

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

March, 1915.

The Month.

The Revision
Muddle. WE have read with respectful attention the debates on Prayer-Book Revision which took place at the February session of the Convocation of Canterbury, and confess we are puzzled. No doubt the Bishops themselves know what they have done and what will be the effect of their action, but ordinary people will find it difficult to declare with any preciseness what is the exact position to-day. The debates arose on the presentation of a Report from the Joint Committee which had been considering the recommendations submitted by the two Houses of Convocation, with a view to harmonizing the various proposals and suggesting how the alterations could best be carried out. The Report is somewhat voluminous, and deals with no fewer than 162 recommendations. On 143 of these agreement has been reached; the remainder are to be dealt with by further consideration, a joint conference, or in some other way. The point, however, is not material for the moment. What is important is that the Bishops, before entering upon the consideration of the Report, discussed what is to be done with the alterations when they are all agreed to. Should they be inserted in the Book of Common Prayer? or should they be issued separately? The Committee expressed their view that it was not desirable to seek to introduce them into the text of the Prayer-Book, but that they should be embodied in another volume, "to be sanctioned by authority for optional use for such period as may hereafter be deter-

mined." The Bishop of Gloucester, as the Committee's mouth-piece, moved a resolution to that effect. The Bishop of Ely dissented, and proposed an amendment to embody the changes in a draft Prayer-Book to be laid before the Church, not for use, but for review and criticism, for a period of at least a year. After the criticism of the Church had been fully considered, parliamentary sanction should be sought for the changes officially recommended. The amendment was lost, and the Bishop of Gloucester's proposal was carried by seventeen to five, with the addition of the words "or schedule" after "another volume." This is fairly clear so far as it goes, but one statement by the Archbishop of Canterbury has introduced an element of mystery which at present is altogether unexplained. He said that his own view was that, when they came to compile the supplementary paper or schedule, they would find that the actual changes were very small, and that the vast majority of the 162 recommendations before them would disappear. The Bishop of Lincoln expressed surprise at the statement, but the Archbishop quietly replied: "I mean it." At present there is no sign of any of these "changes" disappearing—indeed, the reactionary party in the Lower House are steadily contending for them all. Further light may be given to us at the April group of sessions. For the present we feel that the CHURCHMAN may at least congratulate itself on one point. We called for a policy of "hands off the Prayer-Book," and it would seem that even the Bishops have seen the wisdom of such a policy. Whatever may happen eventually, we are sincerely glad to find that the Prayer-Book itself is to remain untouched. But whether there is to be an alternative Prayer-Book, or a supplement, or an appendix, or a schedule, has not yet definitely emerged.

A Vigorous
Protest.

It would be idle to deny, however, that the position has suddenly become one of great gravity. Many of the changes are of no doctrinal importance; but in regard to others, which have been accepted by

both Houses, it is not too much to say that, if they were finally authorized, they would change the character of the Church of England, and change it in the Romeward direction. The Dean of Canterbury, who, all through the Revision debates has steadfastly resisted the Romeward drift, has uttered a strong warning in the columns of *The Times*. In a letter to that journal which appeared on February 17 he referred to the vital disputes respecting ritual by which the Church has been distracted for fifty years, and which the Royal Commission was appointed to appease, and said :

“The use of vestments, the transformation of the present Communion Service, Reservation—these are the chief occasions of the disorders which have prevailed. Convocation was invited, on the advice of the Commissioners, to propose a settlement of these disputes. It has refused to do so. All these matters of bitter controversy are now thrown back as bones of contention in every parish in the country for at least a period of some years. Every clergyman, and any party among his parishioners, are thus invited to promote experiments with the various changes which are to be made optional. The authorities of the Church had two courses open to them. They might have required obedience to the existing law, or they might have obtained a definite alteration of the law. They have done neither. They have not had the courage to take responsibility themselves. They have only proposed to set up a ring within which the parties in the Church are authorized and invited to continue their fights, the Bishop becoming the referee.

“It aggravates the scandal of this proposal that it should have been brought forward, with scarcely any notice, at a time when it was hoped, and understood, that there would be a truce to all such controversies in the Church. The resentment with which it will be received by a large section of Churchmen will be embittered by the indecency—for it is nothing less—of reviving such disputes at an hour when the minds of all serious laymen, at all events, are absorbed in the really solemn realities of the war.”

Nor does the Dean stand alone. He is without much support in the Southern Province, but in the North the cause he espouses is championed by the Bishop of Manchester and others, both in Convocation and out of it. Bishop Knox, speaking at a Church Pastoral Aid Society's meeting at Liverpool, hinted at the possibility “in a very short time” of an Act of Parliament being passed “which would side-track completely their beloved Prayer-Book, won for them by the blood of martyrs.” This warning should be kept steadily in mind, but

we believe that there is much yet to be done before the time is ripe for going to Parliament. When, it may be asked, are the laity to have an opportunity of expressing their views upon these "Revision" proposals? The Church has two Houses of Laymen, one for the Southern and the other for the Northern Province, and these are entitled to be consulted. It will not be enough for the scheme to be brought before the Representative Church Council, of which the Houses of Laymen form an integral part. There ought to be separate and independent consideration by the laity in their own Houses.

"No Truce." We agree entirely with the Dean of Canterbury that it is deplorable that so controversial a question as Prayer-Book Revision should be pressed forward at the present time. The prelates and clergy who are showing such mad haste to get this matter settled are the very men who, only a few months ago, were complaining—and in our view quite rightly complaining—that the Government were taking advantage of the war to force the Welsh Church Act into law at a time when, as they knew perfectly well, loyalty to the principle of national unity would prevent opponents of the measure from offering any effective opposition. The action of the Government, however, fades into insignificance beside that of the Houses of Convocation, which are using their majorities to force through a scheme of revision which, if it were ultimately accepted in its present form, might conceivably rend the Church of England in twain. Their action seems to us to be as tyrannical as it is inexcusable. The war offered a splendid opportunity for parties in the Church of England to call a truce in matters of religious controversy. No individual and no cause would have suffered by it—on the contrary, the cause of religion would have gained immensely from it; and who can tell but that, when the war is over, it might have proved itself the stepping-stone to a larger measure of unity than any of us has yet seen? But the dominant party in Convocation have by their actions—which always speak louder than words—

declared "No truce." War or no war in Europe, the warfare within the Church is to go on to the bitter end. A pretty spectacle the Church will present to the outside world! And for this we have to thank, not the opponents of the present scheme of Revision, but those who are pressing it forward. They seem fairly confident of victory. We are not so sure. Much has yet to be done before Parliament—which alone can legalize the proposed changes—can be approached; and it is quite certain that the Dean of Canterbury and his friends will use the interval for so organizing their forces that when the final tussle comes Parliament will be made aware that there is within the Church of England a strong and compact body of clergy and laity who will resist to the utmost the imposition of any changes which tend to assimilate the services and worship of the National Church to the services and worship of the Church of Rome.

The Welsh Church and Convocation. When the Welsh Church Bill was under discussion much was heard of its "dismemberment" clauses, which found opponents even among those (*e.g.*, the Bishop of Oxford) who were favourable to the main purposes of the measure. Now that the Act has been passed, the question becomes acute: Are the Welsh Bishops and Welsh clergy to continue to sit, or are they to be excluded from Convocation? The wording of the Act is precise: "As from the date of disestablishment the Bishops and clergy of the Church in Wales shall cease to be members or be represented in the Houses of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, but nothing in this Act shall affect the powers of those Houses so far as they relate to matters outside Wales and Monmouthshire" (Clause 3, Section 5). Upon this clause a great controversy has arisen. It is argued, on the one hand, that the enactment violates a fundamental principle of the Constitution, which has always recognized the inherent independence of Convocation; and, on the other, that Parliament, being the supreme authority, has the right to interfere in the way it has

done. The existence of any such "right" may be, and is, seriously contested, but of the absolute "power" of Parliament there is only too much evidence. The Lower House of Convocation at the February group of sessions passed a resolution representing to the President the "urgent need" of a short Amending Bill for the purpose of preserving for the Bishops and clergy of the four Welsh dioceses "their full rights in relation to the Provincial Synod of Canterbury." This proposal was duly communicated to the Upper House, which, it is significant to note, did not express a direct opinion upon the proposal, but appointed a committee to consider "what action, if any," should be taken in regard to it, and to take the necessary steps, "if action seemed desirable." The extreme caution shown by the Upper House at least suggests a doubt whether the Bishops feel the proposal for an Amending Act to be practicable.

The resolution of the Lower House was based upon a Report of the Committee on the Relations between Church and State, which set out the facts of the case from the point of view of Convocation. A few passages from this Report will make the position clear :

**The Case for
Convocation.**

"All the best historical authorities are agreed that 'Convocation' is identical with 'the Provincial Synod.' The Southern Houses of Convocation are, not only in essence, but in fact, 'the Synod of the Province of Canterbury.' Thus, *e.g.*, Bishop Stubbs states that he knows no difference in meaning between a Provincial Synod of Canterbury and Convocation of Canterbury. . . .

"Provincial Synods date back to at least the fourth century. The Council of Nicea (A.D. 325) enacted that the Synod of every Province should be summoned twice every year.

"The four Welsh dioceses have never formed an independent Province. They have from very early times—certainly before the Conquest—recognized a supremacy in Canterbury. . . .

"Welsh Bishops are known to have attended the Synod or Convocation of Canterbury ever since early in the twelfth century—*e.g.*, in 1102 and 1127. . . .

"The regular representation of the clergy by Proctors in Convocation was finally established by Archbishop Peckham in A.D. 1283. . . . Welsh Proctors appeared in Convocation two and a half centuries before any Welsh member appeared in Parliament.

"Prior to the Submission of the Clergy Act, A.D. 1534, a King's writ was issued for the summoning of Convocation when a subsidy was desired. On other occasions the Archbishop summoned them *proprio motu*.

"The Submission of the Clergy Act was passed with the consent of Convocation—it was passed in the arbitrary days of Henry VIII.—and even this Act, though it restricted the power, did not alter the constitution of Convocation.

"Since this Act the King has always issued a writ; but Convocation is not summoned by that writ, but by the Archbishop's mandate issued in accordance with the writ.

"Thus, Convocation is older than Parliament; and Convocation and Parliament have been always independent of one another.

"Convocation conducts the business of the Church with complete independence, subject to the Archbishop's control, and, except when a new canon is to be made, needs no licence from the King.

"Parliament has never interfered with, or assumed any right to interfere with, the constitution of Convocation. . . .

"In answer to the question whether the four Welsh dioceses would still be part of the province of Canterbury, the Home Secretary at first said 'No,' and afterwards said 'Yes.' Evidently, however, they are; and while the Archbishop is bound to summon them to the Provincial Synod, their membership in it is declared by the Act to have ceased. As members of the Province of Canterbury, they have a spiritual allegiance to the Archbishop, and an obligation to attend his Synod, from which they cannot discharge themselves, and from which no secular authority can discharge them. An *impasse*, therefore, has been created."

It is to remove this *impasse* that the Amending Bill is now desired. But on the practical side it is clear that the Government show no sign of willingness to make any concession at all to the Welsh Church. If, therefore, no relief can be found in that quarter it would seem to be certain that the Welsh Bishops and clergy will lose their seats. It has even been suggested that their presence, in the circumstances, would invalidate the proceedings of Convocation. The position must be borne patiently until the time comes—if ever it does—when Churchmen will be able to secure the repeal of the Act as a whole.

Confirmation
and
Communion.

The current number of the *Church Quarterly Review* contains an able article on Confirmation and Communion from the legal point of view.

Unfortunately the paper is not signed—a fact which detracts somewhat from its interest, if not from its value. It is designed

as an answer to the "A. C." of the *Spectator*, and it must be admitted at once that the view of the rubric for which that distinguished lawyer contended is shown to be untenable. The writer of the *Church Quarterly Review* article sums up his own contention thus :

"From 1281 down to the present day a direction (with or without qualification) that no person not confirmed be admitted to Communion has formed continuously part of the written law of the Church of England. The enactment has not been blindly or mechanically continued. On the contrary, at each opportunity of revision it has been materially altered ; in 1549, in 1552, and in 1662. On the last occasion it was modified, in deference to those who objected that as it stood it was too drastic, so that no one comes within its operation who is willing, when called upon, to submit himself to what is unquestionably one of the regular ordinances of the Church. Against this formidable continuity of definite and unambiguous legislation there is really nothing whatever to be set except the general *prima facie* duty to communicate, as to which we have already said enough, and the alleged practice of the Bishops in the latter part of the sixteenth, and earlier part of the seventeenth century. It would be a sufficient answer to the latter point that the legislation now in force is of later date, and was drawn up by those who must have known of this practice, if and so far as it existed. But apart from this, it is obvious that law embodied in actual statutory enactment cannot be abrogated by the negligence of Bishops or anyone else in enforcing or observing it. The question of law, therefore, appears to us to admit of but one answer—namely, that a clergyman of the Church of England is legally justified in refusing Communion to a person who is neither confirmed nor willing to be confirmed."

As an answer to "A. C." the article is effective ; but the writer would have done more useful service if he had referred more explicitly than he has done to the argument advanced by *The Times* writer—another very distinguished lawyer—who last summer also answered "A. C." The real question is whether "the law" as stated above admits of sufficient relaxation to allow of Christian Nonconformists being received at the Holy Communion in the Church of England, and upon this point the writer in the *Church Quarterly Review* offers no direct guidance. It may be inferred that his answer would be in the negative, but we should have preferred an explicit statement. *The Times* writer, it will be remembered, dealt with this question most ably. He upheld the view that the rubric requiring Confirmation as a condition of Communion does not

apply to "persons professing the Christian faith who have been baptized and grown up outside the Church of England," but is confined in its operation to those who have been baptized in the Church of England. "There is no trace of any canon or rubric which lays down the same rule for others." He declared that "the law of the Church of England leaves the question as it affects devout and Catholic-minded Nonconformists thus frankly open"; and we admit that the generosity of this view appeals to us more forcibly than does the hard-and-fast legal rule contended for by the writer in the *Church Quarterly Review*.

A Question of Morals. Among the moral questions which have arisen in connection with this war, few are more important than that which relates to the allowances made to the dependents of the men who have gone to the front. At first, we believe, no distinction was drawn between the wife and her children, and the woman who had lived with the soldier unmarried and had had children by him. Both women were granted the same allowance. This was felt in many quarters to be a grave scandal, and undoubtedly it called for the most serious consideration. The Archbishop of Canterbury, in the name of the whole episcopate, wrote to the Prime Minister to urge upon those in authority their view that, in acting generously towards the dependents of soldiers, there must be the utmost care taken not to break down the distinction between married and unmarried mothers, which they regarded as vital to the country's well-being, and precious beyond measure to those who were the real wives of the soldiers themselves. As a result of this intervention a distinction has now been drawn between the soldier's wife and children and the other dependents of soldiers. In the case of the wife, relief is obtainable, according to the scale set forth, as a matter of right. In the case of the other dependents who claim relief, a test is applied by a tribunal created to investigate each case. There is thus no longer any possibility of confusion between the married woman,

who comes as a matter of right to claim her allowance, and the other dependent, who has to pass through the sieve of the Pensions Committee before relief can be obtained. The arrangement is far from ideal, but it seems to be the best that could be obtained. The point is not free from difficulty, as men who respond to the call to fight for their country are entitled to ask that those who are really dependent upon them, whatever the relationship may be, shall be provided for. What we regret is that the State did not take the opportunity to bring pressure to bear upon the men to discontinue the illicit character of the intercourse. Each man should have been urged to marry the woman with whom he was living, and we are confident that in a very large number of cases the advice would have been taken. The influence of the woman would certainly have been in that direction. We believe that this view obtains favour among Commanding Officers, some of whom, at least, look with disfavour upon even the present arrangement.



The Christ of the Gospel.

No. III.—“CRUCIFIED ALSO FOR US UNDER PONTIUS PILATE.”

