

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

May, 1919.

THE MONTH.

**Bishop of
Oxford's
Resignation.** THE Bishop of Oxford's resignation will be a heavy loss to the extreme High Church party. His friend, Mr. D. C. Lathbury, writing in the *British Weekly*, raises a point to which no large attention had previously been given :—

Is it wrong for a bishop to resign "in such critical times for the Church"? If the crisis in question were likely to be soon over, it would be the plain duty of a bishop to retain such vantage ground as his position gives him for dealing with it. But Bishop Gore feels sure that the crisis through which the Church of England is now passing will not only continue, but "perhaps become more acute for years to come." In such a situation as this a single bishop who is almost invariably one of a very small minority can be of little service. Both in Convocation and in the Representative Church Council Bishop Gore's speeches are listened to, because he knows his own mind and can express it with remarkable force and clearness. But it is more than doubtful whether, except in the rarest cases, they have any influence on the division. They are far more likely to be dismissed with some of the customary platitudes about the mischief of extremes.

"This," adds Mr. Lathbury, "is the main motive which has determined the Bishop's resignation." The passage we have quoted seems to us to convey a very significant admission. It is nothing less than this, that the Bishop and his friends realize that they are powerless to direct the issue of the crisis through which the Church is passing. They see that their influence is passing away, and that there is reason to believe that real power will ultimately—perhaps soon, perhaps late—be vested in a body which, with the laity largely represented, is not specially impressed by sacerdotal pretensions. We think, however, that Mr. Lathbury does the Bishop of Oxford less than justice when he throws doubt upon his lordship's position in Convocation. We should have said that no one bishop has more dominated the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation than

Bishop Gore, and the result is seen in the reactionary proposals agreed to by the House in connection with Prayer Book Revision. That he has failed "to have any influence on the division" in the Representative Church Council we readily admit, and we attribute the fact, as we have hinted above, to the presence in the Council of a strong and independent body of lay opinion. What the effect of the Bishop's resignation will be upon the fortunes of the party with which, all his life through, he has been identified, it is not easy to say. It is certain he will not be inactive. He wants leisure for study and for writing—not little books, but something much larger. How will he use the opportunity? Will he seek to bolster up the tottering cause of the Ritualist party? or will he choose rather to give himself to authorship on lines which will enrich the whole Church? It would be altogether wrong to refuse to acknowledge the great service he has rendered by some of his writings to the study of Christology, and it may be hoped that he has it in mind further to explore that most interesting and most profitable field. That would, indeed, enable Churchmen of all schools of thought gladly to join in the Archbishop of Canterbury's prayer "that for many years to come" Bishop Gore's "learning, devotion and personality may be as heretofore at the service of the Church and people of England." But we should view with the deepest regret any attempt on the Bishop's part to resort to propagandist methods in the interests of so-called Anglo-Catholicism. It is hardly to be expected that he will support the cause of the extremer men of that school, for on more than one occasion he has taken a line (e.g. on Reservation) hostile to their position. Moreover, now that he knows, by seventeen years' experience, what are the duties and difficulties of a Diocesan Bishop, he will, we should hope, be specially careful not to do or write or say anything that would embarrass the position of the episcopate. A retired bishop has hardly less responsibility in this respect than those in active service.

A
Contrast. It is not easy to avoid noticing the startling contrast between the reception accorded by the two Archbishops to the Memorial against the proposed changes in the Communion Service, and to that presented by "the Council of the Federation of Catholic Priests" in favour of lowering the age of Confirmation. In the case of the first Memorial the

reception accorded to that deputation was sufficiently described in these Notes last month, and we have no wish further to refer to it. To say the least, it left much to be desired. But in the case of the Memorial from the "Catholic Priests," we are told that the Archbishops "have been so kind as to allow copies to be given through them to the Diocesan Bishops of their respective Provinces." We do not know who is responsible for the use of this phraseology—the Archbishops or the Federation—but, if the fact is correctly stated, we do feel it to be a matter for deep regret that "through them" this Memorial was sent to the Diocesan Bishops. For it not only asked for a lowering of the age of Confirmation so as to take in children of ten or eleven years of age, or even younger, but it actually spoke of the use of confession in such cases as tending to secure adequate moral preparation! We wonder if the Archbishops had read this Memorial before they were "so kind" as to allow copies to be given "through them" to the Bishops? We hesitate to believe it. In any case, however, they have now had the Memorial before them for some weeks, and Churchmen are entitled to know what reply the Archbishops and the Bishops to whom it has been sent have returned to it. There is a grave danger of their silence being misinterpreted. The Memorial seems to us to call for the most serious condemnation, and any hesitation on the part of the episcopate may easily become disastrous.

We do not propose to comment upon the purpose of this Memorial. It will suffice to give a few passages from it and they will carry with them their own condemnation. The Memorial is signed by the Rev. Dr. Darwell Stone (Chairman) and the Rev. F. Underhill (Secretary), and is presented to the Archbishops "on behalf of the Council of the Federation of Catholic Priests—a Society now numbering some 600 priests of the Church of England, and formed for mutual support in the defence and furtherance of Catholic Faith and Order"—who desire to ask their Graces' help "in a matter which is causing serious pastoral difficulties in some dioceses," viz., "the age limits which are fixed in many dioceses, with considerable variations, for candidates for Confirmation." Here are passages from Part I of the Memorial:—

As belief in the sacramental character of Confirmation, and in the reception thereby of those gifts of the Holy Ghost which are essential for the develop-

ment of the Christian life, has increased among us, both priests and people have come increasingly to desire the Confirmation of children at the earliest possible age.

1. We are encouraged in this by remembering that the Church of England has abstained from placing in the rubrics any definite limitation of age. Instead of an age limit, the Church requires only a sufficiency of knowledge, and a realization of responsibility. If a bishop fixes an age limit, he appears to us to go beyond, and to be in danger of contravening, what the rubrics require.

In children there will be great differences of development, due either to natural causes in themselves, or to the circumstances of home influence and education; and girls mature more quickly than boys. But it is our conviction that in a Christian household, or in a Christian school, where faith and religion are taught to the children on a Catholic basis, the requirements of the Prayer Book can be met normally at ten or eleven years of age, and frequently even earlier.

2. We believe that psychologically it is now accepted as true that there is greater receptivity to religious impressions in children up to the age of twelve, as compared with the years immediately following, and that therefore the grace of Confirmation should be imparted before the critical period of twelve years of age.

3. To this consideration we add that derived from practical experience. It is our experience that one reason for the falling away from Communion after Confirmation is that the habit of Communion was not formed in the age of receptivity. A great effort may be made at fourteen, or fifteen, to reach Confirmation, but a reaction immediately follows. The boy or girl is in the midst of a very rapid development of natural powers, and functions, and is in the full current of the world. It is precisely the period at which the formation of a good habit is most difficult; but for which the strength of a formed habit is most needed.

But the Memorial is much more than a plea for
 lowering the age of Confirmation. The following
 passages from Part II of the document convey their
 own sad tale:—

**Confession
for Children.**

We are not asking for the promiscuous Confirmation of any children. We speak on behalf of those who practise and teach Confession, and who seek thereby to be sure that the grace of God is really received into a loving and clean heart. The graver sins of the flesh begin, often without consciousness of sin, very young. It is in the preparation for Confirmation, and first Confession, that again and again sins of pollution, alone or with others, are for the first time realized as sins. We speak frankly, but we speak for those who have acquired their bitter knowledge by experience in the Confessional, besides that which may be acquired in the conduct of rescue and reformatory work. The roots of these sins, if not killed early, poison life in all its after stages. We implore your Grace to believe that we are not exaggerating. At the same time there is no safeguard of innocence so effective as regular and carefully prepared for Communion.

There will be some who object to the practice of Confession still. We speak of it, because we feel that it removes one objection which might be taken to early Confirmation and Communion. The practice certainly tends to secure adequate moral preparation, and relieves children of a responsibility of

walking alone, for which they are not yet ready, and which it is unnatural to lay upon them.

We do not ask promiscuous Confirmation, without inquiry. The present custom of bishops is to confirm without question all who are presented, if at least they seem to be of the minimum age required in the diocese. This rests no doubt on the fact that it is the responsibility of the parish priest to prepare the candidates, and the bishops trust their priests. We believe this trust to be both reasonable and right, and it would indeed be a great reversal of it for a bishop to refuse merely on account of age a candidate whom the parish priest, on inquiry, certified to be intellectually, morally, and spiritually fit. Yet this has been done.

More interesting than this Memorial will be the answers of the Archbishops—when they are made known.

The discussion which has been proceeding more or less continuously during the last eighteen months concerning the finances of the Church of England culminated at the annual meeting of the Central Board of Finance in a definite proposal by Dr. Headlam that the Prime Minister be asked to appoint a Royal Commission "to inquire into the revenues of the Church of England, and the best use that may be made of them for the religious life of the country." The suggestion found, however, very little support, but in its place the Board adopted a proposal that the Archbishops be approached to form a Committee "to inquire into the revenues of the Church of England and their distribution." What answer, if any, the Archbishops have returned to this suggestion has not yet appeared, and, for ourselves, we should not regret it if the Archbishops refused to comply with the request of the Board. We feel strongly that, if there is to be any inquiry at all, it should be, for obvious reasons, by a Royal Commission and not by an Archbishops' Committee. Whether such an inquiry is called for depends, of course, from what point of view it is regarded. Dr. Headlam's object would seem to be, if we may fall back upon his Lectures rather than his speech before the Board, more extensive than the circumstances seem to justify, and certainly wider than the general body of Church opinion would support. He would like, for example, to obtain funds from the Ecclesiastical Commission for the creation of new bishoprics, of which he thinks that no fewer than twenty are required. But the chief, perhaps the only ground on which such an inquiry is desirable is that it may be ascertained whether it is not possible by some method of pooling and

redistribution to remedy some of the glaring anomalies that now exist in the financial arrangements of the Church of England. It may be hoped, however, that the new Union of Benefices Bill which has passed the House of Lords, and may look, it is believed, for a safe passage through the House of Commons will be the means, when it comes into full operation, of effecting large reforms which will materially relieve the financial situation; and the Commission appointed by the Bishop of London, with Lord Phillimore as Chairman, may be expected to do something, we hope much, to ease the position in London where, by reason of the revenues of the City churches, the anomalies are greater than anywhere else in England. We hope we are not too sanguine, but the fact that steps are being taken in these respects does suggest a doubt whether this is the opportune moment for such an inquiry as has been suggested. It would, of course, take a very long time and might not, in the end, produce commensurate results, and meanwhile the course of reform would necessarily be brought to a standstill. The origin of recent discussions on the finances of the Church, and of such dissatisfaction as exists, may be traced to a lack of adequate knowledge concerning the administration of Church revenues. In a general sense it is known that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have considerable sums of money at their disposal, and that grants are made from time to time for the augmentation of livings and other kindred objects. But essential details have not been grasped, with the result that much misunderstanding has prevailed, and still prevails even on the part of those who, like Dr. Headlam, set themselves up as critics. The small volume published a week or two ago, *The Ecclesiastical Commission: A Sketch of its History and Work*, by Sir Lewis Dibdin, First Church Estates Commissioner, and Mr. Stanford Edwin Downing, Secretary of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. One shilling net), will do much to remove misapprehension and to show the really large amount of assistance the Commission is rendering to underpaid clergy, and in the cause of reform. We cordially recommend it.

It seems to be taken too readily for granted that
 Church and State. the Enabling Bill, which is to give statutory authority to the scheme of self-government lately passed by the Representative Church Council, will be steered through the House

of Commons without much difficulty, and that the measure will become law this year: It may be so; but the friends of the Bill will do well not to be over-sanguine, for it is tolerably clear that at some stage or other the Bill will encounter severe opposition from at least a section of the House. In the old days we should have been inclined to say that such a Bill would have a very poor chance of success, but to-day the political world is in such a condition of topsy-turvydom that it is not easy to predict what will happen. Now that party spirit has been laid by the heels, the House is supposed to be in a conciliatory mood, but even so, there are some members who are not prepared to "shut their eyes and open their mouths, and swallow whatever is sent them." They want to know the why and the wherefore of everything that is submitted to them, and assuredly they will want more information about the practical working of this scheme in its details, than some of its promoters have shown themselves ready to give. Particularly they will want to know how it will affect the present relations of Church and State, and it will not be surprising if they look somewhat askance at the argument which is urged in some quarters that the rights of Parliament will not be affected. It is just possible, too, that some members may urge that the Church of England can have self-government in the same way, and upon the same terms, as it is being "conferred" upon the Church in Wales. If this view were to prevail, what would be the Church's official answer to it? It is believed that some of the hot-heads of the "Life and Liberty" Movement are prepared, if they are driven to it, to accept disestablishment if they cannot get self-government in any other way. But that, we should hope, is not the view of the really responsible authorities of the Church of England. In any case, however, the period during which the Enabling Bill is under discussion in Parliament must be a time of real anxiety for the Church, yet we see very few signs that the possibilities of the position are at all adequately realized.

Quite the most formidable attack on the Enabling Bill which has appeared in the public press comes from the Rev. J. R. Cohu, who, in a long letter to *The Times* raises several points of great importance. These are adversely commented on, but hardly answered by, the Rev. Dr. Temple.

**Attack on the
Bill.**

Mr. Cohu declares that the Representative Church Council is not representative. "None but those whose office compels them to attend such assemblies of clerics and their lay satellites," he says, "can possibly realize their atmosphere or futility, and their proceedings do not in the least appeal to one-tenth of the Churchpeople whom they profess to represent." More than this: he goes on to contend that "there is no blinking the fact that our Church to-day is all but captured by one of its extreme wings," and he points out that "this extreme party all but hold the arena to themselves, are all-powerful in Church councils, and, unrepresentative as they are of the main body of Churchmen, carry all before them at elections and are bound to have a big majority on the so-called Representative Church Council—i.e. its policy and decision will be theirs." There are other important passages in the letter which we must quote more at length:—

Under the new scheme our Anglican comprehensiveness is doomed. At present the coupling of Church and State safeguards one of our greatest assets, the comprehensiveness of our English Church. It takes men of all types to make a nation or a national Church, and differences of religious outlook are largely temperamental. In a national Established Church every member of the nation has a right to the ministrations of the clergy. Inevitably, if the Church is to gather to her bosom a wide variety of thought, she herself must be many-sided. She must have groups of clergy facing truth from these various aspects—High, Broad, Low—yet equally loyal to her leading principles. She must also secure for them a freedom of thought and utterance, and this spiritual independence strengthens both Church and nation alike. Give the Church the "self-government" the new scheme demands, and what then? You place it under the domination of a "predominant partner," the extreme wing forming the majority in the Representative Church Council, and as the memoranda of the Bishop of Oxford (p. 248) and Dr. Frere (p. 277) in the Report itself show, short shrift will be given to those who do not fall into line with the views of this majority: "A dissatisfied member can without difficulty surrender his membership or exchange it for membership of some other body." Obey or go! . . .

