

# ORTH BRITISH & MERCANTILE

INSURANCE COMPANY. Funds Exceed £23,400,000.

"An old and first-class office. Low rates a distinctive feature."—*The Times*.

Chief Offices: LONDON, 61 Threadneedle Street; EDINBURGH, 64 Princes Street.

Vol. xxxi., No. 139 New Series.

JULY, 1917.

# THE CHURCHMAN

*A Monthly Magazine and Review*

CONDUCTED BY

CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN OF THE  
CHURCH OF ENGLAND

## CONTENTS.

### THE MONTH.

"Reservation." Bishop Gore's Position. A Practical Summing-up. "Romanization." Death of Dr. Denney. A Day of National Prayer.

### THE WONDROUS CROSS: STUDIES IN THE ATONEMENT.

By the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D.

A NATIONAL CHURCH AND ITS LIMITATIONS. By the Rev. Canon W. E. Reginald Morrow, M.A.

ST. MATTHEW AND THE FIRST GOSPEL. III. By the late Rev. Arthur Carr, M.A.

THE LORD'S SUPPER AS PRESENTED IN SCRIPTURE: A LAYMAN'S VIEW. II. By A. T. Schofield, M.D.

### PREACHERS' PAGES.

Homiletical Hints and Outlines. Illustrations. The Study Table.

IS HORSE-RACING NECESSARY TO IMPROVE THE BREED ?

By Lt.-Colonel Seton Churchill.

### THE MISSIONARY WORLD.

### REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

"A Study in Christology." "The Valley of Decision." "Divine Humanity." "Mandarin and Missionary in Cathay." "Methods of Christian Work." "Owen Charles Whitehouse."

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT  
ROXBURGHE HOUSE, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.  
PRICE SIXPENCE NET.

By the Right Rev. G. H. S. WALPOLE, D.D.

BISHOP OF EDINBURGH.

**A NEW WORK.**

## Life in the World to Come.

I. The Promise of Immortality.      II. The Fulfilment.

Ready Immediately.      2s. 6d. net.

## WITNESS :

THE WORK OF  
DISCIPLES AND FRIENDS

*Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.*

## THIS TIME AND ITS INTERPRETATION:

or, The Coming of the Son of Man.

With Prayers for those who are mindful of His Coming.

DEDICATED TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

*Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.*

LIFE, DEATH, AND IMMORTALITY.      Price 2d.

THE GOSPEL OF HOPE. A MESSAGE OF COMFORT.

Containing a Selection of Prayers for the Departed.      *Cloth, 2s. net.*

THE SHRINE AND THE PRESENCE. *Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.*

THE PEOPLE'S PRAYER BOOK.      2s. 6d. net.

With Hymns A. & M., 3s. net.

A SIMPLE GUIDE TO HOLY COMMUNION.

A MANUAL FOR YOUNG COMMUNICANTS.

*Cloth, 6d.* Special terms for quantities.

*A Complete List of Works by Bishop Walpole free on application.*

London: ROBERT SCOTT, Paternoster Row, E.C.

2526 304

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE MONTH .. .. .	385
"Reservation." Bishop Gore's Position. A Practical Summing-up.	
"Romanization." Death of Dr. Denney. A Day of National Prayer.	
THE WONDROUS CROSS: STUDIES IN THE ATONEMENT.	
By the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. .. .. .	391
A NATIONAL CHURCH AND ITS LIMITATIONS. By the Rev.	
Canon W. E. Reginald Morrow, M.A. .. .. .	397
ST. MATTHEW AND THE FIRST GOSPEL. III. By the late Rev.	
Arthur Carr, M.A. .. .. .	403
THE LORD'S SUPPER AS PRESENTED IN SCRIPTURE: A	
LAYMAN'S VIEW. II. By A. T. Schofield, M.D. .. .. .	410
PREACHERS' PAGES .. .. .	419
Homiletical Hints and Outlines. Illustrations. The Study Table.	
IS HORSE-RACING NECESSARY TO IMPROVE THE BREED?	
By Lt.-Colonel Seton Churchill. .. .. .	429
THE MISSIONARY WORLD .. .. .	435
REVIEWS OF BOOKS .. .. .	442
"A Study in Christology." "The Valley of Decision." "Divine	
Humanity." "Mandarin and Missionary in Cathay." "Methods	
of Christian Work." "Owen Charles Whitehouse."	

*All articles appearing in THE CHURCHMAN are the copyright of the Publisher, and must not be reprinted without permission.*

# Colonial and Continental Church Society

*Patron: H.M. THE KING.*

works amongst our own countrymen,

## On the Fringes of the Empire,

in Canada, Australia, East Africa, and elsewhere, where new or struggling settlers need help to secure clergy and the services of the Church, and

## On Both Sides of the Fighting Line

amongst our own British communities and the soldiers.

### A Fund of £7,000

is urgently needed in order to put the finances of the Society on a firm basis.

Bankers: BARCLAYS BANK, LTD. Treasurer: F. A. BEVAN, Esq.  
Secretary: The Rev. J. D. MULLINS, M.A., 9 Sergeants' Inn,  
Fleet Street, London, E.C. 4.

# SOCIETY FOR RELIEF OF DISTRESSED JEWS

74 BROOK GREEN, LONDON, W. 6

Owing to the War our work in Palestine is suspended, but we are collecting for over **2,000** women disabled, and children, Jewish colonists cruelly robbed and expelled from Palestine, whom the British authorities are sheltering at Alexandria, Egypt. **500** of the young men volunteered for service in Gallipoli.

## THEIR NEED IS GREAT.

Donations will be thankfully received by:—

**F. A. BEVAN, Esq., J.P., D.L.,** *President and Hon. Treasurer,*  
54 LOMBARD STREET, E.C. 3 ;  
**Messrs. DRUMMOND, Bankers,** 49 CHARING CROSS, S.W. 1 ;  
**E. A. FINN, Secretary,** at the above address.

### NEW S.P.C.K. BOOKS.

#### IN GERMAN GAOLS. A Narrative of Two Years' Captivity in German East Africa.

By the Rev. ERNEST F. SPANTON, Priest of the U.M.C.A. With a Prefatory Note by Sir HARRY HAMILTON JOHNSTON, G.C.M.G., K.C.B. With 16 Illustrations. Cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

#### THEOSOPHY AND CHRISTIANITY. A Comparison.

By M. CARTA STURGE, Author of "The Truth and Error of Christian Science," &c. 1s. 6d. net.

#### COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

By the Rev. A. S. GEDEN, D.D. Cloth Boards, 2s. net. A complete list of the Series may be had post free.

#### UNFERMENTED WINE.

A Report of great importance, published by the request of the Archbishop of Canterbury, drawn up by Scholars of wide reputation, which settles with some approach to finality a number of vexed questions. 6d. net.

#### CARRYING ON THE NATIONAL MISSION. Some Plain and Practical Plans.

By the Rev. CHARLES C. BELL, M.A., Canon Residentiary of York and Diocesan Missioner. With Foreword by the ARCHBISHOP OF YORK. 1s. net.

#### A CHALLENGE TO THE CHURCH. Being an Account of the National Mission, 1916, and of Thoughts Suggested by it.

By the Rev. WILLIAM TEMPLE. Paper Cover, 1s. 6d. net.; cloth, 2s. 6d. net. [READY IN JUNE.]

#### FOOD.

#### THE TOPIC OF THE HOUR.

By ALEX. HILL, M.A., M.D., F.R.C.S., Principal of the University College of Southampton. 9d. net.

**Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge,**  
LONDON: 68 HAYMARKET, S.W. 1.

Lists post free on application.

And of all booksellers.

Inquiries respectfully invited.

# THE CHURCHMAN

July, 1917.

## The Month.

**“Reserva-  
tion.”** THE question of the Reservation of the Sacrament continues to excite attention, and is, in fact, the most prominent feature of ecclesiastical controversy at the present time. The point at issue is not so much the right to reserve the Sacrament for the sick under due episcopal authority—although it should be noted that there is still a very large body of Church opinion opposed to Reservation for any purpose whatsoever—as the right to reserve it under conditions which must inevitably lead to its worship and adoration. The two points are quite distinct, in spite of some efforts to unify them, and in considering the question it is of the greatest importance to keep the distinction in mind. Much literature has been issued in regard to it. Dr. Darwell Stone’s book (published by Mr. Robert Scott, 2s. 6d. net) has already been noticed in our pages. It is quite the ablest book on the extremer side, and is everywhere widely quoted. But what was needed was a careful statement on the part of those who while quite ready to accept the practice of Reservation for the sick are opposed most strongly to the worship and adoration of the reserved elements. Such a book we now have. It bears the simple title *Reservation*, and is published by Mr. Robert Scott at 2s. net. The genesis of the book may be briefly explained. There being some difficulty experienced over the question in the diocese of Chelmsford, the Bishop, Dr. Watts-Ditchfield, invited the whole of his clergy to a meeting, which was held in Easter week, and the Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Gore, attended on his brother bishop’s invitation to address them. He not only consented to give the main address, but to answer questions. This little volume contains the

full report of the Bishop of Oxford's address, and also of the questions and answers and of the Bishop of Chelmsford's summing-up. The volume has been referred to by the Bishop of Durham as one of extraordinary interest ; we go even further and say it is a volume of extraordinary importance.

The Bishop of Oxford's position is well known. **Bishop Gore's Position.** The Bishop of Chelmsford said that Dr. Gore "has done probably more than any other man to advance the cause of Reservation and to bring it into the realm of practical politics," yet he is conscientiously opposed to the Reserved Sacrament being used for worship and adoration. Indeed the real subject of his address was "Access to the Reserved Sacrament for Prayer and Adoration," and we venture to say that the arguments he put forward in opposition to the practice are absolutely unanswerable. It is strange, indeed, that they should not be accepted by all those who have generally regarded him as their leader, but there is a section of extreme Churchmen who seem to recognize no law but that of their own inclination unless it be that of the Church of Rome, for let it be understood quite plainly that the right of access to the Reserved Sacrament for prayer and adoration is recognized by the Church of Rome and by no other Church in Christendom. The practice even in the Church of Rome is of comparatively modern origin. It is certainly not primitive ; nor can it rightly be called Catholic. We must refer our readers to the volume itself for a full realization of its illuminating pages, but we may say that the Bishop of Oxford insisted that what is at stake is not the doctrine of the Real Presence, or the real objective Presence, "but the use to which it is put." The Bishop gave it as his own experience that "the sense of the interior presence of *Christ in us* weakened the desire for the exterior visit" to the Sacrament, and he added that the putting of the Holy Eucharist to a new use "different from any use which is directly or indirectly suggested in the New Testament is something which has about it a great venturesomeness—a great presumption." He warned those who pleaded that they should be content with "visits to the Blessed Sacrament" and abandon the desire for the monstrance or for Benediction that "the whole impulse of logic and devotion renders these various uses so closely interconnected that, if we feel bound to make a stand

against the development as a whole, we must make it at the beginning and not at the later point." The Bishop's reference to "sophistical arguments"—of which we hear too many—was much to the point. He said:—

Then I do also very strongly urge that we should not suffer ourselves to use sophistical arguments. I think that our position is a position of very great difficulty. I have never been an optimist about the Church of England. I expect we have bad times in front of us, such as will test the faith and patience of the best of us. But it is all the more necessary that we should keep our minds unsophisticated. We need to keep honest consciences and maintain only fair arguments. It is absurd to say I am *only* reserving the Blessed Sacrament for the communion of the sick if, in fact, I am reserving it with another purpose prominent in my mind—if in fact it is the desire to have the Blessed Sacrament as an object of worship which is the dominant motive in those desiring Reservation; as is sometimes the case not only in religious communities but in parish churches also. We must not juggle with words. If we want Reservation only for the purpose of communion of the sick we can have it.

The Bishop of Chelmsford's summing-up was remarkably able. It dealt with the question from the practical side. In answer to the argument that many people found it "helpful" to have the Sacrament reserved in "our open churches," he asked those who argue from the standpoint that because something "helps" it is admissible and advisable in our Church "Where are we going to stop?" "People," he said, "who are communicants of the Church of England are telling me and writing to me saying that they are finding tremendous comfort in Spiritualism at the present time. They say that it is a great comfort to hold converse with 'husband' and with 'son.' They say that they find that they can even go to their Communion better on the following Sunday as the result. But, because some people say that they find it helpful, am I necessarily bound to tack on, say, Spiritualism to the Church?" Moreover, he wanted to know whether they were certain that "because fifty people are found in a church praying before the Sacrament that they are more men and women of prayer than the members of other churches without Reservation? Is Family Prayer so frequent? Is there a Prayer Meeting in that parish? Can any one say there is more real prayer in, for instance, All Saints', Margaret Street, parish than in St. Paul's, Onslow Square?" On the question of finality he again asked "Where are we to stop?" "To put it quite bluntly, if anybody eight or nine or ten years ago had told me that the

Bishop of Oxford would be regarded by any body of Catholics in this country as a 'back number,' I should not have believed it, and yet there are men to-day who say, shall I say, straight out, that the Bishop of Oxford is a Protestant and too Protestant for them. Some even say that Keble and Pusey are out of date and did not go far enough. The early Tractarians, rightly or wrongly, held that *all* they asked for was to be found within the Prayer Book, but is not that position openly abandoned by large numbers of clergy to-day? Now, when this is the case I ask my brethren where are we going to stop? What is the final stage?" This is not only a serious question, it is *the* question, and evidence is accumulating that there is a school of extremists in the Church of England who will stop at nothing short of reunion with Rome.

An instructive letter appeared in the *Guardian* of June 7 from Anglican, who bluntly and frankly declared that "the Church of England is being Romanized," and as evidence that there are in our midst men who are doing their utmost to Romanize the Church he called attention to the following facts:—

1. A layman, who was a sincere Churchman, had taken a house in a country parish. He went to church, but found that the services were quite strange to him. They were not the services of the Church of England. The rector, when he found he did not attend, visited him, and when he heard his reason for abstaining from worship, made no excuse but "hoped they would be good friends." The rector frankly acknowledged that he would have joined the Church of Rome had he not been married!

2. A distinctly High Church clergyman friend went to a Communion Service for clergy in a parish in the South of England. He confessed that he had no idea what the service was—it was all strange to him, and he resented the fact that he was not allowed to communicate, although he had been invited to the service.

3. A lady in the South-West of England was pressed by the vicar of the parish to join the Church of Rome. When she showed her surprise, he boasted that he had already persuaded a large number of women to "go over."

4. A High Church clergyman told the writer that as he came from church one day he was chaffed by the Roman priest, on the ground that he (the rector) was not very friendly to him. When asked what he meant, he was told, "You never send me any converts, while I always reckon to get a dozen each year from St. A's"!

5. At a certain well-known church in the South of England three of the clergy went over to Rome. The bishop of the diocese took the services on the following Sunday, and he declared that had he not gone and explained the position of the Church of England the whole congregation would also have "gone over." The clergy had been apparently educating the people for this purpose.

With this letter we may couple a paragraph from the *Church Times* of June 15 :—

We have received a glowing account of a procession of the Blessed Sacrament on Sunday last in the parish of St. Saviour, Hoxton, with Exposition at the high altar throughout the day, and Benediction after Evensong. It appears to have been, as we can well believe, a magnificent and edifying ceremony, a genuine act of worship in crowded and gaily decorated streets. These streets are normally among the meanest and most depressing in London. The description is instructive and suggestive. It shows what a real help to evangelic religion these ceremonies may be. But it provokes comment of another kind also. All was done, not only without ecclesiastical authority, but in open defiance of authority. Regarding it in this light, we cannot abstain from severe condemnation, and we fear that all the good which may have been done by the stimulation of devotion will be more than counter-balanced by the harm that is done to the cause of sacred obedience, and by the further weakening of that spiritual authority which is already in deplorable estate.

We are glad to read the protest of the *Church Times*. It is possible that men who refuse to acknowledge the rule of the Bishops may take a hint from the *Church Times*, although we should have been better pleased if that powerful journal had expressed its dissent from the practices referred to. The case has been brought to the attention of the Bishop of London by Mr. Kensit. We are not favourable to ritual prosecutions, but here is a case, if ever there were one, when the most drastic measures available should be applied.

The death of Dr. Denney is a great loss to the Christian Church and to the cause of Evangelical theology. He was connected with the Free Church of Scotland, but he belonged by his writings, which have helped many thousands, to the whole Christian Church. The Editor of the *British Weekly*, in a moving and sympathetic review of his career, says that Denney was in many respects "the first man in Scotland." At the Free Church College, Glasgow, he was much influenced by Professor A. B. Bruce. "He had a period of what might be called Broad Churchism, but when they came to the fork in the road Bruce took one way and Denney another. It was Denney's wife who led him into a more pronounced Evangelical creed. It was she who induced him to read Spurgeon, whom he had been inclined to despise. He became an ardent admirer of the preacher and a very careful and sympathetic student of his sermons. It was Spurgeon perhaps as much as any one who led him to the great

Death of  
Dr. Denney.

decision of his life—the decision to preach Christ our Righteousness.” Of his writings reference is made to his Commentaries on the Epistles to the Thessalonians and the Second Epistle to the Corinthians in the *Expositor's Bible*. He also delivered in America, and published in 1895, his memorable *Studies in Theology*. There followed his precious Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*—perhaps the very best piece of work he ever accomplished—and his weighty volumes, *The Death of Christ* and *Jesus and the Gospel*. His book of sermons, *The Way Everlasting*, presents his characteristic thoughts with marked simplicity and power. This tribute of the *British Weekly* is one that every one who knows the work of the late divine will readily endorse.

