by attempting to become acquainted with other points of view besides those to which we have been brought up. And it is certainly not unreasonable to ask that we should be able to shake ourselves, in some measure, free from the tyranny of catch-words—that we should be able to go beneath the catch-words to the realities which they were in the first instance intended to

express. Again, we profess to be willing to look facts in the face ; but we are not disinclined to look at them with the wish to defy them rather than to learn from them. We are ready to think that if the facts will not accommodate themselves to our theories, so much the worse for the facts. We refuse to consider the possibility that our theories may be in need of readjustment in order to meet the circumstances of the case.

I do not propose that we should consent to join in the worship of that latest fetish, "the man in the street," the image which the modern spirit of democracy has set up for our worship. The experience of parish work furnishes considerable opportunity of becoming acquainted with his normal attitude upon the subject of the differences between Christian denominations, and I believe that his view might be succinctly expressed in the words of his stock axiom, "We are all going the same way." He has a feeling of profound indifference for all distinctions of party or sect, except in so far as they give him an excuse for standing aloof from all forms of organized religion. He assumes, without troubling to defend, the right of the individual to form promiscuous associations or to join any existing association in which he finds that which he wants. He has an inveterate disposition for forming or joining private connections, and this is true, not only of those who decline the ministrations of the English Church, but also of many who use them—not only of the man in the street, but also of many a man in the pews. For no small proportion of these the church in which they worship is the church of which they are members ; their outlook is either parochial or congregational ; they treat the English Church as merely the sect which has engaged their favour, or the church which they attend as merely the building and congregation in which they feel themselves most at home. So far as any theory of Churchmanship is concerned, they are as defective as the most ignorant upholder of invertebrate Christianity.

We can scarcely, I think, regard such an outlook as really enlightened or scientific. It has at least two cardinal faults. In the first place, it is merely individualist, whatever be its par-

ticular character, for parochialism and congregationalism are only Individualism writ large. And, in the second place, it is merely pragmatic in its view of truth. It is based upon the notion that there are many kinds or degrees of religious truth, and that each individual may select that kind or degree which suits him, and thus it is as hopelessly unscientific as undenominationalism. The cause of Christianity can never be satisfactorily based upon any theory which possesses these two defects. For the problem which Christianity professes to answer is a cosmic problem, and therefore can only be solved by a cosmic witness of Christendom to the world. Christian individualism may coexist with the edifying of Christian individuals, but it cannot coexist with the edifying of a Christian world. And, in the second place, the idea of Christianity is the idea of a system of revealed truth, progressively apprehended; and this idea is wholly incompatible with the notion that there can be a more and a less of truth for various people respectively, without harm resulting to the general structure of the system. If the line of thought, which forms as it were the main artery of the system, ends, for instance, in the Sacraments, then we can say that virtually it began also in the Sacraments; and to cut it short, before that point is reached, is not only to curtail the line, but to divert its whole direction; not only to mutilate the system, but to enfeeble it right down to the very heart. No difference can appear in conclusions, unless it was already latent in the premises. And a half-truth, unless it is distinctly acknowledged to be only preliminary and propædeutic to a farther advance along the same line, a half-truth acquiesced in as satisfactory and final, is a worse enemy to truth than absolute falsehood. Whatever may be the case with material architecture, at any rate in the architecture of thought, a building cannot have a steeple superimposed as an optional ornament; the steeple must have been in the original design before ever the foundations were laid.

But if we cannot accept the man in the street as the dictator or arbiter of ecclesiastical theories, we are not thereby absolved from attempting to supply his need of a theory. It is of no use

to repeat catch-words to him. Even if we understand them, he does not. His whole habit of thought and speech is alien to them, and he will not accept them on authority from anyone. He asks for realities made real to him, and this need we cannot meet so long as we have not made the realities real to ourselves. We cannot explain our principles until we have grasped them firmly ourselves—until we have ceased to be the slaves of our terminology.

There are many catch-words which are commonly used among controversialists and other people of every shade of ecclesiastical colour, often in irreconcilably different senses. Among such are the words "Catholic," "Real Presence," "Apostolic Succession," and so forth, and the phrase "Valid Orders" is, I cannot help feeling, another instance. Different parties attach totally different significations to the phrase, in accordance with their several theories, and the consequence is that discussion of the idea has largely lost all reality. My wish, in this essay, is to begin with the first principles which must underlie all discussion on the subject. If we can carry back our controversies to the fundamentals, we shall at least see where the divergences begin. At the present time we only know where they end, and, since they end in an utter confusion of issues, a return to the beginning may at least help to clarify the problem.

I will begin, therefore, by laying it down as an axiom that the Christian Church, as an historical society, has the duty of preserving an historical continuity, so far as may be possible, throughout all succession of changing conditions; and that this continuity must be one, not only of spirit, but also of structure. This, and nothing less than this, appears to me to be involved in the whole course of primitive Church history; and the classical expression of the idea is found in St. Paul's doctrine of the one Body and the one Spirit. The two must be taken together. Structural continuity is an element in spiritual continuity. But I would ask careful note to be taken that the term to be used is "continuity," and not "identity." It seems

monstrous to suppose that the Christian Church, alone among all societies in the world, is not to be allowed to alter its forms and reshape its framework in accordance with the demands of the ages. There may be, and there must be, development; and development may mean the evolution of one form out of another. Slavery to primitive ideas, for the sole reason that they are primitive, is mere acquiescence in that tyranny of custom which all history proves to involve stagnation of life. This is the fundamental defect underlying all theories of Church organization and practice which are based upon the desire to copy accurately past types. We find it in that strange doctrine—nowadays so fashionable—that our ideal in matters of ritual and worship should be to reproduce exactly every iota of medieval practice, on pain of being denied the epithet of “Catholic.” We find it in the assumption of the Independents that, because the primitive Christian system was largely congregational, therefore the Congregationalist system is bound on the back of the Christian Church for all time; and that too, apparently, without regard being paid to the fact that every precaution was taken by the primitive Christians to secure harmony between the various congregations in matters of faith and doctrine. We find it equally in the theory of the Presbyterians that, because the Apostolic Churches were in the main governed by presbyters, therefore Presbyterian government is the ideal system for every age.

If such be the true view, then the question simply resolves itself into the choice of the particular epoch to be copied. Do we prefer to copy the medieval, the sub-Apostolic, or the primitive epoch? It is a mere matter of individual preference and private choice; we are to suppress all the teachings of antiquity save those of that period which we favour. Such a view is a treason to the belief in the continuous guidance of God’s Holy Spirit in the Church. We must realize that development is of the essence of God’s way of working, and that development may mean a total alteration of form. The Providence which brought one form into being may equally bring another and different form into being to

replace it. But, while this view is alone in accordance with a whole-hearted belief in the Spirit of God, at the same time we must recognize that antiquity has a claim to our respect, that continuous tradition has a moral authority over us. To break loose wantonly from the continuity of the Christian Society is the sin of schism. If we wish to link ourselves on to the past ages of the Christian Church, we must desire to carry on, through whatever developments and alterations, the fundamental principles of the Church's historical existence—those principles which were the sources of its vitality and the basis of its system from the beginning.

It appears to me that if we study carefully and without prejudice the literature of the New Testament, we find that the principles which are there regarded as vital and fundamental to all true Church life are three in number: firstly, the principle of conduct; secondly, that of truth; thirdly, that of life. This classification, which I venture to suggest, is neither taken at haphazard nor selected for the deliberate purpose of supporting a case. It seems to me to come to light spontaneously, as soon as we begin to notice the epithets which the New Testament applies to the Divine Spirit. We find that Spirit called the Holy Spirit, and connected with the life of righteousness; we find Him called the Spirit of Truth, and connected with the notions of faith, wisdom, understanding, and liberty—though the last connection no doubt refers primarily to the notion of moral and spiritual rather than intellectual freedom;—finally, we find the Spirit called the Spirit of Life, the Spirit of Adoption, and connected with the idea of corporate unity. These three divisions correspond to the triple classification which I have suggested. I think they are also involved in our Lord's definition of Himself as "The Way, the Truth, and the Life"; finally, they are in accord with that threefold division of human activities as moral, intellectual, and spiritual, which seems complete and satisfactory for all practical purposes, however much it may lack of scientific precision of analysis.

If, then, we recognize these as the three fundamental

principles of the Church's vitality, we must proceed to ask how the necessity for preserving them bears upon the question of the mutual relations of divers Christian bodies. And, firstly, as regards the principle of conduct, I do not believe that any clear guidance in the matter can be derived from its consideration. Every Christian system can produce, and has produced, Christian saints. Indeed, if I were to go farther, and to say that some non-Christian systems have produced Christian saints, I should only be repeating in other language what not a few of the earliest Church Fathers have already said. I think it would be possible to argue that different systems produce different types of saintliness. But it would be very difficult to compare one type with another in order to prove the superiority of any one type over the others. The facts on which to base a comparison are too intimate and personal to be called lightly into evidence. But, while the appreciation of this circumstance should serve in a negative manner to give us a needful caution against judging too hastily systems which we do not choose to adopt, at the same time we must maintain, in the face of all implications to the contrary, that Christianity is, and was meant to be, more than a system of morals. The type of mind, of which we see many examples nowadays, which draws a distinction between "the propagation of particular doctrine" and "the preaching of true religious ideals," very much to the disadvantage of the former, is one which has failed in observing at least two-thirds of the true purpose of the Christian revelation. Christianity was meant to provide not only a rule of conduct, but also a system of truth and a theory of life; and it is under these two heads, if anywhere, that we shall be able to find some guidance as to our relations with other Christian denominations.

The Christian attitude towards intellectual matters, as taught in the New Testament, is a compound of two factors—a jealous reverence for the essentials of the Christian revelation, and a deliberate recognition of the liberty of the individual mind. We are bidden to "contend for the faith once delivered to the saints," but we are also bidden to "prove all things." And the

history of Christian controversy revolves round the practical difficulty of adjusting these two duties to one another. The course of Christian history seems to lead to two conclusions : Firstly, that the Church must have a creed. Nobody could have been more careful than the Apostles in insisting that, if a man wished to be a member of the Church, there were some doctrines which he must believe. They sought to convince the man's own judgment ; they did not require or encourage a slavish obedience to doctrines delivered *ex cathedra* ; but, nevertheless, they were quite clear as to the fact that there was such a thing as necessary Church doctrine, and that a man who could not assent to it could not claim a position within the Church. And, secondly, the essential and obligatory doctrines of the Church must be deducible from the New Testament. That is the literature which the Church itself, by the slow working of general opinion, selected as providing the standard and norm of Christian doctrine ; and it is the final court of appeal in all questions with regard to dogma. Anything that could not stand such an appeal could not be imposed as an essential of the Christian faith. It might be a matter of pious opinion or customary practice ; it might have a certain degree of force, according to the unanimity with which it was recommended ; but it could not be laid down as a belief which must be held as a condition of Church membership.

Here, then, we find two maxims to apply to our modern controversies. Our own practice, I am afraid, has often been inferior to our theory. We have not always allowed that liberty in non-essential matters which is one of the two Apostolic elements in the Church's intellectual attitude ; we have sometimes been disposed to stifle or ban free inquiry and study, and we have sometimes inclined to insist on forcing upon everybody opinions and practices which have no, or no certain, Scriptural and Apostolic guarantee. But at least in theory we base our position upon the co-ordination of Scripture and Church tradition. And thus we hold strong ground when we declare that the Roman Church has adulterated the truth by

the disregard of Scripture, and the official discouragement of free inquiry and of the free exercise of the intellect, and that conversely the Nonconformist bodies in general appear studious to disregard the essentials of Apostolic tradition, and to set no limits upon the exercise of private eccentricity in matters of intellectual truth. It surely is not Apostolic, not in accordance with the whole teaching of the New Testament and the spirit of early Christianity, either to force people to believe any new dogma that a majority of the authorities may choose to promulgate, or to allow people, while remaining members of a Christian body, to believe or disbelieve at will, without any necessary regard to the historic creed, in which the essentials of the Christian revelation are summed up.

(To be continued.)



The Time of Communion at Troas.

BY THE REV. W. S. HOOTON, B.A.

IT is an admitted fact that in the earliest times the Holy Communion was administered in the evening, and the service at Troas, which is described in Acts xx. 7-12, might naturally be regarded as a plain enough example of the custom. Opponents of Evening Communion have generally sought for their main arguments in other directions, and into these it is not possible now to enter. But there has been manifested in some quarters a tendency to seek for a different interpretation of the passage just mentioned. Perhaps the force of the evidence which is supplied by Apostolic times in favour of administering the Communion in the evening has been felt to be so overwhelming as to call for some attempt to undermine the strong Scriptural position of those who maintain the practice.

Nothing, of course, can alter the fact that all other indications in Scripture point to the evening hour. What, then, can

be said upon the opposite side in the case of Troas? There are, apparently, three alternatives :

1. It may be questioned whether it is ever really seriously urged that St. Paul deliberately extended his discourse so that the actual Communion should take place after midnight. This argument would be so obviously against the tenor of the narrative, and so ridiculously puerile—moreover, it would be such a plain sign of weakness, and so clear an evidence of the straits to which its upholders were put—that it would not be fair to suggest that it has often, if ever, been seriously used. It must be noticed as an alternative—an alternative, too, which may have been adopted occasionally by irresponsible and hot-headed partisans—but it need not be further considered.¹

2. An interpretation which tends rather in this direction has, however, been maintained upon learned authority. The Bishop of Salisbury gives expression to it in "The Ministry of Grace" (pp. 315, 316). To avoid any possibility of unfair representation, and for the sake of clearness, it is necessary to quote the whole paragraph. "The first indication of this new arrangement," he says (*i.e.*, the transference of the service from evening to the following morning) "meets us in the account of St. Paul's travels after he had 'set in order' the troubles at Corinth, which had in some degree been connected with misbehaviour at the Eucharist. When he wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians, the 'Lord's Supper' or Agapé still formed one whole with the Eucharist. It took place, we may presume, like the Paschal Supper, at the beginning of the meeting, and was a scene sometimes of profane and unseemly confusion. But when he came back from Greece by way of Troas, a year or two later, we find him holding an all-night service on the first day of the week, of which the breaking of bread formed a part² (Acts xx. 7-12). The day began, as St. Paul's usage elsewhere implies, at sunset on the evening of the Sabbath. The preliminary

¹ The writer may perhaps be permitted to refer to what he has said upon this point, and also upon the whole case of the service at Troas, in "Turning-Points in the Primitive Church," pp. 173-178.