It naturally follows that the "spiritual independence" and "self-government" which the scheme is demanding mean "ecclesiastical autonomy," or the power of the majority in the Council to impose their own views on the whole Church and crush or turn out all dissentients. At first glance, self-government of the Church by the Church seems such a natural and right form of procedure, but it all depends on the nature of the "self" which governs, and when, as in this case, "self-government" is but another word for government by an official majority which does not represent more than one-third, at the outside, of the real members of the Church, it is a *reductio ad absurdum*. . . .

These are some of the matters which are weighing heavily upon the minds of many thoughtful Churchmen, and they are almost certain to find their reflection in the discussion in Parliament.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM OF THE CHURCH.¹

BY THE REV. W. A. CUNNINGHAM CRAIG, M.A., Vicar of
St. Sepulchre's, Holborn Viaduct, E.C.

THE Report of the Fourth of the Archbishops' Committees will be read with a good deal of disappointment. The Committee were asked to deal with two questions :—

1. What matters in the existing administrative machinery of the Church, including patronage and endowments, seem to hinder the spiritual work of the Church.

2. How can the reform or the removal of such hindrances be most effectively promoted.

The form of these two questions at once suggests that there is a general measure of agreement that Church Reform is needed and that some steps in this direction must be taken. The administrative machinery of the Church is out-of-date. The spiritual work of the Church is hindered. Measures of reform must be taken as part of the general work of reconstruction in which the Church, along with every other institution among us, must engage. That is assumed to begin with. The Committee were not asked to examine the grounds of that assumption. They were bidden, rightly or wrongly, to accept it as their starting-point.

Accordingly the sphere of their inquiry was to that extent narrowed. Very few people will seriously quarrel with that assumption. The Church has without doubt been slow to adapt its organization to new conditions. Reform has always been timid and hesitating. Yet at the same time to start with this initial assumption is to begin with a bias towards change and is likely to raise expectations from administrative reform which in the end may not be realized.

¹ In continuation of the series of articles dealing with the Reports of the Archbishops' Committees of Inquiry we print this month's a review of that (the fourth) on "The Administrative Reform of the Church." The Report is published by the S.P.C.K. (6d. net). The Committee consisted of the following : Bishop of Southwell (Chairman), Mr. Ralph Banks, K.C., Bishop of Birmingham, Dean of Carlisle, Lord Hugh Cecil, M.P., Mrs. Creighton, Mr. Douglas Eyre, Mr. P. Lyttelton Gill, Mr. H. Hodge, Dean of Lincoln, Dean of Manchester (Bishop Welldon), Rev. C. H. S. Matthews, Mr. E. Newton, Sir Charles Nicholson, M.P., Mr. W. Peel, Rev. Tissington Tatlow, Rev. W. Temple, Rev. H. S. Woolcombe.

Only in one of their opening paragraphs do the Committee touch upon the general question. They "believe that the spiritual efficiency of the Church is in many ways greatly hampered by anomalies in the existing administrative system," but they go on to admit that "no rectification or adjustment of machinery can of itself make the Church that spiritual power in the nation which we desire to see it become." "Where His Spirit is there is life and power; where His Spirit is absent there can only be impotence and death." This is well said; but it must not be forgotten that even the most defective machinery cannot altogether defeat the power and influence of the Spirit. Where the Spirit is, His influence will be felt in spite of the most glaring anomalies of the administrative system. It is the very glory of God's working that it can triumph over whatever obstacles may be put in the way by human frailty and blindness. His strength is made perfect in our weakness, and it may be that the Church is hampered in its work to-day more because it has lost the guidance and power of the Holy Spirit than because of any faults in its own organization. That of course does not mean that we should not do our best to discover and remedy these defects. It is merely a caution which ought never to be omitted.

The five Committees were appointed as a result of the National Mission. So far they seem to be almost the only result of that well-meant but mis-timed effort. In the opinion of the present writer, the Church ought never to have been called to such a task in the midst of war. No one can say that the National Mission failed, because no one can say with confidence what the National Mission aimed at. But if we can recall the exhortations which were delivered during the planning and carrying out of the mission, we can be fairly certain that it aimed at something more than the appointment of five Committees of investigation and that if the outcome had been more clearly foreseen, possibly the same result might have been reached by a less circuitous route. The Committees were appointed to deal with facts which the experience gained in the National Mission had brought to light. Yet it is surely true that the facts with which the different Committees were called to deal, were patent to almost every one before the National Mission was ever thought of. If the National Mission revealed those facts for the first time, it was only to those who

had been either culpably or deliberately blind. That is certainly true of the questions dealt with in the Report of the Fourth Committee, whatever may be the case with the other Committees. Church Reform has been a living issue for years. There is not a single question raised in this Report which had not been fully discussed before the war and there is not a single remedy suggested that had not been previously suggested and urged. There is a difference of atmosphere, that is all, and that difference may not be wholly and altogether to the good. In the years before the war the Church Reformer spoke to deaf ears; now he speaks to those who are ready to welcome almost any change, so long as it is change. The one attitude may well be just as dangerous to true progress as the other. To accept drastic changes in a hurry or in a panic, is only less mischievous than to refuse to move at all.

Still, when all this has been said, the Committee had a great opportunity before them. They might have been expected to survey the whole field with an open mind, to start afresh without depending too much on the work of others and to draw up a large and comprehensive scheme of reform based on some broad principle or policy which would combine and correlate the different parts into a consistent whole. They would have begun by inquiring what kind of a Church would be best fitted to grapple with the spiritual tasks of the present and the immediate future, and then would have considered what steps should be taken to make this ideal actual. That would have been a task well worthy of their labours, and had they even attempted it, they would have laid the Church under a deep obligation to them. But they have not attempted it. They have approached the subject piecemeal rather than as a whole. They have attacked different anomalies, one by one, providing some kind of a remedy for each, and then have thrown the whole together, without apparently taking time to consider what the ultimate result of a number of different changes would be or how they would react on one another or on the whole life of the Church. The result is a patchwork—rather than a consistent and thought-out scheme. The cumulative effect of a multitude of separate and distinct changes will be more a matter of chance than of purpose and design.

Nor is that all or even the worst. The Committee do not seem to have given independent thought to any single problem that

they have discussed. Not one of their proposals bears the marks of originality. They have simply taken over and adopted as their own almost every suggestion that had been put forward by different bodies of Church Reformers in the past. "Alas! Master, for it was borrowed" might truly be said of almost every suggestion which they make. With such tools they would rebuild the new habitations, having found that the place in which they dwelt was too straight for them. It should not be difficult to foretell whether the axe will sink or swim.

Thus instead of entering upon the difficult task of examining into the relation of Church and State, they practically borrow right off the proposals of the Archbishop's Committee with some further suggestions, also borrowed, from the Life and Liberty movement. Two sentences are apparently enough to devote to what really lies at the very root of the whole matter. "We desire to give a general support to the Report on the relations of Church and State with regard to the formation and function of parochial Church Councils" (p. 11). "We close our report with the recommendation to which we give all possible emphasis, that the Church should at the earliest possible moment recover freedom of legislation through its own deliberative assemblies" (p. 22).

They borrow the suggestion so often made by the Church Reform League that the parson's freehold should be abolished and that institution to a benefice should be for a term of years. They borrow the suggestion that the law is disregarded because "many of the clergy do not recognize the authority of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council which is at present the supreme tribunal in such cases," and foresee a revision in the system of "ecclesiastical judicature"—significantly adding, "but the chief difficulties of the present situation would be removed if the Church recovered its freedom of legislation." In other words, this means that instead of the Judicial Committee we should soon have a purely ecclesiastical tribunal set up by the legislative action of the Church. Instead of entering upon a discussion of the extremely thorny subject of Patronage, they borrow the suggestion of Diocesan Boards of Patronage and would confer new rights upon the Bishops to refuse institution and a certain right of veto on the parishioners. There is nothing new in such suggestions. They have often been made before and they are little more than ingenious attempts to

evade the real difficulty. With regard to the appointment of Bishops, they yield without a murmur to a recent agitation and adopt the expedient of an Advisory Council to assist the Prime Minister, which has been advocated by the Bishop of Oxford and the Church Reform League. Every little group of Church Reformers is to have its own pet reform adopted and its own demand satisfied. This is borrowing right and left, and the different elements are thrown together and presented to us as a serious scheme of Church Reform.

All that the Committee have done with those borrowed materials is to arrange them under separate headings: parochial, capitular and Diocesan, with sub-divisions under each relating to appointment, tenure and vacation of office. This no doubt is useful and convenient for purposes of discussion and reference, but it was work which might just as well have been carried out by an intelligent clerk with a file of the *Church Times* and the *Challenge* and is hardly worthy of the labours of so distinguished a Committee.

There are, however, some general principles which do seem to underlie most of the changes advocated by the Committee. They would result in a great increase of episcopal authority. Dioceses would be subdivided and Bishops would be invested with powers both in regard to institution and discipline far in excess of those which they now possess. It may well be doubted whether even in the case of Bishops appointed under the present system the granting of such additional powers would be for the benefit of the Church. But the new method of appointment must in time tell upon the character of the episcopate itself. At present Bishops are often men of outstanding ability and independence of character. The Prime Minister is practically unfettered in his choice and need look to nothing else than the personal fitness of the nominee. The suggested Advisory Council, if it becomes effective, can only act in one way. It will bring the pressure of current Church opinion to bear on the choice and will tend more and more to favour the promotion of men who have not made themselves unpopular with any large section of the Church. The absence of any decided views, caution and moderation will be the surest recommendations for the episcopate. This will tend more and more to produce a conventional uniformity just where the highest qualities of courage and independence are most supremely desirable. The increased

powers of patronage and discipline which will be placed in these timid hands will react quickly on the whole life of the Church. Variety, individuality, even a certain measure of eccentricity, give life and colour to a large institution like the Church of England. The proposals now set forward seem deliberately calculated to produce a dull conventionality.

This apparent distrust of liberty seems to run through the whole of the proposals of the Committee. It is even more clearly marked in the case of those concerning patronage and the tenure of parochial cures. The Committee admit that the "parson's freehold" is one of the "oldest of English institutions and recognize the advantages secured by it in the way of freedom from arbitrary action by the Bishop or agitation of the parishioners. But we hold that the advantage is purchased at too high a price." Yet the parson's freehold does far more than protect an incumbent from the arbitrary action of the Bishop and the agitation of his parishioners. It gives him that security of tenure which is the condition of his moral and intellectual freedom. It has produced a type of character among the English clergy which in itself is a very precious thing. The price paid may at times be high, but the boon is priceless.

Now suppose you substitute for the parson's freehold the ten years' tenure of a benefice, along with the institution of Diocesan Boards of Patronage and the right of the Bishop to refuse institution to any one whom he may consider unsuitable to the parish, the whole character of the parochial clergy will gradually be changed. The parochial clergy have in the past been drawn to a large extent from a section of the community with clearly marked characteristics and traditions of its own. They have received at public school and University the customary education of an English gentleman. The type produced is one that is on the whole very jealous of its own independence, rather suspicious of external discipline. It is supremely capable of accepting responsibility and it reveals its best qualities when it can develop without much interference. The peculiar position of the parochial incumbent, with his security of tenure, his well-established position and his definite responsibilities is calculated to develop that type of character to its fullest extent. A long tradition has been established and handed down. This type admits of great variety of expression and

on the whole it has reached a high standard of efficiency. But it has—from one point of view—certain drawbacks. It resents interference and dictation, it cannot be drilled into uniformity nor will it become readily subservient to authority. From the point of view of one school of Church Reformer, these are the things which make him say that freedom can be purchased at too dear a price. He is out to destroy this type and whether they mean it or not, the proposals of the Committee are all calculated to achieve that end. Men of the character and traditions who have found a congenial sphere of labour within the ministry of the English Church, will not tolerate the new conditions which it is sought to impose. Gradually the ranks of the ministry will be filled by a different type, which is even now making its appearance and receives a degree of episcopal favour and encouragement which often seems out of proportion to its intrinsic merits.

Let me try to sketch the career of this new type of clergyman who will step into the place of the old. When the class which has hitherto supplied the majority of the clergy ceases to do so, we shall have to look elsewhere for candidates for holy orders. No doubt there is an abundant supply ready to our hand. Our new candidate will be drawn from those who in ordinary circumstances would not go to the University. He will first be selected and approved by a Diocesan Committee or Council. He will then be wholly or partly assisted in his education by Diocesan or Central Funds. From the very first he will be dependent and his whole career will turn upon his success in pleasing those who have selected him. Should he show signs of undue independence during his University career—too marked a tendency to think and act for himself—he will be gently reminded that he is a Diocesan candidate and that he is expected to move on certain lines. After his ordination, during the ten or fifteen years when he is a curate, his chance of ever attaining an independent sphere of work will depend upon a Diocesan Board of Patronage. The Board will look out for safe men. A man who has shown any marked individuality or has taken an unpopular line, will generally be passed over. Accordingly during his unbeneficed years, the new minister will avoid all exaggeration or extreme and walk warily in the well-trodden paths. Then his turn will come and the Diocesan Board of Patronage will select this mild and exemplary individual for the charge

of a parish. But he is not yet to be trusted with too much freedom. He will only be instituted for ten years and at the end of that time, unless he has retained the confidence of Bishop and Board, he may find that he is removed. The spectre of such a fate will act during those ten years as an effectual check on any tendencies of originality in thought or action, which may not have been crushed out by the training he has already received. Finally, those who are most successful in adapting themselves to these strange conditions—the safest of the safe—may eventually attract the notice of the Advisory Committee elected by the Church Council and be recommended to the Prime Minister for one of the higher offices in the Church—possibly for the Episcopate itself.

Does any one imagine that the Church will be stronger, morally, spiritually or intellectually or will have a greater influence on the life of the nation through such a ministry as this? The discipline of the Jesuits is calculated to crush out the independence of the individual will and make a man the obedient instrument of a great machine. The policy of our Church Reformers by gentler but even surer methods would produce in time a similar result. Compare this programme with the free atmosphere of the New Testament and the initiative shown by apostles and it will appear to be almost a burlesque of Christianity.

