

# THE CHURCHMAN

June, 1920.

## THE MONTH.

**The late  
Bishop of  
Durham.** IN the death of the deeply revered and greatly beloved Bishop of Durham the Church of England, indeed the whole Christian world, has sustained a grievous loss. His influence was immense, and it was always on the side of right. In these days of difficulty the Church has need of leaders with understanding of the times, and this Bishop Moule had in a marked degree. His strong faith, his unflinching patience, his sound judgment and his finely balanced sense of proportion—these were qualities which gave men confidence in his leadership. Other and higher qualities he also possessed which marked him out as a master in spiritual things, and men of all schools of thought were glad and thankful to sit at his feet. Every one recognised that he was a good man, and the obituary notices in the secular press have laid stress upon his simple and unaffected piety. But what has saddened us in some of these notices is the calm assumption that because he was such a good man he was not a great bishop. We protest with all our strength against the notion that goodness and greatness cannot, or, at any rate, do not as a rule go together. Bishop Moule, we contend, was an outstanding instance to the contrary, and the record of his nearly nineteen years' episcopate substantiates that view. Bishop Moule was a great scholar and a great saint. His writings on the Epistles stand out among the most learned contributions to New Testament literature we have. Yet, as has been more than once pointed out, he never confined himself to mere questions of scholarship; he sought to give the very best reading of the Greek, and then to apply the spiritual message to the life of the reader. Thus his works had a double purpose and a double value; they were careful and

exact in their commentary, and they were helpful and inspiring in their appeal. The papers from his pen on St. John xvii. which the CHURCHMAN was privileged to publish in the latter part of last year—fragmentary though he considered them to be—furnished a noteworthy example of what we mean. The “Great Prayer” was examined with fine minuteness, and then its bearing upon life and conduct was unfolded with a richness of exposition which lent to the papers an inimitable charm. As a commentator and an expositor Bishop Moule had few equals and no superior. But great as was the service he rendered to the Christian Church by his pen, it was the saintlessness of his life that carried the greatest influence.

**The May Meetings.** The day of the May Meetings is clearly not over so long as they can command such large and enthusiastic audiences as those which thronged many halls in the early days of the month. Their success is of good augury for the future. There may be—many people think there undoubtedly are—difficult days ahead for religious societies, but whatever those trials and anxieties may be, they can and will be overcome by the faith and prayer, effort and patience of those who believe that God’s work must be done and that they are called to the doing of it.

**N.C.L. Meeting.** We refer with special pleasure to the Annual Meeting of the National Church League, which drew a goodly number of members and friends to the Church House on Tuesday afternoon, May 11. An excellent report was presented of the work done during the year: the only “fly in the ointment” being that financially the League has still had to carry over too heavy a deficit. It is hoped, however, that a generous response to the Emergency Fund will enable a readjustment of the accounts to be made and leave a substantial balance in hand for developing the work. Never were the activities of the League more needed than they are to-day. The Emergency Fund Appeal is for £10,000, towards which about £3,500 has been received: we hope the balance will speedily be supplied. The meeting was fortunate in its speakers. The President, the Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Clarke, referred to the possibilities open to the National Church Assembly in moulding the character, directing the action and controlling the administration of the Church. Sir W. Joynson-

Hicks, Bart., M.P., who was warmly welcomed on his return from India, pleaded for a steady and increasing flow of annual subscriptions, and finally the Bishop of Manchester made a powerful speech in opposition to any alteration in the Communion Office.

Special interest attached to the speech of the **The York Decision.** Bishop of Manchester as only a few days before he had achieved a remarkable triumph in the full synod of the Northern Province. Both Houses sitting together, to put the final touches to Prayer Book Revision, a proposal was submitted by the Bishop of Knaresborough, seconded by Archdeacon Walsham How, that the motion adopted by the Lower House at the last session with regard to the Order of Holy Communion be accepted. The Bishop of Manchester then moved the following amendment: "That this Synod, whilst desiring to record its appreciation of the labours of the committee on the Order of Holy Communion, resolves not to alter the structure and sequence of the Order of Holy Communion." The Archdeacon of Manchester (the Ven. N. L. Aspinall) seconded the amendment, and, after a short discussion, it was carried by 28 votes to 25, a majority of 3. The very great importance of this decision will readily be recognised. It is difficult to see how the Southern Province can now force the proposed changes on the Church.

On another page will be found a letter from the **The Bishop and his critic.** Rev. J. W. Tyrer in reference to the Bishop of Manchester's Convocation speech. We sent a proof of the letter to the Bishop who has replied as follows:—

DEAR SIR,—Mr. Tyrer, no doubt by an oversight, has not quoted correctly the statement which I made in Convocation. What I said was, "What is proposed for our use is an Invocation of the Holy Spirit as Lord and Giver of Life upon the worshippers and the elements. It is important to note this, because the vaguer forms are often quoted in defence of this particular form. But the fact remains that *this particular form* is admittedly an innovation which cannot be attested earlier than the middle of the fourth century." Mr. Tyrer has brought to my notice other interesting matter to which I hope to give attention; but on account of my engagements I must defer doing so till the autumn. Yours faithfully, E. A. MANCHESTER.

## STATISTICAL POSITION OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

### IN THE SELF-GOVERNING PARTS OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

BY THE REV. T. J. PULVERTAFT, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul at  
Kilburn.

STATISTICS are proverbially misleading. They may be accurately compiled, but the inferences drawn from them may be hopelessly wrong. In the nature of the case, Religious Statistics are compiled differently from those collected by State expert enumerators. Denominational figures depend on the accuracy of men of varied temperaments, on the careful and regular revision of rolls and the method of enumeration. In Great Britain we have no religious census—in Ireland we have. The Church of England tabulates its Easter Communicants—non-Episcopal Churches their members. The Church of Ireland supplies us with no such figures. It is, therefore, difficult in the case of these two sister Churches to arrive at a common basis for determining how far the Communicants bear a relation to definite adherents of the Churches. How much more difficult is it to reach a definite comparative conclusion when Church membership is attested by different methods in the various non-Episcopal Churches? Experience in many countries has led to reckoning two adherents for every member or communicant. We follow that rule in the figures set forth. The authorities on which the Tables are based are *Hazell's Annual*; *Church of England Year Book*; *Year Book of the Churches, U.S.A.* (1916 and 1919); *Irish Census*; *Whitaker's Almanack*; and various denominational statistics. The figures as a whole may be taken, within one per cent. of error, as true to the facts revealed for 1918 in the best sources of information.

#### GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

	Communicants.	Population.	
Church of England . . . . .	2,220,194	6,660,582	Estimate
Episcopal Church of Scotland . . . . .	55,788	167,364	,,
Church of Ireland . . . . .	192,000	576,000	Census.
Anglican Total . . . . .	<u>2,467,982</u>	<u>7,403,946</u>	

# STATISTICAL POSITION OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION 295

	Members.	Population.	
<i>Non-Episcopalians—</i>			
Presbyterian—Great Britain . . . . .	1,548,526	4,645,573	Estimate
Ireland . . . . .	104,033	439,876	Census
	1,652,559	5,085,449	
Methodist—Great Britain . . . . .	845,242	2,535,726	Estimate
Ireland . . . . .	20,602	61,806	Census.
	865,844	2,597,532	
Congregationalist . . . . .	489,616	1,468,848	Estimate
Baptists . . . . .	408,209	1,224,627	"
Minor Denominations . . . . .	30,000	90,000	"
	3,446,228	10,466,456	
Non-Episcopal Total . . . . .	3,446,228	10,466,456	

## CANADA.

	Members Estimate.	Population Census.	
Anglican . . . . .	347,672	1,043,017	
Presbyterian . . . . .	371,774	1,115,324	
Methodist . . . . .	359,964	1,079,892	
Baptist . . . . .	127,555	382,666	
Others . . . . .	112,843	338,531	
	972,136	2,916,413	
Non-Episcopal Total . . . . .	972,136	2,916,413	

## AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND.

	Members Estimate.	Population Census.	
<b>AUSTRALIA—</b>			
Anglican . . . . .	570,144	1,710,433	
Presbyterian . . . . .	186,112	558,336	
Methodist . . . . .	182,602	547,806	
Baptist . . . . .	32,358	97,074	
Congregationalist . . . . .	24,682	74,046	
Others . . . . .	21,804	65,413	
	447,558	1,342,675	
Non-Episcopal Total . . . . .	447,558	1,342,675	
<b>NEW ZEALAND—</b>			
Anglican . . . . .	153,674	461,022	
Presbyterian . . . . .	87,015	261,045	
Methodist . . . . .	35,428	106,284	
	122,443	667,351	
Non-Episcopal Total . . . . .	122,443	667,351	

## SOUTH AFRICA.

	Members Estimate.	Population Census.
Anglican . . . . .	155,393	466,180
Dutch Church . . . . .	294,428	883,280
Methodist . . . . .	83,477	250,431
Presbyterian . . . . .	63,112	189,336
Congregationalist . . . . .	97,883	293,651
Others . . . . .	66,551	199,655
Non-Episcopal Total. . . . .	<u>605,451</u>	<u>1,816,353</u>

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

	Members.	Population Estimated.
Anglican . . . . .	1,092,821	3,278,463
Methodist . . . . .	7,166,451	21,499,353
Baptist . . . . .	7,153,313	21,459,939
Presbyterian . . . . .	2,255,626	6,766,878
Disciples of Christ . . . . .	1,266,028	3,798,084
Congregationalists . . . . .	791,274	2,378,822
Lutheran . . . . .	2,467,516	7,402,548
Other Reformed Churches . . . . .	1,630,271	4,890,189
Non-Episcopal Total. . . . .	<u>22,730,271</u>	<u>68,190,813</u>

## SUMMARY.

*Anglican.*

	Members.	Population.
United Kingdom . . . . .	2,467,982	7,403,946
Canada . . . . .	347,672	1,043,017
Australia and New Zealand . . . . .	723,818	2,171,455
S. Africa . . . . .	155,360	466,180
United States . . . . .	1,092,821	3,278,463
Total Anglican . . . . .	<u>4,787,686</u>	<u>14,363,061</u>

*Non-Episcopal Churches.*

	Members.	Population.
United Kingdom . . . . .	3,446,228	10,466,456
Canada . . . . .	972,136	2,916,413
Australia and New Zealand . . . . .	570,001	1,710,004
S. Africa . . . . .	605,451	1,816,353
United States . . . . .	22,730,271	68,290,813
Total Non-Episcopal . . . . .	<u>28,324,087</u>	<u>85,200,039</u>

MISSION WORLD.

Canon C. H. Robinson in *The Missionary Prospect*, p. 186 (1915), gives the following table:—

1914.	Ordained Missionaries.	Laymen.	Single Women Missionaries.	Total Foreign Missionaries including Wives.	Local Clergy (1912).	Other Local Helpers.	Communicants or baptized.	Other Adherents (1912).
Anglican .	1,184	271	1,465	3,990	858	15,809	722,167	438,508
Protestant	6,190	3,533	4,455	20,352	5,083	97,240	3,196,819	1,367,294

According to Canon Robinson, the Church of Rome has in the Mission Field 6,131 European Priests; 2,792 Local Priests; 2,446 Lay Brothers, and 8,512 Sisters. Ten to fifteen per cent. of these are, however, engaged in ministering to Europeans.

THE CHRISTIAN WORLD.

Authorities differ greatly as to the number of the members of the various Churches, and the following figures as far as Roman Catholics are concerned embrace all living in Roman Catholic countries and baptized in that Church. These statistics must be considered as only approximately true. No attempt is made to distinguish between nominal and real members of the different churches.

Roman Catholic . . . . .	272,860,000
Eastern Orthodox . . . . .	120,300,000
Protestants including Anglicans . . . . .	180,000,000
	<u>572,860,000</u>

THOS. J. PULVERTAFT.



## LAMBETH AND UNITY.

BY THE REV. A. W. GREENUP, D.D.,

Principal of St. John's Hall, Highbury (University of London).

WHEN the question of Christian Unity is raised it is natural for an English Churchman—and particularly for an Evangelical Churchman—to turn first of all to those who share with him the fundamental truths for which the Reformation stands. Till the Roman and the Greek become *reformed* Churches all talk of reunion with them is but idle talk—while reunion with our separated brethren of the Free Churches comes within the sphere of practical Christian politics.

It is, of course, a truism to say that there is a real *spiritual* unity between all disciples who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, whatever name they be called by, and to whatever Church they belong: but no one reading the New Testament can doubt that our Lord's high-priestly prayer that "they all may be *one*" implies the possibility and the ultimate certainty of the organic union of all members of the one Body.

Our present concern is with those represented by the Church of England and our Nonconformist brethren. The Church of Christ, to which both they and we belong, is not merely a society for the edification of its own members, but a militant organization for the overthrow of the strongholds of sin and Satan—it is a mighty army under *one* Leader; and unless its battalion are imbued by *one* spirit, heartened by a common discipline, taking the same "sacramentum" in common fellowship, its warfare must suffer and give occasion to the enemy to blaspheme, as indeed he does. And it is a melancholy fact that the churches themselves are to blame for the present state of affairs. He who does anything in the way of healing these divisions is rendering a service to the whole army and to the supreme Commander.

It is hardly necessary to point out the importance of our subject in its bearing on the question of having in our midst a real Church of England—a national Church, which is one more than in name—of the necessity of the union of Church and State, since those ethical problems, which are the controlling principles of all sound



government, demand that there should be harmony, not discord, between them, and the welfare of the State is comprehended in Christian Ethics. Nor is it necessary to point out at any length the bearing of the question on that of Foreign Missions, since the Church of Christ is a missionary Church, a matter accentuated by the Bishops in the last Lambeth Encyclical in these words :—

“ The winning of the Nations to Christ, in fulfilment of His own great commission to His Church, is a matter of much more general concern to Christian people than ever before, and we realize the imperative *necessity* for effective and *visible* co-operation among the workers. The waste of force in the mission field calls aloud for *unity*.”

It was before Catholic unity was subverted by Papal imperialism that the great conquests of the Church in the Mission Field were made ; and it is a significant fact that no great people has been converted to Christianity since the original unity of the Church was lost.

After dealing with the Mission Field, the Encyclical goes on to say :—

“ Nor is this (unity) less necessary for the effective conduct of the war against the mighty forces of evil in *Christian lands*. With the realization of this need has come a new demand for unity, a penitent acknowledgment of the faults that hinder it, and a quickened eagerness in prayer that, through the mercy of God, it may be attained.”

For the sake of the State, for the propagation of the Gospel in heathen lands, for the battle against evil at home, unity is desirable. Add to all this the situation to-day, when owing to the circumstances in which we are unhappily placed, the idea of unity is taking hold of the minds of men in a way which it has never done before—when men are facing the naked realities of the spiritual life, when first things must of necessity be put first, when new “ values ” are being placed on differentiating factors, and when the study of the *consensus* of Christianity is seen to be of vaster importance than that of the *dissensus*. The War will have a beneficent effect on the whole situation ; and the experience of chaplains of different denominations, who have worked side by side in the face of danger, who in many cases have ministered together at the Lord’s Table, who have come to understand one another and have brushed away all prejudices and misunderstandings—such experiences will create a demand for unity which cannot rest unsatisfied, and which will outweigh the academic discussions of scholars and

the resolutions of episcopal bodies. The War will create a "union of hearts" which is the essential preliminary to ecclesiastical unity; it will create, is already creating, we believe, the *spirit* of unity, without which all efforts at external unity are quite useless; it will forbid us to exalt denominational differentia into principles, and help us to realize the spirit of fraternity and the profounder agreement of Christian brethren. The battlefields of Europe will be mightier factors in facilitating Christian union than the council chambers of Lambeth.