² N.B.—It was the main purpose of the gathering. See ver. 7.

service, including the Apostle's preaching, continued till midnight. Then followed the accident to Eutychus and his revival : and then at last came the 'breaking of bread,' followed by the meal. Whether the 'setting in order' at Corinth had anything to do with this arrangement or not, it is striking that the only account we have of the hour of a Eucharistic service in the Acts puts it after midnight."

We must pass over, for the present, the statement that the Lord's Day began at sunset, because it forms the central feature of the next interpretation to be noticed. But we observe that the Bishop definitely admits that Evening Communion was presumably the rule prior to this date, and also that he does not go so far as to state in terms that the alteration was due to the disorders at Corinth,¹ though he would apparently incline to trace such a connection if he could feel the evidence sufficient. What he does positively suggest, however, is that it was the Apostle's definite intention to hold an all-night service, the preliminary part of which was to continue till midnight ; indeed, it seems to be implied throughout the section in which he deals with the subject that such an arrangement was probably the custom at an early period in the Church's history. Space is lacking for full quotation, but these implications are to be found on pp. 304, 310, and 312-315. Moreover, it could scarcely be thought " striking that the only account we have of the hour of a Eucharistic service in the Acts puts it after midnight," unless it be presupposed that matters were definitely arranged with a view to Communion at that time. But, it may be asked with all respect, does not this come perilously near the first alternative already considered ? The key to the whole narrative is that the sermon was unexpectedly prolonged ;² in fact, it seems to have been a conversational discourse rather than a

¹ The Bishop of London recently implied this, and drew from the Rev. Dr. Griffith Thomas in the *Churchman* (May, 1910, p. 324) the statement that " there is nothing whatever in the New Testament to justify the conclusion."

² Ver. 9 says, " διαλεγόμενον . . . ἐπὶ πλείον"—R.V., "discoursed yet longer." Dr. Weymouth renders it : "preached at unusual length."

sermon (see ver. 7, *διελέγεται*—so also ver. 9 : the Revised Version brings out the sense well in both). There was, in all probability, an element of homeliness about it. The converts, having St. Paul among them, seized the opportunity for discussing questions till late in the night. The discussion was greatly prolonged, as his departure was imminent.¹ Such a case might happen in the mission-field to-day, and can easily be imagined. The room was, perhaps, crowded and hot (see ver. 8), and Eutychus fell asleep. Indeed, the testimony of the incident in favour of Evening Communion is immensely strengthened by the fact that it is, to all appearances, not so much intended to give an account of a service as to relate the miracle performed. This seemingly undesigned evidence, throwing light upon a difficulty which was to be felt acutely after so many centuries, if not before, is very forcible.

Once again, even if it could be assumed that an all-night service had been planned on this occasion, it certainly could not be maintained that such was the custom without the strongest evidence. It might conceivably have been arranged on so interesting and special an occasion, though the trend of the narrative is distinctly in the other direction, and it would not under such circumstances be possible to regard it as a "striking" indication of any tendency with reference to the hour of the service. But a weekly gathering extending over so many hours is wellnigh incredible. The case of Eutychus itself affords some evidence that Christians, like other people, were usually asleep at such a time. And when we examine the Bishop's line of discussion, we find, indeed, several interesting suggestions of reasons why an all-night service would be likely to appeal to early Christians (especially with reference to the expectation of the Lord's Advent), but no direct evidence whatever in support of the view, except the assumption that the Troas incident is to be so understood. That is, of course, the very point under discussion.

¹ Perhaps it would not be lawful to assume, from the statement of Acts xx. 23, that the little Church realized that they had an opportunity which would never recur. But it is a tempting conclusion. Cf. ver. 25, 38.

It could not even be argued that the meeting had been arranged a few hours *earlier* than usual, in view of the departure of the Apostle in the morning; for it seems only to be urged that the case of Troas marks a transitional tendency,¹ not that the transition had already taken place whereby the service was customarily held in the early morning (as described by Pliny in his letter to Trajan). Besides, St. Paul did not leave till after daybreak (ver. 11), which would possibly have suited even Pliny's description ("ante lucem"), or at any rate would have made so early a gathering unnecessary. No doubt, as the Bishop seems to grant, the service began soon after sunset. Is it not unnatural to regard it otherwise than as a parallel case to other records of Evening Communion in Scripture?

3. The third alternative is expressed in a few words in a book lately published, "The Church of England as Catholic and Reformed," by the Rev. Canon W. L. Paige Cox. On p. 222 he says: "Amongst the Jews the ordinary day began at sunset, and the argument from the evening hour of the institution of the Sacrament really applies now to the propriety of an early-morning celebration, or at the most to one on Saturday evening, not on Sunday evening. Bishop Wordsworth, in his "Ministry of Grace" (second edition, p. 318), says: 'Of Communion on Sunday afternoon or evening there is, I believe, no trace'—that is, in the records of the Apostolic or Primitive Church."

It will be noted that the writer refers to the Bishop of Salisbury with reference to the point already reserved for discussion, and that his statement referring to the institution obviously covers other Scriptural indications of Evening Communion.

Now the main purpose of this view is to turn the argument from Scripture completely round, and to make it appear that, owing to the different methods of reckoning time, Scripture favours early Communion. The service, it is contended, was the first of the day; the day then began at sunset on Saturday;

¹ See p. 316: "The usage here exactly recorded is the natural transition to the custom described by Pliny."

it now begins at midnight ; therefore an early service is the most Scriptural. Let us examine the grounds upon which such a theory must rest, together with a few of its consequences, if correct.

It assumes that the service at Troas (like other similar gatherings) began on Saturday evening, not on Sunday ; and it may be granted that this view in itself seems reasonable, and has great authority behind it. But certain points do not seem to have been sufficiently considered.

(i.) The analogy of Luke xxiv. 36 and John xx. 19, 26, would appear to be strongly against it. The Bishop of Salisbury says (p. 312) : " The key to most of the early developments of the Eucharist is to be found in the Christian conception of the Lord's Day as a weekly commemoration of the Resurrection—that is, as a sort of minor Easter Day." Now the above passages record the first appearances of the Risen Lord to His assembled Church (*cf.* Luke xxiv. 33), and it is indisputable that they occurred on the *Sunday evening*. The Greek in John xx. 19 gives a peculiar emphasis to that fact, as the Revised Version suggests ; though it is also quite obvious otherwise, from the context. Moreover, it is wellnigh certain that they took place *after sunset*, which would be Monday, not Sunday, in Jewish eyes (though it is true that the Bishop says that St. John adopts the Roman day ; see further below). For it cannot credibly be argued that Luke xxiv. 36 and John xx. 19 refer to different occasions ;¹ and the notes of time and distance in Luke xxiv. 13, 29, 33, make it plain that the return journey of seven or eight miles from Emmaus was not begun till an hour which would practically fix the arrival at Jerusalem after dark.² When we remember the Bishop's connection of the primitive observance of the Lord's Day, and especially the

¹ Dr. Bruce and Dr. Marcus Dods (*Expos. G. T. : St. Luke and St. John*) both assume their identity, and Dr. Plummer (*International Crit. Comm. : St. Luke*) at any rate does not deny it. As the Bishop of Durham says (" Jesus and the Resurrection," p. 84), the appearance in St. Luke's Gospel is " certainly identical " with the other.

² *Cf.* Bruce, *Expos. G. T.*, Luke xxiv. 33 ; and the Bishop of Durham as above.

Holy Communion, with the Resurrection, is there not a distinct presumption that the gatherings of early Christians would have taken place at the hour when the Risen Lord Himself first appeared to His assembled servants ?

(ii.) Certain phrases in the narrative of Acts xx. seem most naturally to agree with such a presumption. From ver. 7 we learn that St. Paul intended to depart "on the morrow." If this necessarily meant "the next day" (however reckoned), it would be conclusive—for it would mean Monday; and as the departure was not long after daybreak (judging from ver. 11), the service must have been on Sunday evening, to bring it to a different day. Under Jewish reckoning, the departure was on *the same day* as the service, so that Roman reckoning alone would satisfy the conditions. But the Greek phrase τῇ ἐπαύριον in ver. 7 would probably be used in accordance with Greek ideas, whether the reckoning was Jewish or Roman; so that it would not be wise or fair to claim so easy a solution. There are, however, other things to be considered. The Bishop himself claims that the adoption of the Roman civil day was a factor in the change to Morning Communion (p. 315); he also considers that the gathering at Troas was "the first indication of this new arrangement" (*ibid.*); how, then, can he be sure that the influence of the Roman reckoning was not (under his theory) already beginning to be felt? It appears, he says, to have been recognized in Pliny's district early in the second century (p. 316)—and Bithynia was not very far from Troas, and was even farther from Rome than Troas was: is there any proof that it was not in use at a much earlier date? And would not this be natural in a Church which would probably be composed chiefly of Gentile converts?¹ Moreover, he points out that St. Luke's custom varied between the Jewish and Roman usages in describing days (p. 305). Now St. Paul's habit of speaking in the Jewish fashion (*ibid.*) would surely not be conclusive proof that the Roman day was not adopted at Troas at this time, as the Bishop seems to suggest

¹ Cf. "Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels," ii. 68.

(p. 316; see the long quotation early in this paper). St. Paul never refers to this occasion, and his custom in speaking would be merely the force of Jewish habit. But St. Luke's *variation of custom* is to some extent in favour of a growing adoption of Roman usage; and where, in face of this variation, he employs a term which seems to suggest that usage (*τῆ ἐπαύριον*, ver. 7) it cannot safely be assumed that he means readers of Acts xx. to understand the observance of the Lord's Day at Troas to have been after the Jewish fashion. Yet again: "St. John in his Gospel," says the Bishop, "shows a knowledge and acceptance of the Roman civil day" (p. 305; xx. 19 is mentioned, with other passages, in a note); and in his case, as we have seen, it is not that he had become accustomed to a mere manner of speech under Roman influence, but xx. 19, and presumably also 26, fix the hour of the meeting of the Saviour with His followers by clear notes of time. To say the least, where there is so much difference of custom, is it safe to take anything for granted without corroborative evidence, and do not John xx. and Luke xxiv. supply at any rate a very likely key to the solution of the problem? If the service was held on Sunday evening after sunset, and the Apostle left on Monday morning, everything is in harmony, and the most natural interpretation of the language of Acts xx. is satisfied.

(iii.) If, on the other hand, the Christians assembled on Saturday evening, and St. Paul left, as it would appear (ver. 11), soon after daybreak, he undoubtedly travelled on Sunday. Dean Plumptre, who took this view, was conscious that the difficulty might be felt, but disposed of it by the doubtful expedient of suggesting that the Apostle would not have held strict ideas upon the subject (quoting passages which at least require a more careful exegesis), and that, even if he and his friends had possessed such unlikely scruples, the ship would not have waited for them.¹ We cannot possibly enter now upon

¹ See his note in Bishop Ellicott's Commentary. His view is expressed in carefully-chosen terms; but if the above is not a true representation of it, it is difficult to see what is the meaning of a somewhat dangerously worded comment.

the many points of discussion that are suggested by so highly controversial an answer ; and it may be granted, perhaps, that the problem might not have been so pressing in that early age, when the transference of Sabbath observance from Saturday to Sunday may have been less complete, and when circumstances were so different. Even if we were forced to accept the theory, we should not therefore be driven to conclude that St. Paul was one of the first of those who hold an "early celebration" to be all that is required for the due observance of the Lord's Day. But, unless we were forced, many of us would prefer to doubt that an Apostle would have adopted a precedent liable to be quoted as an excuse for laxity in a later age, and also that, had he innocently done so in the different circumstances of the time, an inspired Evangelist would have been suffered to include such a fact in a history which is evidently made up of incidents selected under Divine guidance precisely because they contain high principles of action for the Church in all ages. But why should we be forced to accept it? Other reasons to the contrary have already been given, and they are strengthened by the inherent doubtfulness in this matter.

(iv.) Not the least remarkable feature of the theory is the apparent absence of direct evidence for it. It seems to rest chiefly upon this particular interpretation of Acts xx. Suggestions are made which would be likely enough if direct evidence were given ; but this is just what is difficult to discover in the Bishop of Salisbury's comments. Apparently the only reference to an ancient source of information (and this in a somewhat incidental manner) is to Socrates (H. E., v. 22), who speaks of traces of Communion "at the beginning of the night before the Sunday . . . even in the fifth century" in parts of Egypt (p. 317). Worded thus, the reference does at first sight look like a relic of an ancient custom. But how does Socrates himself word it? According to Dr. Zenos's translation : "For although almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the sabbath of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some

ancient tradition, have ceased to do this. The Egyptians in the neighbourhood of Alexandria, and the inhabitants of Thebais, hold their religious assemblies on the sabbath, but do not participate of the mysteries in the manner usual among Christians in general: for after having eaten and satisfied themselves with food of all kinds, in the evening making their offerings they partake of the mysteries." A note by the editor explains that "the sabbath" means Saturday, and that Sunday is never so called by the ancient Fathers and historians, but "the Lord's day" (*κυριακή*). Let it be carefully observed, however, that the Bishop is not strictly accurate in representing the weight of this testimony as if it could be referred to the beginning of Sunday's religious observances. It was, it is true, on "the night before the Sunday," but it is definitely regarded as *the close of Saturday's celebrations*. Socrates is comparing the custom of these particular Egyptians with that of other Churches with reference to the observance of *Saturday* as a liturgical day. The Bishop himself uses this very passage (p. 330) as an evidence of variation of custom in this respect in the Churches of Egypt, taking these particular cases as a contrast to the general Western rule of treating Saturday as a fast and non-liturgical! How can he then, on p. 317, consistently treat them as if they could be confidently regarded as a relic of an early custom which would include them in Sunday's services? It is plain that the emphasis of Socrates is on the fact that the observance in these instances was *later* than in other Churches (apparently chiefly Eastern; see "Ministry of Grace," p. 330), not that they were a few hours earlier than the Sunday celebrations elsewhere.