IN M. Loisy's candid and tragic autobiographical work, entitled “*Choses Passées*,” there is a passage of some note as revealing the extent to which, years before his break with the Church, he had driven the sharp wedge of distinction between truth as fact and truth as value into the historic Christian theology which emphasized the religious necessity of an immutable coincidence of the two. He says that he had come to accept no single article of the Creed according to its literal significance except “*peut-être crucifixe sous Ponce Pilate.*”

Now whether the value of the Cross could continue while the fact of the Cross was represented by a “perhaps” is a question which, in one or two of its bearings, we may try to answer a little further on in this article. At the outset one word of reassurance may be addressed to any who, not for themselves but for others, dread the disturbing influence of the extreme scepticism represented by A. Drews, W. B. Smith, and J. M. Robertson, for whom the crucifixion of any such person as the Jesus of the Gospels has passed beyond the limits of all credibility. However clever and unsettling the literature which resolves historic Christianity as to its origins and the Person of its Founder into a species of widespread, if not universal, mythology may appear, it is essentially ephemeral because it is essentially not sane. It would need a succession of Smiths and Robertsons repeated in generation after generation to make the question of the existence of the historic Jesus a living question, a question which mankind as a whole would ponder over, seeking with anxious heart and aroused intelligence an answer. It is with such concentration of mind and soul that mankind does continually, though not always with equal intensity, confront the deepest and most real problems of religion. But the affirmation of the non-historicity of Jesus is the mark of an

esoteric cult, with which the common sense of mankind clashes as entirely and yet with as little belief in the possibility of such a cult extending or even maintaining its ground, as when some extravagant movement in æsthetics raises a storm of controversy which is destined to be stilled as suddenly as it arose, and to leave behind it no ripple to testify to its former violence.

When, therefore, we confess that Jesus was crucified under Pontius Pilate, we are standing on ground which we have a right to believe will prove firm.¹ The first chapter in Professor Loof's "What is the Truth about Jesus Christ?" may be recommended to those who are interested in the character of early non-Christian testimony to the existence of Christ. But the words "also for us" raise a different, and truly vital, issue. For in these words the fact is integrated into a whole religious and theological view of the world, and is made the subject of a particular valuation. The English word "also" is more forceful than the Greek *καί*, which is simply a connecting particle; yet the connection is of such a nature as to be in itself significant, for it is between an act so obviously transcendental in character as the Incarnation and making man of the Only Begotten Son of God, and an act which, at first sight, is a mere historical occurrence at a point in time. It is obvious why, if the birth of Jesus was in truth the Incarnation of the Son of God, belief in it should be made prominent in a Creed; it represents a completely new point of departure in the dealings of God with man; but, once granted the Incarnation, it is not immediately obvious why a particular event in the life, or rather the conclusion of the earthly life, of the Incarnate One, should be selected for special emphasis. One might have thought it a mere matter of course that if God were to become man He would submit to those experiences that condition human existence. Accordingly, the very fact of a connection being established between the Incarnation and the death of the Only Begotten leads us

¹ For a recent consideration of the testimony of non-Christian writers—Tacitus, Suetonius, and Josephus—see Loof's "What is the Truth about Jesus Christ?" Lecture I.

to expect a special valuation of the latter; and this is given in the words *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* "on our behalf" for us.

A distinction—though one should be careful not to press it over much—can be drawn between the *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* of this clause and the *δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν* with which the clause that asserts the Incarnation begins. Those words do indeed affirm a relationship between the Incarnation and human salvation, yet by way of intention rather than of immediate conjunction. That salvation is regarded as springing from results made possible by the Incarnation rather than as inherent in the Incarnation itself. But the crucifixion is spoken of as definitely endured for the advantage of men. The distinction is clearer in the Greek than in the English. Thus one temporal and historical event is selected as charged with the peculiar power and man-ward purposes of God. If we may make use of a definition from the religious philosophy of Eucken to interpret the Creed, an historical occurrence is raised from the level of phenomenon to the level of fact. And if we conceive of different degrees of reality, then this is real in the highest degree.

So does the Creed answer by anticipation such a modern question as "Does faith need facts?" For if to a fact of history is ascribed a Divine potency, then without doubt faith can function truly only through response to, and dependence upon, such a fact. The attempt of certain Modernists to differentiate sharply between fact and faith is condemned by the union effected in the Creed between facts and values, with the implicit corollary that the abandonment of the facts would mean the abandonment of the values, or, at least, their complete unsettling. It is, of course, open to anyone to reply that we are in the early days of Modernist reconstruction, and that we have yet to see whether the philosophical principles underlying the work of Tyrrell, Le Roy, and Laberthonière, and of Loisy's earlier apologetic, are not capable of creating a new type of Christian belief and theology which shall move free from uncomfortable dependence upon the real or supposed

events of past history. In other words, a new Catholicism may fulfil the unredeemed promises of Ritschl's new Protestantism. It is possible; but if it would be obscurantism to say less, it would be credulity to say more.¹

After all, the importance of the historical order involves the importance of the events which go to make up that order. The values of the present world-civilization have been prepared for and engendered by the facts of the past; facts, too, which are not merely the links in the chain of regular process, but facts of an abrupt and catastrophic character. Even as the great storm which swept over Borrowdale in November, 1898, nearly destroyed the hamlet of Seathwaite, and permanently altered the course of the River Derwent, so may the channel of historical tendency be changed by events which strike athwart and oppose the normal process of the generations amid which they emerge. This being so, there is nothing unreasonable in making a fact of history of decisive moment for religion. Once let it be allowed that God works through history—and the denial of this is possible only to a deism long since exploded or an atheism which saves itself from an enervating pessimism by means of an unwarrantable optimism—and there remains no legitimate philosophical objection to God's mark upon history, and for the sake of all future history being compressed into, though not exhausted in, an occurrence set in a particular environment of time and locality. And though one might not expect a metaphysician to accede to this consideration and argument, it still may not be wholly irrelevant to remember that for the great majority of men the historical order is far more real than any reconstruction of reality finely spun by the philosophical mind—and sometimes merely out of itself. Such a connection of fact with value as the *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* of the Creed enforces would indicate, among other things, a real condescension on the part of God to man in respect of

¹ Reference may be made to the criticism of Modernism in Professor Santayana's "Winds of Doctrine," especially the concluding pages of the essay.

his limited temporal existence; in which existence, however, because its limitations condition him at every point, he looks wistfully and anxiously for something that will assure him of the Divine care for himself and the Divine concern with the only reality that he is able to apprehend.

But granted the relevance of the historical for religion, there still remains the question as to the relevance of this particular historical event, the crucifixion of Jesus. We know how many sincere and devoted Christians, many to whom the doctrine of the Incarnation, of the coming into the world of Him Who is the true light that lighteneth every man coming into the world, is indeed such a "light as never was on sea and land," illumining their whole intellectual and spiritual horizon, yet find it difficult, almost impossible, to attach any peculiar significance to the event in which the self-abnegation of the Incarnation came to its close. And it is a mistake to under-rate, as some esteemed modern theologians are apt to do, the religious value of the Incarnation itself. Nevertheless, the Creed does not permit us to find the fulness of the Christian revelation in the Incarnation alone. Nor is the Cross simply the climax; rather is it a new fact, unique in its bearing upon man's good.

How this is so raises the whole problem of soteriology. And soteriology has never acquired a terminological orthodoxy equivalent to that which, whether viewed as guidance to follow or obstacle to overcome, appertains to Christology. Yet even in the brief statement of the Creed there are hints of which we can avail ourselves. It is not merely that He died, but that He was crucified. The manner of the death was, as far as we can see, irrelevant—an accident resulting from the laws of the time;¹ not so the fact that the death was inflicted by men, and not the consequence of the working of natural laws of gradual bodily decay.

Consider it in this way: there are three magnitudes of a special kind with which almost everyone feels, at one time or

¹ If this is true, then to lay stress on the amount of bodily suffering is to emphasize an accidental rather than essential element.

another, that he has an individual concern—God, sin, and death. And these magnitudes possess an inner connection between themselves, or, at least, man finds it so natural to connect one with the other that he cannot but believe that some link, as it were on the inside, hidden from him, keeps them ever in the same plane. So each magnitude can be defined or represented in terms of the other two. God is the magnitude condemning sin and the utter antithesis of death. Sin is the magnitude defying God and serving death. Death is the contrast to God (but can be regarded as the way to Him), the reward of sin (but also deliverance from those conditions under which sin is known to us). To the problem of these three magnitudes man, in so far as he is conscious of life as more than a succession of transient experiences, addresses himself. If sin and death combined are for him the negation of God, then, in all probability, he will go on to accept as ultimate the defeat, that is, the extinction, of life in the highest forms known to him—a defeat not simply in the physical sphere, for the passing of moral values from the world, with a static, non-moral universe as the outcome, could only be anticipated as a permanent impoverishment of existence by the obliteration of its highest order. On the other hand, the acceptance of God, that is, of a final principle of life and goodness, as the highest of all realities, does not immediately elucidate the whole problem of sin and death; on the contrary, it renders inexplicable for many the fact of moral and physical evil, so that intellectual treatments irritate rather than help.

Now it would be going altogether too far to say that the crucifixion is in itself the solvent of these difficulties. In itself it can appear as the most tragic triumph of sin and death. It invites explanation. And it is useless to look for that explanation—at first, at any rate—in the Cross by itself. The Cross becomes luminous only through the Resurrection and the history of the Church. But in their light we begin to see and to experience the meaning of the Cross, and to understand why the death of Christ is specially mentioned in the Creed.

The Resurrection is the triumphant reversal of death. The Church is the one earthly community which professedly exists in continual reaction from moral evil, from sin. The ultimate subjection of sin is the ideal of the latter, just as the anticipatory, foregone subjection of death is the message of the former. Both message and ideal involve the presence of the power of God. The former would otherwise be incredible, the latter, at best, a pious hope. But message and ideal are also dependent upon the Cross; the former directly, the latter one stage removed. Yet, as we have no means whatever of portraying to ourselves the character of this unique community without, as preceding its foundation, the death of its Founder, since all the evidence that we have to handle brings the two into the closest possible relationship, we have a right to believe that there is more than an accidental connection between the facts that Christ died and that the Christian community sprang into vigorous existence, with constant and increasing backward glances thrown upon that death, in the same year.

The results of the crucifixion being so remarkable, it is entirely legitimate to regard the Cross itself as a fact deserving to be valued far more highly, far differently in kind from what would be the case had the death of Christ been but the normal termination of His earthly career. And we know how the various soteriological theories which have revealed varied strains of Christian thought on this subject have been conditioned by the sense of the imperative necessity for an adequate valuation of His death. With those theories, and with the problem of the choice between them, we are not immediately concerned. But what we desire to emphasize very strongly is that if the Catholic Christology and the doctrine of the Incarnation is true; if belief in the Resurrection is an affirmation of legitimate faith; if membership of the Church is more precious in the richness of the blessings that it brings than attachment to any other form of human organization, then the Cross which brings to so sharp and amazing an ending the Incarnate life, and is yet itself the preparation for the beginning of a new order, must be given

some special place in the Divine purposes, must be held capable of or to involve some interpretation which will show the necessity for so awful an event in the midst of God's gracious dealings with men.

We have spoken of the three magnitudes—God, sin, and death. In the Cross, as an isolated phenomenon, we see the subjection of the first magnitude, in the Person of the only Begotten Son to the third magnitude through the instrumentality of the second, or, looked at from another angle, to the second through the instrumentality of the third. The moment we pass beyond the phenomenal aspect we are conscious of subjection converted into victory. But a subjection of this kind is not at once explained and rendered natural by the triumph. Only if the Cross has a power and value of its own, though we must look beyond the Cross to realize the presence of such power and value, does the fact of the Cross cease to be the stumbling-block which so many have found it. And this reacts upon the doctrine of the Incarnation itself; for an Incarnation which involves the Cross becomes altogether less credible, if the Cross is treated as just an episode.

But if some worthy and sufficient purpose is contained in God's voluntary subjection of Himself, in the person of Christ, to death at the hands of sinners, then the Cross is no longer an unilluminated marvel but a revelation of the kind of God with Whom we have to deal, a God Who will share in the bitterest experience, short of actual sinning, which can ever befall man—the power of sin through death to cut short the work of the righteous. There is nothing which can seem to us so utterly tragic and senseless, nothing so provocative of cankering doubts or gloomy despair. Yet should it be so if this was God's method for the achievement of His ends?

In the Creed, where it speaks of the crucifixion, we are not told what it was that God designed to effect thereby, what could result by no other way save the way of the Cross. But we are told why God so acted; it was "on our behalf." Now it is a very curious thing that, whereas professors of what is called

Liberal Protestantism have had much to say of Christianity as teaching the noblest altruism, as urging that higher righteousness which is produced only through acceptance of the law of love, they have been ready to treat as just so much mythology doctrines which find a place for the supreme exercise of these ethical qualities—by God Himself. But the New Testament connects them specifically. “ Though He was rich, yet for our sakes He became poor ”—that is the Incarnation ; “ Who loved me, and gave Himself for me ”—that is the Cross. There is something radically wrong, profoundly and tragically blind, in a method which can overlook the patent and unparalleled moral implicates of a doctrine, and spend its attention on the elaboration of difficulties and oppositions whose effectiveness too often rests on a failure to remember the distinction between God and His ways, and man and his. That God Himself has done and endured what He bids men do and endure, this is the Catholic doctrine ; and it is this which is needed if the ethical side of the Gospel is to possess that full power and control over men’s consciences, that appeal to their hearts, without which the life has gone out of it.

Not “ Are we to believe in God ? ” but “ What kind of a God are we to believe in ? ” is the question that really troubles men. What is His power, what His will, what His love ? The last above all. And, for whatever the fact may be worth, the Cross more than anything else in the world, more than any other fact, or doctrine, or argument, has convinced men of God’s love. It is impossible to theorize about the Cross when the starting-point is the doctrine of the Incarnation, and not return always to this thought : There would have been no Cross, but for the love of God. Take any “ explanation ” of the Cross, anyone that may offend us at almost every point, anyone that seems beset by the gravest moral difficulties ; nevertheless, the love of God cannot be wholly obscured ; it still shines out as the cause of man not being left to perish, as that which secured in this way from all eternity the salvation of the elect. The great soteriological tradition which descends from Abelard has had most to say of the revelation of the love of God in the Cross,

but wherever there has been Christian devotion to the Crucified, wherever men have lifted up their eyes to Him as their Saviour, calling Him their Representative, Substitute, Sacrifice, or whatever name has seemed best to reveal the meaning of His presence for them in that bitter passion, there has been lit the spark to light men to the knowledge that God is love.

How the Cross reveals God as not only loving but holy, not only saving sinners but also repairing the moral havoc wrought through sin, and freeing life from the fast-bound burden of its own guilt, we are not told in the Creed. But the Cross would be less than it is in Christian experience if, as historic fact, it were not the earthly centre of the holy warfare which God, because He is holy, must wage against evil. That such an understanding of the Cross is grounded in the New Testament and not forced upon it is certain; yet that does not mean the absence of different angles from which the Cross may be viewed, both in the New Testament itself, and for us. And if we say that the "was crucified for us" of the Creed is reminiscent of St. Paul's "Christ died for our sins," we do justice to the emphasis of the words, without trying to read into them the details of any one theory.

The historian Tacitus, our earliest pagan witness to Christianity, knew nothing about Christ except that He was put to death. Christ, as a factor in history—and Tacitus saw, amazing as it appeared to him, that in some degree He was that—was a person Who had been killed. Is there not something divinely ironic in this fact, so contemptuously recorded by the Roman, being *the* fact in which, even while he was writing, the Christian Church gloried? And so, as human fact and Divine value, it received its place in the great Creed of the Church, bearing witness to Christianity as the religion which finds God in history, not directing its course from afar, but moulding it from within, and that not through inevitable immanence, but through sacrifice, suffering, and death for the fulfilment of His holy purposes and inspired by His love. J. K. MOZLEY.

[The fourth article in this series, "Rose again according to the Scriptures," will appear in the April issue of the CHURCHMAN, and will be contributed by the Rev. A. J. Tait, D.D.]

Notes in St. John's Gospel.

IT is a standing rule of the British and Foreign Bible Society that its editions of the Scriptures should be issued "without note or comment." This rule is commendable for many reasons, but in spite of it there are plenty of notes in every Bible; thus, in St. John's Gospel alone there are something like fifty. This phenomenon is full of interest and deserves careful scrutiny.

We have to remember, in the first place, the appearance of the manuscript as it left the hand of the writer, whether it was on parchment or papyrus. There were no capital letters, no brackets or marks of parenthesis, no punctuation, and frequently no separation between word and word. Readers can see this for themselves in the British Museum, or in the Library of the Bible Society where the *Codex Zacynthius* is exhibited. The consequence is that the student of St. John's Gospel has to be led by his mind rather than by his eye if he wishes to detect notes, and he soon finds out that they are of different classes. In the second place, we must bear in mind that there is a distinction between the remarks and reflections of the narrator and the original utterances of the Personage Whose words he records, which may have embodied certain explanatory sentences. Then, thirdly, the scene of the Gospel is laid in Palestine, chiefly in Judea, and the people were largely bilingual, if not trilingual, so that the writer may have felt it desirable to give names in two languages. These linguistic elucidations, however, are not strictly archæological; they are adapted to the day in which the book was written, and may as well have been written by St. John as by anyone else. For archæological notes we should look at such a chapter as Gen. xiv., which contains seven notes giving more modern place-names for ancient ones.

