

The Handmaid of the Church.

THE CHURCH ARMY.

Very numerous Branches of Evangelistic and Special Effort.

FUNDS ARE GREATLY NEEDED.

Cheques crossed "Barclays, a/c Church Army," payable to Prebendary Carile, D.D., Hon. Chief Secretary, Headquarters, Bryanston St., Marble Arch, London, W.1.

Vol. xxxiv., No. 171, New Series.

MARCH, 1920.

123 THE CHURCHMAN

GORDON DIVINITY SCHOOL LIBRARY
BEVERLY FARMS, MASS.

CONTENTS.

THE MONTH.

The Bishops and the Changes. A Narrow Majority. A New Rallying Cry. The Voice of the Laity. The Epiklesis.

SOME LATTER-DAY HERESIES. II. CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

By the Rev. F. Mellows, M.A.

DISLOCATIONS IN ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL. By Chancellor

P. V. Smith, LL.D.

THE MOSAIC TABERNACLE. By the Rev. F. R. Montgomery

Hitchcock, D.D.

THE WITNESS OF HISTORY TO THE INSPIRATION OF THE WORD. By the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D.

PRESENT RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS IN CIVIC, COMMERCIAL, AND INDUSTRIAL LIFE. By the Rev. A. A. Boxley.

A PERVERSION AND ITS LESSONS. By a Clergyman of the Church of England.

STUDIES IN TEXTS. II. The Likeness of Christ. By the Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

"Educational Principles and Missionary Methods." "The Lord of Life and Death;" and "Memories of William Wallace, D.D."

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT

ROXBURGHE HOUSE, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.4

PRICE ONE SHILLING NET.

New S.P.C.K. Books.

THE FIVE LAMBETH CONFERENCES.

Compiled under the direction of the Most Reverend RANDALL T. DAVIDSON, D.D., Archbishop of Canterbury. Cloth boards, 12s. 6d. net.

[*An authoritative record of the Conference from its inception. Indispensable to all who want to understand the Conference of 1920.*]

ERASMUS AND LUTHER: Their Attitude to Toleration.

By the Rev. ROBERT H. MURRAY, Litt.D., H. Blake Scholar in History, Trinity College, Dublin. Cloth boards, 25s. net.

[*Certain aspects of the sixteenth century are here treated with unprecedented fulness, and the wealth of documentation adds to the value of this important monograph. The main subject—Toleration—is one of considerable topical interest.*]

THE LOST APOCRYPHA OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By M. R. JAMES, Litt.D. 5s. 6d. net.

DOCUMENTS ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

Vol. I. To A.D. 313. Edited by B. J. KIDD, D.D. 7s. 6d. net.

[*This will be in future an indispensable companion for Students of Church History. The passages are numerous and full, and designed to accompany Manuals of Church History.*]

NEW LENT BOOKS.

GOALS AND SYMBOLS.

By R. C. JOYNT, M.A., Archdeacon of Kingston-on-Thames. Paper covers, 2s. 6d.; cloth boards, 3s. 6d. net.

[*A plain path to the high mountains of achievement, some flowers to be found on the wayside, and the view from the summit. Forty chapters of suggestions for the climbers.*]

FAITH, WORKS AND GRACE.

Addresses on the Seven Words from the Cross, with a Foreword on Meditation. By ARTHUR CHANDLER, D.D., Bishop of Bloemfontein. Cloth boards, 3s. net.

THE WORDS OF THE CRUCIFIED.

By W. J. L. SHEPPARD, M.A. Paper covers, 1s. 6d.; cloth boards, 2s. 6d. net.

"FAR COUNTRIES."

Simple Addresses on the Lord's Prayer. By D. E. BUCHANAN. With an Introduction by the Rev. G. C. RAWLINSON. Paper cover, 3s.; cloth boards, 4s. net.

[*Originally delivered to a Girls' Guild, and suitable for Lent Reading.*]

IN HIS FOOTSTEPS.

Forty Simple Meditations for Lent for Girls. By E. M. HARTILL. Paper covers, 2s. 6d.; cloth boards, 3s. 6d. net.

LETTERS FROM LUDD.

By CAPTAIN R.A.M.C., with a Preface by FATHER WAGGETT. Paper cover, 1s. 6d. net.

[*A layman's thoughts on religious problems.*]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

Central Offices only: 6 ST. MARTIN'S PLACE, LONDON, W.C.2.

Book Shops: 64 NEW BOND STREET, LONDON, W.1.

43 QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, LONDON, E.C.4.

And of all Booksellers.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE MONTH	117
The Bishops and the Changes. A Narrow Majority. A New Rallying Cry. The Voice of the Laity. The Epiklesis.]	
SOME LATTER-DAY HERESIES. II. CHRISTIAN SCIENCE. By the Rev. F. Mellows, M.A.	122
DISLOCATIONS IN ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL. By Chancellor P. V. Smith, LL.D.	132
THE MOSAIC TABERNACLE. By the Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D.	140
THE WITNESS OF HISTORY TO THE INSPIRATION OF THE WORD. By the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D.	149
PRESENT RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS IN CIVIC, COMMERCIAL, AND INDUSTRIAL LIFE. By the Rev. A. A. Boxley	156
A PERVERSION AND ITS LESSONS. By a Clergyman of the Church of England	162
STUDIES IN TEXTS. II. The Likeness of Christ. By the Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A.	167
REVIEWS OF BOOKS	171
"Educational Principles and Missionary Methods." "The Lord of Life and Death"; and "Memories of William Wallace, D.D."	
CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES	173

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

Among Charred Bones.

At Ourfa I stood knee-deep among charred skulls and bones, the remains of Armenian women and children who were driven over the top of a cliff, afterwards drenched with oil and set on fire

Simply because they were Christians

The dead are past our aid, but we plead for those who have suffered untold cruelties and hardship.

Now Homeless and Starving.

Shall We Fail Them ?

Aleppo reports : The British Army [Funds were suddenly cut off at the moment of the withdrawal of the British Forces, we are therefore somewhat anxious.

PLEASE SEND A GIFT TO

Armenian Massacre Relief Fund

BIBLE LANDS MISSIONS' AID SOCIETY,

Lord Kinnaird, *Treasurer.*

Rev. S. W. Gentle-Cackett,

Hon. British Commissioner for Relief in the Near East.

358

**STRAND,
London, W.C.2.**

5 Hospitals Closed

There are one hundred and fifty million women in India. There is much sickness and disease there, and but few Hospitals.

The Church of England Zenana Missionary Society, which has long carried on extensive medical work among the women and girls of India, has had to close five of its invaluable Hospitals because of lack of workers and funds.

Other Hospitals will have to be closed, too, if needed help does not come to hand soon.

The FINANCIAL YEAR ends on March 31st, by which date £20,000 is needed to maintain existing efforts.

Will you give something to avert further retrenchment ?

**Church of England Zenana
Missionary Society,
27 Chancery Lane, London, W.C.2.**

AN EPISCOPAL JUBILEE.
THE MISSIONARY WHO CONVERTED DARWIN
TO A
BELIEF IN FOREIGN MISSIONS
HAS NOW BEEN A
BISHOP FOR FIFTY YEARS.

You are asked to contribute to the

“BISHOP STRING FUND”

for the erection of a S.A.M.S. Home and Institute for training South American Indians to become Evangelists. Gifts can be sent to the

SOUTH AMERICAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY,
20 John Street, Theobald's Road, London, W.C.1.

The Record

THE : : :
EVANGELICAL
CHURCH : :
NEWSPAPER :

Every Thursday.

Price Twopence.

To save disappointment readers are asked kindly to place an order at once either with their regular Newsagent or with the Publisher of "The Record," 2 Red Lion Court, Fleet Street, E.C.4. By post : single copy, 2½d.; for one year, 10s. 10d.; for six months, 5s. 5d.; for three months, 2s. 8d.

THE CHURCHMAN

March, 1920.

THE MONTH.

**The Bishops
and the
Changes.** A FRESH turn has been given to the discussion on the proposed Changes in the Communion Service by the decisions lately arrived at by the Convocation of Canterbury. It will be recalled that the original proposals evoked the most determined opposition on the part of Evangelical and Moderate Churchmen, culminating in the presentation to the Archbishops of a Memorial signed by nine bishops, upwards of 3,000 clergy, and considerably more than 100,000 of the laity, praying that the changes might not be proceeded with. In consequence of the strong feeling thus manifested the Archbishop called a special Conference to examine the question afresh, and in this Conference representatives of different sections of the Church were invited to take part. The result of the Conference was the substitution of other changes for those previously agreed upon by Convocation (see CHURCHMAN for January last). The decision of the Conference was not unanimous, but there was a substantial majority for the changes proposed. When these became generally known there was a readiness on the part of many Evangelical Churchmen to accept them, not because they approved of the alterations, but rather that, if they were accepted by High Churchmen, they might possibly bring about a measure of peace. On the other hand, some of our Evangelical leaders—notably the Bishop of Manchester—and a considerable body of the rank and file objected absolutely to the changes proposed. All sections of the party were, however, agreed in this, that they would infinitely prefer that the Communion Service should be left untouched. In the meantime it became clear that the proposed changes would not be acceptable to the extreme wing of the High Church Party, who made no concealment of their view that the alterations did not go far enough, and that even if

they did acquiesce in them it would only be that they might use them as a lever to force upon the Church the changes that they desired to see carried into effect. Such was the position when the Convocation of Canterbury met for the February group of sessions. It might reasonably have been expected that a body like the Convocation of Canterbury would have taken some note of outside opinion, but the Upper House went cheerfully on its own way, and by a majority of seventeen to two adopted the proposals of the Conference. The minority was composed of such essentially moderate men as the Bishops of Oxford and Worcester, who were evidently more in touch with Church opinion than were their episcopal colleagues. The one outstanding feature of the debate was that the Archbishop of Canterbury said that though he personally preferred that there should be no alteration, he was willing loyally to abide by the outcome of the Conference—a very significant admission which must not be lost sight of in future discussions. We imagine that the same spirit animated the Bishops of Chelmsford and Truro; on the other hand, the Bishop of Peterborough, who appealed for a unanimous vote, thought the proposals, if adopted, would become the main type of service. The vote was not unanimous, and that fact alone ought to be sufficient to give pause to those who are seeking to introduce changes which very few people want, and which, if persisted in, will cause unnecessary distress to many thousands of loyal Church people.

A Narrow Majority. In the discussion in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury the members came to much closer quarters with the real questions at issue. Representatives of the High Church party showed their hand, and made no secret of their intentions. On the Evangelical side the Dean of Canterbury made an important and weighty contribution to the debate, which was the more notable from the fact that he had previously shown his willingness to agree to the proposed changes if they were likely to promote peace. All such hope must now be abandoned, and the Dean, therefore, spoke and voted against their adoption. So strongly was the case presented against the changes that they were only carried by a majority of eight, the figures being sixty-two to fifty-four. It is likely that the vote in the Lower House, even more effectually than that in the Upper House, will

seal the doom of the proposed changes, for it is now seen that, so far from these offering a basis for agreed settlement, they are only likely to add fuel to the fires of controversy. In the Upper House of the Convocation of York the proposals were agreed to by the casting vote of the President, the Archbishop of York. It would be interesting to know the views of experienced chairmen upon his Grace's most unusual action ; for on the very rare occasions when a chairman's casting vote is required, is it not generally assumed that it will be exercised in favour of maintaining the *status quo* ?

What then must be our attitude in view of the new position created by these decisions ? It cannot be better stated than in the following words of the Dean of Canterbury, which we quote from his article in the *Record* of February 19. After saying that he voted in Convocation against any change at all, he added :—" It is indeed to be hoped that a resolution to oppose, henceforth, any change whatever in our Communion office may be generally and finally adopted, at least on the Evangelical side of the Church. It would seem plain, from these debates, that this is the only basis on which the Church can be held together. Evangelical men do not desire any change in the office, and High Churchmen acknowledge that it is at least sufficient for the validity of the Sacrament. But changes which would satisfy High Churchmen would render the position of Evangelical men in the Church so intolerable that it would be difficult for them to remain in it. The existing office, in fact, may be regarded as neutral ground, on which all schools may meet, and the recent discussions have shown that no changes can be devised which would not destroy this neutrality. There is a further consideration, which was urged by one of the Bishops, as to the effect of allowing an alternative service. That permission, which was much relied upon in favour of the proposals, is really a fatal objection to them. The chief practical controversies in the Church centre round the Holy Communion, and consequently the allowance of alternative services would involve the danger of renewed controversies in all parishes of the country, upon any change of Incumbency. If ever there were hope of ' an agreed settlement ' such as the Archbishop hoped to attain in his Conference, so that one and the same service would everywhere be adopted, a change would be practicable. But

until that can be obtained, let us be content to remain as we are. Last week's decisions in Convocation cannot be regarded as final. In its last week's session the House of Laity claimed a voice in Revision; and now that the National Assembly is in existence, the whole of the Revision must be submitted to its decisions. Meanwhile Evangelical men are justified, after what has just passed, in finally resolving to resist any change in our Communion office, as well as in objecting to the permission which is proposed for the practice of Reservation and for the use of the Roman Mass Vestments." These are impressive words, and should prove a rallying cry for Evangelical Churchmen. They cannot allow the matter to remain where it is; that they should now acquiesce in the decisions of Convocation is unthinkable.

The Dean of Canterbury's reference to the vote in
*The Voice of
 the Laity.* the House of Laity—to give it its new title—calls attention to a matter which may have far-reaching consequences. In all the twelve years that Revision has been under discussion the Houses of Laymen have been regarded by Convocation as a negligible quantity. It is true that time and again it has been said that before the scheme is presented for authorization it will be submitted to the Lay Houses, and, strangely enough, the members of those Houses so far accepted this position as not to trouble themselves to inquire under what conditions the scheme will be presented to them, or what time will be allowed them for discussing the several proposals. They took action promptly enough upon the much less important matter of the Revised Lectionary, with excellent results; and it now seems to have dawned upon them that they ought formally and officially to assert themselves in regard to Revision generally. Accordingly, at the sitting of the House of Laity on February 11, Dr. Brysson Cunningham moved the following resolution:—

"That this House is of opinion that in a matter of such fundamental importance as the revision of the Prayer Book, and particularly as regards the structure of the Order of Holy Communion, the laity should be directly represented on the Revision Committee."

Moreover, it was carried unanimously, which is, in itself, a very strong indication of the feelings of the laity of all schools upon the question. We should, of course, expect that in a Lay House the

majority of the members belong to the Evangelical and Moderate sections of the Church, but the point is that it was not a sectional, but a unanimous agreement that was come to. It is a little difficult to see how the precise proposal of the resolution is to be given effect to, as the work of Revision is now almost completed; still we welcome the resolution—tardy though it be—as the assertion of a right which will be very difficult for Convocation to ignore.