A Day of  
National  
Prayer.

The *Record* has invited from a selected list signatures to the following declaration: “We, the undersigned, are in favour of the proposal that the Prime Minister should advise His Majesty to issue as soon as practicable, and in accordance with constitutional precedent, a Proclamation for a Day of National Prayer in connexion with the War.” There has been a remarkable response. A very large number of names have been published in the columns of the paper, and they are representative of all sections in the Church. The first list was, perhaps, the most noteworthy. Among those who have signed are the Archbishop of Armagh, the Primus of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, the Bishops of Durham, Chichester, Manchester, Oxford, Salisbury, Cashel, Down, Killaloe, Edinburgh, Barking, Crediton, and Kensington, as well as fourteen other Bishops, including the Chaplain-General, Bishop Taylor Smith. The Deans of Canterbury, Lincoln and St. David's have also signed, as have several Archdeacons. The Rev. Principal Selbie, the Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, and the Rev. Dr. Meyer—three eminent Free Church leaders—have also appended their names. The lay signatories include Sir Lewis Dibdin, Dean of the Arches, three Privy Councillors—the Right Hon. W. H. Dickinson, M.P. (late Chairman of the London County Council), the Right Hon. George Lambert, M.P., and the Right Hon. Sir Edward Clarke, K.C. (President of the National Church League); and several heads of Municipalities, including the Lord Mayor of London and the Lord Mayor of Bristol.

## The Wondrous Cross.

### STUDIES IN THE ATONEMENT.

**N**O one can question the centrality of the Cross in the New Testament. It is admittedly the heart of Christianity.

“The centre of gravity in the New Testament. . . . Not Bethlehem, but Calvary is the focus of revelation.”<sup>1</sup>

It is obvious that the New Testament connects our salvation with the Death of Christ; indeed, from the standpoint of apologetics, Christianity is the only religion with a Cross. Yet few doctrines have given rise to greater differences of opinion. Ever since the days of St. Paul the Cross has been to some people a “stumbling-block” and to others “foolishness.” But, meanwhile, Christians continue to say and sing, “In the Cross of Christ I glory.” It is essential, therefore, that we should do our utmost to discover, first of all, what the Bible says about the Death of Christ, and then to get behind this and endeavour to find out what it means.

Before looking at the subject in detail, it will be well to consider the meaning of the word “Atonement,” and the history of it is the best clue to its use in theology. It was not originally a religious term, and apparently its admission in a theological sense dates from the latter part of the seventeenth century. The Christian idea of the word is thus much more comprehensive than its original scope, and it is in this that the danger of its misuse lies by those who are unable to accept the profound Biblical doctrine which it represents. As early as the thirteenth century there existed in English an adverbial expression, *at-one*, meaning “agreed.” This phrase was related to the numeral adjective, *one*, then pronounced as we now pronounce *own*. From this came the verb, *to atone*, and at a somewhat earlier date the substantive, *atonement*, the mediæval form of which was the simple noun, “onement” (pronounced as “own-ment”). About the same time *atonemaker* was introduced as an Anglo-Saxon equivalent for “mediator.” From examples that can be adduced it is clear that the thought conveyed was simply that of reconciliation. Then at a later date theologically the word came to mean the revealed way of reconciliation with God through the mediation of His Son—a far more extensive

<sup>1</sup> Denney, *The Death of Christ*, p. 324 f.

idea. In the Authorized Version the term *atonement* is used of the Levitical sacrifices to translate the Hebrew *kippurim* (lit. "cover"), and in one passage of the New Testament A.V. in the sense of *reconciliation* to represent the Greek *καταλλαγή* (Rom. v. 11). It is therefore essential to discover whether the use of the term is intended to represent the Biblical idea of vicarious atonement, or merely to designate some thought of reconciliation with God apart from "the blood of the Cross." Between these two conceptions there is an impassable gulf, and it is essential that we should know precisely what we are to understand by the term.

### I. THE NEW TESTAMENT REVELATION.

It is best to start here and to make the approach along three lines.

1. In General. It is important to observe the prominence given to the Death of Christ in the New Testament.

(a) In the Gospels attention should be called to the space devoted to the events of the last week of our Lord's life. Thus, taking an ordinary English Bible, St. Matthew has one-third devoted to this week, St. Mark over one-third, St. Luke one-fourth, and St. John five-twelfths, or nearly one-half. There must be something in this proportion, or rather disproportion, in view of the fragmentariness of the remainder of the record connected with the three years of our Lord's ministry.

(b) In the Epistles the prominence is almost equally clear. Thus St. Paul speaks of the Death as "delivered first of all" (1 Cor. xv. 3), while the teaching in such doctrinal Epistles as Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians and 1 Peter is permeated with the truth of the Death of Christ.

(c) In the Apocalypse the central figure almost from first to last is "a Lamb as it had been slain" (Rev. i. 18; Rev. v. 6, 12; xii. 11; xiii. 8).

(d) The Lord's Supper commemorates the Death not the Birth of Christ, and it has been pointed out that the latter is the usual event celebrated.

2. In Particular. A careful survey of the words and phrases associated with the Death of Christ is very necessary.

(a) There are six terms calling for attention: Sacrifice; Offering; Ransom; Redemption; Propitiation; Reconciliation. (1)

Sacrifice, *θυσία* (1 Cor. v. 7; Eph. v. 2; Heb. x. 12). What is its root-idea? According to Robertson Smith,<sup>1</sup> it is communion with the Deity, but a more recent authority, who adduces proofs of his contention from life among the Bedouin, maintains that expiation is the primary conception.<sup>2</sup> The latter seems to be decidedly truer to the Biblical conception than the former, and although nothing is actually said about the original meaning of sacrifice, as seen in the earliest records, yet in the light of all that follows in the New Testament, it would seem as though Abel's sacrifice were best understood as implying sin and redemption in the light of previously given revelation. Certainly the statement that "By faith Abel offered" (Heb. xi. 4) seems to imply a prior revelation to which his faith could attend and respond. (2) Offering, *προσφορά* (Heb. x. 10, 14). The word is familiar from the LXX rendering of corresponding Hebrew terms. (3) Ransom, *λύτρον* (Matt. xx. 28; 1 Tim. ii. 6). Scripture is silent as to Whom the ransom is paid and only emphasizes the worth of that which was thereby given (cf. Rev. v. 9; Gal. iii. 13). (4) Redemption, *ἀπολύτρωσις* (Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14). The original seems to mean "to lose by a price," while the English, following the Latin, means "to buy back," "to re-purchase" (cf. *λυτροῦν*, 1 Pet. i. 18). The thought appears to be the removal of bondage and thralldom. (5) Propitiation, *ἱλασμός*, and *ἱλάσκεσθαι* (Rom. iii. 25; 1 John ii. 2; iv. 10). No word calls for more careful consideration. In propitiation there must be a subject and an object, one who propitiates and one who is propitiated. It is obvious that God cannot thus propitiate man, while man himself, unaided, is unable to propitiate God. The thought of the word is the removal of God's judicial displeasure and the taking away of an obstacle to fellowship, the removal being accomplished by God Himself. This is clearly the idea of the word in the publican's prayer, "God be propitious to me the sinner" (Luke xviii. 13). As a confirmation of this interpretation, it may be pointed out that the Greek Papyri are perfectly clear that the meaning of propitiation was that of an offended God, who needed to be appeased. When this conception is purified of its heathen associations, the principle seems obvious that propitiation is something offered by God on man's behalf to God for

<sup>1</sup> *The Religion of the Semites.*

<sup>2</sup> S. I. Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day.*

the purpose of removing judicial displeasure and hindrances to fellowship. (6) Reconciliation, *καταλλαγή* (Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18; Eph. ii. 16-18). This refers to the adjustment of differences by the removal of enmity and separation. There is practical unanimity among scholars that reconciliation in St. Paul means a change of relation on God's part towards man, something done by God which has modified what would otherwise have been His attitude to the sinner. Thus, reconciliation is much more than a change of feeling on man's part towards God, and must imply first of all a change of relation in God towards man. It is this that the Article was intended to express by the phrase, "To reconcile His Father to us." If it should be said that such a change in God is unthinkable, it may be answered that even in forgiveness, if we are to understand it aright, there must be some change of attitude, for God cannot possibly be in the same attitude before and after forgiveness.<sup>1</sup>

(b) There are three phrases that need to be studied. "Made sin for us" (2 Cor. v. 21); He died "the just for the unjust" (1 Pet. iii. 18); "Made a curse for us" (Gal. iii. 13). The true and complete meaning of these words must be insisted on.

(c) There are also four prepositions requiring attention: *περί*, "with reference to"; *ὑπέρ*, "on behalf of"<sup>2</sup>; *διὰ*, "on account of"; *ἀντί*, "instead of" (Matt. xx. 28; 1 Tim. ii. 6).

3. Not least of all, consideration must be given to the Biblical doctrine of sin, its nature, and effects, and the Divine attitude towards it.

(a) The words used for sin are important, especially *ἀμαρτία*, "failure," "coming short"; *παράβασις*, "transgression"; *παράπτωμα*, "falling aside."

(b) The consequences of sin are also clearly taught. They seem to be mainly two. A debt (objective), which requires payment, and a disease (subjective), which requires cure.

(c) The term, "Wrath of God" (*ὀργὴ θεοῦ*, Rom. i. 18), must have some meaning, and it seems best to interpret it of God's

<sup>1</sup> There are two other words not found in the New Testament which are useful for expressing aspects of the Atonement. (1) Expiation, *i.e.*, "cancelling by sacrifice" (cf. 2 Cor. v. 21); (2) Satisfaction, *i.e.*, "restitution for broken law."

<sup>2</sup> Sometimes *ὑπέρ* has the clear substitutionary meaning of "for." (Crawford, *Atonement, in loc.*)

judicial displeasure against sin. "This abominable thing that I hate" (Jer. xlv. 4).

(d) The meaning of Forgiveness, ἀφεσις, "the sending away" of sin.

## II. THE OLD TESTAMENT ANTICIPATION.

1. The New Testament points back to the Old, and sacrificial terms of the former find illumination in the Ritual of the Old Testament. It must never be forgotten that nearly all the great terms of the New Testament are stated without any explanation, and apart from the Old Testament through the Septuagint they would be unintelligible.

"It stands to reason that to describe the ceremonialism of Judaism, for example, apart from the cardinal doctrines of Christianity is like writing a history of the acorn and saying nothing of the oak to which it grows; it stands to reason that the theologian, who defines the Christian doctrine of the Atonement without reference to the expiatory features of Mosaism, might as wisely undertake a philosophical biography and ignore the entire story of childhood and the early display of hereditary tendency" (Cave, *Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice*, Preface).

2. The Old Testament sacrifices call for interpretation, for, whatever view we hold of the Old Testament, they must have some spiritual meaning. As we contemplate the sacrifices of Genesis, the sacrifice of the Passover, and the various Levitical offerings, they are evidently intended to embody some spiritual reality and to set forth some profound truths.

3. There are several acts, words and phrases in the Old Testament connected with Atonement, especially a word like *kaphar*, to cover, the bearing of sins (Lev. xix. 8; Isa. liii. 11, 12) and the killing of the lamb (Exod. xiii. 13).

## III. THE PRAYER BOOK EXPLANATION

We naturally proceed to inquire what use the Prayer Book and Articles make of the Biblical teaching.

1. The Creeds state the fact of the Atonement rather than any theory. They are historical, not theological, and yet even here we are reminded of the uniqueness of the Death of Christ in that it was "for us men and for our salvation."

2. In the Collects and Communion Office the devotional aspect of the Atonement is naturally emphasized, and we are reminded of Him "Who made there by His one oblation of Himself once offered

a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

3. In the Articles the subject is dealt with from the doctrinal standpoint, and in particular Articles II, III, XV, XXVIII and XXXI give the Anglican view of the Atonement. In addition to the statement of the special Article (II) we have the following: "Christ died for us" (Article III); "He came to be the Lamb without spot, who by sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world" (Article XV); "our Redemption by Christ's Death" (Article XXVIII); "the offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone" (Article XXXI).

#### IV. THE THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION.

When the subject of the Atonement is considered from the historical standpoint, the three eras of Athanasius, Anselm, and the Reformation naturally call for special attention.<sup>1</sup> Athanasius laid great stress on the moral and spiritual renovation which resulted from the Incarnation of the Son of God in connexion with His Death on the Cross. Anselm laid emphasis on the profound truth of the satisfaction offered to God as caused by the outrage of sin. The Reformation naturally dealt with this subject in connexion with its emphasis on the work of Christ and the direct application of redemption to the individual soul. Most modern writers criticize with great severity the early idea of a ransom being paid to Satan. It would be well, however, if, while rightly criticizing and rejecting this view, care were taken to disentangle the truth from the error and to endeavour to discover the profound reality intended by the conception. It may fairly be argued that the great minds who occupied themselves with this thought were not wholly ignorant of some of the modern implications. A book that endeavours to do justice to this thought, while rightly indicating the error associated with it, is Dimock's *The Death of Christ*.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

(To be continued.)

<sup>1</sup> For the history see Cave, *The Scripture Doctrine of Sacrifice*; Crawford, *The Doctrine of the Atonement*; Orr, *The Progress of Dogma*; Mozley, *The Doctrine of the Atonement*.

## A National Church and its Limitations.

“**Q**UOD Ecclesia Anglicana libera sit.” These words which are contained in the first clause of Magna Charta give the “text” for the subject of this article. It is only natural, however, to deal with the Church of England as presenting facts, problems and possibilities known to us as English people, while we affirm that the same principles apply to any “National Church.”

It is my purpose first to develop from history the root idea of the National Church and to see how far the title was justified by its contact with the national life in the successive periods and crises of our nation.

When Augustine came over with the Roman Mission he was somewhat surprised to find a living and growing Church which was in harmony with the thoughts and sentiments of the British. The Church may have lacked organization, but that it was alive was very evident from the fact that Augustine—while strongly prepossessed in favour of the Roman system—was afraid to force it upon the British Church. On his asking Bishop Gregory’s advice as to how he was to act, he was told that he must not pursue any rigid system, but to tactfully make choice of anything of service in either the Roman, Gallican or *any other Church* which may be more acceptable to Almighty God and “sedulously teach it to the Church of the Angles. . . . For things are to be loved not for the sake of places, but places for the sake of good things.”

It was not, however, until Archbishop Theodore, who died in 690, that the “Church of the Angles” resumed its national character, for Augustine, with all the narrow exclusiveness and prejudice for which ultramontaniam is well known, wellnigh destroyed its national character by Romanizing it with the Bishops whom he caused to be sent over.

Theodore nationalized the Church, for (1) he was, as Bede tells us, “the first Archbishop whom all England obeyed,” and (2) “before his time the Bishops were Romans, but from his time the Bishops were English” (*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*).

The Anglo-Saxon spirit then began to permeate the whole of the Church, and the Church and nation were thoroughly allied the one to the other; the Church, representing all that was best

and noblest in the national life and ideal, taking her part in the troublous periods of the Barons Wars, the reigns of King John and Henry III. She acted right nobly in espousing the cause of the poor villeins against the Barons and also against the King.

But about the year 1307, owing to the "Foreign" element in the high offices in the Anglican Church, the influence of the National Church slowly and steadily decreased. The Church no longer represented the broad independent English feeling, and therefore became more and more out of touch with the national life and aspirations. The Ecclesiastical Courts, once the foundation of English justice, had gradually degenerated into corrupt tribunals, full of extortion and excess.

This state of affairs reached its consummation in the reign of Henry VIII. The Church had long since ceased to have any touch with the nation, and therefore the idea of a National Church as being the moulder of the national sentiment and the inspirer of the national imagination was completely lost. The Church of England was Roman, and it is not so incorrect to say that Henry VIII "disestablished the Roman Church in England."

The deed, however, was done, and the Act of Supremacy, passed in 1535, "established the King as Supreme Head on Earth under God of the Church of England."

Thus gradually the Church and nation was again being drawn towards each other. The common cause, the common aim and the common desire for a deeper religious sense brought the idea of the National Church coinciding with and representing the spirit and temper of the nation into being once again.

The Act of Supremacy in the reign of Queen Elizabeth welded this union still closer when it declared the Queen "the only supreme governour of the Realm as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things as things temporal."