The general bias of the Committee against allowing too much freedom to the clergy may be illustrated in another way. They do make one concession to the principle which they appear to distrust. "Being aware of the advantage of Crown patronage in relation of the appointment of Canons, in the interest of the comprehensiveness of the Church of England, we are of opinion that this should be better distributed as between the various Cathedrals." The concession appears somewhat reluctant, but it is on that account all the more significant. Residentiary Canonries are to be left as a last shelter and resting-place for clerical independence. Having done their best to bring about uniformity everywhere else, the comprehensiveness of the Church is to be saved by reserving a few positions for men who are excluded from every other position of influence in the Church. Crown Patronage will be allowed to remain in order to provide for a small section of the clergy who cannot be fitted into the conventional moulds, and thus an appearance of comprehensiveness will be retained when the reality has been destroyed.

Such a suggestion shows only too clearly the motives which have influenced the minds of the majority of the Committee. They are really abandoning the best traditions of the Church. They would, if they could, alter its whole character. The comprehensiveness of the Church of England has been its most outstanding feature. This which has been the expression of its inner soul, is now to be left in a mere backwater. What we have been accustomed to find more or less throughout the length and breadth of the land, must now be looked for only in a Cathedral close.

This present article must now be drawn to a close. It is only fair to say that the most searching criticism of the proposals of the Committee come from one of their own members. Every one should read the masterly memorandum of the Dean of Carlisle containing his reasons for dissenting from many of the principal recommendations. If there had been one or two more men like Dr. Rashdall on the Committee the Report would have been of a very different character.

There are two general remarks which may be made in conclusion. True reform will always aim at preserving the spirit and genius of an old institution while altering and adapting its outward form. The Committee have not kept this sufficiently in view. The old spirit could hardly live under the conditions which would be created. Continuity of life may be preserved amid outward change where care is taken to keep alive the inner spirit, but continuity is broken when we destroy what has been the vital force behind the old forms. The Committee's proposals would give us a new Church without vital connexion with the past.

Lastly, what strikes one most forcibly on reading this report, as it does in the case of many other schemes that have been put forward, is the conviction that Church Reform cannot be safely left in the hands of ecclesiastics—whether clerical or lay. It must be the work of the nation speaking through some organ in which the real voice of the laity will find expression. The vital flaw in all ecclesiastical schemes is that they aim at creating a Church which will be easy to manage. They are framed in the interests of the ecclesiastical statesman. We want a scheme based on larger considerations than that—one that will meet the religious need of the nation. One practical way—and only one—has been suggested, that of a Royal Commission. The suggestion was first made by the Bishop

of Hereford. It has received the powerful adhesion of Dr. A. C. Headlam. Surely the next step that should be taken by all who desire reform but distrust our ecclesiastical reformers, should be to press for the appointment of a strong Royal Commission which would explore the whole range of the subject with sympathy and breadth of vision. Then it would be seen whether such a body of men could not produce a scheme of Reform more acceptable to the great mass of the laity and more in accordance with the true interests of the Church.

W. A. CUNNINGHAM CRAIG.

THE EMPTY TOMB.

"In the Resurrection of Jesus Christ we have the triumphant vindication of God as Master in His own world. His power and love will have the last word in the universe that He has made. With such a confidence we may not only face the dark enigma of sin and suffering and death, but be bold to live by that same law which Christ made the rule of His own life, and bade us do the same by taking up our cross and following Him. He has shown us that faith is better than sight, dying for the truth better than living for the false, right mightier than force, love stronger than death. Loyalty to right and truth shall triumph when all time-serving and compromise with evil shall have had their day. Here and now the good is often worsted. Vice often wears a crown, while virtue is an outcast. 'But moral principles prevail beyond the tomb, and in the world on the yonder side of the grave they are recognized as supreme.'

"It is for us to win back, first to ourselves and then to the age in which we live, this joyful certainty that springs from the empty tomb. The things for which the Crucified one stood were not 'only the dream of a Peasant, whose cross stands in the deep darkness in a dark world': they are the very truth of man, of the world, and of God. No longer need we say our Alleluia weeping, but may rather strike up our Te Deum to Him who by overcoming the sharpness of death has opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers and 'filled all the world with joyful music.'"—CANON DE CANDOLE in *Christian Assurance*.



WHAT DID OUR LORD MEAN ?

BY THE REV. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D.

[The substance of this paper appeared in 1911 as a booklet which was compiled at the request of several influential and representative Canadian Churchmen who wished to have in brief form a statement of the main teaching of the New Testament and Prayer Book on the Lord's Supper, with special reference to a Canadian publication for Sunday School teachers in which some erroneous teaching had appeared. It is now reissued, because the problems are just as ripe to-day as they were eight years ago, and because the truth of Scripture and our Prayer Book needs constant presentation.]

WHEN the Lord Jesus Christ instituted the Lord's Supper He used these (among other) words : " This do in remembrance of Me." And St. Paul in giving his account of the Institution added : " As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come." What do these words really mean ?

A Sunday School Canadian paper¹ for Teachers gave its readers this explanation :

" St. Luke and St. Paul tell us that our Lord said, ' Do this (make this offering) in remembrance of Me.' "

" Our Lord is in heaven ; His Church is on earth. Because of His words in the Upper Room the Church does here what Christ is doing in heaven. He pleads before God the Father, the offering of Himself as the Lamb. . . . What Christ is doing in heaven the Church does on earth in Holy Communion ; we plead the Lamb of God, Jesus our Lord, when as He commanded we do ' this.' "

Now the question is whether this interpretation of our Lord's words is correct.

How can we test it ? Only by the highest and best Greek scholarship, and by the clearest and most accurate New Testament teaching.

Several points call for attention.

I. DOES " DO THIS " MEAN " MAKE THIS OFFERING " ?

1. The Greek word for " do " occurs in the New Testament more than 550 times, and is translated in more than fifty different ways, and yet not once is it found translated by the word " offer."

2. In no translation of the New Testament, not even the Roman Catholic Douay Version, has it ever been translated by any other word than " do " in the words of Institution.

¹ *The Teachers' Assistant*. Edited by the late Rev. T. W. Powell. S.S. Institute Publications, Eglinton, Ont., Canada, Nov. 1910, p. 426.

3. Wherever the Greek word translated "do" is found in the Greek Version of the Old Testament it is the equivalent of the Hebrew word "make" or "do," and it is only when the context is perfectly clear that the word is rendered in the Greek Old Testament by "offer," or "sacrifice." Everywhere else the ordinary meaning of "do" is found.

4. If the word means "offer" in connection with the Holy Communion, then 1 Corinthians xi. 25 must read "*Offer* this as oft as ye *drink* it." Surely this would be an utterly impossible rendering of the verse.

5. This rendering of "offer" is rejected by Roman Catholic commentators like Aquinas, Cajetan, Estius, and others.

6. Dr. Ince (late Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford) says: "Not one English Greek scholar sanctions the translation, e.g., Thirlwall, Christopher Wordsworth, Ellicott, Alford, Westcott." To these can be added Bishop Gore, Canon Mason, and Dr. Plummer. It will be useful to have the very words of some of these authorities. Bishop Ellicott says: "To render the words 'Sacrifice this' is to violate the regular use of the word 'do' in the New Testament, and to import polemical considerations into words which do not in any degree involve or suggest them."¹ Dr. Plummer remarks: "The proposal to give these words a sacrificial meaning, and translate them 'Offer this,' 'Sacrifice this,' 'Offer this sacrifice,' cannot be maintained."² Canon Mason states that: "The rendering 'Offer this' has against it the fact that it is of recent origin."³ Bishop Gore concludes: "On the whole, then, there is not sufficient evidence to entitle us to say that 'do' bears the sacrificial sense in the New Testament."⁴ Bishop Westcott writes: "In the context in which the words occur I have not the least doubt that 'Do this' can only mean 'Do this act' (including the whole action of hands and lips), and not 'Sacrifice this.'"⁵

Dr. Darwell Stone admits that the writers of the Early Church and the compilers of the Liturgies understood the words to mean "Perform this action."⁶

¹ Bishop Ellicott on 1 Cor. xi. 25.

² Plummer, "St. Luke," International Critical Commentary, p. 497 (abbreviated).

³ Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*. Second Edition, p. 328, note.

⁴ Gore, *The Body of Christ*. First Edition, p. 315.

⁵ Westcott's *Life and Letters*, Vol. II., p. 353.

⁶ *History of the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, p. 9.

II. DOES "REMEMBRANCE" MEAN "MEMORIAL"?

1. The Greek words for "remembrance" and "memorial" are quite different and are never confused or identified. "A 'memorial' is something *exterior* to the person, which can generally be perceived by the senses; whereas the word translated 'remembrance' is a *mental act*, performed in, or by, or upon the mind. A 'memorial' may produce a 'remembrance,' but it is certainly *not* the mental effect or act itself." ¹

2. The best Greek scholarship bears out this distinction and does not interpret "in remembrance" as "for a memorial." "There is not sufficient evidence to entitle us to say that 'do' bears the sacrificial sense in the New Testament. The matter stands similarly with 'remembrance.'" ²

III. DOES "SHEW" MEAN "PLEAD" OR "OFFER"?

1. The Greek word means "announce," "proclaim," and has nothing sacrificial about it.

2. The object of the verb is always man and never God. It means to announce to man and not to God.

3. No Greek scholarship would allow it to be interpreted to mean "exhibit before God."

IV. IS IT TRUE TO SAY THAT—"BECAUSE OF HIS WORDS IN THE UPPER ROOM THE CHURCH DOES HERE WHAT CHRIST IS DOING IN HEAVEN"? ³

1. Nothing whatever in the New Testament shows that He is "pleading" or "offering" His sacrifice. On the contrary, He is "seated" at God's right hand after His "one oblation of Himself once offered."—Hebrews i. 3; viii. 1; x. 10; x. 12. Westcott says: "The modern conception of Christ pleading in heaven His passion, 'offering His blood,' on behalf of man, has no foundation in this epistle." ⁴ Hort remarks similarly: "The words, 'Still . . . His prevailing death He pleads,' have no apostolic warrant and cannot even be reconciled with apostolic doctrine." ⁵

2. Nothing in the Prayer Book teaches or even suggests "plead-

¹ Soames, *The Priesthood of the New Covenant*, p. 28.

² Gore, *The Body of Christ*. First Edition, p. 315.

³ See above, p. 249.

⁴ Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 230.

⁵ *Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort*, Vol. II., p. 213.

ing" or "offering." "We look at our time-honoured creeds—it is not there. We turn to the grand anthem, which has come down to us from remote antiquity—the 'Te Deum'; not a word. We examine our Eucharistic Service—it is not there. We find a Proper Preface for the day of our Lord's Ascension into heaven—it is not there. In the obsecrations of our Litany we find mention of all the prominent points in our blessed Lord's work for our salvation, but no word of any offering of propitiatory sacrifice in heaven. We look at the Articles of Religion. It certainly is not there."¹ The Sunday School paper already referred to has the following statements :—

"That we thus may be able to feed upon Him, He has given to His Church authority to consecrate, by the power of His Holy Spirit, bread and wine to become for our souls His Body and Blood. When we receive the bread and wine thus consecrated, we verily and indeed receive His sacred Flesh and Blood according to His Divine method."

"This is what is known as the doctrine of the Real Presence. The term 'Real Presence' signifies the presence of a Reality. This reality is the Body and Blood of Christ present in the Sacrament under the form of bread and wine."

"We should never speak of receiving bread and wine in the Sacrament, but rather of receiving the Body and Blood of Christ which are hidden beneath the bread and wine."²

Whether these words truly and properly represent New Testament teaching may be tested by the following considerations.

1. Where may we find the warrant for the statement that "He has given to His Church authority to consecrate"? There is some confusion of thought here, for our Lord's words at the time of the first Institution of the Communion were not words of consecration at all, but words of *administration*. He did not consecrate, He administered, using certain words and actions at the moment of doing so. Of course we to-day in using our Lord's words and reproducing His actions may rightly be said to consecrate the elements by setting them apart for the sacred purpose of the Lord's Supper. But this is very different from saying that "He has given to His Church authority to consecrate." It is never safe to make a general statement involving matters of great importance without being able to support it by proper authority.

2. "To consecrate, by the power of His Holy Spirit." Here

¹ Adapted and abbreviated from Dimock, *The Christian Doctrine of Sacerdotium*, p. 13 f.

² See above.

again, we naturally ask for proof of the statement. No reference to the Holy Spirit appears in the New Testament in connection with the institution of the Lord's Supper. No reference to the Holy Spirit is found in the prayer of Consecration in the Communion Office. An Invocation of the Holy Spirit on the elements was found in the Prayer Book of 1549, but was omitted from the Prayer Book of 1552, and has never been restored. Would it not have been more accurate and fair, either to state these facts, or else to have omitted any reference to the Holy Spirit in connection with the consecration of the elements?

3. "Bread and wine become for our souls His Body and Blood." Again, there is an entire absence of authority from New Testament or Prayer Book for this word "*become*." How can bread and wine "become" our Lord's Body and Blood? The elements of bread and wine and the Body and Blood of Christ are always kept distinct in connection with the Holy Communion, and are not to be identified in any way whatever. There is a constant and beautiful parallelism between them at every point, but the one never "becomes" the other.

4. "We verily and indeed receive His Sacred Flesh and Blood." But our Lord spoke of His "Body," not His "Flesh," and as the Lord's Supper is always associated with the Lord's Death, and never with His glorified life in heaven, it is impossible to speak of receiving His "Blood" except in the sense of the spiritual efficacy of the Atonement on Calvary. Bishop Westcott's testimony is to the point here: "One grave point I am utterly unable to understand—how the Body broken and the Blood shed can be identified with the Person of the Lord. I find no warrant in our Prayer Book, or ancient authorities, for such an identification. . . . The circumstances of the institution are, we may say, spiritually reproduced. The Lord Himself offers His Body given and His Blood shed, but these gifts are not either separately (as the Council of Trent) or in combination Himself."¹

5. "The Doctrine of the Real Presence." The phrase, "Real Presence" is not found in any of the Anglican formularies. It is unknown earlier than the Middle Ages, and the compilers of our Prayer Book objected to its novelty and ambiguity. All presence of Christ must be real, and a spiritual presence is not less real because

¹ Westcott, *Life and Letters*, Vol. II., p. 351.

it is spiritual, but it is altogether inaccurate to say that the only "real presence" can be a presence in the elements by virtue of consecration. The reception by us of the spiritual efficacy and power of Christ's Atonement is independent of His local presence at any given place or time. The Body as "given" for us and the Blood as "shed" did not exist at the time of "the Institution, and do not exist now, and therefore cannot be locally present. Yet they are "given" by God in spiritual force and blessing through faith. The Atonement of Calvary is not and cannot be present now, and yet we continually partake of its vital efficacy and blessing. But for this no special mode of the presence is necessary. Scripture and the Prayer Book will be searched in vain for any indication that the presence of our Lord in the Lord's Supper means a presence attached to, or identified with, the elements.