1. The linguistic notes are *Rabbi* (*i.e.*, being interpreted, Teacher), chap. i. 38; *Messiah* (*i.e.*, Anointed, or Christ), i. 42; *Cephas* (which is, interpreted, piece of rock, or Peter), i. 43; I know that *Messiah* cometh (who is called Christ),

iv. 25—apparently the woman's own note; *Thomas* (who is called Twin, Didymus), xi. 16—repeated in xxi. 2; *Rabboni* (*i.e.*, Teacher), xx. 16.

There are also certain place-names: *Siloam* (which is, interpreted, sent—forth), chap. ix. 7; *Lithostroton* (Hebrew Gabbatha), xix. 13; place of a *cranium* (which is called in Hebrew Golgotha), xix. 17. The order of the words in these last cases is noteworthy. There has been much discussion as to St. John's interpretation of Siloam. Nehemiah (iii. 15) tells us that the Pool of Siloam was by the King's garden (compare ii. 14—the King's Pool). Perhaps St. John gives the word the natural Greek rendering, because he sees in this "conduit" a spiritual significance. The "Hebrew" here referred to was the current Jewish tongue in which Christ spoke to Paul, and Paul to the people (Acts xxvi. 14, xxi. 40).

Some words are not interpreted—*e.g.*, *Bethesda* (v. 2); *Hosanna* (xii. 13); the *Encenia*, or Feast of the Maccabean Dedication (x. 22); and *Satan*.

2. Notes of the second class are for the elucidation of the narrative. Thus, the Lord says to the woman, "Give Me to drink (for His disciples had gone away into the town to buy food);" in this way only could His request be accounted for (iv. 8). In the next verse there is a note explaining that Jews have no dealings with Samaritans. It might be the woman's remark, but it is probably John's. The note in chap. viii. 6, "this they said tempting Him," etc., is evidently John's. The same is the case with chap. vii. 5, which tells us of the unbelief of the Lord's brethren. Similarly there is a note on the conduct of the blind man's parents (ix. 22), which otherwise would appear rather hard and unnatural. In xiii. 11 we have St. John's comment on his Master's words, "ye are clean, but not all." Compare the note on the knowledge of the servants who drew the wine at Cana (ii. 9), and the distinction between the one Judas and the other in xiv. 22.

3. A third class of notes bears on quotations from the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Thus (ii. 17), "His disciples

remembered that it is written, Zeal for Thy house hath consumed me"; and again, with reference to the Lord's riding on an ass, John adds: "These things the disciples did not know at first, but when Jesus was glorified then they remembered that these things were written of Him, and that they did these things to Him." In xix. 24, where the casting of lots for the vesture is narrated, the fulfilment of Ps. xxii. 18 is pointed out; and, again, in the same chapter, verses 36 and 37 are marked as fulfilling both part of the Paschal ritual and also a sentence in Zechariah's prophecy.

Sometimes it is not St. John, but Christ Himself, who makes a direct quotation from the Old Testament. Thus, in xiii. 18: "I know whom I have chosen, but that the Scripture might be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with Me hath lifted up his heel against Me." So in xv. 25: "But that the word written in their law might be fulfilled, They hated Me without a cause." Again, in xvii. 12: "None of them hath perished (is lost) but the son of perdition, that the Scripture might be fulfilled." In the light of these passages let us look at chap. xix. 28: "Jesus, knowing that all things were now finished, that the Scripture might be completed, saith, I thirst . . . when therefore Jesus had taken the vinegar, He said, It is finished." Was the reference to Scripture John's note? or was it intended to represent what was passing through the Lord's mind? He knew that all things which were written by the prophets concerning the Son of man were to be finished or accomplished (Luke xviii. 31), and that vinegar must be given Him to drink. This had not yet been done, and that it might be done He saith, "I thirst." St. Matthew tells us that the mysterious cry to God immediately preceded the giving of the vinegar (Matt. xxvii. 34). It may be taken as certain that the latter is the right view. The reference to Scripture was the Lord's. There is another note by our Lord which should be mentioned here—viz., chap. vii. 22—where, in referring to circumcision, He says, "not that it is from Moses, but from the fathers" (*i.e.*, the patriarchs). Doubtless the Jews needed to be reminded

of this important fact, which St. Paul made use of in later discussions.

4. Some of John's notes are references to previous words or incidents. Thus, when the Lord said, "Let these go their way," the writer adds, "That the word which He spake might be fulfilled, Of them that Thou gavest Me have I lost none"; and a few verses later, after naming Caiaphas, he adds: "Now Caiaphas was he who gave counsel to the Jews that it was expedient that one man should die in behalf of the people" (xviii. 14). Compare the reference to Cana (iv. 46) and to Nicodemus (vii. 50). In the case of Mary of Bethany (xi. 2), a note is added referring to an event which was to be described in considerable detail in the twelfth chapter, because of its bearing on the character and conduct of Judas Iscariot. In chap. xxi. 20 Peter sees the beloved disciple following, and John identifies him by a note as the one who had leaned on the Lord's breast, and had said, "Who is it that betrayeth Thee?" (xiii. 23).

5. Some notes of time and place are interesting, not only for their contents, but for the peculiar position in which we find them. John's theology merges into history when the Baptist comes on the scene. We have his testimony (i. 19); then a note as to the place where it was uttered—viz., Bethabara, or Bethany, across Jordan; then we are taken to "the next day," when the Lord is definitely pointed out as Lamb of God, Son of God, a Baptizer in the Holy Ghost; again, "the next day" certain seekers are invited to spend the day with the Lord, and John notes that it was about the tenth hour; once more we have a "next day," when the interview with Nathanael takes place. Here, then, we have four consecutive days, no years or months; three days afterwards we are at Cana, and John observes (ii. 11) on the beginning of signs, of its nature as a manifestation of the Lord's glory, and of its results, that His little group of disciples believed on Him. In chap. iv. 54 he speaks of a second sign which he had just recorded. From chap. vi. 59 we learn that part of a conversation which we could not otherwise have located took place while He was teaching in a synagogue in Capernaum.

Similarly, in xxi. 14 we are reminded that John had been referring to the third of the Lord's manifestations after His resurrection. In all these cases he first records the event, and afterwards indicates its position in the order of time.

6. We now come to a class of notes which help to elucidate statements not clear at the time.

The disciples (*i.e.*, the Apostles and others) had much to learn during our Lord's lifetime. When He spoke of the Temple being raised in three days (ii. 21), they did not understand; but when He was raised they remembered, and they believed the Scripture and the word of Jesus. We know from the other Gospels that this utterance of Christ played a great part at the time of His condemnation, and was twisted against Him; but its true meaning came to light afterwards. So when the Lord spoke of Lazarus sleeping they misunderstood (xi. 13); and with regard to the entry into Jerusalem we are told that the disciples did not understand at first, but when Jesus was glorified they remembered the things written (by the prophets), xii. 16. Again, they did not know what Christ meant by saying to Judas, "What thou doest, do quickly," and John gives two ideas which rose in their minds (xiii. 28, 29). Their ignorance of the Old Testament is referred to again in xx. 9. John also expounds the reference to Peter's death in xxi. 19, adding that Peter thereby should glorify God, while he corrects a current misapprehension concerning his own destiny (xxi. 23).

The note on our Lord's death through His being lifted up (xii. 33) is shorter than that on St. Peter's, but it illustrates two other passages in the Gospel (iii. 14 and viii. 28), and throws light on the double meaning of "lifting up" (see Acts ii. 33, v. 31). The brief note on Jewish ignorance of the fact that "He was speaking to them of the Father" (viii. 27) indicates the writer's desire to make things clear to his readers; and the same is the case in vii. 39, where he expounds our Lord's world-wide invitation to the thirsty: "This He said of the Spirit which they who believed on Him were to receive; for the Holy Spirit was not yet, for Jesus was not yet glorified." Our

mind naturally travels to Acts xix. 2 : "Have ye received the Holy Spirit since ye believed? . . . We know not if the Holy Spirit is." Neither of these passages could signify a doubt as to the existence of the Holy Spirit, for it had been plainly taught by the Baptist that the Son of God was to baptize with the Holy Spirit. The mission of the Spirit would be in a special sense the result of the mission and glorification of Christ. Along with these notes may be mentioned the postponement of the seizure of the Lord because "His hour was not yet come" (vii. 30, viii. 20), and the singular elucidation of the utterance of Caiaphas in which he acted unwittingly as a prophet. Jesus was indeed to die, and in behalf of the Jewish race, but His death would tend to unify God's scattered children.

How the writer entered into the mind of Christ is shown not only by the way in which he depicts the Lord's mental disturbance (xi. 33, xii. 27, xiii. 21), but also by the deliberate utterances concerning Christ's knowledge of all things about Himself and His relationship with the Father and the disciples (xiii. 1, xviii. 4).

Such are the notes and comments contained in this precious Gospel. Can it be said that in permitting them to appear John exceeded his duty as an historian? It was his business to write down the things which were impressed by the Spirit on his own mind, and they were written "that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life in His name" (xx. 31). If it be asked, How is it that the Jews did not believe in Jesus in spite of all? he answers in a long section (xii. 37-43) : it was owing to the hardness of some hearts, and to the lack of courage and single-mindedness in others.

Those to whom John wrote seem to have been Greek rather than Hebrew. Perhaps their home was in Western Asia. Did any of them doubt the authority and trustworthiness of the writer? His personality is only slightly veiled. He wrote of what he had heard and seen and his hands had handled (see 1 John i. 1). He occupied a peculiar position both with regard

to his Master, whom he probably attended on the most private occasions referred to, and with regard to Jewish officials, such as the High Priest (xviii. 15); and his testimony was endorsed by others (xxi. 24). The readers must have known much of Christ from other sources, but they welcomed fresh light, and the notes made things clearer. Strike them all out, and you will have lost much. Some readers would have preferred more rather than fewer comments, and we sympathize with them; but John wrote under a sense of Commission. There is only one note which he could not well have written—viz., the last referred to (xxi. 24): "we know that his testimony is true." This voucher must have been added by the elders of whom we read in the Muratorian Canon and other early Christian writings.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.



St. Paul's Doctrine of Resurrection.

A REPLY TO CRITICISMS.

THE interest which is naturally felt in this subject, and the great importance of having a clear and accurate apprehension of what the New Testament really teaches about it, will justify a brief notice of the criticisms that have appeared in the February CHURCHMAN.

Mr. Cohen's first comment, in which he charges the writer with teaching "resurrection by driblets," and with holding the heresy of Hymenæus and Philetus, is evidently based upon a confusion in thought between resurrection and re-embodiment. Now, these are two facts which are quite distinct the one from the other, although it is open to anyone to hold the opinion that they may occur simultaneously. To treat them, however, as *necessarily* simultaneous in their occurrence or as practically identical, as Mr. Cohen has done, is to beg the question at issue.

The words "then and there" in the writer's paraphrase of 2 Cor. v. 1 are not an unwarranted interpolation, as Mr. Cohen imagines, but rightly direct attention to the significance of the tense which St. Paul employs in this place—*οἰκοδομῆν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἔχομεν* (we *have* a building from God). Winer's comment on this use of the present tense is as follows: "The words are designed to indicate the instantaneous acquisition of a new habitation as soon as the *καταλύεσθαι* has taken place."¹

Nor are the words "in the very act of death," in the paraphrase of 2 Cor. v. 2-4, an unwarranted interpolation. The use of them will be justified in the remarks which follow on Mr. Routh's kindly criticism.

Mr. Cohen's second comment passes in review what he considers to be the clear teaching of Scripture, "that resurrection takes place *from the grave*, not from Paradise." He rejects

¹ "Grammar of Greek Testament," 3rd edition, p. 333.

the interpretation of St. John v. 28, which is given in the January article, but does not show wherein it is defective; and cites Isa. xxvi. 19 and Dan. xii. 2, together with the account of the raising of Lazarus, as evidencing this clear teaching of Scripture. Let us then study these passages.

In Isa. xxvi. a comparison of verse 19 with verse 14 makes it evident that the prophet is not referring to physical death at all, but figuratively to national overthrow. Unless, in verse 14, he is to be regarded as denouncing annihilation of both soul and body as the doom of Israel's adversaries, this interpretation is inevitable; and therefore the resurrection of Israel, proclaimed by way of contrast in verse 19, must be understood figuratively also. Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones, understood in the light of the interpretation of it in the same chapter (xxxvii. 11), is a similar case of the figurative use of resurrection to signify national restoration. Hos. xiii. 14 affords another example of the same thing when we examine the whole of the context, for the expressions in verse 14 ought no more to be taken literally than those in verses 13, 15, etc.

The words of Dan. xii. 2, "them that sleep in the dust of the earth," are obviously incapable of a literal interpretation, and must be regarded as a metaphorical way of saying, "those who are dead and buried," unless we force upon the author of this book a meaning which contradicts the explicit teaching of Jesus Christ and the evidence of our own observation. For (1) the departed are not asleep, but, according to our Lord's teaching, are fully awake¹; (2) these living persons, consciously awake, are certainly not in the dust of the earth, but are described by the Lord as "in Paradise," or "in Hades"; (3) and even of their former mortal bodies only a very minute proportion, consisting of elementary solids, can literally be said to be in the dust of the earth. Many of us would hesitate in any case to go to the Book of Daniel for an explicit pronouncement on the Christian doctrine of resurrection; and where a metaphorical interpretation of the writer's words is so reason-

¹ St. Luke xvi. 19-31; xxiii. 43.

able and natural, few will venture to exact a literal interpretation at such a price.

The raising of Lazarus cannot be regarded as indicating the mode of the resurrection at the coming of Christ, for in his case life was restored to a body *which ultimately died again*. But "those who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead . . . *can die no more.*"¹ That which happened to Lazarus is, therefore, not the kind of resurrection to which we look forward, and can afford no information concerning it.

The third comment, to the effect that the risen Lord would have been resorting to a sham and a deception if the wounds that Thomas demanded, and our Lord offered for his inspection, were only temporarily assumed for a particular purpose, depends for its force upon the suggestion that such temporary assumption must necessarily have been "unreal." But a little reflection will make it plain to most persons that in the case of the Lord's resurrection body—which, according to the recorded manifestations, appears to have been a perfect instrument for the expression of His will at every moment—no bodily modification or operation could be unreal which He willed to be or to perform, for each would be the true expression for the time being, in form or in action, of His personality and mind. Thus the form and features that defied the recognition of His most intimate friends were no less real than the bodily appearance which they perfectly recognized; the whole body was no less real in the moment when it vanished away into apparent nothingness, than when it reflected the light which rendered it visible and offered resistance, as of flesh and bones, to touch; the act of eating fish and honey was none the less real because such earthly food was most assuredly no part of that body's normal requirements. In short, whatever bodily manifestation was used by Christ to serve some wise and loving purpose of enlightenment and confirmation for those most bewildered disciples, in the moment when so immense a revelation was

¹ St. Luke xx. 35, 36.

dawning upon their unaccustomed minds, was most truly real. And thus the prints of the nails that helped to raise poor doubting Thomas to the highest pinnacle of Christian faith were not unreal, even though we may not believe that every injury and mutilation that may have happened to the earthly body is to be permanently reproduced in the spiritual body of our Saviour or ourselves.

Mr. Routh's suggested interpretation of 2 Cor. v. 1-5—viz., that the passage refers to the instantaneous translation from the earthly into the heavenly body at the coming of Christ, which experience St. Paul hoped might be his happy lot, cannot be maintained if we consider the whole of the context.

St. Paul describes himself, in common with other preachers of the Gospel, as having the treasure of the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in earthen vessels¹—frail, earthly bodies. He speaks of bearing about in the body the putting to death of the Lord Jesus²; of being alway delivered unto death for Jesus' sake³—carrying his life in his hands, as we should say; of being, nevertheless, sustained with the knowledge of resurrection and future glory, so that, although the outward man—the body—is decaying, yet the inward man is being renewed day by day⁴; and thus he turns his eyes away from the things that are seen, which are but transient, and fixes his gaze upon the unseen things, that are eternal.⁵ For if the earthen vessel be broken, if the daily threatening death overtake him, if the decaying outward man—the earthly house of his bodily frame—*be at length dissolved*, he has, then and there, a new habitation of the spirit, a heavenly body, eternal, and from God.⁶

Clearly, it is *dissolution*, physical death, which the Apostle is here anticipating as the portion of his worn and burdened

¹ 2 Cor. iv. 7.

² Verse 10.

³ Verse 11. Cf. also xi. 23 and 26, "in deaths oft" . . . "in perils."