Bishop Creighton, in writing upon this period, says:—

"The question that England had to settle in the sixteenth century was not whether the Church was to still recognize Papal jurisdiction, but in what relation the system of the Church was to stand towards the aspirations of national life. Past experiences influenced other countries to abandon it altogether, but this was not done in England. The system was retained in its integrity, freed only from noxious growths which disfigured its primitive characteristics. The object of this pruning was to reinstate the Church into its proper position as the trainer of national life, a position which it had wellnigh forfeited."

Here, then, was the national character of the Church restored in all its glory. The Reformation Settlement not only reinstated the Church once again as the central stone in the setting of the national life, but it also finally decided under what conditions the representatives of the different schools of thought should find a place in its comprehensive scheme.

The Settlement, Bishop Westcott tells us, was not a compromise, but a frank acceptance of differences which were held to be compatible with apostolic order and Catholic teaching.

Passing on to the Puritan period, the idea of the National Church still remained paramount in the hearts of the English people, for although Puritanism with its two great arms—Presbyterian under Cartwright and the Independents under Brown—was a serious foe to the national prestige of the Church, yet the English people remained faithful to the Church. Thus Presbyterianism went to Scotland and the Independents migrated to America, finding no room in England owing to the generally loyal temper of the people towards their Church. A later phase of the national idea arose when in James II's reign he wanted to procure the Roman Catholic pre-eminence. In this he was completely foiled, for when he first failed to obtain toleration by means of the Church of England, he offered Dissenters, as well as Romanists, toleration. This was a Jesuitical plot, and was quickly discovered. When the Declaration of Indulgence was issued in 1687 it was received with lukewarmness and shortly declared illegal. Why? Because toleration was as yet far from being desired by the great mass of the nation. Even the Dissenters refused to accept the toleration, for they said, "If the King did not respect the existing laws, he was not likely to respect laws which were yet to be made."

I have said enough to show that the National Church was running in line with the spirit and temper of the nation, and because of that the people were faithful and loyal to her, ever ready to defend her from all assaults.

To sum up, then, the root idea of the National Church of England, is that England can manage its own ecclesiastical affairs without interference.

## II.

What, then, are the limitations of the National Church?

I. *Doctrinal.* A National Church is not opposed to the great

idea of a Catholic Church, but she has no power to change the creeds of Christendom. This does not need much amplification. The General Councils and the Primitive Church have amply defined the articles of the Christian Faith, and it is not for a part of that Universal Church to contravene the authority of those General Councils.

Following on from this a National Church has no power to teach anything that is not contained in the Primitive Church or is contrary to Holy Scripture. The great importance of the General Councils consisted in the fact that the Bishops and others who attended were not asked for their own opinions. They simply were witnesses to the truth handed down to them at a time when the canon of Scripture was in abeyance. There are, therefore, well-defined limits in points of doctrine beyond which the National Church cannot go. What is the case to-day? The Church is in danger of becoming denationalized to-day by the doctrines which are taught by the Romanizing Party—doctrines which have no warrant from Holy Scripture, and which were unknown until the beginning of the "Dark Ages." England has an inbred and ingrained horror of Rome, and the Romish doctrines which are taught to-day by many, alas, of her clergy constitute the very death-knell of her usefulness or enshrinement in the hearts of the English people.

2. *Practical.* But the denationalizing of our dear old Church is palpably seen in the practices of our Church at the present day. What are its limitations in this respect?

(1) A National Church ought to be in line with the spirit and temper of the nation on its best side. The ideals of the two should be in harmony. It is one of the marks of disintegration when the Church begins to get out of touch with the national life, and is the surest prelude to Disestablishment.

Looking at the Church to-day we regret that we see some of these signs of the times. We compare Parliament to-day with Parliament forty years ago. Then it was mainly a Church Congress. Now it is a Free Church Council. The causes for this revulsion of feeling may be many, but I feel that all sober and honest Churchmen will admit that if it had not been for the growth of Ritualism, Nonconformity would never have gained the numbers or prestige which it has to-day. The narrowness, the bigotry, the

exaltation of the sacerdotal office, the "ecclesiasticism," the "clericalism" that has marked the progress of the Later Tractarians has alienated the sympathies of thousands from the National Church. One by one they are leaving her and joining the Dissenting Churches. This leakage consequent on the denationalizing of the Church reminds me of Haydn's Farewell Symphony, where all the performers at one time filled the orchestra, each with his lighted candle; then one by one, during the performance, blows out his candle and retires until only one remains—the first violin, who is playing most beautifully, all unconscious that his friends have all gone. Suddenly he returns to mundane things after "soaring into heights of music which the raptured soul attains" and finds himself alone. He promptly blows out his candle and rushes off the platform amidst the amused applause of the audience! This represents the state of affairs in our Church to-day. One by one going elsewhere because the doctrines and practices of our Churches are opposed to Scripture and primitive tradition. Unless she recognizes her limitations in this respect, it is but a step to a loss of numbers and prestige that will bring her down to the insignificant position she holds to-day in the United States.

(2) Another limitation is that she cannot oppose the laws of the State when they are not contrary to Scripture. The theory that the State is a Christian institution is not accepted by the Ne-anglicans. Consequently, if a statute is passed of which they disapprove, they say that the Church teaches the reverse, and overlook the fact that, as in the case of one Act recently "banned" by some of the Extremists, the question was debated for many years by as wise and as Christian councillors as ever guided the destinies of the Church.

(3) But a most important limitation is this: a National Church cannot impose any ecclesiastical system upon the nation in which it is impossible for the majority of them to join without offence.

This limitation obviously condemns the imposition in many of our Churches of a type of service which is Roman in all but name. Is it any wonder when the ordained clergy of our Church, which has been secured to the nation by the Reformation, substitute the Mass for the Holy Communion, inculcate Auricular Confession, and use all sorts of subterfuges to undermine the Protestant character of our Prayer Book? Is it, I repeat, any wonder that our

grand old Church with all its history at its back is losing ground fast? The true estimate of ritual should be non-symbolical. It should be conducted in every Church so that the Evangelical, the High Churchman and the Broad Churchman could meet on a common ground and be able to join in the same worship, even though they differ in minor things. The difference between ritual and preaching is interesting and sheds light on this point. In preaching the preacher does not compromise the congregation by the views which he holds or by the ideas he is expressing. They can accept them or reject them, for they are only the preacher's own views. But in ritual the worshipper is taking part in the service himself, and if there is illegal ritual carried on the worshipper is compromised by taking part in a service of a kind which symbolizes doctrines he believes false. So Bishop Creighton, in his Peterborough Charge in 1894, insisted on this grave principle, "Worshippers must not be confused by the multiplicity of variations in the conduct of services. There must be a clear understanding about the limits of permissible variations."

We have now seen that the National Church can only justly claim her title so long as her ideals represent the spirit and temper of the nation, and that if from any cause she ceases to represent the spiritual tone of the people she is in danger of dissolution. We believe the Evangelical Party will yet play an important part in the Defence of the Church, for its position is the apostolic and primitive position and therefore must appeal to all true Christians. We give the right hand of fellowship to the moderate High Churchmen and ask them to join us against those medieval encroachments which have done much to alienate the sympathy and allegiance of the mass of the English laity. We ask them to read the history of the Church from the Reformation period down to the Early Tractarians, for we believe that the study of the period of the Caroline Divines or Early Tractarians will open their eyes to the fact that they have not a single view in common with those reactionary medievalists who are crippling the influence of our Church by narrowing its whole conception.

We are confident that the only way to "defend the Church" is to proclaim from our pulpits "the grand Evangel," for in this lies the secret of how to enshrine our Church once more in the hearts of the English nation.

W. E. REGINALD MORROW.

## St. Matthew and the First Gospel.

### III.

[We much regret to state that since these papers on St. Matthew and the First Gospel were written, the writer, the Rev. Arthur Carr, has passed away. His death is a great loss to Biblical scholarship.]

PROFESSOR WHITE, while rejecting Dr. Allen's reasons for abbreviation of St. Mark's narrative by St. Matthew, suggests as a more probable cause the need of abbreviation on account of space. It is, however, difficult to see why such considerations should have induced the Evangelist to omit notes which in some cases add greatly to the value of the incidents described. A simpler, and, in the view of the present writer, a far more reasonable explanation of omission, abbreviation and change in phraseology in St. Matthew as compared with St. Mark is to postulate the independence of the Synoptists so far as *immediate* sources are concerned. Ultimately the Gospel tradition must be traced to the teaching of the Apostles (*διδασχῆ τῶν ἀποστόλων*) already referred to. This twofold source affords the best solution of the synoptic problem. It accounts at once for the close verbal resemblance in parts of the parallel passages and of divergencies in other parts. A unique verbal form or a unique construction or an identical report of our Lord's words cannot be accidental, and seem to point to a common written source; on the other hand divergency, when divergency is unnecessary for dogmatic or any other reason, points to variety of tradition. It is precisely the result to be expected from the circumstances which must have arisen from the first delivery of the Gospel.

Here and there a phrase, especially if conveying a report of our Lord's words, would be carefully noted and would appear in every transcript and be reproduced literally. The rest of the incident would be variously narrated, and here and there omissions would occur due either to the inattention of the listener or to apparent unimportance of the saying.

This position can only be verified by reference to parallelisms in the original language. But a comparison of some typical parallelisms in the English Version will illustrate the position here taken.

Mark iv. 35-41. Matthew viii. 18, 24-27. Luke viii. 22-25.  
(Stilling of the storm on the Sea of Galilee.)

Here there is a close general agreement between the synoptic accounts in the particulars of the incident and in the sequence of the acts recorded. On the other hand, the actual verbal points of contact are few, and St. Mark especially has some strikingly vivid descriptive touches. No intelligent scholar reading these accounts side by side in the original could possibly come to the conclusion that one was in any sense copied from the other. Why, for instance, should St. Matthew, or "the compiler," have changed St. Mark's "a great storm (*λαίλαψ*) of wind" to "a great tempest" (*σεισμός*); or "carest Thou not that we perish?" to "Lord, save us, we perish"; or why should our Lord's expressive words given by St. Mark, "peace, be still" (*πεφίμωσο*) be omitted by St. Matthew? Or why should St. Matthew say the disciples " marvelled " when St. Mark said they "feared exceedingly"?

These divergencies are precisely such as would occur in the reports of a speech or lecture given by different listeners. They are not such as would be found in the pages of two historians copying from a common source. Nor are they such as would be found in the treatise of a theologian endeavouring to put a reported incident in a light more suited to the controversial aspects of the time.

Mark vi. 14-29. Matthew xiv. 1-12.

(Herod and St. John the Baptist.)

This parallelism is interesting, partly because of the greater length of St. Mark's narrative, partly because of the occurrence of a rare grammatical construction in each <sup>1</sup> report which points to a written source common to both. Each of these characteristics is to be expected on the hypothesis suggested in this paper. A single Greek phrase, remembered with precision, the story reproduced in its essential points but expressed differently and enriched by St. Mark with additions due to his traditional intercourse with St. Peter.

Mark viii. 14-21. Matthew xvi. 5-12.

(The leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.)

Here the parallelism is very close, but the passage consists

<sup>1</sup> τοῖς γενεαῖσις αὐτοῦ, Mark vi. 21. γενεαῖσις γενομένοις, Matt. xiv. 6. A fuller knowledge, however, of the vernacular grammar might show that this use of the dative is not uncommon.

almost entirely of our Lord's words, which are usually more or less exactly reproduced in the several accounts. But each Evangelist has recorded words spoken by Jesus omitted by the other Evangelist. This again suggests independent reports. For Matthew is unlikely to have omitted the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus.

Other parallelisms point in the same direction, and a list might be made of striking expressions in St. Mark which it is hardly possible for St. Matthew to have omitted in his transcript if he had the second Gospel before him. Among others note: "Was with the wild beasts," Mark i. 12; "talitha cumi," Mark v. 41; "with persecutions," Mark x. 30; "taking him in his arms," Mark ix. 36; "with all thy strength," Mark xii. 30.

Such comparison, we believe, demonstrates the independence of each synoptic writer. In the words of a recent harmonist of the Gospels already quoted: "I cannot see any indications which lead me to think that any one of the first three Evangelists had seen the work of another."<sup>1</sup> If this conclusion is accepted the priority as well as the authenticity of St. Matthew's Gospel seems to follow.

Closely examined, therefore, the parallel passages adduced to prove the use of St. Mark's Gospel by St. Matthew present such diversity of expression as to preclude the possibility of direct citation. It may be added in regard to the selection of events that the incidents themselves are of special interest and importance, and such as would naturally be selected by a biographer.

It is a well-known fact that in early national records, out of multitudinous events which must have occurred, a few only as a rule have been selected as typical and illustrative by independent historians. Confirmation of this is to be found in the early annals of Greece, of Rome, and of our own country.

In regard to parallelism of sequence. It has already been remarked that this is not consistently observed. Further, the fact, so far as it goes, may equally be explained by the hypothesis of Mark following Matthew rather than the reverse; and this notwithstanding the alleged fact that St. Luke supplies the *lacunae* observed in St. Matthew, as compared with St. Mark. These instances of omissions in St. Matthew's narrative being supplied by St. Luke, in other words, where Mark and Luke agree apart

<sup>1</sup> C. C. James, *Harmony of the Gospels*, p. viii.

from Matthew, are extremely rare, perhaps six in all. Of these three occur in Mark xvi., now generally regarded as an after addition to the genuine Gospel of St. Mark. In another instance quoted as parallel, so far as expression goes, the parallelism consists of one word only (Mark vi. 12, 13; Luke ix. 6); one instance only remains of value for proving the thesis, viz., Mark ii. 21-28, compared with Luke iv. 35-37. (The healing of a demoniac in the synagogue.)

It is, however, possible on the hypothesis of the priority of Matthew to suppose that Mark may have added the incident to Matthew's account, and to have been followed by Luke.

The present contention, however, is that each of the three synoptists was independent of the others, and that each followed mainly a catechetical order of the facts of the Gospel arranged for the use of converts.

To call the non-Marcian passages common to Matthew and Luke an unknown source, designated as "Q" is to beg the whole question. That some catechetical order of instruction was in use almost from the first appears both from the summaries of Gospel teaching in the Acts and from the presentation of incidents in the Synoptic Gospels. It is hardly conceivable that St. Matthew should not have been among those who gave instruction in those early days at Jerusalem. And both tradition and probability suggest that the lines of this Apostle's teaching may have formed the basis of a recognized catechetical scheme.

This suggestion of an unknown source would never have been made except on the hypothesis of a Marcan basis to a considerable part of the first Gospel. Reasons have been given for doubting the grounds of this hypothesis. A further objection rests on the continuous and uninterrupted style of St. Matthew's Gospel. No such break in the first Gospel is discernible as that between the opening chapters of St. Luke and the later chapters, or between the sixteenth chapter of St. Mark and the rest of the Gospel. On the contrary, it bears the marks of an original work, composed with a definite purpose throughout and with singular literary ability, being, perhaps, as Renan calls it, "the most important book that has ever been written." Archdeacon Allen himself observes "The Gospel as it now stands is an indivisible unity" (p. lxxxv.). The question of homogeneity of style can only be satisfactorily determined by reference to the original Greek. It may be observed,

however, that unity of authorship is chiefly discerned in the frequency and regular distribution of connecting particles such as "thus" and "as." The first of these occurs ninety times in Matthew and six times in Mark; the second, "as" (*καθώς*) ten times in Matthew, not once in Mark. A participial form rendered "that which was spoken" occurs thirteen times in Matthew, and nowhere else in the New Testament. A verb meaning "to appear" is used thirteen times by St. Matthew, and once only by St. Mark. For other instances of characteristic words in the first Gospel found rarely in Mark or elsewhere in the New Testament, see *Horae Synopticae*, by Sir John Hawkins.

Even an English reader can discern a diversity in style between the opening chapters of St. Luke's Gospel and those which follow, and between the sixteenth chapter of St. Mark compared with the rest of the Gospel. No such diversity is discernible between the so-called Marcan and non-Marcan chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel.

The precise date of the Gospel according to St. Matthew or of the Gospel according to St. Mark cannot now be determined with certainty. Sir W. Ramsay considers that "Q," or the non-Marcan portion of Matthew, was written "while Christ was still living on earth." Archdeacon Allen now states A.D. 50 as a probable date; Dr. Harnack<sup>1</sup> puts Luke at 62-63, Matthew considerably earlier. According to Dr. J. A. Robinson, the date should be placed "shortly after A.D. 70." Dr. Sanday conjectures the composition of the Gospel to have been in the decade A.D. 60-70. Others assigned a much later date to the Gospel, at the end of the first Christian century, or the beginning of the second, chiefly on the ground that it contains indications of a later period of Church life.