6. "This Reality is the Body and Blood of Christ present in the Sacrament under the form of bread and wine." Once more we ask for the Scriptural and Anglican authority for any presence "under the form of bread and wine." Bishop Andrewes repudiated this idea with scorn, as the late Bishop of Edinburgh (Dr. Dowden) has convincingly shown, and Dr. Dowden himself, one of our greatest liturgical authorities, writes as follows: "One thing is absolutely certain: It is no part of the doctrine of our Church that there is an adorable presence of our Lord's body and blood *in* or *under* the forms of bread and wine. Such language is undiscoverable in the doctrinal standards of our Church, and wholly unknown to the Church of the early Fathers."¹ Bishop Westcott uses similar language: "It seems to me vital to guard against the thought of the presence of the Lord in or under the form of bread and wine. From this the greatest practical errors follow. The elements represent the human nature, as He lived and died for us under the conditions of earthly life."²

7. The Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Gore) says that in the Declaration on Kneeling, and, "what is more important, in the form of consecration," the doctrine of a presence in the elements is "plainly evaded, and not asserted."³ Is not this a surprising and significant admis-

¹ Bishop Dowden, *Define Your Terms*. An Address to his Diocesan Synod, 1900, p. 21.

² Westcott, *Life and Letters*, Vol. II., p. 351.

³ Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 321.

sion? We believe that the truth would be better expressed by saying "plainly avoided," for the compilers of our Communion Office were not the men to "evade" a question of this kind, and the changes made in the Prayer Book of 1552, including the omission of the Invocation of the Holy Spirit on the elements are positive proofs, not of "evasions," but of "avoidances." As Vogan in his able and unanswered book well says: "It will, perhaps, be said that the Church of England does not deny 'the Real Presence'; but this is nothing to the purpose. She does not teach it: and if it were her belief she would not have left a doctrine of such moment to be inferred by a very doubtful process from statements which at best do not necessarily mean it."¹

8. The extract given above from the Sunday School paper says that "we should never speak of receiving bread and wine in the Sacrament, but rather receiving the Body and Blood of Christ which are hidden beneath the bread and wine." It is difficult, not to say impossible, to reconcile these words with those used by every clergyman at the consecration of the elements: "Grant that we, receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine." This, with the phrase immediately following, "may be partakers, etc.," and also the Words of Administration to each communicant, show clearly the careful way in which the Church of England keeps separate and distinguishes between the elements of bread and wine and the spiritual efficacy of the ordinance. The two parts of the Sacrament are never confused or identified in the accurate, scriptural, theological language of our formularies.

9. There is one supreme test of the accuracy of the teaching now being considered. If there be a presence of Christ "in" or "under" the elements, what becomes of that presence in the case of unworthy recipients? If the elements are administered to two persons in succession, one of whom is not a Christian, what, on this theory, is given, and what does the unfaithful one receive different from the other? If Christ be present in the elements independent of use and reception, it surely follows that all who receive the elements receive Christ. But is it possible to receive the Body and Blood of Christ without receiving Christ in His Grace and power? And what is the meaning of Article XXIX., which teaches that "the wicked . . . although they do

¹ Vogan, *True Doctrine of the Eucharist*, p. 254.

carnally and visibly press with their teeth the Sacrament yet IN NO WISE (*nullo modo*) are they partakers of Christ " ? Could language be clearer or stronger ? There is no " evasion " here.

All the statements of the articles in the Sunday School publication in question have now been considered, and it is believed that no vital point has been overlooked. What, then, is the conclusion to be drawn ? First, in the face of these facts is it fair to tell Sunday School teachers (who do not know Greek and cannot test statements for themselves) what is found in the extracts quoted above ? And second, is it right ? Truth is the one great requirement. It is no question of differing theological interpretations ; it is a question of what words and phrases actually mean. Let us have truth at any cost, and let us follow it whithersoever it leads. Let us not teach our teachers and children anything that cannot stand the test of the most rigid inquiry by the finest scholarship.

That only is true Christianity which is loyal to New Testament teaching. And that only is true Churchmanship which, based on New Testament teaching, is loyal both to the utterances and the silences of the Prayer Book. " To the law and to the testimony ; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them " (Isa. viii. 20).



ISAAC WATTS.

BY THE REV. C. SYDNEY CARTER, M.A.

THERE are few, if any, hymns more universally popular than "O God, our help in ages past," and none, it may surely be safely asserted, which has been in such frequent use in all our churches during the past four and a half years, and yet its celebrated author is probably little more than a name to most modern Church people. He was, however, not only an influential and prominent figure in the religious and literary world of his day, but his life (1674-1748) also forms an interesting connecting link between the Puritan Fathers of the seventeenth century and the great Methodist Revival of the eighteenth, which was in full bloom at his death.

Isaac Watts, the eldest of nine children, came of a sturdy and staunch Puritan ancestry. His grandfather, a gallant Naval Commander, was killed in the Dutch Wars in 1656, and his father suffered severely for his Nonconformist principles under the iniquitous penal laws of Charles II, being more than once imprisoned, and in 1684 compelled to leave his family and live secretly in London for two years owing to the virulence of the persecution against the Dissenters. He kept a large and flourishing boarding school at Southampton, having pupils entrusted to his care from places as distant as America and the West Indies.

As we read the letters the father wrote to his youthful family during his enforced exile from home, we can have little doubt that young Isaac owed much of his future usefulness in the Church of Christ to the pious and exemplary home training he received from the godly deacon of the Independent congregation at Southampton. From the same source he must also have inherited his remarkable poetic gifts, as we find the old father composing a beautiful hymn at the advanced age of eighty-five! Isaac very soon developed a talent for versification and was also of a peculiarly studious disposition from his early years, all his spare pocket money being expended in the purchase of books.

When we learn that his father commenced teaching him Latin at the age of four, Greek at nine, and Hebrew at thirteen, we are not surprised that Watts should attribute the cause of the chronic

invalidity of his later years to overstudy in his youthful days ! At the age of six he was sent to a Grammar School in Southampton.

Although he was nurtured in a home of piety and godliness and familiar from his earliest days with the truth and precepts of the Gospel, it was not until Watts was fifteen that he dates his own definite spiritual awakening from a personal realization of peace and joy in believing. It was about this time that he received a generous and attractive offer from a local physician to defray the expenses of his education at the University with a view to his entering the Ministry of the Church. With the intimate knowledge of the persecution which his father had endured for conscience' sake, young Watts respectfully declined this tempting offer and decided to throw in his lot with his father's people. In 1690 he went to a Dissenting Academy in London presided over by Thomas Rowe and had here for his chief friend and fellow student Josiah Hort, the future Archbishop of Tuam. He left Mr. Rowe's College in 1694 with a considerable reputation for piety and learning, and for the next two years retired to his father's house to prepare himself by further study and quiet meditation for the work of the Christian Ministry. In 1696 Watts accepted the post of tutor in the family of Sir John Hartopp, Bart., a prominent Dissenter residing at Stoke Newington, where he remained for the next five years.

In 1698 Watts was chosen as Assistant Minister and morning preacher to a Congregational Church meeting in Mark Lane, where his patron worshipped, and his accomplished and attractive preaching soon won for him the esteem and affection of a congregation which had been somewhat languishing under the unpopular ministrations of its pastor, Dr. I. Chauncey. His ministry was interrupted in 1699 and 1701 by prolonged periods of ill-health, but on the resignation of Dr. Chauncey in 1701 he was somewhat reluctantly persuaded, owing to his ill-health, to succeed him. He was solemnly ordained to the pastorate in 1702.

It is interesting and instructive to read the Articles of Faith which the zealous young Congregational pastor furnished for the approval of his people, since they probably represented the generally received views of the Independents of that time. While admitting that "every Society of saints" walking according to the principles of the Gospel "is a Church of Christ," and "may pray

together and exhort one another," Watts considers this Society an "incomplete Church" and "not to possess power to administer all ordinances" until "they have chosen a proper officer to be over them in the Lord"—one who must be ordained "by their public call and solemn separation of him by fasting and prayer," and then "unto this officer is this power committed." It would be interesting to know how many Congregationalists to-day retain this sharply defined rule of discipline! It is interesting also to notice, in view of the existing Reunion movement, that a similar Christlike aim and spirit was not altogether wanting amongst those early Nonconformists who had been nurtured in an environment of the harshest intolerance and persecution. At the very time of the fanatical High Church outbreaks against Dissenters occasioned by the Sacheverell trial and the Occasional Conformity Bill struggle, Watts published in 1707 a treatise on *Orthodoxy and Charity United*, in which he strongly reprobated the prevailing spirit of sectarian bitterness and earnestly pleaded for a reunion of Churchmen and Dissenters, or at least for a greater spirit of love and brotherhood amongst Christians differing only over such minor matters as the use of ceremonies, liturgical prayers and vestures. This timely appeal fell on deaf ears, but throughout his life Watts was on most cordial terms of friendship with men of all parties and was specially intimate with such eminent Church dignitaries as Archbishops Secker, Blackburne, Hort and Bishop Gibson, all of whom habitually received, and greatly appreciated, presents of his theological writings. The celebrated evangelist, Whitefield, also visited him, and Watts took a deep and sympathetic interest in the progress of the Methodist Revival, although he seriously warned Whitefield against his early claims to special revelations of the Holy Spirit, which Bishop Butler had also denounced as "A horrid thing, a very horrid thing!"

In 1707 the Mark Lane congregation removed to Bury Street, St. Mary Axe; but as early as 1703, owing to his uncertain health, an assistant pastor had to be chosen to help Watts, and in 1711 a serious illness, which would be described to-day as neurasthenia, quite unfitted him for any public work for the next four years and was often so severe as to endanger his mind. Watts displayed a remarkable patience and faith throughout the distressing symptoms of this illness, affirming his opinion that St. Paul's "thorn

in the flesh" "was the debilitated state of his nerves occasioned by the overpowering glories of heaven, whence he concluded the Apostle was in the body when he was caught up into Paradise."

After this severe attack Watts never enjoyed any very prolonged period of health and was frequently unable to preach, or often the great pain and weakness following on any such attempt confined him to his bed for some time. A happy outcome of this extreme weakness occurred in 1713, when he was invited as a guest to the house of Sir Thomas Abney, a former Lord Mayor of London, and this generous and affectionate hospitality was continued until his death! The Countess of Huntingdon related to Toplady a conversation with Watts which well illustrates the great respect which his hosts entertained for their invalid minister. Dr. Watts informed her that she was visiting him on "an auspicious day," since exactly thirty years before he had come to Sir Thomas Abney's intending to spend but one single week, and he had extended his visit to the length of thirty years! Lady Abney interposed, "Sir, what you term a long thirty years' visit I consider the *shortest* my family ever received."

Watts first gained fame and reputation as a poet on the publication of his *Horæ Lyricæ* in 1705, a second edition of which was required in 1709 and which had passed through eight editions at his death. Although they were rather hurriedly and lightly written, they earned the praise of Dr. Johnson as well as the highest approbation of the religious public in England and America. Encouraged by this success Watts published the first edition of his *Hymns and Spiritual Songs* in 1707 containing 220 hymns. In 1709, 150 new ones were added, and by 1720 a seventh edition appeared, which also included his widely circulated and highly valued "Psalms of David imitated in the language of the New Testament," which soon supplanted the older versions of Sternhold and Hopkins and Tate and Brady.

Although his *Psalms and Hymns* partake of the sterner theology of his day in being at times harsh and severe in expression and can easily be criticized on the score of their faulty versification and inelegant expression, they are always catholic in their outlook, and the whole Christian Church owes him a deep and abiding debt of gratitude for such beautiful and standard hymns as "Before Jehovah's awful throne," "When I survey the wondrous Cross,"

“There is a land of pure delight,” as well as “O God, our help in ages past.” His biographer in comparing Watts’ merits with those of the “Poet of Methodism” aptly declares that Watts possessed the greatest skill “in design and originality,” Charles Wesley “in execution and polish.” It was in 1720 that Watts published his *Divine and Moral Songs for the use of Children*, which were highly eulogized by Dr. Johnson and enjoyed a long and well-deserved popularity. Many million copies were circulated throughout the world, and over a hundred years after their publication they had an annual sale in England alone of 80,000.

In 1728 the Universities of Edinburgh and Aberdeen bestowed the well-merited diploma of D.D. on the great Nonconformist poet-divine.

When we remember the almost continual bodily suffering which Watts endured we are amazed at his prodigious literary labours. In a little over forty years he produced fifty-two distinct publications, many of them scientific and erudite works on deep philosophical or theological subjects. He wrote numerous treatises in support of the Christian Faith against Arianism, Deism and infidelity, many of which, although forgotten now, were exceedingly popular at the time.

It was unfortunate that his horror of religious dissension led him to intervene in the unprofitable Trinitarian Controversy started by Dr. Samuel Clarke and the eccentric William Whiston. Watts, in his sincere and earnest endeavour to reconcile the Arian and Trinitarian protagonists amongst the Dissenters was betrayed into publishing a definition and explanation of the doctrine of the Trinity which certainly overstepped the bounds of orthodoxy, and as is usual with mediators, he was rewarded by the condemnation of both parties, although attempts to fasten on him a denial of the essential deity of Christ were entirely devoid of foundation.

His great mental exertions had completely undermined his enfeebled constitution and shattered nervous system several years before his death, and the closing period of his life was also clouded by the malicious and slanderous attacks made on his character by a near relative which greatly distressed and depressed his highly sensitive nature. His trust in his Saviour remained, however, bright and serene through all. Renowned as he was as philosopher, poet and theologian, he yet retained the simplicity of his early

faith to the end. It is inspiring to read the dying testimony of so profound a thinker and scholar. "I should be glad to read more," Dr. Watts told Lady Abney, "yet not in order to be confirmed more in the truth of the Christian religion, or in the truth of its promises, for I believe them enough to venture an eternity on them." When almost worn out and broken down with his infirmities he remarked that "an aged minister used to say that the most learned and knowing Christians, when they come to die, have only the same plain promises of the Gospel for their support as the common and unlearned, and so," said Watts, "I find it." "They are the plain promises of the Gospel which are my support, and I bless God they are plain promises, which do not require much labour or pain to understand them; for I can do nothing now but look into my Bible for some promise to support me and live upon that." Truly "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge and wisdom" for us all!