Successive Lambeth Conferences have given to the question of Reunion an importance which otherwise it could not have attained. But the idea was not initiated by them. There is a whole history, creditable both to the Church of England and to Nonconformists, lying far back up to the time subsequent to the rise of Dissent. But to come to recent years. The Lower House of Convocation in 1861 passed a resolution urging the Bishops to commend the matter to the consideration of all Churchmen; and in 1870 a committee was appointed to consult on the subject with the chief Nonconformist bodies. What was done—if anything—I do not know; but the leading organs of Nonconformity at the time, and particularly those of the Wesleyan body, gave considerable attention to the matter. And shortly before 1870 the Home Reunion Society, of which Earl Nelson was the leading spirit, was formed with the object "of presenting the Church of England in a *conciliatory attitude* towards those who regard themselves as outside her pale, so as to lead towards the corporate reunion of all Christians holding the doctrines of the ever-blessed Trinity and the Incarnation and Atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ." These words, taken from the official paper of the Society, are noteworthy, and seem to me to point the path to unity—the basis to be doctrinal, not ecclesiastical. The Chicago Convention in 1886 formulated articles of reunion, which were adopted by the Lambeth Conference of 1888 and became known generally as the Lambeth Quadrilateral. These articles are:—

- (1) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the revealed Word of God;
- (2) The Apostles' Creed as the baptismal symbol, and the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith;
- (3) The two Sacraments—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord

—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him ;

- (4) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church.

These resolutions were re-affirmed by subsequent Lambeth Conferences ; and the cutest comment on them that I have read was one delivered at the Pan-Anglican Congress of 1908 by Mr. Silas McBee, an American. His criticism is of such importance that I venture to quote what forms its salient feature :—

“ The Quadrilateral sets forth the *results* of unity as the conditions of unity. It separated essential facts and principles from the life that produced them. The four essentials of that declaration grew historically out of the *oneness* of Christ's body. It is inconceivable that they could have produced it. It is a ruinous error to confuse the possessions and instruments of the Church with the Church itself as the Living Body of Christ. . . . The idea of monarchical rule is taken over from human dynasties. It is not inherent in the Church, but is antagonistic to it. The Kingdom of Christ is a universal democracy. Its King is among His people as One who serves. The exercise of autocratic authority destroyed unity. The recovery of representative authority can alone restore it.”

Now, despite this able and, to my mind, just criticism, the Lambeth resolutions have their value as at any rate offering a basis for the discussion of the whole question. The first three articles would probably be accepted by all orthodox Nonconformists, and I do not propose to deal with them. It is only the fourth—relating to Church government—which is the subject of any controversy.

When the articles were first published in 1886 the editor of *The Presbyterian Review* wrote : “ The four terms set forth as essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom are, in my judgment, entirely satisfactory, *provided* nothing more is meant by their authors than their language expressly conveys. There is room for some differences of interpretation ; but these terms ought to be received in the same generous manner in which they are offered, in the hope that the differences will be removed by conference and discussion.”

What is meant by the “ Historic Episcopate ” ? Various opinions are held, represented say by Gore for the extreme High Church party, Gwatkin and Lightfoot for the Evangelicals, Hatch for the Broad Church. *The Lambeth Conference of 1888 left the matter open.* “ Nothing is said here,” as one of the American

Bishops reminded us, "of episcopacy as of divine institution or necessity, nothing of Apostolic Succession, nothing of a scriptural origin or a doctrinal nature in the institution. It is expressly proposed here only in its historical character, and as locally adapted to the varying needs of God's people. All else, unless it be its scripturalness, is matter of opinion, to which this Church has never formally committed herself. Her position here is the same broad and generous one taken in the preface to her Ordinal. The phrase 'historic episcopate' was deliberately chosen as declaring, not a doctrine, but a fact, and as being general enough to include all variants."

Alas! what the good Bishop wrote in 1889 he could not have written in 1909, for the Lambeth Encyclical and Report of the Committee of 1908 make it clear that by "Historic Episcopate" the majority of the Bishops mean the theory—I won't call it doctrine—of Apostolic Succession, and all that it connotes. Indeed, one of them, in a paper read so lately as January, 1917, at the Birmingham Ministers' Conference, speaks of "those securities for unity which the Church of England has maintained in the Historic Episcopate and the Apostolic Succession." The fact is, as can be seen from the Report, what the Bishops desiderate is a narrow sectarian view which was unknown in pre-Tractarian days. They speak of full union on the basis of Episcopal ordination; and the seventy-fifth resolution insists on the historic episcopate as a distinguishing mark of "the Church of Christ as He would have it." But such a narrow theory is not upheld, indeed is disallowed, by the Thirty-nine Articles. The only Article referring to the principles on which the Church of England ministry rests is the twenty-third, which reads:—

"It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard."

Not a word is said here about episcopacy; and, as the Article is based on a Lutheran formula, it is significant for the view taken by our Reformers of Churches lacking in episcopal government; and it is amusing to see how Bishop Gibson gets over the whole difficulty by saying that the omission in the Article is made up elsewhere, and so it was not considered necessary to introduce a

more formal mention of the episcopate here ; and by urging us to remember that the Articles were not designed to be a complete system of Theology. We agree to *that*, and, nevertheless, beg to maintain that they were not meant to place the theory of Apostolic Succession amongst the things to be included in the theology of the English Church. Bishop Gibson refers us to the Preface to the Ordinal, and we have no objection to his reference, for there we have a ministry which satisfies the Article. "It ought to be perfectly clear," says Canon Simpson (*C.Q.R.* 3, 361), "that nothing in this statement (of the Preface) either modifies, or is intended to modify, the silence of the article with regard to non-episcopal ministries. When a principle is stated which applies to the Church Universal there is advisedly no reference to bishops. The formularies cannot be interpreted as 'defacing foreign churches.' Moreover, the moderation of the historical statement must not be forgotten. It is simply maintained that this form of ministry, universal at the beginning of the Reformation, has been in the Church from Apostolic times. It is *not* said that it was universal in the primitive Church, still less that it obtained an exclusive privilege from the Apostles themselves. That the English Reformers probably were not contemplating cases of non-episcopal ministers of national churches who might seek office in the Church of England, is proved by the fact that Archbishop Grindal thought he was within the law in admitting Scottish ministers to English benefices, when he had been granted a certificate that they had been ordained according to the custom of their own communion." This has been impossible since 1662 owing to the clause then inserted, "hath had formerly episcopal consecration, or ordination."

The reason for the "exclusion" clause is obscure ; but there is good cause for thinking, with Dean Goode, that it had reference to irregularities during the time of the Commonwealth ; and there is ample evidence that leading English Divines looked upon the clause as one inserted for reasons of expediency only ; and amongst testimonies going to show this I may select out of Goode's examples the letter written in 1719 by Archbishop Wake to the congregations of Geneva, in which he says :—

"The Reformed Churches, though differing in some points from our English Church, I willingly embrace. I could have wished, indeed, that the episcopal form of government had been retained by all of them. Mean-

while, far be it from me that I should be so iron-hearted as to believe that, on account of such a defect . . . any of them ought to be cut off from our Communion, or with certain mad writers among us to declare that they have no true and valid sacraments, and thus are scarcely Christians."

After quoting other testimonies the Dean says: "From these it is quite clear that the original doctrine of the Church of England, the principles on which our Church was founded, and the opinion of nine-tenths of her great divines, are all in favour of the cultivation of brotherly communion between that Church and the foreign Protestant non-Episcopal Churches."

Not only is the Lambeth view not that of our Articles, but it is not that (as Dean Goode says) of representative men of the English Church. Hooker did not hold it. In the Seventh Book of the Polity he says:—

"Where the Church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath, nor can have, possibly a bishop to ordain; in case of such necessity, the ordinary institution of God hath given oftentimes and may give place. And therefore we are not simply without exception to urge a lineal descent of power from the apostles by continued succession of bishops in every effectual ordination."

Andrewes expressly disclaimed the Lambeth attitude, and Spottiswoode of Glasgow, referring to the events of 1610, when the Church of England definitely committed itself to the recognition of the validity of Presbyterian Orders, says:—

"A question was moved by Dr. Andrewes, Bishop of Ely, touching the consecration of the Scottish Bishops, who, as he said, 'must first be ordained presbyters, as having received no ordination from a bishop.' Archbishop Bancroft maintained, 'that thereof was no necessity, seeing where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by the presbyters must be esteemed lawful. . . .' This applauded to by the other bishops, Ely acquiesced, and at the day and place appointed the three Scottish bishops were consecrated."

Enough has been said, I think, to show that any refusal to recognize non-Episcopalian Churches is not a doctrine of the Church of England. But I will just mention one other matter. The "exclusion" clause must be read in the light of the Caroline Act of Uniformity, since in that Act there are recognized the orders of non-episcopal churches, by providing "that the penalties in this Act shall not extend to foreigners or aliens of the foreign reformed churches allowed or to be allowed by the King's majesty, his heirs and successors in England." As Dr. Henson says, "This provision clearly disallows the interpretation which is now often placed on the Preface to the Ordinal, as if it were not only, what it certainly

is, a statement of the Anglican rule, but also a declaration of an 'essential principle' as to valid ordinations."

With the Lambeth Encyclical before them, I cannot see how any of the Nonconformist bodies can with any respect to themselves negotiate for union with the Church of England. Had Lambeth in 1908 simply affirmed the principles laid down in 1888, and been content to leave them as they stood, the case might have been different. We can only hope for better things at the next Lambeth Conference.

Now the impression produced by the Encyclical is deepened when we consider what has happened in the case of the Moravian Church, that glorious little missionary Church on whose labours the sun never sets. The Anglican proposals were brought before the General Synod of that Church in 1909 by Bishop Hassé, and were met in a most sympathetic manner. Through the kindness of a Moravian Bishop I have seen the official correspondence which passed between the Synod and Lambeth. The third resolution of the Synod ran:—

"We hold that inter-communion with the Anglican Church must rest on the same mutual recognition and freedom to co-operate as now exists between us and several churches, episcopal and other, in Europe and America; and, corporate union not being in question, we regard our position as that of an independent branch of the Church Catholic, 'an ancient Protestant Episcopal Church,' as described in the Act of Parliament," etc.

The Archbishop of Canterbury invited a Pan-Anglican committee to consider Moravian Orders, with the result that, although that Church claims a true episcopal succession, that Archbishop Potter allowed it in 1737, and it was recognized by Parliament in 1749, this Committee held the succession to be "not proven." Can anything show more clearly that by "historic episcopate" the Lambeth Fathers mean "Apostolic Succession"? Dr. Henson was right when, preaching at Westminster, he said: "Something will have been gained if we cease to look to Conferences of Bishops for the solution of this problem. The ultimate solution must come from the rank and file of the churches, not from the official leaders."

It is on this last sentence I fasten. How can we, the rank and file, contribute to the ultimate solution? Lambeth gives some suggestions.

(1) I quote from one of the Committee's paragraphs: "few things tend more *directly* to godly union and concord than co-

operation between members of different communions in all matters pertaining to the social and moral welfare of the people." This suggestion, good as it is, is open to some criticism. It is like putting the cart before the horse. We are not likely to unite in Christian fellowship through social service, a duty incumbent on every one as a citizen, be he Jew, Turk, Infidel or Christian. Discipleship is the way to Christian fellowship and unity, not social service.

(2) "Take pains to study the doctrines and appreciate the position of those who are separated from us." This is rather a large order for any than a professed scholar. But something can be done by the ordinary man. *Curtis' Bampton Lectures* on "Church and Dissent" will make a good beginning, though it is a book to be read with caution. His delineation of the truths for which each denomination stands is worth thoughtful study; and he suggests that each of these truths can be secured within our Church—the Independents contending for the purity of the Church in its external relations, the Baptists in its internal relations, the Quakers for its spirituality, the Wesleyans for the development of feeling in religion; and so on. Each has emphasized some one important aspect of Christian truth, and the Lambeth Committee "would commend to the Church an ideal of reunion which should include all the elements of divine truth now emphasized by separated bodies; in a word, the path of efforts towards reunion should be not compromise for the sake of peace, but comprehension for the sake of truth, and the goal not uniformity, but unity."

(3) "We must avoid in speech and act anything savouring of intolerance or arrogance." Sad that such a warning is necessary to those who profess and call themselves Christians! I transcribe, without comment, a letter from a leading Nonconformist divine in the *Westminster Gazette* when a correspondence on the interchange of pulpits was taking place:—

"Some months back a squireess of a Lincolnshire village, meeting me in the train, did me the honour of mistaking me for a member of the English Church, and said, 'I always think that I can tell a Dissenter. They are so different from you and me. There is something about them so underbred, isn't there?' She was quite the nicest old lady I had met for a long time, and she was only repeating a postulate of her caste, clerical and lay. Hence her significance."

(4) A last suggestion is made in these words: "the Committee venture to suggest that the constituted authorities of the several



churches of the Anglican Communion should . . . arrange conferences with representatives of different Christian bodies, and meetings for united acknowledgment of the sins of division, and intercession for the growth of unity." Nothing has come of this—and one could hardly expect it in view of the Lambeth interpretation of "historic episcopate." You don't enter into brotherly conference when your brother wants to swallow you up! "If it be laid down," said the Moderator of the Church of Scotland, "that one system is exclusively divine, the only one acceptable to the great Head of the Church—to such assumption, in the name of God's truth, of past history, and of Christian liberty, we can give place, no, not for an hour. Else we should barter our Christian freedom for sacerdotal bondage."

We might, however, take a hint from the Committee's suggestion, and local conferences of Churchmen and Nonconformists should be encouraged for the purposes of study and prayer. The more we can see of one another; the more we can realize each other's difficulties; the more we study and pray together, the better are we preparing ourselves for the coming unity.

All that Lambeth suggests falls far short of any real inter-communion; and nothing but the unscriptural, un-Anglican theory of Apostolic Succession prevented them going further and suggesting the old pre-Tractarian practice of occasional conformity on the part of Nonconformists in their admission to the Lord's Table in our Parish Churches. The rubric in the Confirmation Office is no bar (for reasons I cannot go into now) to this; and every baptized Englishman has a right to the ministrations of the National Church—any clergyman repelling such, unless he be a "notorious and evil liver," does so at his own peril. But there should be no talk of repelling—there should be welcome—and on special occasions the example of the Bishop of Hereford should be followed: there should be a hearty invitation. "There are many," says Mr. Wilson in his excellent book, *Episcopacy and Unity*, "who insist that before Dissenters can be admitted to the sacraments they must sever themselves from their old spiritual home and practically repudiate their previous religious history. Such an attitude is unchristian, unhistorical and unscriptural, and will raise an effective barrier to all hope of that better understanding which is an essential antecedent to Christian reunion."