Were it necessary to labour the point further, it might be suggested that this solitary exception would be a slender thread upon which to hang so heavy a burden—even if it could be applied in the sense supposed. Such an exception might have arisen from other causes, especially as it is evidently considered so peculiar; and there is almost more than a suggestion that the objection to it had to do with the tradition of fasting,

to which reference will presently be made. But seeing that its very application seems to have been overstrained, what need is there to go farther?

(v.) Very briefly, it must at least be pointed out that learned authority is not unanimous in regarding the service at Troas as a Saturday evening gathering. The first article on the "Lord's Supper" in Hastings' "Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels," by the Rev. Dr. Falconer (ii. 68), assumes as a matter of course that it took place "on Sunday night."

In view, then, of all these considerations, is it not very far from certain that the Holy Communion at Troas took place on a Saturday evening? Yet, even if the point were established beyond doubt, it would not follow that it, and similar cases, fixed for all time the custom of celebrations early in the day's observances. But this would lead us to the consideration of other arguments for and against Evening Communion, upon which we have not space now to enter. The fact can therefore only be noted; and it should further be observed, with like brevity, that the theory, if true, would at least give no support to fasting Communion. It is, indeed, adopted by those who attack Evening Communion on other grounds. But there are still many on both sides¹ who hold that the main objection to the practice is that it makes fasting reception impossible.

One or two points must be noticed in conclusion. First, the theory would tell almost equally against Communion at midday. It is only a question of degree—viz., how far the time is shifted from the opening of the Lord's Day. But the Prayer-Book plainly contemplates that the Holy Communion should follow Morning Prayer (see the evidence of the Bishop of St. Albans before the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, vol. iii., especially Answers 21513, 21596 to 21600,

¹ The *Church Times* (May 16, 1910), referring to the *Churchman's* remarks alluded to above (upon the Bishop of London's view of Evening Communion) says: "We agree with our contemporary in its view that the real reason for communicating early is that the rule of fasting may not be broken." (The "rule," of course, is imaginary; nor was the view of the *Churchman* expressed in those terms!)

21648 to 21651). The Bishop of Salisbury suggests authority for "9 a.m. on Sundays as the 'canonical hour,' Mattins having been said previously" (p. 318). Whether such an arrangement could have been contemplated in the sixteenth century or not, it can surely be scarcely thought practicable now.

Again, Canon Paige Cox, in the passage quoted above, suggests that it might at least be possible to apply the Scripture examples to Saturday evening Communion. Does this mean that if, in view of our contention of the necessity of Evening Communion in our time, we were to arrange such services on Saturday instead of on Sunday, the opponents of the practice would be obliged to admit that we had Scriptural authority? If so, it would surely be a *reductio ad absurdum* of their objections! For which is better, a Communion when (at any rate in our altered conditions) the mind is distracted and the body wearied at the close of the busiest day of the week, or after the peace and quiet of Sunday? For it is certainly a day of comparative peace and quiet, even for those who cannot leave their homes in the morning, particularly when we remember the rush and bustle of Saturday for exactly this class of people. Indeed, they are just those who probably could not come on Saturday evening at all. Such an arrangement would, after all, only be another illustration of that bondage to tradition which characterizes so many of the objections to the Scriptural and primitive custom of Evening Communion. But would even such a concession meet with more than a most grudging assent? For is it not true that the main objection is to Communion *in the evening*? Yet there can be no doubt of the Scriptural authority for this.

To sum up, may it not be respectfully asked, even in the face of weighty and learned authority for one or two of the alternatives, Should we ever have heard of either of the three of them if there had been no special theory to defend? Once more let us press the inquiry, What is the *natural* interpretation of the incident at Troas?

The Reformation under Josiah.

BY THE REV. W. F. KIMM, M.A.

II.

IN a former article (in the November number), the two accounts of this Reformation given in Kings and Chronicles were compared, and it was shown that the chronological order of events as expressly stated in Chronicles is also necessarily implied in Kings, if the history is to be believed at all; and that the destruction of high places and the restoration of the central sanctuary took place *before* the finding of the roll.

This at once disposes of the theory that there had been no central sanctuary before this time, and that it was a spurious book of Deuteronomy that suggested the reform.

In this article it is proposed to consider the subject from another point of view, comparing the histories with the prophecies of Jeremiah, especially in regard to the witness they bear to the character of the reformation and its issue.

The order of events is found to be as follows :

1. The rising up of the young King in the twelfth year of his reign and the twentieth of his age, to make war upon the idolatry that prevailed throughout his kingdom. We are not told of any helpers or allies in the work : the king commanded, and by personal and untiring activity he accomplished the task. Six years were spent upon it, and when altars, idols, high places, and heathen priests had been destroyed everywhere the King "returned to Jerusalem."

The fact that so great a work was accomplished in spite of all the resistance of long custom and vested interests indicates that there was among the people some well-established tradition of a national worship of Jehovah at Jerusalem : else the authority of the King would hardly have prevailed, and the publication of a spurious book would not be likely to have much weight.

2. The next event is the repair or restoration of the fabric of the Temple, and after the removal of the idols and altars and

houses of shame that cumbered the sanctuary and its courts and gates, some work of repair would be indispensable.

The interesting thing is that the cost of the work was defrayed by contributions collected from the people from "Manasseh and Ephraim, and all the remnant of Israel and all Judah and Benjamin."

This collection itself is a proof that by this time a widespread movement for the worship of Jehovah at Jerusalem had taken place, as it is in the highest degree improbable that a people who were practising idolatry would of themselves, without any external influence, agree everywhere to contribute to the repair of the House of Jehovah. But if the King had been about and among them for six years, using to the utmost his authority and influence for the destruction of idols, and if they had yielded to him in this matter, we can understand that they might be ready to go farther and help him in the crowning act of the reformation.

3. To expedite this work of repair the King sent Shaphan and other officers of state to the high priest, and this royal commission implies that the King had no great reliance on the zeal of Hilkiah in this matter, and little, indeed, could be expected of one who had lived and officiated in the Temple under its recent conditions. However, the commissioners found that the work was being done satisfactorily; there were some zealous faithful workers, Levites, who now gladly undertook the work that pertained to their office.

It was to these royal commissioners that Hilkiah gave the roll of the Law which he had recently found in the House. It was "when they emptied out the money that was brought into the House" that the book was found, and maybe the roll was found in one of the money-chests, where it may have been secreted in the evil days of Manasseh, who like other persecutors would be a destroyer of sacred books. This book may have been the very book laid up near the Ark, and when the Ark was removed from the Sanctuary (as appears to have been the case, 2 Chron. xxxv. 3); this other treasure would be hidden

in any convenient receptacle, and a trumpet-mouthed money-chest might very well have been utilized. Another interesting suggestion has been recently made on this subject by a French writer.

4. Then followed the mission to Huldah and the distressing reply.

Then the King called upon his people to renew the covenant with Jehovah in His house, and then to hold the Passover solemnities. It may again be pointed out how utterly improbable it is that the King should at this juncture, *without any previous work of reformation*, be able to induce all his people to come up to Jerusalem to the covenant service, and then to submit to the destruction everywhere of all their idols and high places, and then to keep the Passover, and that all these things should be accomplished in one year, the eighteenth of his reign.

It may be that the covenant service and the Passover were suggested by the book, but if so it would not be Deuteronomy that would furnish Josiah with instructions. It is in Exodus that the Covenant-making is described, and it is in Exod. xii., Lev. xxiii., and Num. xxviii., that rules concerning the Passover are found, and without these the King would not know how to proceed. As there is no mention of a Passover in the days of Manasseh, it is likely that sixty or seventy years had elapsed since its last observance, and the King would therefore probably have no one about him with any personal knowledge of the matter.

The new critics attribute to Josiah the keeping of the Passover, but allow him no instructions except the few general expressions he might find in Deuteronomy. Surely, if ever the priestly code was needed it was in the eighteenth year of Josiah, not to speak of Hezekiah and Solomon.

Thus the historical records lend not the least countenance to the theory that the reformation was brought about by a recently written and spurious Deuteronomy. Such a theory is negatived by every circumstance in the story.

The King's alarm at the threatenings contained in the roll,

and the awful answer returned to him through Huldah, would move him to do everything that could be done to bring the people back to their God; and he did not cease to make war upon everything evil. "Moreover, them that had familiar spirits and the wizards and the teraphim and the idols and all the abominations that were spread in the land of Judah and in Jerusalem, did the King put away, that he might confirm the words of the law that were written in the book that Hilkiah the priest found in the House of the Lord."

Such is the account given us of the King's energy and zeal. He was successful in so far that he had his way. His authority was not openly resisted, and the face of things was changed. But what of the spiritual condition of the people? The idols were destroyed, the Temple was restored, the Covenant had been made, the Passover had been revived, and the wizards and necromancers put down by the strong hand of the King. "Like him there was no King that turned to the Lord with all his heart and with all his soul and with all his might, according to all the law of Moses. . . . Nevertheless the Lord turned not from the fierceness of His great wrath, wherewith His anger was kindled against Judah, because of all the provocations that Manasseh had provoked Him withal," and this must mean that, with all that the King did, nevertheless the people remained for the most part what they were in the days of Manasseh, alienated from the Lord. Josiah was warned of this, and the promise he received was only this: "I will gather thee to thy fathers, and thou shalt be gathered to thy grave in peace, neither shall thine eyes see all the evil which I will bring upon this place."

He was a brave man, indeed, who thus, from a strong sense of duty, persisted as long as he lived in a thankless and hopeless task.

We turn to Jeremiah, who was a contemporary of the King, and who was called to be a Prophet while still, as he says, a child, in the thirteenth year of Josiah's reign and the twenty-first year of the King's life, when he had already commenced his work of reform.

The prophet's first message (chapter ii.) is a remonstrance against idolatry, and implies that idolatry prevailed at the time (thus agreeing with the histories), but the force of the remonstrance consists in the knowledge the people possessed of their past history, and this past we find is the past recorded in the historical books now extant. There is no development of religious consciousness from fetishism to monotheism, but their history begins with a Divine deliverance and covenant, and is marked throughout its course by a tendency to degradation, that is kept in check only by Divine chastenings.

There are indications that some work of outward reformation had now begun, but the conscience of the nation was not awakened, and there was no acknowledgment of sin. "For though thou wash thee with lye, and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before me. . . . How canst thou say I am not defiled, I have not gone after Baalim? . . . Thou saidst, I am innocent, surely His anger is turned from me. Behold, I will enter into judgment with thee, because thou sayest, I have not sinned."

In chapter iii. there is a contrast drawn between the open rebellion of Israel and the pretended loyalty of Judah. The *backsliding*, the restive resistance, of the one is followed by repentance, the *treacherous* pretences of the other by ruin. True piety is not a matter of material and visible things. According to the histories Josiah's work of reformation began at the Temple, and much attention would be drawn to the Ark which seems to have been removed, probably during the days of Manasseh. The prophetic word at this time was that this very ark, the most precious piece of sacred symbolism, would be no longer inquired for or thought of in the better time to come, when Jerusalem would attain to its high destiny as the gathering place of the worshipping nations.

The opening words of chapter iv. imply that there was a movement of return to the purer worship: "If thou wilt return, O Israel, saith the Lord, unto Me shalt thou return."

There must be a real putting away of sin. The oath, "the

Lord liveth," must be used in truth and judgment and righteousness. The fallow ground must be broken up by the ploughshare of repentance; there must be no sowing of good seed among thorns; circumcision must be of the heart.

The exhortations are interrupted by warnings of coming destruction, and the prophet cries: "O Jerusalem, wash thine heart from wickedness, that thou mayest be saved. How long shall thy vain thoughts lodge within thee?" The words of false prophets promising peace are sternly reprov'd in several places in this part of the prophecy, and priests and prophets are frequently linked together for rebuke in subsequent chapters.

Chapter v. begins with a condemnation of prevailing impiety. There was not a man to be found who did justly and sought the truth, while the great ones of the land had with one accord broken the yoke and burst the bonds. Smooth words were spoken and fair professions made, but there was no health in the nation. Priests and prophets "healed the hurt of the people, lightly saying, Peace, peace, when there was no peace."

The beautiful and costly services in the Temple were vain. "To what purpose cometh unto Me frankincense? . . . Your burnt offerings are not acceptable, nor your sacrifices pleasing unto Me." The people were "refuse silver." The Lord had rejected them.

Chapter vii. may belong to the next reign, as there is mention here again of idolatry, which is not mentioned in the four preceding chapters.

But we find the Temple worship still in use, and the Temple a subject of boasting. The Prophet takes his stand in the Temple, and calls on the people to amend their ways, to cease from lying words that cannot profit, and sternly condemns the impiety of living in sin while they come and stand before the Lord in His house, making it a den of robbers. He bids them do what they would at the altar in violation of all rules of sacrifice, for it is not sacrifice the Lord required, but obedience.

Such is the general tenor of the succeeding chapters. Special attention is drawn in chapter xi. to the *covenant*, and

to the curse that must fall upon those who break their covenant with the Lord. There is mention of "a conspiracy to turn back to the iniquities of their fathers," implying that there had been a reformation, but that its force was now spent.

Thus the prophecy corresponds with the histories. There was an outward turning unto the Lord, a covenant made, the Temple services revived, words of piety on the lip, but no more, and, when the restraining hand of Josiah was withdrawn, there was a return to open idolatry.