It may be hoped that the Bishop of Manchester's *The Epiklesis*. powerful speech in the Upper House of the York Convocation on Wednesday, February 11, dealing with the proposed changes in the Communion office, will be reprinted for general circulation. It constitutes the most damaging attack upon the proposals of the Conference that has yet appeared, and will undoubtedly do much to weaken the position of those who were inclined, for the sake of peace or from any other motive, to acquiesce in the compromise. Specially important is his treatment of the Epiklesis. "What," he says, "is proposed for our use is an invocation of the Holy Spirit as Lord and Giver of Life upon the worshippers and upon the elements. It is important to note this, because the vaguer forms are often quoted in defence of the use of this particular form." The Bishop establishes the fact that this particular form is admittedly an innovation which cannot be attested earlier than the middle of the fourth century, the passage from Irenæus on which an earlier origin was based having proved a forgery. Then as to its doctrinal significance, the Bishop shows that it was associated with a belief in the change in the elements effected by the Holy Spirit. This invocation cannot be officially adopted by our Church, even as an alternative, without involving an assimilation of Eucharistic doctrine to that of the East, which affirms that the change "takes place through the Holy Ghost in exactly the same way as our Lord became flesh from the Holy Virgin through the Holy Ghost." Moreover, its adoption would lay us open to the imputation that "having been rebuffed by the Latin Church as to the validity of our Orders and Sacraments, we are seeking to rectify them by overtures to the East." But the speech must be studied in its entirety: no summary of it can be adequate. It appears in full in the *Record* of February 12.

SOME LATTER-DAY HERESIES.

II. CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.

BY THE REV. F. MELLOWS, M.A., Vicar of Sparkhill,
Birmingham.

A LADY whose three sons had all fought in the Great War was recently introduced to the writer of this article. She was an ardent Christian Scientist and had paid regularly for what is called "absent treatment" for each of her three sons, during the whole time of their service abroad. She herself had also co-operated in the treatment. The purpose was to try to prevent them being either killed or wounded. What was the result? Instead of being preserved from calamity, one brave boy had lost his life and another had been terribly maimed. Only one had come through safely, and he is an entire sceptic regarding the tenets of Christian scientists. Both he and the husband smile at the mother's credulity, though they are grieved to note how she blames herself—her wrong thought—for the calamities that befell the two sons. In spite of this failure, which must be heartrending to a sensitive mother, the lady still persists in her belief in, and support of, Christian Science, and endeavours to propagate its claims.

I

What is the cause of this keenness? Why do the adherents of this cult evince such tenacity and pertinacity? Why have its numbers increased with almost startling rapidity? ¹ There are at least four reasons.

(1) Almost without exception each member has experienced some personal physical benefit which is attributed to obeying the teaching of Christian Science. Some have been cured of illnesses of a serious character, after ordinary medical treatment has proved ineffective. Even though later there may be a relapse, or though other diseases may appear and medical aid be sought, they never

¹ The first "church" was founded in 1879 with 26 members. There are now said to be over 1,600 Christian Science Churches and Societies, with well over 3,000,000 adherents.

forget the first "cure," and account for the subsequent failure by their own lack of understanding of the full Truth. The system is right, they say, but their progress in it is inadequate.

(2) The fires of their enthusiasm are kept burning by constant testimonies from others. Every week there is published in *The Christian Science Sentinel* a number of "Testimonies of Healing." In the current issue (Dec. 20) there are nineteen of these, two of which are from England. Names and addresses are given. These reveal the fact that they are nearly all from ladies. At the local mid-week meetings these personal testimonies occupy much of the time. Those who have not experienced such results maintain silence, because acknowledgment of failure would seem to reflect on their understanding or faith. In the text-book no less than one hundred pages are devoted to what is called "fruitage."

(3) The possession of an authoritative book and literature. Their standard text-book is *Science and Health, with Key to the Scriptures*, by Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy. This is to be possessed and carefully studied by all members. Extracts from it are read at all their Sunday gatherings, where it takes its place as equal, if not superior, to the Bible. No sermon or address is permitted, but two well-chosen Readers are appointed, one of whom reads a verse or verses from the Scriptures, whilst the other at once follows with a specified portion from *Science and Health*. This alternation continues until the full selections for that day have all been read. The selections are chosen by the authorities in Boston. No comment whatever is allowed. All the literature circulated is published from Boston, and has to pass the official censorship. At least once a year there is a public lecture, but this can only be given by one who has been appointed and commissioned by the authorities of the "First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts." No one else is permitted to lecture on the subject, and no member is permitted publicly to defend the system when attacked. All this autocratic control is intended, no doubt, to prevent diverse teachings entering into the cult; to satisfy the cravings of some for authoritative declarations, and, not least, to prevent its absurdities being publicly admitted.

(4) For many it has seemed to make God and Spirit far more real than ever they experienced in the vagueness and variety of any previous teaching.

II

It must be freely admitted that many of the adherents are people of high moral character ; that they really believe (or believe they believe) what they profess, and that they think they possess the secret " of a power that must eventually have infinitely greater results for the human race than any discovery that has preceded it." It must also be as freely admitted that a large number of people have received physical benefit, which they attribute to Christian Science. It must still further be granted that the present revival of spiritual healing in the Christian Church is largely, though not entirely, due to the circulation of Mrs. Eddy's works and the results of her labours. For all that is good we are truly grateful. But we must object most strongly when she takes a half-truth, magnifies it until she assumes it to be the whole truth,¹ constructs a philosophy and a religion upon that inadequate conception, and *rejects everything that disagrees therewith*, including all other peoples' experience, research and faith, no matter how well authenticated. We must oppose when Christian Science casts out as untrue practically all the fundamental beliefs of Christianity as understood by the Church and expressed in the Apostles' Creed ; when it alters and even denies the truth of the words and messages of the Bible, not excluding that which came from our Lord's own lips ; and when we believe that if its teaching and practice were given a free course, the misery, pain, sorrow and sin of the world would be multiplied enormously.

Part of the " half-truth " is the fact that Mind has a potent influence upon the body ; that it is possible for maladies of many kinds to be removed—at least for a time—without any resource to doctors or drugs. The evidence for this is abundant. Mental therapeutics, including hypnotism, suggestion, mind-healing, are fairly widely practised to-day.² Since the War most wonderful cures have been wrought in this way, equal to anything claimed by Christian Science. The other part of the " half-truth " is the fact that trust in God gives the best conditions, and assures the best results. The heresy consists in denying the need of medical help on any occasion ; in denying the reality of the disease or the suffer-

¹ " We admit the whole, because part is proved " (*Science and Health*, p. 461).

² *Vide* " Report of the Clerical and Medical Committee on Spiritual Healing " (1914).

ing, and in asserting the "nothingness" of all matter, all mortal mind and all evil. All is "illusion."

III

The "fundamental propositions of divine metaphysics" (i.e. Christian Science) are summarised by Mrs. Eddy as follows:—(1) God is All-in-all. (2) God is good; Good is Mind. (3) God, Spirit, being all, *nothing is matter*. (4) Life, God, omnipotent good, deny death, evil, sin, disease. Disease, sin, evil, death, deny good, omnipotent God, Life (*Science and Health*, p. 113).

Assuming the truth of these propositions she makes her startling statements which assert the unreality, nothingness, illusion of all pain, suffering, disease, sin, death, even matter itself. "If Spirit is *all* and is everywhere," she asks, "what and where is matter?" (p. 223). It is "a human concept" (i.e. idea), "an error of statement" (p. 277), "another name for mortal mind" (p. 591), whilst "mortal mind has no real existence" (p. 115), "there is no mortal mind" (pp. 399, 487).

Another writer, an enthusiast, who has studied the subject for years, and who tries to make clear the involved, bewildering, contradictory and oft-repeated utterances of Mrs. Eddy, gives "the basic argument or thesis of Christian Science" as (1) God is perfection. (2) All real or true life is a spiritual expression or manifestation of God; (3) and is, therefore, equally perfect. He adds, "Upon this basis the whole fabric of the philosophy and religion of Christian Science rests, so that what is provable from this basis is Christian Science, and what is not logically deducible therefrom is not Christian Science."¹

That God is perfection no Christian will deny. Scripture states it (Matt. v. 48) and reason demands it. But what is our conception of a Perfect God? What does the term "Perfection" connote as applied to the Deity? To the Christian it not only includes such attributes as Omnipotence, Omniscience, Infinity, Eternity, but also Love, Sympathy, readiness to help,—in fact all that is summed up in the fullness of the word "Father." Nothing less would be a "perfect" God. The Christian Scientists, whilst using terms that suggest otherwise, in reality refuse to recognise in Him this "perfection." God is denied all knowledge of human conditions, and

¹ *A Plea for Christian Science* (C. H. Lee), p. xx.

hence of all sympathy. "Immortal Mind takes no cognisance of matter" (*Science and Health*, p. 591). "God cannot be a party to the sin, sickness and suffering of the world, nor *indeed can He be conscious of it*" (*A Plea*, etc., p. xiv). "God has no knowledge of evil, and consequently is not conscious of this material world with all its imperfections" (*A Plea*, etc., p. 31). "God is not and *cannot* be conscious of the material world as we know it" (p. 23). "When we fully understand our relation to the Divine we can have no other mind but His . . . and *no consciousness of the existence of matter*" (*Science and Health*, p. 206).

God, therefore, knows nothing of the Great War with all its sufferings and agonies. If He were conscious of the pain, the struggle, the armies, they would all be real, and to admit their reality would overthrow the whole structure of Christian Science. He knows nothing of the suffering in our hospitals; nothing of the sin in our cities, nothing of the injustices; nothing of the wrongs of humanity. No Ear hearkens to the cry of the troubled or distressed, no Mind understands their sorrow, no Heart sympathises, no Hand is stretched out to help. "Sympathy with sin, sorrow or sickness would dethrone God as Truth, for Truth has no sympathy for error" (*Yes and No* (Mrs. Eddy), p. 30). "God . . . is too pure to think of man as sick or bad" (*Christian Science Journal*, June 19, p. 138), that is of man as he really is. Is Ignorance a factor of "Perfection?"

Sometimes Christian Scientists try to deny this terrible consequent of their teaching, and they quote passages from their textbook, e.g. : "It is the all-hearing and all-knowing Mind to whom each need of man is already known and by whom it will be supplied." "God knows our need before we tell Him or our fellow beings about it." But the context shows that these words are used to emphasise the uselessness of petition. They must also be taken in conjunction with the fundamental principle of Christian Science that sickness, suffering, disease, sin, death, are absolutely unreal to God, and do not enter into the Divine consciousness. Hence no part of man's need which God supplies can include any of those things which are the most pressing to the man, and in which he needs the most help. He cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities : He knows not our frame.

It follows as a consequence that the Christian Scientist refuses

to admit any value in Intercessory Prayer. Since both God and man are perfect ¹ there is nothing for which to supplicate, and there is no One Who can or will grant the supplication. There are no audible prayers at their gatherings, except the repetition of the Lord's Prayer, which is accompanied by Mrs. Eddy's exposition, lest this might appear to be petition and intercession. "It is true that the Lord's Prayer seems to be partly in the form of petition," says a recent Christian Science writer, "but it is beautifully explained in our text-book . . . in affirmation of the truth and denial of error, without any pleading with God to do what He otherwise might not do" (*Christian Science Journal*, June 19, p. 137). The petition "Thy kingdom come" means "Thy kingdom is come; Thou art ever-present"; "forgive us our trespasses, etc." is merely the statement "Love is reflected in love," and so on. All audible worship in the Churches is untrue, unspiritual. All petition and intercession are vain and useless. St. Paul was quite wrong when he exhorted that supplication, prayers and intercessions should be made for all men (1 Tim. ii. 1). Mrs. Eddy understands the truth far better than the Apostle. Such is the teaching of this "latter-day heresy."

IV

The Teaching about our Lord. One of the most important subjects for inquiry concerning any new religion is the conception held of our Lord's Person and Work. Christian Science naturally has much to say, but it is entirely subversive of the orthodox faith. It is, as they admit, "a very distinct divergence from the accepted teaching of all the other Christian Churches" (*A Plea*, etc., p. xv). The following extracts reveal their position. "Jesus Christ is not God" (*Science and Health*, pp. 361, 473). In the earlier editions the words occur, "Jesus was not God's son in any other sense than every man is God's son." This sentence is now omitted but it represents their thought. Mrs. Eddy distinguishes between "the eternal Christ and the corporeal Jesus" (p. 334). "The eternal Christ . . . never suffered" (p. 38), "Jesus represented Christ" (p. 316). "Jesus demonstrated Christ; he proved that

¹ "The science of being reveals man as perfect, even as the Father is perfect" (*Science and Health*, p. 302). "In spite of all contrary appearances, man is not a material being, but a perfect spiritual being" (*A Plea*, etc., p. 20). Everything else is "unreal," "illusion," "nothing."

Christ is the divine idea of God—the Holy Ghost, or Comforter ” (p. 332). Jesus “ was endowed with the Christ ” (p. 30). There was “ a dual personality,” “ a duality.” “ Jesus is the name of the man, who, more than all other men, has presented Christ, the true idea of God ” (p. 473). The difference between our Lord and other men is “ not one of origin or nature, but *only of degree.*” “ In the Christian Science view all men are equally perfect spiritual beings with Jesus Christ ” (*A Plea*, etc., p. 43), though He was “ the most spiritual man that ever lived.”

Not only is the Incarnation denied, but also the *Atonement* as generally understood. “ Christ never suffered.” “ One sacrifice, however great, is insufficient to pay the debt of sin ” (p. 23). Sin is an illusion which cannot be pardoned, but must be destroyed. “ Christ came to destroy the *belief* of sin.” “ Man is incapable of sin, sickness, and death ” (p. 475). “ The real Christ was unconscious of matter, of sin, disease and death, and was conscious only of God, of good, of eternal life and harmony ” (*Yes and No*, p. 36). A wonderful collection of words and phrases is used to try to give meaning to the Atonement, to retain the word, whilst denuding it of all Christian interpretation. Our Lord did nothing that Christian Science, fully followed, is unable to do to-day.

What about the Resurrection? The death was not real but “ seeming ” (*Science and Health*, p. 45). “ His disciples believed Jesus to be dead while he was hidden in the sepulchre, whereas he was alive, demonstrating within the narrow tomb the power of Spirit to overrule mortal, material sense.” “ The lonely precincts of the tomb gave Jesus a refuge from his foes, a place in which to solve the great problem of being. . . . He met and mastered on the basis of Christian Science, the power of Mind over matter, all the claims of medicine, surgery and hygiene ” (p. 44). This is how Rev. i. 17, 18 is quoted, “ I am he that liveth, and was dead [not understood]; and behold, I am alive for evermore [Science has explained me] ” (*Science and Health*, p. 334). Does not this read like blasphemy? Similar language is used of the *Ascension*. At “ the Master’s Ascension, the human, material concept,¹ or Jesus, disappeared, while the spiritual self, or Christ, continues to exist in the eternal order of divine Science, taking away the sins of the world ” (p. 334). Hence the human Jesus no longer exists, and the divine

¹ Is not this a contradiction in terms? Can a *concept* be material?

Christ is not a Person but only an "idea" of God, and Mind. Truly they have taken away my Lord."