⁴ Verses 12-16.

⁵ Verse 18.

⁶ 2 Cor. v. 7.

bodily frame ; but the prospect occasions him no uneasiness, for there is for him the certainty of instantaneous re-embodiment in the moment of his death. The unclothing of the spirit from which he might well shrink, as incidental to bodily dissolution, will not be his experience, for God has so fashioned him that dissolution shall not be an unclothing, but rather a clothing upon, so that what is mortal—that which death connotes—shall be swallowed up of life.¹

G. ESTWICK FORD.



Correspondence.

ST. PAUL'S DOCTRINE OF THE SECOND ADVENT.

To the Editor of the CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—I think we should all—even those who are least disposed to follow him—be grateful to Mr. Ford for giving us much food for thought in his article on St. Paul's Doctrine of the Second Advent. Personally, I specially welcome what he says on the passage in Romans xiii. 11, 12, which I have for the last quarter of a century taken in the same sense as Mr. Ford, though I have seldom found an appreciative listener. I would suggest, however, an amended translation in verse 12, in place of "The day is far spent, and"—which the Greek will hardly bear—"the night got very dark (*cf.* the terrible picture in Romans i.), *but* the dawn has come." The Greek word commonly translated "is far spent" surely expresses the *degree*, and not the speedy explanation of the darkness of the night, though the latter is thankfully implied in the following phrase. This rendering gives some force to the adversative "*but*," altogether omitted in A.V., and equally ignored in R.V., but still clearly present in the text.

A. HANNAM.

DIDDINGTON VICARAGE,
HUNTINGDON.

¹ 2 Cor. v. 2-5.



Liberal Evangelicalism: What it is and What it stands for.¹

I.—THE ESSENCE OF EVANGELICALISM.

AN English Churchman who appreciates the genius of his Church will feel that one of its most distinctive characteristics is its broad platform. No Christian can say with such truth as the English Churchman: "Thou hast set my feet in a large room." Sometimes the layman is a little petulant with this broad toleration. He finds such diversity in outlook among our clergy—the different keynotes struck, emphasis laid on different points of Christian doctrine, such variety in conducting public worship—that he cries out for uniformity. Little does he realize that uniformity means stagnation and death.

There never was (and, we trust, never will be) a time in our Church's history when all its clergy thought alike. If that dull day should ever dawn, it will set upon a dying Church. Schools of thought there always have been and always will be.

It is exceedingly difficult to give definitions of these schools of thought, for this reason: there is an ineradicable tendency so to word the definition as quite unintentionally to disparage those from whom we differ, and to flatter those with whom we agree. No man can really define the position of another; indeed, so much do bias and predisposition and mental peculiarities contribute to the shaping of one's outlook, that it is doubtful if a man can always state the why and wherefore of his own position. Logic is only one of the factors (and seldom the greatest) which determine our religious standpoint, instinct, training, and other like forces, affect us so much more forcibly.

There are three leading schools of thought in our Church—the High, the Evangelical, and the Broad. The Evangelical

[¹ It may be convenient to state that the CHURCHMAN is not necessarily identified with all the views set forth in this series of papers. They are contributed by one of the ablest writers amongst the younger Evangelicals who is entitled to be heard.—ED.]

stands in the intermediate position, for he has much in common with both the others. He recognizes freely and heartily the right of the others to exist, but we would say at once—and only once, for we are not about to write a polemic—that he marks in both these other schools a tendency to develop beyond legitimate limits.

So far as the former is concerned, it has recently been admitted by a leading High Churchman that the limit has already been passed. The same charge can be made against the extreme representation of the Broad Church school, but over these points we shall spend no time.

The Broad Churchman has never been made to feel at home in the Church. He has been always regarded with suspicion, and generally with dislike. Very largely this is due to his most prominent characteristic—cold and impartial criticism. No doctrine is passed over by him without examination. He will take nothing on trust. Reason and conscience are his guides to truth. He will apply his measuring line to the most venerable dogmas. He will crush down sentiment and plumb the depths of the most sacred doctrines, and till he finds the bottom he will not believe. Like St. Thomas, he demands to put his finger in the very wound-prints. While others are content to kneel at the Cross in wondering and worshipping awe, he will sit and argue. Not in irreverence, let it be said. He is no more irreverent than are we who differ from him. His reason is God's gift, and to be false to it would be unfaithfulness to God.

The result is that no section of Churchmen have done so much for theology as he has. Directly his contribution has been immense, indirectly it has been even greater, for he has stimulated thought and inquiry in others; he has forced those whose ultimate conclusion is contrary to his own to think out and restate their own position. The formulation of Christian doctrine in the Creeds was due very largely to the ancient heretics, and these heretics were frequently Broad Churchmen born out of due time. He is like the salt in our meals: without

him our Church would be dull and flavourless. Unless he abides in the ship we cannot be saved.

The High and the Broad Churchmen have little in common. The former finds his ideal in the past, and all his efforts are bent upon recreating that ideal; the latter is seeking to build up a conception of truth greater, higher, and deeper, than any age has yet seen. The former conceives the Church as having once attained; the latter conceives the Church as always attaining, and with a future yet before it wherein it will attain higher still. The former looks back wistfully on the past; the latter looks hopefully to the future. The High Churchman's ideal is static, the Broad Churchman's dynamic.

These two types of mind are utterly unable to do justice to one another. The Broad Churchman is impatient and somewhat contemptuous towards the High Churchman; he in turn is shocked and alarmed at the Broad Churchman, whom he regards as a very dangerous and suspicious character, and sometimes as a clever rascal.

But between these two extremes is a third class—the Evangelicals, so called. It is a peculiarly difficult thing to describe them. No definition reasonably exact can be given of them. They have no peculiar tenets. They are not essentially the Protestants of the Church. They are Protestants, but so are the Broad Churchmen—and often far stronger Protestants, too; and so were the old High Churchmen and the old Low Churchmen, who were the bitterest opponents the Evangelicals ever had. They are Protestants, but their Protestantism is secondary, and merely the outcome of something far deeper.

The Evangelicals have always been happy in the Church. When the rupture of the Methodists from the Church took place, the Evangelicals remained in their old spiritual home. They refused to be driven out. Although they were, as Overton has said, "the salt of the earth in their day," they were cold-shouldered and ridiculed, for they were guilty of the awful crime of enthusiasm. But secede they would not, because they were essentially Churchmen—men who loved the Prayer-Book

and loved the national Church. But despite all they did for the Church they were never welcomed; despite the fact that they were the life and soul of foreign missions and evangelistic work, and the pioneers of philanthropy and social betterment, they were always regarded as "the ugly duckling." Things are better to-day; but, still, though they believe from their hearts that they express more truly than any other section of Churchmen the genius of the Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed, and Protestant Church of England, there are not absent from time to time indications that the old feeling towards them is not dead.

The distinctive thing about the Evangelical is the emphasis which he lays upon the fact of the death of Christ. His doctrine concerning that great transaction is practically identical with that of the High Churchman, but he differs from him in this: Calvary is the centre of gravity of his faith, and *everything else* is merely incidental to that. The Incarnation, upon which the High Churchman lays chief stress, is to him secondary, except in so far as it was the preliminary to the Atonement. It was not enough that God in Christ entered into human life to touch it, elevate and ennoble it. Humanity needed more than that. Humanity was lost and ruined, and the only thing which could help it was salvation, and this the Cross of Jesus achieved. Each son of man stands a lost and condemned sinner before God, and the Cross is his only hope. This is the characteristic of Evangelicalism. It makes no pretensions to discovery of this truth; it acknowledges gladly that such a faith is held far beyond the limits of its own school of thought; but it stands for the constant emphasis of this doctrine. This is the very essence, the very root, the very kernel, of Christianity.

"We preach Christ *crucified*:" not merely Christ incarnate in the past, or Christ immanent in the present. All such truths are but the setting of the jewel. The keynote of the Christian message to us is that "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners," that that salvation was achieved by the death of the Lord; for "without shedding of blood there is no remission."

We are not greatly exercised about theory. *How* the world's salvation was achieved on Calvary is one question. Reverent inquiry is not only legitimate, but desirable, and there is no occasion for agreement on this point upon the part of thinkers. Our own Church has never seen fit to attempt to formulate any theory of the Atonement. But Evangelical teaching insists that the central truth of Christianity is *the fact* that man's salvation was achieved by the sacrificial death of Jesus, and that by faith that death is efficacious for us to-day.

It is this insistence upon the propitiatory character of Christ's death which on the one hand unites us with the more moderate High Churchmen, and on the other hand divides us from the extreme Broad Churchmen. A writer of extreme liberal views has expressed himself very clearly, and we can make our point clearer by noting his words :

"In these ages the significance of one short life seems as nothing, and when it is claimed that the salvation of our race was effected on a certain Friday afternoon in the spring of a year somewhere about A.D. 30, the mind recoils from the startling incongruity." "Jesus might have died in bed, if He had been born in different circumstances, but He would still be the Saviour of men if He had lived out a life of perpetual sacrifice." "The Cross was a circumstance, a hindrance, an accident. It was the preceding life, the unswerving fidelity, the triumphant personality, of Jesus, which turned a secular accident into a sacred opportunity."

Here the wide gulf is disclosed. We do grasp the hands of the large bulk of Broad Churchmen across many of the narrow streams which divide us ; we Liberal Evangelicals are in harmony with them upon many questions, but we cannot touch finger-tips across the broad stream between us and those who think thus of the redeeming death of the Lord. We do not depreciate "the preceding life"—far from it. We regard this as a part of the Atonement, inasmuch as it was the prelude to the great and final act. But apart from the consummatory death, the life is for us robbed of its supreme value. The ethics of

Jesus remain, His example is ours, but we are like men in a museum forbidden to touch the exhibits. We gaze with reverent awe at the beauty displayed in that life, and the high standard set forth, but we cannot make it ours. Apart from Calvary, there remains a wondrous spectacle, but it is a dead thing for us ; it is only the death and faith in that death which can make it alive for us.

Full well we know that philosophy sometimes deals unsympathetically with this great truth ; full well we know that our Anglo-Nietzschean philosopher has said : " I don't glory in the Crucifixion ; I think it was a deplorable and thoroughly objectionable proceeding. . . . I believe nothing has done more to prevent the spread of Christian doctrine than the substitution of morbid interest in the sensational execution of Jesus for intelligent comprehension of His views."

We know all this, but we know something more from the deepest personal experience—that by that death we are so intimately united to Christ that, though we may not have " an intelligent comprehension of His views," whatever that may mean, we are conscious of His nearness to us. Our " morbid interest " in His death has removed the barrier of sin between us and God, and we are now able, falteringly and feebly, by His life and power within us, to live in harmony and union with Him. Let the logic-choppers reason about it as they will, let them talk sagely about mere " subjective impressions," we know this as a fact, based upon the surest personal experience.

This carries us a step farther. Evangelicalism stands not only for the centrality of the Cross ; it maintains that it is not by any means enough to assent to the historic fact of the death of Christ and the significance of that act. It goes very much farther. It holds that it is not only desirable, but vitally necessary to real living religion, that the individual should have personal dealings with, and personal experience of, the world's Redeemer. It is not only possible to touch Him, we insist that we *must* do so if we are to receive " forgiveness of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion."

Evangelicalism has often been accused of being mere individualism run mad, of having lost sight of the corporate side of religion. We are not careful to defend ourselves against these charges. Its history in Christian work denies that it has come to disaster from either of these imaginary errors. But we stand fast for this : the individual soul to receive the full blessing of pardon must come face to face with the Saviour ; He must take each one "apart from the multitude" and alone with Him, impart to him His pardon, His power, and His life.

In a word, we believe that Christianity is not a mere creed to be believed or an ethical system to be followed. We believe that primarily it is individualistic ; that each soul stands apart from others in God's sight, and that there must be conscious personal dealing with God, issuing in constant personal experience of His power and peace in the heart. Christianity we know has its corporate side, but we have little fear that this will be lost sight of. The sense of kinship will naturally draw believers together, but to be effective this bond must be one which unites *believers in Christ* and not mere *assenters to a creed*.

It is the fashion to groan somewhat over one's own time. We do not know whether these days are any more irreligious than the days gone by ; we incline to think they are rather better days now. But in any case we are sure that the condition necessary to the reawakening of deeper religious life in the community is the revival of personal religion, and real vital personal religion can only be built upon an intimate personal experience of God, the conviction that the soul had, and has, intercourse with the Unseen.

We modern Evangelicals, as we shall see later on, have travelled, no doubt, some distance beyond our fathers in many respects : maybe they might regard us as very dubious characters, and perhaps repudiate their offspring. But we steadily refuse to deny our parentage. They stood for the principles we have tried to make clear, and we stand for them to-day. Men still need to be "brought to Christ" ; for what is

that but a time-honoured phrase which means what we have been saying, that the need of all needs in the Christian Church to-day is for the soul to meet its Saviour face to face and receive from Him the life-giving touch. In this comfortable world the Gospel for "blood-bought sinners" may seem to some out of place, but it is a Gospel the world needs, and never needed it more than to-day.

Some time ago we remember hearing one of the most acute minds of to-day criticizing the Evangelical position. He pointed out that one most serious defect was the use of such phrases as these from the pulpit. He complained that such terms conveyed nothing to the hearers; they were words in an unknown tongue. We hold no brief for the use of mere cant expressions from the pulpit, nor do we believe that such phrases jerked out to congregations serve any good purpose. But we deny that they are not understood. There is no cruder theology anywhere than that of the Salvation Army; its preaching consists very largely in the reiteration of such phrases. Can anyone maintain that their audiences do not understand? Intelligent understanding there may not be, but facts prove that they have an instinctive appreciation of what they hear.

Let our critics say what they will, the world of to-day has not got beyond the old Evangel, and by that Evangel we stand or fall, for it is the very *raison d'être* of our position. We believe that it finds men to-day, that it is the only message of hope to an awakened soul. We believe it is the only thing which will stir up an indifferent world, or arouse in it the sense of the guilt of sin.

To some, as in Apostolic days, the preaching of the Cross may be foolishness, but to others we know that it is life, pardon, peace, and joy. Yes, so strongly do we feel this that we can take the words of St. Paul to ourselves, and say, "If we preach any other Gospel, let us be anathema."

Liberal we are in many other respects, but we have not moved one foot from this rock, and we believe that the day we do so our candle will be taken away.

Tithe and Tithe Rent-Charge.

THE following paper is an attempt to summarize the origin and history of tithes, and to give a short account of the existing law relating to tithe rent-charge. It does not purport to do more than deal with the facts, and the writer does not, therefore, enter into any discussion as to the political bearings of the subject.

I.

The first mention of tithes in English law, so far as can be ascertained, appears to have been in the decree of a Synod of 786. In this decree the payment is strongly enjoined, but it had no legal binding effect upon the laity. It was, however, shortly afterwards confirmed by the Conventions of the two kingdoms of Mercia and Northumberland, and it may therefore be considered that the payment has been compulsory since the latter part of the ninth century—that is to say, for upwards of eleven hundred years. By the “Laws of Edward and Guthrum” of about the year 900 the liability to tithe is expressly laid upon the Danes under Guthrum’s dominion, and its payment was enforced by a penalty. Athelstan in 930 extended the provision to the whole kingdom. It is probable that long before tithes were made payable by law they were voluntarily offered by a large number of the laity, but it is impossible to speak with any certainty as to the extent of the practice.

Tithes are the tenth part of the annual increase or produce arising from land, the stock upon land, and the personal industry of the inhabitants. All those things which yield an annual increase by the act of God, with the aid of cultivation or other human labour are, with certain exceptions, liable to payment of tithe. Such things are said to be “titheable.”

Tithes are of three kinds: (1) Prædial; (2) mixed; (3) personal.

I. Prædial tithes (from a Latin word meaning an estate or land) are those which “arise merely and immediately

from the ground, such as grain of all sorts, hay, wood, fruits, and herbs."

2. Mixed tithes are those which "arise from things immediately nourished by the ground, as by means of goods depastured thereupon, or otherwise nourished with the fruits thereof, as colts, calves, lambs, chickens, milk, cheese, and eggs."
3. Personal tithes are those which arise from the profits of personal labour and industry (manual occupations, trades, fisheries, and the like), and are chargeable upon the clear gain only after deduction of all charges. They were only payable where, and in so far as, the particular custom of the place allowed them. They seem to have gradually fallen into disuse, and for all practical purposes became obsolete at a very early date.

The most important of things which are not titheable are animals *feræ naturæ*, or kept for mere curiosity or pleasure, and things which are of the substance of the earth, such as stone, lime, chalk, and other minerals. Land which is barren is not titheable, and does not become so until it has been in cultivation for seven years.