That Jeremiah is not mentioned in the history of Josiah's reign, nor Josiah mentioned in the prophecy, is noticeable. The King must needs do the best he could with the men about him, but Jeremiah could not identify himself with the men who gathered about the King to enter into covenant with the Lord, while their hearts were far from Him, and their lives spent in self-seeking deceit and violence. And they would not desire his presence, and certainly would not yield to him a leading position. So Jeremiah would not appear in the history; and so, also, Jeremiah, as a prophet, does not commend a movement which, notwithstanding the piety and sincerity of the King, was without moral earnestness or spirituality. And Jeremiah had no message for Josiah, who had received a Divine word through Huldah, which would suffice to keep him to the end.

That Jeremiah knew and loved the King is evidenced by his bitter grief at his death; but the word of prophecy concerning this event is: "Weep not for the dead, neither bemoan him."

So Josiah does not appear in the prophecy.

It may seem difficult to believe that Josiah should of his own mind and will undertake so great a task, and persevere in it unto the end. But such men of resolution have appeared on the earth, and have succeeded. It is, however, possible, and indeed probable, that he was trained for the work from childhood. His grandfather spent the last years of his life in such a work, and Josiah, who was six years old when Manasseh

died, would have some personal recollections of him. His mother, Jedidiah, whose name is suggestive of pious parentage, may have set this work before him as the work that he, as King, sitting on the throne of the Lord, ought to undertake. The history of the kingdom would be known to him ; the names of Hezekiah and Isaiah would be an inspiration. He would know that his people had been called to be the people of Jehovah, and ought not to worship any other God ; and he would know, *pace* the critics, that the Temple at Jerusalem had been and was the one sanctuary where the people should worship.¹

We see that our literary sources—Kings, Chronicles, and Jeremiah—supplement and confirm one another in ways that are obviously undesigned, and that they lend no support to the theory of a spurious Deuteronomy placed in the King's hand to induce him to set up a central sanctuary. Every word in them condemns it, and it seems quite time that those to whom now are committed the oracles of God should refuse to regard such a theory as an assured result of criticism.

¹ Even the critics would grant him J and E and the prophecies of Hosea, Amos, Micah, Isaiah, etc.



The Archbishops of Canterbury as Lay Lords.

BY THE LATE W. HENEAGE LEGGE, Esq.

THE Primates of all England, during the Middle Ages, being temporal as well as spiritual peers, had possessions, powers, and privileges as secular and earthy as those of any earl or baron of the realm, knight of the shire, or lord of rural manor. They were, indeed, overlords of many a baron, knight, or squire who held lands under them; they were lords of the bodies as well as shepherds of the souls of many men and families of men dwelling on their demesnes. All these—their temporalities—were held with the same material object and managed by the same kind of officials, their deputies and servants—"ministers" as they were called—as were the lands of any lay lords.

Their chamberlains or stewards held their manor courts, their reeves managed their farms, and their collectors drew in the fiscal net, whose fine meshes allowed little to escape, while their bailiffs executed distrains and their parkers protected their parks.

The transactions of all these officials are to be found, to a large extent, extant to-day, enrolled on miles of narrow parchments, or, later, on reams upon reams of paper, and even the archiepiscopal registers contain a large amount of merely mundane matters. All these embrace an immense amount of detail, some curious and interesting, much trivial, their £ s. d. of their accounts extending from thousands of pounds to the sixteenth part of a farthing, all presenting the varied aspects of the archiepiscopal temporalities.

The first appearance of an Archbishop as a temporal peer was one—perhaps not unfittingly for the good of his soul—in which he had to play a secondary part—namely, his render of homage and oath of fidelity to his Sovereign as his overlord, precedent to his entering on the temporalities of his See. Since in the vacancy of an Archbishopric its lands and revenues were

“seized into the King’s hands,” the confirmation and investiture of a Primate was sometimes deliberately delayed by a needy or greedy monarch. Thus William Rufus, on the death of Lanfranc, seized the temporalities of Canterbury, and retained its rich revenues for four years. Even on their restoration, some tempting morsel of a manor might be retained, until the Papal power had to be invoked. Some Archbishop might be fortunate enough to obtain retrospective restoration, as when, in 1276, Edward I. ordered to be restored to John Peckham all the corn that had been cut and carried in the great manor of South Malling during the four years past.

A curious custom once existed in connection with the accession of a new Primate—the gift, namely, to the King of a palfrey fully caparisoned, a render which in time became commuted into a money payment, called “Palfrey-Silver.” It would appear that this render was, as a matter of fact, a payment less from the Archbishop than his “servile” tenants, for an Originalia Roll of 1350 records that “the King, on the supplication of the Venerable Father Simon, Archbishop of Canterbury, excused his villeins from a certain payment of a sum of money called Palfrey-Silver, due on every vacancy of the Archbishopric.” Such feudal customs on these and similar occasions were often productive of disputes derogatory to the dignity of the ceremony.

Thus, in the year 1294, there is a record of the King’s endeavour to compose “the dissention concerning feudatory rights, on the day of the Archbishop’s enthronement, between him and the Earl of Gloucester.” Among other feudal renders associated with the accession of an Archbishop was a payment of ten pounds made to him by the tenants of some of his manors due on his first visit thereto. Though I have not met with a record of this custom earlier than Henry VI.’s reign, it was apparently an ancient render, since the entries of its receipt are usually accompanied by the words “*ex antiquo consuetudine.*” For their temporal possessions and positions of honour and profit as lay lords the Archbishops were indebted to individuals

of the laity and to the State through the King, since the monarch was the fountain-head of honours and privileges. From him they obtained grants of manorial fairs and markets, hunting rights, and licences to impark or enclose lands, and to fortify their manor-houses. That they were liberally endowed with such earthly possessions and privileges even at an early date is shown by ancient charters of the See still extant; from those enumerating such small donations as (in 824) "a little farm of one plough[land]" to the comprehensive confirmation by Ethelred of—"All the donations of lands which have been given to the See of Canterbury, with all the rights of hunting, hawking, fishing, and all other liberties."

Succeeding Kings made many and various grants to their Archbishops. Thus John gave licence for a fair and a market at Lambeth, whose fishery had been granted to the See nearly five hundred years before; and a few years later he made a like concession to the Archbishop for his Sussex manor of Pagham. This domain was formerly a possession of Wilfrid, Archbishop of York (*ex dono Cædwalla*), who signalized his becoming lord of the manor by the worthy act of liberating all the serfs on the demesne. Although he had been long at variance with his brother primate Theodore, Wilfrid, on his death-bed, "remembering the benefits he had received from the Church of Canterbury," conferred upon the Southern See this large Sussex manor, one of the most fertile domains in the country.

Apparently, his liberation of the serfs had not extended freedom to their "sequelæ," or progeny, since Domesday enumerates seventy-four villeins as existing on the demesne at the time of its survey. From John, also, the Archbishop obtained a grant of the very worldly privilege of having a mint and money exchange at Canterbury, as well as the more pertinent power of imprisoning criminous clergy; doubtless a very valuable concession for which to be able to show an actual charter; since so much contended for by the ecclesiastical power in its long contest with the secular was more the offspring of fancy than fact.

But John was not always so complaisant to the clergy, and a few years later, having placated the Pope by an acknowledgment of suzerainty, he procured from the Holy Father a Bull, addressed to the Archbishop, concerning the dissensions between the King and the Barons, in which the Primate was "severely accused of taking part in the said discords"; while the King, on his part, demanded the surrender of Rochester Castle, at that time in the hands of the Archbishop.

For Hubert Walter, as well as other Primates, like Becket before him, and many after, had held several high and potent secular offices, as Lord Chancellor, Lord Chief Justice; and as Governor of the whole realm while King Richard was warring abroad he had doubtless incurred, as a lord temporal, the displeasure of the unfraternal John in his designs upon the Crown. To Henry III., also, the occupant of the chair of St. Augustine was not always *persona grata*, and in 1261 a representative was sent to the Roman Court to complain of "the grievous things done to the King and Kingdom" by Boniface, Archbishop of Canterbury; while a prohibition was addressed to the Primate himself against "attempting anything against the Crown." Two years later the temporalities of the See were seized, and committed to various favourites of the King; for it was not only in vacancies of the See that these or similar seizures were made. In 1275 Edward ordered the sheriff to proceed in person to the archiepiscopal manor of West Tarring—a "peculiar" of the See where Becket is said to have introduced fig-trees for the first time into this country—and to seize it and all the goods and chattels therein until the settlement of the long dispute which had existed between Sir Richard de Waleys and the Archbishop.

Per contra, the Primates received upon occasion the entirely secular but profitable "custody" of the lands of various lay lords, as when to Archbishop Reynolds' the rich manor of Petworth with its many submanors was committed at the moderate render of 200 marks. As head of the Anglican Church, Reynolds presided, in conjunction with his suffragans

and the Papal Inquisitors, at the trial of the Templars, and as such published the Bull dissolving the Order; but he does not appear to have taken a prominent part in these iniquitous proceedings, nominally religious, but actually secular and worldly, inspired by the greed of Pontiff and Princes who had cast covetous eyes upon the great wealth of the religious knights.

So much, indeed, and so often in the long history of the Metropolitan See were the Archbishops concerned in purely secular affairs, either by reason of the greatness of their state, their abilities, or the favour of Princes, that perforce they became involved in the dangers and chances of this temporal life, in which they risked not only power, wealth, and the royal favour, but life itself. Archbishop Elphege, who in 1011 was slain in the sack of Canterbury, was by no means the only Primate to meet with a violent death; for Becket, in 1170, and Sudbury, in 1381, also lost their lives by the rage of Prince or populace. Robert Winchelsey, Archbishop in Edward I.'s reign, being accused of treasonable practices and his temporalities seized, withdrew abroad, where he fell into such poverty that he was saved from starvation only by the assistance rendered by his monks of Canterbury. On the accession of Edward II. he was, however, recalled, and his temporalities restored; the King, doubtless, being mindful of the Primate's friendly actions in such purely secular matters as assisting the Prince (when in exile in Sussex) to purchase the hunting-stud of Earl Warren, Lord of Lewes, and in lending him stallions for the improvement of his stable. Archbishop Arundel also suffered the pains and penalties of banishment. These do not appear, however, to have weighed very grievously upon him, since he found refuge in sunny Italy, and while in exile superscribed a letter to his monks of Canterbury — "From my terrestrial paradise near Florence."

On the other hand, the Archbishops were by no means usually deficient in loyalty or patriotism. Thus, we find Robert Winchelsey sending a letter to all suffragans, ordering them to hold services of praise for Edward's victories over the Scotch.

Walter Reynolds, Archbishop and Chancellor, provided for the purposes of Edward III.'s expedition to Scotland 150 quarters of wheat, 300 quarters of flour, 15 quarters of beans, and 5 quarters of peas, and 200 great oaks from his Sussex manors, and sent them from Shoreham to Newcastle by the ship *La Sainte Marie*.

Archbishop Bradwardine accompanied the same King in his French wars; and before the great naval victory of *Les Espagnols sur Mer* offered prayers for his country's success.

The Primates, being lords temporal as well as spiritual, found themselves bound by the feudal tenures of their temporalities, and thus could be called upon by the medieval monarchs, whose favourite sport was war, to furnish their due quota of knights and men-at-arms to follow their Sovereign in the field. In their turn they demanded kindred contribution from barons, knights, and squires who held lands and manors under them; and this, not only from their lay tenants, but also from the clergy themselves, in some cases *in propriis personis*. Thus, in Richard II.'s reign, when the French were making preparations for an invasion of England, Archbishop Courtney, son of the Earl of Devonshire, sent letters to his Commissary of Canterbury to arm the clergy of the city and diocese in their due rates and proportions. These were such that a benefice exceeding sixty-five pounds a year had to provide a man-at-arms and two archers; a parson "passing rich on forty pounds a year" had to furnish two archers; while an incumbent of a living worth twenty pounds supplied one archer; the poorer clergy providing only coats of mail and arms. Similar commands to arm and array the clergy in person were issued by Archbishop Chicheley in view of a supposed invasion of the French in Henry IV.'s reign.¹

In humbler and more local matters the connection of the Archbishops with secular affairs is abundantly manifested in

¹ Grose, commenting upon these orders, says: "Notwithstanding these writs were at least three or four times issued, history does not inform us that these reverend battalions were ever actually called forth under arms."

the view which is afforded by the Court Rolls of their numerous manors. Concerning such aspects, an immense number of documents exist, both at Canterbury and Lambeth; and this in spite of the great loss of such material which was caused by a fire at the end of the fourteenth century, if we may judge by the Royal Writ issued in 1399: "To make inquiry concerning all the records of the Archbishopric of Canterbury destroyed by fire." A large number of the manor-rolls related to such places as Otford, Croydon, Mayfield, and Slindon, where the Primates possessed palaces, or South Malling, where they frequently visited. On these manors a large number of officials were maintained, each having to account for some secular aspect of the lord of the manor's interest.

In the Sussex Archiepiscopal Manor-Rolls I have found more than twenty-five officials named (after endeavouring to eliminate "duplicates," and not mentioning such as hayward, fisherman, etc., of the manor), viz.:

Auditor.	Keeper ("custos") of the Fishery.
Bailiff.	" " " Park.
Chamberlain.	" " " Quarry.
Cofferer.	" " " Manor.
Collector.	" " " Herd of
Clerk of the Court.	Goats.
" " Kitchen.	Master of the Servants.
Cadaverator.	Seneschal of Lands.
Drossman.	" the Household.
Forester.	Sergeant.
Ranger.	Treasurer.
Reeve.	Supervisor.
Receiver.	Woodward.
Keeper ("custos") of the Woods.	Woodseller.

Two of these call for some notice—viz., "Cadaverator," a manorial officer one might designate "Coroner of Cattle," since his duty was to report on the deaths of cattle, particularly as regards "Murrein," the endemic cattle disease of the Middle Ages; and the "Drossman," who was the keeper of the cattle pasturing in the woods of the manor. All these must have involved the Primates in great expenses, for though their salaries or wages—varying from a penny to sixpence a day—

appear to us small, their "liveries" raised the value of their offices considerably. The word "livery," as used in the Middle Ages, had by no means the restricted meaning it has to-day, and though in the case of these officials it sometimes included a robe, it usually had a wider scope. Thus, what was "delivered" to them as part payment for their work, comprised in one case a certain quantity of wheat or flour; in another, one or two pigs, or sheep, or a bullock; while some had pasture for a cow or two; another a horse to ride, and an allowance of oats or hay for its keep.