If the earlier date be adopted, the question may well be asked whether it is possible to believe that a Christian writer with St. Mark's Gospel before him, based on its Apostolic authority, should have written a Gospel of his own with changes of omission and addition even in the case of our Lord's own words, and have issued it under the name of Matthew, probably in the lifetime of that Apostle, and that a Gospel so edited should have been received into the canon as of Apostolic authority and "placed first in all the great and authoritative collections."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Luke the Physician*.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Sanday, *Book by Book*, p. 385.

Even among those writers who deny the authenticity of Matthew as a whole, some are disposed to regard the non-Markan portions, consisting chiefly of discourses and parable, as genuinely the work of the Apostle to whom tradition ascribes the first Gospel.<sup>1</sup> To the present writer the admission of so early a date as A.D. 50 seems to carry with it the authenticity of the first Gospel.

If the later date be assumed, how are we to account for the reception of a Gospel by a late "compiler" as of equal authority with a contemporary document? And how could its divergencies from St. Mark have been accepted? Surely only if equally with St. Mark it possessed Apostolical authority.

In support of the suggested later date of the Gospel, passages are adduced pointing, it is said, to a period when the Christian Church was fully constituted and its discipline acknowledged. "It is urged," Professor Hort says (*Ecclesia*, p. 9), "that these passages have the appearance of having been thrust into the text in the second century in order to support the growing authority of the *Ecclesia* as an external power. An interpolation of the supposed kind would, however, be unexampled, and there is nothing in the passages themselves, when carefully read, which bears out this supposition." In chapter xviii. 17, the reference is to the Jewish Church or *Ecclesia*. But in the far more important passage, xvi. 18, Dr. Hort points that "there is no question of a partial or narrowly local *Ecclesia*. . . . The *Ecclesia* of the Ancient Israel was the *Ecclesia* of God; and now having been confessed to be God's Messiah, nay, His Son, Jesus, He could to such hearers, without grave misunderstanding, claim that *Ecclesia* as His own." The same line of argument is applicable to other similar objections to the early date of this Gospel.

The words of the baptismal formula, for instance (Matt. xxviii. 29), have been regarded by some as a late insertion. Here, too, it may be argued that, in a matter so vitally affecting the life and discipline and belief of the Church, it is far more probable that our Lord would have given precise direction than that He should have left so grave a point of discipline to be decided by His followers.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> E.g., Dr. Sanday and Dr. J. A. Robinson.

<sup>2</sup> This hypothesis of later interpolation in ancient writings much in vogue in the Victorian period is now generally discredited in the case of classical books. The most familiar example is the criticism of the Homeric poems. But Homer has come to his own again. Another very learned

Interpolation indeed, or insertion of words, falsely attributed to our Lord, could hardly be possible at this early date in the history of the Church. It is surely incredible that an unknown writer using the name of St. Matthew should be able to gain credence for a Gospel which in important passages changed or added to the traditional teaching of the Church. The result of a Gospel thus compiled would be to raise a reasonable doubt "whether the teaching here put into the mouth of Christ was, as a matter of fact, taught by Him" (Allen, p. 9).

Briefly stated, the contention in favour of the authenticity and priority of St. Matthew's Gospel rests on the following points:—

- (1) The *a priori* probability of a Gospel by one or more of the Twelve in response to our Lord's words (John xvii. 20).
- (2) Special fitness of Matthew for the work of an Evangelist, that is, for delivering "the Word" in writing.
- (3) The evidence of Papias and others for a Hebrew (Aramaic) Gospel of St. Matthew.
- (4) The certainty of a demand for a Gospel in the Greek language by St. Matthew's Greek converts.
- (5) The appearance of a Gospel in Greek "according to St. Matthew" as first in the earliest canonical lists.
- (6) The unchallenged authenticity of the Gospel for many centuries, and citations from it in its Greek form.
- (7) The uniformity of style which precludes the hypothesis of compilation.<sup>1</sup>
- (8) The improbability of St. Matthew having a Gospel by St. Mark in writing before him, as shown by a comparison of parallel passages.
- (9) The parallelism of sequence in narration to be explained either by the supposition of a recognized "catechetical order" of instruction, of which St. Matthew may have been the author, traces of which are discernible in the Gospel summaries recorded in Luke xxiv. and in the Acts.

ARTHUR CARR.

scholar, Dr. Rutherford, came to the conclusion that Thucydides, Book IV, was a mass of interpolation. On this Sir W. Ramsay remarks: "The main value of this and some other modern work is to show that the initial principle is false."—*The First Christian Century*, p. 7.

<sup>1</sup> See here Sir J. Hawkins on Matthaean Vocabulary, to prove homogeneity of Gospel.

## The Lord's Supper as Presented in Scripture.

### A LAYMAN'S VIEW.

#### II. THE LORD'S SUPPER AS A REMEMBRANCE.

**I**N the last chapter we considered the Institution of the Lord's Supper generally. In this we look at that aspect of it which is especially emphasized in our Lord's own words and is perhaps the one best known to all our hearts—the remembrance of Him in His death on the cross as the paschal Lamb of God.

This aspect is before the apostle in 1 Corinthians xi., and we notice that in this connexion, when we consider the Supper as a remembrance of the past, the One we speak of is the "Lord Jesus." . . . When we consider the Supper as in 1 Corinthians x. with regard to the present, the "Lord Jesus" is never named; it is only "Christ" (ver. 16) or the Lord (ver. 21); the obvious reason being because "the Lord Jesus" was the One *Who was crucified*, and "Christ the Lord" the One *Who is risen*, and Who is alive and present with us now.

Let us then here consider in connexion with our subject 1 Corinthians xi. 23-26; and may God not only open our eyes to things new and old, but also speak to our hearts as we read these wonderful words: "FOR I RECEIVED OF THE LORD THAT WHICH ALSO I DELIVERED UNTO YOU, HOW THAT THE LORD JESUS IN THE NIGHT IN WHICH HE WAS BETRAYED TOOK BREAD."

It is the same night that witnessed our deepest degradation as men, in doing our worst to the Son of God, betraying Him with a kiss, and selling Him to His enemies, that He did His best for us; and instituted this wonderful feast of His body and His blood to be given and shed for our redemption. The contrast is most touching; and the apostle evidently feels this when he says "IN THE NIGHT IN WHICH HE WAS BETRAYED, TOOK BREAD," thinking not of Himself but of us. What a sudden contrast is here to the riotous scenes of strife and gluttony at Corinth that occupy the earlier part of the chapter. What an impressive transition from the noise where one is taking before another his own supper, resulting in the lowest forms of disorder, to the solemn hush, as in a moment we are taken in spirit to that upper chamber, "in the night in which He was betrayed." We do not consider here the benefit

of this Supper to ourselves, but rather ponder what it cost Christ to give it to us.

The words that follow are: "AND WHEN HE HAD GIVEN THANKS." In St. Matthew and St. Mark it does not say when He had given thanks, but "When He had blessed it." These are two words with distinct meanings. There is blessing, and there is giving thanks at the Lord's Supper and both have their place, and both are directed to God; because where St. Matthew and St. Mark use both, St. Luke only says, "He gave thanks." So here in Corinthians xi. it says our Lord gave thanks; but in chapter x. it is the "cup of blessing which we bless." We gather, therefore, that two things are inseparably connected with this feast, the one is blessing or adoration of God, and the other is giving thanks to Him. The difference is that between worship and thanksgiving.

"HE BRAKE (IT)" (ver. 24). What did He break? The bread.

Here in the eleventh chapter you get God's side, and the bread first; and in the tenth chapter you get man's side and the cup comes first. The cup comes before the bread in the tenth chapter because the gift is known to me before the Giver; I lay hold of salvation before I learn fully to know my Saviour. But in the institution of the Supper it is the opposite, and the bread comes before the cup, for Christ gives Himself to God, an offering for sin before the precious gift of His blood. In the early Christian Church, as I have pointed out, the cup was given before the bread; now the universal practice is the bread before the cup, which seems to be the original order.

Speaking literally (as shown in the first chapter), the breaking was always necessary with regard to the so-called bread of the East, because it was a sort of hard biscuit which could not be cut, only broken; it is not so with regard to our bread. It is better, however, that the bread should still be broken, for it is a significant symbol of our Lord's violent death in the giving of His body for us. So He brake the bread; and observe, it is Christ Who breaks it here, and Who also gives thanks; in the tenth chapter we do both; "the bread which *we* break" and "the cup which *we* bless." It is remarkable that not only is the order reversed in the tenth chapter, but we do everything, whereas in the eleventh chapter it is Christ Who does all. The reason for this is beautiful. In its institution Christ did everything, but in the present communion of

the Lord's Supper, we do everything in communion with our Lord ; for we are here " one spirit " with the Lord. If He blessed then, we bless now ; if He brake then, we break now ; and what He did in that upper room, we do every time we take the Lord's Supper.

" AND SAID, THIS IS MY BODY WHICH IS FOR YOU." May I here repeat that the words " This is My body " never means, nor can mean, " This has become My body " ; and that the bread has, therefore, undergone a change. This is perfectly clear when we know we are in the presence of a sacrament, which is an outward and visible sign of an inward spiritual reality.

" This (bread) is My body " therefore clearly means that that which is bread actually and materially, is to us spiritually—the Lord's body.

A parallel expression occurs at every Passover feast amongst the Jews ; they buy an unleavened cake the day before, and put it on the Passover table ; and the family stand around and say : " This is the bread of misery which our fathers ate in the land of Egypt." "*This is the bread*" : but of course it is not so literally, because it has just been bought from the baker ; but it is a symbol or a sacrament. There is no change in the bread ; but though bread but one day old literally, to them spiritually it is the bread which their fathers ate in Egypt : no Jew therefore ever had any trouble about the parallel words " this is My body." It is only, I should say, too probable, that the mind is perverse which seeks to bring in here a literalism that is never attempted by students in many other similar expressions in Scripture, to support the false idea, that the word " is " here means " has become." It simply means " is," and there is no emphasis on it. I dwell on this at some length, because of the superstitions that are creeping in, from which God in His grace will, I trust, deliver us.

" THIS DO IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME." Here is the supreme purpose. It is in remembrance of Jesus—our Lord. That word " remembrance," at once presents a difficulty. The noun is in the active form ; it is a calling Jesus to mind in His death on the Cross : " This do " to call Me (risen) to mind (in My death). But how can we call to mind what we never saw ? We cannot call to mind an event where we never were present. Therefore how are we to call to remembrance our Lord's death ? And yet it is the purpose of the Supper ; it is the command of the Lord ; but how

is it to be effected in our hearts? The remembrance of a thing we have never seen would seem to be impossible to us; and we were not present at the Crucifixion.

The only possible means whereby any one partaking with a thankful heart of the Lord's Supper can call to mind the Lord's death, is by the power of the Holy Spirit. He was present at the Crucifixion, and He is also present in us. Such is the mystic power of the Spirit of God that He can accomplish what is apparently impossible. We can doubtless remember paying a visit last week and recall some things that were said, because we actually heard them; but no one can remember the Cross of Christ apart from the power of the Holy Spirit. This is most important to note, as we shall see when we come to the last of our subjects. He brings all things to our remembrance, and thus as "one spirit" with the Lord we recall His death at this time.

What then is Christ doing, while we are partaking of His Supper here on earth? Turn to Lamentations iii. 1, "I am the man that hath seen affliction by the rod of his wrath." "I am the man." Of whom spake the prophet this; of himself or of some other man? Was Jeremiah the man, or is it the Man Christ Jesus, who says: "I am the man that hath seen affliction by the rod of His wrath?" Look at Lamentations iii. 14, "I was a derision to all My people and their song all the day." Now compare that with Psalm lxix. 12, "They that sit in the gate speak against Me, and I was the song of the drunkards." See how parallel the passages are. To find out who is speaking in Lamentations iii. we must find out who is speaking in Psalm lxix. If we compare St. John ii. 17 with Psalm lxix. 9, we get the key. "The zeal of thine house hath eaten Me up" is in both, and are the words of Jesus. There can then be little doubt in any mind that the voice in these passages of the sixty-ninth Psalm is the same that speaks in Lamentations iii. 14 and St. John ii.—the voice of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Then passing from Lamentations iii. 14 to v. 19 we come to our Lord speaking in the present tense—now "Remembering mine affliction and My misery, the wormwood and the gall; My soul has them still in remembrance." <sup>1</sup> Nothing can be more full of

<sup>1</sup> There is of course much both in Ps. lxix. and Lam. iii. one could not obviously apply to our Lord without the sanction of a New Testament quotation.

the most wonderful power, or more touching, than the thought that, while we are, in the power of the Spirit, remembering in our imperfect way at the Lord's Supper the wormwood and the gall, the crucifixion and the mighty Sacrifice, the Lord has them still in remembrance, and feels them.

Oh! for that deep, divine sympathy to fill our poor hearts bowed within us, as in spirit we are transported from our earthly surroundings to the stillness of that upper room and to the cross of Calvary. I think we all feel that nothing but the power of the Spirit of God can work a miracle like this.

At the Lord's Supper we are a mixed company gathered together from all sorts of occupations and from busy lives; for what? To be brought at the Lord's Table, by the power of the Divine Spirit, into such an absolute communion and fellowship with our blessed Lord, that we remember what He remembers.

What wonderful and profound thoughts of the Lord's Supper are here presented to us in the Word of God! "Remembering," that is calling Him actively to mind; not as He *is* now in glory; such is not the immediate object of our thoughts, though it fills our hearts with sunshine; nor as He *will be* when He returns, and when we shall be transformed into His likeness body and soul, though this surpasses all that we can ask or think; but as He *was* under Jehovah's wrath, drinking the wormwood and the gall; the derision of the drunkards, forsaken of all men, and at last forsaken of God. To such profound depths of the fellowship of His sufferings are we led at the Lord's Supper.

We are deeply blessed, as—

"Here we rest, in wonder viewing,  
All our guilt on Jesus laid;"

but the object in this chapter is not primarily our own blessing. We have in this Supper, holy communion, we have spiritual food, but what is before us is not our food; it is not joy or worship that occupies us now, but the remembrance of the Lord Jesus in communion with Himself by the Holy Spirit, in His death and sacrifice for us. That is what is presented in 1 Corinthians xi. Christ now remembers His grief, and we are privileged on the Lord's Day morning at the Lord's Supper to remember it specially with Him. This makes this communion inconceivably holy and precious to each of our souls.

There are, however, for this remembrance, for this blessed enjoyment, for this apprehension, certain conditions needed, and they are laid down in Hebrews x. 22, "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience (that is, by blood), and our bodies washed with pure water." These are the conditions of true communion at the Lord's Table—an honest heart, a cleansed conscience, a baptized body; a true heart, consciousness of peace by the blood of Christ, and the body washed with pure water; spiritually—that which is in contact with the world, cleansed by the application of the word, a probable reference to the cleansing before the Supper in St. John xiii.

Let us now consider the next verse (1 Cor. xi. 25), "IN LIKE MANNER ALSO THE CUP AFTER SUPPER." I mention in passing, that it is very remarkable that never in the institution of the Lord's Supper is the word "wine" used. If you look at your Hymnals you will always find the word "wine"; but in Scripture it is the cup we drink. Of course you will say the wine was in the cup. But do you not think if the Holy Ghost wanted to say wine, He was capable of doing so? I do not say it was not wine,<sup>1</sup> because it was, though diluted (according to Jewish custom); but for some reason the Holy Spirit uses the word cup, not wine, and bread not plate. Bread and wine naturally go together, and plate and cup; but spiritually, for some reason, the bread and the cup are spoken of here; "the bread which we break" and "the cup which we bless."

"SAYING, THIS CUP IS THE NEW COVENANT IN MY BLOOD." The cup *is* the New Covenant or Testament. The New Testament is the name of the second half of the Bible, and the cup is the new testament; that is to say the essence of what the New Testament contains is found in the death and precious blood of Christ. It is a New Testament of grace, as contrasted with the Old Testament of law.<sup>2</sup> The New Testament remits the sins that the Old Testament bound on the sinner. The Old Testament binds the sin on the sinner by the law, but the New Testament takes the sin off the sinner by grace through the blood of Christ. Such is the new

<sup>1</sup> That is fermented: the unfermented juice of the grape is not wine.

<sup>2</sup> Strictly speaking of course both covenants are made with Israel; but the blood was shed for the remission of *our* sins.

testament in His blood. We drink the cup. That is to say the memorial of the blood of Christ is partaken of separately from the memorial of His body. In the Old Testament the Israelites were not to eat blood on pain of death. That is why the Jews to this day have their meat specially prepared for them, so that no blood may be left in the carcase, because they are forbidden to eat blood. If I eat blood the animal is alive symbolically, because the blood is in the flesh. The blood apart from the body is a sign of death ; but until the blood is poured out, it is a sign of life ; for the blood is the life.