As a general rule, every acre of land in the kingdom was liable to payment of tithes; but certain persons and lands were exempt, and lands might also be especially discharged.

The exemption or discharge might be either by custom or prescription, or by what is called a "real composition." The custom might be either *de modo decimandi*—that is, an arrangement whereby the tithes were discharged in some special manner; or *de non decimandi*—that is, a claim to be entirely exempt. The *modus* was either a pecuniary compensation, or some other yearly benefit to the parson. The claim *de non decimandi* applied to the Crown and spiritual persons and corporations. The discharge by a "real composition" was by means of an arrangement made between the owners of the lands and the parson, with the consent of the Ordinary and the

patron, whereby some land or other "real" recompense was given to the parson in lieu of the tithes. Of course, since tithes have been replaced by tithe rent-charges, there are statutory provisions for their redemption, which will be more fully noticed hereafter.

Tithes belong to that species of property which is known in law as an "incorporeal hereditament," and which has been defined as "a right issuing out of a thing corporate (whether real or personal), or concerning, or annexed to, or exercisable within, the same." It is in general subject to the same rules of ownership and the same laws of descent as a corporeal hereditament. Tithes being an incorporeal hereditament in realty, are themselves real estate, and not personal estate, and in so far as the same are transferable—that is to say, when they belong to lay impropiators—pass by deed of grant. The same rules apply to the rent-charges which have now taken their place.

II.

Tithes, when first instituted in France by Charlemagne, were distributed by him into four parts: one for the use of the Bishop, another for the maintenance of the fabric of the church, another for the poor, and the fourth for the incumbent. The Bishops' endowments subsequently became amply provided for, and they were prohibited from receiving their share of the tithes. The whole of the tithes then became payable to the parson or *persona ecclesiæ*, as representing in his own person the Church. It appears that in England originally every man was at liberty to pay his tithe to whatever priest and church he pleased, but as the division of the country into parishes developed, the tithes became payable to the parson of each parish. In extra-parochial places they would be payable to the King, whose duty it was to provide a pastor to minister in such places. The "arbitrary" consecrations of tithes, as the payment to whomsoever the person liable for them chose was called, lingered on for many years after they became strictly illegal. The influence of the regular clergy, or monks, was

exercised to deprive the secular or parochial clergy of the tithes in favour of their own monastic houses. This was not finally stopped until the reign of King John, when, by a decretal epistle of Pope Innocent III., the payment of the tithes to the parochial clergy was enjoined. This epistle, though not legally binding, was adopted by general consent, and became part of the *lex terra*.

After the general formation of monasteries and the increase in their power and interest, there crept into usage the custom of "appropriating" parsonages and their emoluments—that is to say, the benefice was annexed to some corporation, either aggregate or sole, as patron. When the corporation to which the benefice became so annexed was a monastery, it was the custom for it to nominate someone of its own body to conduct the services without formally presenting him to the living, and it was thus enabled to retain for its own use a large part of the emoluments. Speaking of this appropriation, Blackstone says: "This contrivance seems to have sprung from the policy of the monastic Orders, who have never been deficient in subtle inventions for the increase of their own power and emoluments." The person deputed to officiate on behalf of the appropriating corporation became known as a "Vicarius," or Vicar, and his stipend was at the entire discretion of the appropriator. Owing to the way in which the needs of many parishes were neglected, it was enacted in the reign of Richard II. that in all such cases of appropriation the Bishop should ordain a competent sum out of the emoluments for the poor of the parish, and that the vicarages should be "sufficiently" endowed. This, however, so far as regards the Vicar, was not found to have the desired effect, as he still had no permanency of tenure, and was practically at the mercy of the Order of which he was usually a member. It was, therefore, further provided, in the reign of Henry IV., that the Vicar should be unconnected with any religious house, that he should be perpetual, and should be instituted and inducted, and, further, that he should be sufficiently endowed at the discretion of the Ordinary. In con-

sequence of these enactments, it became customary to set apart a certain portion of the emoluments for the use of the Vicar. This portion usually consisted of a part of the glebe land adjoining or near to the parsonage, and a certain share of the tithes. The share of the tithes so given again indicated the rapacity of the monastic houses, for in most cases it consisted of those tithes which were most troublesome to collect, and which became known subsequently as privy, small, or vicarial tithes. These small tithes were generally the mixed and personal tithes, and the prædial tithes other than corn, hay, and wood. There was, however, no uniformity of practice, and in some places the vicarages were more liberally endowed than in others.

This, then, in general terms, was the position at the time of the dissolution of the monasteries in the reign of Henry VIII. as regards all appropriated benefices, which, according to Selden, numbered more than one-third of all the parishes in England. The natural effect of the dissolutions would have been the disappropriating of the parsonages, but this was avoided by a special provision in the Statutes effecting the dissolutions whereby they were given to the King. As is well known, many of them were from time to time granted out by the Crown to laymen. These lay appropriations became known as "impropriations," the reason being, according to Spelman, that they were "improperly" in the hands of laymen. The result was that in a large number of cases the rectorial or great tithes became vested in laymen, and could be disposed of by them, whether by sale or otherwise, like any other species of property. They constituted an interest in land quite distinct from the land itself, and so much so that, if the rectorial tithes (being in the hands of a layman) and the lands in respect of which they were payable became vested in the same owner, there was no merger of interests, but the land and the tithes might be dealt with by him separately.

III.

In process of time tithes became in many cases converted into rent-charges under various enclosure and other local Acts. But nothing was done in a general way to effect this until the Tithe Commutation Act, 1836. Under this Act provision was made for the commutation of tithes in every parish, either by agreement between the owners of lands and the owners of tithes, or by compulsion. The commutation took the shape of a money payment, called tithe rent-charge, payable half-yearly on January 1 and July 1. Failing an agreement, the amount of the rent-charge in each parish was to be such a sum as represented the clear average value of the tithes for the seven years preceding the year 1836, based on the price of wheat, barley, and oats for such seven years. The total rent-charge of each parish was apportioned between the different lands in the parish. In some cases the assessment was on each field, and in others on a whole farm together. Tithe Commissioners were appointed to carry out the provisions of the Act, especially in places where no agreement for the commutation was arrived at, and in such cases their award was made binding upon both land-owners and tithe-owners. The value of the rent-charge under the Act depends each year upon the average price of wheat, barley, and oats for the preceding seven years, and is, therefore, as all tithe-owners know, a very variable quantity. The price is based upon the weekly averages, and is published in the *London Gazette*. Special provisions were made for the payment of extraordinary rent-charges on hop-grounds, market gardens, and coppice woods, but these extraordinary rent-charges were subsequently abolished by the Extraordinary Tithe Redemption Act, 1886, whereby an annual payment calculated at 4 per cent. on the capital value of the charge was substituted.

The rent-charges created by the Act are made subject to the same rules of ownership as the tithes which they replaced, and the Act also contained special provisions as to the mode of recovery of the charges in case of non-payment. A right of

distress was given for this purpose, but this has been abolished by the Tithe Act, 1891, which provides that tithe rent-charge may be recovered by an Order of the County Court, and in no other way. Proceedings cannot be instituted until the rent-charge is three months in arrear, and not more than two years can be recovered. When the owner of land liable to payment of the rent-charge is also the occupier, the Court appoints an officer to distrain for the amount due, and in other cases an officer is appointed receiver of the rents and profits of the land until the amount has been recovered.

The tithe rent-charges were expressly made subject to all Parliamentary, parochial, and county and other rates, which were by the Act of 1836 assessed upon the occupier of the lands in respect of which the rent-charges were payable; but by the Tithe Act, 1891, the rates are assessed on and may be recovered from the owner of the tithe rent-charge.

Another important point is dealt with by the Act of 1891. Previously the rent-charge might, as has been mentioned, be recovered by distress—that is to say, upon the goods of the occupying tenant—who might or might not, as between himself and the owner of the land, be liable for the payment. The liability would depend upon the contract between the landlord and the tenant. By the Act of 1891 it is expressly provided that tithe rent-charge shall be payable by the owner of the lands, notwithstanding any contract between him and the occupier of such lands. Any contract made after the passing of the Act for payment of the rent-charge by the occupier is void. In all cases, therefore, in which it is endeavoured to make the occupier liable, it must be shown that the liability arose on a contract made before the passing of the Act.

IV.

The redemption of tithe rent-charge can be effected through the instrumentality of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries under the Tithe Acts, 1860 and 1878. The redemption is compulsory under the Act of 1878 in cases where land charged

with tithe rent-charge is taken for certain public purposes, the most important of which are—(1) The building of any church, chapel, or other place of worship; (2) the making of any cemetery or other place of burial; (3) the erection of any school under the Elementary Education Acts; (4) the erection of any town hall, gaol, lunatic asylum, hospital, or other building for public purposes; (5) the formation of any sewage farm, or the construction of sewers or sewage works, or any gas or water works. The amount of the redemption money is twenty-five times the amount of the rent-charge.

In other cases the Board has a discretion in the matter. The provisions of the Acts are as follows:

1. When the rent-charge does not exceed 20s., the application may be made either by the owner of the land *or* the person entitled to the rent-charge. The redemption money is twenty-five times the amount of the rent-charge.
2. When the rent-charge exceeds 20s., the application must be made by the owner of the land *and* the person entitled to the charge, and if such person is so entitled in right of any benefice or cure, both the Bishop and the patron must consent to the application. The redemption money is a sum not less than twenty-five times the amount of the rent-charge.
3. When lands charged with rent-charge have been divided for building or other purposes into numerous plots, so that no further apportionments can conveniently be made, the owner of any of the plots *or* the persons entitled to the charge may apply for the redemption. The amount payable is a sum not less than twenty-five times the amount of the charge.

In cases in which the redeemed rent-charge was payable to any spiritual person in respect of his benefice or cure, the redemption money must be paid to the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, and is devoted by them to the augmentation of the benefice.

English History as Evidenced in Tewkesbury Abbey.

SAXON, Norman, Plantagenet—these are the three powerful dynasties which Tewkesbury Abbey brings to mind. There are indeed no remnants of Saxon work in the glorious fane, but its first founding about the year 715 was due to the piety of two noble brothers, Oddo and Doddo, whose very curious portraits are to be seen in the “*Registrum Theokus-buriae*,” attired in armour and bearing models of the church in their hands. Very early in its history the Abbey was selected as a resting-place for the great of the earth, for Leland says that Earl Hugh carried thither the body of Berthric, who usurped the Wessex crown, and laid him in the Chapel of St. Faith. Hugh himself was buried in the nave.

Like most religious houses, Tewkesbury suffered considerably at the hands of the Danes—so much so, indeed, that it became dependent on Cranborne Abbey, founded by Hayward de Meawe, on whose grandson, Britric, Matilda of Flanders vainly bestowed her affections. Britric was Lord of Gloucester and King Edward the Confessor’s envoy at her father’s Court, so no doubt they saw a good deal of each other, and his rank, wealth, and handsome appearance rendered him quite a fitting husband for the fair Matilda. Unfortunately, however, he did not reciprocate her love, and the lady never forgot what she deemed a slight. As all the world knows, she afterwards married William, Duke of Normandy, and when they became King and Queen of England she persuaded her husband to grant her all Britric’s lands, and caused him to be arrested and flung into prison at Winchester, where he subsequently died. In this way the Manor of Tewkesbury came into the possession of the Normans, and William Rufus bestowed it upon his cousin, Robert Fitz-Hamon, who was also a great general. At the instigation of Abbot Giraldus of Cranborne, Fitz-Hamon refounded Tewkesbury, and to him we practically owe the main part of the grand church. He was mortally wounded at the

siege of Falaise, and was brought to Tewkesbury, buried in the chapter-house, and more than a hundred years later his body was transferred to the ambulatory, and eventually enclosed by the beautiful Founder's Chantry as we now see it, with its open screen-work of Perpendicular design and exquisite fantracery of the ceiling. Fitz-Hamon was the father of four daughters, and a marriage was arranged between one of them, named Mabel, and Robert, an illegitimate son of King Henry, who was created first Earl of Gloucester, and acquired the broad acres his wife brought with her. This warlike Earl, who generalised the army of his half-sister, the Empress Maud, and took such a prominent part in the strife for the Crown which for so many years raged between her and King Stephen, did not neglect gentler matters, for he completed the Abbey Church and much of the tower. Although we usually think of him as a great soldier, he was also something of a scholar; to him William of Malmesbury dedicated his masterpiece, and beside his lavish expenditure on Tewkesbury he founded a priory at Bristol, where he was buried. In fact, endowing abbeys seems to have run in the family, for his successor built Keynsham in memory of his only son, and chose to lie there rather than at Tewkesbury.

Henry II. acted as guardian to his daughters, and it was doubtless thought an excellent idea to convey such good lands to Prince, afterwards King, John, by marrying one of them to him. John, however, subsequently divorced her, and she took the manor to a second husband, Geoffrey de Mandeville, but the earldom finally passed to her sister Amice, who had wedded Richard de Clare, Earl of Hertford.

The powerful family of the Tewkesbury de Clares is as well represented in the Abbey Church as it is in English History. Portraits of three of them are to be seen in the painted glass of the fourteenth-century windows in the choir, in company with Fitz-Hamon, Robert Fitzroy, and Hugh le Despenser, all in armour of the period, and below them, under the choir pavement, lie their bodies.

There is Gilbert de Clare, who leagued with the barons against King John, and signed Magna Charta. So proud was he of the part he had played in the Constitution that he had graven on his tablet the words "Magna Charta is law; let the King henceforth beware." His widow, Isabelle, afterwards wedded Richard, Earl of Cornwall, brother of King Henry III., but she evidently remembered her first husband, for when dying she desired to be buried next him; Earl Richard very properly thought this proceeding incorrect, so the fair Isabelle ordered her heart to be interred in De Clare's grave, while her body was laid to rest before the High Altar at Beaulieu Abbey. Oddly enough, Tewkesbury remains intact, while not a stone upon another is left of Beaulieu Church.

Richard de Clare was a Crusader, and fought in the Holy Land, and a sister of his was the grandmother of King Robert Bruce of Scotland. Gilbert, the Red Earl, wedded the Princess Joan, daughter of King Edward I., and alternately supported his royal father-in-law and Sir Simon de Montfort in the strife between the barons and the Monarch. "A stout and brave man who had no fear of death"; so runs the legend on his tomb, and it concludes with the very appropriate words "Pray and Fight."

These were indeed doughty men of valour, accustomed to hold their own with the Sovereign; but even these were eclipsed by Gilbert de Clare, tenth Earl of Gloucester, who acted as Regent for Edward II., both in England and France, was killed at the Battle of Bannockburn, and laid to rest in Tewkesbury Choir by his wife, the Lady Maud, and his father. From the north-west window he still remembers that proud inscription graven in Latin by his arms on the tablet, "Gilbert, the third of the name, tenth and last Earl of Gloucester and Hertford, died on June 23, 1314. He was slain in battle, to the joy of the Scots."

Gilbert left no heirs, so the Manor of Tewkesbury passed to his sister Eleanor, who had married Hugh le Despenser, a name which has become a byword in English history of

that period. This Hugh played the part of royal favourite, and it is generally considered that his father shared in the profits which accrued thereby. However, when the wretched King fled to Wales he did not forsake him, and so was taken prisoner, hung, drawn, and quartered after the barbarous custom of the times. Very likely it was at his wife's instigation that his poor remains—such as they were—were collected together, and thus found rest in the consecrated Abbey of Tewkesbury. His son married the Lady Elizabeth Montacute, daughter of the Earl of Salisbury, and their effigies lie under the lace-like canopy of the Despenser monument. He is in armour, with his head reclining upon a helmet and his feet on a lion, and she is dressed in a flowing gown and square head-dress of the period, while a dog lies at her feet. After his death Lady Elizabeth married Sir Guy de Brien, who was also Lord Welwyn, and a soldier of great renown, acting as standard-bearer to King Edward III. at the Battle of Crécy, and performing prodigies of valour. Very likely he was the same Guy who built the quaint Castle-Manor of Woodsford, which still guards the passage of the Frome. Together they rebuilt the Choir of Tewkesbury, and he is also credited with vaulting the tower, for his arms appear on the bosses. At the same time the beautiful apsidal chapels were erected. His tomb is in the ambulatory, wrought into the stone screen-work of the Chapel of St. Margaret, over against the Despenser monument, where his wife chose to rest by her former husband. Perhaps she loved him best of the three, for the Lady Elizabeth was a widow when she wedded Hugh Despenser, and therefore the valiant Guy lies all by himself beneath a canopy or a very similar tomb, also clad in armour and with a lion at his feet.