V

Something must be said about the claim of Christian Scientists that they alone are fulfilling our Lord's command "to heal the sick," and are accomplishing this in exactly the same way in which He Himself did His mighty works. It is strange that this one command should be accepted quite literally whilst nearly all else has to be understood spiritually. When our Lord says "*lay hands* on the sick and they shall recover," we are to understand "the word *hands* is used metaphorically" (p. 38). When He said "cast out devils" He referred to "evil thoughts," "delusions," "errors," "belief in sin, sickness and death" (p. 584). When He said "raise the dead," He meant "raise the dead in trespasses and sins," or "deny the reality of death." When He spoke about the "poor" to whom the Gospel was to be preached, He meant "the meek in heart" (p. 33), "the receptive thought" (p. 34). [This explanation is required from the fact that no literally poor person could understand Mrs. Eddy's "Gospel"; and that the *cheapest* edition of *Science and Health* is now 15s. 6d., pre-war price 12s. 6d. (Contrast the price of Bibles.) Enormous profits have been made.] "Our *baptism* is a purification from all error." "Our Bread . . . is Truth" (p. 35). After such spiritualising one would expect that the "sick" must mean the sin-sick, as the Church has often interpreted it, but this term must be taken absolutely literally. In fact power to "heal the sick" is the great test whereby true Christianity is to be discerned; all else is negligible. Mrs. Eddy's argument is that Christian Science does heal the sick, and therefore it must be *all* true, it must be divine, it must be one with the practice of our Lord. Only one so illogical as the author of *Science and Health* could make such an absurd statement. Every quack, every charlatan, every patent medicine vendor can claim to have "healed the sick," often after the patient has been pronounced incurable by doctors; every hypnotist, mesmerist, mind-healer, can claim to have worked cures without the use of drugs. Do the results prove the truth of their theories? Further, what about the failures, which are many? Do not these, in like manner, demonstrate the falsity of Christian Science? These failures would be more apparent and common if

the law did not defend the citizens, and demand medical treatment in time of need. There is one conspicuous inconsistent passage in *Science and Health* in this connection. After asserting over and over again such words as "the 'drug does nothing, because it has no intelligence" (p. 12), Mrs. Eddy says, "If from an injury or from any cause, a Christian Scientist were seized with *pain so violent* that he could not treat himself mentally—and the Scientists had failed to relieve him,—the sufferer could call a surgeon, who would give him a hypodermic injection, then, when the *belief* of pain was lulled [pain has no reality, it is an illusion], he could handle his own case mentally" (p. 464). This injunction is a useful admixture of a little common-sense, but it loosens the foundation [of Christian Science, and overthrows their claim that they and Jesus Christ are one in principle and method of operation. Another amazing inconsistency is that their teaching denies the body all real existence, yet the one great purpose of *Science and Health* is to show how it can be kept in a healthy condition. Further, if matter, mortal mind and the physical senses are all "nothing," an "illusion," if this life is a dream, what guarantee can we have that Christian Science itself is not part of that illusion, and of that dream? When this question was put to one who had been led astray by this un-Christian teaching and who was speaking about the "dream" of life, he could not answer, but had to admit "that is what puzzles me."

Space forbids one dwelling upon the cruelty of the system to sufferers, the callousness that its teaching generates, the autocracy of its discoverer, her quarrels with her students, her law-suits, her divorce from the second of her three husbands, her large profits on her publications, or the strong denunciation of all who oppose Christian Science. What must be the mentality of one who could write, "Only those quarrel with her method who do not understand her meaning, or discerning the truth, come not to the light lest their works be reproved. No intellectual proficiency is required in the learner, but sound morals are most desirable" ? (*Science and Health*, p. x). Therefore if any Christian finds contradictions, untruths or misstatements in *Science and Health*, he must be either weak-minded or immoral. What an accusation !

¹ *What is Christian Science?* (S.P.C.K.), p. 17. This pamphlet contains an address to Bible Class members, and is useful for distribution.

In spite of this denunciation, we are bold to say that *many of the statements* of Christian Science *are* contrary to reason, to Scripture and to all other teaching. A diligent student of *Science and Health* has said: "It abounds in contradictions not only to be found in the same page, the same paragraph, the same sentence, but often between two words used consecutively."¹ Words are used with double meaning, and most logical fallacies find frequent illustration. Expressions occur which seem to border on blasphemy. For example, "God, without the image and likeness of Himself, would be a non-entity." That is to say, man is essential to God's existence, and before man there was no God. The system cannot be styled Christian in any honest sense, neither is it scientific in any admitted definition of that word. Yet it is spreading, and herein consists a call to the Church to re-emphasise the great truths which come as a revelation to those who are brought into contact with its devotees, and to give clear warning of its truly un-Christian tendencies.

These great Truths are (1) The Unity which underlies all creation. The All-ness of God. That Mind, Spirit, is the ultimate Reality. (2) That God is Perfect, Good, Love. (3) That sin, suffering, disease are contrary to the "mind of God." In the true life, eternal life, these can have no place. (4) That "mind" has a powerful influence on the physical condition. (5) That our Lord intended spiritual healing to continue with His Church. That "the prayer of faith" can still help to "save the sick." That prayer is at least as important as medicine. (6) That Christ alone destroys the sin of the world. Had the Church proclaimed these truths with clearness there would have been less opportunity for such a strange religion as Christian Science to arise and to spread. If her preachers now publish them repeatedly, and at the same time show the absurdities, the inconsistencies, the un-Christian teaching concerning God our Father, Jesus Christ our Lord, prayer, the soul and the future life, they will prevent leakage in her ranks towards this "latter-day heresy."

F. MELLOWS.

¹ *The Truth and Error of Christian Science*. By M. Carter Sturge (Murray). This book is strongly recommended for further study. See also *Christian Science*, by Dean Lefroy. A list of contradictions is given at the end.

DISLOCATIONS IN ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.

BY CHANCELLOR P. V. SMITH, LL.D.

IT is probable that the various problems connected with the authorship and contents of the Fourth Gospel will never be completely solved in this world. But one thing about it is clear. Before it was issued in the only form in which it has come down to us, it passed through another hand, by which at least one addition was certainly made to it. The two concluding verses of the last chapter were clearly not written by the author of the Gospel himself, but are due to an independent editor. Whether he added any of the many comments and explanations which are scattered throughout the Gospel we have no means of knowing; and there is no valid ground for supposing that he did so. On the other hand, there are strong reasons for conjecturing that he arranged its various portions in their present order—an order differing in several respects from the sequence in which, according to their contents, they ought apparently to be placed. This dislocation has been pointed out by more than one student of the New Testament, and formed the subject of a small book entitled *Disarrangements in the Fourth Gospel*, by F. Warburton Lewis, of Mansfield College, Oxford, published by the Cambridge University Press in 1910. The most striking evidence of it is furnished by the relative positions of chaps. v. and vi.

At the end of chapter iv. our Lord is represented to be in Galilee. Chapter v. opens with the statement that He went up to Jerusalem to attend a Jewish festival. So far there is nothing inconsistent; but at the close of the chapter He is still arguing with the Jews in Jerusalem; and then at the beginning of chapter vi. it is abruptly asserted that He departed across the Sea of Galilee; and the events of that chapter take place on its two opposite shores. We can scarcely conceive of the Evangelist actually making this statement immediately after he had left our Lord still in Jerusalem; but it would be quite appropriate if it followed on the close of chapter iv., in which our Lord is stated to have come out of Judæa into Galilee. It was from thence that He must have departed across the lake. In chapter vii. 1, we read that after these things He was itinerating in Galilee, instead of in Judæa, because the Jews were

seeking to kill Him, a fact which is recorded in chapter v. 16. This statement follows much more naturally after an account of a visit by Him to Jerusalem than after the end of chapter vi., at which we find Him already actually in Galilee. The presumption is very strong that chapters v. and vi. ought to be transposed.

But the existence of one dislocation in the Gospel necessarily leads to the suspicion that there may be others. And one of these is connected with the chapters which we have been considering. It seems probable that chapter vii. 15-24 ought to be transferred to the end of chapter v. as forming part of the controversy recorded in that chapter. The marvel of the Jews and their question: "How knoweth this man letters (*γράμματα*)?" (ver. 15) have no particular point where they stand, but come most appositely after chapter v. 47, where our Lord refers to Moses and says: "If ye believe not his writings (*γράμματα*) how shall ye believe my words?" The allusions to Moses in verses 19, 22, 23, naturally follow after the reference to him at the end of chapter v.; and the mention in verse 23 of the healing of the man on the Sabbath day is entirely appropriate if it formed part of the discussion on the subject recorded in chapter v., but seems forced and out of place at a much later visit to Jerusalem, when many intervening events had taken place. Again, our Lord's assertion and the denial of His hearers that there was a plot to kill Him (verses 19, 20) are quite consistent with the contents of chapter v., but their insertion in chapter vii. renders the question in verse 25 of that chapter somewhat unmeaning. On the other hand, if verses 15-24 are eliminated from chapter vii., we can see that verse 25 and the following verses follow very naturally and appropriately on verse 14.

Mr. Warburton Lewis further suggests that chapter viii., verses 12-20, should be removed from their present position. In any rearrangement of the Gospel, we must, of course, omit all consideration of chapter vii. 53-viii. 11. This episode, though probably an authentic narrative of what actually took place, is admitted by all Biblical students to be a later addition to the Gospel and not to have formed part of its original contents. We have then to deal with chapter vii., ending with verse 52, and chapter viii., beginning with verse 12. With the exception of the opening words of verse 12, "Then spake Jesus again unto them saying," the whole passage, chapter viii. 12-20, forms a fitting completion of the discussion

recorded in chapter v. and chapter vii. 15-24. It continues the topic of the testimony of the Father, which is dwelt upon in chapter v. 31-37, and of our Lord's claim to judge, which is introduced in chapter v. 22, 27, 30, as contrasted with the judgment of His opponents to which allusion is made in chapter vii. 24 and viii. 15. And the opening words: "I am the light of the world," are in contrast to what our Lord had said of the Baptist in chapter v. 35. "He was the lamp that burneth and shineth and ye were willing to rejoice for a season in his light" (R.V.). The difficulty caused by the opening words of verse 12 will disappear if we realise that when once the dislocation of chapter viii. 12-20 had taken place, it was necessary to insert these words in order to connect the narrative with chapter vii. 52. It only remains to notice that the theory of that dislocation is further supported by the fact that in chapter viii. 21-59 the discussion proceeds upon quite different lines and follows very naturally upon chapter vii. 25-52. It is suggested, therefore, that the portion of the Gospel which we have been considering should be rearranged as follows: Chapter vi. ; v. ; vii. 15-24 ; viii. 12-20 ; vii. 1-14 ; 25-52 ; viii. 21-59.

But the dislocations in the Gospel apparently begin earlier than these chapters, for chapter iii. verses 22-30 seem to be out of place. The existing order makes the contents of chapter iii. verses 31-36 either a continuation of John the Baptist's testimony as to Christ, which we can scarcely imagine them to have been, or else a comment of the Evangelist on that testimony, which in that case seems rather out of place. If, however, we insert chapter iii. 22-30 between verses 12 and 13 of chapter ii. the whole sequence becomes consistent. In either case no incident of the short stay at Capernaum (chap. ii. 12) is recorded. But with the suggested amendment in the arrangement of the text, the journey of our Lord and His disciples into Judæa, and the episode respecting baptism (chap. iii. 22-30) is next mentioned, and then on the eve of the Passover He goes up to Jerusalem (chap. ii. 13) and remains there until after the visit of Nicodemus, on which some light is thrown by the current controversy about purifying and baptism.

Chapter iii. verses 31-36, then becomes a natural continuation of verses 18-21 of the same chapter, which seem to be the Evangelist's comment on our Lord's conversation with Nicodemus. It may be suggested, however, in the alternative, that chapter iii. 22-30

ought to be transferred to the end of chapter iii. In support of this alternative, though, upon the whole, less probable, it may be noticed that at the beginning of chapter iv. our Lord is represented as leaving Judæa, where the Evangelist located Him in chapter iii. 22 ; whereas according to Mr. Warburton Lewis's arrangement, He goes up to Jerusalem from the land of Judæa after chapter iii. 30, and is in that city and not in the rural parts of the land of Judæa at the opening of chapter iv. Moreover, according to verse 1 of that chapter our Lord is said to have resolved to leave Judæa on account of comparisons being drawn between Himself and John the Baptist as regards baptism and discipleship. This statement would naturally follow after chapter iii. 22-30. We observe, then, that, upon the hypothesis that this passage is at present out of place, the two alternative rearrangements would give us either chapter ii. 1-12 ; iii. 22-30 ; ii. 13-iii. 21 ; 31-36, or else, less probably, chapter ii. and iii. 1-21 ; 31-36 ; 22-30.

The next apparent disarrangement to be noted occurs in chapter x. As that chapter now stands the parable or simile of the sheep-fold follows abruptly upon the close of chapter ix., which is concerned with the subject of spiritual blindness, arising out of our Lord having given sight to the man born blind. Then at verse 19 a division among the Jews is recorded, arising again out of that miracle and having nothing to do with the parable of the sheep. But verse 22 introduces a new scene at the opening of which the Jews categorically demand of our Lord a direct answer to the question whether or not He is the Christ. He replies that He has already told them but they believe not, "because," He adds, "ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you" (verse 26). There is nothing in verses 1-18, which contain the parable of the sheep, about the Jews not being of His sheep ; and the words must therefore refer to the discussion recorded in chapter viii. But having mentioned "sheep" in chapter x. 26, our Lord continues the idea in the next three verses, and if verses 1-18 are transferred to follow these verses they quite naturally still further develop and amplify the same idea. Verse 30 will follow verse 18 as appropriately as in our Gospel it at present follows verse 29. It would seem that chapter x. ought to be rearranged thus :—verses 19-29 ; 1-18 ; 30-42.

We now come to the last and perhaps the most interesting of the suggested rearrangements, namely, that in our Lord's final discourse

to His disciples. It is generally admitted that this, as it stands, has suffered from some displacement. Not only are the last words of chapter xiv., "Arise, let us go hence," inconsistent with the continuance of the discourse in chapters xv. and xvi., but the last seven verses of chapter xiv. (25-31) are clearly the winding up of the discourse. Verses 25, 26, 30, indicate that they are our Lord's last earthly words to His disciples. Verse 27 contains His parting legacy to them and verses 28, 29, 31, finally sum up His teaching to them about His imminent departure. There can be little doubt that chapter xiv. 25-31 should come at the end of the discourse. The openings of chapters xvii. and xviii. seem conclusive on this point. In the first we read, "These words spake Jesus and lifted up His eyes to heaven." What words? "Arise, let us go hence" (ch. xiv. 31). The whole company rose and then, before they left the room, our Lord offered His prayer standing. At its conclusion we are told (ch. xviii. 1) that He went forth with His disciples. But is the removal of chapter xiv. 25-31 to the close of the discourse the only change to be made in the present order? Mr. Warburton Lewis thinks not. He would arrange the discourse thus:—Chapter xiii. 1-32; xv.; xvi.; xiii. 33-38; xiv. He adduces several reasons for this rearrangement. There is, he says, an obvious gap between xiii. 32 and 33. On the other hand, chapter xiii. 33-38, can scarcely be disconnected from the opening verses of chapter xiv. The whole passage contains questionings as to whither our Lord is going. But in chapter xvi. 5, He says, "none of you asketh me whither goest thou?" These words can hardly have been spoken after the questionings narrated in that passage. Later on in the same chapter (verses 17, 18) we read that the disciples whispered among themselves as to what His prediction of His imminent departure meant. They did not venture to address Him openly on the subject until He made the explicit declaration contained in verse 28, which they could not mistake. Still they knew not how He would go to the Father, and did not inquire about it until as recorded in chapter xvi. 32, 33; xiii. 33, He had more clearly explained the coming situation. It was only then that the question "Whither goest Thou?" was really asked of Him (chapter xiii. 36). It seems, therefore, that, at any rate, the end of chapter xiii. ought to be placed after chapter xvi.