“ THIS DO, AS OFT AS YE DRINK IT IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME ” (ver. 26). It does not say how often. As I have already mentioned, there is nothing official here ; there is no president, nor priest, nor officer, ever mentioned in the Epistles in connexion with the Lord's Supper ; it is not even formally discussed at all. It is only alluded to twice ; once in connexion with idolatry, and once in connexion with its desecration at Corinth. But it appears it was the practice then as now to take it weekly and on the first day of the week. I have pointed out in the previous chapter that the same word is used of the day and of the supper : it is the Lordly Supper and the Lordly Day ; that is to say, it is the Supper of high repute, of high dignity, vested with all the distinction of the One in Whose remembrance it is instituted. It is to be taken on the Lordly Day ; but what was the Lordly Day ? Our Lord is Christ, the pagan's lord was the Sun, and therefore the lordly day to the pagan was Sunday ; the Lordly Day to us is the Lord's Day, the first day of the week. So God has instituted the remembrance of Christ's death on the Lord's Day.

Now observe in this fact what an incidental proof we here get of the resurrection of Christ ; and especially for a man who does not believe in the resurrection, nor in the Word of God. Such a man might enter a church at a communion service and say : “ What are you doing here ? ”

“ Oh ! ” may be the reply, “ we are remembering a very precious event ; we remember it every week, and that is the death of our Lord.”

“ Then He died on Sunday morning ? ”

“ Oh, no, He did not die on Sunday.”

“ When did He die ? Do you not know when He died ? ”

“ Oh, yes,” we reply, “ we know when He died ; He died on a Friday.”

This would puzzle the man, but he might say : “ Ah, then ! He instituted this Supper on the Sunday ? ” And his astonishment would be increased when he understood this was on a Thursday.

“ Then why do you not remember Him either on Thursday or on Friday ? ”

We have nothing more to say ; but simply that God did not tell us to do so. Now is this not an extraordinary thing ? We celebrate the battle of Waterloo ; we celebrate our birthdays ; we commemorate every event on the day that it happened ; the only event recalled deliberately on the day it did *not* happen is the Lord's death. The man would be struck with that fact, and might say : “ But why do you take this Supper on Sunday ? it is surely better for you to remember His death on the day He died.”

Of course it is if Christ never rose, and then there would be no alternative. Our presence at the Lord's Supper on the Lord's Day is an undesigned proof of the resurrection of Christ, which cannot be gainsaid. Nothing but a more glorious event than even Calvary could justify its remembrance on the Sunday. All over the world from pole to pole, from East to West, in every country and clime, on this first-day morning, the Lord's death is remembered by common consent, and the only possible reason is that on this morning Christ rose from the dead. God has thus inseparably joined together what man ever tries to put asunder ; for there are few who doubt that Jesus died, whilst there is an enormous and ever increasing multitude who deny with derision that He ever rose. This feast is the irrefutable proof that Christ died *and rose* : for it is only on the day of His resurrection that we remember His death ; and this fact cannot be too strongly emphasized.

Now note further. “ FOR AS OFTEN AS YE EAT THIS BREAD AND DRINK THE CUP ” (ver. 26). In verse 28 we read : “ Let a man prove himself and so let him eat.” Observe that although a man who eats and drinks unworthily is guilty of the body ; what he eats materially is still said to be bread. We have already read “ this is My body ” ; nevertheless, after the elements are consecrated (to use an ecclesiastical phrase) it is still called by the Holy Ghost “ bread,” although those who eat it unworthily are guilty of the body. It is not ordinary bread, for it is set aside for a special

purpose, but it is literal bread, and it is nothing more than bread even after it is blessed and so set apart. But we cannot eat it as ordinary bread, for if we eat it unworthily, we are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.

“YE PROCLAIM THE LORD'S DEATH TILL HE COME” (ver. 26). The Lord's death in the past is therefore announced now on His resurrection day, until He comes. And with this blessed hope of every Christian heart we close this chapter, in the hope that perhaps some of the thoughts it contains may, in God's mercy, prove helpful to earnest souls who desire to enter more fully into the holy and blessed mysteries of the Lord's Supper, as given in the Scriptures.

A. T. SCHOFIELD.

*(Next article: “The Lord's Supper as a Communion.”)*



## Preachers' Pages.

### HOMILETICAL HINTS AND OUTLINES.

[Contributed by the Rev. S. R. CAMBIE, B.D., B.Litt., Rector of Otley, Ipswich.]

#### Fourth Sunday After Trinity.

Text: "I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us."—*Rom.* viii. 18 (Epistle).

Here is a mathematical problem worked out by experience and the rule of faith. The word rendered "reckon" signifies a pronouncement based on calculation. In another familiar passage the same thought is in St. Paul's mind—he is estimating values and holds up the balance. In one side of the scales he puts "But for a moment," and in the other "The eternal weight of glory." Again, in one side he puts "Light affliction," and in the other "Weight of glory" (*2 Cor.* iv. 17). In each case the same conclusion is reached—"passing soon and little worth" are the things temporal. The Apostle thus faces the facts and hopes of this human life of ours.

I. THE FACTS OF LIFE—THE SUFFERINGS OF THIS PRESENT TIME. (a) *These are shared by the whole creation.* "Groaneth and travaileth together in pain until now" (ver. 22). What a tale of suffering and woe is contained in this brief sentence. (b) *These sufferings are varied in character.* We are reminded of the terrible facts set out by John Stuart Mill in his fierce indictment of nature. Think of the mental and physical sufferings of man, and he is joined in the fellowship of suffering with all nature—animate and inanimate. (c) *The sufferers are sustained by hope.* "Not only they, but ourselves also . . . waiting" (ver. 23). "For we are saved by hope" (verses 24, 25).

II. THE HOPE OF LIFE—THE FUTURE STATE OF GLORY. "The earnest expectation"—*ἀποκαρδοκία*. After a critical examination of this word *Godet* observes—"What a plastic representation! An artist might make a statue of hope out of this Greek term." Not less striking is the significance of *ἀπεκδέχεται*. "This substantive and verb together vividly describe the attitude of the suffering creation, which in its entirety turns, as it were, an impatient look to the

expected future."—*Godet*. (a) *Of this future glory we now enjoy the earnest*. "The first-fruits of the Spirit" (ver. 23; cf. 2 Cor. i. 22; v. 5). In some parts of the Highlands a sod, cut from somewhere on the estate, is solemnly presented to the heir on his twenty-first birthday, as a pledge of his future possession of the whole. So the Spirit is "the earnest of our inheritance" (Eph. i. 14). (b) *In that future glory man will take his rightful place*. The position, originally assigned to him by God (Gen. i. 26, 28; cf. Ps. viii. 6), man failed to take—"we see not yet all things put under him" (Heb. ii. 8). This is a disappointment. "But we see Jesus . . . crowned" (Heb. ii. 9). This the pledge—"Man's power to exercise beneficent rule results entirely from his relation to God."—*Campbell Morgan*. "The revealing of the sons of God" will issue {in freedom (ver. 21). "The state of sons of God will not be fully realized in us until to the holiness of the Spirit there be added the glory and perfection of the body" (cf. Rom. i. 3, 4 and 2 Cor. v. 4).—*Godet*.

#### Fifth Sunday After Trinity.

Text: "Let him refrain his tongue from evil."—1 *Pet.* iii. 10 (Epistle).

St. Peter has been addressing inspired counsel to certain classes, e.g. servants (ii. 18), married women (iii. 1-6), and their husbands (iii. 7). He now proceeds to lay down moral precepts universal in their application,—“be ye *all*” (iii. 8), enjoining the duties of Christian unity, thoughtfulness, forgiveness, etc. Nor are these to be regarded as mere suggestions, but as obligations. As will be seen by the text, we have singled out one of these. It invites us to certain considerations of practical importance.

I. CONSIDER THE GIFT OF SPEECH. From the first we have reason to believe that the functions of thought and language went together. A conception received a name; a name recalled a conception; and every accession to the knowledge of things expanded the treasures of expression."—*Archbishop Thomson*. "Speech . . . the eldest daughter of heaven."—*T. Carlyle*. "It grows out of life—out of its agonies and its ecstasies, its wants and its weariness."—*Oliver Wendell Holmes*. (Much that is suggestive will be found in Max Müller's *Science of Language*.) This gift alone suffices to place man above all other created beings.

II. CONSIDER THE USE OF THIS WONDERFUL GIFT. (a) NEGA-

POSITIVELY. It is not to be ignobly used. "Refrain the tongue from evil." (1) *There is the evil of "the idle word."* This is (literally) the "unprofitable word" for which an account must at last be given (Matt. xii. 36). It includes the unseemly jest (Eph. v. 4). See also Jas i. 26. (2) *There is the evil of the slanderous report.* Men and women who would scorn the petty theft will in the most barefaced way steal a reputation, and often on quite insufficient grounds. He who "privily slandereth his neighbour" shall not go unpunished (Ps. ci. 5). How striking that St. Paul should use the word *διάβολος* in 1 Timothy iii. 11. The tenth Commandment touches this. (3) *There is the evil of the blasphemous utterance.* Not only all profanity, but all "light" speech about good things and good people is forbidden by the third Commandment. (4) *There is the evil of the palpable untruth.* It may be merely what we are pleased to call, with a smile, "a trick of the trade," or a "white lie": it may be merely the clever evasion, or the skilful concealment of the whole truth, but it remains an evil which God condemns and of which our conscience cannot approve. St. James has indicated the power of the tongue for evil (Jas. iii. 5-8). (b) POSITIVELY. (1) *The tongue is an appointed vehicle of knowledge.* Instruction may be conveyed to the mind by the eye, but the most general form is by speech. (2) *In this dispensation of the Spirit the human tongue is the medium of Divine communication.* The tongues of fire at Pentecost signified the place of the ministry of consecrated and sanctified speech in the economy of God. May we not all pray—

Take my lips and let them be  
Filled with messages from Thee.

---

#### Sixth Sunday After Trinity.

Text: "We . . . should walk in newness of life."—*Rom. vi. 4* (Epistle).

In this passage we have one of the paradoxes of holy religion. St. Paul shows how the man who is "dead unto sin" must show himself "alive unto God." Life reveals itself. When it is at the lowest possible ebb, the faint breath will produce a mist on the mirror, which gives the assurance that the vital spark has not fled. So in every Christian there will be some token of spiritual life. One way in which it may be expected to exhibit itself is in a holy "walk." An interesting study in the different aspects of the "walk" may be

helpfully woven into the introduction. We will consider the significance of the expression—"Newness of life."

I. THE NEW LIFE BEGINS WITH A DISPLAY OF THE CREATIVE ENERGY OF GOD. In the material world there was such a beginning. (a) The Divine Spirit was the agent. "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." (b) Without God creation is impossible. Man may mould and fashion, but he cannot originate. Men may desire to be what God would have them be, but they cannot, without the aid of God, fulfill the purpose of their being (see John vi. 63).

II. IT IS A LIFE IN WHICH THE ENERGY OF THE SPIRIT IS CONSTANTLY DISPLAYED. The results are—(a) *New views of sin*. Repentance—a change of mind—an altered view of things, becomes a normal condition. (b) *New views of truth*. The life-giving Spirit opens the understanding and reveals to us the things of Jesus. (c) *New impulses for service*. Not "the oldness of the letter," but the constraining power of the love of Christ. And He Who furnishes the impulse, supplies the motive power.

III. IT IS A LIFE WHICH ANTICIPATES THE FINAL GOAL OF CREATION. One of the saddest things in life is to meet the man we have not seen for years and to find that in the interval he has grown old—his memory has lost its old retentiveness, his step its former elasticity, his eye its keenness, and we sigh over the passing of youth with its brightness, its optimism, and its buoyancy. The future prospect is rejuvenation—a state in which none grow old and decrepid, but in which life is maintained in its full perfection with none of its powers impaired.

Up above the crowned and happy spirit  
Live an infant in th' eternal years,  
Who shall grow in love and life for ever,  
Ordered in his place among his peers.

#### Seventh Sunday After Trinity.

Text: "Yield your members servants unto righteousness."—*Rom. vi. 20.*

St. Paul has dealt with the subject of the justification of the believer: in this section of his letter he treats of sanctification exhaustively. This passage contains one of the most forcible and urgent appeals in the New Testament to Christians to live a holy life. There is a contrast presented.

I. THE DOMINION OF SIN. They are reminded of the eagerness

they formerly displayed when they yielded their members as instruments of unrighteousness. He points out the characteristics of a life lived under the dominion of sin. (1) *As a degrading servitude.* Ἀκαθαρσία. A life of uncleanness, licentiousness—"personal degradation" (Godet). (2) *As a disregard of law.* Ἀνομία. Contempt for the standard revealed to each man by his conscience as well as by the written word (ii. 14, 15). (3) *As a fruitless life.* "What fruit had ye then?" The only result of such a life was things of which they were "now ashamed." Such a life shuts God out of His inheritance, sets sin—the usurper—on the throne of the heart, dulls the moral sensibility, and gives an entirely false perspective. In contrast, however, with this we have—

II. DELIVERANCE FROM SIN. If the argument is closely followed, it will be seen that verse 15 is not a repetition of verse 1. (See Godet *in loco.*) This deliverance means—(1) *Liberty.* "Being made free from sin." (2) *Obedience.* Lit. "Ye have begun to yield a hearty obedience." (3) *Reward.* St. Paul takes up again the two words καρπός and τέλος. The present reward, "being made holy." The final reward, "the life of the ages." The latter is a "free gift" and not something merited like the "wages of sin."

#### Eighth Sunday After Trinity.

Text: "Led by the Spirit of God."—*Rom.* viii. 14 (Epistle).

Last Sunday our subject was Sanctification—the work of the Blessed Spirit—its conditions and results. To-day sonship and guidance are the outstanding subjects of the epistle.

I. SEE WHAT CONFERS UPON MEN THE STATUS—"SONS OF GOD."  
 (a) *Not a flawless natural descent.* The Jew prided himself on his ancestry—"We have Abraham to our father" (Luke iii. 8; John viii. 33-39). But grace does not run in the blood. The scions of many a noble house leave blots on the escutcheon. (b) *Not religious advantages.* However helpful these may be, they cannot of themselves confer spiritual sonship on those who enjoy them. (c) *Being "born of the Spirit" admits us to this relationship.* The Saviour's conversation with Nicodemus leaves us in no doubt as to this.

II. SEE WHAT ADVANTAGES THE "SONS OF GOD" ENJOY. We talk about a man being born with the silver spoon in his mouth, but none are born to such privileges as these of whom we speak. (a) *They succeed to a grand inheritance.* St. Paul, writing to the Cor-

inthians, could say, "All are yours" (1 Cor. iii. 22). None can walk the earth with so light a step as the sons of God, for they are conscious that it is their Father's world. The past—all that it has meant and left us—is ours: the present with its opportunities: the future and its prospects are all ours. Whom, then, should we envy?

(b) *They are admitted to a privileged intimacy.* Nearness is the result of this relationship. The term expressive of the relationship may be used without presumption but of right. (*Abba*, the Aramaic form of the Hebrew word for father, "had no doubt passed from the liturgical language of the primitive Judeo-Christian Church into general ecclesiastical language."—*Godet*.) Sonship includes brotherhood.

(c) *They enjoy the advantage of guidance.* Under the old dominion of sin they were led by the flesh (see ver. 12), by the baser passions, by fancy or fashion. To secure the "leading" there must be a conscious yielding to the gracious influence of the Spirit. "Though one becomes a *son* by justification, he does not possess the filial state, he does not really enjoy *adoption* until he has become loyally submissive to the operation of the Spirit."—*Godet*.

(d) *But they enjoy no immunity from suffering.* "If so be that we suffer with Him." "What son is he whom the father chasteneth not?" (Heb. xii. 6-7). The Via Dolorosa—the way of the Cross—is the path to the Glory of the Coronation. "*Now* are we the sons of God . . . it doth not yet appear *what we shall be.*"

---

#### ILLUSTRATIONS.

[Contributed by the Rev. J. W. W. MOERAN.]

**Positions—** IN the great advance made by the Allies on the Somme, certain sectors in the lines of the enemy were assaulted; **High and** and those who successfully attacked them drew on their **Lowly.** actions the attention and admiration of the waiting and watching Empire behind. But in a great concerted movement like this, many parts of the line have to fight a containing battle. Theirs is perhaps the most difficult task of all. They have none of the exhilaration of an advance; their business is to hold the greatest possible number of the enemy; and they do this sometimes at great cost to themselves. They are fighting for somebody else to win. The battalions who press forward in the great movement earn high honour, and their names are soon known, and their praises sung everywhere.

And there is a danger of forgetting those whose service was to stand and hold the ground. They have captured no position, and yet without their quiet aid and steady reliance no advance could have been made by those who get all the éclat. Very much the same thing may be said of the Church, the Army of the Living God on earth. There are those for whom is appointed some prominent position—the main advance in attacking the strongholds of sin. Their names are known as Christian statesmen, philanthropists, and gifted preachers who know how to use the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. And yet they would never be heard of, but for those who hold the humbler position of containing the battle-line for them. Their great accomplishments are only made possible by the influence of a saintly mother, or devoted nurse, or conscientious schoolmaster, or loyal friend, whose places are always in the background. These have all combined to mould the character and shape the career of the popular hero ; and yet fame never comes to them ; but their part in the great concerted movements of Divine Providence will not be forgotten, nor go unrewarded by our Father Who seeth in secret.