Tewkesbury Manor passed to Elizabeth's nephew, Edward le Despenser, who fought at Poitiers, and was one of the first Knights of the Garter. To his memory his wife built the beautiful Trinity Chapel, where she was buried; and at its summit, beneath a rich canopy of exquisite proportions, the

figure of Lord Despenser kneels for ever in prayer, with his face turned towards the High Altar.

His son Thomas married Constance, daughter of the Earl of Cornwall and niece of the Black Prince; faithfully served Richard II., and at his death was attainted, executed, and buried beneath the sanctuary lamp, which burned before the altar as a sign that "the house was evermore watching to God." "Rather death than dishonour" is inscribed on the brass commemorating him. His son Richard, who also lies in the choir, was the last of the Despensers, and his sister Isabelle, by her marriage with Richard Beauchamp, carried the manor into that illustrious family. He was killed at the siege of Breaux, and the young widow of twenty-one expressed her grief in stone by erecting the magnificent chantry chapel, which, oddly enough, is usually called by the name of her cousin and second husband, the Earl of Warwick, to whose memory she built the Beauchamp chapel at Warwick. The exquisite chantry possesses two roofs, with superb vaulting and richly-carven tracery; and amongst the heraldic decorations of the Clares and Despensers are blazoned the Royal Arms of England and France, Castile and Leon.

Isabelle, who must have been endowed with the spirit of an artist, elected to be buried in the choir next to her father, and ordered a truly imperial tomb to perpetuate herself. Her statue was to be of marble, and by it were to stand St. Mary Magdalen, St. John the Evangelist, and St. Anthony; there were also to be figures of "poor men and women in humble apparel with beads in their hands," which may have referred to her charitable character or some pious foundation for the indigent. Unfortunately, all this magnificence has disappeared. Her young son became a great favourite with Henry VI., who showered all manner of dignities upon him, including such titles as King of the Isle of Wight, King of Jersey and Guernsey, beside creating him Duke of Warwick. But he died at twenty-one, was buried under the tower, and his sister Anne took the Tewkesbury estates to her husband, that great maker of English history, the famous Richard Neville, the "King-maker." This popular

soldier, given to lavish hospitality and celebrated for his personal valour, generated in turn the Yorkist and Lancastrian armies during that Civil War which was peculiarly a war of the nobles, and plunged in blood both the Red and the White Rose. He was the most powerful man in all England, and a cousin of Edward of York, whom he placed upon the throne. Subsequent events caused him to espouse Queen Margaret's side; and the tie was cemented when he gave his second daughter, Anne, in marriage to the young and gallant Prince Edward, King Henry's only son and rightful heir to the Crown. Anne's sister and co-heiress, Isabelle, had already been wedded to the Duke of Clarence, brother to Edward IV.

The "Kingmaker," fighting to the last, fell at the Battle of Barnet, with his brother, his captains, and his army. Twenty days later Queen Margaret and her soldiers marched to Tewkesbury, and encountered King Edward's force some half-mile or so distant from the town. In a field called Bloody Meadow the fight raged, and the Lancastrians were defeated. Nobles fell slain on either side, Prince Edward was taken prisoner; even the Abbey Church ran with blood, so that it had afterwards to be specially cleansed and reconsecrated. To the Abbey were carried the bodies of the fallen for interment in hallowed ground. Under the floor, in front of the altar to St. James, above which a modern window bears in its tracery the red and white roses of Lancaster and York, were laid the Duke of Somerset, Lord John Somerset, the Earl of Devon, Sir Richard Courtenay, Lord Thomas Courtenay, and Sir Humphrey Hadley. Sir Thomas Tresham was buried by a pillar standing betwixt the altars of St. Nicholas and St. James. Tradition has it that the metal plates on the oak door of the vestiary were made by the monks from armour and weapons found in the precincts after the battle. To a grave under the tower was borne—probably at night, when attention would not be aroused—the body of Prince Edward, only son of King Henry and Queen Margaret, foully slain after the fight. It is said that he "was homelie interred with the other simple

corpses in the church of the monasterie of the blacke monks in Teukesburie." There were none to mourn as the good monks of the Abbey Church received corpse after corpse and laid the poor mangled bodies to rest in mother-earth, and the last of the Plantagenet princes received no further ceremonial than the others, some of them comrades, some of them foes. Yet in a measure he claimed his own when brought to Tewkesbury Abbey, for through his wife Anne, daughter and co-heiress of the Duke of Warwick, he took a part in that long, illustrious, semi-royal line which from Norman Fitz-Hamon, the founder of the Abbey, had held Tewkesbury Manor down to the end of the fifteenth century. Writing in 1680, a chronicler speaks of the Prince's grave as "a fair tombstone of grey marble, the brass whereof has been pickt out by sacrilegious hands, directly underneath the Tower of the Church, at the entrance into the Quire, and sayed to be layd over Prince Edward who lost his life in cool blood in the dispute between York and Lancaster, at which time the Lancastrians had the overthrow."

As far as Tewkesbury Abbey is concerned, English history practically stopped with the Battle of Tewkesbury, fought on that May morning in the year of our Lord 1471. It had taken a share in the history of England right down to the end of the fifteenth century—no mean or small record. It comes very distinctly before our mind, this sudden ending of all things, when we walk around the glorious Abbey Church and read the illustrious names of men and women known to fame, who scorned to be mere puppets, and stood forth in the glare that beats upon those who live in the public eye to take a part in making or marring the records of their own times. After the Dissolution and Reformation scarcely anyone of real celebrity seems to have been buried in the Abbey; its walls read like the nations which have no history, and are therefore deemed happy. But it is a blank nevertheless. Certainly the world came to an end when the sunset flamed redly over the Battle of Tewkesbury. Yet one flicker of brilliance lit its silent gloom five years later, when Warwick's daughter, Isabelle, Duchess of Clarence

and legal descendant of Fitz-Hamon, lay in state in the choir for no less than five-and-thirty days. For her reception a vault was contrived behind the High Altar, and little more than a week after her burial her murdered husband, whose vacillation had partly caused her father's death and the Lancastrians' defeat, was brought from the tower to share her resting-place.

Looking through the iron gates, the casket containing their remains can be seen placed half-way up the wall in safety from occasional floods. On a brass in the pavement are engraved two suns in splendour, the badge of the House of York, and a Latin inscription :

"LORD GEORGE PLANTAGENET, DUKE OF CLARENCE, AND LADY
ISABEL NEVILLE, HIS WIFE, WHO DIED, SHE ON DEC. 12TH,
1476, HE ON FEB. 18TH, 1477.

"I came in my might, like a sun in splendour,
Soon suddenly bathed in my own blood."

Nevertheless, it would have been more fitting for the tomb of one of the last direct descendants of the second founder of Tewkesbury Abbey to have been surrounded with the coats-of-arms borne by her celebrated ancestors through four centuries—Fitz-Hamon, De Clare, Le Despenser, Warwick, Castile and Leon, France, and the Royal Arms of England.

Truly, it is English history which we read in the glorious Abbey Church of Tewkesbury.

M. ADELINÉ COOKE.



“The Old Sermon.”

“I HAVE a nice little stock of six hundred sermons, so I generally give my people cold meat.” So spake our brother of the cloth. It was complacent. It was frank. It was amusing, and also pathetic. Cold meat! Such might be the estimate of some brutal critic, but when it becomes the parson’s own description of his homiletic bill of fare, it suggests that the fire in the parsonage study had burnt low. It suggests that a few new books for the parson’s bookshelves, above all a draught of fresh air from the wind of God, were badly needed to make the old fire burn and glow. The phrase appeals to our sense of humour. We can almost see the paterfamilias sitting down to his Sunday repast, and saying to his much-enduring spouse: “I hope you are giving us a good dinner, my dear; it was cold meat in church.”

But the words suggest some serious reflections. Have we never surveyed complacently our batches of sermon notes, wondering whether, in this age of insurance for everyone and everything, we ought not to insure these treasures of homiletic wealth? Was that complacency justified? Is all this, once the product of our thought and study—aye, and of our deepest longings and purest visions; once hot with the warmth of our whole mind and soul—is all this now no better than cold meat, to be served up on Sunday under, perchance, another name, but in reality a mere dished-up *réchauffé*? The old sermon—will it do?

Honestly we can assert that not every sermon has grown cold because it has grown old. Some of the old ones are the best. They are full of the old wine, *ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστότερός ἐστι*. But what is it about the old sermon which makes it often impossible to-day? We will not think of those wonderful productions whose acceptance by the Bishop set the seal upon our fitness for the priesthood, nor of those early masterpieces which, with all humility, we realized had settled for all time the interpreta-

tion of some text. We will rather think of the effusions of our first six or eight years of clerical life, some dated from the period of our delightful irresponsibility as the Rector's colleague, others which blossomed forth in the early years of our first blushing vicariate. Why cannot we preach them as they stand to-day? We thought much of them then. They were not lacking in real earnestness. Coming from young men, they were not unacceptable. By the help of God they were not unblest. Yet we look at them askance to-day. Why?

Our outlook has broadened. We are as firm believers as we ever were that 'twixt time and eternity there are but two ways—the broad and the narrow. We never felt more convinced than we do to-day that there is none other name but One through which we may obtain health and salvation. But we have found out that some people are walking in the narrow way that we had not espied then, and that there are other ways of expressing faith in Christ than in the phrases that seemed to us then to enclose and exhaust it. We have got to know men better, and have found here and there a spirituality that we had not suspected. We have got to know ourselves better, and have discovered that our own spiritual vitality was not measureable by our phrases or our feelings. We have learned something about "varieties of religious experience." Some sad incidents of ministerial life have convinced us that that religion is not always deepest which is most demonstrative, nor that most genuine which sounds most orthodox. The conviction has slowly possessed us that it is in the daily life that the Life is manifested, and that some whose lives are most often found reflecting "the Life which is the Light of men" would make but a poor show if asked to define their spiritual experiences. Thus added knowledge of the dealings of God with men, and of the modes and phases of the soul's uplift to God, has made us feel that we must soften some of the harshness of the old sermon.

Again, the disappointments of our ministry have made us more conscious of the limitations of the preacher. We were so

sure we could convince, we were so exuberant, so persuaded that our interpretations could not be regarded as other than adequate, so confident that our appeals must be responded to; there was such an air of finality with which we disposed of every problem! Then followed of necessity disillusionment, inducing first petulance, then chagrin, then mortification; then, by the mercy of God, some little measure of humbleness of mind, as with chastened spirit we began to gather some of the peaceable fruits of righteousness, and to see them in the gardens of our neighbours' souls. We read the old sermon, and experience teaches us to feel that it is too professional, too confident, not sufficiently human. Its spirit must be chastened as ours has been.

Wider experience of men and things has taught us that there are two sides to every question, and that no subject has been mastered till both sides have been studied. We are convinced that it is so with the wide range of questions connected with the critical and exegetical study of Holy Writ. We are not quite so sure as before that ours is the only legitimate theory of inspiration, or that Evangelical theology is summed up in Augustine and Luther. We are willing now to learn from other schools of thought beside our own. We are convinced that no one school or Church has a monopoly of the Faith, or has exhausted its meaning. In the political as in the religious world we are getting far more concerned for the welfare of the nation than for the victory of our party. In the wide sphere of social activity we are losing our prejudice against legal innovations, and our dislike to legislation of which we disapprove no longer blinds us to the good which the same legislators have effected. In Church and State we are less inclined to partisanship. We are more zealous to assert our common faith and aim, than to magnify and emphasize a gulf which seems to be fixed, and a cleavage which seems irreparable. So the old sermon appears to us now somewhat too narrow, too aggressive, too partisan in its tone and temper. It is the truth—yes, thank God!—but it does not seem to contain, as we thought it did,

the whole truth. It must not negative other aspects of truth. It must not foreclose other roads to truth.

There is a certain lack of humour, too, which is very evident in the old sermon. How we lectured our long-suffering hearers ! What a scolding we gave them ! It would have irritated them if they had not found it mildly amusing. But a young man's sermon is generally treated very leniently so long as it shows some real earnestness and genuine conviction. Polish is not expected ; breadth of view arouses suspicion ; crudity is easily condoned ; but the people like life and vigour in the young parson. " He got it off his chest fine," was the recent description by a Westmorland rustic of a curate's sermon, which was certainly a very dashing performance. " He's only fit for an armchair ! " was the scornful comment upon the sermon of a great strapping parson, who may have had something good to say, but who did not take the trouble to let the congregation hear it. The " loud voice " of the Prayer-Book rubrics is a warning against a mumbled service, but a mumbled sermon exasperates the most amiable of listeners. Yet, looking at the old sermon, strong and vigorous as it was, we cannot but feel that its tone is not altogether that which we should now adopt towards our congregation.

It is the change in us which has altered the tone of our preaching. There has come upon us as the years have passed by a greater sense of the mystery of life. The great landmarks of revelation stand out as clearly as ever ; but while we used to think that every detail of the picture was plainly discernible, we now observe that the picture is full of atmosphere, that surrounding every prominent feature and enveloping the whole wide prospect is an atmosphere of mystery. We do not step in with quite the same boldness into regions " where angels fear to tread." A sense of wonder comes over us.

There is something unspeakably awesome about the eternal destiny which this little life is to determine. The scheme of the Divine purpose for the human race, both as regards its spiritual winners and its spiritual losers, and the vast mass of

mankind who never on earth have had the opportunity either to win or to lose the eternal prize ; the place, the function, and the service in the universe that is to be the portion of the glorified Church of Christ through the eternal ages ; the nature and object of human relationship when the great wrench has taken place from all things corporeal—in short, the mystery of the universe which has overshadowed us has coloured our thoughts and judgments, and has introduced into our sermons an element which was not there before. It has made us less disposed to dogmatize, less satisfied with the best of definitions of things and themes which are ineffable, more patient of a varied dogma and a varied standpoint where there is evidence of the life which is life indeed.

If there is more mystery perceivable in the background of the preacher's mind, there is also more sympathy issuing from the modern pulpit. The chastening effect of our own disappointments has brought us closer to our people in theirs. The preacher gets nearer to his people as the passing years bring to him experiences akin to their own. The growing fellowship between them cannot but influence the tone and character of the weekly messages from him whose solemn office it is to stand at once as God's ambassador and as the people's leader and servant. If the world is to be his parish, it can only safely become so by beginning with the parish as his world. He lives among his people, and in increasing measure their joys and sorrows become his.

As sympathy is born of increasing knowledge and fellowship, so also is charity. He is slower than of yore in passing judgments, slower in attributing motives, slower in estimating results. A deepening consciousness of personal shortcoming makes the shortcomings of others look less glaring. The knowledge that God alone knows his own heart's secrets restrains him from assuming that he knows all that is best of his people's. He remembers the old "Varsity days, when he and his coterie sized up the men of his year who professed and called themselves Christians, and classified them with great precision as

keen and *slack*. Their after history has falsified many of his definitions and surprised many of his expectations; so by degrees he has learned to "judge nothing until the Lord come." The old sermon was too censorious. If it is to do duty again, it must be clothed with the garment of love.

The added experience of men and matters has deepened the conviction that "God fulfils Himself in many ways." The modes of the operations of the Holy Spirit appear increasingly varied and complicated. The action of spiritual influences, whether holy or unholy, that play around the soul of man, the cumulative effect of a combination of agencies for evil or for good, the strife between the Spirit and the flesh which is going on, all unseen, within, and wholly screened from outside scrutiny, these are phenomena that baffle all attempts at analysis and foil all schemes of spiritual strategy. God must work His own will in His own way in the hearts of men. The seed will spring up he knows not how. He must sow his seed under the directions of Him who alone giveth the increase. He is not so sure now as when he first preached that old sermon that he can foresee the nature and manner of its effect upon his hearers; but he is more convinced than ever that God's word shall not return to Him void, that it shall accomplish that which He pleases, and prosper in the thing whereunto He has sent it. So the old sermon seems to him now to suggest certain limits and restrictions to the methods of the Holy Spirit's working that the preacher can no longer impose. It must not dictate the phases or the stages of the soul's awakening; it must leave room for many vistas of truth, many glimpses of eternal things, many pathways which lead to the one unchanging Door.

But before we lay aside the old sermon as something which gives an inadequate expression to our larger views of life, it would be well for us to consider whether, as compared with it, the newer sermon is all gain. It may even be imperative that we make inquiry with ourselves whether there has not been loss as well as gain; for to some there may come the crushing conviction that not only has there been loss as well as gain, but

that the loss has outweighed the gain. Does a sense of regret and shame, and even guilt, steal over us as we read the pages of the old sermon? Does conscience convict us of a loss of the sense of vocation? Do we see something in the old sermon that the new does not contain, but something which the accusing voice within us charges us with failure and guilt for omitting? Have we in these later years been dealing as faithfully as we used to do with the great verities of the Faith? Have we preached the great foundation truths of the Evangel with the old earnestness and plainness and conviction, or is it true that the topical sermon, the critical sermon, the social sermon, the up-to-date newspaper-inspired sermon, has ousted the Gospel of the grace of God? Is there to be found in it the old solemn appeal to conscience? Is it inspired by the old longing to bring the prodigal back to the Father's home? Is there the old holy ambition for definite spiritual results, the old yearning that the message may prove the power of God unto salvation?