But then, which part of the discourse ought to follow chapter

xiii. 32? We notice that the whole discourse consists of eight distinct and more or less disconnected paragraphs, namely, the passages which in our Gospel comprise (a) the end of chapter xiii. ; (b) chapter xiv. 1-14 ; (c) 15-24 ; (d) 25-31 ; (e) chapter xv. 1-10 ; (f) 11-16 ; (g) 17-27 ; (h) chapter xvi. Of all these paragraphs, that which forms chapter xv. 1-10 appears most naturally and appropriately to follow verse 32 of chapter xiii. ; for it directly refers to the events recorded in that chapter. After washing the disciples' feet our Lord had declared that they were clean, but not all ; Judas being the exception. He has now gone and therefore our Lord could say, without any reservation : " Now ye are clean " (chap. xv. 4). Again, the casting forth of the unfaithful branch (ver. 6) may be regarded as having a distinct, though, of course, not an exclusive, reference to the falling away of Judas. Then, subject to what will be said later on about chapter xiv. 15-24, the rest of chapter xv. and the whole of chapter xvi. will run straight on, to be followed by chapter xiii. 33 to end and chapter xiv. This rearrangement has, among other recommendations, the advantage of placing our Lord's prediction of the scattering of the disciples (chapter xvi. 32) before His prediction of St. Peter's denials (chapter xiii. 38), which appears to be the more natural order, and is the order in which the two predictions are recorded in the first two Gospels (Matt. xxvi. 31, 34 ; Mark xiv. 27, 30).

It remains for us to consider how the references to the Paraclete in the discourse are affected by the proposed rearrangement. Do they contain any indication as to what is their proper order of priority? The references are as follows :—

(1) " I will pray the Father and He shall give you another Comforter that He may be with you for ever ; even the Spirit of Truth ; whom the world cannot receive, for it beholdeth Him not neither knoweth Him ; but ye know Him ; for He abideth with you and shall be in you " (ch. xiv. 16, 17, R.V.).

(2) " But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My name, He shall teach you all things and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you " (ch. xiv. 26, R.V.).

(3) " But when the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father, He shall bear witness of Me " (ch. xv. 26, R.V.).

(4) " It is expedient that I go away, for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I go, I will send Him unto you. And He when He is come, will convict the world of sin and of righteousness, and of judgment. . . Howbeit when He the Spirit of Truth is come, He shall guide you unto all the truth " . . . (ch. xvi. 7-13, R.V.).

Opinions will probably differ as to the order in which these sayings, looked at by themselves, would seem likely to have been uttered. Certainly the first, in which our Lord speaks of the sending of "another Comforter" would seem naturally to have preceded the others in which "the Comforter" is spoken of. It is quite clear that the reference to Him in chapter xvi. must have followed one or more of the others. It could not have been the introductory mention of Him. But the same cannot be so positively asserted of the second passage in chapter xiv. and the passage in chapter xv. ; and Mr. Warburton Lewis argues that the reference in chapter xv. is the first, and that those in chapter xiv. are the two last. He regards the statement in chapter xv. 26 as a formal introduction of a Person hitherto unknown. On the other hand, he considers the statement in chapter xiv. 16, 17, to be part of Our Lord's final farewell. The Comforter is represented as filling the gap which will be left on His departure, as becoming, in fact, His substitute, to abide after He has gone.

The words, "He abideth with you and shall be in you," would, Mr. Lewis urges, be incomprehensible to the disciples if spoken before those in chapter xv. 1-8, where "abiding" is asserted and insisted on. Our Lord could not have spoken of His Substitute abiding with them and in them, before He had made clear the idea of His own abiding in them and their abiding in Him from the simile of the vine and the branches.

We may grant the cogency of this last argument, and yet hesitate in admitting that it outweighs the strong presumption that the mention of "*another* Comforter" must precede all the passages in which "*the* Comforter" is alluded to. Is there any way of reconciling the two conflicting probabilities? Apparently there is, if we bear in mind the distinct paragraphs into which the whole discourse is divided, and also the fact that in an earlier part of the Gospel good reason was found for taking ten verses out of the middle of a chapter (vii. 15-24) and transferring them to another context. If this can be justified in one case, the process may be legitimately repeated. If then we insert the paragraph, chapter xiv. 15-24, between verses 10 and 11 of chapter xv., we shall make the mention of another Comforter the first reference to the Paraclete, and at the same time place the idea of His abiding presence after, but in close connection with our Lord's own abiding with His

disciples. The whole of chapter xv. with this insertion in it will read quite as naturally as it does at present without the insertion ; and the first fourteen verses of chapter xiv. will fit on to the last seven quite suitably without the intermediate verses. Indeed, we may venture to think that they are an even more striking immediate preface to those concluding verses than is furnished by verses 15-24.

We have seen, then, that there are good reasons for believing in several distinct dislocations having taken place in the Fourth Gospel. The reasons in favour of each are, of course, different, and are not equally cogent ; but it is important to recognise that their weight is not merely independent as regards each separate dislocation, but is to a certain extent cumulative as regards them all. For the probability of any one of the dislocations having taken place enhances the probability of the others having also occurred.

It seems probable, then, that the Gospel should be rearranged in the following order, in which the possible alternatives are noted in brackets :—

Chapter i., [ii. 1-12, iii. 22-30 ; ii. 13-25, iii. 1-21, 31-36] or [ii., iii. 1-21, 31-36 ; 22-30], iv., vi., v., vii. 15-24, viii. 12-20, vii. 1-14, 25-52, viii. 21-59 ; ix., x. 19-29, 1-18, 30-42, xi., xii., xiii. 1-32, [xv., xvi., xiii. 33-38 ; xiv.] or [xv. 1-10 ; xiv. 15-24 ; xv. 11-27 ; xvi., xiii. 33-38, xiv. 1-14 ; 25-31], xvii., xviii., xix., xx., xxi.

It remains to inquire to what cause we can attribute the dislocations. This must, of course, always remain a matter of mere conjecture, but we seem to be practically reduced to choose between two hypotheses respecting them. As the present arrangement of our Gospel is the same in all the extant MSS. and versions, the disarrangement must almost certainly have occurred in the original MS. of the Gospel, and could only have happened in one of two ways. Either (*a*) the author wrote his MS. on separate sheets of paper, or whatever other material he used, and, as suggested at the beginning of this article, these were pieced together in a slightly mistaken order by the editor to whom we are indebted for chapter xxi. 24, 25, and perhaps for chapter xx. 30, 31 ; or (*b*) the Gospel, after it had been correctly compiled, fell to pieces by some accident, and was not quite correctly restored. The former alternative would certainly seem to be the more probable of the two.

P. V. SMITH.

THE MOSAIC TABERNACLE.

BY THE REV. F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.,
Rector of Kinnitty, King's County, Ireland.

IN the Mosaic tabernacle we have a test case by which either the falsity of the Pentateuch, or the falsity of the critical theory may be established. If the critics can prove their position with regard to the tabernacle, it follows logically that the Bible account of it is false. But if, on the contrary, the Bible account can be established, then the theory of the Higher Critics, not only regarding the tabernacle, but also regarding the composition of the Pentateuch falls to the ground.

The Higher Critical theory is that this tabernacle had no existence, that it was invented by the priestly circle after the return from Babylon, and that the Temple was its prototype.

The three following passages from the writings of this school will suffice to explain their position :

(1) "The attitude of modern Old Testament scholarship to the priestly legislation as now formulated in the Pentateuch, and in particular to those sections of it which deal with the sanctuary and its worship is opposed to the historicity of P.'s (i.e. the old Mosaic) Tabernacle." (Dr. A. R. S. Kennedy in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 666.)

(2) "All that is said about this structure in the middle books of the Pentateuch is merely post-exilic accretion." (Graf.)

(3) "The truth is that the Tabernacle is a copy, not the prototype, of the Temple at Jerusalem." (Wellhausen, *Proleg.*, Eng. trans., p. 37.)

If it is true that the Tabernacle was only a miniature copy of the Temple, and that all the institutions connected with the Tabernacle were the inventions of post-exilic scribes, it follows logically and conclusively that the Bible records are false. "We do not imply this," the Critics may answer, but they say it, nevertheless, in other words. Dr. A. R. S. Kennedy in the above quoted article says : "The most convincing of the arguments against the actual existence of P.'s Tabernacle is *the silence of the pre-exilic historical writers regarding it.*" The Higher Critics treat all the

passages describing the Mosaic Law and the Tabernacle as portions of P., their priestly document, according to them composed after the Exile, which has no existence, however, outside the writings and imaginations of the Higher Critics. Having, therefore, relegated all references to the Tabernacle to a post-exilic date, they conceive that they are in a strong enough position to assert that there are no references to the Tabernacle in any writing before the Exile, and should such references be found, to be able to say that the text is not "genuine."

See the same article: "The tabernacle of P. has no *raison d'être* apart from the ark, the history of which is known with fair completeness from the conquest to its removal to the Temple of Solomon. But in no *genuine* passage of the history of that long period is there so much as a hint of the tabernacle, with its array of ministering priests and Levites" (p. 666).

Dr. Kennedy bases his argument on Wellhausen's *Prolegomena*, p. 39 f. Surely we have a right to ask now, what was the object of the priestly scribes who composed P., and inserted it with such cleverness among other documents that constitute the Pentateuch, and assigned it to the authorship of Moses—a palpable forgery.

The answers to this question are different. According to some (Nödelke and others) it was to "give pre-existence to the temple and to the unity of worship"; according to others it was to help them to establish a new temple ritual in Jerusalem, and to obtain more power for the hierarchy. It is also stated by Dr. Kennedy and others that it was to express the sublime idea of Jehovah's relation to His people by dwelling among them, and that as Ezekiel projects this idea into the Messianic future, P. throws it back into the Mosaic age (p. 667). Accordingly, the whole history of the Tabernacle and everything connected with it was a development of the idea expressed in the words, "Let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them" (Ex. xxv. 8), and this, they argue, is proved by the name *mishkan*, which means "habitation." A similar word, *shekhen* (habitation, R.V.), from the same verb, occurs, however, in Deuteronomy xii. 5. And no hint of such an idea is said to be there.

This theory affects more or less the truth of the whole history Pentateuch. If it is true, just half of this work including portion of Genesis, some thirteen chapters of Exodus, the whole of Leviticus, and

some ten chapters in Numbers are forged and fraudulent compilations—however beautiful the notion of inventing the Tabernacle, etc., for the expression of the union of Jehovah with His people be, if such, indeed, was the purpose of the priestly scribes, and if such priestly scribes were the authors of these portions of Holy Scripture. Moreover, the truth of the Tabernacle is implied in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is a spiritual commentary upon it and its relations to the new order of things (see Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 236 f.), and its Mosaic authorship is specially emphasised. See viii. 5: “Moses is warned of God, when he is about to make the tabernacle.” Also see Acts vii. 44-47: “Our fathers had the tabernacle of the testimony in the wilderness, even as he appointed who spake unto Moses, that he should make it according to the figure that he had seen. . . . But Solomon built him an house.” The New Testament references to the Tabernacle, then, involve the Mosaic authorship of the Tabernacle and its priority to the Temple of Solomon—both facts denied by the Higher Critics. If the Higher Critics are right, the New Testament references must be wrong.

The consequences of this conclusion would be disastrous for the authority and inspiration of Holy Scripture. The Pentateuch would be reduced to a patchwork, and a forgery, having no more literary value and worth than any other literary work which was produced or was evolved in any other nation, the Vedas and such like, no matter how lofty the ideals of the compilers were. It therefore behoves us to examine with all care and diligence the destructive arguments of the Higher Critics, and to accept no assumption or statement of theirs on the grounds of either their superior ability, or superior learning, or superior daring. In the first place, it is to be noted that the only evidence the Critics can adduce on behalf of their position is *internal*, based altogether upon vocabulary and style which can be shown to be a very weak foundation for their skyscraping edifice. On the other hand, the defenders of the Bible have strong external evidence for their case.

We shall now call the witnesses for the truth of the Pentateuch and, incidentally and inferentially, of the Bible against the Critical theory. The first to be examined is the Septuagint translation. This is the Greek translation of the Old Testament begun in the middle of the third century in Alexandria. “It is all but certain

that the Torah was the first part translated."¹ From Dr. Swete's *Introduction*, p. 23, we learn that it is admitted that the Pentateuch was the first part of the Old Testament to be translated into Greek. Now the Septuagint contains a very full description of the Tabernacle, its history, services, priesthood, etc., differing in but a few chapters in Exodus from the Hebrew Bible and the ancient versions. What a formidable witness the Septuagint would have been, and how mercilessly it would have been used by the Higher Critics if it was against us! Their case would have been proved up to the hilt at one stroke. As it is against them, they profess to ignore its evidence.

Our next witness is the Samaritan Pentateuch. The small body of Samaritans at Nablus, the ancient Shechem, possess a Roll of the Law. And it is this people and their Roll that are now in the witness-box. Jesus the son of Sirach (*Ecclesiasticus* I. 26), writing some 250 years after the return from the Babylonian captivity, says his soul abhorreth "them that sit upon the mountain of Samaria and that foolish people that dwell in Sichem." Without calling this writer into the box, it will suffice to state that he also could give evidence for the traditional belief. In the Prologue the translator writes: "Many and great things have been declared unto us by the law and the prophets, and by others that have followed their steps, for the which things Israel must be commended for learning and wisdom . . . my grandfather Jesus when he had much given himself to the reading of the law and the prophets and other books of the fathers . . ." Notice the old threefold division, "the law, the prophets, and the writings," twice adhered to here. Notice also the priority twice given in the course of a few lines to the law. As the translator mentions the 38th year of Euergetes king of Egypt, it is calculated that he wrote about 130 B.C., and his grandfather about 190 B.C. Thus the evidence of *Ecclesiasticus* is not to be despised. It would have been used against us had it stated "the prophets and the law." Notice also how the translator distinguishes "Israel" from the "Samaritans." In his praise of the fathers he gives a brief sketch of the events in the Pentateuch as recorded in our Hebrew version.

The Samaritans were a mixed people. When the ten tribes were deported by the Assyrians, men from Babylon, Cuthah, Avva,

¹ E. Nestle, Hastings' *D.B.*, "Septuagint," IV. 1439.