\* \* \* \* \*

“ Time is the deadliest of all the neutral powers.

*Time.* Let us see that we enlist him among our allies. The only way to win time is not to lose time. You must not lose time in the council chamber ; you must not lose time in the field, in the factory or the workshop. Whoever tarries when he ought to be active—whether it is a statesman, a soldier, an official, a farmer, a worker, a rich man with his money—is simply helping the enemy to secure the aid of the most powerful factor in the war—Time.”—*David Lloyd George*. These words are as true for the Christian as they are for the patriot. The Church of Christ as a Church has never realized properly the value of time. Had she done so, it would not have been left for the nineteenth century to make up for the Church's past failure to evangelize the world. Even now we are doing but little compared with what should be done, and could be done, if the whole Church put her whole heart into this great enterprise. Satan, the master-foe, knows this well. Witness, for example, those parts of Africa where Islam is making such gigantic strides among the pagan tribes of the Dark Continent.

For centuries Time has been a neutral there. In many parts he is still a hesitating and perplexed neutral. On whose side will Time come in as an Ally? on the side of the false prophet, or on the side of the true and only Saviour Jesus Christ? The answer depends largely on Christian people. Let us not lose time by selfish pursuits, by luxurious living, by coldness in prayer, by lack of faith, by indolence, by half-hearted service, by stingy giving where money is plentiful. Rather by all the means in our power, let each one seek and strive to make this powerful neutral—Time—our friend and comrade-in-arms.

\* \* \* \* \*

A correspondent of the Associated Press had an interview (in February, 1916) at Ædipsos with King Peter of Serbia. He found the exiled sovereign bent under the weight of his seventy-two years, almost quite blind, his crown gone, his native land overrun by ancient enemies; but the fires of patriotism, courage and hope still burning brightly in the old man's heart. He said: "I believe in the liberty of Serbia as I believe in God. It was for that I fought throughout manhood. It has become the faith of the twilight of my life. I only live to see Serbia free. I pray that God will let me live until the day of my people's redemption. On that day I am ready to die, if the Lord wills. I have struggled a great deal in my life, and am tired, bruised and broken from it; but I shall see, I shall see their triumph. I shall not die before the victory of my country." Should not such words sound as a call and a challenge to the patriotic spirit of England? If every Christian man loved his country with the fire of a sacred passion born of God, he would long to see her set free from the slavery of sin, the tyranny of social vices, the invading forces of unbelief and irreligion. He would know that these things are the curse of his land; and he would also know that the love of God in Christ is the only power that can liberate his country. Like King Peter of Serbia, he would work for that, and pray for it, and desire that he might live long enough to see England greater and nobler and fairer than ever in her long history, because her people have recognized the claims of God on their national life, and have learned that old truth, Divinely taught, that "Righteousness exalteth a nation" (1 Prov. xiv. 34).

Mr. Hodge, the Minister of Labour, was speaking on one occasion <sup>1</sup> in the Central Hall, Birmingham.

**The Christian Ministry.** He referred to the lamentable failure in pre-war times of the Labour Exchanges to help the working-man. There had been so much officialism and so little heart. He went on to say, "We want live men in the Labour Exchanges, men with sympathy and understanding. It would be an everlasting disgrace to us if, when our lads come back, a sort of wooden image is to be behind the counter to receive them." Let us not be afraid to adopt his homely metaphor, and apply it, as in truth we may, to some of the churches in our land. "Some," only, I say: for, thank God, it is true only of some. But there are churches where the minister of Christ has not been much more than a wooden machine. We have heard with pain our beautiful Liturgy gabbled through with no apparent heart or feeling in the tones of the reader's voice. We have had to listen frequently to a cold moral essay, or a sermonette cribbed from a current Church newspaper, or else bearing tokens of belonging to a series, paid for at "so much the set," varied now and then by some feeble platitude or attempt at humour on the part of the man who claims to be a preacher of Christ's Gospel. May God grant there be an end to that sort of thing wherever it has been found in the past. When our lads come back from the front, they will want something much better. They will want live men to receive them, men with sympathy and understanding. Surely the Gospel our Lord has given us to preach ought to set all our hearts on fire with love. Then let our lips proclaim it, so that none who listen may have to go away and say they found a sort of wooden image in the prayer-desk and pulpit.

---

### THE STUDY TABLE.

"This book is not intended for scholars, but for general readers. It is not a commentary, but the sympathetic study of 'an experience.'" So we read in the Foreword of *Ecclesiastes; or, The Confessions of an Adventurous Soul* (by Minos Devine, M.A., Worcester College, Oxford, and St. Peter's, South Croydon, Surrey. Macmillan & Co., 4s. 6d. net), but as a matter of fact these studies are quite scholarly. The author has made himself well acquainted with the best available works on the subject. His standpoint is that of a reverent modern critic. He believes that *Ecclesiastes* is "a soul's diary, not the morbid confessions of egotism like Rousseau's *Con-*

---

<sup>1</sup> At the first public meeting held under the auspices of the newly founded National Alliance of Employers and Employed, January 20, 1917.

*essions* or De Senancour's *Obermann*, but the frank story of struggle with and triumph over temperament. The writer gives us the benefit of his experience." Solomon, we are told, was not the author of the book. His name is introduced in an ideal sense as the representative of wisdom. Mr. Devine tries to apply the practical teaching of the book to conscience in daily life. All critical questions are relegated to the appendix. The author shows a comprehensive knowledge of general literature which he uses with much skill to enliven his pages. His chapter on "Time and Everlasting" makes a delightful reading. We can heartily recommend this book to general readers and to leaders of Men's Bible Classes.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Rev. T. W. Gilbert's volume, *Confirming and being Confirmed* (Robert Scott, 1s. 6d. net), is a manual of real merit. In the Preface, written by the Bishop of Liverpool, it is suggested that it will be of service to three distinct classes of readers—young clergy, adult candidates for Confirmation, and those who are not members of our Church, and are ignorant of the meaning, nature, object and value of Confirmation. The usual ground is covered, but in a fresh and striking way, and each chapter is prefaced by a short summary of its contents. After "Confirming the Promises," and "Being Confirmed," come three chapters on "The Baptismal Promises," two on "The Holy Communion—as a Duty; and as a Means of Grace." The closing chapters are specially valuable, "The Value of Decision," and "Advice to those Confirmed."

\* \* \* \* \*

A notable addition to Mr. Robert Scott's "Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice," is made by the publication of a delightful volume, *Recent French Tendencies, from Renan to Claudel*, a study in French Religion, by the Rev. G. C. Rawlinson, M.A. (Robert Scott, 2s. 6d. net). In Chapter I, "Fin de Siècle," the writer traces the influence of Renan and of Hippolyte Taine, which resulted in a state of affairs in which a Christian, let alone a Catholic renaissance, seemed quite impossible. Yet signs of spring were in the air, and the conversions of Kingsmans and Brunetière proved that the Catholic religion was beginning to reassert its sway over the minds of the highly educated. Chapter II is a concise summary of the origins, development and failure of "Modernism," and the place and influence of L'Abbé Loisy in this movement is sketched. "The Catholic Renaissance" occupies the third chapter. However unlikely such a thing appeared at the dawn of the twentieth century, yet it came to pass, largely owing to the political situation, and the novelists, Maurice Barrés and Paul Bourget, helped forward the movement. In the realm of philosophy Henri Bergson exerted a strong influence in favour of religion: "standing outside, he held a lantern which showed men the way back to the Church." "Les Jeunes" is the title of Chapter IV. The new Catholic movement was almost entirely the work of laymen. The influence of three is weighed and estimated—Ernest Psichari, Charles Peguy, and Paul Claudel. In a short epilogue the writer has some shrewd observations upon the motives that weighed with England and France, in entering upon war with Germany, and the probable effects of the war upon both these nations.

\* \* \* \* \*

Miss Marie Corelli has written *Eyes of the Sea* (Marshall Brothers, 1s. net.), a literary trifle in which she pays loving and loyal tribute to the men who guard our shores. She writes with pride of the achievements of the British Navy, and strikes a firm note of confidence and cheer for the present conflict. The splendid work among the men of the British and Foreign Sailors' Society fills her—as it must do every one who knows about it—with admiration.

### Is Horse-Racing necessary to Improve the Breed?

IT is most encouraging to all those who take an intelligent interest in the moral welfare of their fellow-creatures, and wish to see temptation removed out of their way, to read the announcement that the Government has at last decided to suppress all horse-races for the period of the war. This step following so soon after another great moral victory, the severance of the Government from all participation in the evils of the Indian opium traffic, should not only be a great cause for praise, but great encouragement to those who believe in prayer. Thus our loving Father gives us bits of encouragement from time to time to help us to persevere in prayer for other great moral victories.

There is no use attempting to forecast the future of racing after the war is over. The probabilities are that the millionaires who now prop it up as a national institution will themselves be so hit by the high taxation which must follow the war, that they will not have much money to spare for so useless and demoralizing a luxury as horse-racing. *The Spectator* many years ago predicted that "The day that it (racing) loses its hold on the affections of the millionaire will be the first of its decadence, of its gradual decay, and possibly of its ultimate disappearance." It is, of course, well known that racing as an institution is not a self-supporting one, and could not be maintained were it not the toy of rich men. There are, I believe, no dividend-paying companies conducted in the interests of racing, showing that this institution is not a self-supporting concern.

The future, however, of horse-racing is no business of ours at present, as just now we are only concerned with the appalling waste of grain associated with it, to say nothing of the enormous amount of petrol and labour that is directly or indirectly expended on it, all of which might be better utilized in connexion with the great war, in feeding the poor people, manufacturing munitions, etc. Some time ago the number of race-horses throughout the country was estimated by Mr. Kennedy Jones, M.P., and others at about 4,000, but directly the outcry against waste was raised, supporters of the institution rushed into print to assert that there

could not be more than 1,600. As soon, however, as they thought that the gullible British public was able to swallow this, some even went so far as to assert that it could not be more than 600! One only wonders how much lower their estimate is going at this rate! Considering that the list of horses for training last spring was given at 1,640, including Ireland, it is very doubtful if the original estimate of 4,000 given by Mr. Kennedy Jones was not an underestimate rather than the reverse.

Race-horses consume a great deal more food than ordinary ones, and even Mr. Allison, the Manager of the International Horse Agency and Exchange, admits in a letter to *The Times* that the amount of oats daily expended on one horse amounts to 14 lb., which I expect is an underestimate. But even accepting that low figure and multiplying it by three hundred and sixty-five days, it will be obvious that 4,000 race-horses consume 20,440,000 lb. of grain per annum, or a total of 61,320,000 lb. of the food of the poor for the period of the three years of the war. But this even does not represent the total expenditure of valuable grain, for every one who has any knowledge of racing stables knows that in connexion with these establishments there is a large number of other horses employed who may not be actual race-horses, but who consume a considerable amount in the aggregate. Probably it would not be an exaggeration to say that this colossal figure might be doubled and that at least 120,000,000 lb. of good food has been expended on forage of various sorts on racing establishments during the three years of this war.

The grain, however, is not the only consideration, for allusion has already been made to the enormous amount of valuable petrol that has been expended carrying people to and from race meetings, and this during the greatest war this world has ever seen, when we are struggling to keep the Empire from being broken up by a very powerful and unscrupulous foe, and need every drop of our petrol for military purposes. It does not require much imagination to consider the appalling amount of waste that has been going on for the nearly three years of the war by the many luncheon parties, house parties, etc., associated with racing alone, and all based on the false assumption that horse-racing is an essential institution for the existence of good well-bred horses, a fallacy which I hope to expose.

The great Lord Derby who died in 1869 was not only one of the greatest Parliamentary debaters of his time and a Premier on three occasions, but was a famous sportsman. He used to lament that "The once national sport of horse-racing is being degraded to a trade in which it is difficult to perceive anything either sportive or national," and he adds, "the old pretence about the improvement of horses has become a delusion too stale for jesting." Many more quotations might be given did space permit, but the reason that I have singled him out is that his grandson, the existing Lord Derby and the present Secretary of State for War, unfortunately was ill advised enough, when Director of Recruiting, to give an opposite opinion to that of his celebrated sporting grandfather. Possibly the present man had overlooked the opinion of so great a predecessor, even though the relationship was such a close one. At all events, many experts and breeders are of opinion, as was expressed in the House of Common on April 25, that safeguards could be provided for the maintenance of an adequate supply of blood horses without public racing. In view, however, of the great national importance of maintaining a good breed of horses in this country, especially for military purposes, it is all important that thoughtful intelligent men who care for the morality of their country, as well as for such valuable assets as good horses, should thoroughly attempt to understand this question. If not correctly informed they might, like the present Secretary of State for War, throw in their influence with the reactionary party, and, with the very best intentions on the subject, do their country more harm than good. We have a splendid breed of horses in this country and we also have race meetings, but the evidence has yet to be produced that the one is the cause of the other, and those who keep on reiterating this delusion "too stale for jesting," as the great Lord Derby termed it, have yet to prove their point. Mere assertion is no argument.

There was a time in the history of England when the breed of horses was very inferior, and hardly anything better existed in large numbers than the common forest pony, still to be seen in the New Forest, Dartmoor, and elsewhere. At the present time there is not a country in the world that can produce better horses. But it does not follow that the improvement is due to horse-racing institutions. The fact only shows that a great deal of attention has

been devoted to horse-breeding during the last few centuries. To improve our breed we had at first to import from other countries, but we do not find that the countries from which we got our blood horses obtained their supply by means of horse-racing. In England we are proud to say that not only has the breed of swift-footed animals improved in the last few centuries, but so also have the heavy draught horses. Surely no one could seriously contend that we are indebted to racing for our beautiful and powerful cart horses ! Indeed the more one looks into the question the more convinced one becomes that to assert that our splendid breed of horses is due to such a cause is only one of those popular delusions that cannot stand scrutiny. England has long been noted for its splendid breed of cows, of sheep, of dogs, and of many other animals ; but I have never heard that the owners of these ever attributed the superiority of breed to the fact that their animals were either betted on or raced ! I have the honour to have known in my lifetime a good many celebrated breeders of all kinds, and I know too well how they would ridicule such an idea. We have these splendid breeds of animals because we possess a splendid breed of patriotic, enterprising men, who produce them by means of their brains !

Many years ago, I remember a Frenchman, a M. Touchstone, bringing out a book advocating an extension of racing in France, and appealing to his countrymen on patriotic grounds to support the institution. Briefly stated his arguments were, that without racing it would not pay to breed thoroughbreds, and that unless betting took place racing would not be a success. Such a line of reasoning only shows how hard up those who uphold racing are for arguments to justify themselves. One wonders that it has never occurred to them that the Arabs have for centuries, long before Ascot and Epsom became notorious, had a splendid breed of horses, which is not attributable to either betting or racing. It may be true that the winner of the Derby might give a good Arab charger many yards' start, and beat it over a short distance ; but that proves nothing beyond the fact that the race-horse is an artificial production, in which great speed has been developed at the expense of every other quality valuable in a horse. A good racer is not a weight carrier, nor has it necessarily great powers of endurance. For all practical purposes the speed of the Arab is sufficient, and if extra rapidity is required it can be produced,

but it will be at the expense of something else that is valuable.

It stands to reason that the number of horses required by a country for military purposes is so great, and on the other hand there are comparatively so few race-horses, that the actual amount of blood obtained from artificially bred horses must be almost infinitesimal in troop horses! Then, again, such a fancy price is asked for a good race-horse, quite out of all proportion to its intrinsic value, that it must be beyond the reach of ordinary dealers and farmers who supply our troops with horses. To give an idea of the fancy prices given for good racing horses, it may be mentioned that the Hungarian Government paid Mr. Merry £5,000 for the winner of the Derby in 1873. The animal was an old one, as it was not bought till 1884, and it died at the beginning of 1892, so that probably it was used for about seven years only. What private dealer could afford to pay over £700 per annum, in addition to its keep, for the use of a stud horse for breeding purposes?