What gain has it been that the sermon is more polished, if its message is less plain, and if its subject is less prominent? If an added breadth has blurred the old lines and obliterated the ancient landmarks, if the newer light and learning has made us ashamed of the Gospel, how stands the gain in comparison with the loss? The very ease of our sermon preparation and delivery may have been a curse and not a blessing. It is born with less travail. Has it, therefore, become a light thing to proclaim the truth of God? Has a fatal facility in construction permitted other things to deprive it of its unique place in our parochial ministrations? Has the cleverness of the modern sermon taken the place of the convicting and converting power of the old? If so, then it is time that the old sermon was taken from its resting-place and studied and preached anew, so that once more there may sound forth from the pulpit to eager, wistful hearts of needy men the old Gospel, simple and clear, bold and strong, the good news from Heaven to a longing world, the good news of a Saviour who is mighty to save.

B. HERKLOTS.

The Missionary World.

THE month of March has come, and this year, more than ever before in the history of modern missions, have those words a serious meaning for most of the great societies. The month of March has not yet gone, and in those words, more than ever before, does the challenge of a great opportunity lie before a tested Church. The finance of missions in its most urgent form looms up before us, and we are as much impressed by the possibility of a great sufficiency in the mercy of God as by the pang of a great deficit should such come to pass. Looked at very simply and practically, a deficit is probable unless we eliminate the Divine factor, and we need to reason quietly with ourselves to ascertain whether *we*, in our particular mission or society, have any reason to advance which would justify us in expecting that the Divine power will operate on our particular behalf and avert such a contingency.

* * * * *

Let us rule out of count for the moment errors of estimates, lesser faults of judgment whereby at earlier stages certain items, now doubtful, seemed essential in our budget. The most scrupulous care and the maturest experience will not save estimates, as we all know well, from such entries. Let us also rule out—or be prepared to rule out—items which, if we could see as clearly now as we shall see six months hence, we should cheerfully cast aside, and let us humbly stand by our estimates, our engagements, our indebtedness to others, and, “errors and omissions excepted,” ask our God, Will there be enough?

* * * * *

Let us go one stage farther and be prepared to admit that we may be—nay, we are—in need of chastening and humbling; that we have tended to upset the balance of material and spiritual things in our service; that we have so dreaded monetary need for missionaries dear to us as brethren or children that we have clung tenaciously, before all else, to

securing means for their support, giving the material side first place. Knowing that, for our profit, we and, far harder to us, those abroad for whom we are responsible, may have to face financial shortage, let us, in personal contrition for any individual or corporate unworthiness, ask our God whether, in the highest sense, there will be enough.

* * * * *

We shall find our answer far outside the missionary society, far outside the Church. It lies in the Will of God and the Kingdom that is coming. What we have really desired all through the past eleven months was not that our exchequers might be full, our missions free—though we clumsily put it so, because we use so small a range of words and think so small a range of thoughts—but that the Will of God might be done on earth and His Kingdom come. Incomes, however great, are very small, and easy to hide away altogether within such vast prayers as these—prayers, too, not of our own making, but prayers duly “authorized.” We have to ask ourselves, Will *these* prayers be granted? Why, assuredly; Christ taught them, and they are immutably operative. We may take it as certain that through our prayer, our aim, our service, and the sacrifice of our missionaries, the Will of God must be done and the Kingdom be nearer; and the lesser prayer—for what we think the needful money—will be relegated to its own true place as the servant of the Will and the Kingdom, not the determining factor in the issue. These things are so; nevertheless, there is a balancing for them on the other side.

* * * * *

It is conceivable that personal parsimony, personal dread of the future, fear of the cost of further sacrifice, may diminish the total that the income of the missionary societies ought to reach in the purpose of God. Here, then, and now, is the Church's chance. Here are four full weeks in which to give, remembering that sufficient unto next year is the income of that year. Even supposing that we are all less able to give than even we are now, there is time for readjustments in expenditure to

be made in the interval whereby work need not be arrested harshly. But there is no justification at all for holding over for another time, or holding back for "worse days" (which may never come), what ought to be given now. We might easily be found among those who allow prudence to dictate to love—a dangerous precaution when the Church is in need of a true measure for her sacrifice.

* * * *

Both the Church Missionary Society and the China Inland Mission have grave words to say about finance—grave, but not gloomy, and we have a right to know and to share in the gravity. These are days in which grave things appeal, and we would be ashamed to need to be cheered so that we could the better be induced to give. The China Inland Mission, whose financial year has already closed, can speak of signal spiritual blessing; so also could the C.M.S., but with the latter Society there is every possibility that the month of March may be filled with giving, and every apprehension swept away. And this is so because we can never eliminate the Divine factor from the affairs of the Kingdom.

* * * *

The special claims of the Colonial and Continental Church Society should not be forgotten at this time. The current number of the *Greater Britain Messenger* forecasts a considerable deficit. The nation, and in particular the Church, has cause to realize its debt to the Society for its faithful and enterprising work in those Colonies which have rallied round the Mother Country in her hour of need, and also for the courageous and spiritual ministry being carried on by the Society's permanent chaplains in the war zone. The letters telling of chaplains' work at Dunkerque, Rouen, Brussels, and Boulogne in the February magazine are full of interest. The greatness of the opportunity afforded by Continental chaplaincies is strongly stated in an address delivered at a conference in January by

the Rev. E. S. Woods, who has been chaplain both at Davos and at Lausanne, and is now working with the forces.

* * * * *

The opening of the new premises of the C.M.S. on February 1 by the Archbishop of Canterbury was a notable occasion. It was an answer in part to the question whether the war need check the advance of missions. Even though the project originated in time of peace, the ceremony of dedication fell on a time of war, but was none the less marked with a spirit of confident hope. If, as the Archbishop said, the C.M.S. has a peculiar contribution to make in the life of the Church, how much more has it not to make to the life of the world—and at such a time as this! It is sometimes said that the thought of perishing souls has a waning influence on Evangelicals, but it ought to be able to be said that the manifestation of the love of God in Christ has an ever growing power upon them. If the new premises are peopled by men and women who see in Christ the suffering, sovereign love of God for human souls, and if through the offices and across the threshold there pass to the mission-field men and women impelled by that same love, then the new premises will fulfil their great design. On the side of good organization we congratulate the C.M.S. on the completion of a long-needed extension; we have little doubt that the work can grow to fill the new space.

* * * * *

We shall hear much in the next few months of Medical Missions. The C.M.S. has made preliminary announcements of the approaching jubilee of its Medical Missions, which is to be celebrated shortly. We who have watched the growth of the Medical Auxiliary, and have seen the rapid passage to the forefront of missions of this agency, know what stirring records will be available for rousing fresh response at a time when suffering and its relief make a peculiar appeal. In an admirable number, given up chiefly to its own large Medical Missions, "F. L." says in the *L.M.S. Chronicle*: "All this magnificent organization is used to advance and reinforce the work of the

rest of the mission . . . and even after a Christian Church is created, the doctor still stands forth as carrying on the healing ministry of his Master." Medical Missions need no explanation, no advocacy, no defence ; they are their own witness.

* * * * *

There is a danger lest we should overlook typical events in the mission-field in all the nearer significance of the war. We select two or three for notice, each pointing in a different direction. In the Evangelistic Mission in China, led by Mr. Sherwood Eddy, to which we referred briefly last month, we find further food for hope and thanksgiving in fresh details come to hand. In 1896 Dr. Mott characterized the Chinese *literati* as "the Gibraltar of the student world," by which he meant that they were an impregnable fortress. Now, we find in this Mission that thousands of gentry, officials, merchants, students, soldiers, flocked to the meetings, and the great audiences sat in hushed attention to the faithful message of life and truth for the men and the nation of China. The public preparations for the Mission were remarkable. In Peking Mr. Eddy was personally welcomed by the President, the Ministries of the Interior and of War granted respectively a site and materials for the pavilion, the Ministry of Education granted a half-holiday to Government students to enable them to attend the opening meeting. In Changsha the Governor gave the site for a pavilion, and the interpreter was a nephew of the well-known Marquis Tseng, and but recently baptized himself. In Hangchow the largest theatre was lent for three afternoons and the usual charge remitted. Overflow meetings were held, with an attendance of 2,000. In Amoy the Taotai entertained Mr. Eddy at luncheon, when representatives of civil and military officials, and of students, gentry, and merchants, welcomed him. Here, again, thousands assembled in a mat shed, undeterred by the rain that came through, to listen to the proclamation of Christ as the hope of China. Similar scenes also took place at Tientsin and Foochow. Better even than the influence of the meetings at the time are the thousands of

Bible students since enrolled. In Amoy alone over 1,000 men, many of them leaders in the city, signed cards signifying their purpose to study the life and teaching of Christ. Truly the Church in China has a great work to do to follow up this movement—and so have we. It was not ephemeral: it was the result of long preparation, and, as the *Student Movement* says, of “the work of Christian education, the growing recognition in China of the nation’s weakness, the passionate desire of her people to save her, and the conviction that moral power . . . can be found . . . in Christianity.”

* * * * *

The other instance we select has a very different significance, but it also is typical and important. We learn from the *Uganda Notes* that a schism has appeared in the Church for the first time in thirty-seven years. The difficulty appears to have arisen in connection with a certain chief who refused medicine of any kind, and influenced his people to do the same. Such an attitude could not escape notice, owing to the existence of diseases necessitating treatment. The separation of a congregation ensued, and the uprising of a man who baptizes all who wish to be baptized in a wholly irregular way has caused confusion and is a source of anxiety. While it would be more than unwise to overestimate this anti-medicine movement, and its far more serious development as regards baptism, yet it seems to remind us that now, as of old and always, the Church will have its battles with heresies and schism, and that those who labour for it will never be able to shield it wholly from such disaffections. It is no discouragement, but it is a salutary reminder that the Church in Uganda will have no charmed safety of doctrine, but must wrestle its way, upheld by us, against foes which assail its welfare.

* * * * *

The *Missionary Review of the World* is in this country the most familiar of the American missionary periodicals. Its wide outlook and industrious summary of matter from other periodicals have made it welcome to speakers, though a certain uncritical

element in its selection of matter for repetition has occasionally brought its accuracy into question. With great pleasure we note the steady advance of our contemporary towards the attainment of its ideal. It has now, while continuing under the editorship of Mr. Delavan Pierson, a co-operating editorial council, who keep in close touch with representatives of the various missionary societies in America. A programme has been issued for 1915, which indicates the purpose of the *Review* to make a systematic presentation of news from the mission-field.

G.



Notices of Books.

IN THE DAY OF BATTLE. By the Right Rev. H. L. Paget, D.D., Bishop of Stepney. With Introduction by the Bishop of London. *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

The Bishop of Stepney has given us a very beautiful book for our edification this Lent. It was written at the request of the Bishop of London, who warmly commends it to the attention of his diocese. And it is worthy of commendation for the freshness and fulness of its thought, its clear discernment of modern needs, and its true spiritual power. The war is, of course, the greatest thing in men's minds just now, and the Bishop has shown a wise discretion in so modelling his Lenten book that it touches at almost every conceivable point the interests of those whose lives, responsibilities, and duties, are affected by the war. Men need guidance, and the Bishop of Stepney seeks to offer it them in a careful, reasoned, sympathetic series of chapters on the Lord's Prayer. "The Prayer, by itself," he says, "cannot mislead us," and truly his wonderfully impressive expositions of the various petitions will arrest attention. The book is full of thought, and it compels thought. "Interesting" it is in the best sense of the word, but we think that "inspiring" best expresses its effect upon the reader's mind and heart.

It is not a book that calls for criticism or review in the generally accepted sense. Its purport can best be described by giving a few extracts. The volume consists of seven chapters, each chapter dealing with a separate petition of the Lord's Prayer; and, as the book runs to 157 pages, it will readily be understood that the treatment of the various subjects is ample and complete. There is nothing superficial or unreal about it; depth of thought and earnestness of spirit characterize every page.

In the chapter on the love of the Father and its relation to suffering, the Bishop says that "we have a disastrously distorted idea of God's omnipotence, if it is to us the sort of thing that casts a shadow on God's love."

Try, then, to say "Our Father." He is not far away; He is with us in this stricken world of grief and terror and confusion and pain, His world which He has made and pitied and redeemed.

St. Paul, under an unjust suspicion of a certain hardness, could call God to witness, "Because I love you not! God knoweth." God cannot appeal to another; because there is no greater, He must swear by Himself! "Because I love you not?" "Yea, I have loved you with an everlasting love."

One of the finest chapters is on the hallowing of the Divine Name, and in it the Bishop incidentally refers to the forgotten value, in this connection, of the diligent use of the Psalms:

There were times when the Psalms were the common possession, the treasure, of the simplest Christians; times when, as the ploughman guided the plough, he would be heard singing gently to himself "something of David." They have, it is to be feared, very largely passed away from us. It may be that elaborate chants with high reciting

notes have helped to rob us of them. We should do well to get hold of them again. It is wonderful how even the daily use of them month by month brings us, if only we say them carefully, the thoughts, the encouragements, the comforts, that we need. Even more wonderful is the growing sense they give us of the reality of God. It grows upon us, faint it may be at times, but rising again to incredible strength of absolute conviction.

Or take, again, the practical application of the petition, "Thy Kingdom come"; the Bishop shows how far short of our profession we often come:

We do well to ask ourselves what measure of reality and sincerity there has been hitherto in the fiercely warlike terms in which we have spoken and sung of the Christian life—"Marching as to war," "The trumpet-call obey," "Take to arm you for the fight the panoply of God," "Fight the good fight with all thy might." It is all sound and good; it is all implicit in our Christian obligation and in our baptismal vow. But how thoughtlessly, how listlessly, we have used the big words! Tested by our complacent attitude towards the horrible evil around us, by our faint and intermittent and half-hearted struggle with our own particular and besetting sin, by the sort of fight we make and the sort of vigilance with which we are satisfied, how can such language stand, as we face the inexorable demands, the absolute and primary requirements, of an actual state of war? Let us pray to be delivered from the inconsistency of braggart language coupled with cowardly inaction. The soldier language on the lips must be justified by the soldier spirit at the heart.

The chapter on "Thy Will be done" is specially addressed to those suffering bereavement through the war, and has many passages for their comfort and consolation. "It is quite certain," the Bishop says, "that life here is only, at most, the short prelude to life hereafter."

And, thus, when a man with these, just the bare outlines of it all, in his mind, opens his Bible, and, kneeling, yields himself to the teaching of the Holy Spirit, the vision becomes clear and bright. There are the many mansions in the Father's house, there is the welcome of the Father's love. There is the better country, that is, a heavenly; the rest that remaineth for the people of God. It is no longer a dreary, colourless outlook, it is a land of life and love; it is no longer desolate and lonely, for Christ and Christ's servants are there. It is no longer dark, it is the light of God's presence. The bitter sense of separation yields—at least begins to yield—to the assurance of a union that death cannot destroy. The horror of loss is broken by the clear hope of a happy meeting.

One more quotation must be permitted to us. It is from the chapter on "Our Daily Bread," and contains a strong protest against personal luxury:

There is room in life for splendour—more room, perhaps, than has been allowed it: in God's service, in great national affairs, in buildings that serve high purposes, in our memorials of great work and great worth. Those are the things which splendour may well be invited to adorn. But over-dressing, over-feeding, personal self-indulgence, what is there worthy of splendour in these? Personal luxury has always been the precursor of national decay. It is a bitter provocation flung in the very face of the poor. It is disastrous for those who seek it. It is the commonest form of that love of the world which is actually death

to the love of the Father. We might almost thank God for the stern discipline which to-day so sternly rebukes it.

The closing chapters are very fine, and breathe the true devotional spirit. The volume will be read with pleasure and profit, and we venture to thank the Bishop of Stepney for giving us so uplifting a book.

PLAIN TALKS ON THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. By Eugene Stock, D.C.L.
London: *Robert Scott*. Price 5s. net.