C. SYDNEY CARTER.

THE PRAYER BOOK.

The paramount claim which the Prayer Book has upon the affections and reverent regards of the English-speaking world is doubtless based upon *its fitness for its purpose*. We love and reverence it because experience has proved, and is daily proving, that in it the Church of God finds a most apt vehicle of worship; because in it our spiritual desires and aspirations, our penitence, our gratitude, our joy, find adequate utterance; because through it God speaks to our hearts, even as He graciously permits us through it to speak to Him. Here, beyond all question, lies the permanent, paramount and inexhaustible source of its power. The simple, unlettered Churchman who joins in the Church's public worship, or who uses the Prayer Book as his manual of private devotion, finds in it satisfaction, comfort, delight. And the best instructed, it may be said, need scarcely ask for more.—BISHOP DOWDEN in *Workmanship of the Prayer Book*.



THE TREADING DOWN OF JERUSALEM BY THE GENTILES.

BY THE REV. W. J. L. SHEPPARD, M.A.

AS the very kindly critic of my book, *The Lord's Coming and the World's End*, put it at the close of his review in the *MARCH CHURCHMAN*, what is needed with regard to prophetic interpretation is "discussion without recrimination." It is a happy phrase, and it is in the spirit of that phrase that I write this article.

There is one Text of Scripture which during the last fifteen months has, perhaps, been more quoted than any other in addresses and writings on the question of the near approach of the Lord's Return. That Text is the second half of St. Luke xxi. 24: "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Not only is its quotation markedly frequent, but it generally seems to be quoted with a certain assumption of finality, as if the fulfilment of this prophecy at least was beyond dispute, since no one could doubt our Lord's reference to General Allenby's entry into Jerusalem in December, 1917.

I venture to think that this assumption is at least open to question, and that a careful examination of our Lord's words may at any rate disclose some uncertainty as to their fulfilment in the way now very widely understood. I do not say that this interpretation of the words is absolutely wrong; I only contend that it is not so certain as many think it to be. I do not want to dogmatize, but I want to discuss.

There are three outstanding points in our Lord's prophecy which seem to me to have received little or no attention from their interpreters, but which have a vital bearing on the truth of the interpretation now given to His saying. They may be capable of a solution which fits in with that interpretation, but even so they are well worthy of notice.

First:—What is the exact force of the word *πατομένη*, translated "trodden down"? Does it necessarily imply *oppression* by a non-Jewish race, or does it only convey the idea of such a race holding power and authority over the city? Can we get any guidance on this question from the other instances of the use of

the word in the New Testament? The verb *πατέω* is used only in four other passages: St. Luke x. 19; Revelation xi. 2; Revelation xiv. 20; and Revelation xix. 15. In the last two of these passages the word is used literally of treading the winepress, and therefore not being figurative, is so far different in use as to afford no clue. In Revelation xi. 2 the words are obviously a direct repetition of our Lord's prophecy which we are considering, and therefore throw no light on the exact meaning, since what they mean here they will mean there. There remains our Lord's one other use of the word in St. Luke x. 19—"I have given you authority to tread upon (*πατέῖν*) serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy." Can any possible sense of oppression or persecution be read into the word there? Must it not simply imply the possession of the supreme authority and power? Then is it an unjustifiable assumption that such may be the meaning in St. Luke xxi. 24, and that our Lord was foretelling government by another race but not necessarily oppression? In that case the emphasis of the first part of the prophecy would not lie on "trodden down" but on "Gentiles," as indeed the order of the Greek appears to indicate. But if this be so—and this is the important point—the prophecy as yet must remain unfulfilled, for—unless we hold the extraordinary British-Israel theory—the British are Gentiles equally with the Turks, and most certainly General Allenby's victory did not end Gentile *dominion* over Jerusalem, although it may have ended Gentile *oppression*, so that in what is at least a possible—and, to my mind, the probable—sense of our Lord's words, Jerusalem is still "trodden down of the Gentiles."

In view of this it is extremely interesting to read the statement of Mr. Percival Landon, which appeared in the press some weeks ago, to the effect that Zionists do not desire that the Jews shall become the governors of Palestine, but that one of the Great Powers, preferably Britain, shall control the country as mandatory for the League of Nations. He also points out that the Jewish population is at present only about a fifth of the whole inhabitants, whose rights they have no desire to infringe. If this be so, then the removal of Gentile rule is not yet even in sight.

The second point is concerned with the second part of our Lord's saying—"until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." What is the exact meaning of that sentence? What are the "times of the

Gentiles" ? Godet well points out that it cannot possibly mean, as some have declared, the time of Gentile dominion over Jerusalem, since this would make our Lord's prophecy tautological, and almost meaningless, if He only declared that Jerusalem would be trodden down of the Gentiles until the time of Gentile dominion ended. Must not the phrase have much the same meaning as " the time of thy visitation " in St. Luke xix. 44, that is, the day of God's offer of mercy and salvation, and so be parallel with the Apostle's teaching in Romans xi., that the fall of the Jews from God's favour brought in the day of salvation for the Gentiles ? Then " the times of the Gentiles " would mean the Gentiles' day of grace and opportunity, that is, the present time in which we live. But in our Lord's prophecy the cessation of the two things He refers to—the down treading of Jerusalem and the times of the Gentiles—are simultaneous ; when the one ends so also ends the other. Yet no one could contend that the day of grace for Gentiles has now closed. If therefore the fulfilments of the two halves of the prophecy are, as they obviously are, coincident, and if it is certain that one has not yet taken place, it seems that we may feel sure that neither has the other. So that, looked at from this point of view, it would also seem that, whatever our Lord meant by the treading down of Jerusalem, it cannot yet have ceased.

Yet a third question remains. Are we quite sure that, in speaking of Jerusalem in His prophecy, our Lord was speaking of the actual city ? It is not like His teaching to ascribe such definite importance to any locality, so that the mere capture or the deliverance of a city should mark the determination of an age-long epoch in God's dealings with mankind. When the Samaritan woman began to discuss the rival merits of Jerusalem and her own locality as places of worship, His reply indicated that Jerusalem was of no more importance as a locality than any other, despite the glories of its past history, and its connection with the chosen race. His words to the woman certainly imply that the attachment of a special sanctity to particular cities or places is of those " rudiments " which marked the Older Dispensation and which have disappeared in the fuller light and higher teaching of the New. The Jerusalem of Palestine is, indeed, and will ever be, a city of historic and sacred memories, but beyond this it would seem, in the view of the New Testament writers, to have no special interest for the Christian ; he

is ever pointed away from the old city to the new Jerusalem, whether we understand by that the Church of Christ on earth, or the eternal heavenly abode, or both. St. Paul himself, Hebrew of Hebrews as he declares himself to be, plainly states that for him, as for all Christ's people, the old Jerusalem is superseded by the new—not the captive city in Palestine but “the Jerusalem that is above” and that “is free” is the Mother City which now claims his and their hearts and hopes. (Gal. iv. 25, 26.) May not our Lord, then, be speaking of Jerusalem here in the same way as in St. Matthew xxiii. 37, where quite certainly it is not the city but the people of whom He speaks, using the name of the capital city as representing the nation itself; it could only be the Jewish *people* who killed the prophets, or who could hail Him with the cry, “Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord,” just as in St. Luke xix. 42-44, although the actual siege of the city is foretold, yet it still stands for the people, who alone could have known the things that belonged to their peace, or recognized the time of their visitation. If then “Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles” refers, not to the condition of the actual city, but to the lot of the whole Jewish race, it is a wonderful description of their history for centuries, scattered among the nations of the earth, entirely under their dominion and in their power. If this be the true interpretation of our Lord's words, then it seems to me to make those words a far more striking and solemn declaration than if He were merely announcing an incident in the history of a now comparatively insignificant city. But if this be the real meaning of the saying, then most certainly the treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentiles is not only being continued still, but there is no indication of its approaching end.

W. J. L. SHEPPARD.



BLESSED BE VAGUENESS.

BY THE REV. CHARLES COURTENAY, M.A., Chaplain of
Holy Trinity, Rome.

THE intrusion upon the modern eye with such a subject as this is bound to administer more or less of a shock to the modern mind. It sounds almost as bad as to shout at a Friends' meeting, or to put back the hands of a town clock, or to revert to the dark ages of the world. "Blessed be clearness rather," we expect the modern voice to say admonishingly, while the modern eye looks on us pityingly, and the modern head shakes at us with an action almost threatening. Nevertheless, I venture to repeat it, and, at the risk of being written down a fool, venture to give a reason or two for my contention. In these days, when the most forlorn cases are taken up and argued, I claim my right to say my say on the blessedness of the vague.

Blessed be vagueness in the realms of nature and art and general life. This is my first position. For here, at least, vagueness lends a charm and glory all its own.

I.

Nature is full of dim, dark places, half revealed and half concealed, high lights flecked with great shadows. Who cares to gaze at mountain peaks standing out in midday clearness, sharp and vivid and hard? The educated eye prefers to see them shimmering through a haze, or with white fleecy scarves thrown across their great bosoms. Who wants to see distances seemingly almost within touch in their sharp outlines? Better far, most men think, to see them in dimness and ghostly shadowiness. Their vagueness constitutes their chief charm. It is not the scientific explanation of the rainbow which appeals to our hearts and minds, but the marvellous beauty of the bow itself. Its glorious gradation of colours as they melt into one another without a join, the spectral beauty of it all is largely due to its vagueness. The contrast of cloud and colour strikes our deepest soul as we look and wonder. As Wordsworth says, "Our hearts leap up when we behold a rainbow in the sky," but not because we can make the colours with a prism and a ray of white light ourselves, but because nature's

bow is not clear, is not self-evident, is not tangible. It is but a vague general impression we get of an old English flower garden when first we step into it, but its glory falls upon our eyes and hearts at once. All is aflame with beauty, and we do not stay to pick out its individualities before we admire. You can render it less vague if you choose. You can pick out flower by flower, study their parts, count their petals and stamens, and you can hang long labels around their necks, and so get clearness in plenty, but you have lost the vague, charming, haunting beauty in the clear particulars. A lark sings up in the heavens, and you catch glimpses, vague glimpses, of the little plain songster, as he shakes down his waves of melody. By and bye he will descend, and, for clearness of exposition, you catch and kill him, and lay bare with your scalpel the glorious little throat. And now you know all about it. You have a clear view of the singing organ of the lark. But, look you, you have lost that song for ever, and the song, I think, is better than the knowledge, the vagueness than the clearness.

II.

As it is with nature, so is it with art ; the life of art, too, depends much upon vagueness. Your microscopic painter will paint you every leaf and stone with all the fidelity of a photograph. But under the process the picture vanishes. A truer artist will abound rather in vagueness with shadows more or less transparent, in which more is suggested than expressed, and with the atmosphere as much like nature as he can portray it. He is careful to leave much to the imagination, and only to help it by suggestions here and there. Your admiration of an old Cathedral, to what is it due ? Not merely to its grand proportions, its massive structure, its traceried roof, and the sentiment which clings to all old things with a history. These make their own great appeal. But, deeper than these, lies the charm of vagueness. The glorious old windows filter the light through them, and throw upon the pavement splashes of commingled colours, and we do not try to form them into shapes, and trace them to their Sources. We are content to admire, and not to define. In the dim religious light all outlines are broken, shadows deepen in the darker corners, and the imagination is allowed to play about in the dimness and vagueness. Where this vagueness is absent, as in the newer buildings, all their costliness does

not compensate for the glories of the old and dim and ill defined, for they are too hard and clear in their white glare and ample light.

So it is with music. An arithmetical genius was once at the pains to count the notes which a celebrated pianist struck in his performance, and they were, of course, multitudinous. But through his clever exertions and care he lost the music in the notes. Isolate and define, and you are lost to the true enjoyment of music, for you will probably miss the theme. It is in the skilful blending of all the notes that the music emerges.

III.

As it is with nature and art, so the salt of vagueness savours our general life.

What do we know of one another? We form vague estimates, and find them sufficient. Suppose we knew all, and all vagueness passed, how many of our present intimacies would persist? Definite and accurate knowledge of one another's characters would dissolve Society at a stroke. Here and there some friendships might bear the strain, but not many. It is better for our friendships that we do not, and cannot, know. Blessed be vagueness.

What do we know, again, of our future fortunes or misfortunes? Almost nothing. Would it be good to know, think you. If all vagueness passed away, and all was clearly revealed, what a paralysis would fall upon innumerable lives! It might not be amiss to know our future good fortunes, but to know our ill ones, to see them spread out before us in the mass, would assuredly embitter life, and doom it to unmitigated gloom. Some foolish people consult fortune-tellers, and seek to dive by their arts and tricks into futurity. It is their salvation that they only partially believe the revelations of the occult powers. Happily, vagueness prevails in the realm of the future, and a merciful Providence Who knows better what is good for us has dropped a thick veil before our eyes to compel us to short views. Blessed be that vagueness, too.

Let us not say, then, that vagueness is a defect and a hard limitation. It is better so. God might have given us a telescopic vision to see far, or He might have endowed us with a microscopic vision to see deep, but He has done neither. Short sight is ever the strongest and the best sight for the generality of people. And, although we are inclined to resent life's many mysteries, and quarrel

with the Power which permits them, or fails to prevent them, we must remember that He Who forms the decision to reveal or conceal knows better than we what is best.

Some knock their heads against the dark problems of pain and privations and life's inequalities. Why should they quarrel with this vagueness of understanding? It may be better for us not to know. Does a child understand all that his parents do on his behalf? The reasons are beyond our present intelligence. But, later on, the veil will drop. Can we not wait and trust? Meanwhile we have the bright assurance: "What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter."

The horrors of war stiffened many necks in strong rebellion, for it seemed to them an arraignment of Divine love and power. But an event is not unreasonable because we do not see the reason for it. To argue furiously against the Ruler of life is hardly wise until we know a little more of the issues and the aftermaths of war. It is early days yet to see the harvest from the present bloody sowing. But many of us believe that blessings will assuredly come, if not at once, later. Socially, nationally, personally, there shall be a resurrection which shall be due to the recent horrible clashings of men on the stricken field. In the Great Plague, in the Great Fire of London, nobody at the time saw anything but evil, but we who look back over the centuries know that the Plague destroyed all future plagues of the same type, and the fire swept away huddled masses of insanitary dwellings. Things grow clearer as time passes, and then the true perspective appears, and men bless where once men cursed. Terrific thunderstorms are nature's safety valves for purifying the air and making it possible to breathe freely amid the stifling heats of life. Meanwhile, until the clearness and the answer come, blessed be vagueness.

IV.