In addition to the Archbishops' expenses that came upon them daily as lay lords, there were the costs of maintenance and the continual repairs of houses, granges, fences *et hoc genus omne*, throughout their various demesnes.

Archbishop Peckham is said to have spent 3,000 marks on the necessary repairs in his manors.

The Primates, as lords of manors, were also constantly concerned in the temporal affairs of their tenants, particularly those who were "unfree"; their villeins, serfs, or "nativi."

We have already referred to St. Wilfrid's "manumission," or setting free all the serfs on his large demesne of Paghham, and to the fact that his action does not appear to have affected any but those actually in a state of servitude at the time. How the perpetuation of a community of villeins could come about in such a case appears from a manumission which Archbishop Islip (in 1361) granted to a certain serf, on his Manor of Mayfield, named Nicholas, whom he "freed from the bond of servitude," together with all his "sequelæ," or family, with the exception of Walter, the youngest. This unfortunate was doomed with all his descendants to remain serfs on the demesne for ever. Among the servile customs prevailing on certain of the archiepiscopal manors was that called "chivage"—the payment made by the villein to his lord for permission to go beyond the bounds of the estate for a stated period. Thus we find mention of frequent renders of "six capons for permission from the lord to remain out of the manor at Christmas."

In a variety of other ways the Archbishops, as lay lords, were involved in purely secular matters, as in protecting their own material rights and privileges, as well as those of their tenants. At Pagham, the tenants of the Primate, Richard Wethershed, and those of the Bishop of Chichester were at variance on the matter of rights of pasture, concerning which the Archbishop wrote to the latter complaining that he had been led to think it "some small matter comprised under the name of boundary, as a ditch or such-like . . . but we have since learned from our bailiffs for certain that the matter is not small, but rather great, concerning things in peaceful possession of which the Church of Canterbury has stood for a hundred years and more," finally requesting further conference about the affair. Nor did the Archbishops neglect their dependents in distress, and so we find Peckham, in 1234, while residing at South Malling, ordering his officials to provide for the poor who were afflicted by a famine, while in another case he wrote to Earl Warenne, asking him to attend to the complaints of his tenants whose crops were damaged by the excessive amount of game that swarmed in the woods, warrens, and chases of the Lord of Lewes.

Again, he interfered on behalf of the Rector of Pagham, writing to the Dean and Chapter of Chichester to warn the Bishop of the Diocese to restore a cart and horse which his bailiffs had taken from the parson ; while at the other end of the county he ordered the Barons and Bailiffs of Rye to remove their distraint on the tenants of Richard de Waleys.

Some of the most interesting documents exhibiting the concern of the Archbishops with worldly matters are the Rolls of their Foresters and Parkers. Parks and chases were among the earliest possessions of the See, from the days of Egbert, who conferred upon it the great manor of South Malling, with its large and numerous woodlands, to the donation of the Wood of Blean, by Richard I. onwards.

The economic aspect of the parks of the Middle Ages was particularly to the fore when they were the possessions of

ecclesiastical persons or corporations. Not that the clergy forbore all hunting—albeit forbidden by the Canon Law—and the reiterated command of an Archbishop that “The servants of God should not keep hawks or hounds,” for a later modification allowed them to hunt, not for pleasure, but the benefit of their health. Before the introduction of turnips, mangolds, and similar crops made possible the winter keep of cattle, large numbers of swine and bullocks, as well as deer, were killed and salted down in autumn to supplement the food-supply during the cold season; while the lakes, ponds, and fisheries which the parks and chases included, afforded the large amount of fish required for the numerous fasts and lengthy Lents of the pre-Reformation period. The large number of swine pastured and “pannaged” in the woodlands of the kingdom may be gleaned from the statistics of Domesday. Thus, in the aforementioned manor of South Malling, we learn the lord received 300 hogs from those “pannaged”—*i.e.*, feeding on the acorns and beechnuts in its woodlands; a figure which indicates the large total of swine so maintained as at least 3,000, if a tithe was the proportion due to the lord; or 3,600 if one in twelve, as some figures given seem to indicate, was the ratio. In the same manor the Archbishop received 355 hogs from those pasturing on the herbage therein, which gives the large total of 2,485, since a marginal entry in Domesday states that throughout all Sussex the render for herbage was “one hog from every villein who had seven.” The privilege, therefore, of turning out swine to pannage and herbage was a substantial benefit conferred by territorial lords on the houses of religion of their foundation or patronage.

In an undated charter, Archbishop Theobald granted the Dean and Canons of South Malling the privilege of “pannage for 24 swine in his park commonly called the Broyle.” As for the deer in the various parks of the See, the Archbishops, if they had not the pleasure of hunting them, had the venison always at their command, for their own use, that of their numerous retainers and dependents, or their friends. Many

“warrants” are extant commanding the parkers to deliver deer to favoured persons, usually in terms similar to the example here adduced :

“Right welbeloved we greet you well we wyll and charge you that ye kill and deliver w^out any disturbanc^e of our game w^o reasonable expedition oon seasonable deare of grece in oure parke of Broyle to the berer here of to the use of our welbeloved John Wornet and this oure warant shall be yor sufficient discharge Wryten at oure man^o of Lambhithe the xix day of July the xxi yere of Kyng Henry the VII” Willm^o Cantuar’.”

Needless to say, the Archbishops, in common with other lay lords, suffered much from the depredations of poachers in their parks and chases. Thus, in 1324, Archbishop Winchelsey obtained a Commission of Oyer and Terminer, on his complaint that Robert de Morley and Thomas de Hevre had broken into his park of Slindon, and hunted and carried off his deer. In his mid-Sussex manors, a succeeding Primate obtained a similar Commission to try “certain malefactors and peace-breakers who, arrayed in manner of war, had broken into his parks of Frankham, Mayfield, Broyle, Ringmer, Plasshet, More, and Glynde, had hunted therein, carried away his deer, beaten and assaulted his servants.” More than one, even of this small number out of all the parks of the See, had small lakes, stew-ponds or fisheries within their bounds; the first-named, Frankham, to wit, having a lake of the area of nine acres. During the time when Archbishop Arundel was in exile and his temporalities in the King’s hands, Richard II. sold all the fish in the South Malling ponds, or *vivaria*, to Sir Edward Dalyngridge for £5.

In an archiepiscopal “Receivers’ Roll” for 1481, there is account of no less a sum than £46 6s. 8d., paid for “salt fish of various kinds bought for the use of the lord’s household this year.” A similar roll, of a date twenty years earlier, mentions the various kinds of fresh fish—*pisces recentes*—bought for the Archbishop’s household when he was at South Malling, £2 5s. 8d. having been paid “in Lent and the Rogation days after,” for thirty-seven “bremys,” six “tenchys,” and four “perchys”; while other Rolls, still extant, record further payments for *pisces aquæ dulcis*.

The Archbishops had yet another source of profit in one at least of their parks—namely, from Ringmer, where there existed a heronry from a very early date. The parkers' rolls contain numerous records of the sale of herons from Ringmer Park, of sending them to London "for the use of the lord," etc., but no record of hawking them. A payment entered on one roll (of Henry VI.'s reign) of "eighteenpence paid for the labour of one man climbing the trees and taking the said herons," suggesting that this was the prosaic method of capture adopted, instead of the picturesque pageant of hawk and horse.

Most profitable of all the products of the parks of the Primates was the timber growing therein, especially in days when all ships were built of it, and most houses and bridges, and when but little "sea-coal" was used for fuel. The same Dean and Canons who had Theobald's grant of pannage for their swine had also the right to take four oaks yearly from the same park—"namely, each of them one oak, large and fit for fuel." From Broyle Park, also, Edward I. had taken, during a vacancy of the See, eighteen cartloads of timber for making a drawbridge at Pevensey Castle.

We have already noticed Archbishop Reynold's free gift of 200 great oaks to Edward III. for national purposes. During the Middle Ages roofs of houses, barns, and the spires of churches were usually covered with "shingles"—as, indeed, are the latter even to-day in wooded districts. These are, as it were, small tiles of split oak, and immense quantities of them were used, their making and fixing by men called "shinglers" being often mentioned in the archiepiscopal Court Rolls, usually those of the parkers. In a Roll of 1458 it is recorded that 15,000 shingles were cut, made, and sent to London "to cover the roof of the Lord's house at Lambeth," an equal number being used for the rectory at Mayfield, and 11,000 for that of Wadhurst, all of which appear to have been made in the contiguous parks of Mayfield and Frankham.

The position of the Primates as lay lords is nowhere more evident than in the aspect presented of them as lords of manors

in the multitudinous rolls of their Courts-Baron, Courts-Leet (or View-of-Frank-Pledge), and Hundred-Courts, though I have not been able to find any record of an Archbishop presiding in person at one of these secular courts. Apparently the chief court of all these was that held, not at Lambeth, but at Canterbury, for some of the lands and tenements held under the See were subject to "suit of court at the great court of Canterbury," doubtless held in the hall of the Archbishop's palace.

Very different was the locale of one of their Sussex courts, for there is still extant the record (in Latin) of a "Court held xx^o day of September in the 6th year of the reign of King Edward IV. in the cemetery of St. John, under the Castle" [of Lewes]. St. John the Baptist's Church is of great antiquity, and has built into its north-east wall a Saxon doorway, the oldest ecclesiastical relic in Lewes; but it is not a "peculiar" of the See of Canterbury, and it is not evident why an Archiepiscopal Court should have been held there. At all these courts purely mundane matters came under review, such as reports of ditches choked up, cottages wanting repair; of "heriots" and "reliefs" due on the death of tenants and the incoming of their heirs; of fines levied for non-appearance at court, for assaults or for trespass, for overcharging the common with cattle, etc. Usually, the receipts were trifling in amount, seldom more than a pound or two; commonly a few shillings, or even pence. The total received at the court held in St. John's Cemetery was only twopence; at another twopence halfpenny.

At some courts "Inquisitions" were made by the "homagers" into manorial customs; as that held in Henry VII.'s reign at Tarring, which reported that "The lord should receive his heriot before the rector receives his mortuary" on the death of a tenant in that manor.

Much interesting matter is contained in all these various documents which might be drawn upon indefinitely; but enough has been already adduced to set forth the position of the Primate of all England as lay lords.

The Critical Attitude.

BY THE REV. HENRY W. CLARK.

Charisma, Westfield, Harpenden, Herts.

ONE of the most noticeable tendencies in the average man of to-day is that which leads him into the critical spirit. And by the critical spirit is meant, not the spirit which is alive to real fault and frankly indicates it, but the spirit which takes for granted, when any case comes before it, that there will be more to blame than to praise. It is quite true that precisely the opposite mood prevails with some; and certain people "enthuse" hotly over every new idea, so to say falling upon it with a wildly frantic hug, and petting it without considering whether it may not be a monstrosity after all. But, leaving these easily intoxicated folks on one side, it remains true that the majority of sensible men and women are often in danger of letting suspense of judgment go so far as to become prejudice, and of looking upon anything new (in religion, in literature, in individual persons, in social enterprise, and many other things) as "guilty" until its innocence is proved. The attitude is always one of warning and defence; there is a fear of uttering any word in the way of warm approval; examination is always cross-examination, and that of a distinctly hostile kind. The first question is, "What can be found *against* this person, this doctrine, this programme, which seeks an introduction to my favour?" Most of us, though we resent this attitude when it is adopted towards ourselves, fall into it at once when we have to judge and try. We are so sensitized beforehand as to take (and to exaggerate) the impression of the bad features alone.

It may be said that the adoption of this attitude is in some respects natural enough, and even that some justification for it exists. It is not by any means always under the pressure of mean motives that the attitude is taken up. Sometimes, indeed, it may be so motivated; and eagerness to scan any person, or any idea, or any system, for faults, may merely signalize the critic's

fear that he is himself going to be excelled. But very often the critical attitude marks a reaction from many disappointments, the disillusionment of a nature which was once ready, not with criticism, but with commendation, and which has found that many of the things for which at different times it has enthusiastically voted have turned out hollow. It is one of the saddest elements in a growing experience of life that so many promising theories prove delusive, and that so many loudly recommended enterprises, hopeful as at first they appeared, are found to be unsubstantial as the mirage. The percentage of novel ideas and novel programmes which are proved really to have anything in them is so lamentably small! And it is little wonder that any man, after being disillusioned again and again, becomes slow in the welcome he offers to any fresh suggestion, and is ready to see only a new trap in each new doctrine or scheme which claims his regard. In fact, it is no matter for surprise that some go farther than the critical spirit, and fall into a cynicism which declares that all men are liars, and that all is vanity under the sun. Certainly, the critical attitude can excuse itself in part by pointing to the shattered fragments of hastily adopted ideas and ideals which lie upon the path behind. It may be added, also, that the prevalence in certain circles of the too indiscriminate faddism previously alluded to is quite sufficient to drive many people to the opposite extreme, and to the wearing of a much more complete suit of critical armour than they otherwise might. All this, admittedly, has to be reckoned into the account.

Nevertheless, the maintenance of the critical attitude—when pushed to the indicated length—brings about more evils than it avoids, and does harm both to those who persist in it and to the good and great causes of the world. To those who persist in it, because its inevitable result is a narrowing of soul and a loss of sympathetic faculty. It is not to be denied that a dryness of nature, a withering of some of the fairest flowers of personality, befalls him who makes a habit of restraining the upward leap of his heart for fear that reaction should afterwards set in.