Hamath, and Sepharvaim were placed in the cities of Samaria (2 Kings xvii. 6, 24, 26; Josephus, *Ant.* ix. 14. 1). These men were called "Samaritans" (2 Kings xvii. 29). In Ezra iv. 9, 10, we read of fresh colonists sent by Assur-bani-pal (Osnapper). Josephus says they were called "Cutheans" in Hebrew, but "Samaritans" in Greek. A captive Jewish priest was sent by order of the King of Assyria (2 Kings xvii. 27), and he came and taught them "how they should fear the Lord." In consequence, they adopted the Jewish ritual combined with the worship of graven images (2 Kings xvii. 41). "They feared the Lord and served their graven images." When the Jewish exiles returned in 536 B.C. and commenced to rebuild the Temple, the descendants of these people, "the adversaries of Judah," came and said, "Let us build with you: for we seek your God as ye do, and we do sacrifice unto him since the days of Esarhaddon king of Assyria, which brought us up hither" (Ezra iv. 2). The Jews refused the help rudely. And the "people of the land" in consequence hindered their work for sixteen years (520). These may have included others, but all were instigated by the "adversaries" of Judah. This was the beginning of the feud, which increased with the years. After the accession of Artaxerxes in 465 these people made a protest against allowing the Jews to rebuild the city walls. This was made by foreigners: "Dinaites, Apharsathchites . . . Elamites, and the rest of the nations whom the great and noble Osnapper brought over, and set in the city of Samaria, and in the rest of the country beyond the river" (Ezra iv. 9, 10). Then, when Nehemiah came in 444 to rebuild the city, he was opposed by Sanballat the Horonite, with whom was "the army of Samaria," Tobiah the Ammonite, and the Arabians, and Ammonites, and Ashdodites (Neh. iv. 2, 7). Sanballat was called the "Governor of Samaria" by Josephus and the Elephantine Papyrus. Here we have three attempts by Samaritans to interfere with the Jews. The feud began with the refusal of help. And it is distinctly stated in three places in Scripture that these people with whom the Jews quarrelled were Samaritans, and that the first quarrel was on religious grounds, the Jews refusing to recognise the Samaritans as worshippers of the same God. The feud culminated eventually in the institution of a rival religion, with a rival priesthood and temple. In Nehemiah xiii. 28, we are told: "And one of the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliashib the high priest,

was son-in-law to Sanballat the Horonite : therefore I chased him from me." Josephus (*Ant.* xi. 7. 2, 8. 2) tells us that this priest was Manasseh, the brother of Jaddua ; that the Jews commanded him to divorce his wife, or not to approach the altar ; that the high priest, his brother, drove him away from the altar ; that Manasseh laid the matter before Sanballat his father-in-law, and that he promised to make him high priest, and to build a temple for him upon Mount Gerizim. From that time (shortly after 432, Josephus wrongly dates it in the days of Alexander the Great) there were two rival Jehovah religions in Palestine, with rival temples, and rival books of the Law.

The Samaritans had the same five books attributed to Moses, with certain paraphrases, grammatical mistakes and many alterations, e.g. Gerizim for Ebal in Deuteronomy xxvii: 4, and in the old script, not in the square or newer Assyrian character, said to have been introduced by Ezra (Talmud, *Sanhedrin* 221*b*). Now it is to be remembered that the breach with the Samaritans began in 536 B.C. and reached its climax in 433 B.C. The Higher Critics, as we have seen, maintain that P., containing the Levitical Law, and the account of the Tabernacle, its services, priesthood, etc., was composed by the priests after the return from Babylon, a considerable time after the breach with the Samaritans in 536. If the Samaritan Pentateuch did not contain this P. we can imagine what a formidable witness it would be against us, and how it would have been used ! But the Samaritan Pentateuch contains all P. And surely it must be allowed to be an equally formidable witness on behalf of the opponents of the Critical theory. For it proves that the Pentateuch did contain all P. already before the returned priestly scribes could have set to work to compose it. The Samaritans are proved to have respected this portion of the book P. as much as the rest. And they surely would not have done this had it emanated from those people who refused to acknowledge them as servants of the Lord, and to accept their help in rebuilding the Temple. The fact that they did accept the Law of Moses affords a very strong presumption that such law did not proceed from their Jewish enemies, but was in their hands previously to the quarrel. Would it not be a strange and incredible thing for Manasseh and his priests to take away with them to Gerizim an edition of the " Law " freshly compiled by his own enemies, containing

a recent law that condemned their conduct (Levit. xxi. 15), and if they had done so, would it be credible that the Samaritans to whom they ministered would have accepted a work that rested on the authority of Ezra and Nehemiah, their foes? Would Sanballat, for example, allow a book to be taught which expressly condemned Manasseh for marrying his daughter, if the law that did so was recent?

The Higher Critics, however, attempt to explain away this evidence. Mr. Chapman¹ asserts that the men who offered to help with the rebuilding of the Temple were "Israelites," that "when the Jews came back from Babylon they found a religious community established in Jerusalem," that "the Babylonian Jews wished to exclude these Israelites from joining in the work," but "the children of the Captivity, with their strict views of preserving the holy seed and a pure worship, regarded these Israelites as defiled by contact with their heathen neighbours, and refused their proffered help."²

These statements are conjectures, and are confuted by the evidence of Scripture. Would Israelites who had "remained faithful to the Lord God of Israel" have said: "We seek your God, as ye do; and we do sacrifice unto him since the days of Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, which brought us up hither" (Ezra iv. 1, 2)? Is not this what might have been said by the descendants of the Assyrian colonists who had been taught "how they should fear the Lord" by a captive priest sent to them by the king of Assyria (2 Kings xvii. 28). In Ecclesiasticus we find the people of Samaria and Sichem distinguished from Israel. (See Prologue and c. 50, 26.)

Mr. Chapman asks: "Is it likely that those who would describe themselves as of heathen descent would wish to assist in building the Temple?" This is a pertinent question, but it can be answered in the affirmative, for the Samaritans were always ready to claim relationship with the Jews when they thought it would help them. See Josephus, *Ant.* ix. 14. 3 and xi. 8. 6, where it is said "the Samaritans who had Shechem for their metropolis, seeing that Alexander had greatly honoured the Jews, determined to profess themselves Jews, and when they made their request for privileges, and Alexander asked them who they were, they said they were Hebrews." On the occasion in question they evidently wanted to

¹ *Introduction to the Pentateuch*, pp. 277-294.

² *Ibid.* p. 297.

please Cyrus, who had ordered the rebuilding of the Temple. The men who opposed the rebuilding of the city in Ezra iv. 9, 10, were certainly not Israelites, and the opponents in Nehemiah iv. 7 were the Governor of Samaria and his people. There is no mention anywhere of "seceding Jews" in the Scriptural passages. Mr. Chapman, however, assumes that it was "seceding Jews" who quarrelled with the Jews from Babylon, and who took "away with them the Book of the Law which had been newly compiled by Ezra and Nehemiah, because they would not wish to magnify the points of difference between themselves and their brethren who remained at Jerusalem."¹ But would it not have been in their interest to discredit the work of their enemies, Ezra and Nehemiah? Would they not have been able to deal a deadly blow to Ezra and his party if they could have said: "We have the genuine Law, the Law of Moses, not the Law invented by the priests of Ezra. All the Israelites will, therefore, follow us"? But if they could not do so, it was because the Law of the Jews had not been invented by Ezra and his scribes.

If the Higher Critics desire to establish their case, they must call evidence to prove that the schism between these Samaritans who, according to them, were "Israelites," and the Jews began after the return of 444 B.C.; that the Samaritans, who were "Israelites," for the first time received the Law fresh from the hands of Ezra, when Manasseh fled, a discarded priest, to his Samaritan father-in-law, to officiate in a Samaritan temple as a Samaritan high priest, and that they were not acquainted with it previously. The fact that the Samaritan text has variations from the Massoretic recension only proves that the Hebrew text, on which the Massoretic was based, was older than the Samaritan text. The question is when did the latter come into existence? It must have been before 432 B.C., at all events.

The fact that the Book of Joshua is not included with the Samaritan Pentateuch² is an argument against the Critical theory that the Pentateuch is a compilation of several sources (including Joshua) which they call the Hexateuch, not completed before 444 B.C. And

¹ *Introduction*, p. 293.

² The fact that the Samaritan Pentateuch agrees with the Massoretic text against the Septuagint in passages in Exodus (xxxv.-xl.) only proves that the latter followed a slightly different original, not that it was prior in time to the Samaritan Pentateuch, as Mr. Chapman asserts.

the existence of the Samaritan Pentateuch, containing the Law of Moses and the cultus of the Tabernacle, at least dating from 432 B.C., is a proof that the Critical theory of the "fiction" of the Tabernacle is wrong.

We have now called up two witnesses, the Septuagint translation and the Samaritan Pentateuch, for the real existence of the Tabernacle. We have also the Greek Apocrypha, which has many references to the Tabernacle, Judah ix. 8; Wis. of Solomon ix. 8; Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 10, 15; 2 Macc. ii. 5. We have also a full account of the Tabernacle in the *Antiquities* of Josephus, and in the Talmud, where one treatise, the Bereitha, is given up to a description of it. And in all these works it is treated as a real historical structure, not as an "ideal." In Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 7 f. it is treated in connection with the Law of Moses. We have already referred to this evidence. In Wisdom of Solomon ix. 8, we have: "Thou hast commanded me to build a *temple* upon thy holy mount and an altar in the city, *an imitation of the holy tabernacle* which thou hast prepared from the beginning." Of course this book may not be older than the first century B.C. At the same time, if it had said that the Tabernacle was an imitation of the Temple, what a formidable witness it would have been for the Critical theory. It is not so much what such writers say themselves, as the tradition that lies behind their writings—in this case a written tradition that goes back to the days of Ezra, and to the truth of which they testify—that is important. The external evidence for the Tabernacle is strong.

Before we proceed to take up the evidence of the Old Testament itself, there is another important piece of external evidence which is not in favour of the Critics—the Elephantine Papyri. The letter to Bagohi dated 407 B.C. proves the existence of a colony of Jews in Egypt who had a temple there, before the entry of Cambyses in 525. This letter also shows acquaintance with the meal and burnt offering, the word *degel* for standard, said to be characteristic of P., and the use of frankincense, etc. If P. was a post-exilic work, how were these things so well known in Egypt about the same time as it is said to have been compiled?

(To be concluded.)

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK.

THE WITNESS OF HISTORY TO THE INSPIRATION OF THE WORD.¹

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

IT is a familiar statement, and as true as it is familiar, that all the religions in the world have their sacred books. It would seem as if a religion were impossible without a book. Tradition is uncertain and truth cannot be handed down by word of mouth to successive generations without becoming involved in error. For this reason the old saying is both true and pertinent, *littera scripta manet*, "the word abides."

The Bible has occupied a special place through all the Christian centuries, and this constitutes our present topic, "The Witness of History to the Divine Character of Scripture." It will only be necessary to appeal to facts, for those matters which are capable of verification by all.

I. The most important evidence is that which is afforded by the Christian Church. Starting from to-day we can see what this means in all the ages of Christianity. The Bible is found everywhere to-day in connection with Christian life and work. It is used for preaching and teaching, in connection with commentaries, books and articles, and as the court of appeal for the various aspects of Christian truth.

When we work backward we can see the same thing during the four centuries or more in which we have had a printed Bible. No one can question the unique place occupied by the Bible throughout this period. Then behind the printed Word there are various versions of the Middle Ages, especially that of Wycliffe. The authority of the Scripture was equally evident then. From this time we can work back to the age of the manuscripts in the fourth century. Of these, which are very numerous, there are three very important ones. There is Codex Vaticanus in Rome, Codex Sinaiticus in Petrograd, and Codex Alexandrinus in London. Scarcely less important is the Freer manuscript now in America. From the same century come no fewer than ten catalogues of New Testament books, six of these being identical with ours and the other four, while

¹ An address given at a Conference on Fundamentals held in Philadelphia.

omitting some of ours, do not include any books not found in the present New Testament.

Further back still, there are quotations by various writers representing both the Eastern and Western branches of the Church, quotations that afford clear testimony to belief in the divine authority of Scripture. Then in the second century there are versions like the Latin and Syriac, and this brings us to within fifty years from the time of the Apostle John. In the first century there is the evidence of the well-known and representative Jew, Josephus, whose testimony clearly proves the identity of the Old Testament of his day (our Lord's time) with that of ours.

These are a few of the important points made in that old but (in this respect) still valuable book, Paley's *Evidences of Christianity*. And it shows that all through the centuries the Church has regarded the Bible as an unique book, as the record of divine revelation, and therefore the voice of God for human life. There is scarcely anything more impressive than the unanimity of belief in divine character of the Scripture in the early centuries. Westcott in his *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* points out how, amid varieties of attitudes, influences, temperaments and places, with differences of education and character, the essential agreement of the Fathers of the first three centuries is all the more remarkable. There was "one great idea of inspiration in the scattered societies of ancient Christendom" (p. 417).

II. Another witness is that of Heresy, for every erroneous idea asserting itself to be Christian claimed to be based on Scripture. In the second century Gnosticism appealed in this way, and one heretic, Marcion, drew up his own list of New Testament books, rejecting everything that did not agree with his own views. The same testimony is seen in the Sabellian heresy of the third century and the Arian of the fourth. So it has been ever since, errors of various kinds, ancient and modern, claiming their warrant from Scripture and thereby testifying to the uniqueness of the Bible in Christianity. Swedenborgianism, Christian Science, Russellism, Theosophy, Spiritualism and the like, all call attention to the Bible and attempt to justify their positions from the Word of God. These things clearly indicate what the Bible is in the eyes of those who wish to prove that their views are in harmony with Christianity.

But at this point comes the inquiry as to wherein lies the authority

of the Bible. Some say the Bible was given by the Church and that on this account the authority consists in the volume as handed down through the ages. But another question at once emerges: When did the Church do this, and what Church did it? History will be sought in vain for any action of a church council settling the Bible. When, for the first time, in the fourth century, the Church as a whole dealt with this subject, it was not to settle by decision what was to be the New Testament, but simply to bear witness to what beliefs already existed in the various churches regarding these books. The separate books had their own authority from the moment they were written and issued by properly qualified men, and the Church in the fourth century in its corporate capacity testified to the way in which these books had long ago received authority from Christian people. The reason why these writings were regarded as authoritative was the belief that they contained divine revelation. Thus when Jeremiah wrote the contents of chapter xxvi., the truth was at once recognised as authoritative because of authority behind it. And so also when Paul wrote Romans it was immediately authoritative and would have continued to be so, even though it had never been included in a volume. The inclusion into a volume did not give authority to what did not before possess it, but merely recognised the existence of that authority. The gathering of all the separate books is called canonisation, and as some one has truly said: "Canonisation created a book, not a revelation." The collection into a volume was inevitable, especially in view of the example of the Old Testament, but it must never be forgotten that the gathering together into one volume did not for the first time constitute the books authoritative. The heart of this whole question has been well put in words that deserve special emphasis and careful consideration: "*the New Testament is not an authorised collection of books, but a collection of authorised books.*" The authority lies in the books, not in the collection. For this reason when heretics collected their books, the Church naturally bore testimony to what it believed to be the inspired and authoritative Scripture.

III. There is the witness of other books. It is well known that a number of other books "hovered" on the verge of the canon of the Old and New Testaments for some time, but were finally rejected. Thus the books of the Apocrypha though closely associated with the Old Testament, were never recognised by the Jews as part

of their Bible, and the fact that they are now included in the Scripture by the Church of Rome was largely due to the ignorance of Hebrew on the part of Augustine. Men like Origen and Jerome made no mistake, and always differentiated between the Old Testament and the Apocrypha. So also in regard to the New Testament, certain books like the Epistle of Barnabas were set aside because of the proofs that they did not come from apostolic sources and were therefore lacking divine authority and inspiration. The bearing of this on our present subject can be seen from some words of that great scholar, Professor Gwatkin, of Cambridge, England: "There is no more striking contrast in the whole range of literature than that between the creative energy of the apostolic writers and the imitative poverty of the sub-apostolic. The difference of the canonical and uncanonical, so studiously ignored by some of the literary critics, is not a fiction of some church authority but a fact which no serious reader can fail to notice. . . . We miss the spiritual depth and intellectual force and clearness of the New Testament." (*Early Church History*, Vol. I, 98, 99.)