A. W. GREENUP.

## SOME LATTER-DAY HERESIES.

## III. CHRISTADELPHIANISM.

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

**D**URING the war this sect came into some prominence through the efforts of all its male members to escape military duty. Every Christadelphian is essentially a conscientious objector. No liberty of thought or action in this matter is allowed. Any "brother" joining the Army, Navy, or Police Force, is at once, *ipso facto*, disfellowshipped, or "withdrawn from" as an evildoer. There are no exceptions, and no extenuating circumstances are allowed. The few patriots who did respond to their country's call are only being received back into fellowship if they publicly confess their grievous sin, and solemnly promise that under no conditions will they ever again re-enlist, but will rather suffer even unto death.

Men who are willing to endure ridicule, imprisonment and punishment for conscientious reasons, are an asset to a nation. We may denounce their action as absurd, unpatriotic, narrow-minded, pharisaic or suicidal, but it is impossible not to admire the true martyr spirit. Unfortunately, there are hypocrites and cowards who make use of "conscience" in order to shirk danger, or unpleasant duties, but such are despised by all true men. The evil in the Christadelphian attitude is that the body legislates for and exercises lordship over its members' consciences, giving them no choice, and even forbidding them to do anything to alleviate the sufferings and agonies of war by joining the R.A.M.C., Red Cross, or A.S.C., though permitting them to increase those agonies and horrors by working on munitions.

Before dealing with this apparent inconsistency, and explaining their strange and unique views on war and other subjects, it might be well to mention briefly a few noteworthy characteristics of this cult. The Christadelphian is well-known as a lover of the Word of God. Every year he is expected to read through the whole Bible. Scripture is the only authority they profess to recognize. No one can read their books or pamphlets without being impressed by the number of texts which are quoted; neither can any one

converse with any members without realizing how well acquainted they are with, at least, parts of the Word of God. They study and know the verses that support, or seem to support, or can be made to support, their peculiar theories. Would that all Church-people were as diligent in the reading of the Word!

They are strong Sacramentarians. Baptism by immersion is regarded as essential to salvation. Every Sunday, usually in the morning, they meet for the "Breaking of Bread." Regular attendance at this service is a condition of fellowship. No "alien" is allowed to take part. The public service is at night, when efforts are made to capture the "stranger." They have no paid ministry, nor any "laying on of hands."

They are strict disciplinarians. Rigid control is exercised over the actions and faith of all members. There is neither liberty of thought nor freedom of conscience permitted concerning what they have judged to be the essentials of the Christian Faith and practice. Their founder, Dr. Thomas, was continually changing his opinions. When accused of this he rightly replied, "Must a man never progress? If he discovers an error in his premises, must he ever hold to it for the sake of consistency? May such a calamity never befall me! Rather let me change every day, till I get right at last."<sup>1</sup> But no such liberty or change is allowed to any member without sacrificing fellowship, and thereby endangering his hope of eternal life. The Birmingham Ecclesia's Constitution contains thirty-eight articles dealing with the working of the Ecclesia, to which all must agree who wish to join. This is followed by thirty-one articles of Faith which must be believed by all members; after this, there are thirty-five doctrines which must be rejected, and then come fifty-three "Commandments of Christ" which must be implicitly obeyed. Altogether, there are 157 separate articles. Surely this is binding men with burdens grievous to be borne, and putting their necks into a galling yoke. Many of the people who subscribe to this extensive and exclusive creed are unquestionably sincere, and are endeavouring to walk in what they firmly believe to be the truth. They try to live consistent Christian lives. For whatever is good and Christlike we are devoutly thankful, but the tendency of this limitation is to make the members narrow, exclusive, suspicious and even deceitful. The best Christadelphians feel this keenly and

<sup>1</sup> *Life and Work of Dr. Thomas*, p. 245.

chafe under it. One such said to the writer a few weeks ago: "This exclusiveness is a constant grief to me." There are few Englishmen, however, who will so sacrifice their God-given liberty and variety of thought, as to allow their intelligence to be stunted by such bondage, and to be "cabined, cribbed and confined" for the rest of their lives.

To return to their strange attitude to war. How do they justify their conduct? As conscientious objectors, they lay stress on the same texts which have led the Society of Friends to take up a similar position. But they affirm that these words only apply to God's own people, and have no reference to the nations of the world, or even to Christendom. Christadelphians believe it is God's will that the world-powers shall fight and destroy one another. They assert that "peace is to be deprecated as a calamity by the faithful . . . War is not displeasing to God. It is a divine institution for the punishment of the transgressors of His law; and a most beneficent one too."<sup>1</sup> War will "thin down (the world's) overstocked and corrupt population; it will relieve the atmosphere of fœtid and oppressive elements."<sup>2</sup> The Christadelphian is opposed to all "Peace Societies" or "League of Nations." "These peace-criers are the enemies of God." Such organizations are of the world, and "eternal war" is to be preferred to them. What a contrast this is to our Lord's attitude: "Blessed are the peace-makers for they shall be called sons of God." The founder of Christadelphianism (Dr. Thomas) went to a meeting in London (in 1849) called for the purpose of adopting a petition to Parliament in favour of Mr. Cobden's motion for special treaties of arbitration, instead of the brutalities of war in the settlement of national disputes. A crowd of about 2,000 men had assembled to support the petition. Dr. Thomas moved a long amendment praising war as "a divine institution," but it was hopelessly lost. The audience became turbulent, and the doctor described them as "a mere mob of swine."<sup>3</sup>

The Christadelphian, therefore, heartily supports war, and by making munitions he not only earns big wages, but helps to fulfil the purposes of God. As a Bible Christian, he argues, he must not "take the sword," because that is forbidden, but he is at perfect

<sup>1</sup> *Elpis Israel* (Dr. Thomas), p. 111 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Christendom Astray* (R. Roberts), p. 359.

<sup>3</sup> *Life and Work of Dr. Thomas*, p. 277.

liberty to make swords, as that is nowhere forbidden in Scripture. When our Lord returns, the embargo will be removed, and the Christadelphian expects to take a prominent part in the terrific slaughter and bloodshed which he believes will follow the second Advent. Those of his faith who are dead will be resurrected, or rather re-created, and given bloodless immortal bodies of flesh and bones. Those who are alive will be immortalized after the same fashion. Christ and His saints (i.e., Christadelphians) will then begin a terrible work of vengeance and destruction. "The saints will be associated with the Lord Jesus in destroying the political, ecclesiastical and social systems, which aggregately constitute 'this present evil world.' This is a work of devastation for which the mere religious sentimentalists of the age would be unfit. (It needs conscientious objectors.) It will involve much destruction of life, after the wholesome example of the flood. . . . Widespread will be the desolation produced; bloody and scathing the judgments ministered at the hands of Jesus and the saints."<sup>1</sup> For forty years this "great slaughter over all the earth" will continue. When it is finished the existing order of things will have been completely abolished, and those left alive will have learnt righteousness, and will have been subdued to the sceptre of Shiloh. Then the Prince of Peace and His saints will reign for 1,000 years, and "rule the earth with a rod of iron." At the end of the millennium there is to be a great revolt of the nations which will only "be suppressed by a summary outburst of judgment; after which will occur a resurrection and judgment of those who had died during the thousand years, and a judging of those who are alive at the end of the period; resulting in the immortalization of the approved, and the consignment of the rejected to destruction. None will then remain but a generation of righteous, redeemed, immortal persons, who shall *inhabit the earth for ever*. Christ's work will be finished, and the Father will reveal Himself without mediation."<sup>2</sup> "This is the Hope of Israel which is set before men in the Gospel, and for which Paul was bound in a chain. It is a very different one to that exhibited in pulpit-theology: yet it is that which must be embraced as the soul's anchorage, if a man would be saved, and inherit the Kingdom of God."<sup>3</sup> What a travesty all this is of the true Gospel!

<sup>1</sup> *Christendom Astray*, p. 314 f.

<sup>2</sup> *A Declaration*, etc., § xviii:

<sup>3</sup> *Elpis Israel*, p. 454.

How repellent to any noble-souled, tender-hearted man or woman ! If the world is only to be won at the point of the sword (or the muzzle of a gun) then Might is Right ; Christianity, as revealed in the Gospels, is a hopeless failure, and the devil and his principles have triumphed, for it is only by adopting his methods that the kingdoms of this world and the glory of them are to become the kingdom of the Son of man. (See Matt. iv. 8.)

To enter upon a detailed examination of the scriptural passages, mainly from Daniel, Ezekiel, Zechariah and the Apocalypse, from which they construct their theories, is impossible in this article. A study of their writings, however, reveals that they take verses from their context, distort others, ignore others, often literalize what is evidently metaphorical, allegorical or spiritual, and evolve from their imagination whatever is lacking to complete the structure. In this way they have misled many earnest but semi-educated Christian people.

#### THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

Part of the "Gospel" includes predictions as to the future of our Empire. Amongst much detail we have the following particulars. The navy is to be destroyed in the Mediterranean by a violent tempest, and England abased. "The British Lion is a proud and lofty beast. . . . Proud persons, proud nations, and proud governments are equally objects of God's detestation."<sup>1</sup> The king and the royal family are to be deposed and ejected from their possessions. "When the saints have made captive of the royal family of Britain, and their nobles and dependants, they will ask no favours, but take all they possess as the spoil of the victors."<sup>2</sup> "There will be no alternative before the royal family, bishops, nobles, legislators, administrators of the law, official subordinates, ecclesiastics of all sects, and soldiery of the British Empire, but unconditional surrender of place, power, property, and allegiance, or *death*."<sup>3</sup> "The clergy of the Gentiles will not retain even a shadow of an existence: they would be only 'cumberers of the ground.'"<sup>4</sup> "The kingdom of God made known in the Scriptures is a kingdom localized by the promises of God in Palestine, and destined to rule over all the earth. The clergy and their flocks have no part in

<sup>1</sup> *The Destiny of the British Empire* (Dr. Thomas, revised by C.C.W.), p. 24.

<sup>2</sup> P. 41.

<sup>3</sup> P. 42.

<sup>4</sup> P. 44.

this kingdom.”<sup>1</sup> “The aristocracy of Britain, with all their official retainers in church and state, will be ejected from place and power, and all their glory, honour, and emolument will be taken from them and bestowed upon the personal friends of Jesus”<sup>2</sup> (viz., Christadelphians). “The saints are to *take* the kingdom by force, and to leave none of the greatness for any but themselves.”<sup>2</sup> Our king and rulers will be conveyed in fetters and chains by “the saints” to Jerusalem, to receive the judgment there to be pronounced on all the kings of the earth.<sup>3</sup> The land having been subdued, all rebels destroyed, and the “saints” given all authority and power, the millennium of peace and prosperity will commence.

#### THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING MAN.

The Christadelphian asserts that “Man is a creature of dust formation, whose individuality and faculties are the attributes of his bodily *organization*. That man is mortal (that is, subject to death, or *dissolution of being*) in consequence of the disobedience of Adam. . . . That in the death state, a man is as utterly unconscious as if he had never existed. Corruption will destroy his dead body, and he will pass away like a dream.” (Declaration § XXIV.) He goes “into a state of nothingness.” When our Lord returns, some will be resurrected (or rather re-created, since all trace of them will have perished), a few to receive immortality, as stated above, but the others to be judged, punished, and finally annihilated. All children, heathen and the insane, perish for ever at death. None but those who believe the Christadelphian Creed, and have been immersed in that faith, have any hope of “resurrection unto life.” Hence, since they never baptize a child under fourteen years of age, they have no hope of ever seeing again any of their own little ones who have died. What a terrible and cruel belief for bereaved parents to hold! They have no comfort to give to any outside their fold in sorrow. A few months ago one of the teachers in Birmingham lost her husband. She was of a kind, sensitive and gentle nature, and felt the blow keenly. A fellow-teacher said to a Christadelphian, “Why don’t you speak to her, and tell her what you believe?” The answer was a pathetic cry, “Oh, I daren’t! It would be cruel.” What a sad, comfortless religion!

<sup>1</sup> P. 44.

<sup>2</sup> P. 40.

<sup>3</sup> P. 47.

All the vast multitudes of China, India, Africa, Russia, France, Italy, Belgium, etc., are to perish for ever. They are to be "cast as rubbish to the void." The Christadelphians have not a single missionary amongst them, and have no desire to send one. And not being a missionary Church, they are essentially a very small community.<sup>1</sup>

In order to maintain their view concerning the nature and future of man, they ignore or explain away the clear teaching of the New Testament and construct their faith mainly upon verses to be found in Job, Ecclesiastes and a few Psalms. Their great texts are "The dead know not anything"; "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest" (Eccles. ix. 5, 10). "In death there is no remembrance of Thee" (Ps. vi. 5). (Man's) "breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish" (Ps. cxlvi. 4). These passages are regarded as fundamental, and whatever else occurs must be made to harmonize with them. The immortality of the soul is a "damnable doctrine," "sheer paganism," and none who believe it can be saved.

Last August, the writer of this article gave an address to over 500 Christadelphians on this subject. This address has been published under the title of *Man and his Destiny*,<sup>2</sup> and those who desire to see the position examined in more detail are referred to that pamphlet. In it is pointed out that there is no New Testament support for their contentions as to their doctrine concerning man; that *not one* of the passages in the Old Testament, upon which they build their faith, is ever quoted by our Lord or His apostles, and that even the Old Testament does not really teach their doctrines. It is also affirmed that they dare not take the passage from Ecclesiastes literally, because the verse continues, "Neither *have they any more a reward*, for the memory of them is forgotten: as well their love as their hatred and their envy is now perished, neither have they any more a portion FOR EVER in anything that is done under the sun." This cuts at the root of all the Christadelphian holds dear, for his only hope for the future is that he shall

<sup>1</sup> No statistics are published, but they claim to number between 5,000 and 10,000, all in English-speaking countries. Birmingham is their headquarters, from which nearly all their literature is issued.

<sup>2</sup> C. J. Thynne, Whitefriars Street, E.C.4. Post free, 5d. The pamphlet also contains a short history of the sect.



have a "reward," which shall be a goodly "portion" *on this earth*. One of their leaders has replied: "As to Ecclesiastes ix. 5, 6, it is perfectly true of the majority. The exceptions prove the rule."<sup>1</sup> But if only true of the majority, it is not true of all, and hence, "The dead know not anything" cannot be quoted by them as though it referred to all, unless they are prepared to "handle the word of God deceitfully." They are on the horns of a dilemma.

Some illustrations ought to be given of their treatment of the New Testament evidence for continuity of existence. The great passage, Luke xvi. 19 to end, is regarded as deliberate delusion on our Lord's part. He was blinding the Pharisees by one of their own fables. The words to the penitent thief, "Verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise," are altered by placing the comma after "to-day." The passage is then made to refer to the distant future when Christ comes into His kingdom. St. Stephen's prayer, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," is denuded of all its significance. The word "spirit" is said to be synonymous with "breath," which man possesses in common with the animals. This "breath" Stephen hoped to get back at the resurrection. (How comforting to a martyr!) St. Paul's words, "depart and be with Christ" (Phil. i. 23) are wrested by making "depart" mean "return," or a space of about 2,000 years is put between the two clauses. As to the Transfiguration, we are to believe that Moses was specially raised from the dead for that event. In all these and similar passages any interpretation is to be accepted rather than the simple, natural and obvious one. They dare not take these verses as they stand. Yet the Christadelphian boasts that he accepts the word of God as his only guide, and that he believes it to be verbally inspired and "consequently without error in all parts." In fact, it is his copious quotation of Scripture which frequently proves an attraction—and pitfall—to the simple-minded believer. There are practically no really educated men amongst their supporters.

#### THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING OUR LORD.

As in most of their other articles of faith, so in their Christology do they differ absolutely from all other branches of the Christian Church. They are neither Trinitarians nor Unitarians. They believe in the Virgin birth, but they do not believe in our Lord's pre-existence.

<sup>1</sup> *The Christadelphian*, April, 1920, p. 149.

They assert that He was born with a *sinful* body exactly similar to that of other men. "God made Him to be sin for us" is taken as referring to the Incarnation. Being thus sinful by nature, He was able "to condemn sin in the flesh." "His body was as unclean as the bodies of those for whom He died. The nature of Mary was as unclean as that of other women . . . and not one can bring a clean body out of a defiled body. . . . Upon this principle he that is born of sinful flesh is a sinner; as he that is born of English parents is an English child."<sup>1</sup> Hence, when our Lord died for sinners, even though He Himself had been perfectly obedient (and they believe this), *He died for His own benefit*, as well as for the sake of others. His sacrifice was necessary for Himself and He profited by it. This unorthodox view of our Lord's person and work is a constant source of trouble to the members of this sect. At the present time, some of the small Ecclesias in Australia are being rent in twain by the doctrine, and there is danger of a split, even if one has not already taken place. The words of the angel Gabriel to the Blessed Virgin are important in contradicting the above blasphemy. "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; wherefore *that which is to be born of THEE* shall be called holy, the Son of God" (St. Luke i. 35). The Christadelphian teaches the abhorrent doctrine that "that which was born of her" was "unclean, sinful, sin." (See also Heb. x. 5, "*A body didst Thou prepare for me.*")

Our Lord's miracles were wrought, not by any inherent power in Himself, but solely by the Father Who made use of Him for His own purposes. It was God who specially kept Him from sinning, whilst possessing a sinful nature. "As to how the Father could be manifest in a man with an independent volition, we need not trouble ourselves."<sup>2</sup> "We must simply believe . . . (even) if our understanding be baffled."<sup>3</sup> In this way is the insuperable difficulty of their position evaded. When our Lord died on the Cross, He was for the time being extinguished, and in "a state of nothingness," until the Father raised Him from the dead. Then He was given an immortal body of flesh and bones similar to the Father's own body, and He now is at the centre of the Universe where the Father dwells corporeally in light unapproachable.

<sup>1</sup> *Elpis Israel*, p. 128.

<sup>2</sup> *The Blood of Christ* (Roberts), p. 24 f.

<sup>3</sup> P. 25.

## THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The Holy Spirit is not a Person, but "the radiant, invisible power or energy of the Father, filling universal space and forming the medium of His omniscient perceptions and the instrument of His omnipotent behests, whether in creation or inspiration."<sup>1</sup> But what exactly does this mean? The "Father is a tangible person," and the spirit is something which can be traced "in the laboratory of the experimental chemist." In fact, it is that "subtle, unanalysable, incomprehensible principle, which, though inscrutable in its essence, is found to be at the basis of all phenomena of nature—ELECTRICITY."<sup>2</sup> When God works consciously through this agent then it becomes Holy Spirit. This He did in apostolic days, but "there is no manifestation of the Spirit in these days. . . . The present days are barren days, as regards the Spirit's direct operations."<sup>3</sup> The electricity is not now being used for the accomplishment of the divine revelation. *What a creed!*

The Christadelphian faith is, therefore, not one to be desired, or which brings joy to the heart. Several of their writers have admitted that it was no pleasure to them to discover the "truth," nor would they ever have accepted it had they not been convinced it was in accordance with the Word of God. Their whole hope is centred upon an eternity of good things on this earth, attained after heart-rending destruction. God is a great autocrat, and at present is an unspeakable number of millions of miles away from them; Jesus Christ is at His right hand; the Holy Spirit is not a person, a friend, but mere power—electricity. There is no fellowship with the departed, because they are for the present blotted out, and as though they had never been. There is no hope for all the noble, God-fearing, unselfish men and women who are now devoting their lives and substance to the service of their fellow-men, unless they believe and are baptized in the Christadelphian faith. All our splendid men who fought and died to save Europe from the horrors that threatened are now so much refuse. All children, of whom Christ said, "It is not the will of your Father that one of these little ones should perish"—all these at death are of no more value than rabbits or vermin. Such is part of the awful creed that the

<sup>1</sup> *A Declaration*, p. 20.

<sup>2</sup> *Christendom Astray*, p. 123

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 128.

advocates of this sect ask men and women to believe. No wonder they are few in numbers, in spite of great efforts for over seventy years ; no wonder they are constantly losing members ; no wonder there are innumerable splits ;<sup>1</sup> no wonder they are narrow, bigotted, assertive, unattractive, soulless, unless they (as some do) rise above the confines of their profession, and breathe the purer and freer air of the breadth and length, and depth and height, of the love of God. From such a "latter day heresy" may our people be delivered !

F. MELLOWS.

<sup>1</sup> In Birmingham, there are three bodies which have no fellowship one with another, in addition to some who now meet alone with their own family for the "Breaking of Bread."



## MEMORIES OF CANON CHRISTOPHER.

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

(Continued from THE CHURCHMAN of May, p. 258.)

### III. INDIA, 1844-1848

MR. and Mrs. Christopher sailed from Spithead on August 2, 1844, and after a three months' voyage reached Calcutta. By the same boat, Mr. Christopher's younger brother, Lieutenant Leonard Raisbeck Christopher, returned after sick leave to India, where he subsequently did good service during the war of the Mutiny in 1857. As Colonel Christopher, the Chief Commissariat officer at Cawnpore, he was responsible for the food supply of Lord Clyde's army at the time of the relief of the residency and the occupation of Lucknow. It was a saying at the time that "you could walk from Cawnpore to Lucknow on Christopher's carts." He received the thanks of the Government for his services, and later became a Major-General. Another passenger on this boat was Henry Brougham Loch, a Cavalry Cadet, who was afterwards Lord Loch and Governor of Cape Colony. In after years Lord Loch was Governor of the Isle of Man, and there Mr. Christopher resumed acquaintance with him.

At this point it is necessary to understand something of the Institution to which Mr. Christopher had been appointed. Claude

Martin, the founder of three great schools at Calcutta, Lucknow, and Lyons, each called after his name "La Martinière," was a Frenchman born at Lyons in 1735, a Roman Catholic by birth and profession. He arrived in South India as a private in the French Army, but after some time, he joined the English Army, and rose to the rank of Major-General. Retiring from the service, he became a successful money-lender at Lucknow, where he amassed a great fortune, and left a large portion of it in his will to the care of "the Government or the Supreme Court" at Calcutta, that they might "devise an Institution the most necessary for the public good of the town of Calcutta or establish a school." Although General Martin died at Lucknow in 1800, nothing was done in the matter for thirty-two years, and in the meantime the large bequest had trebled itself with interest. In 1832 the Supreme Court issued a decree establishing a school to be called by the name of "La Martinière," and a building was directed to be erected in Calcutta at a cost of £17,000, to be completed on or before January 1, 1835. The decree declared that the *ex-officio* Governors of the said school should be the Governor-General, the Members of Council, the Judges of the Supreme Court, the Bishop of Calcutta, and the Advocate-General. These were required each year to elect four additional Governors, who, for the year for which they were elected, should have equal power and authority with the *ex-officio* Governors in the management and direction of the school.

La Martinière is one of the finest buildings in Calcutta, being 300 feet long. In 1840 the Supreme Court decreed that this should be used as a school for boys only, and that a large house on the other side of the road should be purchased at a cost of £10,000 to be "La Martinière for Girls." Thus the two buildings together cost £27,000. After this great expenditure, there still remained £157,000, which, when invested, yielded an annual income of £6,280 for the support of the two schools. To this was added a further sum of £1,860 a year by the paying scholars.

There is a large class in India engaged in business of various kinds, whose children receive a good education so long as the father lives and has health to earn an income, but if the father should die, there is no pension and perhaps no savings for the widow and children. It was from this needy class that the Foundation Scholars were drawn, and there were sometimes seventy applications for

seven vacancies. Those were generally chosen who would have received a good education if their fathers had lived. There were no natives in the Institution ; a minority were Europeans and the majority Eurasians.

Mr. Christopher was the first Head Master sent out from an English University, and at first he was quite alone in his task. The " College Department " was simply the First Class of the School, and the education was in Latin, Greek and Mathematics as in an English school. There were about a hundred boys who were Foundation scholars and another hundred who were paying scholars. Nine of Mr. Christopher's pupils went in at the age of sixteen for assistantships in the Trigonometrical Survey of India. The Surveyor-General of that time, Colonel Thuillier (afterwards General Sir Henry Thuillier), said of three of these boys that " there was no one within sight of them." The Head Master worked up one pupil, A. Wilson Steel, until he became the first boy in the school, and as such, received the gold medal from the Governor-General on Founders' Day, September 13, 1848. But Mr. Christopher's successor, Henry Woodrow, Fellow of Caius College, Cambridge, did still more for this very promising scholar by carrying on his education and persuading Steel's uncle to send him to Cambridge. There, as a member of Caius College, he was bracketed Second Wrangler, Canon Wilson of Worcester, formerly Head Master of Clifton College, and Archdeacon of Manchester, being the Senior Wrangler that year. Steel died as Senior Tutor of Caius College, having long been one of the chief leaders in Church missionary and other Christian work in the University, besides Vicar of St. Sepulchre's Church. Mr. Christopher often spoke of him as the friend of many men in several generations of undergraduates, and referred to the great pleasure it gave him to be the guest of his old pupil when on a visit to Cambridge.

During the first two years there were special difficulties at times in the discipline of the school, but the Principal was enabled to overcome them and at length all went well. Mr. Christopher had a Bible Class on Sunday afternoons at La Martinière at which attendance was not compulsory, though it is interesting to know that all the boys attended. In later years it was a favourite and frequent topic with the Canon that in trying to do his best for his boys he was brought to feel his own spiritual weakness. He found that although

he could give his pupils knowledge, he could not convert their hearts. He could ensure their knowing what was right and what was wrong, but to do what was right and to resist and overcome the temptation to do what was wrong necessitated Divine power. Nothing, he used to say, did so much to bring him to Christ as the feeling that without Divine grace he could not prevent the boys from being overcome by temptations to evil. He was of opinion that boys should be lovingly made to understand what Jesus Christ would do for them if they would trust Him and give themselves up to Him, and that when this was done, it might be that more would learn to live for Him. He is not the only schoolmaster who has emphasized in the case of boys the need of grace and not merely an ideal of life. Some years ago Canon Lyttleton, then at Eton, expressed similar convictions.

It was in the year 1846 that Mr. Christopher's deafness came on. He had had fever, and during the recovery therefrom took, as usual, frequent doses of quinine, which often causes deafness. Then, too, the lecture room, the great hall of the Institution, was cylindrical in form and had an echo, and as it was difficult to hear the boys construe even before he was deaf, he often thought that straining to hear helped to bring on his deafness. The affliction lasted all his life, and his ear-trumpet became one of the most familiar sights at Evangelical meetings. Many a man would have succumbed under such trying circumstances, but not so our friend, for it seemed only to spur him to undertake tasks and face difficulties which might have daunted other men. Moreover, his remarkable brightness and humorous references to his deafness were most noteworthy. Whenever a strange preacher came to his Church, he would say, referring to his own practice of standing up near the pulpit, "Now, brother, you must make the deaf hear." In going over cobblestones, or when travelling by rail, or whenever else he was amidst great noise, his hearing became improved, and he would say, "Now mind, no secrets now." He often remarked that his deafness gave him one advantage—it prevented him from hearing disagreeable things. As an illustration of this, he would say: "If a beggar goes away without getting what he wants, he murmurs out something. I put my hand to my ear and say to him, 'What did you say?' But he never says it again."

In 1846 Mr. Christopher as Principal of La Martinière was re-

quested by the Government Council of Education to be the Examiner in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy of the candidates from all the Government Colleges of North India for Senior Scholarships. The best man in Mr. Christopher's opinion "would have been a high Wrangler if he had gone to Cambridge."

It was a great satisfaction to the Head Master that he was so well supported by the acting Governors. One of them was Archdeacon Dealtry, afterwards Bishop of Madras. Others were members of the Supreme Council and the Legislative Council, a Church of England Chaplain, and the Scottish Chaplain.

In 1847 Mr. Christopher gave a course of Experimental Lectures in Electricity, and threw them open freely to Senior Students of the native Colleges in Calcutta. Many attended, and it is interesting to know that sometimes among those present were men like the Bishop (Daniel Wilson), his Chaplain, Archdeacon Pratt, Third Wrangler of his year at Cambridge, and Mr. Drinkwater Bethune, a member of the Legislative Council at Calcutta, who had been Fourth Wrangler of his year at Cambridge. But Mr. Christopher's life was not free from anxiety, for his wife had several attacks of illness, especially of cholera, and was more than once at death's door.

After Mrs. Christopher sailed in June, 1848, Mr. Christopher used the following September vacation in visiting the C.M.S. Mission at Benares and the Christmas vacation in going round all the Missions of the Krishnaghur District. He always said that if he had not done this, he would probably not have been invited to become an Association Secretary of the C.M.S. in 1855 or Rector of St. Aldate's, Oxford, in 1859.

Mr. Christopher's successor was the Rev. Henry Woodrow, M.A., Fellow of Caius College, Cambridge. Woodrow had been a pupil of Dr. Arnold at Rugby, and was in the sixth form with T. Valpy French, afterwards Bishop of Lahore. Mr. Woodrow proved an admirable head of La Martinière, and after working most heartily and usefully at La Martinière for some years, was appointed a Government Inspector of Schools, and after a time became Director of Public Institutions, the highest educational officer in India. He came home to England some time after the Sepoy Mutiny had been suppressed.

The Governors of La Martinière, besides sending Mr. Christopher



a very handsome written testimonial, testified their generous appreciation of his services to the Institution by paying his passage home overland.

Mr. Christopher's life in India may fitly close with the testimony borne to him by the Bishop of Calcutta, Dr. Daniel Wilson, who, when Mr. Christopher was leaving, wrote that he had "raised the Martinière to the highest pitch of reputation, and had conciliated all the Governors in a remarkable manner." This is how the Bishop introduced him to the Bishop of London :

BISHOP'S PALACE,  
November 1st, 1848.

My dearest Lord, I have great pleasure in introducing to you Mr. Alfred Christopher, who is leaving India partly on account of his wife's health, and partly because he is desirous of being a candidate for Holy Orders in our church. He has been four years the excellent Principal of our Martinière College, one of the rules of which is that no Clergyman or Minister of Religion should hold that office. The foundation of that Institution I failed in attempting to place on the basis of our church ; but all the grand doctrines of the Gospel are acknowledged as the source of the education.