The critical spirit does much to petrify the finer constituents of character in him who yields to it; and, while he may guard himself against falling, he does it at the price of losing the power to move. It is so easy to overstep the precise line at which the spirit of criticism turns from a virtue to a vice. It really comes to this—that we spoil ourselves for distinguishing the worthy applicants for our encouragement and help if we insist on *absolute* security against the unworthy. If we are to be certain of rising to the occasion when there comes to us a call which we ought to obey, we must be willing sometimes to make a mistake. The hardened critic will, in the nature of the case, avoid mistaking a bad cause for a good; but his habit of settling his features into a frown will often cause him to mistake a good cause for a bad. Yet it is better, surely, to spend one's ardour now and then for that which is not bread, than to be bankrupt of ardour and have none left to spend! And in thus harming the man himself, the attitude of stereotyped criticism harms, necessarily, many of the good causes of the world. For many a new thought and suggestion, having vainly sought for sympathy and encouragement, will turn away baffled and disheartened from the critic's coldness, and slink into a corner to die. If there are many new ideas and enterprises asking for favour, the loudness and persistence of whose clamour is out of all proportion to their real worth, there are many, too, which are scared back into silence by the first frown. And the prejudiced critic must reckon with this—that he is quite likely, in the due measure of his influence, to deprive the world of something it sorely needs, as well as to save it from something out of which no profit could come. It may be added, also, for a last consideration, that the critical attitude, when too fixedly adopted as a protest against faddism, overshoots its own mark and gives faddism its chance. It makes the faddist look more plausible as he launches himself against the unyielding rampart which the critic has raised; it causes the faddist to appear as the only possible saviour of the situation; and it thus delivers the whole thing over to the very extremists whom it is designed to keep back and to defeat.

All this does not, of course, amount to advocacy of the other extreme. The arms always open are as bad as the arms always raised up in guard. But criticism should become a real "appreciation"—in the sense in which Mr. Walter Pater, for instance, employed the word. Criticism should search into *all* the qualities of the thing to be judged, not seeking primarily for the censurable ones, and should reach its verdict at last only when it has made the complete circuit of the case. It should approach every matter in neutral spirit, not with a hostility which requires to be pacified before the real merits can be weighed. It should not be always as a challenging sentinel—certainly not as a sentinel who shoots first and challenges afterwards—but it should rather be as a host in a house with open doors, inviting each new idea to come in (on the understanding, of course, that it must give good account of itself if it is to stay), and in free converse to declare what manner of thing it is.



Ascension and Whitsuntide.

"The things above."—COL. iii. 1-4, 10-17.

ROLL back, heaven's everlasting gate,
 Move on thy shining grooves of gold,
 And where the flowery fields await
 Their King, to us, in low estate,
 The things above unfold!

Thy footprints, Lord, on Olivet,
 Upsquaring thence on cloud-borne wings,
 Faith sees in adoration yet
 Though the long suns still rise and set
 Over these earthly things.

Thy footsteps still with splendour glow
As when they passed across the land,
Full nineteen hundred springs ago,
The while celestial trumpets blow,
 To sit at God's right hand.

Still through the starry depths and heights
We see Thy stream of glory go,
Those ten celestial days and nights,
Salvation and true wisdom's lights
 Each distant world to show.

Our very flowers of earth expand,
As if uplifted by Thy love,
And dream unfolding of the land
Where fadeless, by Life's breezes fanned,
 The gardens bloom above.

Spirit Divine, Heaven's free wind blow,
Thy freshness on our slumber pour :
Lift us the things above to know,
Or days of heaven to spend below,
 Close to that open door !

The things above ! pure tender heart,
High knowledge, charity divine,
Forgiveness, peace on my glad part,
And thankful song, and wisdom's art,
 The Virtues' gracious line :

The peace of Christ upon the throne,
The fountain full of His true word,
(Prophet's, evangelist's voice alone) ;
And all creation's song far-blown
 Of peace with God is heard.

A. E. MOULE.

The Missionary World.

THE ranks of those intelligent Christians who are uninterested in Foreign Missions would have been decimated by attendance at the May Meetings this year, or even by reading the reports of them which the religious papers—and especially the *Record*—so admirably give. The survey of world-wide work has been comprehensive, the recorded results deeply encouraging, the opportunities presented in every land and to every missionary organization fairly overwhelming. To realize the position in any one Society or field is thrilling; to face all together either paralyzes or absolutely inspires. The whole enterprise is stupendous in its greatness and quite compelling in its appeal. Catholic outlook and sympathy send us back with renewed faith and quickened understanding to our individual task.

* * * * *

We have entered into fellowship with the B.M.S. in its campaign to secure an increase of regular subscribers, noting with regret its deficit of some £10,000, to remove which a "150,000 Shillings' Fund" has been instituted. By the way, the small, well-illustrated "Spring" Report called *Open Gates*, issued by the B.M.S., is a model as to size and general appearance. We have given thanks with the British and Foreign Bible Society in their widening operations in this Tercentenary year; we have followed "the record of mercies" in the annual statement of the China Inland Mission, and have again been revived by their faith; we have been stirred by the intensive work of the L.M.S. in the Home Church, and have shared their joy over the Christian Jubilee of Khama, the great Bechuana chief; we have entered into the belief of our Wesleyan Methodist brethren, in face also of a deficit, that "what is missing in our service of the kingdom is due to something lacking in the vision and conviction that lies behind our doing and giving"; we have noted the sixty years' retrospect of the Zenana Bible

and Medical Mission ; we have—passing to the Societies of our own Anglican Communion—shared with the S.P.G. in the impetus given by Bishop Montgomery to the whole great cause, appreciated the wisdom which has led the Society to enlarge its membership, and entered into its joy over an income adequate for the work of the past year ; we have heard with thankfulness of the unexpected deliverance worked for the Church of England Zenana Missionary Society, whereby they are encouraged in the prosecution of their great work ; and, lastly, our hearts have been freshly knit to the C.M.S., facing a large deficit with humility and abounding hope.

* * * * *

The position of the C.M.S. has already been fully stated elsewhere. The Society has dealt with its friends frankly, and will meet with due return. Humbling and disappointing as the financial position is, we are deeply thankful that it is being faced with fearless courage and dealt with on adequate lines. The Resolutions of the Committee, the speeches at the Anniversary Meetings, the utterances of the Honorary Secretary as published in the *Record*, have inspired a confidence which will not pass. These statements should suffice to avert misconceptions—such as that the Society is in debt—which might otherwise arise. It was singularly impressive, during Anniversary week, to note the ready response, widespread and unflinching, to the lead given by Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Bardsley, and others. There is general agreement that the Anniversary was more full of promise than any in recent years.

* * * * *

But we cannot disguise the fact that the check is a serious one, and involves far-reaching consequences both at home and abroad. The largest Missionary Society in the world, in the year of the Edinburgh Conference, and in view of unparalleled opportunities, has been compelled to pause, and even to retreat. The fact concerns all Christendom. Further, this Society is an agency within the Anglican Church, and was brought into being by our Evangelical fathers as a channel for the outflow of our

life into the world. The fact touches every Anglican, and in particular those of the Evangelical school. But, beyond all this, thousands of us hold the C.M.S. in our heart ; it is our own, in a deep and special sense ; we have prayed for it, spoken for it, worked for it, given to it ; now we feel, not that it has come short, but we ourselves have failed. Here, where the pain goes deepest, hope of health and healing comes. In so far as we individually take home this reverse to ourselves that we may face its meaning and learn the lessons it brings, in so far as we lay the blame on ourselves and not on others, will the loss work out in the end for gain ? He Who has called us in vain by doors set invitingly open has sent shut doors to rouse us to strive more earnestly to enter in. And the conviction grows and deepens, as the chastisement of our loving Father exercises heart and mind, that enter in we must and can. The Review of the Year, presented by the Committee at the Annual Meeting, shows the way ; its lead will doubtless be followed up in the Society's work throughout the country.

“ At a time when God's call to ‘ go forward ’ is so clear and strong, the Committee, conscious of their own personal shortcomings, and with a deep sense of responsibility, would venture to emphasize four great needs :

1. *The need of corporate sacrifice.*
2. *A truer sense of personal discipleship.*
3. *An increased spirit of prayer.*
4. *A stronger faith in God.*

These, it may truly be said, are obvious things. But the obvious is often central, and not always real to us. It has been said that “ our growth in knowledge and experience consists to a large extent in our learning to put an ever-deepening meaning into familiar words and ideas ”—Sacrifice, Discipleship, Prayer, and Faith.

* * * * *

The Committee, backed by their missionaries and home staff, face retrenchment bravely ; but it must not be looked on as a light or easy thing. There are no C.M.S. “ luxuries ” to be given up, no “ surface waste ” of expenditure to be saved, nor can whole branches of work be lopped off. Every detail is

responsible in work which deals with the welfare of human souls. Those weighing all the complex issues of the situation need the support of constant prayer, that they may have insight, tenderness, and courage for their task. The burden falls heaviest upon the missionaries, whether those who are detained at home or those who remain in the field. Let us specially pray for them, and for the converts who will share the cost.

* * * * *

There is another side to all this, which Faith needs to remember, while as Mr. Bardsley said in the *Record* interview "we go through with" what has come upon us in connection with the C.M.S. A pregnant sentence is quoted in the Wesleyan *Foreign Field*: "The resources of God are promised only to those who undertake the programme of God." Some far-seeing thinker in another Society, weighted with a great work which tends to become hampered by half-living organization and to settle down into routine, might speak as an onlooker now: "I would face the cost of the C.M.S. position for the sake of the after-gain, both central and local, both at home and abroad. Such a shock is bound to awaken; such humbling is sure to purge; such a pause compels outlook, revision, and reconstruction; such pruning thins out dead timber and enriches fruitful boughs; such chastening turns many to God. Gideon's way was costly, but it meant a victory for the Lord." It is this view of the "afterward" which will fill our hearts with hope. It has already been suggested that through the C.M.S. deficit there may ultimately come the biggest interpretation of the message of the Edinburgh Conference to the Church.

* * * * *

In the May number of the larger reviews two articles bearing on missions call for notice this month. There is a striking article in the *Contemporary* on "The Womankind of Young Turkey," in which the writer describes the sequel to those conditions of *harem* life with which Pierre Loti has already familiarized us. It is hard to say which need is most pathetic—that of the untaught, downtrodden, wholly secluded women of

the older East, or the generation of half-educated, half-liberated women now growing up in Westernized non-Christian families in the Turkish Empire, in India, and elsewhere. The situation has wide bearing upon future home ideals, and claims from the Church at home for missionary service the highest type of educated and disciplined Christian womanhood. The *Nineteenth Century and After* has an able article upon "The Domiciled Community in India," whose needs have also been strongly advocated in the *Times* of late. The joint effort being made by all Protestant Churches to secure adequate Christian education for a class which must play an increasingly large part in Indian life is one which demands the sympathy and co-operation of all.

* * * * *

Animistic faiths begin to be more fully included in the study of comparative religion. A recognition of their nature is a key to many problems, and will adjust some disproportion of thought. A good summary of Animism is given in *Our Missions*, the organ of the Friends' Foreign Missionary Association :

"Animism underlies all other religions. It is, in fact, the early faith of every child, and its shadowy recollections are never outgrown. . . . Animism believes in a spirit world, but in a spiritualistic rather than in a spiritual way. It is social, especially in totemism. It has faith, and may teach lessons in believing to a more critical age; but it has no revelation, no ethical sense of holiness, nor (its converse) of sin; its sense of holiness or sin is unethical, and the animist's sense of justice and right conduct is unconnected with his sense of religion. The salvation which the animist feels the need of is from the dread of many spirits, and the thing he must first learn from the Christian message is to substitute reverence for the One for fear of the many. His early faith will be fervent, but his ethical attainment will come more slowly, and must be worked for and prayed for with patience. This animistic religion is universal in our fields, and needs to be properly understood and rightly met by all missionaries."

There have been great ingatherings amongst the Asiatic Animists, both from the hill-tribes in India and the aboriginal Miao in China. Concerning the latter a book with a wonderful story has just been issued, "Amongst the Tribes in South-West China."¹ The textbooks for next autumn's Missionary Study

¹ By Samuel R. Clarke, China Inland Mission. Illustrated. 3s. 6d.

Circles will deal with African Animism, which, with Uganda and Livingstonia, has been an equally fruitful field. By the way, those who are interested in linguistic matters will find a fascinating article on "The Speech of the Bantu Africans" in the *C.M. Review* for May.

* * * * *

The Missionary Summer School has great possibilities. Four of the larger non-Anglican organizations are announcing their plans for one or more of these Schools within the next few months, besides the S.P.G. and the C.M.S. Care needs to be taken lest the popularity of the movement should defeat its end. A Summer School should have real, educative value. The programmes of last year's Schools are open to some criticism from those impressed with the tremendous importance of the Home Base at this juncture. But more carefully related work and deeper purpose may be manifest this year. We note from the preliminary announcement in the *C.M.S. Gazette* that at the Eastbourne School (May 26 to June 3) the Rev. W. Hume Campbell, of St. Christopher's College, Blackheath, is lecturing on Method; and at the subsequent C.M.S. School at Newcastle, Co. Down (June 10 to 17) Canon Garrod of Ripon will do the same. It is noteworthy that at this juncture the importance of method in home work is being so widely recognized by the C.M.S. In the current number of the *Gazette* we find an able article—the fifth of a series—on Method in its Bearing on Life; a report of a Mutual Training Course for Women, the first of its kind; and a report of a Training School held by the C.M.S. Girls' Movement; besides the announcement of some study of Method as a special feature at the Summer Schools.

* * * * *

There is a suggestive article in the *Wesleyan Foreign Field* called "To Revive the Missionary Prayer-Meeting." This is going to the very heart of things. The Churches begin, in some degree, to rise towards the prayer ideal long recognized by individual intercessors, but expressed and emphasized at the World Missionary Conference. Such prayer acts not only Godward; it also draws men of various denominations, though they may seldom

intercede together, into closer unity. Some are learning more freedom in method, more liberty in regard to set forms of prayer ; others are learning the value of ordered and disciplined intercession. Upon all is falling that blessed mantle of silence, familiar to the Society of Friends, which makes united and directed prayer so full of reverence and purpose. Amongst many other existing aids to prayer, a first place is being given to the new *Intercession Paper* issued monthly by the C.M.S. Its aim is to focus prayer—whether private or united—on immediate needs in the Society and the Church. One or more copies can be obtained, *gratis*, by any who, purposing really to use the paper, send six stamps, to cover a year's postage, to the Honorary Secretary, C.M. House, Salisbury Square, E.C.