This contrast shows what the early Church and indeed what the Church of all ages has felt as to the uniqueness of the books contained in our Bible. As another profound scholar, Dr. George Salmon, Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, remarked: "The Scriptures by their own weight . . . crushed all rivals out of existence."

IV. The evidence of opponents of Christianity is another point of importance. Their attacks have invariably been centred on the Bible as the citadel of the faith, for they evidently realised that the destruction of holy Scripture would involve the destruction of the Christian religion. Thus in the second century, Celsus attacked the truth of the New Testament, in the third century the Roman imperial authorities significantly ordered all sacred books to be given up for destruction, and in the fourth century Porphyry concentrated his opposition on the book of Daniel because of its predictive and therefore supernatural element. And so it has been ever since; men have attacked the Bible because of its place and power in Christianity, and this fact is one of the striking testimonies to it as a book of divine authority and inspiration.

V. The explorations in Eastern lands can also be brought forward in support of the uniqueness of the Bible. For over sixty years there have been wonderful discoveries in Babylonia, Egypt,

Palestine and Asia Minor, and these have shed singular light on the contents both of the Old and also of the New Testament. Indeed it is a remarkable and profoundly impressive fact that not one of these discoveries has proved the inaccuracy of the Bible, but on the contrary, many of them have confirmed the truth of the Scripture in regard to facts of history and customs of ordinary life. Very much in support of this contention can be derived from *The Deciding Voice of the Monuments*, by Dr. M. G. Kyle.

VI. A comparison of the Bible with the sacred books of other religions is another proof of what history says of the Christian Scriptures. During recent years much attention has been given to the comparative study of religion, and this method is capable of producing very valuable results, because the more Christianity is studied in comparison with other faiths the more it will be seen to be, as Dr. Joseph Parker once said, not a comparative, but the superlative religion. We have only to look at other books making the same claim as the Bible to see the vast difference. Max Muller translated some of the sacred books of the East, but was compelled to omit great sections because of the absolute impossibility of reproducing these books verbatim into English. When people now read these translations and observe their interest and beauty, their truth and purity, they forget, if indeed they know, that sections of very different character have been omitted. But the fact of an expurgated edition tells its own tale.

To the same effect is the evidence of another great authority, the Oxford scholar, Sir Monier Monier-Williams, whom I heard several years ago say that the fundamental difference between all those books of the East and the Bible is that the former taught salvation by works and merit, while the latter teaches it as coming by grace through faith.

And the results of these books on human life, as compared with what the Bible has done and is doing, is a strong and striking proof of the divine power of the Word of God. If you want to see what other books can do, look at the countries where they have been influential. If you want to know what Hinduism can do, look at India. If you want to know what Buddhism can do, look at India and Japan. If you want to know what Confucianism can do, look at China. If you want to know what the Koran can do, look at Turkey and Egypt. We have no fear about the comparison. We

feel perfectly certain that every comparison will show the infinite superiority of the Bible over all these books of the various religious systems.

VII. Last of all, and crowning everything else, is the circulation of the Bible. Bible societies in various countries are circulating the Scripture in whole or in part in over 600 languages and dialects. There is no book in the world as widely translated and distributed. Not only so, but there is no book so capable of proper translation. Many books cannot be adequately rendered from the original language into another, for the "flavour" becomes lost. We have only to think how much of Shakespeare would be left if one of his soliloquies were rendered (say) in Chinese. But the Bible loses very little by translation, and its message of salvation finds expression, at once adequate and satisfying, in every tongue into which it is rendered.

And the effects of all this circulation of the Bible are apparent everywhere. The war alone has done much to prove the power of Scripture over human life. It is not too much to say that the Bible House in New York and the Bible House in London are among the finest evidences of Christianity.

Surveying this summary of history in relation to the Bible, three things stand out.

First. *The Singularity of the Scripture.* It is unique. There is no other book in the world of which these things can be said. There is no real alternative: either this book is divine or else there is no other.

Second. *The Sufficiency of the Scripture.* In the Bible we have a little book, easily obtained and quickly read. It has transformed individuals, uplifted communities, permeated literature, influenced philosophy, faced empires, dominated civilisation and demands attention wherever it goes.

Third. *The Supremacy of the Scripture.* History shows that the Christian revelation and the Bible go together and that Christ never reveals Himself fully apart from the Scripture. The Bible is supreme over human reason because reason is only a channel, not a source of truth; an opportunity for testing revelation, not the creator of it. And Scripture is supreme over the Church, because the Church was created by the Word of God, first spoken and afterwards written. We do not set aside either reason or Church, but simply say that for

the purest, clearest, fullest revelation of Christ as our supreme authority we have to turn to the Bible. It is our final court of appeal, and contains the last and supreme word on everything connected with the spiritual life. We cannot imagine any book giving us the last word on astronomy, geology, biology or any of the other sciences, because there is always something new to be discovered and stated. But here is a book nearly 2,000 years old which contains the best and last teaching about God, sin, redemption and eternity. And for this reason some of us rejoice in these words of one of the Articles of the Episcopal Church: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, and so that whatsoever is not read therein or may be proved thereby is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." This is what David Livingstone meant when, speaking to Stanley, he said, "Stanley, I read the Bible through four times while I was waiting at Manyuema. All that I am I owe to Christ Jesus, revealed to me in His divine Book. Oh, Stanley, Stanley! here is the source of strength and transforming power."

Among other testimonies to the same fact, the words of President Grant may be given: "Hold fast to the Bible as the sheet-anchor to your liberties. Write its precepts in your heart and practise them in your lives: To the influence of this Book we are indebted for all the progress made in true civilisation, and to this must we look as our guide in the future."

In the Louvre in Paris, there is a picture of the great Council of Constantinople, 381, which dealt with the heresy of Macedonius in regard to the deity of the Holy Spirit. The bishops present are depicted as seated in a semi-circle and in the centre is a throne, with a roll on it indicating Scripture as the final appeal. And at another Council, that of Chalcedon, 451, the Gospels were placed similarly in the centre for the same purpose.

And so we say to every one: examine these facts of history and experience, sift them to the very last possibility, and without a doubt the conclusion will be: "Thy Word is true from the beginning"; "Thy Word is very pure"; "Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet"; "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the Word of our God shall stand for ever."

PRESENT RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS IN CIVIC, COMMERCIAL, AND INDUSTRIAL LIFE.¹

BY THE REV. A. A. BOXLEY, Vicar of All Saints', Leyton.

THE Bishop of Chelmsford in a recent pastoral letter wrote :—

“The Labour Party in this country is at the cross roads. Largely the instincts of that section of the community are spiritual and idealistic, but by their side is the growing power of a purely materialistic sentiment and, if this prevails, then indeed will England have been delivered in vain from the German power, for she will have fallen a victim to an even greater horror and a greater tyranny. It is ours to prevent this, but the call to the Church to arouse and fulfil her destiny as the Body of Christ is urgent, pressing and imperative. The old England is gone. The new England is unbuilt. Men everywhere are saying ‘let us rise and build.’”

That, I take it, expresses the object of this Conference. Suggestions as to what plan should be adopted are many and varied. It is for us, first of all, to get an insight into the true condition of things. Not until we get a vision, not only a view, of what really is, shall we be able to see what the need is and find out whether anything we possess will meet that need and assure a more satisfactory future.

That unrest would prevail after the war was a conviction with every thinking man. Previous to 1914 there was not a single Christian worthy of his name who did not blush with shame at the conditions, both social and industrial, that prevailed, and yet we stood by as in a nightmare, too paralysed to move a hand to avert the inevitable. Paralysis is not too strong a term to use in connection with the Church's attitude towards the glaring injustice and moral conditions, or immoral conditions, under which men, women and children were forced to exist.

But the war came, and how did it find our nation? Advanced? Progressing? Educated? As compared with a hundred years ago, yes, but when looked at in the light of the elevating and purifying power claimed for Christianity, decades behind-hand. This applies to each of the three departments of our national life which we have under discussion this morning. To get a vision of the religious life of each of these great factors in our national life, we must retrace our steps a bit. We must not judge either department by the

¹ A paper read at a C.P.A.S. Conference.

immediate happenings, for the strikes, the profiteering, the commercial juggleries and the red-tapism of civic bodies to-day are but effects of certain causes. There is to-day much *license* but very little real *liberty*, and liberty and freedom are among the birthrights of man.

CIVIC LIFE.

If we take the civic life of our cities and towns we find it is generally accepted that the members of the administrative bodies are men of ability, hardworking, patriotic, and with a preponderance of Christian characteristics, yet when it comes to voting on questions, if ever such questions are raised, which involve the application of Christ's plain teaching, such as the relationship of picture palaces, amusements, trading, etc., to Sabbath observance, there is no power of conviction in a protest, even if it is made. What does this mean? Of course, we recognize that these men are representatives of a community, hold their office by the pledges they make to their electors, and probably, for this very reason, administer and advise not as individuals but as representatives who feel that they cannot wisely go beyond the wishes of the people, or administer up to the standard of their personal convictions. It is argued by the vast majority of people that there is nothing harmful in the amusements provided to-day. Strict censorship is already being exercised, but while there is undoubtedly a proportion of truth here, it cannot but be acknowledged by the earnest Christian that the influence of much that is produced is not conducive to the best development of character. How is it that we see so few films of educative value advertised? An attempt has been made by cinema proprietors to include them in their programmes, but so far as I know with little success, or success as it is measured by proprietors, viz., packed halls. This, apart from the Sunday programmes. What is behind all this? Frankly, we have to confess that members of public bodies, cinema proprietors and even publicans are, on the whole, men of the best type, and even anxious to raise the ideals and do their work in such a way as will not hurt the consciences of Christian people, or merit for themselves anything but the title of Christian gentlemen. It was Ellen Terry who once said, "We hear much about the reform of the stage, but very little of the reform of the audience." Here, I think, is a suggestion. Take your municipal bodies. Let us picture the position before an

election of the members of that body—each candidate is a highly respected citizen and in most cases corresponds in character to what I have already said of them. As things are to-day these men must associate themselves with, and be in sympathy with, the demands of the public. The party spirit prevails. The would-be member must be a party man. Now where is the Christian Church (and by Church I mean the whole body of Christians) at times like these? Whoever heard of a body of Churchmen running a campaign irrespective of any party question, in which they have fearlessly advocated a return to the poll of members who will interpret Christian conscience into administrative reform? “Good is enemy to the best.” We get good men in and they do good work, but why can’t they do what we believe to be the *best* work? Is it not because they do not feel there is sufficient backing by the *best* in people? The pulpit should be the place of leadership of thought as to what is required by Jesus Christ in a district and what every true follower should work for. Public opinion is the greatest force of the age. It is the very corner-stone of democracy. If there are defects in our civic life, and there are, the source of these defects are to be found in a defective people. To remedy them we must get back to the source, train the consciences of the people to harmonize with their avowed profession of Jesus Christ and foster such a spirit of co-operation and enterprise for righteousness and manly piety that they will be ready to act upon the promised power of God, and prove that “this is the victory that overcometh, even our Faith.”

COMMERCIAL LIFE.

Of the commercial life in the country it is obvious that without expert knowledge and practical experience it is not possible to do more than to give impressions. They may be open to criticism, but from the religious point of view, it is plain to every man that there is an unhealthy onesidedness in most business dealings. It has ever been a temptation to men to gain at the expense of another man’s loss. The history of the Jews is punctuated from beginning to end with references to the usurer. Unjust balances, short measure, the gloating over an unequal bargain, are all evidences of the temptations peculiar to a nation’s commercial experience. What was true in the Old Testament days is unfortunately true to-day. We went to war against Germany to vindicate our honour because

the terms of our agreement were not complied with. Germany had signed, but with a reserve, and as soon as occasion demanded the exercise of that reserve, the contract was ignored, they sought their own ends, and had there not been sufficient force to wrest their ambitious desire the other signatories to that contract would have gone to the wall. Now look at the evidence we have had both in pre-war days and since, and do we not see the same lack of principle undermining the straightforward dealings of man with man? From the largest commercial enterprises to the smallest, the germs of this self-interest at the expense of another is patent. The very existence of anti-profiteering committees is evidence of it. At the bottom of all is *selfishness*—the very opposite to the fundamental principles of a prosperous human society. Such a condition will always prevail until there is a realization of the fact that all men are members of one family and we are all of equal value, mutually dependent on each other. One great impetus was needed previous to 1914 to break down increasing injustices and differences which threatened to divide the nation. That impetus was provided by the call to work and sacrifice for one great national aim, viz., to win the war. We have seen with pride how class distinction was almost entirely eliminated during the war, and each man, rich or poor, was ready to share the fortunes of his fellow-men. What brought this about was co-operation and self-sacrifice. Now all history teaches us that unless energetic co-operation and self-sacrifice receives a fresh impetus, not less potent than that of the war, the removal of stimulus will be followed by a dangerous slump. What is the impetus needed in the commercial world which is likely to succeed in bringing about fair-play and honourable business transaction? Protective legislation is being exercised at present, but it only muzzles the offender. What is needed is the awakening of men's consciences to a new sensibility of honour and chivalry. Mere negativism will never do more than intimidate the weak. It is the positive teaching of the grandeur of an unselfish spirit that must permeate our commercial dealings, not "how much can I get out of this deal?" but "how little can I manage with to allow for a fair profit?" Here, again, there is a call for men who will take the lead. By far the majority of the men who attend church, are commercial men. Here is the call to these Christian men for a readiness to sacrifice business tactics for the cross of Christian witness

in the commercial world. There are many material helps towards the attainment of this ideal such as that provided by public school education and "team" work of every description, but the point that affects the Christian Church, and through it the establishment of the laws of the Kingdom of God (every one of which is a positivism), is the practical appropriation of God's Word through Micah, "I will shew thee, O man, what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God."

INDUSTRIAL LIFE.

The position in the industrial life is one which most certainly claims careful consideration and immediate attention. In the past relationship between employer and employed has been grossly misunderstood. To refer to employees as *hands*, to treat them as mere cogwheels in the industrial machine, has done more to put the men's backs up than any question of wages or hours. To be looked upon as merely having a market value but no recognized rights as human beings is bitterly resented. So many and varied are the ramifications of the industrial question that one is compelled at the brief time at one's disposal to omit facts of a technical character. But there are burning questions to be faced by the Church in regard to this matter, if the Church is to vindicate her claims as a leader of the forces which oppose every form of evil. There is a great "Why?" being articulated just now. During the last century experts tell us that there was a hundred per cent. advance in the industrial conditions of our nation, yet in spite of this what still prevails? The tyranny of the few over many weak. Look at the utter inadequacy of wages paid to the toiling class. True the terrible sweating of ten years ago has been largely eliminated, but there are still millions of our people living, or rather existing under a mere pittance. There has been great advance in the improving of conditions in factories and mines. Who is to be thanked for this? Not the Church. Labour has fought its own battles and is daily growing more powerful. The Bishop of Chelmsford's words quoted at the beginning of this paper bear testimony to this fact, but it reveals that side by side with the spiritual and idealistic force in the movement there is growing a purely materialistic sentiment. Why has the Church left others to find out and apply remedies to these ills as if it were no part of Christian religion?