To this gentleman, as a layman, I cannot give letters Testimonial ; but I am most happy to afford your Lordship the assurance that he is in my judgment a learned, amiable, engaging, pious person, particularly attaching in his disposition and conduct, and a thorough Churchman in principle. He was educated at Cambridge. I cannot, of course, speak of his Theology, as not being in orders ; but I know and believe he is really spiritually minded and sound in the Faith—to what extent, I cannot say.

But all this your Lordship will take care to fully inform yourself of, if you should be disposed to admit him to become a candidate and to appoint him to a Curacy in your Diocese.

With best regards and begging the continued benefit of your prayers,

I am,  
My dear Lord,  
Your most affectionate,  
D. CALCUTTA.

Bishop's Palace, Calcutta,  
November 3rd, 1848.

I not only testify that the three Clergymen who have signed these testimonials are of my Diocese and deserving of credit, but I also willingly beg to assure the Lord Bishop of London that I personally know Mr. Christopher and only wish I could give him a title in my own Diocese. I believe him to be a most excellent, pious, learned, sober-minded person and likely to be a blessing to any Diocese where he may be stationed and an ornament also.

D. CALCUTTA.

To the Rt. Rev.  
and Rt. Hon. The Lord  
Bishop of London.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.  
(To be continued.)

## A MODERN DEVELOPMENT IN THE STUDY OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. F. W. E. WAGNER, M.A., D.D., Rector of  
St. Anne's, Strandhill, Sligo.

### PART I

(Continued from the *CHURCHMAN* of May, p. 270.)

THE papyri have been of no little value in confirming some traditional renderings of Greek words and phrases in the New Testament, which would otherwise rest on a rather insecure basis. Some of these confirmations are not only valuable but also extremely interesting. For example, the word *λογία* (or perhaps it would be more correctly written *λογεία*) which occurs only in 1 Corinthians xvi. In Grimm-Thayer's *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, this word is classed among "Biblical Words," i.e. one which does not occur in profane authors. It is translated "collection" in both the Authorized and Revised Versions.

In Grimm-Thayer's Lexicon it is defined as meaning "a collection of money." How exactly correct this is we learn from a letter of B.C. III, in which a tax-gatherer says: "My instructions to you are, hasten on Nicon *περὶ τῆς λογε[ί]ας*," "in the matter of the collection" (The Tebtunis Papyri, Grenfell-Hunt-Smyly, i., p. 168, No. 58<sup>5b</sup>).

Or take the passage Philemon xviii. *εἰ δέ τι ἠδίκησέν σε ἢ ὀφείλει τούτο ἐμοὶ ἐλλόγα*. "If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, set that down to my account." The verb *ἐλλογάω* occurs in two inscriptions. Inscr. ap. Boeckh. i. page 850, no. 1732 a. Bishop Lightfoot adds Edict. Diocl. in *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* iii. p. 836 (compare his note Philemon xviii.; and see also Buttmann's *Grammar of the New Testament Greek*, p. 57). It occurs in two instances in the papyri. In the collection of Greek Papyri edited by Grenfell and Hunt, (ii., p. 101, No. 67<sup>17</sup>) there is the phrase *ὑπὲρ ἀραβώνος [τῆ] [τ]ιμῆ ἐλλογουμέν[ο]υ* "by way of earnest money to be reckoned in with the cost." This particular phrase has a twofold interest; in

<sup>1</sup> Being a Thesis submitted for the Degree of D.D.

the first place as confirming the traditional rendering of the Pauline *ἔλλογα*, "set it down to my account"; in the second place in connexion with the word *ἄρραβών*. That I shall deal with in the next paragraph. It is worth noting further that *ἔλλογέω* (another form of *ἔλλογάω*) occurs in a papyrus of A.D. 261 (*Griechische Papyrus der Kaiserlichen Universitäts und Landesbibliothek zu Strassburg im Elstrass*, i., p. 119, No. 32<sup>19</sup>), in which a certain man is requested to furnish his account for payment. The words are, *ἵνα οὕτως αὐτῷ ἐνλογηθῆ*, "that so a reckoning may be made with him."

This word *ἄρραβών* is really a Semitic word (Hebrew *אָרַבּוֹן*), which passed from the Phoenicians to the Greeks. In the New Testament it occurs in three places: 2 Corinthians i. 22; v. 5; Ephesians i. 14. In each place it is translated "earnest." Dr. T. K. Abbott defines it as meaning "a portion of the purchase money given to ratify the contract, and so as a pledge of full payment." Lightfoot remarks that it would also have the effect of binding the recipient to complete his contract. The Greek Papyrus (Grenfell and Hunt, ii. 101, No. 67<sup>17</sup>) quoted in the previous paragraph confirms both commentators, and strengthens the position of the translators who, quite correctly, rendered it "earnest."

There is in the *Berliner Griechische Urkunden* a very interesting papyrus letter of A.D. 41 (iv. p. 123, No. 1079<sup>24</sup>). This letter was written to a man whose financial affairs had become much involved, and who was apparently heavily in debt. The writer makes some suggestions as to the best way out of the embarrassments, and gives his friend some sound and homely advice. One piece of advice is "*βλέπε . . . ἀπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*." "Beware of the Jews." We are reminded at once of two phrases in the Second Gospel. Mark viii. 15: *βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης . . .* "Beware of the leaven . . .", and Mark xii. 38: *βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων*, "Beware of the scribes." But *βλέπειν ἀπὸ* "to beware of" is not known in classical Greek, and so the expedient was adopted of explaining it by saying that it was a construction borrowed from the Hebrew. That this expedient was really quite unnecessary is clear from the papyrus, which shows it to have been an ordinary usage of contemporary colloquial Greek. Indeed, I cannot help thinking that we have been far too ready to attribute peculiarities in the language and expressions of the New Testament writers to Hebrew sources. It was an easy way of shelving a difficulty, and was a convenient

explanation to fall back upon when no other was apparent. Take, for instance, the expression *ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς*; (1 Cor. iv. 21), "Shall I come unto you with a rod?" To translate *ἐν ῥάβδῳ* "with a rod," involves a peculiar use of the preposition *ἐν*, which means "in," not "with," yet manifestly the latter is the sense required in this passage. The stock explanation is that this use of *ἐν* is borrowed from the Hebrew *בְּ*. This is really unnecessary. In the Tebtunis Papyri i. No. 41, of about 120 B.C. there occurs an example of a usage of *ἐν* precisely parallel to that of S. Paul, where it is said that a certain Marres was accustomed to come into the village with many others armed *ἐν μαχαίραις* "with swords." Several other examples of the same usage might be quoted from the Tebtunis Papyri. And here, perhaps, it is well to meet a possible objection. It may be urged that the usage is Hebraic, and its occurrence in papyri no proof to the contrary. But with reference to the particular usage under consideration this argument loses its force in view of the fact that the editors distinctly state that the Tebtunis Papyri are "free from all suspicion of Semitic influence" (i., p. 86, note). Let me make my point quite clear. There are undoubted Hebraisms in the Greek Testament, and whether the number of them be large or small does not seem to me to be of any great importance. I am merely warning the student that it is wise to be quite certain that a peculiar usage is a Hebraism before he sets it down as such. There are other possibilities, and these should be carefully exhausted. Everything is not a Hebraism that looks like one, and the student needs to be on his guard lest he may be misled by a purely fortuitous resemblance. I wish to return again to the papyrus letter quoted at the beginning of this paragraph in connexion with Mark viii. 15. The writer advises his friend, the harassed debtor, to make an "ad misericordiam" appeal to a creditor, *μὴ ἵνα ἀναστατώσῃς ἡμᾶς* "do not disturb us," that is, "do not turn the whole household upside down." This is an excellent and illuminating confirmation of the traditional rendering of that familiar description of the Christians in Acts xvii. 6 *οἱ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀναστατώσαντες*, "these that have turned the world upside down."

*τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύναται προσθεῖναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ πῆχυον ἓνα*: "Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature?" We have a choice of meanings for *ἡλικία*; either "age" or "stature." The Authorized and Revised Versions

concur in rendering it "stature," the Revised Version adding "age" in the margin. It is not improbable that they were led to adopt the translation "stature" by taking *πήχυς* in its literal sense, "a cubit" a measure of space. It is my purpose to justify the translation "age" for *ἡλικία* wherever it occurs in the New Testament (except in Luke xix. 3, where "stature" is manifestly correct). In Matthew vi. 27 as quoted above the translation "age" is imperatively demanded by the sense. For the addition of a cubit to one's height could not be a matter of such anxious thought, it would not be likely to be brought about by such means, and, even if it could, the particular advantage of adding about eighteen inches to one's stature is not easy to see. On the analogy of Psalm xxxix. 5, "Behold, Thou hast made my days handbreadths" *תַּחֲבֵרָה*. I do not see any valid reason against a metaphorical interpretation of *πήχυς*; and then there is no difficulty whatever over translating *ἡλικία* "age"—the sense in which it almost invariably occurs in the papyri. This leads back to a consideration of another passage in which *ἡλικία* occurs.

Luke ii. 52. *Ἰησοῦς προέκοπτεν τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ ἡλικίᾳ*. "Jesus increased in wisdom and in stature." Dr. Plummer objects that the rendering "age" in this passage is an empty truism; and prefers the translation "stature," as implying physical perfection. But if it be correct, as I believe it is, to interpret Isaiah liii. 2, 3, literally of the personal appearance of Christ—"he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men . . . he was despised, and we esteemed him not"—it militates against Dr. Plummer's objection; as does also the fact that *ἡλικία* is not used in the Greek Version of this passage of Isaiah. In support of my contention for a literal interpretation of Isaiah liii. 2, 3, I make the point that our Blessed Lord was not easily recognized after His Resurrection, because the glory and the transcendent beauty of His Risen Body were in sharp contrast to a perhaps uncomely Body of humiliation. I assert further, that the translation "age," so far from being an empty truism, serves to emphasize the completeness of His Humanity, in that His progress to mature age was in no way different from that of other children. That some such idea was present in the mind of S. Luke when he was writing his Gospel narrative is, I think, evidenced by his careful choice of words in this second chapter

to mark out the stages of the progress. In verse 16 βρέφος "babe"; verse 40 παιδίον "child"; verse 43 παῖς "boy"; verse 52 Ἰησοῦς "Jesus," and it does not seem unreasonable to regard his use of ἡλικία as a continuation of the same idea. I have no doubt but that S. Luke deliberately chose the word as according with his purpose in selecting the other words. It has been suggested that Luke ii. 52 is copied from 1 Samuel ii. 26. There are variants in the Septuagint Version of the latter, but the best attested reading is τὸ παιδάριον Σαμουὴλ ἐπορεύετο, καὶ ἀγαθὸν καὶ μετὰ Κυρίου καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων. "The child Samuel ἐπορεύετο, and was in favour both with the Lord, and also with men." The word ἐπορεύετο is best translated, "set out upon the journey of life"—if Luke ii. 52 is an echo of this passage the case for "age" as the translation of ἡλικία is, to some extent, strengthened. It is interesting to note, in this connexion, a quotation from an inscription in "Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum," No. 325, Dittenberger, where ἄ man is referred to as ἡλικία προκόπτων καὶ προαγόμενος εἰς τὸ θεασεβεῖν "increasing in age and advancing in piety."

In *The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, page 166, Professor Milligan defends "covenant," as the translation of διαθήκη, in Hebrews ix. 16, 17. In numerous contemporary papyri διαθήκη is the ordinary, regular word for "will" or "testament." The Authorized Version translates the passage under consideration correctly. The Revised Version is wrong. It is worth noting that the Latin Vulgate, in the New Testament, consistently renders διαθήκη by "testamentum," a will, or testament. "In the papyri, from the end of cent. iv. B.C. down to the Byzantine period, the word denotes testament and that alone, in many scores of documents. We possess a veritable Somerset House on a small scale in our papyrus collections, and there is no other word than διαθήκη used" (Moulton, *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, 1909, p. 497).

Ἴνα τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως πολυτιμότερον χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου διὰ πυρὸς δε δοκιμαζομένου εὑρεθῆ εἰς ἔπαινον καὶ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 1 Peter i. 7. "That the δοκίμιον of your faith, being much more precious than gold that perisheth, yet is tested by fire, may be found unto praise and glory and honour, at the appearing of Jesus Christ." We are confronted with some difficulty as to the exact meaning of δοκίμιον. Ordinarily it is a noun meaning "a test." But in Proverbs xxvii. 21,

*δοκίμιον ἀργυρίῳ καὶ χρυσῷ πύρωσις.* "As the *δοκίμιον* for silver, and the furnace for gold"; it seems to mean "testing." Yet again in Psalm xii. 6 (Septuagint Version, Psalm xi. 7) τὰ λόγια κυρίου λόγια ἀγνά, ἀργύριον ἱπεπυρωμένον, δοκίμιον τῇ γῆ, "κεκαθαρισμένον ἑπταπλασίως." "The words of the Lord are pure words; as silver purified in a furnace, *δοκίμιον* on the earth, cleansed seven times," *δοκίμιον* is apparently an adjective, "tested." The Latin Vulgate renders it by "probatum." The full Vulgate text is, "Eloquia Domini, eloquia casta: argentum igne examinatum, probatum terrae purgatum septuplum." This is useful inasmuch as it shows us the sense in which Jerome understood *δοκίμιον*, for it is a commonplace of Biblical knowledge that the Latin Psalter as it appears in Jerome's Vulgate, unlike all the other books of the Old Testament, is translated from the Greek, not from the Hebrew. In 1 Peter i. 7, "test" and "testing" are equally impossible renderings of *δοκίμιον*. The difficulty in this passage was faced by Hort, he perceived at once that the meaning was "the tested part." But he could find no sufficient authority for such a sense of *δοκίμιον*, on the one hand, and on the other hand was the inexorable fact that an adjectival sense was required, was even inevitable. But *δόκιμον* exists as a variant reading for *δοκίμιον* in this passage in a few cursive MSS. Now *δόκιμος* is an adjective meaning "proved" or "accepted." In the sense of "proved" we find it used of coins and metals in the Septuagint: Genesis xxiii. 16; 2 Chronicles ix. 17. In the New Testament it is used of one of tried faith and integrity: Romans xvi. 10; 1 Corinthians xi. 19; 2 Corinthians x. 18; xiii. 7; 2 Timothy ii. 15; James i. 12. So Hort got out of the difficulty in the only way he could—by boldly conjecturing that *δόκιμον* was the true reading. Such a conjecture was daring, in view of the slender MS. support, and, at any time, rather in the nature of a heroic measure. But, as we now know, it was unnecessary. There is no difficulty at all over the passage, for there are numerous instances in the papyri, where both *δοκίμιος* and *δόκιμος* are used as adjectives meaning "proved" or "tested"; so the word need cause no difficulty, either in this passage or in S. James i. 3.