Some, no doubt, who have accompanied me thus far with more or less tacit consent will break away from my next contention, that as it is with nature and art and general life so also is it with the religious life. Blessed be vagueness in the sphere of religion too.

That vagueness exists no one will dispute. That it could not but exist is equally evident, for the great religious ideas are unlimited in their nature and range and immensity. A God Whom we could

wholly understand would cease to be a God for us. It is no reflection on the great religious facts that, as with nature, there are yawning gaps and gulfs and chasms which are unbridgeable, that, as with the sun, there are black depths which are unfathomable. It is easier to ask questions than to answer them. God is great, and we are small. God's shuttles flash across great looms of which we can only see a fragment, and His tapestries show so large a pattern that we fail to grasp their wholeness. But that there is a pattern we are sure, and that He is at work in the world we have no doubt. Some are foolish enough to deny Worker and loom and pattern because their dim eyes are too weak to see them. So may a child deny his father's actions of love and wisdom because he cannot trace them. So may an imbecile deny the assured findings of the philosophers. Neither do we make a virtue of necessity when we laud vagueness in this religious sphere. It is really the best for us here and now; no intolerable position, but a positive boon. Let us see how this must be.

It is in the sphere of vagueness that faith walks serene and bright; and faith is better than sight in this particular realm of religion. "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." "Seeing is believing" is the world's view, and a false view on every ground. For sight is short, and most fallible, and cannot be trusted without confirmation. There is an inner vision, which we call faith, which sees infinitely better and infinitely further, and, compared with physical sight, is far more satisfactory in its issues. It is faith which throws out its tentacles, and like the amoeba grasps its spiritual provender and absorbs it. Faith may not know all, and may move amidst much vagueness, but it knows enough for its life and existence. Clarity of view may give intellectual satisfaction, but it is faith which feeds the inner fires.

It is in vagueness, too, that the spirit of worship is evoked. When we realize something of the eternal greatness and love we are filled with a sense of wonder, and we stretch out our hands in the immensity and adore. The spirit spreads itself out in the vastness, is awed by the infinite purity, and rests secure in the infinite tenderness. In that atmosphere of necessary vagueness the spirit of reverence, confidence, and prayer springs up. If vagueness went, as it never can so long as man retains his comparative littleness and unimportance, worship and adoration would lose their wonted fires.

The immensity of greatness might make us grovel, but the immensity of love compels us to look up and adore.

It is in vagueness, too, that we grasp the idea of super-abundance, the more-than-enough for human needs. A God Who can only love a little, and extend His favours to but a few, would come into our compass and stand out clearly enough, but, with such unhappy limitations, He would be too like ourselves. The very meagreness of the supplies would reduce Him to littleness and mere human limits. It is only when the reservoirs are eternal, and the world is grasped in their supplies, that we are, if vaguely, yet immensely impressed. We cannot grasp an inexhaustible vastness, and we cannot imagine a commissariat which meets the needs of a whole universe, but we do not want to grasp them. We prefer to gaze upon the vague vastness because we know that through its very vagueness we are touching God. A little lake I can sweep with the eye, and I know it to be little because I can take it in so easily, but the great seas are beyond me, and I appreciate their vastness because I know that beyond the horizon there are many more in the great vague beyond.

Just as the vagueness of God's great Being impresses me, so do His dealings with me, and His provisions for my dealings with Him.

There are mysteries about *prayer* which baffle men's understanding, and throw many into sad attitudes. They jib at its vague and twilight features. But rather should they have expected them, and be thankful that they exist, God being what He is, and man being such as he is. But be prayer even vaguer than it is, men must and will pray despite science and the scoff of unreasonable men. For the fact is clear enough, and the promises are beyond doubt, and the fruits are notoriously splendid, and, if vagueness lies about the philosophy of prayer, let it lie. The electric current flies from pole to pole, and the messages arrive sure enough, but no man alive can tell you of what the current itself consists. The message is clear, the results are evident, but what constitute the intermediary is darkness itself.

CHARLES COURTENAY.

(To be concluded.)

OUR LORD'S STATE OF HUMILIATION.

BY THE REV. JOHN R. PALMER, LITT.D.

II.

WITH regard to the truth of our Lord's Humiliation, the actual language in which it is taught in Holy Scripture, appears to us conclusive. We may now briefly examine certain passages in which we believe the reality of our Lord's Humiliation is set forth. Such examination will be made with special though not exclusive reference to the able and scholarly expositions of Bishops Christopher Wordsworth and Lightfoot and Deans Alford, Payne Smith, and Vaughan. But perhaps it may be well to add that here and there a remark or statement may be made for which the present writer cannot claim such high authority, but which it is hoped may serve to throw a little light on the force or importance of a point which is often either overlooked or only partially treated.

(i) *St. Luke* ii. 52 (cf. ver. 40; *St. John* iii. 30). With Alford it seems preferable to translate ἡλικία by "age" rather than by "stature," not only because it "comprehends the other," but also because of the presumptive evidence in its favour derived from the circumstance of its *more frequent use in this sense*. The following short table of its uses may illustrate this point:—

ἡλικία.

<i>Age.</i>	<i>Age and Stature.</i>
St. Matt. vi. 27, cf. St. Luke xii. 26.	Eph. iv. 13, cf. 16= <i>spiritual</i> growth imaged forth by the symbolism of "age" and "stature." Thus ver. 13, "age" (cf. "faith," "knowledge"); ver. 16, "stature" (Alf.); [ver. 13, R.V., "full-grown man." A.V., " <i>perfect</i> man." Greek, ἀνδρα τέλειον].
St. Luke ii. 52 (Alf.).	
St. John ix. 21, 23.	
Gal. i. 14.	
Heb. xi. 11.	
1 { Job xxix. 18.	
{ Ezek. xiii. 18=men of every age.	
<i>Stature.</i>	
St. Luke ii. 52 (Wordsw.).	
St. Luke xix. 3.	

On the use of such terms in Scripture in reference to "age," cf. also Ps. xxxix. 5; Job ix. 25; 2 Tim. iv. 7. Moreover, we more reasonably regard "*wisdom*" as a concomitant of "age"

than of "stature." In this respect, the dwarf may be a Socrates, the giant something else. But, further, our blessed Lord not only gave *promise* of "wisdom," He manifested wisdom itself at the age of *twelve*, when His physical growth had not as yet attained its full development (St. Luke ii. 42, 49, 50). And Bishop Pearson attributes this "wisdom" to our Lord's Human Soul (cf. Nichols' Ed. of *Pearson on the Creed*, 1878, Art. iii, p. 234).

We, therefore, believe this passage (St. Luke ii. 52) points to an *actual increase* in wisdom and not merely to any "progressive *manifestation*" of it. Hence, we conclude with Alford, that our blessed Lord "*advanced towards the fulness of divine approval* which was indicated at His baptism by ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα (St. Luke iii. 22). . . . The Divine personality was in Him carried through (these) states of weakness and inexperience, and gathered round itself *the ordinary accessions and experiences of the sons of men*. All the time the consciousness of His mission on earth was *ripening*; 'the things heard of the Father' (St. John xv. 15) were *continually* imparted to Him; the Spirit, which was not given by measure to Him, was abiding *more and more* upon Him; till the day when He was *fully* ripe for His official manifestation." So much for our Lord's capacity for increasing in "wisdom." We shall see a little later that there was a *limitation* of knowledge in Him in *one particular* even when He had arrived at man's estate, and during at least His pre-resurrection life and the exercise of His earthly ministry.

(ii) *St. John* x. 29—"My Father . . . is *greater* than *all*." Such is our Lord's own statement. Now, while we would not overlook the very significant point, that here and elsewhere (e.g. xiv. 28) our blessed Lord says, "My Father," not "Our Father," we believe that what is implied by His use of "My" is a reference to His Divine Generation, and yet no less that His "*My Father*" does not by any means exclude the view that the ἐγὼ of the passage, "My Father is greater than *I*" (xiv. 28), is included in the παῖς of the passage, "My Father is greater than *all*," that is, so far as our Lord's dependence on the Father is concerned (cf. also *St. Mark* xiii. 32). In *St. John* x. 29, our Lord is not speaking only of "all" under the Father,¹ but of "all" beside the Father. And in chapter xiv. 28, He passes from the *general* to the *particular*.¹

¹ By the "*is greater than I*," we may understand a reference to His Incarnate "state of Humiliation." Cf. "The Creed of *St. Athanasius*"

Alford commenting on the words, "My Father is greater than I," says, "the going of Jesus to the Father is an *advancement*," and the words "indicate *that particular subordination to the Father in which the Lord Jesus then was*—and the cessation of the state of humiliation . . . there is a *sense* in which the Father is greater than even the *glorified* Son, is beyond doubt (see especially 1 Cor. xv. 27 f.); cf. "to the glory of GOD the *Father*" (Phil. ii. 11); "in the glory of *His Father*" (St. Matt. xvi. 27).

(iii) *St. John* xv. 15. Here our blessed Lord represents Himself as the Medium through whom men receive a "knowledge" of the "things" of the Father, and as being Himself, in a sense, "dependent upon the Father" (cf. *St. John* xi. 41, 42; vi. 57).

(iv) *St. Mark* xiii. 32. Alford's exposition of this passage leaves little to be desired. He says no more than the truth demands when he observes that the οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς is included [in the εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ μου μόνος of *St. Matthew* xxiv. 36. And equally true is his comment on the latter passage: "All attempts to soften or explain away this weighty truth must be resisted; it will not do to say with some commentators 'nescit ea nobis,' which, however well meant, is a mere evasion:—in the course of humiliation undertaken by the Son, in which He increased in wisdom (*St. Luke* ii. 52), learned obedience (*Heb.* v. 8), uttered desires in prayer (*St. Luke* vi. 12)—*this matter was hidden from Him.*" It seems to us to fall far short of the real significance of this passage to say "Christ does not know it *as man*," or to observe: "The times and seasons are in the Father's own power, and they are not therefore for the Son to reveal. It is in this sense *only* that He says that they are not known by Him." Such an interpretation is at least quite inadequate. It is, however, true that "He (Christ) instructs us by *concealing* certain things as well as by *revealing* others," but there is no hint in the passage, or in its context, that we have *here* an instance of this method of instruction. What we have is a plain and positive statement in which our Lord attributes the knowledge of a certain future event to the Father "*only*" (*St. Matt.* xxiv. 36).

—"inferior to the Father, as touching His Manhood." Also the careful and well-balanced statement of Bishop H. C. G. Moule on *Philip* ii. 7, that our Lord was, during "the days of His flesh" (*Heb.* v. 7), "*significantly dependent indeed on the Father*, and on the Spirit, but always speaking to man in the manner of One able to deal sovereignly with all man's needs" (*Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*).

In St. Matthew xi. 27, our Lord is speaking of Himself in His relationship to the Father, and without any apparent reference to His "state of Humiliation." In Colossians ii. 3, the Apostle's meaning appears to be, if not exactly as it is represented by the Vulgate, "Of GOD the Father of Christ" (ver. 2), yet what approaches to it very nearly indeed, namely, that "all the treasures of wisdom and *knowledge*" are contained in the Godhead of the Father and of the Son *considered apart from "the state of Humiliation"* undertaken by the latter. Cf. St. John xvii. 5—"the glory which I had with Thee *before* the world was."

Again, Alford remarks, with great force: "We must not deal unfaithfully with a plain and solemn assertion of our Lord; and what can be more so than *οὐδὲ ὀ υἱός*, in which by the *οὐδὲ* He is *not below* but *above* the angels?" Cf. Ps. viii. 4-6; Heb. ii. 9.

Without doubt we have in this passage (St. Mark xiii. 32) one of the most difficult problems concerning our blessed Lord in Holy Scripture. But, surely, that does not justify the employment of any species of *evasion* in considering it. Such a method can never serve the sacred cause of Truth, but only weakens the influence of other arguments with thinkers who do not receive what we believe is the full measure of revealed truth respecting the Divinity of our blessed Lord.

Our Lord's words in this passage involve, in the language of Bishop Conybeare *On the Mysteries of the Christian Religion*, "a doctrine, which is attended with difficulties: and which being above our reason, we receive purely on the authority of the *Revealer*." And what higher authority can we have than that vouchsafed by *our Lord's own words concerning Himself*?

Moreover, His personal testimony (St. Mark xiii. 32) to the *limitation* of His knowledge, in this particular matter, must be received in a sense exactly parallel with His testimony to the genuineness and authenticity of e.g. the Pentateuch. We must remember that we are not considering the words even of an Apostle or Evangelist of our Lord, but a statement of "*the Word*, full of grace and *truth*" (St. John i. 14), in short, of "*Him Who was Himself the highest Revelation which man can be conceived capable of receiving in the flesh.*"

(v) *Acts* i. 7. Alford says, "This is a *general* reproof and assertion, spoken with reference to *men*," but he also adds, "it is remark-

able that not *Θεός* but *ὁ πατήρ* is here used ; and this cannot fail to remind us of the saying in St. Mark xiii. 32." He prefers to take *ἔθετο* as = " kept " ; *ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ*, cf. v. 4 (Alford). Here *ἐξουσία* is translated in A.V. " power," in R.V. (more correctly) " authority." In the next verse (Acts i. 8), the word " power " of A.V. and R.V. is the translation of a different Greek word, *δύναμις*. As Canon Norris remarks, " not till after the fall of Jerusalem were the disciples taught (in St. John's Apocalypse) how remote was the Second Advent." Cf. 2 Thessalonians i. 7 ; ii. 2, 3.

It is noteworthy, too, that our Lord here uses *ὁ πατήρ* instead of *θεός* (as Alford points out) *αἰτερ* His Resurrection (cf. Acts i. 3, 7). And, observe, that while here it is *ὁ πατήρ*, in St. John x. 29, xiv. 28, He uses *ὁ πατήρ μου*. Cf. (ii) above.

Cf. St. Matthew xx. 23.

(vi) *Philippians* ii. 6-8. Here (Phil. ii. 1-18) " St. Paul is exhorting the Philippians to mutual condescension, self-abasement, and self-sacrifice, in regard to and for the sake of others," and he inserts, in something of the form of a parenthesis, this difficult but profoundly interesting analysis of our blessed Lord's Humiliation and *consequent* (*διὸ καὶ*, ver. 9, Lightfoot) Exaltation (verses 6-11) and all this is set forth by way of *example* (cf. ver. 5).