The question of the oppressed, underpaid, underfed and ill-housed has been allowed to pass untouched. We have been too content with ministering to the wounded in the social strife without valiantly attacking the enemy. What is the enemy? Surely it is the spirit which makes men use other persons as the instrument of their profit and pleasure. The welfare of the community should be supreme over the profit of the individual. Christianity teaches that all men are brothers, and should labour for the community because of the equal value of every individual soul. We have the reports of the Archbishop's Committee upon the industrial question, but experts like Sir G. B. Hunter tell us that there are many defects. One among others is this: it is asserted that the evils that we most deplore are caused by or are incurable under our social and industrial system. This is not so. It is evident that the machinery of industrial organization is all right. It is the right spirit that is wanted, and this is what the Church claims to possess—clear-sighted and unselfish co-operation. Those who are best qualified to interpret the needs of the industrial question are constantly emphasizing the fact that what is wanted is unselfish co-operation. Resentment, class hatred and suspicion must go both in employer and employed. Where does the Church come in? One fact is plain. Men see the superiority of Christianity, but they do not see in the Christian a genuine allegiance. Christianity ceases to involve any risk or to cost men any personal sacrifice. The moral level of Christianity has been lowered, and consequently its moral witness dimmed. Jesus Christ plainly taught that the Church would, until the complete establishment of the Kingdom of God, be comparatively small. She is "a city set on a hill," "Salt of the earth," "a little bit of leaven which would leaven the whole lump." Power belongeth unto God and He has promised to exercise that power through men. Here then is the duty of the Church. Among her own members there must be the witness of the very spirit which alone can guarantee happy industrial conditions. Personal redemption is needed for social salvation, and this redemption is only found in Jesus Christ. What a challenge to the Church of Christ! Our Lord made no mistake in His administrative policy for the Church. Fellowship with His body cannot be separated from the obligation of membership.

A PERVERSION AND ITS LESSONS.

BY A CLERGYMAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

IN the autumn of 1866, my health not being strong, I was dispatched to the south of England. My father was the Incumbent of a slum parish in London, and was well known as a decided opponent, like his friend "S.G.O.," of what was then known colloquially as "Ritualism," or nowadays as "The Anglo-Catholic Movement." I was receiving a course of training as an organist, often supplying the place of some regular performer, and church music was my delight. So I was sent to a certain parish where there was a community of men to which my father had been assured that I might with safety be entrusted; and that the Curate, who lived with them and was known as the "Prior," would not instil into my mind any of those "strange doctrines" for which his Vicar was so notorious. In this, however, he was misled, as the sequel will show. In addition to the "daily celebration," as it was called, we were marshalled every few hours for "Prime, Terce, Sext, Vespers and Compline." These "offices" were quite new to me, and I was astonished to hear at them the frequent recital of the "Hail, Mary," both in Latin and English. On asking for an explanation, I was told that this was only the "Sarum Use" revived, also that this was a Catholic custom, and we were all Catholics; also that we ought to pray to the "Holy Mother of God" "to influence her Son to intercede for us." I had recently been confirmed, and was preparing for my first Communion. One part of this preparation, according to the "Prior," should have been my "sacramental confession"; but this I refused point blank to make, saying that the only persons supposed to hear confessions were the Romish priests. I was taught to pay reverence or "devotion" to the consecrated elements, which were reserved in a "tabernacle" and exhibited with bell-ringing at certain times. My remark was, I remember, that if this were not Transubstantiation it was first cousin to it. I had a very keen logical faculty, which enabled me to analyze the terms Transubstantiation, Consubstantiation, etc., as affecting the consecrated elements. I held to my decision as to confession, so the "Prior" gave way, and I went to the Lord's table without it. And I may here say that on one occasion, a few

years ago, when a new Vicar was appointed who tried to enforce confession as a preliminary to communion, I resisted the unwarrantable innovation, as I had been working for some time as an extra helper to his predecessor, a good and holy man of very different calibre.

Then there was a great deal said about the A.P.U.C. (Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom), and on September 8 ("Nativity of B.V.M.") a great festival was held, at which the principal performer was a foreigner who had been to the East, where—so he told us—he had received "valid" ordination as a Bishop from the Eastern Patriarch, with the title of "Bishop of Iona." I was struck with the spangles on his vestments which, if feathers count for anything, should have made him a very fine bird indeed! We were instructed that there were only three "Branches" of the Catholic Church, which could claim to possess valid "Apostolic Succession." In this unity—or trinity in unity—there had never been a breach since the Day of Pentecost. A few weeks later my father explained to me that there had been several such breaches, notably that, when two rival Popes were set up in Italy and France, and "reigned" at the same time. He pointed out the difference between the *ἐπίσκοπος* of the old, and the presbyter of the New Testament. But what seemed to me so specially inconsistent in this novel régime at the "Priory" was that this young Curate should, as he said he was, be really a member of the Romish Church, which had granted him a "dispensation" to take orders in the Church of England, in order to obtain as many "converts" to Rome as possible, and that he, upholding strenuously the doctrine of Papal infallibility, which was then exciting much attention, should pretend that the 'above-named three "Branches" could all be orthodox, when two out of the three repudiated the Infallibility dogma. I called his attention to the fact that "Roman" or "Anglo" Catholic was a misnomer, since these local appellations imply *division* instead of unity; however convenient they may be colloquially. On All Saints' Day there was another great Festival, at which, as a member of the congregation, my father was present. From the tone of my letters he had become suspicious, and had come to see for himself what was going on. Not long after this visit I was sent for, and returned to London. But the seed had been sown, and a spirit of disquietude was working in my mind. I could not make my

belief in the Reformed National Church of England square with these neo-Catholic inventions, which taught me to regard the very name of Protestant with contempt.

After many hours spent in turning the matter over and over again, I gave it up as useless, and was forced to the conclusion that the only way out of the difficulty would be to join the Church of Rome, as I was told that the Pope would take all responsibility off his "children," and he was the only infallible guide. We were then living near to a Roman Catholic church, and it now assumed a new position in my eyes, for I wanted to go in and find a priest who would tell me what to do. The sound of beautiful music acted as a decoy, and so I went of an evening to the "Benediction." I could follow the Latin jargon easily enough, but I felt that it did not conduce to prayer, and the entire performance had in it more of a dramatic show than a religious function. From attending these services (unknown of course to my parents) I next made up my mind to take the final step. As I have shown, the Infallibility and other doctrines went against my reason ; but it all seemed so confused and contradictory that, like many another youth and maiden, I clutched at the chance of shifting the responsibility on to other shoulders. I next called at the presbytery, or priests' house, and asked to see one whose name I had noticed on one of the confessional boxes, and had an interview with him. He then passed me on to another. This latter was an English gentleman, a graduate of Oxford, who had given up his profession as a barrister in view of taking Romish Orders. He had an attractive personality, and was just the sort of person to receive and instruct would-be perverts ; for which reasons his superiors had allotted that office to him. I could not then help liking the man, and now I regret that, in sacrificing his private judgment to a Church which does not allow her members to use what is freedom's birthright, he lost the opportunity of becoming an eminent judge. This Reverend "Father" had an answer to all my objections, the sophistry of which I have since perceived. But he could not satisfy or deceive me on two points, though he tried hard to do so. The first was, the possibility of a sinner being infallible, even in matters of doctrine. The second was, the right of children to judge for themselves in matters of religion in opposition to the views inculcated by their parents. My conscience sorely vexed me on this point, and I kept repeating to myself that the

Church said my parents were heretics ; but it would not do. I felt I was doing wrong, and that feeling, coupled with a conviction that there was " something very wrong somewhere," led me ultimately to return to my own mother Church of England. But first of all I now took that course which removed, as I was told, all responsibility from me, and went to obtain instruction preparatory to being received into the Romish Church. At the end of some five weeks I made the preliminary confession, and was " received " on March 6, 1867, before the Benediction Service.

Previous to that event my father had taken me with him when he went to preach what proved to be his *last* sermon in the same black gown in which nine years later I preached my first sermon. My father died on April 13, and shortly before his death I found I had been betrayed and that he had been told of my perversion. When I saw him a few hours before he died, however, I felt comforted, because his words assured me not only of his forgiveness, but of the one and only means of salvation: " Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." This event gave the finishing touch to my connexion with Rome. I never went near the priests again, and from the hour that I bid my dying parent farewell till the present time I have had no commerce with the papal religion. On the contrary, I have been what the King is bound to declare himself to be: " A faithful Protestant."

And now I wish to add to the foregoing account a few reflections which forced themselves upon me, partly at the time, and partly during my forty-three years' ministry in the Church of England. That Church appears to be divided into two automatically opposing camps. On the one side lies the Protestant Reformer—on the other the Anglo-Romish Innovator. These two may be the best of friends personally, but their religious tenets are as far apart as the poles. The former is ever striving after that Bible Christianity that looks to the Church's One Foundation, Jesus Christ her Lord, for inspired guidance. The latter places the authority of " the Church " before the divine revelation. Then there are the only too obvious differences in *doctrine*, such as the Lord's Supper and the Mass ; the two sacraments of the Gospel as ordained by Christ Himself, and the five rites or ceremonies elevated by the Pope to an equality with them ; the family life of the parsonage, and the celibate life of the presbytery. But perhaps the most

subtle and dangerous error is that of what is called the "Sacrament of Penance." It is through this secret agency that the Romish Church has worked to get at the secrets of nations, of families and of individuals, in order to direct politics, arrange the disposal of money, and manage the education of the young. The Mass and Confession are the two great dangers that threaten our Protestant Church to-day. Can any reasonable person suppose that any "restrictions" will prevent the elements being carried about and worshipped? Or that confession before communion will not be enforced if it be *permitted*? The very genuflections which children are taught to make before the "altar" are the acknowledgment of material worship under the name of "Eucharistic Adoration."

Lastly, I refer to that great rock of offence, Papal Infallibility. I never could swallow this big pill. Having been always taught to regard the Holy Scriptures as the one and only infallible guide in *this* world and to the *next*, I was always incredulous when told that the Pope was the only inspired authority, and that he alone could correctly interpret the Old and New Testaments. Great stress was laid on this point, and I was told it was an essential part of my "obedience." Obedience! What tragic mental and moral asphyxiation is involved in the Romish abuse of that word! Mr. Gladstone in his "Vatican Decrees" (1870) wrote: "A convert now joining the Papal Church not only gives up certain rights and duties of freedom, but surrenders them by a conscious and deliberate act. To speak strictly, the claim now made upon him requires him to surrender his mental and moral freedom, and to place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another."

I cannot conclude without a solemn warning, especially to young people, who are in danger of being perverted by the seductive fallacies of Rome. Indeed, this paper from one who has now passed some forty-three years in the Anglican Ministry is intended specially as a danger signal to all who are influenced by the proselytizing emissaries of Rome. I will conclude therefore with these solemn words from Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet quoted above. He says: "A change of religious profession is under any circumstances a great and awful thing."

STUDIES IN TEXTS.

Suggestions for Sermons from Current Literature.

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

II. THE LIKENESS OF CHRIST.

Text.—"The face of Jesus Christ." (2 Cor. iv. 6).

[Book of the Month: JESUS AS THEY SAW HIM,¹ by J. Alexander Findlay = F. Other refs., Glover's *Jesus of History* = G. Swete's *Apocalypse* = S. H. C. Lees' *Eyes of His Glory* = L.]

"The most valuable feature of the Second Gospel is to be found in the suggestions it provides for a picture of the Lord Himself" (F. 39). When St. John pictures the Lord in the Apocalypse, "I cannot believe that all the details of the picture are merely conventional symbols of the divine majesty. The Lord, as He appears there, has eyes like a 'flame of fire,' and a voice deep and many-toned as the sea. Mark tells us of the strange inward glance of Jesus, and the other Gospels echo his suggestion" (F. 39). Professor Swete has made the same application, and drawn a similar inference: "The penetrating glance which flashed with quick intelligence and, when need arose, with righteous wrath, was noticed by those who were with our Lord in the days of His Flesh, and finds its counterpart, as the Seer now learns, in the Risen and Ascended Life" (S. 17). So Dr. Glover says: "The Gospels do not, like some biographies ancient and modern, give a place to the physical characteristics of Jesus" (G. 46). "The only personal traits of this sort that I recall in the New Testament are the eyes of Jesus, and Paul's way of stretching out a hand when he spoke. In view of this reticence, it is rather remarkable how often the Gospels refer to Jesus 'looking'" (G. 46). We have an instinctive feeling that His characteristics added to His power of ministry, and we have pictured them as spiritual experiences, especially in song:

"I have seen the face of Jesus,
Tell me not of aught beside;
I have heard the voice of Jesus,
And my heart is satisfied."

¹ *Studies in St. Mark's Gospel*. Published at the Epworth Press, by J. A. Sharp, 2s. A fine, fresh and suggestive book, and, happily, there are others coming.

“ There is no man who ever plans how he may catch a glimpse of the Lord, but, when he looks up, finds the eyes are there melting him with their tenderness, and searching him with their glory. There are over sixty passages, including the parallels, in the Gospel pages, which speak of the eyesight of Jesus Christ ” (L. 18). So let us gather what we can of help from the Gospel story in regard to—

I. THE EYES OF JESUS. “ An unusual word, meaning to ‘ look into,’ or, as we should say, ‘ searchingly at ’ (*emblepein*), is used of Jesus in Mark x. 21, 27 ; Luke xx. 17 ; John i. 42 ; Luke xxii. 61 ” (F. 39).

“ We are told by his biographer that Marcus Aurelius had a face that never changed—for joy or sorrow, ‘ being an adherent,’ he adds, ‘ of the Stoic philosophy ’ ” (G. 50). “ The writers of the Gospels do not conceal that Jesus had feelings, and expressed them ” (G. 50). “ We must assume some change of expression on such a face as that of Jesus ” (G. 48). “ The look seems to come into the story naturally, without the writers noticing it ” (G. 47).

(a) *It is a look of kindness.* “ Luke and John keep the word (*emblepein*) sacred to Jesus, while Matthew only has it once, in the mouth of the Lord, ‘ examine the wild birds.’ Closely connected as it is with this ‘ kind but searching glance,’ we may take the Lord’s habit of looking round, passing from face to face in a company ” (F. 39). “ In Mark iii. 34, we are shown the lingering tenderness of Jesus. In the group round Him—not all of one sex—there were those who could be His brothers, His sisters, His mother. With keen delight in their differences, He, so to say, sorts them out, glorying in His own discoveries of the variety of human love ” (F. 40).

“ When we read of His happy way in dealing with children, are we to draw no inference as to His face, and what it told the children ? ” (G. 51). “ If we are not explicitly told of such things by the evangelists, they are easily felt in the story. The ‘ paradoxes,’ as we call them—a rather dull name—surely point to a face alive with intellect and gaiety. The way in which, for instance, the leper approaches Him, implies the man’s eyes fixed in close study on Jesus’ face, and finding nothing there to check him, and everything to bring him nearer ” (G. 47-8).

(b) *It is a look of searching scrutiny.* Dr. Glover pictures Christ watching buyers and sellers. “ Jesus stands by the stall, watching

some small sale with the bright, earnest eyes which we find so often in the Gospels" (G. 37).