* * * * *

Hearts beat high at this time with loyalty to our most Christian King (whom God preserve !), and with thanksgiving for his rule over a wellnigh world-wide Empire. But above the King, whose Coronation we hail with rejoicing, we see another, greater King, still by many of His subjects uncrowned ; and behind our great Empire a greater, not yet wholly subject to its Lord. The whole world is our Mission-field ; we clearly hear its call ; yet it is well at this time that we should survey those lands which own our rule. In India King George V. has some 20,500,000 subjects in excess of those numbered when King Edward VII. began his reign ; he is ruler over more Moslems than any other monarch in the world. Within his Empire there are great tracts where no messenger of the Gospel has gone ; amongst his subjects there are thousands upon thousands who have never heard of that LORD before whom our monarch bows his knee. In the vast Dominion of Canada a new nation is being born, and looks to the Church in the home-land for those who will guide its youth. Obedience in fulfilling our commission "to the uttermost parts of the earth" is due to the King of kings ; but there is a special and binding sense in which the lands within the British Empire are a trust from Him. Are we looking, striving, praying, towards this greater Coronation Day?

G.

Discussions.

“HAS THE TIME ARRIVED FOR A FRESH REVISION?”

(*The Churchman*, April, 1911, p. 244.)

Is it allowable for one who cannot claim to be an expert to express considerable doubt as to whether the time has fully come for a further revision of the Scriptures? As regards the New Testament I suppose it must be conceded that immense progress has been made with Textual Criticism, but are we yet in possession of all the available evidence from the papyri and the ostraca of the ancient rubbish heaps? Surely Dr. Deissmann, Dr. Moulton and other labourers in this field are but the pioneers who have broken up the first clods of a new field of knowledge, and we may yet look for much further light from the ancient East.

It must, moreover, be remembered that in many quarters the Revised Version has been largely used for many years, and although I would not for a moment condone the many harsh alterations from the musical Authorized Version (as for example “that gratulation of yourselves” in Gal. iv. 15), yet the unsettlement of another revision would be a very grievous thing *unless we can reach some measure of finality*.

And when we come to the Old Testament, there seems still more reason for patience. As Mr. Harold Wiener has so forcibly pointed out in his Pentateuchal studies, hardly any effort seems to have been made to ascertain the accuracy of our Massoretic text or to collate it with the texts of the Septuagint version. Yet he has made it abundantly clear that the Septuagint text throws a wondrous light upon numerous difficulties, while its study seems to render it increasingly difficult for scholars to accept the Graf-Wellhausen theory. I must not, however, dwell upon the latter point, but confine myself to the question of an *accurate text*, without which no revision can be anything more than experimental. The day of Septuagintal criticism of the Old Testament seems to be dawning, and I suppose we shall soon have the inevitable swing of the pendulum in that direction, so that we may possibly have to wait another generation before anything like a reasonable consensus of opinion can be reached as regards the Text of the Old Testament. Meantime we can surely struggle on with an Interlinear or Two-Version Bible for our Old Testament studies, while as regards the New Testament we have Nestle's Bible Society edition of the Greek Text, and the Authorized Version, the Revised Version, and Weymouth's Version of the English. These latter versions have been supplemented by the Revised Version with fuller references by Greenup and Moulton; and when to these is added the text of the whole Bible in the version of the American revisers, I contend that we can afford to wait the advance of knowledge and the Holy Spirit's further enlightenment. Meanwhile

for public use the cheapening of the Interlinear Bible would seem to be the chief need, and this I understand is now being, effected by the proprietors.

GEORGE DENYER.

“HISTORICAL RECORDS AND INSPIRATION.”

(*The Churchman*, May, 1911, p. 337.)

SIRS,—I have read with attention Mr. Russell’s “Historical Records,” in which he criticizes Mr. Pilter’s Islington paper. Being a higher critic—*i.e.*, a student of the signs of compilation and stratification in the Scriptures, and a member of the Biblical Archæology Society for many years, I venture on a word of caution. I understand that Mr. Pilter’s view is that the accuracy of the Old Testament is taken for granted in the New Testament, and that it is confirmed by modern research. I do not know that he holds what Mr. Russell calls a “mechanical theory” of inspiration, or that he would accept the infallibility of the Bible in every particular. Such expressions require careful consideration. Probably he would say that the “Christian” view means the view taken by Christ and His apostles. As instances of what this view is I would refer to the way in which Christ reverts from Moses to “the beginning,” in the matter of marriage, and to Paul’s use of the historical fact that certain promises bearing on pardon were uttered to Abraham, not after, but before, he was circumcised. The “traditional view” of the Bible is that God has revealed Himself and His purposes not only by what He has said but by what He has done, specially in regard to certain historical events leading up to or connected with the life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ. The Christian Church is based upon these historical events. If our histories are “unhistorical,” which to an ordinary person means “untrustworthy,” where are we? Christ and His Apostles not only claimed the Old Testament as authoritative, but supported it by appeals to conscience, common sense, etc. There is nothing inconsistent in this, and I do not see why Mr. Pilter should be blamed for illustrating and confirming the Sacred Records by modern discoveries. What an ordinary man wants to know is whether the words recorded in Scripture and the deeds narrated are really true. Those who are called “evangelical” specially feel the need of such assurance because they accept the Scriptures as their court of appeal. They search the Scriptures to find out if Christ is going to judge the world, if He really gave His life and shed His life-blood for the remission of sins; if death came into the world through sin; if Moses spoke of Christ, and Christ of Moses. These and a thousand other things are settled in Scripture, and if we are not to accept them as true on this ground, we must wait till all critics of all ages and countries shall issue their schedule of what may be taken as historical according to the canons of criticism which shall finally prevail. Mr. Russell holds that

inspiration and historical infallibility are "unconnected," but that all godly and sensible men may be presumed trustworthy. I think that we ought to go farther. The intervention of God in the affairs of men which culminated in the mission of His only Son has been recorded all the way through by Prophets and Apostles who wrote under authority. The things which they record set forth God in history, and historical accuracy must have been sought and found by the writers as a gift from the Spirit of Truth, just so far as it was needed either for the *Præparatio Evangelica* or for the Gospel narrative. Christ is thus the criterion of Scripture inspiration. If this or anything like this view would be accepted by critics of various schools, there would be a step taken in the direction of harmony.

In closing I should like to call attention to Professor Kittel's "Scientific Study of the Old Testament" (Williams and Norgate), also to Dr. Pinches' paper on the new Deluge fragment read before the Victoria Institute in April, and to the important discussion which followed.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

"FRESH LIGHT ON THE DATE OF THE CRUCIFIXION."

(*The Churchman*, April 1911, p. 265.)

I shall be grateful for a small space in which to reply to Mr. Bothamley's interesting comment. There are fashions in chronology, as in other things; and fashions tend to move in circles. Half a century ago it was customary to date the Crucifixion Nisan 15, A.D. 30. Now it is more usual to put it on Nisan 14, A.D. 29. Both dates, I think, are wrong; and my own plea was for the restoration of an older date, A.D. 33. The question of the year is only of chronological interest; but the question of the day involves that of the Christian fulfilment of the Old Testament symbolism of the Sacrificial Lamb and Offering of the Firstfruits. Nisan 15 may be called a little heresy. The day was Nisan 14. The year was either 30 or 33.

I have no quarrel with Salmon. Recent calculation confirms Salmon's Table of New Moons; but it also clears up much that Salmon perforce left doubtful. What is more, it prohibits "tinkering" with Salmon in the manner of those chronologers who wish to have the Moon an hour or two earlier, or later, as best may suit their fancy. The uncertainty of the evening on which the Moon could first be seen must disappear. The days of the Jewish month may be identified with confidence. Unfortunately some uncertainty may still be left as to the months of the year.

In the year 29 a New Moon fell on March 4, and a new month began soon after. That month cannot have been Adar. Salmon supposed it to be the intercalary month Veadar. It is more often taken now as the month Nisan. On the whole, I am inclined to think

that Mr. Bothamley is right in following Salmon, though I gave the earlier date for Nisan as a concession to Mr. Turner and most modern chronologers. Now, if Salmon is right, 29 disappears from the case at once. But *if* we can make this doubtful month Nisan, and *if* we can further squeeze the moon's phasis a little so as to make it visible a day sooner than the tables warrant, then Nisan 14 can be brought to a Friday as required. But the application of stricter astronomical calculations shows such squeezing to be impossible. Whether Nisan of A.D. 29 began in March or in April, the year is equally excluded.

So I only differ from Mr. Bothamley in preferring 33 to 30. At His Baptism I believe our Lord had just turned thirty-three. Mr. Bothamley does not like to think that in such a case St. Luke would have called him "about thirty." But why not? A number (especially one of the round tens) introduced by "about" is necessarily indefinite, and three years is surely no unreasonable latitude to allow the Evangelist. Let us consider this indefinite "thirty" in comparison with another vague number. "Thou art not yet fifty years old," said the Jews, in St. John viii. 57. Now, the Jews would hardly have said "not yet fifty" had they known that "not yet forty" would suit their purpose better. Clearly they did not know on which side of forty our Lord then was. It is better, therefore, to suppose He was thirty-six than thirty-two or thirty-three, and hence this Feast of Tabernacles is more probably that of 32 than that of 29. In either case the Crucifixion was six months later.

Mr. Bothamley has not hit me hard enough with regard to the expression in St. John ii. 20: "Forty and six years was this Temple in building." The foundation of Herod's Temple is generally put in Chisleu A.U.C. 734 (20 B.C.), so that the forty-sixth year brings us to A.U.C. 780 (A.D. 27), the Passover of which year is the very date Mr. Bothamley requires. But it is a mistake to assume that the date so given is that of the cleansing of the Temple, and of the Jews' controversy with our Lord. Surely it is that of the last cessation of work on the building and its temporary completion. The Aorist (*ἐκκοδομήθη*) suggests that the building had then stopped; though as a matter of fact further additions were subsequently planned and carried out. Rightly considered, therefore, the verse indicates a date shortly after 27, rather than the year 27 itself. And in my opinion it was 30.

Perhaps I said enough about Augustus and Tiberius in my former paper. Tiberius was not the first to be chosen as successor to Augustus. Only after the deaths of Marcellus (23 B.C.), Lucius (A.D. 2), and Caius Cæsar (A.D. 4) was he adopted by his stepfather. No doubt the titles and offices conferred on him were intended to secure the succession; but, even so, Tiberius feigned reluctance in assuming the purple, and the death of Augustus was the signal for mutiny in more

than one province. Indeed, the very idea of succession marks the difference between the two during the lifetime of the elder. There was nothing that could be called a "reign," or hegemony, of Tiberius till August, A.D. 14; and for that reason I would put the appearance of St. John in A.D. 29 rather than in 26 or 27.

I quite agree with Mr. Bothamley in preferring a ministry of four Passovers to one of three. So I put our Lord's Baptism in January, A.D. 30, and His Death and Resurrection in April, A.D. 33. It is certainly curious that, while St. Luke's approximation, "about thirty," led Dionysius Exiguus in ancient time—and the whole Church following him—to date our Lord's Birth four years too late, so it has also led most living chronologers to date His Crucifixion four years too early.

D. R. FOTHERINGHAM.



Notices of Books.

A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By F. Warre Cornish. London: *Macmillan*. Price, 2 vols., 7s. 6d. each.

These are the last volumes of the "History of the English Church," edited by the late Dean Stephens and Dr. Hunt, and the editors are to be warmly congratulated upon the selection of Mr. Cornish as the writer of that section of the history which, with the possible exception of the Reformation period, makes the greatest demands upon the ability of the historian. Mr. Cornish possesses the rare capacity of being able to write history and to comment upon it, with a sympathetic regard both for those with whom he agrees and those from whom he differs.

Most Churchmen will find some things that are not entirely to their mind in these volumes; the mere partisan will find many things. But all will realize that Mr. Cornish has tried to do his work with real impartiality, and we are inclined to say that he has entirely succeeded. The book is very full; every topic of importance is dealt with, and generally fully dealt with. The story of the Evangelical Movement, of the Oxford Movement, and of "Essays and Reviews," is told in each case with scrupulous fairness. Mr. Cornish sees clearly the strong and the weak points of each movement. Probably the High Churchman, the Evangelical, and the Broad Churchman, would like to write a commentary on those portions of the history where each is criticized; but Mr. Cornish's shrewd criticisms, and his judicial putting of both sides, will make most fair-minded men hesitate to cavil. We, for our part, are content to very warmly thank the writer for the fullest and fairest, the most interesting and the most instructive account of the Church in the nineteenth century which we possess.

Mr. Cornish has the eyes which see beneath the surface and behind the

protestations of partisans. In the first chapter of the second volume he deals with the relationship of ritual and doctrine, and, in view of some of the controversies of to-day, his recognition of underlying fact is most valuable. For instance, he writes: "Those who know will tell you that ritual is only valuable as it symbolizes doctrine," and the chapter begins with the sentence "Ritual is the expression of doctrine." He discusses the various sectarian riots that have from time to time disgraced our common Christianity, and then he sums up the position:

"The Bishop keeps aloof as much as he can, or counsels moderation to deaf ears, and all parties are aware that the troubles will cease when the cause is removed, and that if the troubles go on long enough, the cause will probably be removed. Then there is indignation at the 'triumph of the mob'; but how is it to be helped?"

We have made these quotations because they indicate the common-sense attitude of the book and have reference to present controversies. Here is a similarly straightforward reference to a matter not quite so controversial. He is referring to the Revised Version:

"The work as a whole is marred by small and even insignificant departures from the Authorized Version. . . . The reviser's work has been judged more by its shortcomings than by its merits, which are great. It is no small advantage to have at hand a version which has high pretensions to verbal accuracy."