Ver. 6. In His Pre-Incarnate state He was *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ* which He at no point of time assumed or received, but in which He had ever subsisted (*ὑπάρχων*). But in entering upon His " state of Humiliation," He " emptied " Himself of the *μορφῇ θεοῦ* and took the *μορφῇ δουλοῦ* : as really as He originally and rightfully " subsisted " in the *former*, so really did He " take " the *latter*. The *μορφῇ δουλοῦ* of His state of Humiliation must be understood to be as real as the *μορφῇ θεοῦ* of His Pre-Incarnate state. If *μορφῇ* " has the sense, not of external appearance, but of essential quality " (Vaughan), has it not this sense in *both* cases ? If we affirm the one to have been a great reality, is it open to us to practically treat the other as a mere *semblance* ? Besides, by treating the *μορφῇ δουλοῦ* as if it were less real than the *μορφῇ θεοῦ*, we destroy the true significance and reality of our blessed Lord's *κένωσις*. And this is especially so, if we hold that, as Lightfoot says, " the action of *λαβών* was coincident in time with the action of *ἐκένωσεν*."

Moreover, His *μορφῆν δούλου λαβών* is expressed in Hebrews

ii. 16 as *σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ ἐπιλαμβάνεται*, and so His Incarnation and *κένωσις* were coincident, and the reality of the one involves the reality of the other.

Ver. 8. But, further, we read of His "being found in *σχημα* as a man." And does not the *μορφῇ* in *μορφῇ δουλοῦ—μορφῇ* "having the sense, not of external appearance, but of *essential* quality" (Vaughan, see above)—point to the *σχημα* in *σχήματι ὡς ἄνθρωπος* as "denoting appearance with underlying reality" (cf. Bp. H. C. G. Moule, *in loco. Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*). His Humanity then was nothing less than a profound reality, and constituted the sphere in which His *κένωσις* was affected. He not only "was made in the likeness of *men*" (*ver.* 7)—of the human race in its concrete aspect, not in the likeness of some exalted type of Humanity—but came "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (*Rom.* viii. 3). And here, as Alford remarks, "the *likeness* must be referred not only to *σάρξ*, but also to the epithet *τῆς αμαρτίας*."

JOHN R. PALMER.

(*To be concluded.*)

STUDIES IN TEXTS.

Suggestions for Sermons from Current Literature.

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

V. SEEING HIS FACE.

Text.—"The Glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. iv. 6).

[Book of the Month: FROM EGYPTIAN RUBBISH-HEAPS ¹=M.
Other reff. Burkitt's GOSPEL HISTORY = B. Rendall on Galatians in Expositor's Greek Test. = R. Westcott's REVELATIONS OF RISEN LORD = W.]

¹ By Dr. J. Hope Moulton, published by C. H. Kelly. A fascinating little popular book on the papyri, full of suggestive sidelights on the New Testament.

What is God like? Christ came to answer the question (John i. 18; Col. i. 15; Heb. i. 3). "The most famous of all statues, the 'Olympian Zeus' of Phidias, which looked down the race-course at Olympia, had a face of unspeakable majesty, but of benevolence and fatherliness. Phidias was an innovator. His predecessors portrayed Zeus as majestic and terrible, brandishing the thunderbolt. Five centuries before Christ that deeply religious man had realized that God was good. The glorious figure disappeared during the Dark Ages, but the face lived on. It was actually taken over by the Church to become in Christian art the traditional face of Christ" (M. 68, 69). In art we see the glory of God as the Greek sculptor conceived it, in the face of the Jesus Christ of our pictures.

I. *It is possible that Paul saw the face of Jesus on earth.* Had Paul ever seen the Lord Jesus in the flesh? M. thinks he had (p. 72). Quotes a very able discussion by Johannes Weiss called "Paul and Jesus." "Weiss argues, I think with conclusive force, that the text in 2 Cor. v. 16, 'Even if we have known Christ in the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more,' necessarily implies that Paul really had seen Jesus. Very natural. Paul in Jerusalem before the Passion; studied under Gamaliel (Acts xxii. 3); was there very soon after: the 'Acts' implies it. Ordinary theory assumes Paul had gone back to Tarsus when Jesus was exercising His ministry. At least as easy to believe Paul never left at all. Some indications of Paul's language that Paul really was in Jerusalem when Jesus was there" (M. 72, 73).

(a) "In story of Passion Luke deserts usual sources for a source he regards as more important still. What can that source be? why not the personal experience of Paul?" (M. 73). See Luke xxiii. 40-43; xxiii. 46.

(b) Mark xii. 12. "If a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another she committeth adultery." Result of question by deputation from Jerusalem. Why did they think they were trapping Him by that question? (M. 73). "If Christ said a man might divorce wife, so did Shammai, one of the greatest Rabbis. If He said man might not, then so did Hillel, a still greater Rabbi." No trap here. But, as Prof. Burkitt says, a woman divorcing husband different thing, and probably refers to Herodias (M. 74). "An ordinary woman could neither 'divorce' nor 'marry': she

might 'be divorced' or 'be married' " (B. 100). "I venture to think the saying as reported in Mark clearly implies a reference to Herodias" (B. 101). "We know the woman and her history" (B. 101). "A princess could do what an ordinary woman could not" (M. 74). "John the Baptist had lost his life in protesting against the pagan morals of Antipas and Herodias; Jesus in the eyes of many was first and foremost the successor of the Baptist. The question about divorce could not fail to draw from Him a decisive pronouncement" (B. 98). "Paul has an allusion to such a case in 1 Cor. vii. 10. I believe Paul was a Pharisee of the deputation. Effort to convict Jesus of unorthodoxy" (M. 74).

(c) The expression "house made without hands," part of charge made against Jesus at trial (Mark xiv. 58). Paul also uses it in our context in resurrection connexion. 2 Cor. v. 1. (M. 75).

(d) In Luke xx. 22, he forsakes Mark's sword for "tribute" and uses Paul's word of Romans xiii. 7. M. believes Paul was also on that deputation (p. 75).

(e) Paul says God has delivered us out of the "authority of darkness and translated us" (Col. i. 13). But this is the phrase of Jesus in Luke xxii. 53 alone. Was Paul one of the arresting crowd? (M. 75). Other illustrations also.

II. *It is certain that Paul saw the face of Jesus in Heaven.* Acts ix. 27; xxvi. 19. "In the clouds outside Damascus he saw that wondrous Face which changed his life" (M. 72). This is vital for 1 Cor. ix. 1 and xv. 8. "A revelation through sense, yet in no way measured by sense" (W. 194).

III. *It is wonderful that Paul saw Jesus within his heart.* "It pleased God to take away the veil from His Son's face within me" (Gal. i. 15, 16). "The context is decisive in favour of an inward and spiritual revelation to Paul himself: and it distinguishes this from his previous call" (R. 154). See also 2 Cor. iv. 4, 6; Acts xxvi. 16, specially last phrase.

IV. *It is helpful that the world saw Jesus in Paul's face.* "We with unveiled face reflecting the glory are transfigured" (2 Cor. iii. 18, R.V.), and the Spirit of God knows no greater achievement (cf. Acts vi. 15; vii. 55; Gal. i. 21, 22, 24).

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

- THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND: ITS NATURE AND FUTURE. London: *Hodder & Stoughton*, for *London University Press*, 5s. net.
- CHURCH OR SECT? By A. C. Cooper Marsdin. *Robert Scott*. 6s. net.
- THE VOICE OF THE CHURCH. By N. H. James. *Rivingtons*. 4s. 6d. net.
- THE CHURCH IMPOTENT HERE ON EARTH. By W. H. T. Rainey. London: *Robert Scott*. 10s. 6d. net.
- THE NATIONAL CHURCH. By F. W. Bussell. *Robert Scott*. 3s. 6d. net.
- THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By John Bland. London: *Elliot Stock*, 2s. net.
- CHURCH AND STATE IN ENGLAND. By Alfred Fawkes. *John Murray*. 1s. net.

All these works are due, directly or indirectly, to the incidence of war on thought concerning the Church. They are of varying values and readability.

Mr. Alfred Fawkes, with his charming literary skill, writes a pamphlet to prove that the Church of England as it exists in its comprehensiveness and present form of Government may be made the most useful possible instrument for the maintenance of true religion in this land. He is not blind to the need of Reform in details, but he is far from being convinced that revolution is the best method of improvement. He boldly says that the Report of the Archbishops' Committee is disappointing, and speaks in the air. The case he pleads will be presented by many laymen, although it is at present side-tracked as opposed to the prevailing current in ecclesiastical life; and the Bishop of Hereford, who supplies the Preface, will have more supporters in Parliament than he had in the Church Council.

Mr. Bland's scheme of improving the machinery of the Church is a clever effort that will be at once seen to be impracticable under present conditions. He evidently has but little knowledge of the working of a Parish or a Diocese.

Dr. Bussell is encyclopædic in his knowledge, and unfortunately possesses such a range of facts and such a desire to drive home his convictions by marshalling evidence, that he obscures his arguments by a wealth of detail. He is a high Tory Democrat in outlook, and gives very hard blows to Collectivists. He is convinced that "the Anglican Church, whatever be its political future, has good and useful work before it in keeping fast in this reign of mechanism and automata, of coercion and secularism, those medieval truths of personal and eternal values, the loss of which has told so hardly on our creed, compassion and culture in Europe to-day." No one can read this treatise without learning much.

We find it hard to understand Mr. Rainey. He has a basis of sound sense for many of his contentions, but he has a style that is not always free from irritation. He wishes to see religion made the possession of the race, and his remarks on Sunday observance are a clue to his entire outlook. He writes severely on the effort to make fasting communion a regular duty. "Perhaps if we gave the laity more rest on Sunday they would give us more worship—after all, it is service rather than services which matters most." There is shrewd criticism as well as over emphasis in a book that suffers from a certain inchoateness of form and expression.

Dr. N. H. James, an Irish Rector, breaks a lance with Dr. Salmon on his view of Infallibility, and shows that he is a disciple of the Tractarian School without the present-day excesses. He argues ingeniously, but unconvincingly, that the Church does not limit its Sacraments to the Sacraments of the Gospel, and strongly holds a view of the Sacerdotal character of the Ministry which is not that of the Preface to the Irish Prayer Book. The book well deserves reading as an able presentation of views honestly held by an earnest Parish Clergyman.

The late Canon Cooper Marsdin, in *Church or Sect?* gives us an apologia for the Church of England as it seemed to him to be presented in history, and its formularies. We have seldom seen a better prepared Bibliography than that compiled by him on the various Chapters. He puts forward the views with force and skill of the Middle High Church School, and does so in a manner to attract rather than antagonize those who differ from him.

We have seldom read so thought-provoking a volume on the Church of England as the series of King's College Lectures, edited by Professor Matthews. Their five writers differ greatly from one another, and with the exception of the appeal by the Bishop of Peterborough to the Church to reconstruct itself and devote itself to the new problem, all deal with controversial matters in a way that cancels out. Dr. Headlam is very cross with the Bishop of Hereford for his description of the Church of England as "divided, illogical and incoherent," and for his contention that "the modern world is not growing more friendly to the privileged paradox of a self-contradictory Church." Professor Headlam will find even in this book a conflict of ideals that are irreconcilable, and the thoughtful reader will discover under phrases that are cleverly turned implications that the writers are aware of contradictions. Much of the difficulty of facing present-day problems arises from the fact that owing to the State connexion liberty has been granted to widely different schools of thought, and the school that most abuses State interference has taken to itself a measure of licence that carries it over into the Church from which the Church of England separated. The perplexity Dr. Headlam faced when striving to describe the Church of England as a living organism is largely due to the inability of some of its leaders to distinguish between its *ethos* and that of Rome. No thoughtful student of contemporary Church life and problems can afford to overlook this book. Professor Watson has some striking things to say about continuity and the multiplication of Bishops. Bishop Hensley Henson maintains his thesis that our Church is a Protestant Church, and it is hard to see how he can be refuted. Canon Goudge, without using any catchwords, lays stress upon the "Catholic" conception, and incidentally manages to make severe comments on the Irishman's reply to the question as to the way to Roscommon. "If I wanted to go to Roscommon, I shouldn't be starting from here." He forgets that Pat was asked the question on a platform from which trains did not go to Roscommon, and wished to inform his questioner that he should go to the other platform. Those who desire to see the Church of Christ in accordance with the "pattern showed unto Moses in the Mount," stand very often on the wrong platform and refuse to move to the right one. Dr. Headlam is as thought-provoking and helpful as usual. He lays stress on the fact that the ideal of the Gospel is so comprehensive that no man can embrace it all, and apparently holds this is the source of our schools of thought and recognizes that other Churches have some things we do not possess. No man who carefully reads this useful volume will lay it down without feeling he has learned something, and has been given food for thought and inspiration for work.

HEADMASTER AND SOLDIER.

LETTERS OF A HEADMASTER SOLDIER. By Harry Sackville Lawson. London: R. H. Allenson. 2s. net.

By a strange coincidence this notice is being written in a room that the subject of this touching memoir knew very well, for it was at one time his father's study! On the lawn outside he and his brothers played many a game of tennis, and though the writer never met him or any member of the family, he has heard a good deal about them all, and about this boy who is described, in this short story of his all too short life, as "outstanding as hero, leader in mischief, torment, delight and terror in nursery and school-room." He was a grandson of John Mason Neale, the well-known hymn writer of Sackville College, East Grinstead, which no doubt accounts for Mr. Harry Lawson's second name. After graduating in honours at Cambridge his career as a schoolmaster began, and 1910 found him Headmaster of Buxton College. He had an aptitude for teaching and a wonderful capacity for understanding boys. Nothing reveals this more clearly than his delightful letters written to his own children from France. When the war broke out and all his staff joined the Forces, he too volunteered but was refused, owing to the importance of the work in which he was engaged. However, later on he was accepted. For a time he retained his Headmastership, but resigned in the summer of 1917. He wrote on July 3 of that year, a farewell letter to his boys at Buxton—the letter of a sensible, manly Christian, and no doubt his closing message will serve those to whom it was sent as a memory and an inspiration—"Keep innocency and take heed unto the thing that is right, for that shall bring a man peace at the last." On February 4 he wrote "hoping to be homeward bound by the 20th to 25th of this month," but the next day he was killed. This little volume, dedicated to his children and his old boys, and compiled by his wife and mother, will give many who never knew him personally, the portrait of what we once heard the late Dr. Percival describe as "an English Christian gentleman." S. R. C.

CHRIST AS JUDGE.

THE GREAT TRIAL AND THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. By Alfred D. Kelly, M.A. (Society of the Sacred Mission). London: S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d. net.