"Only a look is needed to bring Peter to hand again. Putting John i. 42 and Luke xxii. 61 together, we see that it was the same penetrating glance with which Jesus had first greeted Peter. In those two looks is written the history of Peter's soul" (F. 95-6). "A blind man has to consign himself to the care of a stranger, is led right away from the familiar village, from any part of which he could find his own way without help, is cured gradually, and by the use of saliva. It may not be too fanciful to suggest that the methods used in this case were somewhat roundabout, because the man was blind, and his eyes gave his Healer no help" (F. 43). For "'Jesus,' as Mr. Bradfield once said in my hearing, 'is like a Lover, who take you for a walk in the dark, and you are not sure at first where He will take you, and whether you can altogether trust this most unceremonious Wooer'" (F. 43-4). "Mark xi. 11 is different, but equally suggestive. On the evening following His triumphal entry, Jesus reconnoitres the position with a view to action on the morrow. In Mark v. 32, He keeps looking round 'to see her that had done this thing'" (F. 40).

(c) *It is a look of indignation.* "In Mark iii. 5 this is a look of anger; He is searching vainly for a sign of relenting in the faces of His enemies" (F. 39-40). So Mark viii. 33, of the disciples who could not face the stern fact of the Crucifixion; and Luke xx. 17, of the men who were planning to bring it about.

II. THE VOICE OF JESUS. (a) *It is a voice of strength.* "As to His voice, we have still less information. We infer from a quotation from Isaiah in the First Gospel (Matt. xii. 19) that it was normally low in tone; but evidently it was sometimes raised in sharp rebuke, for 'out of His mouth proceeded a sharp two-edged sword.' In Mark i. 43, Matthew ix. 30, as also in John xi. 33, 38, a word is used which is translated in the A.V. of Mark and Matthew 'straitly charged,' in John 'groaned'; literally it seems to mean 'roared,' 'growled,' or 'thundered'" (F. 40). "In Mark xiv. 5 the same word is applied to Mary's critics, who grumbled at her action in harsh undertones. But Matthew, Luke and John conspire to keep the word sacred to Jesus. It is curiously significant of the painstaking reverence with which the writers of our Gospels treated their Subject, that, when once even so strange a

word had been used of Jesus, it should be set aside for Him " (F. 40). " In Mark i. 43, Matthew ix. 30, the men addressed proceed at once to disobey Him ; Jesus must have foreseen their behaviour. John xi. 33, 38, is somewhat different " (F. 40). " The wrath of Jesus is caused by the contrast between Mary's grief and the sham tears of those Jews who had come ostensibly to condole with the family ; actually to watch over the Lord Himself. Grief and anger are struggling for the mastery in the soul of Jesus, for the real omen of Calvary lay in the hatred of His enemies. The poignancy of the scene is almost too much for Him ; as the ' Lewis ' Syriac has it, ' The tears of Jesus were coming ' " (F. 41).

(b) *It is a voice of sweetness.* " It is only familiarity that has blinded us to the ' charm ' they found in His speech—' they marvelled at His words of charm ' (Luke iv. 22)—to the gaiety and playfulness that light up His lessons " (G. 48).

" A nervous woman, who has got what she came for, is hurrying away, when she is summoned back by the mastery in the eyes and voice of Jesus, and is constrained to tell Him ' all the truth ' before the crowd " (F. 42). " Note again the word which He uses in speaking to them (*Tekna* : Mark ii. 5, x. 24). It is a diminutive, a little disguised as ' children ' in our English version. It reappears in the Fourth Gospel in even more diminutive forms (*Teknia*, xiii. 33 ; *Paidia*, xxi. 5) with a peculiarly tender suggestion. The word of Mark answers more closely than anything I know to ' Boys,' as we used it in the Canadian Universities " (G. 79). " It was this friendly, pleasant word, or one very like it, that He used with them " (G. 79).

And then transfigured and wondrously glorified these characteristics appear in the Ascended Lord as Stephen and Paul and John see Him, and we hear the voice like music, and see the eyes like stars, and love the face like sunshine.

" One dusk like this I think did Moses stand
 And trembled as he stood—
 Then trembling, bared his face, and saw on high
 Upon the Mount's blank face one glowing eye,
 And drawing nigh—
 Heard words as tides of many waters sound
 In flows and ebbing calms,
 And knew the Everlasting Arms
 Beneath him and around."

—Arthur Shearley Cripps.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

A MISSIONARY CRITIC.

EDUCATIONAL PRINCIPLES AND MISSIONARY METHODS. By the Rev. Roland Allen, M.A. London: *Robert Scott*. 7s. 6d. net.

Mr. Roland Allen, who has certainly some claim to be heard, has already offered some trenchant criticism of modern missionary methods. He enforces the arguments advanced in his work on St. Paul's methods in the present volume, which, although it approaches the same subject, does so from an entirely new point of view. It is not easy, nor does it seem quite fair for persons who have no actual experience of work in the Mission Field to criticize a study like this, based, as it is, upon actual observation. All we dare allow ourselves to say is that we venture to think that many missionaries—some of them with wider experience than Mr. Allen possesses—will challenge some at least of his contentions and conclusions—indeed Bishop Gore anticipates this in his preface.

At the outset Mr. Allen faces the fact of the comparative failure of the missionary enterprise, the failure of converts to stand alone and to evangelize the country round them. The blame, he says, has usually been laid on the converts themselves—the failures has been attributed to racial weakness, lack of initiative and so forth, theories which he vigorously assails. Under the heading "The Supremacy of the Pupil," Mr. Allen shows how in our teaching the pupil is often subordinated to the subject or to a policy. He very truly observes that we have not taught any one any truth unless he has received it and can live by it, and he is "up against" that conception of teaching which demands that we shall follow a scheme of instruction based upon some supposed natural order in the subject, rather than upon the state of the pupil and the pupil's need.

In this there is no doubt very much truth, though we think the author unnecessarily belittles the use of "orthodox Christian formulae." St. Paul seems to have attached some importance to "a form of sound words." With equal force the subordination of the education of the pupil to a policy is treated—that is, that the pupil is educated not that he may attain to the truth, but that he may serve the interests of the State or the Church, and we are reminded of the way in which in Germany education has been directed by the desire to produce a certain type of citizen, the painful results being too clearly seen and acutely felt.

There is no denying the force of much that is considered in these pages, and we commend its careful study to all who have at heart the claims of the great enterprise; even though, as Bishop Gore admits in his preface, it may seem to be "seriously one-sided" it deserves "sympathetic attention." At any rate there is no denying the sincerity of the author whose courage is not less conspicuous than his ability.

NEW WORK BY DR. J. D. JONES.

THE LORD OF LIFE AND DEATH. By the Rev. J. D. Jones, D.D. London: *Hodder & Stoughton*. 6s.

Dr. Jones has many readers among Churchmen who have learned to value his suggestiveness and skill in getting to the heart of the meaning of Scripture. In this book he writes on the raising of Lazarus, and in so doing he adds to our knowledge and brings the incidents before us in an attractive and in-

forming manner. He accepts the narrative as historical, and in our opinion takes the only possible course open to a man who believes in the historicity of the Fourth Gospel. "There can be no difficulty in accepting the story as simple and literal fact, for the man who believes that Jesus was the Son of God. If you believe that Jesus was the Son of God, that He was declared to be such by His own resurrection from the dead, there can be no possible difficulty in the way of believing that He who triumphed over death so gloriously in His own case did verily possess the keys of death and of Hades. The narrative alike by what it says and by what it does not say, is itself warrant of its truth." It is refreshing to find him maintaining so strongly what Meyer has said, "No narrative of the New Testament bears so completely the stamp of being the very opposite of a later invention." Myth and legend do not clothe themselves in the unstudied naturalness that we find in every verse of the Eleventh chapter of St. John's Gospel. It is the key to the whole meaning of the Gospel. It also sheds a flood of light upon the Synoptists who deal with the Galilean ministry.

Dr. Jones is at home in the study of character, and his account of Thomas—"this melancholy and devoted soul"—is illuminating. Thomas was apt to allow the facts that were nearest, the dark, disturbing, distressing facts of the immediate present, to absorb his thought and to fill his entire horizon. The visible blotted out the invisible. The hostile Jews blotted out the thought of God. That is true, and it is clear that Thomas never faced until he saw the nail-pierced hands of the Risen Lord the full fact of the Incarnation. Dr. Jones treats the Bethany household as a happy family circle, and here again he has no sympathy with the many theories that have been woven round the character of the family. He takes the story as he finds it, and gives no place to that inventive imagination which is the besetting sin of many ancient and modern commentators and the despair of Bible students who are not hampered by the desire to discover something recondite and obscure in the plainest tale. By adopting this attitude he wins confidence, and that confidence becomes gratitude as the chapters are read. Sound exegesis is the fruit of common sense reverently devoted to the study of revelation. Dr. Jones has common sense and reverent insight.

DR. WALLACE OF STEPNEY.

MEMORIES OF WILLIAM WALLACE, D.D., FIRST VICAR OF ST. LUKE'S, STEPNEY, 1870 TO 1914. London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 5s. net.

The Bishop of London contributes a Preface to this memoir of "dear old Dr. Wallace," as he calls him. Mrs. Wallace tells the story of her husband's long, strenuous and self-denying labours among the poor of the East End parish in which he laboured for over forty years. An Ulsterman, and a distinguished graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, he was one of the many who have brought into the service of the Church of England the religious enthusiasm, the versatility and the unflinching cheerfulness of the Celt. The volume, which is enriched with portraits and illustrations, will be welcomed especially by the London clergy of the older generation who knew him, but many of the men of a younger generation will find in these pages a fine example of unselfish devotion to duty under depressing conditions and may gather inspiration for their own tasks. The chapters on teaching and preaching contain much that is useful. Dr. Wallace's type of Churchmanship was not that of which most of our readers would approve, but the wise among the sons of men are always prepared to learn from many teachers and to appreciate transparent goodness wherever they find it.

S. R. C.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

EVANGELICAL clergy and others are invited to write to the Church Book Room for samples of the various leaflets and forms which are published through its agency in connection with the new Constitution of the Church of England. The leaflets are *The Ladder of Lay Representation*, 2s. per 100 post free; *The New Constitution of the Church of England*, 2s. per 100 post free; and the forms, *Declaration as to Qualification* (1st schedule), 1s. 6d. per 100 post free; the same printed with form for non-resident electors, 2s. per 100 post free; the same printed on cards for index system 3s. per 100 post free, the same printed with space for six signatures, 3s. per 100. Notice of Parish Church Meeting, 1d. each. Parochial Roll Sheets, 3s. per 100. Voting papers for Parochial Lay Representatives with spaces for twenty or for forty names, 3s. per 100.

Enabling Act.

A new leaflet, addressed to those lately confirmed, by Canon Grose Hodge, has just been issued by the Book Room entitled *The Life Beautiful*, 9d. per dozen or 4s. per 100. We are also able to announce that a new edition of the Archbishop of Sydney's manual, *Confirmation*, published in the English Church Manual series, has been issued at 2d. net. It is unfortunate that the high cost of printing at the present time prevents the former price of 1d. being adhered to, but we hope the increased price will not hinder the circulation of the new edition, which is printed on good paper and with an attractive cover.

Few questions are more to the fore at the present moment than that which concerns the origin and authority of the Christian Ministry, and it may be of service to mention the late Archbishop Whately's book, *Apostolical Succession Considered*, price 1s. net. Few men have had the gift of clear exposition of a weighty argument to so great an extent as the great logician whose mark upon the contemporaries of Newman was deep. His work is by no means forgotten, but it has suffered some eclipse on account of the readiness of readers to study what is novel and untrue, to the neglect of sound criticism and saving common-sense. In this volume we have one of the most powerful attacks ever made on the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, which was the chief plank of the Tractarian movement. The Archbishop shows the true character of the Christian Church as the organisation for propagating the social religion of its Founder. He proves that Christianity is without Sacrifice, Altar or Temple, and argues rightly that the English Reformers rested the claims of ministers "not on some supposed sacramental virtue, transmitted from hand to hand in unbroken succession from the Apostles in a chain, of which, if any one link be even doubtful, a distressing uncertainty is thrown over all Christian Ordinances, Sacraments, and Church privileges for ever; but on the fact of those ministers being the *regularly appointed officers of a regular Christian community.*" The logic of the Archbishop is irrefutable, his appeal to Scripture cannot be overthrown, and his healthy common sense and fidelity to the Reformation make his book valuable and stimulating. The usefulness of the present edition is considerably enhanced by an appendix, giving quotations from Anglican Divines, including such names as Bishop Gore, Bishop Lightfoot, Bishop Westcott, Canon Bigg, Dr. Sanday, Dr. C. A. Briggs, Professor Gwatkin, Dr. Hort, Dr. Harnack, and others.

At the present time, when the authority and Person of our Blessed Lord are discussed with freedom by many who are officers of the Christian Church, the little book by the late Archdeacon Gifford, is.

The Incarnation. net, entitled *The Incarnation*, should be read and studied. No one should be deterred from studying this little volume of 105 pages by a feeling that because it is scholarly and a classic it is difficult to read and hard to understand. We have no hesitation in saying that by the purity of its English, the lucidity of its style, and the masterly method of presenting its arguments, no person of average intelligence—even if he has not a knowledge of Greek—will be unable to follow the reasoning and see the grounds of the position adopted. The main portion of the book is taken up with a very careful and complete discussion of Philippians ii. 5-11. This passage has frequently been interpreted to admit dangerous views of the relationship between the Divine and the Human in the Person of our Lord. Some of those views have depended upon a partial examination of the passage before us. Here we have a thorough examination, the study of which will help us to a truer appreciation of its meaning. The second part of the book consists of a sermon on Psalm cx. preached before the University of Oxford, and discusses a particular question in reference to Our Lord's knowledge which is of typical importance. It shows that Our Lord did not exhibit either the literary ignorance, or the condescension to the literary ignorance of His opponents, which have been attributed to Him.

A reprint at 1s. net of the late Dean Goulburn's very useful work, *Primitive Church Teaching on the Holy Communion*, has been recently published. A

Primitive Church Teaching. High Churchman, he had a strong realisation of the Church as Reformed and Protestant, and felt it his duty to write and speak plainly on the introduction of practices and doctrines that are medieval and were deliberately rejected by our Reformers. This book was written by him, as he states in his preface, because since the original publication of his book, *The English Office of the Holy Communion*, "two or three practices, which seem to me wrong in principle, and to have a tendency to undermine the true doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, have shot up with an amazing rapidity, and are gaining every day a greater foothold among the members of our Communion," and he felt that readers of his book on the Holy Communion had a right to expect from him some guidance on such subjects as the practices he refers to in it: Fasting [Communion, Non-communicating Attendance, and previous private Confession.

The Rev. Bernard C. Jackson's little manual entitled *The Thirty-nine Articles*, 3d. net, has been described as the best popular boil-down of the Articles that has been issued. It is not wordy nor does it

The Thirty-nine Articles. ever state the obvious as though the reader were in need of the most elementary knowledge, but is a real help to grasping the spirit and meaning of the Articles. In Sunday-schools and young men's classes it will be most useful, as the price enables it to be used by every member of the class, and it is faithful to the formulas which it unpretentiously illustrates. Mr. Jackson's little book is clear and concise, and the teaching which it contains is excellent in every way. For Churchpeople generally who desire to make themselves better acquainted with the Articles nothing could be more suitable.