"*Ἦτις ἐστὶν πρώτη τῆς μερίδος Μακεδονίας πόλις* (Acts xvi. 12), "Which is a city of Macedonia, the first of the district" (Revised Version). This was a passage which drove Hort to an even more daring and heroic measure. On the grounds that *μερίς* is never

used in a geographical sense of the divisions or districts which make up a province, for which the proper word is *μέρος* (as in S. Matt. ii. 22 ; xv. 21 ; xvi. 13 ; S. Mark viii. 10 ; Acts ii. 10 ; xix. 1 ; xx. 2 ; Ephes. ix. 9) Hort objected to the reading *μερίδος*. He saw, moreover, that *μερίς* is used in the sense of " a portion, a share," in Luke x. 42 ; 2 Corinthians vi. 15 ; Acts viii. 21 ; Colossians i. 12. This time there were no friendly variants or cursives to suggest a solution. Therefore Hort proposed to emend *μερίδος* to *Πιερίδος* ! so that the text would read *ἥτις ἐστὶν πρώτη τῆς Πιερίδος Μακεδονίας πόλις*, " which is the chief city of Pierian Macedonia." The emendation is highly ingenious, and plausible. In one respect Hort was right, there is no classical authority for the Revisers' translation, " district." Yet it was correct, however it was arrived at, for *μερίς* is constantly used in exactly this sense in contemporary papyri. For Hort's discussion of the point see *Notes on Select Readings*, Hort, page 96, and the Appendix (*ad loc.*) to Westcott and Hort's *New Testament in Greek*.

*Ἄδολον γάλα*, 1 Peter ii. 2. The Authorized Version rendering " sincere milk " is almost meaningless to the modern reader. It is perfectly correct if we take " sincere " in its archaic sense as meaning pure or unadulterated. This is really its root meaning, for it comes from the Latin " sincerus " a word compounded from " sine cera " " without wax," an expression used to denote the purity of honey ; the meaning of " sincerus " is evident from the passage of Seneca, " Ex amphora primum, quod est sincerissimum, effluit, gravissimum quodque turbidum subsidit " (Epist. 108) " That which is most pure flows out of the jar first, whatever is most heavy and full of sediment sinks to the bottom." And it is in this sense that we are to understand " sincere " in the Authorized Version of 1 Peter ii. 2. By derivation the Revisers' translation of *ἄδολον* " without guile " may be more accurate, but it is doubtful if the phrase " milk which is without guile " conveys any meaning at all to the average reader. *Ἄδολος* occurs many times in the papyri in the sense of " unadulterated," usually in speaking of corn ; and perhaps there is a hint of this meaning in the passage of Aeschylus " *χρίματος ἀγροῦ μαλακαῖς ἀδόλοισι παρηγορίαις* " (Ag. 95) " Unadulterated " is exactly the meaning required in 1 Peter ii. 2.

*Ἀπέχω δὲ πάντα*, Philippians iv. 18. The verb *ἀπέχω* denotes the having received what one had a right to expect or demand, (Winer,



*Grammar of New Testament Greek*, p. 275. Cf. also Alexander Buttmann's *Grammar of the New Testament Greek*). I cannot help thinking that when Lightfoot, in commenting on Philippians iv. 18, says the verb denotes correspondence of contents to capacity, of possession to desire, he is really wide of the point. Ἀπέχω occurs in numerous papyri receipts; and it is in that sense that S. Paul uses it in writing to the Philippians. It is almost as if he was saying to them—"You have repaid me anything you owed me. I can give you a formal receipt for it." For the use of ἀπέχω in receipts, see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, page 229, where he says, in commenting on our Lord's condemnations in Matthew vi. 2, 5, 16, that ἀπέχουσιν τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν ("they have their reward," Authorized Version) means: "They can sign the receipt of their reward, their right to receive their reward is realized, precisely as if they had already given a receipt for it."

We find in signatures to tax-receipts, among the Tebtunis Papyri, a use of ἐπηκολούθηκα in a confirmatory sense, and a further use of the same word by those who examined accounts, and certified them to be in order, much as a modern auditor would write, "I have examined the above account, and certify the same to be correct." A somewhat similar use of the word in an endorsement ratifying an order is to be found. (*Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, iii. p. 121). The verb only occurs once in the Gospels, and then in the pseudo-Mark xvi. 20, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἐξεληθόντες ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ, τοῦ κυρίου συνεργούντος καὶ τὸν λόγον βεβαίουντος διὰ τῶν ἐπακολουθούντων σημείων. "And these, having gone forth, preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs authenticating it," or "with signs certifying its truth." Neither the Authorized Version—"following," nor the Revised Version—"followed," does anything like justice to the original ἐπακολουθούντων. Once we bring the knowledge acquired from the papyri to bear on this passage of the pseudo-Mark we gain a remarkable insight into the meaning which the writer wishes to convey; i.e. that the accompanying "signs" authenticated or certified to the truth of the preaching and teaching of the Apostles. The verb also occurs in 1 Timothy v. 10, 24 and 1 Peter ii. 21. In each of these cases the sense will bear an infusion of the papyrus meaning. It is most interesting to perform this substitution in these three cases, and to observe the alteration, and the suggestiveness of it. In Mark

xii. 1, Matthew xxi. 33, Luke xx. 9, occurs the irregular form ἐξέδετο for ἐξέδοτο the second Aorist Middle of ἐκδίδωμι, a common verb in Greek, but in the New Testament only in these three places. The sense in which it is used in the New Testament is the classical one, of letting for hire. In the Septuagint it occurs in Exodus ii. 21, 1 Maccabees x. 58. In Exodus it is used of Jethro giving his daughter in marriage to Moses, and in 1 Maccabees of Ptolemee giving Cleopatra his daughter in marriage to Alexander. In the Synoptic Gospels the irregular form ἐξέδετο is the reading which has the best MS authority (N.A.B.\*C.K.L.). It need not cause any surprise, as it is of common occurrence in the papyri.

This adjective *ὄνικος* which Grimm-Thayer defines as meaning "of, or for an ass" occurs twice in the New Testament, Mark ix. 42, Matthew xviii. 6 in the expression *μύλος ὄνικος* which the Authorized Version inadequately renders "mill-stone," equally inadequate is the Revised Version "great millstone." The correct translation is given, rather periphrastically, in the margin of the Revised Version, "a millstone turned by an ass." The Textus Receptus, that Proteus of Greek Testament students, in Scrivener's edition reads *μύλος ὄνικος* in Luke xvii. 2 on the bare authority of Codices A and N where *λίθος μυλικός* is the true reading. The word *ὄνικος* does not occur elsewhere in sacred or profane literature, except in papyri of the first century A.D. which shows that it was an expression in vogue about the time the Gospels were written. The upper millstone was, as a rule, revolved by an ass, and this would seem to be the derivation of the word.

The use of the present tense to express past action vividly and graphically is not common in Hellenistic Greek until we come to the New Testament. It is rare in the Septuagint, except in 1 Samuel. It is, however, frequent in the papyri, and in Josephus.

*Ἀσπάζου τοὺς φίλους κατ' ὄνομα.* "Salute the friends by name," 3 John 15. It is customary with commentators to take *κατ' ὄνομα* "by name" as implying an unsatisfactory state of affairs, and as going to prove that there were only a few members in the Church of Gaius. But a glance at the usage in some of the papyri shows that such an inference is unwarranted. For instance—*Ἀσπάζομαι τὴν γυναικάν μου καὶ τὰ παιδιά μου καὶ Σεραπάμμωνα καὶ Ἀματίαν καὶ τοὺς ἐνοίκους κατ' ὄνομα* (Tebtunis Papyri, ii. 299, p. 422) or, *Ἀσπάζομαι τὴν γλυκυτάτην θυγατέρα Μακκαρίαν καὶ τὴν δεσποίνην*

μου μητέραν ὑμῶν καὶ ὅλους τοὺς ἡμῶν κατ' ὄνομα (Oxyrhynchus Papyri, ii. 123). In both of these cases the salutations κατ' ὄνομα, "by name," must have included quite a considerable number of people, so that the use of the expression in 3 John 15 does not convey any suggestion of a scanty membership in the Church of Gaius. Ἐκλεκτῇ κυρία (to the elect lady?) 2 John 1, in the form of address has given rise to considerable discussion and speculation. Is this designation the name of an individual, and if so, are we to regard the first, or the second, or both words as proper nouns? or are both descriptive adjectives? In verse 13 of this Epistle the words "τῆς ἀδελφῆς σου τῆς ἐκλεκτῆς" "of thy elect sister" militate very powerfully against the theory that ἐκλεκτῇ in verse 1 is a proper name. With regard to κυρία, we know that it did exist as a proper name from an inscription—"Φένιππος καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ Κυρία." "Phenippos and his wife Kuria." (*Corp. Inscr. Gruter*, p. 1127, m. xi.) But if it were a proper name here contemporary usage would require the definite article before it in the Greek. As a matter of fact κυρία and κύριος are used repeatedly in papyrus letters as titles of respect. For example—"Ἰνδικῇ Θαεισούτι τῇ κυρία χαίρειν" "Indike, to the lady Thaeisoutes, Greeting" (Oxyrhynchus Papyri, ii. 300). Or, consider also the same use of κύριος in an affectionate letter written by a slave to her master, "Ταυς Ἀπ[ολλ]ωνίωι τῷ κυρίωι πλείστα χαίρειν." "Taus, to the lord Apollonius, manifold greetings" (*Griechische Papyri im Museum des Oberhessischen Geschichtsvereins zu Giessen*, i., No. 17).

Ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται "The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence" (S. Matt. xi. 12). The Authorized Version translation suggests that the kingdom of heaven was suffering violence at the hands of its enemies. Manifestly this cannot be correct. In the middle voice βιάζεσθαι followed by the preposition εἰς means "to force one's way into." In that sense it is used by Thucydides, Polybius, and Philo. But the sense will not permit us to regard βιάζεται as middle in Matthew ii. 12, for it could not be said that the kingdom of heaven forced its way. βιάζεσθαι = "to take forcible possession of" occurs in the Tebtunis Papyri 6. 31. It seems to me that, in order to bring this passage into consonance with Luke xvi. 16, we must render it "The kingdom of heaven is taken by force"; that is, men press eagerly into it.

Καὶ ἠκυρώσατε τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, "And ye made void the

word of God," S. Matthew xv. 6. There is a variety of readings here. I take the text of Westcott and Hort, following  $\mathfrak{N}^{ca}$  B.D.a.b Sinaitic-Syriac and Curetonian Syriac,  $\tau\acute{o}\nu \nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu$  "the law" is the reading of  $\mathfrak{N}^*$ .C.  $\tau\acute{\eta}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\lambda\eta\acute{\nu}$  "the commandment" E.F. and other uncials. The verb  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\upsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}$  (from which  $\eta\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$  comes) occurs in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, iii. 491, 494, 495, in each case of revoking a will. In 2 Esdras vi. 32, it occurs, and is translated "make light of." In the New Testament we find it in Mark xii. 13, and Galatians iii. 17.

$\Sigma\nu\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\iota \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\nu$  "to make a reckoning with," S. Matthew xviii. 23 (see also S. Matthew xxv. 19). This is a phrase which does not occur in Greek authors. But the exact expression  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\iota \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\nu$  occurs in a second century papyrus, *Aegyptische Urkunden aus dem Koeniglichen Museum zu Berlin*, 775. " $\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta\acute{\rho}\mu\alpha\iota \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\nu$ " occurs in the Fayûm and Oxyrhynchus Papyri.

The word  $\pi\alpha\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$  in its Christian significance is used in the New Testament of the second "Coming" of Jesus Christ. It is interesting to learn, as we do, from papyri that during the period contemporary with the New Testament writings  $\pi\alpha\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$  was the ordinary word for the visit of a king. In the Tebtunis Papyri 48. 9, the phrase " $\tau\acute{\eta}\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon\theta\acute{\iota} \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma \pi\alpha\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ " "the coming of the king" is used with reference to an expected visit of Ptolemy II. Rev. A. E. Brooke, B.D., of King's College, Cambridge, in his commentary on *The Johannine Epistles*, observes that  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\alpha$  seems to have been similarly used, and adds the very interesting note, "Many of the words and titles which Christians loved to use of their Lord had a special significance as protests against the blasphemy of the popular Emperor worship" (p. 67).

So far I have been dealing only with the indirect way in which recently discovered profane papyri have assisted, and continue to assist us in coming to a truer understanding of words and phrases in the New Testament; an assistance which, though it is indirect, and I might almost say accidental, is none the less exceedingly valuable. I have, in this little work, only covered a small portion of a very large field. My object has been rather to indicate the lines on which modern research is proceeding, in a broad, general way. I do not claim anything like fullness or detail. The examples which I have given are, for the most part, taken from notes and lists which I have compiled during several years of study. In some cases

I have been able to verify my references, but in others this has not been possible, and I have had to rely upon the accuracy of MS. notes.

I hope to deal with the whole subject much more exhaustively and in far greater detail. I have amassed, and am continuing to amass, large numbers of papyri references and quotations from contemporary letters and documents. I have refrained from commenting on many of these for the present because they require much careful sifting and consideration, and also because this essay is designed as an introduction to a much larger and more complete work. There are also manifold difficulties not alone in deciphering and emending, but also in determining readings and comparing forms. In some cases I have adduced papyrological evidence without giving references; where I have done this the references are numerous, and my lists require verification. This I feel to be a defect, but it is one which a future work will remedy. I have omitted any reference to the closing salutations of the Pauline Epistles; in the first place, because it opens up a very large question as to the method of writing the Epistles, and also because my researches on this point are far from complete at present. It is possible that a more detailed inspection of the papyri will moderate or alter views which are, at present, immature; and, hence, I deem it wise to refrain entirely from discussing the point.

Two facts emerge from the foregoing. (1) The New Testament is written in colloquial Greek—Greek as it was written and spoken in the times, and by the people, of the Apostolic Age. To this fact are due many of the irregularities and peculiarities which have hitherto been alleged as Hebraisms, Semitisms, Biblical Greek, etc. Really there is no such thing as distinctively Biblical Greek—what we know as such is nothing more nor less than the Greek which was spoken by “the man in the street” in the ordinary round of daily life in those times. It may be convenient to use the term in speaking of the language of the New Testament, but it is somewhat misleading, unless we appreciate its true meaning. (2) No student is properly equipped for New Testament research, criticism, or exegesis without a fairly comprehensive knowledge of what the science of papyrology has done in the past, and what it is doing to-day. It is a science which looms large on the horizon of New Testament study. To attempt to investigate the problems of the Greek Testament without possessing, at least, an elementary knowledge of papyro-

logy, both sacred and profane, is not only to deprive oneself of a valuable ally, but it is a veritable making of bricks without straw. In the past, a very inadequate use has been made of the science of archaeology by Biblical students and commentators ; in the present, its value is slowly but surely gaining recognition ; and, in the future, it will doubtless take its proper place, and form a " sine qua non " in the intellectual equipment of every man who sets himself to inquire into the problems, the import, and the true meaning of the God-given message which the several writers of the New Testament proclaim. It is only the foolish defenders of the Faith who decry criticism ; to some minds it seems almost impious to bring the New Testament, as it were, under fire. Such an attitude is not only injurious to the cause, for it gives the impression that the Bible will not stand fire, but it is also unreasonable and absurd. The wise in this matter are those who welcome honest criticism. We know in Whom we have believed. We are perfectly persuaded and fully convinced of the truth grounded on our New Testament, and nothing pleases us better than to have the fullest light turned upon it, and to submit it to the most minute and searching examination by unprejudiced critics, for we know full well that such a process can only have one result, these things can only fall out unto the furtherance of the Gospel. Therefore, we welcome this new science of papyrology as an ally in our labours of research, and as a vindication of our contention for the accuracy of the New Testament. This concludes, for the present, what I have to say about the relations between the profane papyri and the New Testament writings. In Part II I propose to indicate some of the direct additions which papyrological research has yielded to our knowledge.