Here we must leave a delightful book—a book for which all sober-minded Churchmen will be intensely grateful. F. S. G. W.

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY. By the Rev. Principal F. S. Guy Warman, B.D. London: *Longmans*. Price 1s. net.

To deal at all adequately with so great a subject as the theology of the New Testament within the limits of a small handbook of 130 pages is a task of no mean order. That it is not an impossible one is evidenced by this excellent contribution to the series of Anglican Church Handbooks, which has come from the pen of the Principal of St. Aidan's Theological College, Birkenhead. The treatment of the subject is strikingly fresh and up-to-date, embodying as it does references to such recent works as Zahn's "Introduction to the New Testament," Schweitzer's "Eschatology," Sanday's "Christologies, Ancient and Modern," and others by New Testament scholars of like repute.

In the Introductory Chapter we have a brief summary of the latest results of the critical study of the New Testament documents. This leads to a most helpful treatment of such subjects as the "Kingdom of God" and the various titles of our Lord found in the New Testament.

Chapter V., entitled "The Divine Plan," sets forth in a masterly way the successive stages of our Lord's redemptive work. One by one the great fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith are put before us in orderly sequence, suggesting a line of thought which should prove most helpful to those who have opportunities for a more detailed study of the subject. The rest of the book is an elaboration of this plan. For those who desire to have in a concise and well-arranged form the teaching of the New Testament concerning the vital elements of the Christian faith and worship, there is in the remaining seventeen chapters a series of studies which is invaluable.

The object of the writer has been not merely to indulge in an academic treatment of New Testament theology, but to show how that theology should

issue in practical life and conduct. Hence we have some very practical words on such subjects as "Prayer," "The Church," her "Ministry," and "Sacraments." Social subjects and Christian missions are also dealt with as being among the practical issues of a living theology. At the close of each chapter there is a list of authorities who deal with the subjects treated in further detail, and on the last page is an Index of Subjects, and References to Scripture.

In the Preface the writer tells us that he has written not for the scholar but for the "vast number of sons and daughters of the Church of England who are anxious to have an intelligent grasp of her doctrines." Of such there are many, especially Sunday-School teachers, mission workers, and young Christians newly confirmed, who would greatly profit by the reading and study of this book, and, notwithstanding the writer's modesty, even the scholar may find in its pages much that is suggestive and helpful.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE LAITY. (Donellan Lectures, 1907-1908). By the Rev. Canon A. R. Ryder, B.D. *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 6s.

Canon Ryder has given us a solid contribution to a fascinating subject. He sets out to prove that the Priesthood of the Laity is something more than a startling paradox. It is a truth which has its roots in revelation and in history, a truth which needs to be kept continually in the foreground as the corrective to autocratic hierarchy and as the inspiration of personal service.

For the genesis of these lectures two far-reaching modern movements seem to have been responsible. The first is the application of a severe and scientific criticism to the Biblical records. This has stimulated research into a wider field—viz., the early organization of the Christian Church—and encouraged the application of the same historical science and impartial criticism to the records of that period. Such discoveries as "The Testament of our Lord," "The Apology of Aristides," "The Sources of the Apostolic Canons," have made big breaches in the stronghold of medieval tradition. The second is the social unrest all over Europe, breaking out here and there in an open struggle between State and Church, secular and religious. This points to the failure of the Church somewhere. And the author finds the secret of her failure in the obscuration of one great truth—the Priesthood of the Laity.

He goes on to show that the word "laity" is no mere negative term, but a word "of most positive spiritual privilege," implying "the possession of the glory of covenanted access to God and intimacy with God." To this privilege Baptism is the door of admission, while Confirmation is the conscious ratification of the conditions and the conscious ordination to a personal share in the kingship and priesthood of Christ. The realization of this would do much to shatter those dangerous and prevalent notions that there are two standards of holiness, one for the cleric, the other for the layman, and that a large share of the former's work is to save the latter the trouble of performing his own devotions.

Chapters III. and IV. are taken up with an extremely interesting exposition of the "Great Commission" of St. Matthew xvi. 18, of which the interest centres round the word "Ecclesia," and the fundamental ideas which underlie the New Testament usage. These ideas may be compressed into

one sentence. The Ecclesia is a united fellowship with Jesus and with the brethren through Him, manifesting itself in a visible society, deriving from its Lord Divine authority and possessing sacerdotal privileges. An examination of the primitive Ecclesia affords ample evidence that the assistance of the laity was both expected and invited in matters of Church government and discipline. Their co-operation is clear in the appointment of the seven deacons, in the decisions of the Jerusalem Council, in the sentence of excommunication at Corinth. On the other hand, there is the striking fact that the ministerial office had no special sacerdotal associations. The priesthood of all Christians and the priesthood of Christ are "the only priesthoods known in the Christian Ecclesia of the New Testament." The primitive picture of the *Didache* is a replica of the New Testament picture. In both the ministry of office lies in the background. It is eclipsed by the ministry of enthusiasm, in which all Christians have their share.

In Chapter V. the evolution of the Christian ministry is discussed and described as "the creation of successive experiences, yet all the time carrying out a Divine plan in a divinely-appointed way." It is pointed out that Bishop Lightfoot's suspicion of a wider use of the word "apostle" is amply confirmed in the *Didache*, where the "apostle," or missionary with a roving commission, takes precedence of the officers of the local church. The frequent conjunction of "apostles" with "prophets" would seem to suggest that their status was due, not to succession or delegated powers, but to their possession of spiritual gifts.

Canon Ryder has some interesting things to say about the hotly disputed phrase, "laying on of hands." He points out that the only known formal ordination of St. Paul took place not at the hands of apostles, but of the prophets and teachers of Antioch:

"The act did not denote the transmission of power from one who had it to one who had it not. . . . It was rather a symbolical act, appropriate to the invoking of blessing from on high, making more solemn the prayer which it accompanied." That the prayer was the essential thing is the view of St. Augustine ("De Trin.," xv. 26-46).

Passing on, the author first directs attention to the important references to early Church organization to be found in the Apocalypse. From Rev. i. 3 (*ὁ ἀναγινώσκων*) it seems clear that the office of "reader" (probably lay-reader) was in vogue in an organized congregation at the close of the Apostolic age. This view is strongly upheld by Harnack, who quotes in support the oldest sermon we possess—viz., the Second Epistle of St. Clement. But the main interest of the Apocalypse for the writer's purpose lies in its conception of the Church as a great sacerdotal society embracing every baptized member of Christ: "The Apocalypse, like the Epistle to the Hebrews, shows us all sacrifices consummated in One Sacrifice, all priesthoods in One Priest."

In fact, nowhere in the New Testament is the word "priest" (*ιερεύς*) used with reference to any human *Christian* minister. Its use is confined exclusively to the Jewish or pagan priesthood, or to the priesthood of Christ. But the plural, *ιερείς* ("priests"), and the collective title, *ιερατεῖα* ("priesthood"), are several times used of the whole Christian body. The New Testament gives no warrant for the sacerdotalism of one privileged

class. And surely it is no accident that this aspect of the ministry is passed by unnoticed in the Pastoral Epistles and in the letters to the Corinthian Church, where St. Paul is maintaining his apostolic authority in the teeth of slander and scandal.

St. Paul had caught the intention of his Lord. For, though Christ built on the old wherever He could, He refrained from "utilizing the existing cultus of His own nation."

Circumcision and the sacrificial system found no place in the New Covenant. It is a gross mistake to represent the Eucharist as the continuation of the series of Jewish sacrifices, or the Christian ministry as the continuation of the Jewish priesthood. The Cross marked the culmination of Jewish sacrifices. "The antitype had been manifested, and the type and symbol were now abrogated for ever."

Canon Ryder proceeds to criticize Canon Moberly's definition of sacerdotalism in "Ministerial Priesthood." He accuses him of begging the question. If "the spirit of priesthood is a spirit of love in a world of sin and pain," surely "this may be predicated of many other things as well as priesthood"! Does it fairly or fully represent the sacerdotalist's view of "sacerdotalism"? If such a definition of sacerdotalism could be accepted, there would be no objection to calling the Eucharist and many other things sacrifices. "For us the Holy Communion is a sacrifice—that of ourselves . . . ; it is the commemoration of a sacrifice—that of Christ upon the Cross; it is also the representation of a sacrifice—that of the Son of God regarded as an eternal act. Let us remember it is the eternal act that we are symbolically representing, not the temporal act we are repeating or continuing."

But how are we to account for the remarkable change in the conception of the Christian ministry, which rapidly gained ground [after the days of Cyprian, that strong upholder of the sacerdotal authority of the priesthood? Canon Ryder traces it to Gentile influence. The Gentile convert brought into the Church the sacerdotal atmosphere in which he had been born and bred. It is no surprise, then, to find the germs of sacerdotalism flourishing in the Church of Carthage—*i.e.*, in Latin Christendom. Yet the growth of the idea was regulated by Judaistic influence, for the metaphor and analogy of the term "sacrifice" was borrowed from the Old Testament, and the threefold order of the Christian ministry was a reflection of the three ranks of the Levitical priesthood. "The ideal of universal priesthood was sub-merged first by the infiltration of Gentile sentiment, and then of Jewish analogies."

But what would the resuscitation and recognition of this faded ideal mean? It would give the layman a new interest in the work of the Church. He would be made to feel that he is part and parcel of the organization, and no one else can exactly fill his place and do his work. After all, lay influence is a mighty influence; it does not labour under the suspicion of professionalism.

And lay work is needed to free the clergy from the petty details of the purely business side of things and allow them to throw themselves wholeheartedly into the ministry of the Word and prayer. And lay counsel is needed too. The layman's contribution of non-professional common sense

is a tremendous asset. "In legislation, from Cyprian's time and down, it is the laity who have been on the side of strictness, and in matters of discipline have been conservative. If discipline is ever to be restored to the Christian Church, if we are to trust history, allies are to be relied upon by calling in the counsels of the laity."

The concluding chapter reflects the fearless, outspoken character of the whole book. It is a moving appeal to the younger generation to realize their vocation and their privilege as members of a sacerdotal society. We bring to an end a pleasing task by quoting one striking sentence of it: "We shall not be asked in that great day whether we have been priests or laymen, for there will not be a different rule and measure for one and another, but whether we have tried to mould our lives as disciples of Christ and to be true brethren of all men."

W. E. BECK.

Received: THE MOSLEM WORLD. Edited by Rev. S. M. Zwemer, D.D. London: *Christian Literature Society for India*. Price 1s. net. LONDON DIOCESE BOOK. Edited by Rev. Prebendary Glendinning Nash. London: S.P.C.K. Price 1s. 6d. net. SERMONS ON THE CORONATION. London: S.P.C.K. Price 6d. SUNDAY LETTERS TO UNKNOWN FRIENDS. By L. H. M. Soulsby. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. net. A series of practical meditations, written with her usual charm. THE TRAINING OF VILLAGE CHOIRS. By Rev. W. Kerr Smith. London: S.P.C.K. Price 2d. OUR ENGLISH BIBLE: HOW WE GOT IT. By Rev. R. B. Girdlestone. London: S.P.C.K. Price 6d. AN AFRICAN PENTECOST. By Rev. Chas. Inwood. London: *Marshall Bros.* Price 1s. A BOOK ABOUT ROSES. By S. Reynolds Hole. London: *T. Nelson and Sons*. Price 1s. CHRIST IN ISAIAH. By F. B. Meyer. London: *Morgan and Scott*. Price 1s. net. A reprint of Mr. Meyer's well-known "Bible Studies." TELL JESUS. By Anna Shipton. CHOICE SAYINGS. By R. C. Chapman. CHRISTIAN LIVING. By F. B. Meyer. ROBERT ANNAN. By Rev. J. Macpherson. FUTURE TENSES OF THE BLESSED LIFE. By F. B. Meyer. PRESENT TENSES OF THE BLESSED LIFE. By F. B. Meyer. London: *Morgan and Scott*. Price 6d. each. Reprints in cheaper form of little books that have helped many. THE MINISTRY OF THE HOLY GHOST. By Mrs. James Gow. London: *H. R. Allenson, Ltd.* Price 1s. net. Three addresses on the Holy Spirit originally given to meetings of the Mothers' Union. UNDER THE JUNIPER TREE. By J. M. Collis. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 3s. net. Daily readings for those whose life is troubled; a beautiful and helpful collection. OUR KING AND QUEEN. By David Williamson. London: *The Sunday-School Union*. Price 1s. An excellent account of the life-story of our King and Queen. A useful Coronation gift for young and old. RANDOM REMINISCENCES. By Charles Brookfield. London: *T. Nelson and Sons*. Price 1s. THE GOOD COMRADE. By Una L. Silberrad. London: *T. Nelson and Sons*. MESSAGES TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES. By T. H. Brindley, D.D. London: S.P.C.K. Price 1s. 6d. A reverent and useful series of addresses. WINDSOR CASTLE. By W. Harrison Ainsworth. London: *T. Nelson and Sons*. Price 6d. THE CHILDREN'S BOOK OF PRAYERS. By S. B. Macy. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 6d. net. A CORONATION SERMON. By Archdeacon Wilberforce. London: *Elliot Stock*. Price 6d. net. THE CORONATION OF THE KING. S.P.C.K. Price 3s. per 100. THE MILLENNIAL CITY. By E. A. Rawlence and D. Baron. London: *Morgan and Scott*. Price 6d. CHURCH SONGS. By Rev. S. Baring-Gould. London: S.P.C.K. SHOULD THE CENTRAL BOARD OF MISSIONS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND BE FINANCED, AND HOW? By E. B. Trotter. London: S.P.C.K. Price 1d. BISHOP SANDERSON ON CONSCIENCE. By G. G. Walker. London: S.P.C.K. Price 6d. A brief account of Sanderson and these particular writings. THE COMING OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. Price 2d. THE SEQUEL TO THE COMING OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. Price 1d.