If it be shown that we cannot maintain a high standard of efficiency, and cannot secure a sufficient number of good horses for military purposes in hunting countries like England and Ireland without resorting to such devices as racing and betting, the sooner the Government of our country follows the example of other Governments on the Continent the better. Elsewhere very large studs are maintained at the public expense, and military chargers are carefully bred, due attention being paid both to speed and to other qualities required. Such a plan would certainly be much better and cheaper for the nation, for it is unquestionable that horse-racing as now conducted tends to deteriorate the men who own them, the men who ride them, and the men who bet on them. Space forbids enlarging more on the subject, but I hope that enough has been said to show that the hackneyed statement as to horse-racing being necessary to improve the breed of horses is a popular delusion unsupported by any substantial arguments. I have known many who have disapproved of the evils connected with horse-racing yet continue to support the institution because they have fondly imagined that it was a patriotic thing to do. I venture to submit that not only is this a great delusion, but that at the present time the institution has been very seriously crippling us as a nation during this war, and that to lend it any encouragement is a most unpatriotic act and only tends to play into the hands of

the enemy. There will no doubt be a great outcry on the part of some for the step taken by the Government, but it is a duty that every patriotic Christian man owes to his country that he shall grasp the fundamental principles underlying this decision so as to answer false arguments and to be able to educate public opinion and thus prevent any reactionary steps being taken.

SETON CHURCHILL.



## The Missionary World.

WE are reminded in *China's Millions* for June that "of Wesley and his fellow-workers it has been said, 'They raised the level of the possible.'" It is in the attainment of such an ideal that we are now given the opportunity of sharing. The world abroad and the Church at home call loudly for men and women who will not seek to force the fullness of the future into the measure of the past, or, for lack of conception, attempt to rebuild the order of life out of fragments shattered by the war. Human life as we see it now is a grander, fuller, fairer thing with infinite relationships. To raise the level of the possible through the power of faith in the living Christ is the simple duty before us in the Church of England; and we can plainly see the need in the condition of the Church at home and of its work across the seas. There never was a time when so much earnest thought was given to the witness of the Church, to its power to meet the needs of men in the new age which has begun, for the conscience of the Church has been deeply moved and anxiety would be heavy—seeing that the Church needs release and renewal in every part—were it not that through Christ we can "do all things." More and more clearly it is being proved that what is called "organized religion"—including the expression of religion in the Free Churches as well as in our own—has lost hold on the masses of the nation. Yet it cannot be said that antagonism to Christianity grows; it is our representation of it that does not impress even the earnest souls outside the recognized Christian bodies. And this condition is a theme for foreign missions, for it is only as the Church at home becomes living and free that the witness of the Church abroad can guide the nations.

\* \* \* \* \*

It is perhaps a certain satisfaction that others feel as we do, though for the sake of the world this is a deplorable admission to make. But it is well to learn the need of radical change among ourselves and others by looking steadily at the facts that continually face us. The following statement taken from *The Record* of the United Free Church of Scotland could well describe the condition of our English Church. Dealing with a number of letters from loyal

members which he has received commenting on the situation, the editor writes:—

“The dominant note running through all these letters is one of grave discontent with the state of things in the Church. There is in every age a certain amount of discontent with the conditions which prevail; a certain number of minds are always in advance of their fellows and make themselves heard; but the volume of dissatisfaction at present would seem greater than at normal times. . . . The idea is expressed again and again that the Church at present ‘does not meet the needs of the age’; that while the people under the pressure of many forces have advanced in thought and outlook and understanding, the Church has stood still and is rapidly losing contact even with her members. It is interesting to note a general concurrence in the view that the Church has a wider and a grander sphere than it has yet seen fit to occupy. It is asked to come out of its ‘narrow ecclesiasticism into the living world with its manifold interests and guide and lead all sorts and conditions of men and women along true spiritual lines.’ This one takes to mean a recognition of social claims and problems and a practical effort to deal with them. The various suggestions need not be particularized—they deal both with the spirit and the organization and method of the Church—but behind them all one discerns a wistful desire that the Church will move, will do something to show that it is alive. . . . The problem seems to be therefore: How can the Church, while conserving everything that is best in its structure and life, meet this new spirit which is so impatient with things as they are? . . . Should it not be thinking out, planning great things at home, bigger stronger efforts in all its mission fields abroad?”

It may be that we have almost reached the stage when thought can take effect in action, when we can not only see ideals, but resolutely seek to attain them. We would venture to suggest that what was said of Wesley and his followers should be ceaselessly applied by ourselves to every form of Church life with which we are identified, and a persistent effort made to “raise the level of the possible.”

\* \* \* \* \*

The address given by Mr. W. H. Aldis, of Paoning, Szechwan, at the Annual Meeting of the China Inland Mission, reported in *China's Millions*, is full of vividly told encouragement. The past ten years have seen great changes in China, and it is Mr. Aldis's opinion that God is working out His purposes in China through the various revolutions which have taken place. The revolution of 1911 saw the overthrow of an anti-Christian government, and, whatever its defects, the present government (shaken even since Mr. Aldis wrote) is, as far as bringing in the Kingdom of God, a distinct advance on any that has preceded it. This change is due in part to the influence of Mr. C. T. Wang, a name well known in missionary circles in England. Mr. Aldis relates that recently, when

some Chinese clergy and evangelists were passing through Peking to establish a Chinese diocese in Shansi, Mr. Wang invited all the members of Parliament from that province to meet them that the objects and aims of the Gospel might be explained to them. The Christian missionary from being the most unsafe man in China is now the most safe, from being the most hated he has become the most trusted and loved. During the last two years when Szechwan province was infested by brigands and Chinese travellers were robbed on every hand, the foreign missionary, almost without exception, was not molested. We select the following paragraph as an illustration of the change that has taken place and of the new appreciation in China of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ.

“In recent years crowds of people have at night time stolen down the streets with boxes of treasures on their shoulders, and deposited them quietly in our place for safety. Two lady missionaries in our district were in a besieged city for seventeen days. Night and day shot and shell flew over the city. An official and all his soldiers were deeply concerned for the welfare of the ladies, and sent day by day to see whether they needed anything. The brigands outside the city were equally concerned for their welfare, and allowed supplies to be put over the wall not only for the ladies but for the cow which the ladies kept. It is indeed a marvellous change; we can scarcely believe that it is true. Not very long ago a large number of robbers, soldiers they called themselves, came to attack our city. Within three minutes of the firing of the first shot nearly all the officials, soldiers and gentry crowded into our compound for safety. They asked for our advice, and they trusted us absolutely and implicitly at a time of trouble like that. This is an answer to prayer. Thank God, we are to-day enjoying a change of attitude towards the foreign missionary.”

\* \* \* \* \*

The Baptist Missionary Society has recently celebrated the Jubilee of its Women's Missionary Association, the Society itself being 125 years old. Strong and able statements appear in the B.M.S. *Herald* from the pen of the Secretary, the Rev. C. E. Wilson, on the subject of women's work. He points out that in the course of its work the Baptist Missionary Society realizes that it has made two mistakes with regard to women's work: one, that women's work was organized separately; the other, that mission stations manned by men only are as “incomplete and unscientific as mission stations ‘manned’ by women only.” The B.M.S. is dealing effectively with both these situations, and has been one of the first of the large societies at home to unify the work of men and women. Mr. Wilson gives it as his deliberate judgment that the chief development the B.M.S. needs is a large increase in its women's staff.

He quotes an appeal from women missionaries in North India for men to be sent to their districts where women have done the pioneer work. He seems to think that owing to the demands of the war now, and for a period even after the declaration of peace, the enrolment of men missionaries may necessarily be slow, and it is well to know how strongly the B.M.S. believes that "greater than all our needs is the need of women missionaries and an adequate equipment for their work." It is surely a divine economy that, owing to the war when men are scarce and when women have had and are having plenteous opportunity for ardent service, the mission field should await their help when peace comes, and that a wider sphere than ever before is open to them now in non-Christian lands.

\* \* \* \* \*

Following on Mr. Wilson's statement in the *Herald*, come some striking words from Dr. Timothy Richard, probably the foreigner best known to the Chinese people. He says: "For two thousand years China walled herself into a square cell from which she could see nothing outside. She studied the conditions of her cell with wonderful skill and developed a literature behind that of no nation; but she was terribly handicapped for want of knowledge of the outside world. In 1895 the Chino-Japanese war battered down the walls of this cell, and let in a flood of light from all parts of the world." Dr. Timothy Richard sketches "the stampede" of young men and women to Japan for education and the results which followed. In particular he refers to the reading circles and lecture centres started on Christian lines in the chief cities of China in 1900. The result has been that a number of the leading ladies of China have joined in the work, chief among them being Lady Nieh in Shanghai, sister of the Chinese Ambassador, Marquis Tseng. A strong contrast is to be seen between the old days in which highly educated women missionaries went to China and taught any pupils whom they could get hold of, those quite uneducated requiring perhaps twelve years' teaching before they could read with ease. Now women missionaries can pick out girls from educated and cultured homes, open high schools and colleges, and rapidly educate Chinese girls who can in their own turn open schools or colleges for their own country women. Dr. Richard adds: "I have it on the highest authority that in different parts of the country the daugh-

ers of the intelligent gentry are most eager for this higher education."

\* \* \* \* \*

In this connexion we must refer to Miss Pao Swen Tseng, B.Sc., London, who is a member of a distinguished family in the province of Hunan. This young lady came to England in 1912, accompanied by Miss Barnes, C.M.S., Hangchow, colleague and friend of the late Miss Mary Vaughan, revered in C.M.S. circles. We are told that Miss Tseng's Chinese classical education began at the age of three under a tutor, that at five years of age she had two tutors, at twelve she was already a classical scholar. At a later age she took a thousand-mile journey from her inland home to receive a European education, and ultimately entered the Mary Vaughan High School; here she came for the first time under Christian influence, herself joining the Christian Church in course of time. She entered Westfield College in 1914, and took an Honours Degree in Natural Science last year. Miss Tseng, again accompanied by her friend Miss Barnes, hopes to return to her home this year, there to open a school for girls of her own class, hoping that it will eventually develop a college department. Her family are in a position to provide the site and the buildings; Miss Tseng will be the honorary head. At least one English graduate to teach English and mathematics must be on the staff. Funds for this purpose must be provided in England. The object of Miss Tseng's school is "to help China by bringing these Chinese girls to a personal knowledge of our Lord." In the person of Miss Tseng, the first Chinese woman graduate of London University, is expressed the great hope of Chinese women; the whole Church will follow with hope and sympathy Miss Tseng's future career. It is to be hoped that information about her school will be supplied from time to time.

\* \* \* \* \*

The outbreak of correspondence in the Press about the future of Palestine has stirred up thought. The question who is to hold the land when the war is over has called out divers views and shown the division of opinion in Jewish circles. At this stage of the war, in the uncertainty of known circumstances and the certainty of unknown circumstances, opinions may well be divided, for that the exceptional happens is being abundantly proved. The Christian Church can do no more nor no less than "Pray for the peace of

Jerusalem." One Jewish writer has said, "Christendom and Islam alike have the deepest interest in the Holy Places of Palestine, and their rights must and will be secured to them in the fullest measure that is necessary. But this interest is a religious, not a national interest. A little while ago a distinguished geographer proposed that Palestine should be converted into a vast kind of archæological museum for Christians, in which conditions of life in the first century should be restored and artificially maintained. A tendency to look on Palestine with that kind of eye, though not expressed quite so extravagantly and candidly, is not limited to one geographer. It is forgotten that it was not an artificial nor a petrifed Palestine which gave religious inspiration to the world, but that the Zion from which the Law came forth was the natural home of the living Jewish people. The Jews are the only people of whom Palestine is the national home and centre." It is with this general view of the future that the Christian Church has had the most sympathy, remembering Deuteronomy xxx. among the promises of God to the Jewish nation, and, unable to do aught else now, prays for the fulfilment of Joel's words, "Fear not, O land, be glad and rejoice; for the Lord hath done great things."

\* \* \* \* \*

We have heard with thankfulness that the Central Board of Missions had appointed a Committee of Inquiry, thereby recognizing the Archbishop's statement when the five Committees of Inquiry were appointed immediately after the Council of the National Mission was dissolved:—

"Again, a necessary result of the prayers and efforts of this year must needs be the quickening of loyalty to the cause of the Kingdom of God throughout the world. But we have not thought it necessary to appoint a Special Committee on the Missionary Work of the Church Abroad, because it is the special task of the Board of Missions to see that this paramount obligation holds its rightful place in the corporate life of the Church. During the coming year the Board of Missions will present its own plans for following out the vision and call of the National Mission."

The Church, like the ancient system of Chinese education, already referred to, is somewhat disposed to study the conditions of her cell with wonderful skill. And were the present missionary inquiry to be limited to internal rearrangements without taking into effective account the transformations in the non-Christian world abroad and in the religious, social, industrial world at home since the Central Board of Missions was created, no good would be done.

It is those who differ from us from whom we can usually learn the most, and we must go outside ourselves and our circle for our teachers at present. It does not follow that we accept their views and acts, but we accept their instruction because what they think stimulates our thought, what they see enlarges our vision, what they have attained shatters our prejudice, and what they are creating helps us to build truly. There is little doubt that the social separateness of the rank and file of the Church of England is responsible for much stagnation of mind ; however glorious our missionary past, it is as nothing to the glorious future which will come when we are instinct with life and courage. We look for bold leadership from this missionary inquiry ; we want to learn how the whole loyalties of men and women can be won for the spread of Christ's Kingdom. We do not want to hear merely of a new concordat between Societies and Board ; that might have given satisfaction before the war taught us to face realities, but not now.

G.



## Reviews of Books.

A STUDY IN CHRISTOLOGY: THE PROBLEM OF THE RELATION OF THE TWO NATURES IN THE PERSON OF CHRIST. By the Rev. H. M. Relton, D.D., with Preface by the Rev. A. C. Headlam, D.D. *S.P.C.K.*, 7s. 6d. net.

This study was accepted by a Board of adjudicators in the University of London as a Thesis for a Doctorate of Divinity. To those who know the high standard required for a Doctor's degree in that university no further evidence is necessary that the study is not only based upon full knowledge and careful thought, but also makes a real contribution to the literature of its subject. Dr. Headlam, who was one of the Board, gives it as his opinion at the end of the Preface that "Dr. Relton's thesis marks a distinct step in advance on current methods of dealing with the problem," and says, "I believe that the teaching which lays stress on the reality of Christ as God and man, without attempting to distinguish in the way that modern divines do distinguish between His Divine and human consciousness, represents a more healthy and a more satisfactory solution than some of those offered to us."

The study falls into three parts. The first hundred pages are devoted to a sketch of ancient christology from Apollinarius in the fourth century to Leontius of Byzantium in the sixth, with the final formulation of the theology of the Eastern Church by John of Damascus in the eighth. The writer then jumps from the eighth century to the nineteenth, and in another very interesting hundred pages he shows us the modern dissatisfaction with the ancient results, points out the difference between the psychological categories of the past and the present, and then proceeds to deal with the problem from a modern point of view. He gives us a careful analysis of human nature in the light of modern psychology, treating of the real existence of the soul, of its relations with the body, and of the nature of human personality. He follows on with an analysis of Divine personality, adopting the theory of Lotze, with which Dr. Illingworth familiarized us, that Divine personality only is perfect, while human personality is incomplete and progressive. Then comes an examination of Human and Divine in their relationship, in which space is found for a discussion of the more extraordinary religious phenomena of mysticism, ecstasy, inspiration with revelation and prophecy, as well as for the ordinary Christian life with its dual basis in Divine grace and freedom of will. The third section of the book first reviews some modern attempts at christological reconstruction, particularly Dr. Sanday's "Christologies, Ancient and Modern," and the Bishop of Zanzibar's "The one Christ," representing respectively a cautious and tentative appeal for help to the subliminal consciousness, and a modified form of Kenotic theory. The author then states his modernized version of the doctrine of the Enhypostasia as a fresh contribution to the solution of the problem, and justifies it as the best working solution by an appeal to the New Testament data. It may be convenient to begin where the author ends, viz., with these data, and to ask what is the problem to be solved? Briefly of course it is to find a formula to express the two-sided character of the Figure depicted in the Gospels. Let us state these two sides in the author's own words. On p. 244 he says, "We can accept without any reserve the Lucan statement that Jesus increased in wisdom and stature and in favour with God and man: we need have no hesitation in giving full weight to that beautiful picture of the Christ, made perfect through suffering which the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews presents. The Gospels depict the earthly life of the Incarnate Son of God as

normal in the sense that He underwent a growth and development in body and mind, being subject to temptation up to and beyond anything experienced by sinful man before or since His time, inasmuch as He, and He alone, resisted unto the uttermost." Again, on pp. 247 and 251 he writes, "To admit that the Christ had a mind moulded by the environment of a Jew's life in Palestine in the first century is not to deny the equally vital truth revealed in the Gospels, that His whole earthly life was so truly human as to be capable of transcending its historical setting, if we may so put it, and of revealing itself as absolute, archetypal, universal: incapable therefore of being identified with or confined to any particular age, but recognized to be for all time. . . . The key to the universality of Christ's manhood lies in its truly human character, and the key to its truly human character lies in the fact that it was truly Divine. It was the humanity of the Son of God Himself."