F. W. E. WAGNER.

*(To be concluded.)*



## STUDIES IN TEXTS.

Suggestions for Sermons from Current Literature.

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

THE SUCCESSES OF AN UNSUCCESSFUL SERMON.

*Text.*—"Some men however did join him and believe." (Acts xvii. 34, Moffatt).

[Book of the Month: DAVID SMITH'S ST. PAUL<sup>1</sup> = DS. Other refs. Ramsay's *St. Paul* = R. Plummer's I *Corinthians* = P. Knowling's *Acts* = K. Lightfoot's *Notes on St. Paul's Epistles* = L. Findlay's I *Corinthians* = F. A. S. Peake's *One Vol. Comm.* = ASP. *Dict. of Apost. Ch.* = DAC. *Hastings' Dict. Bible* = DB.]

St. Paul's speech at Athens was undoubtedly disappointing in its results. "It did little or nothing to storm the enemy's citadel" (DAC. I. 110). Partly due to the place, cool and critical. "In Athens he met with opposition and contempt" (P. xiv.). "This attitude continued long after the Apostle's departure. For a century or two Athens was perhaps the chief seat of opposition to the Gospel" (P. xiv.). Perhaps, too, he felt he had been mistaken in method. "Athens was no longer endurable, and there were two special reasons which constrained Paul to take his departure. One was the shame of his ignominious failure, aggravated by bitter self-reproach. In his speech before the Council of the Areiopagos, he had committed what he now recognized as a fatal error. His mind had been 'corrupted from its simplicity toward Christ.' He had forgotten that faith's best array is 'not men's wisdom, but God's power,' and had attempted to meet philosophy with philosophy and win his hearers by 'persuasive words of wisdom.' It had proved a disastrous blunder, and he determined that he would never repeat it. Thenceforward, he would eschew 'lofty speech and wisdom,' and 'announce God's testimony,' 'knowing nothing except Jesus as Christ and that a crucified Christ,' and relying on the 'demonstration of the Spirit and of power.' He would fain quit the scene of his failure, and make a new beginning elsewhere" (DS. 148-9).

<sup>1</sup> *Life and Letters of St. Paul*, by Prof. David Smith. Hodder and Stoughton, 21s. A splendid modern account on the familiar lines of Lewin, Conybeare and Howson, Farrar, etc. Widely read and lucid, as always.

So also " he felt that he had gone as far as was right in the way of presenting his doctrine in a form suited to the current philosophy ; and the result had been little more than naught. When he went on from Athens to Corinth, he no longer spoke in the philosophic style " (R. 252). " The philosophic style in which he had addressed the Athenians is now abandoned " (K. 386, and see " Athens " in DAC). " It is possible that he felt he had made a mistake." Yet the results of the speech at Athens were real and lasting. Three representatives of different classes were touched.

I. THE THINKING CLASS. " His converts were few, but one of them at least was a personage of importance—Dionysius, a member of the Council of the Areiopagos " (DS. 147). " Dionysius was a member of the Council—the words can mean nothing less ; it is evident, therefore, that this convert must have been a man of some distinction, as an Areiopagite would previously have filled the office of Archon " (K. 380). Words like Acts xvii. 23–28 appealed to his philosophic mind.

II. THE THOUGHTLESS CLASS. " Of the others only one is named—a woman called Damaris. The name is apparently a variant of Damalis, which signifies ' a heifer ' ; and since it was the sort of designation which was commonly borne by Athenian courtesans, and women of good fame lived in close seclusion, it is probable that she belonged to that numerous and unhappy order ; and it may be taken as evidence of her subsequent devotion that she was counted worthy of particular mention " (DS. 147). " It was impossible, in Athenian society, for a woman of respectable position and family to have any opportunity of hearing Paul " (R. 252). Verses like xvii. 29–31 would arrest thought.

" Then to their temple Damaris would clamber,  
 Stood where an idol in the lifted sky  
 Bright in a light and eminent in amber  
 Heard not, nor pitied her, nor made reply.

So from the soft air, infinite and pearly,  
 Breathed a desire with which she could not cope,  
 Could not, methinks, so eager and so early,  
 Chant to her loveliness the dirge of hope.

Then I preached Christ : and when she heard the story—  
 Oh, is such triumph possible to men ?  
 Hardly, my King, had I beheld thy glory,  
 Hardly had known Thine excellence till then."

—F. W. Myers.



III. THE INDUSTRIOUS CLASS. One other name should probably be added here, that of Stephanas, the first-fruits of Achaia ; and Athens was in Achaia (1 Cor. xvi. 15). Was he possibly a Corinthian bronze merchant with business connexions in Athens and Ephesus ? Did Acts xvii. 29 move him ?

(a) *Stephanas in Athens.* " It appears that Paul won at Athens another convert who has left an honourable name, though, since he was not an Athenian, it does not appear in the record of the Athenian ministry. Four years later, in his correspondence with the Church at Corinth, he mentions one of its leading members, Stephanas, and terms him and his household ' the first-fruits ' of his labours in the Province of Achaia. Stephanas was a Corinthian, but evidently he had been sojourning at Athens and had there encountered the Apostle and been won for Christ " (DS. 147). " It would seem that Stephanas was an earlier convert even than Crispus (xvi. 15). ' Achaia ' technically included Athens, and Stephanas may himself have been converted there with the ' others ' of Acts xvii. 34 " (P. 15). " About Stephanas (1 Cor. xvi. 15 ; i. 16) we are in doubt whether he was converted and baptized in Athens or in Corinth. He was probably a Gentile ; that he was a Corinthian convert is commonly assumed, but it is by no means certain " (P. xv.). " 1 Corinthians i. 16 is an explanation, not a correction : Stephanas, though a Corinthian, had been baptized at Athens " (DS. 245). " It happened after the departure of Silas and Timothy when Paul was at Athens alone, since he had baptized Stephanas with his own hands—an office which, like the Master, he was not accustomed to discharge. Preaching was his business, and he left the administration of baptism to his colleagues, especially, it seems, to his attendant " (DS. 147-8). Such were Mark and Timothy (Acts xiii. 5). " 1 Corinthians i. 16 was an afterthought. He was, perhaps, reminded of the omission by his amanuensis, who may have been Stephanas himself or one of his household, for they were with him at the time " (L. 156). " On second thoughts, Paul remembers that he had ' baptized the house of Stephanas ' " (F. 766). " Stephanas proved a loyal and generous friend in after years, and it was a merciful Providence which had brought him into the Apostle's life at this juncture " (DS. 148).

(b) *Stephanas in Corinth.* He and all his became a tower of strength in their native place. He welcomed Paul no doubt on his

arrival. "Paul had been exhausted by those eager months of travel and preaching and controversy and alarm, and as he fretted his heart at Athens with anxiety for his converts in Macedonia, he fell sick. It was a recurrence of his chronic malady; and while he languished alone and despised in the gay city, 'in weakness and fear and much trembling,' his thoughts turned to Stephanas, and he resolved to betake himself to Corinth and cast himself on the care of that kindly friend. It was a convenient retreat, no farther remote than Athens from Macedonia, which he still regarded as his appointed sphere, and whence he was eagerly expecting the return of his colleagues" (DS. 149). "The Stephanas family must have been of independent means; for *etaxan heautous* (*they arranged or appointed themselves*, 1 Cor. xvi. 15—made this their business) implies a systematic laying out of themselves for service, such as is possible only to those free to dispose, as they choose, of their persons and their time" (F. 950). "In Clement of Rome's Epistle, chapter xlii., we are told that the apostles, preaching from city to city, and country to country, *appointed their first-fruits*, having tested them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons of those who should believe. It would be beside our purpose to discuss the exact meaning of this passage, but it may reasonably be held that Stephanas, and perhaps some members of his household, had been appointed to a position in the nascent church at Corinth, which implied, on the one side ministry (*diakonia*), on the other side some recognition of their authority. If this was not the local ministry, in the later sense of the term, there were here the germs out of which it grew" (DB. iv. 613).

In 1 Corinthians xvi. 15, 16, Stephanas is named as a leader. "The Apostle enjoins spontaneous submission to the direction of those able and disposed to lead in good works" (F. 950). "'The saints' does not mean the poor at Jerusalem, but believers generally—the sick and needy, travellers, etc." (P. 395). "The household of Stephanas seem to have been among the first assistants of the Apostle, outside the inner circle of his chosen companions, and they were specially valuable to the work in Corinth. No doubt their work was a voluntary consecration: there is nothing to indicate an ecclesiastical office" (DAC. 525).

(c) *Stephanas in Ephesus*. In 1 Corinthians xvi. 17, Stephanas has come on a deputation. "Stephanas himself was one of the

deputation and was, therefore, a trusted leader" (DAC. 525). 1 Corinthians xvi. 18, "describes the restful effect of friendly converse and sympathy, realizing that the comfort of heart received by himself will react upon his friends at Corinth: the Corinthians will be cheered to know that their fellowship, in the persons of Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus, has so greatly cheered him at a time of weariness and heavy trial" (F. 951). "It made up to Paul *for the absence of the Corinthians*, supplying him, representatively, with their desired society" (F. 951). "Of the Church in Athens we hear no more; it is perhaps included in 1 Corinthians i. 2" (ASP. 796). So also K. 382 perhaps "included in 'whole of Achaia' (2 Cor. i. 1).

Yet the names of these three "and others," come down through the ages as a proof that the seed of the Gospel, when sowed on the top of the mountains, yields its handful of corn to go into the sheaf of Christ's first-fruits, even though the mountain be Parnassus or the Acropolis.

And Athens, home of culture, and auditorium of St. Paul's most elaborate evangelistic address, is not left outside when the Lord writes up His people, but says of Dionysius and Damaris and Stephanas—"this one was born there."

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

### CHANGES IN THE COMMUNION SERVICE.

*To the Editor of the CHURCHMAN.*

SIR,—I have just come across an article in your April number by the Bishop of Manchester on the proposed alterations in the Communion Service. In it I find the statement that the Invocation of the Holy Spirit on the elements "is admittedly an innovation which cannot be attested earlier than the middle of the fourth century." The Bishop is doubtless relying on the late Mr. E. Bishop's *Moment of Consecration*, published in 1909. But a discovery has been made since which has completely altered the aspect of the case. The work commonly called the "*Egyptian Church Order*" is now known to have been written by Hippolytus of Rome, and therefore earlier than the year 235. It contains the earliest extant Prayer of Consecration, and in this there is a distinct Invocation of the Holy Ghost on the elements. Hence such an Invocation is at least as early as the first half of the third century, and the title ("*The Apostolic Tradition*") which Hippolytus gave to his work may well lead us to believe that it was no novelty then.

Trusting that you will, in the interests of truth, insert this letter,

Yours faithfully,

(Rev.) J. W. TYRER.

7 PICKERING ROAD,  
NEW BRIGHTON, CHESHIRE,

[See Note of the Month on this letter.—ED.]

## POVERTY OF THE CLERGY: A SUGGESTION.

To the Editor of THE CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—The poverty of the Clergy becomes daily a more urgent question, and speedy and substantial help is required to meet their increasing difficulties.

The Laity are not indifferent to the poverty of their Clergy; they are deeply distressed by it; but they have hitherto had no suitable channel through which to convey their practical sympathy.

The passing of the Enabling Bill has at last provided one.

Let the Church now start a Central Stipend Fund, to be supported entirely by the Laity, and administered by the National Assembly of the Church of England.

All the expedients hitherto tried for raising money have been failures. Easter offerings, Christmas gifts, etc., are distasteful to the Clergy, who feel, and justly, that the matter is one "not of grace, but of debt"; while the average layman is frankly bored by the intricate diocesan, parochial, and other plans for coping with the need. He sees that they are mere palliatives, and realizes that money must now be raised from fresh sources.

A large scheme is sometimes simpler to work than a smaller one, and my suggestion is that every lay member of the Church of England who is a householder should be asked how much he or she will contribute annually to this sorely-needed Stipend Fund.

Churchmen in Wales are setting a noble example; but their aim is to raise a *capital* sum for investment, not an income to be contributed yearly by individuals.

The latter method would require a smaller immediate effort from the Laity, though it would not meet the special case of Wales.

The need being so great, let the aim be to collect an income large enough to meet it,—large enough to provide every clergyman of the Church of England with a stipend sufficient to maintain him and his family in comfort, and to enable men about to take orders to dedicate themselves to the spiritual service of their fellow-men without the prospect of being steeped to the very lips in poverty for the rest of their lives.

It is a commonplace of human experience that we never duly value what has cost us nothing; and we all need the recent reminder of the Archbishop of Canterbury that "as far as spiritual ministrations are concerned, we are living on the beneficence of people of long ago."

If the obligation of the Laity of the Church of England to support their Clergy were brought home to them by a direct, personal, and individual call, an adequate response might confidently be expected; for we have only to look back on the Great War to see how the spirit of self-sacrifice that dwells in our nation will rise to a great occasion and a realized need.

Our clergy have done much for us; is it a great matter if we deny ourselves something for them?

A. S. FOWLER.

CROOKHAM END, BRIMPTON, BERKS.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

## PUSEY HOUSE TEACHING.

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE. By Darwell Stone, D.D. Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice. London: *Robert Scott*. 3s. 6d. net.

In this course of Lenten Sermons, Dr. Darwell Stone, the well-known Head of Pusey House, gives us his conception of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. We need scarcely say that we consider his view not in keeping with the representation of the New Testament. He considers that the Eucharist is the sacrifice of the Christian Church and that in it the Church presents to the Father the life of the Lord as a sacrificial offering.

The book is full of unjustifiable assumptions. Thus, despite all assertions of modern scholars to the contrary, Dr. Darwell Stone still imputes a sacrificial sense to "Do this" and "In remembrance of Me" in the institution of the Lord's Supper.

Interesting reference is made to what will happen when the Sacrament is reserved. No mere reservation for the purpose of communicating the sick will suffice. We are told that worshippers will expect more: "They will look for a seemly and dignified method of reservation. They will look for a fitting place. They will claim that when they are in the presence of the Sacrament they may worship and praise and pray in their realization that He who is hidden there is their Lord and God." As for the methods of reservation and the Services of devotion round the reserved sacrament, we are told that, while these "must be under the control of the bishop of the diocese," yet the worshippers will claim to "worship our Lord where the sacrament is reserved, with that fullness of adoration which they feel and express towards Him in the Mass" (p. 53).

With respect to the doctrine of Sacrifice, we notice that Dr. Darwell Stone gives no place to the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews. With that Epistle before us, as Hooker and Lightfoot said, there can be no place for sacrifice in the Christian Ministry.