Mr. Kelly deals with three great facts and three great duties of the Christian life—the fact of Christ as Master and Friend and the duty of loyalty—the fact of our disloyalty and the duty of repentance—and finally the fact of Christ as the Saviour and the duty of trust, and these are effectively illustrated and enforced from the narrative of our Lord's Trial. These chapters will be found helpful and suggestive. Let one example suffice. In the chapter on *Christ the Judge* the two main divisions are—(1) Christ's Verdict on the World, and (2) Christ's Sentence on the World. Under the first heading we have the proposition that "the world's verdict on Christ is a verdict on itself." "The crowd at a concert criticize the music. The goodness of the music (assuming that it is good) is not affected by their adverse verdict, which only shows that they cannot appreciate what they hear. It is the music that tests the crowd, not the crowd the music. . . . Their verdict gave them away. . . . It was they who were on their trial." Under the second heading we have the further proposition that "the world's sentence on Christ is a sentence on itself." "A court of justice must pass a sentence as well as give a verdict. Pilate's sentence was that it should be done as the people required." Mr. Kelly proceeds to show how "the world's sentence, as well as its verdict, recoiled on itself." Thus in a graphic and

lucid way every point is dealt with. Considering the ecclesiastical position of the author, it seems necessary and fair to say that the references to the sacraments are free from those extravagances which sometimes appear in the works of writers of this school. A useful analysis at the beginning of the book outlines the plan.

S. R. C.

CHRISTIAN ASSURANCE.

CHRISTIAN ASSURANCE. By Canon H. L. C. V. de Candole, M.A. London : S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d. net.

In these pages Canon de Candole deals with those truths that cannot be shaken. There are forty short chapters arranged for Lenten reading, but of course suitable for devotional study at any time. They are written in that easy, graceful style that has made the Canon's ministrations so acceptable at Clifton and elsewhere, and which will no doubt prove equally attractive in the wider sphere upon which he has entered at Westminster. But happily there is something much more than pleasant writing and orderly method in this little volume—there is real and deep spiritual insight and an understanding, too, of the perplexities with which many people find themselves face to face, perplexities that have been acutely and widely felt during the war. Some grounds of Assurance are first set forth—namely (1) the revelation of the Old Testament, (2) the Christian Facts, (3) secular witnesses to those facts, (4) the books of the New Testament; and then are expounded Assurance through the Incarnation, through the Cross, through the Resurrection, through the Holy Spirit, and through the Ascension, concluding with the consideration of some characteristics of Assurance and the more particular Assurances of Holy Week. Even this outline fails to indicate the scope of the book, for each one of these subjects takes up three, four or five chapters. We have set it aside to read again, and we recommend our readers, clerical and lay, to possess themselves of a copy of a treatise that is calculated to stimulate faith and fervour.

OTHER VOLUMES.

FATHER STANTON'S SERMON OUTLINES. SECOND SERIES. By Rev. E. F. Russell, M.A. London : Longmans, Green and Co. 6s. net.

The former volume has already been reviewed in these columns. These notes, too, have been collected from six quarto volumes of manuscript containing, we are told, about a thousand outlines. Of course here and there are paragraphs with which we do not agree, but really they are very few and far between, and on the whole these outlines seem to justify the preacher in saying, as he does in one of them—"We have preached the same old Gospel as in the days that are past. We have not substituted Immanence for Incarnation, or Evolution for Redemption, or made the Holy Ghost out to be an illuminating process . . . We have never allowed the Saviour of the world to be remodelled by the world . . . All of grace, not give and take,—by grace are ye saved." In so far as such ministries as Father Stanton's have tended to the uplifting of the Crucified Redeemer we rejoice, but we nevertheless dissociate ourselves from sacramental teaching which seems to go beyond the Bible and the Prayer Book. In one sermon on Holy Communion Father Stanton with refreshing candour says, "This is not the teaching of the Book of Common Prayer. So much the worse for the Book of Common Prayer." We say, "So much the worse for Father Stanton!" However, he has passed beyond the pale of human judgment, and if we did not always agree with him, we remember that he has left behind him a fine record of devotion to duty, and

there still lingers in the slums of Holborn the fragrance of an unselfish life that was lived for the souls for whom the Saviour he loved, died.

* * * * *

DAILY THOUGHTS OF HELPFULNESS AND STRENGTH FOR DAILY LIFE. From the writings of Archdeacon Wilberforce. London: *Elliot Stock*.

This compilation from the writings of the eloquent if somewhat erratic Archdeacon Wilberforce will be appreciated by many who were helped by his ministry. There are extracts which give pungent denials of Pantheism, Re-incarnation, Annihilation, and Theosophy. Cruelty to animals and Temperance are not forgotten, and all the great truths of our religion are represented. But here and there are expressions which do not appear to be very illuminating. It does not seem to us to be very helpful to be told that "the Mother-Soul brought us forth from the womb of Infinite Mind," it savours too much of Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy's "Science and Health." Again, we are told in another paragraph that "we are children of the Universal Soul," and we find in another a curious definition of the New Birth—"I understand being born anew (without which new birth we cannot see the Kingdom of Heaven even though it is within us) is—this Christ in you, this individualization of the Infinite Mind, being 'born' into recognition of your spiritual consciousness." This is certainly not the Evangelical doctrine of the New Birth.

* * * * *

IN AND AROUND PALESTINE WITH NOTEBOOK AND CAMERA. By Alfred Forder. London: *R.T.S.* 3s. 6d. net.

No more interesting description of the Holy Land as it is to-day has appeared of recent years. Moreover, the volume is great value,—attractively got up, it is enriched with nearly a hundred reproductions of photographs taken by the author, and all for three and sixpence! When our troops entered Damascus they found Mr. Forder ill in hospital. He had been for two years interned and was treated as a common felon, but as the book was written before this, there is no reference in these pages to his experiences, beyond a brief introductory note. In this sense, then, it is a pre-war book, but recent happenings have aroused or revived interest in the Land of Promise, and this graphic narrative of one who has lived for many years in Jerusalem is bound to find many readers.

CORRESPONDENCE.

"THE LORD'S COMING AND THE WORLD'S END."

(To the Editor of THE CHURCHMAN.)

SIR,—I entirely appreciate both the skill and the courtesy displayed in the review of my "Much Discussed Book" in THE CHURCHMAN for March. May I, by your kindness, explain that the reviewer, in his criticism of my interpretation of the "pivotal passage" of Rev. xx. has misread my comment thereon, and (quite as unintentionally as I omitted the word "the" in quoting from Bishop Moule) has represented me as saying the exact opposite of what I wrote. A good deal of his criticism in that paragraph, although not all of it, is therefore beside the mark through a mistake which he has frankly admitted. I only draw attention to this from a sense of fairness, and in no spirit of resentment of criticism.

If I may further trespass on your space it is only to say that I would gladly add to my book a chapter on the "year-day" theory, in any succeeding edition, but I do not want to advance the price of the book as on inquiry,

I find this would do. In brief, my feeling is that this theory differs widely from ordinary prophetic interpretations inasmuch as its basis is wholly mathematical. But mathematics are nothing if not infallibly exact. I mean that if a mathematician professed to have found a new method of solving simple equations, and pointed to the fact that out of nine problems he had by this method obtained the right answer in seven instances, the method would still be discredited, because being mathematical, it should be invariably correct. I have before me an elaborate calculation based on this "year-day" theory, given me about twenty years ago by a scholar of the Irish Church, and further vouched for by Mr. J. B. Dimpleby, who would I think be acknowledged as a skilled exponent of the theory in question. Mr. Dimpleby describes this article as "the best and clearest he has seen on the subject," and adds that "the years are correct in their enumeration," and "are unassailable." The calculations work up to the statement of two great dates in the then near future, and two events which could not fail then to take place; the lapse of time has proved both these to be hopelessly mistaken. But, as I said, if a mathematical system is once found incorrect it is, as a method, discredited altogether, however high its percentage of correct results in other cases may be, so it appears to me.

Yours faithfully,

W. J. L. SHEPPARD.

(To the Editor of THE CHURCHMAN.)

SIR,—I am obliged to you for letting me see Mr. Sheppard's letter, and I take this opportunity of expressing my sincere regret that I missed his point with reference to *ἐζήσαν* in Rev. xx. 4, 5. As he generously says, the consequent misrepresentation was quite unintentional. Mr. Sheppard does not assign two meanings to that word in the same context, as I asserted. He had spoken of two resurrections, spiritual and bodily respectively, in Rev. xx., and apparently I was prepossessed with the idea of two resurrections in vv. 4, 5, and missed the fact that the bodily one mentioned by himself was that in v. 12. But I ought not to have misread this reference, or his statement about spiritual life on p. 15. Mr. Sheppard does not think Rev. xx. 4, 5 refers to bodily resurrection at all. This affects also what I said about "the rest of" the dead.

With regard to the other point in his letter, I am not qualified to speak for the Historical School, but I think they would say that the system referred to is mathematical, and is moreover infallibly and universally correct. The best of interpreters and calculators, however, is not infallible; and I think they would admit that many reckonings thought to be unimpeachable have been falsified by an unrecognized flaw, and that certainty is only approached by slow steps and is not even yet attained in all details. Personally, I am not deeply versed in this matter, and I do not even know what value would be placed upon the expositor named in Mr. Sheppard's letter. But it certainly seems reasonable to urge that a system which has been verified again and again is not necessarily discredited by any slips in calculation (perhaps due to factors impossible of recognition at the time) by persons however eminent. If I may slightly vary and adapt Mr. Sheppard's illustration, a couple of *mistakes in working equations* would not prove the *method of working* was wrong. On the contrary, the seven correct answers would strongly suggest it was right.

Yours faithfully,

THE REVIEWER.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

ARRANGEMENTS are being made for the immediate issue of a new and revised edition of *The Catholic Faith* by Dr. Griffith Thomas. The new edition will be published at a price little in excess of the old (1s. 6d. net), so as to enable it still to be used largely by students and teachers who cannot afford expensive books, and also to allow for its continued distribution to Confirmation Candidates, Sunday School teachers, etc. The book is particularly useful for this last purpose, as it is a comprehensive and at the same time a simple work on Church doctrine. It is designed to answer the questions, What is the Church of England? and What does the Church of England teach? Part 1, "The Catholic Faith and the Individual Life," deals with the relations of the individual Christian to God, and how that relation is formed and maintained. Part 2, "The Catholic Faith and Church Life," deals with the relation of the individual Churchman to his fellow Churchmen in regard to doctrine, worship, and practice. Part 3, "The Catholic Faith and Current Questions," deals with the relation of the individual Churchman to some important questions of the day, and to this section is added an extremely useful and instructive chapter on what is known as the Principal Service. These sectional headings only imperfectly suggest the wide range of subjects dealt with, and from our knowledge Churchmen will find in the Manual just the guidance and assistance they require. We live at a time when spiritual men of all Churches should not only make their position intelligent to themselves, but be ready to define and defend it in view of all opposition. This book has served in the past, and will, it is hoped, continue to help many in such endeavour.

Sir Edward Clarke supplied a real need when he wrote *What Vestments are Legal in the Church of England?* It was very desirable to have the entire historical and legal position reviewed by one who is fully acquainted with its ramifications, and has the gift of putting facts in their right perspective, and of making them clear to the "man in the street" without sacrificing accuracy or employing invective. Two large editions of the pamphlet have been sold and circulated since its first issue in 1912, and it has been found necessary to issue a third edition which is now obtainable from the Church Book Room at 2d. or 14s. per 100 net. It is unfortunate that owing to the largely increased cost of production it was found impossible to issue the pamphlet at a cheaper rate, but its intrinsic value, and the constant demand for it, are such that it was imperative to publish now and not to wait in the hope of a fall in production charges. Sir Edward Clarke has carefully revised the new edition, which will be found most readable, and free from technicalities that obscure the strength of the case in the minds of people who are confused by words that convey no meaning to them, but who appreciate the force of language they understand.

This is a little book by the Rev. G. R. Balleine, M.A., author of *The History of a Layman's of the Evangelical Party*. *A Layman's History of the Church of England* (6d. net) consists of 200 pages telling the story of the Church of England from its beginning in the second century to to-day. It is as fascinatingly written as any romance. It is suggestive, and few will read it without sermons springing from its pages,

for it shows in a most remarkable way how Christianity can transform a people. To make it very concrete, the author takes one single church, an imaginary one in an imaginary village, and traces its history and fortunes and vicissitudes down to the present day. But this history of this one Church is the history of Christianity in England. As the author says: "Some church histories have been written from the standpoint of an archbishop's commissary. They deal with kings and councils and conferences, and the business of bishops and archdeacons. They move in an atmosphere immensely remote from anything that the average Churchman ever comes in touch with. But the present book deals with the Church as it is seen by the man in the pew, not by the man in the mitre. It keeps a typical English parish in the centre of the stage. It tries to trace the religion and worship of an ordinary village congregation through the different centuries. It aims at showing how the things with which every Churchman is familiar gradually grew to be what they are to-day. It does not ignore what bishops and kings were doing at headquarters, but it studies these matters, not through the debates of the council chamber, but through the results which followed in the actual life of the parishes."

Many clergymen and active workers amongst children have long felt that there is a weakness in the otherwise excellent work of Sunday Schools, boys' and girls' clubs, etc., that it does not in any way prepare the children to take their part in the public worship of their church when they are too old for what they have been accustomed to as children. It is felt that some effort should be made to supplement Sunday School work so as to enable the young to take a full and interested part in the life and worship of the Church. An attempt has been made to compile a form of service for use at Children's Services, at Sunday Schools, Mission Services, etc., by Mr. Lawrence C. Head, who has for many years done a great work among children in South London. The great advantage of the book is that it follows Prayer Book lines closely, so that it really does prepare the children to worship as adults, and the service runs on without awkward breaks and the necessity for finding fresh places. The Psalms are printed from the Cathedral Psalter and are twelve in number, and there are several hymns, the Church Seasons being the basis of choice. The printing is excellent, and the price is moderate (2d. net or 14s. per 100).

That there is a strong movement in our Church at the present time to re-establish the practice of systematic confession to a Priest in order to obtain private absolution is evidenced by the references to Confession contained in the recent Memorial to the Archbishops signed by 600 Priests in the Church of England. It is necessary for all Churchpeople to make themselves acquainted with the teaching of the Church of England in regard to this important matter, and a trustworthy guide on the facts of the subject is to be found in *The Confessional* by Canon F. Meyrick (3d. net). This pamphlet is a severe condemnation of the practice on the grounds alike of Scripture, of primitive custom, of history and of its practical consequences. Those who read it with unprejudiced minds will probably be convinced that few greater injuries can be done to the English Church and the English people than the re-introduction for general adoption of a practice so inconsistent with ancient example and so adverse to the cultivation of the best manly and womanly character.