We have said that Dr. Relton makes special allusion to Dr. Sanday and Dr. Weston. He rejects the suggestion that the proper seat of Christ's Divinity lay in His subliminal consciousness as being an unverifiable and risky dependence upon what is not much more than a name for the unexplored elements in personality. He rejects the Kenotic theories broadly on the ground that they are so concerned with the limitations of Christ's humanity that they ignore the universal elements in His character. Of his own theory of Enhypostasia let us quote two statements: "The doctrine of the Enhypostasia, as we interpret it, secures that the self-consciousness of the God-man is a single-consciousness which is not purely human, nor merely human, but truly human, and this because, and only because, it is at the same time truly Divine. Therefore it, and it alone, could be the subject of both Natures, and be the basis of their union within the Person of Christ" (p. 226). "The doctrine of the Enhypostasia gives us the unlimited Divine Logos as the Ego of the manhood of the Incarnate Christ. His self-consciousness was not only truly human, but it was the self-consciousness of One Who was the Incarnate Deity. He did not cease to be God when He became Man, nor lose the consciousness of Himself as God transcendent when He became God in manhood" (p. 253).

It may be said at once that this position is logically inconsistent. Our author frankly admits it. The doctrine "does not solve the problem, because the problem is ultimately insolvable by any finite mind. It postulates a logical impossibility—the particular cannot embody its own universal. But the Person of Christ is the bankruptcy of human logic. And it is better for us to face this last fact than to endeavour to gain intellectual consistency at the cost of explaining away or reducing the Christ within the categories of human finite reasoning" (p. 265).

Supposing then that we admit this as sound, are there any lines of argument which seem to point in this direction, and which would lead us to maintain that Enhypostasia is not irrational even though it is super-rational? The exposition of these arguments is the heart of the book. Dr. Relton shows excellent knowledge of modern psychology, and works out in many ways his main contention that God and man are essentially alike, that human personality is incomplete, and that it requires Deity for its completion. The upshot is that Jesus Christ was perfect man just because He was also God, and that psychologically it is quite defensible to say that His two consciousnesses found their unity in His single Divine Personality. It would be impossible here to examine the arguments at length. They must be read in the book itself.

The purpose of the first section of the book is to show that this is really precisely the conclusion to which the ancient Greek theologians came at length

in the writings of Leontius of Byzantium and St. John of Damascus, though they were hampered in their statements by Platonic and Aristotelian categories. Dr. Relton has rescued Leontius from obscurity, and claims a very high position for him.

We have endeavoured to state simply the thesis of the book. While the style is clear and pleasant and the printing admirable, the book cannot be described as altogether easy reading. Considerable portions of it are technical, and it is desirable to be equipped for reading with some previous knowledge both of ancient and modern literature. Nevertheless, though the book will not be "popular," it should be widely read by the clergy and other educated laymen. We are confident that it will be regarded as a very illuminating contribution to the solution of a fascinating if insoluble problem.

C. H. K. BOUGHTON.

---

THE VALLEY OF DECISION: A PLEA FOR WHOLENESS IN THOUGHT AND LIFE. By E. A. Burroughs, Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College, Oxford. *Longman, Green & Co.*, 5s. net.

Within a few months, three impressions of this book have been sold. No wonder, seeing the volume is replete with brilliant thoughts often felicitously expressed. Although essentially a War book, it touches on a great variety of topics, such as temperance, Lord's Day observance, the failure of the Churches, God at the Front, the Vindication of the Cross, Penitence, Revival, Prayer, Faith and the Universal Kingdom, and makes a strong plea for "wholeness in thought and life."

"The crying need of the present time," says the author (to whom, upon his new appointment as Honorary Chaplain to the King, we offer our congratulations), "is not for more power, but for a new spirit." The spiritual uplift which was experienced at the outset of the War has now to a certain extent passed away. It is the object of this book to help men to recover that spiritual frame of mind "by suggesting how the War has vindicated the superior reality and value of 'the Spiritual,' and pointing to some logical consequences of the faith, to which, willingly or unwillingly, a large part of the world has been driven back" (p. 10).

In a brief sketch of the history of modern Germany, Mr. Burroughs shows that Prussian militarism is the direct outcome of "success" in Germany's Wars of Unification. "In the words of one of themselves, German people were 'drunk with victory' thirty years afterwards, and from the delirium of that drunkenness the world is suffering now" (p. 17). The moral for ourselves is, to beware "of the danger of judging ideas and policies by their material success."

On the subject of Sunday labour we are told that, instead of arranging a system of shifts whereby the works could be kept always active and yet every worker would have his rest day *some* day of the week, the authorities thought that it would pay in the end to offer double wages for a day's work on Sunday. What was the result? The men either "tried to work seven days, and broke down, or (like canny Northerners) they took their double pay on Sunday and their rest day on Monday."

In the chapter entitled "the Words of eternal life," we are told: "Science, in particular, has failed to bring in the Golden Age. The chief result, so far, of its triumphs has been to make war more horrible and destructive than ever before. And at the end of so much 'civilization,' human nature would still appear to be at heart barbarian. But this is, of course, what Christianity has always preached. . . . 'The heart of man is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked.'" Hence the need for the Cross of Christ.

We turn now to the chapter on "the failure of the Churches." The author tells us that, in the eighteenth century, "conventionality" had curbed and cramped the Church; but beneath the surface there was a craving for "freedom." This freedom found expression in the Evangelical Revival, which ushered in a period of unparalleled expansion and change. Then came the materialistic philosophy of the nineteenth century, which the Tractarians attempted to meet by "entrenching themselves behind the watchword 'authority'—the authority which goes with Apostolical Succession—that was the stronghold in which the dominant party shut itself up, 'a papier-maché fortress made to look like rock'" (p. 170). Unhappily, the rank and file of the clergy still retain the authoritarian attitude, "imagining that the average man is impressed by the vocable so frequent in their sermons and interested in what 'the Church' has said." We may be allowed to give two more quotations from this excellent chapter. "The root of all our trouble is a defective sense of the spiritual, of its modes of manifesting itself, and of its relation to the material order: in other words, unspirituality of life and outlook" (p. 181).

"It is such a Religion which the world is waiting for and would accept. The path to it is not the path of tradition and authority: that has been leading us nowhere, and now we know it. It is the path of enterprising obedience to what the Spirit says in the depth of our own surrendered personality. Only by following that path—'going out,' like Abraham, 'not knowing whither we go'—can the Churches save themselves or the world" (p. 182).

This book reveals Mr. Burroughs as a Christian philosopher and a man of vision. We wish the book a still wider circulation.

KHODADAD E. KEITH.

---

**DIVINE HUMANITY.** By Alexander Pym, sometime Assistant Master at Wellington College and Winchester College.

Christian readers should cordially welcome this useful and remarkable book. It is the production of a young and virile mind, grappling dispassionately with problems of perennial concern. A peevish Agnostic might call it inconclusive. A pedantic Sciolist might call it immature. But the author expressly disclaims any intention to exhaust the great matters of which he writes. He is drawn to the discussion by something more than a philosophical interest; and something more than philosophical interest must be brought to the just critique of his volume. Evidently much of what he writes has been struck out in the collision of his own spirit with modern difficulties in religion.

The book is a contribution to Apologetics. It is intended to show the reasonableness of Christianity, by showing that Nature itself, and history too, are rich in premonitions that the Gospel of Christ is the only way out of the dark and entangled maze of existence. After tracing the many tokens, within us and around, that the spiritual order really exists, and that it is really the supreme thing in the world, Mr. Pym surveys the life of Christ, His miracles and His teaching, as presented in the four Gospels; and shows, that He, of whom these things are written, is the true and only answer to the inquiries and yearnings of the human spirit. In the third part of the book the author examines in trenchant language the manner in which the Christian Church in general, and the Church of England in particular, present the Gospel to the modern mind. Mr. Pym writes as a layman, who has full and reverend sympathy with the visible Church; and yet as one who feels, and feels justly,

that the visible Church, and the Anglican part of it, may rather be compared to a sepulchre filled with dry bones, than to a living image of her risen Lord.

That Mr. Pym possesses a beautiful style, which we hope will often be used in the service of the truth, is clear from the following quotation from his book.

"That the mark of Divine nature is stamped upon the human race is attested by every nation and epoch. The consummate generalship of an Alexander or Hannibal; the intellectual aspirations of a Socrates or Plato; the literary inspiration of a Homer, Æschylus, Sophocles or Virgil; the artistic magnificence of a Pheidias; the political idealism and incorruptibility of a Pericles or Cato, proclaimed to the ancient world the mystery of human birth. And in later days neither intellectual acumen nor technical skill account for the *Divina Commoedia* of Dante, the *Beatrix de Cenci* of Guido Reni, the *Madonna of Cimabue*, the paintings of a Giotto or a Michael Angelo, the despairing sweetness of a Chopin, the unearthly grandeur of a Beethoven. No theory of chemical compounds or evolutionary physics can analyze the moral beauty of a St. Francis or the spirituality of a Newman. The source of inspiration seems to be of another world. It presents old facts in a new and startling light, revealing in a moment of time an undying truth, instilling on the mind thoughts which surpass natural ability. It descends upon personality with energizing power, thrilling every fibre of being. A Divine fire, smouldering within, at times burns through the material envelope and scorches the world. In undaunted courage on the field of battle, in brilliance of intellect, in exalted ideals of statesmanship, in acts of heroism—it is seen that the heart of the world pulsates with divinity, and that a spiritual exuberance courses through the arteries of human life."

A writer so intelligent and candid as Mr. Pym will not, I am sure, resent a few words in conflict with some of the propositions that he advances. He asserts that the story of the Fall in Genesis iii. is strictly allegorical. This is not a self-evident proposition. At the back of that tragic and moving narrative lies a reality quite definitely and strictly historical. It narrates what actually occurred once upon a time, and somewhere on this earth of ours. Neither is it self-evident that the doctrine of verbal inspiration ought to be abandoned. The grotesque and indecent lucubrations of monks; the dogmatic crudities of Puritans, are not really the outcome of a belief in verbal inspiration; but are only the caricature of that belief. If inspiration be not verbal, what is it? What do we mean when we say that the Bible is the word of God?

I am not able to agree to the assumption made by Mr. Pym, as by many others, that Renan and Harnack are names so great that the dicta of these writers should be treated with almost servile acquiescence. Renan was a brilliant person; but he had very little critical discernment and no constructive power. Harnack, though indisputably learned, has so completely reversed his judgment on the dates of the New Testament writings, while no fresh evidence on the subject was before him, that he has forfeited all claims to be trusted as a guide.

H. J. R. MARSTON.

---

MANDARIN AND MISSIONARY IN CATHAY. By Ernest F. Borst-Smith, F.R.G.S.  
*Seeley, Service & Co., 5s. net.*

Mr. Borst-Smith is a Baptist missionary with a keen sense of humour and picturesque powers of description. His book presents a delightful account of the exciting and often amusing vicissitudes of life in one of the remotest corners of N. W. China, almost on the confines of Mongolia. Under the bequest of the late Mr. Arthington for new work, the city of Yenfanfu was occupied by the B.M.S., and Mr. Borst-Smith tells the story of his resi-

dence there, covering the greater part of twelve years in a critical and dangerous period of Chinese history. Yen-anfu has for centuries been a place of great importance, and the author has made extensive researches into its history, part of which was "already ancient in the days of Abraham." The first section of his book embodies the result of his inquiries into these chequered experiences of the border city during the Hun invasions, the introduction of Buddhism, the establishment of the Manchus, and other great national events. There is something, in fact, for every taste. Some of the chapters are as full of thrilling adventure as any story-book, as these titles, among others, may show—"The Reign of Terror"; "The Return Journey: Dangers, Difficulties, Delays" (a truly apostolic narrative of travelling perils); and "Where was White Wolf?" Then there is the stirring account of the growth of an infant Church under truly primitive conditions, which is skilfully interwoven with other elements of the book in a manner calculated to interest the casual reader as well as the more missionary-minded. We could wish nothing better than that Churchmen should read more about the missionary work of others, especially in a book like this: it would powerfully foster the "Kikuyu spirit" and hasten the day of closer union. The chapters are attractively short, and are illustrated by many striking photos: the bird's-eye view of the city among the mountains is particularly good. Almost the only criticism we feel disposed to offer is that the author's delightfully humorous touch carries him too far on a very few occasions. His quotations of sacred words are exceedingly apt and entirely reverent in nearly all cases: but this gift has its notorious perils, and they are not entirely escaped, though the lapses are few.

We could say much of special features, but can only mention one or two. The stories of native helpers are particularly charming, and sometimes very touching. We like Mr. Ch'ü as well as any, with his bold and vigorous Christianity and his quaint confidence in patent medicine and (to the dismay of his neighbours and family) his addiction to fresh air and purchase of a bath. Then there is Mr. Hou, the "Thomas" of the party, of whom the author says that in days when death seemed likeliest for them all, he "can remember Mr. Hou devising ways and means of dying." Of these and another we are significantly told—"For upwards of eighteen months Yen-anfu was without any foreign missionary. And when we returned we found the whole work one decided step further on. Here in the character of the Chinese leaders is a promise of the permanence of the Church in China."

Mr. Borst-Smith is also a great believer in Medical Missions, and insists that the full programme is "Preach, Teach, Heal." And his opinion of medical missionaries may be gathered from the following: "I have never known a medical missionary so engrossed in his work of healing that he was indifferent to that of preaching. Such men only exist in the fears of those of little faith."

Altogether this is a book as useful and informing as it is interesting and entertaining. We should like to recommend it heartily. W. S. H.

---

METHODS OF CHRISTIAN WORK: Hints for Preachers, Teachers and Lay Workers. By the Bishop of Salisbury, Bishop Thornton, Prebendary Carlile, and other Church Army Workers. Edited by Captain W. R. Davey, C. A. Evangelistic Secretary. With Foreword by the Bishop of London. *H. R. Allenson, Limited*, 1s. 6d. net.

This is the third edition of a work formerly known as "Evangelistic Grindstones," and is a perfect storehouse of valuable hints and suggestions for almost every department of Evangelistic or Mission Work. In his Foreword the Bishop of London says truly, "It *does* sharpen the minds of those who

try and fight for God. Nothing increases faith so much as seeing 'the Gospel in action'; and the men who write this book are in the fighting line. They know what they are talking about, and each chapter has the stamp of reality." Again he says "it will be my own fault if my keenness for souls has not been whetted by these 'Grindstones,' and my love for Christ increased by the words of those who so evidently and so sincerely love our Lord Jesus Christ."

This little volume contains twenty exceedingly valuable and helpful papers bearing upon Gospel work in a practical manner from almost every point of view. Two sisters write respectively on "The Evangelist's character and aim," and "Work amongst young Women and Girls." Prebendary Carlile leads off with a paper on "Individual Dealing." Such subjects as "Positive Witnessing," "The Passion for" and "the Study of Souls," "The Office of the Evangelist," "After Meetings," "The Gathering, Storing, and Using of Illustrations," "Cottage Meetings," "Open-air Services," and "Scouting," are all dealt with in both a masterly and spiritual manner. There is an excellent chapter on "The Prayer Book as an Evangelistic Weapon," also one on "The Importance of Correct Breathing and Voice Culture," and the whole is closed by the Bishop of Salisbury with a paper on "Equipment for Service." The book is indeed "Mulum in parvo," and such a rich compendium of stimulating and inspiring counsel and advice for almost every branch of Gospel work has seldom appeared in so small a compass. It should be invaluable to all who would be soul-winners.

---

OWEN CHARLES WHITEHOUSE: *The Plain Tale of a Godly Scholar's Life*, told by his daughter Lilian and others. *W. Heffer*, 3s. net.

This is the biography of a remarkable man of considerable literary distinction, whose first years were associated with India. At Nagercoil, in 1849, O. C. Whitehouse was born. Coming over to England with his parents, and after receiving his early education here, he went through a theological course at the University of Bonn before settling in the ministry at home. Germany was then—it was about 1876—in a state of truculent elation at her recent victories over Austria and France. The nine months which he spent there were perhaps the most crucial in his life as regards the foundation of his outlook and the broadening of his interests. "His stay in Germany," says his biographer, "opened his eyes to the sceptical criticism which was being applied more and more to the Bible and to matters of Christian faith, and gradually it became the task of his life to reconcile faith and knowledge. An unreasoned faith seemed to him reprehensible, simply the outcome of mental apathy." In 1877 Dr. Whitehouse became Professor of Classics and tutor in Hebrew and German at Cheshunt College, and subsequently he was installed as President. It will be observed that his theology was tinted by his early studies in Germany. His simple Evangelical faith was widened by the school of Wellhausen, and probably the two never completely harmonized. His biographer remarks that "What makes Whitehouse's life-work especially significant is his continuous interest in the external subjects that bear upon the Old Testament, by the side of an equally keen and constant interest in the internal criticism of the Biblical sources."

As the simple statement of facts in the life of a saint and a scholar this biography will be read with abiding interest and with spiritual profit.

---

The Secretaries of the London City Mission gratefully acknowledge 2/- from Wimbledon.