In its teaching of the continual presence of Christ with the believer there is a firmer ground of assurance and joy than in the unjustified assumptions which have gathered round the sacramental bread and wine.

## THEOLOGY AS AN EMPIRICAL SCIENCE.

THEOLOGY AS AN EMPIRICAL SCIENCE. By D. C. Macintosh, Ph.D., Dwight Professor of Theology in Yale University. London: *George Allen and Unwin*. 12s. 6d. net.

The purpose of this volume, issued by the Dwight Professor of Theology at Yale, is to relate theological theory with that acquaintance with the divine which is to be found in religious experience at its best. Through religious experience genuine knowledge of a divine Reality can be gained, and this knowledge can be formulated and further developed by inductive reasoning. The author, therefore, wishes to give us the Theology of Experimental Religion. He quotes the saying of William James: "Let empiricism once become associated with religion, as hitherto, through some strange misunderstanding, it has been associated with irreligion, and I believe that a new era of religion as well as of philosophy will be ready to begin." He takes up the challenge of Huxley: "If any one is able to make good the assertion that his theology rests upon valid evidence and sound reasoning,

then it appears to me that such theology must take its place as a part of science."

While many good things appear in the work, there is much with which we cannot agree. In the chapter which deals with conclusions in the field of the scientific history of religion, the author feels himself warranted in "assuming the improbability of the virgin-birth of Jesus or of any other religious leader." To him "it seems not unreasonable to suppose that the virgin-birth story is a legend, comparable with the similar, although more crudely expressed birth-legends that grew up about certain Greek and Roman heroes and such religious personalities as Gautama (the Buddha), Krishna, and Shankara." Similarly, in dealing with the miracles recorded in the Gospels, he finds it possible to "deal with them in a fairly plausible way" apart from miracle. "Legendary accretion" may account for the restoring of the ear of Malchus, the feeding of the 5,000, the stilling of the tempest, etc. Not very much value is attached to the Fourth Gospel as a source of historical information.

Similarly defective is his attitude to Jesus. Did Jesus have a pre-existent life? We are told: "The answer to this seems to be that, while God who was manifested as imminent within the historic Jesus, must, of course, be thought of as having existed prior to the beginning of Jesus' earthly life, we have no positive basis for asserting the same of the personal spirit whom we know as Jesus."

The work covers very much ground, but is not at all lengthy. We get careful discussions of Human Free Agency, Immortality, Sin, Existence of God, Revelation, Person of Christ, Work of Christ, Salvation, the Moral Attributes of God, the Metaphysical Attributes of God, the Problem of Evil. An appendix gives a sketch of the Philosophy of Religion, showing the relation of Theology as an Empirical Science to Philosophy.

---

#### THE PROBLEM OF EVIL.

**THE PROBLEM OF EVIL:** Being an Attempt to show that the Existence of Sin and Pain in the world is not inconsistent with the Goodness and Power of God. By the Rev. Peter Green, M.A., Canon of Manchester. London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 6s. net.

Not so long ago we were reminded in "Army and Religion" that the one great problem of to-day was the Problem of Evil and that the faith which dealt most adequately with that question would be the one which would last longest. For this reason we extend a hearty welcome to Canon Peter Green's new work upon the subject.

The object of his work is to enable a man still to retain his faith in a living and merciful God, Almighty and Good, while at the same time recognising all the evil and sin and suffering that is in the world. The argument proceeds upon the usual lines. God's omnipotence is not absolutely unlimited, and He could not create a being with free-will and yet force him to choose good. With the possibility of choice there came the possibility of man's fallen condition and an imperfect world. In some passages Canon Green boldly challenges man to think of a better moral world.

One part of Canon Green's work will astonish his readers considerably. In his view of the Fall, he resorts to a theory of a Fall, not as something which took place in this world of ours, but as a pre-mundane event. He says that he arrived at this view quite independently. He did not rely upon Origen of early date, nor upon Müller of more recent times. He is convinced of the need of a theory of a pre-mundane fall as being absolutely

necessary to any adequate view of moral and physical evil ; and he proceeds to shape a theory accordingly.

The Canon is more at home when dealing with modern Necessitarian views. He notes the great impetus given to necessitarian principles by the attention paid to physical science, but aptly criticises the modern application made :

“ Having observed the way in which inanimate objects acted, the man of science has decided that spiritual beings must necessarily act in the same way. But in so deciding the man of science merely reversed the fallacy of the savage, who, finding that he himself was influenced by love, and hate, and fear, and desire, gave to the rocks and streams and trees a character like his own. . . . The man of science assures us that a free spiritual being *must* behave as a material object would do, and we are overwhelmed in discussions on free-will and necessity with illustrations drawn from guns and loots and falling weights . . . neither suggestion is based on a truly scientific method.”

We have said sufficient to give an indication of the nature of Canon Green's new work. The book is extremely suggestive, and is in close touch with life. The problem is stated fairly and accurately ; and a carefully reasoned treatment is given to it. We certainly advise all students of religious questions to read this work.

---

### -THREE BOOKS ON PRAYER.

HELPING BY PRAYER. By Constance Lady Coote. London : *Marshall Bros*, 2s. 6d. net.

This little volume contains thirty-three beautiful prayers—twelve for the morning, six for the evening, two for Sunday, and the rest for special occasions and for special topics. The book is written in response to the request of many who have used the author's *Abide with us*.

THE SOUL'S APPEAL TO GOD. By the Rev. A. D. Belden, B.D., with a foreword by the Rev. J. Stuart Holden, D.D. London : *Challenge, Ltd.* 9d.

The author devotes one chapter each to “ The Definition of Prayer ” ; “ The Practice of Prayer ” ; “ The Effects of Prayer—Subjective ” ; “ Prayer as Petition ” ; “ The Effects of Prayer—Objective.” The book will repay the most thoughtful reading—its forty-four pages are packed with good things.

THE REALM OF PRAYER. By the Rev. R. A. Coats, M.A., B.D. London : *Macmillan, Ltd.* 7s. 6d. net.

This is a valuable treatise on prayer, full of definite teaching upon a subject that must ever be of the greatest interest to Christian people. At the head of each of the seventeen helpful chapters, the author has collected appropriate quotations from writers ancient and modern, which, together with the concluding appendix of quotations, form a most valuable collection. Each chapter is complete in itself, but there is a certain unity of thought throughout the volume. The writer has the rare power of making himself simple, while being scholarly and profound. Where all is of so high an order, it is hard to select for special commendation ; but perhaps those chapters are of more present-day importance which deal with “ The Psychology of Prayer,” “ Prayer and the Natural Order,” “ Prayer and Healing.” Perhaps in a later addition the writer may add a chapter emphasizing the place and power of silent, guided, prayer.

## CANON BURROUGHS' LATEST BOOK.

THE WAY OF PEACE—a study of the Earliest Programme of Christian Life.

By the Rev. E. A. Burroughs, M.A., Canon of Peterborough and Chaplain to H.M. the King. London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 3s. 6d. net.

Although this little volume was written at the request of the Bishop of London for Lenten reading in his Diocese—and the Bishop in a commendatory introduction expresses his gratitude to Canon Burroughs—its message is not confined to any one season. The book points for a “moral equivalent” for war to the service of the great Leader who is calling to-day, not for “fine-weather Christians,” or merely “orthodox Churchmen,” but for “adventurers for God.” Canon Burroughs' latest volume is well up to the standard of his previous work—it is scholarly, trenchant, original, and brave. It is not in any sense a “popular” treatise. It calls for thought—concentrated and sustained; but it rewards the reader, who is also a thinker.

After an Introductory Chapter entitled “The Present Distress,” the writer presents “The Way of Disappointment,” which is followed by “The Way of Service.” Then come, “The Passport to Service,” “The Provision for Service,” “The Two Sides of Service,” “The Conditions of Service,” the background being formed by “The Benedictus.” The closing chapter—“The Peace Offensive”—is a summons to a forward movement, for the spread of what a modern labour leader has called “The greatest agitative influence of all time,”—Christianity. The Epilogue (“The Fight and the Light”) forms a challenge to personal service in the great venture of faith issuing in obedience. This volume has a lofty message for the present day.

## THE TOWN PARSON.

THE TOWN PARSON—HIS LIFE AND WORK, being the substance of the Pastoral Theology Lectures delivered before the University of Cambridge and at King's College, London, in the year 1914; now written out and enlarged by the Rev. Peter Green, M.A., Canon of Manchester and Chaplain to H.M. the King. London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 6s. net.

Canon Green writes as a Town Parson to Town Parsons, and writes wisely, out of a rich and varied experience. He has an ideal, but he is no mere idealist. There is much sound common sense, and sanctified “worldly wisdom” within the covers of this book—and clergy, young and old, will do well to “read, mark, learn and inwardly digest” its varied and comprehensive contents. There is a certain element that savours of a type of churchmanship commonly called “high”—but it does not bulk large in this book; and the deep tone of spiritual earnestness that pervades it will make it helpful reading to “pastors and teachers” of all schools of thought.

GALILEAN DAYS. By the Rev. F. W. Drake, Rector of Kirby Misperton. London: *Longmans, Green & Co.* 4s. 6d. net.

A devotional study of some of the chief events of our Lord's ministry in Galilee, in twelve chapters. The author holds that no mere humanitarian view of Jesus can meet the demands of the gospel story, or satisfy the deepest instincts of the human heart. Jesus must be the rule of life and the Ruler of all thought and action in days like the present if a soul would build truly and well. The author's views on the Holy Communion will not commend themselves to all: but the book reveals the Master—and that stands for much.



## CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

A USEFUL pamphlet by Mr. Albert Mitchell has just been published by the Church Book Room on the question of *Elections to the House of Laity*. The

**Enabling Act.**

pamphlet supplies a want, as it is an explanation of the change in the method of election in the new House of Laity from that which prevailed in the elections to the old House of Laymen.

In the old elections each elector had as many votes as there were members to be elected, but he could not give more than three votes to any one candidate. While that rule is retained for the lower elections, it is now superseded in the case of the elections of the actual members of the House of Laity and is based upon the principle of what is called "Proportional Representation." The pamphlet describes in clear language the effect of this and gives instructions as to how votes can be given and how they can best be used. (Price 2s. per 100). In addition to these leaflets, forms of nomination to the Diocesan Conference and to the House of Laity have been published. (Price 6d. per dozen).

A few months ago Miss Ellen M. Knox, Principal of Havergal College, published in Canada a little book of Prayers for girls, entitled *A Student's*

**Prayers for Girls.**

*Week of Prayer*, and in response to many requests an English edition of this booklet has been published by the Church Book Room, entitled *A Girl's Week of Prayer*, price 4d. The

book is primarily for the use of schoolgirls, but many older persons will find it helpful. It is simple and practical in its style, deeply devotional, and true to the spirit of the teaching of God's Holy Word. The prayers have been written in view of the difficulties of to-day and with a special longing after reality. As Miss Knox states in her preface: "We are realizing better than ever that if we would pray effectively we must think effectively, and that Prayer is *not* a magic charm, *not* a mere grasping after the good things of life, *not* a shirking of the ill, but something far grander, far nobler." The booklet contains two short prayers for every morning and evening of the week, and at the end some additional prayers for preparation for Holy Communion, for schools and colleges, before Bible study, for the choice of vocation, etc.

A little time ago we published a pamphlet by Lieut.-Col. Seton Churchill entitled *Is There a Prayer-Answering God?* Lessons from the late Great

**Prayer.**

War, price 2d. or 14s. per 100. The pamphlet was excellently reviewed and the first edition was exhausted soon after

publication. A new edition has now been issued and is on sale. The pamphlet is full of much that is valuable and contains many apt up-to-date illustrations. It will be found useful for a widespread circulation, not only to stir up the indifferent, but to satisfy the more thoughtful class of reader.

In January of this year, two pamphlets by the late Bishop of Durham were published by the Book Room. The first, *The Power of the Presence,*

**The late Bishop of Durham.**

*and its Relation to the Holy Communion*, not long since given by him as an address at a meeting of the London Clerical and Lay Evangelical Union. The Bishop's handling of this subject is at once spiritual and masterly. The second is entitled

*Holy Baptism*, a pamphlet full of instruction given in the way for which the

Bishop is so well known. Other pamphlets by the Bishop to be obtained from the Church Book Room are *The Supper of the Lord*, 1d.; *The Story of the Prayer Book*, 1d.; *The Cup of the Covenant*, 1d.; *Conversion*, 1d. Of the Bishop's larger books several copies of his Biography of *Charles Simeon*, a book now out of print, are in stock, price 1s. 6d. net, and some copies of the following devotional books at 1s. net each: *Thoughts on Christian Sanctity*, *The Secret of the Presence*, *Temptation and Escape*, *Our Prayer Book*, and *Pledges of His Love*.

An excellent translation by the late Canon F. Meyrick of Jewel's *Apology of the Church of England* is published by the Book Room at 6d. net, and in two penny pamphlets under the title of *Jewel on the English Reformation* and *The Faith of English Churchmen*. Lady Ann Bacon's translation of the *Apology* can also be obtained, price 6d. net. The Dean of Canterbury, when addressing the students of St. John's Hall, Highbury recently, speaking of the care that should be taken to give utmost attention to the study of history and principles of the Reformation, said that "they would be helped in this by studying Jewel's *Apology* of the Church of England. It contained the principles of the Reformation and the Church of England in a nutshell, and was written by a man whom Hooker called the greatest scholar of his age. A clergyman who did not know Jewel's *Apology* did not know the trust deeds of his Church. If they studied that book they would get at the heart of the Reformation, and know the ground upon which the Church of England stood. They must remember that the Church of England, so long as it remained the Church of England, would never get away from those trust deeds."

In view of the forthcoming Lambeth Conference the following books will be of interest to readers: *Episcopacy and Unity*, by the Rev. H. A. Wilson, Rector of Cheltenham, price 3s. 6d. This book is marked by its scholarship, by its lucid, temperate and careful writing, and gives exactly the information required. Readers will have no doubt as to the views held by the Reformers and their successors on Episcopacy and the Church of Christ. *No Bishop, No Church*, Anglo-Catholic Claims Examined, by the Rev. J. R. Cohu, M.A., Rector of Aston Clinton. Mr. Cohu examines utterances by Anglo-Catholics in the light of the best available English theological thought as represented by Lightfoot, Hatch, Hort, Westcott, Swete and Gwatkin. His aim being to show in a very simple, popular, yet accurate form their invaluable historical facts bearing on the Christian Ministry. *Apostolical Succession Considered*, or *The Constitution of a Christian Church, its Powers and Ministry*, by Archbishop Whately, with an Appendix of recent Anglican Views on Apostolical Succession. 1s. net. Professor Gwatkin's *Episcopacy, In Scripture and Episcopacy, In the Church of England*, 1d. each. *Steps towards Reunion*, a Statement for the Consultative Committee, by the Rt. Rev. W. G. Peel, D.D., Bishop of Mombasa, and the Rt. Rev. J. J. Willis, D.D., Bishop of Uganda. 1s. net. *Kikuyu*, 1918, Report of the United Conference of the Missionary Societies in British East Africa. 6d.