Dr. Stock furnishes an excellent commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, characterized by that thoroughness and systematic work which we have learned to associate with all his work. He declines to use the word "commentary," because the treatment is not "chapter by chapter . . . verse by verse"; but every word of importance is carefully studied, and, although he rightly claims that his topical method has "the merit of novelty," the reader will find here all for which he usually consults a commentary, and more. The discussion of the Epistles by analysis of the contents, whether doctrinal, ecclesiastical, or ethical, and by separate consideration of each, adds interest to the book, and provides an ampler elucidation of the sacred text than can usually be obtained from other sources.

The Greek Text is the basis of this exposition, but results are so presented that readers will have no difficulty even when they are unacquainted with that language, for the Greek letters are not employed except in occasional footnotes. In this way Dr. Stock is enabled to associate together the various verses in which the same word is used, and to unfold its meaning with precision. Scientific theology is thus clothed in its most pleasant guise. Incidentally, suggestions of considerable value are made, and will engage the attention of subsequent scholars and writers.

The great army of Bible-readers who, like the Bereans, search the Scriptures daily, but who cannot follow the New Testament in its original language, will welcome the aid afforded them here, and will long for other Epistles to be treated in like manner. They are aware that much is inevitably lost even in the best of translations. They timidly hold to their conclusions, in fear lest some linguistic expert should suddenly and sharply expose their delusions. Thus many fall a ready prey to the specious expositions offered in such fertile abundance by the improvisors of innumerable modern heresies. The judicious use of Dr. Stock's able, solid, and lucid explanation of St. Paul's teaching will give balance to their judgment, and security against these disastrous but popular errors. They will know that they are building on the sure foundations of truth.

Apt illustrations from missionary information frequently assist the exposition of a word or phrase; acquaintance with the thought and life of to-day brings forth the permanent value of the old doctrine; the facility of accurate expression in the simplest terms removes many difficulties. But Dr. Stock in no wise undertakes to think for his readers. He guides and instructs, but they must apply for themselves. Here and there is room for legitimate difference of opinion; Dr. Stock never writes in an imperious or dogmatic tone. We are brought up to the point where application to modern conditions arises; then we are wisely left to pursue the road. The lamp is

turned to cast its light upon our path ; in its light we must walk. Sufficient has been done if the obscurities of partial knowledge have been to some extent removed, and we can now see our way more clearly.

The book before us is just the one for thoughtful Sunday-school teachers and earnest Christian workers. It cannot be hurriedly read, but needs contemplation at every paragraph. Then its teaching power will be found to be immense, and it will strengthen and stablish many in the Christian Faith.

THE AUTHOR OF THE SPANISH BROTHERS (DEBORAH ALCOCK): HER LIFE AND WORKS. By Elisabeth Boyd Bayly. London: *Marshall Brothers, Ltd.* Price 6s.

The large circle of people who have been charmed and fascinated by the late Miss Alcock's writings will read with very great interest this account of her life, coming as it does from the pen of her intimate friend, Miss Bayly, herself an authoress of no mean repute. The biography of one who numbered among her friends such well-known personages as W. E. Forster, Mrs. Rundle Charles, Dr. Blaikie, Sir Robert Ball, Archbishop and Lady Plunkett, Archbishop Crozier, and the Bishop of Durham, could not fail to be full of interest. The commanding interest, however, of the volume is Miss Alcock herself, her personality and influence, her struggles, her successes, and, above all, her gift for winning souls. She had a powerful imagination. As a child she would make up stories about her dolls till she made the discovery that "the stories could do just as well without the dolls." Passionately fond of history, John Huss, Gustavus Adolphus, and Alfred the Great, were her heroes. Great was her disappointment when after hard work at a religious tale she failed to win her father's approbation, he believing, as many Evangelicals of that day did, that all fiction was wrong. It was a cruel blow to her, as for some considerable time she could not, from a sense of filial duty, exercise what evidently was her vocation. Her father at last himself came to recognize this, and God's blessing obviously rested upon her writings, for many true conversions resulted from them.

Like many others, she was much exercised on the subject of future punishment, and if it be the rule, as has been said, and possibly may be the case, that those who cannot accept the doctrine of a literal eternity of suffering are not blessed with so many conversions as those who hold the "orthodox" teaching, at least Miss Alcock's case was the exception which honours the rule.

The work ought to command a very wide circulation, and Miss Bayly is heartily to be congratulated upon her book.

THE OBJECT OF THE BIBLE. By the Rev. Edward F. Wilson. London: *Elliot Stock.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

We thoroughly go with the author of this little book in the Gospel truth which he sets forth, and in his contention that the Bible is the Word of God, also that "the tribes of Israel, the direct descendants of Abraham, were destined by God to be the conveyors of His will and the expounders of His laws to the remainder of mankind." After the Introduction, the second chapter deals with the question, "Who was Abraham?" Then come seven chapters on Isaiah, which is taken in sections, and these are followed by one

on "The Present Condition of the Jews." After this, and before the concluding chapter, we have one on "The Whereabouts of the Ten Lost Tribes," in which the Anglo-Israel theory is maintained and defended, a view to which some of the statements in the earlier portions of the book have been leading up. We are sorry to join issue with one with whom otherwise we are so much in agreement, but we cannot regard this position as in any sense proven. It seems to us to contradict the prediction of Noah, "God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem." If the Anglo-Israel view is correct, then God has enlarged *Shem*, and he is certainly now dwelling in the tents of Japheth.

THE MANHOOD OF THE MASTER. By Harry Emerson Fosdick, D.D. London: *Student Christian Movement*. Price 1s. 6d. net.

A course of short readings from the Gospels, with brief comments, arranged for each day during twelve weeks, each separate week having its own special subject—e.g., "The Master's Joy," "The Master's Magnanimity," etc., concluding with a week's study on "The Fulness of Christ." "Originally prepared for American students," we read in the Preface, this "little book is issued for British students, by permission of the International Committee of the Young Men's Christian Associations, who are owners of the copyright." A manual put forth under the double sponsorship of the Student Christian Movement and of the Y.M.C.A. should meet with a warm welcome, and when to this we add the sacred nature of the subject, so infinitely precious to every lover of the Master, the success of this little volume should be assured.

THE UPWARD CALLING OF GOD IN CHRIST. By Bertha Fennell. London: *Marshall Brothers, Ltd.* Price 2s. 6d.

A sweet little volume, full of rich and deep spiritual thoughts. There are twelve papers or meditations, each on some Scripture character, taken as illustrating a principle. Thus, Abraham stands for "the separated life," Eliezer for "stewardship," the man born blind for "progressive revelation," and St. Paul is "the bond-servant of Jesus Christ." We would heartily commend these Bible studies, which are on thorough Keswick lines. The reader will find many suggestive and happily worked out ideas—e.g., the thought of full surrender leading to prosperity and plenty, as shown in the acceptance of Joseph's corn policy by the starving Egyptians; or, again, the reflection in the case of St. Paul's deliverance from the conspiracy at Jerusalem that "to be the prisoner of Rome meant deliverance from the plots of vile conspirators—to be the bond-servant of Jesus Christ carries with it the glorious liberty of sonship." Each meditation is closed by a suitable hymn or poem, which, as no name is given, we conclude to be the author's own. We wish the little volume a wide circulation.

THE SLEEPING CARDINAL, AND OTHER SERMONS. By Canon C. H. D. McMillan, M.A. London: *Robert Scott*. Price 1s. 6d. net.

These sermons, preached in Malmesbury Abbey, are well above the average. Our only regret in reading them was that there were but seven of them, and one hopes that the volume will be so well received that the author may be tempted to give us another. The title of the first sermon is certainly arresting, and the subject of each discourse is introduced with a

graphic and apt illustration. The "Sleeping Cardinal" is the recumbent effigy of an ecclesiastic in the beautiful church of Santa Maria del Popolo in Rome. Slightly raised on one side, there is the suggestion that the Cardinal is about to rise; but still he sleeps, unmoved by the music of his solemn services. So, when the throne of the Papacy was rocking on its foundations, he slept on through September 20, 1870. "As our Lord moves to and fro in the aisles and choir and countless chapels of the vast structure of the church, is it not true that in a large number—nay, in the vast majority of instances—the men and women He looks upon, so far as spiritual life is concerned, are like the lifeless effigies of the dead?" These sermons are intensely practical, and treat of such subjects as Socialism, Christian Science, and New Theology. Canon McMillan speaks well of the Reformation (p. 83), and is a firm believer in the mission and future of the English Church and the ultimate downfall of the Papal Church as punishment for her many offences. Young preachers will find these sermons excellent models in style and arrangement.

THE PARABOLIC GOSPEL. By the Rev. R. M. Lithgow. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. Price 4s. net.

An original and careful study of the significance of the sequence of our Lord's parables. The author says: "The development and synthesis of doctrine which the parables reveal, when arranged in their chronological order, afford an interesting conspectus of the whole scope of Christ's evangelic teaching. They present that before us as a distinct and harmonious message from God." The Matthean and Lucan parables are therefore chronologically arranged under five headings: (1) The Great Distinction; (2) Growth and Prayer; (3) Grace and its Conditions; (4) The Divine Claims; (5) Judgment and Doom. These are elaborately and exhaustively discussed, together with what are called the "Minor Parables" and the "Parabolic Emblems of the Fourth Gospel." A glance at the preface is sufficient to show how extensively the author has read upon the subject to which he has given so much attention. Even those who cannot follow him all the way will find much that is suggestive in these pages.

AUSTRALIAN SERMONS. By the Right Rev. A. V. Green, LL.D., Bishop of Ballarat. London: Macmillan and Co. Price 3s. 6d. net.

These sermons, "preached to country congregations," have certainly what is considered a merit nowadays—namely, brevity. As might be expected, there is a good deal of local colouring and some plain speaking on what the Bishop, in his preface, calls the besetting sins of Australia which threaten its growing national life. The book has been published by request of the Council of the Diocese in order to afford help to the honorary lay readers who have frequently to officiate in the absence of a clergyman, and who find the printed English sermon seldom meets their requirements, because the seasons are inverted, Christmas being at midsummer and Easter in the autumn; and because, too, the allusions and illustrations are often inappropriate. All this notwithstanding, these plain, short sermons will be found helpful by many an English preacher, clerical and lay. The sermon, for instance, on Betting and Gambling might, with the omission of two sentences, be delivered with advantage in any English church, and the appeal on

behalf of Sunday is as sorely needed in England as in Australia. If these are typical Australian sermons, we need have no fear for the virility and vitality of the Church of the Commonwealth.

THE SON OF MAN. By the Rev. R. O. Shone, B.A., B.D. London: *Robert Scott*. Price 2s. net.

This volume, which consists of a series of addresses delivered in a Liverpool church, is full of suggestion. In his careful introduction, Mr. Shone discusses our Lord's probable reason for selecting a title, frequently used and used by Him alone. In the chapters that follow the subject is worked out—the Son of Man: His ministry, authority, sufferings, triumph, glory, and personality. These are sound, thoughtful discourses, in which the "gallery" is never "played to." Happy indeed is the pastor who has gathered round him those who love sermons of this order. Perhaps Mr. Shone's little book will serve as an encouragement to others to feed their people on strong meat and discontinue the milk diet!

THE CHURCH, THE STATE, AND THE POOR. By W. Edward Chadwick, D.D., B.Sc. London: *Robert Scott*. Price 6s. net.

Dr. Chadwick has made the subject his own, and he lays before us the results, carefully arranged, of his work and thought. The articles attracted attention when they appeared in the *CHURCHMAN*; and now that they are obtainable in bound form they re-present a full and illuminating treatment of the social problem which all students of human conditions, and especially all clergymen, will buy and read with much interest and definite advantage. Obviously the book has entailed hard work, and it deserves and demands careful reading. The fifteen chapters give us an historical survey of the relationships between the poor and the Church and the State from the days of the Early Church to those of the C.S.U. and the 1909 "Minority" Report. How both Church and State have repeatedly fallen into traps and errors which had ensnared them in previous generations is clear enough. How amateurish and clumsy many of the palliatives and remedies have been is just as plain. The enormous advance secured by the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834, of which "it is impossible to exaggerate the importance," is seen by the twofold fact that it absolutely transformed all existing methods of poor relief, and still remains in force, with modifications, to-day. The new problems thrust upon the community by the industrial revolution, and again by the rise of Unions and Federations, are dealt with, and there is abundant information providing much food for thought for those younger clergy who will have wisdom enough to acquaint themselves with the kind of problem which is filling the minds of many thoughtful men and women of this generation, and which will unquestionably loom largely in the next. The Church must enlarge her outlook if these matters themselves are not to prove too large for her in the result, and to have the subject discussed carefully, sympathetically, thoroughly, as Dr. Chadwick discusses it and from a clergyman's point of view, is great gain.

MESSAGES OF THE BEATITUDES. By the Rev. T. A. Bailey. London: *Robert Scott*. Price 3s. net.

Ten sermons on thirteen verses of St. Matthew, chapter v., which the author has wisely left in the direct spoken form of appeal in which sermons

are ordinarily delivered. In simple phrases which should bring comfort and direction to many ordinary Christian folk, the sermons emphasize the beauty and inner meaning of our Lord's wonderful words. The poor, the mourners, the meek, the merciful, the pure, the peacemakers, the persecuted . . . all are "blessed," not only in that they thus please God, but because such graces do actually result in deep and lasting happiness. We have Jesus Christ's authority for this as well as life's experiences, and we believe it because we believe Him.

WORLD PROBLEMS. S.P.G. Price 1s.

This attractive little book is made up of addresses delivered to London business men by "Five Bishops," who prove to be the Archbishop of Brisbane (who deals with Australia), the Bishop of Willesden (Canada), Bishop Montgomery (the Far East), the Bishop of Lucknow (India), and the Bishop of Bloemfontein (Africa). The addresses naturally vary somewhat in "grip," for no five men can be exactly equal, but, generally, they are forceful and direct, and they bring before men with busy minds and lives the important "world problems" of the new world and the old in a vigorous manner. "No new organ ought to be built in England, no new window inserted, no new vestment bought, unless a similar sum to that expended on them is given for the work of our Church in Canada," says the Bishop of Willesden. The Bishop of Bloemfontein's desire for Christian unity in Africa is interesting in the light of recent controversies. He wants a "spirit of co-operation in which each fragment of Christendom shall contribute to a common stock."

GOD'S WORD SUPREME. By Arthur H. Carter. London: *Protestant Truth Society*. Price 1s. 6d. net.

Many who are in general agreement with Mr. Carter's attitude to the Holy Scriptures will find it difficult to appraise the worth of his lectures. In a court of justice two methods are employed to persuade a jury. The evidence is carefully adduced and sifted, and there is the counsel's speech. This book is the counsel's speech. Minds which attach weight to trenchant delivery, definite statement, and unhesitating confidence, will be readily swayed. Others will instinctively feel that eloquence is not evidence, assertion is not argument, discursiveness is not demonstration. Moreover, Mr. Carter forgets the old adage of the indifferent attorney, and prefers to launch accusations against each and all of the Higher Critics in a manner which is neither fair nor charitable. We believe those critics are in error; we think that, commencing with a literary criticism, they will never be led on to discovery of the Word of God; we are persuaded that a true study of the Bible must begin with a recognition of its wonderful power in the conversion of souls; but we should not be justified in attributing a deep moral guilt to those who proceed from another source in their investigations. For all that Mr. Carter has brought much interesting information together, and his labours will not be useless.

BATTLING AND BUILDING AMONG THE BHILS. *Church Missionary Society*, Salisbury Square, E.C. Price 1s.

Here is another missionary book full of illustrations and facts about C.M.S. work among the Bhils. In a chapter entitled "Pioneering" the

story of the Rev. C. S. Thompson's life and death is briefly but effectively told. The rest is a stimulating account of the triumphs of the Cross among an interesting but little known people.



Publications of the Month.

[Insertion under this heading neither precludes nor guarantees a further notice.]

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

- IN THE DAY OF BATTLE.** By the Right Rev. H. L. Paget, D.D. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 2s. 6d. net.) The Bishop of Stepney's Book for Lenten Reading, with an Introduction by the Bishop of London. [See review on p. 231.]
- DISCOVERY AND REVELATION.** By H. F. Hamilton, D.D. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 2s. 6d. net.) An interesting and profitable study in comparative religion. It follows very closely Dr. Hamilton's previous work, "The People of God." The idea of "The Layman's Library" series, to which this volume is an addition, is "to offer a religious ideal which may satisfy both heart and mind"; and, "while taking full account of the results of modern criticism," to "build up a constructive religious ideal."
- EMOTIONS OF JESUS, THE.** By Professor Robert Law, D.D. (*T. and T. Clark.* 2s. net.) A welcome addition to the "Short Course" series, which theological students have cause to value much. It does not profess to be exhaustive, but as a succession of studies on the human side of our Divine Lord's character the book will be found at once both scholarly and simple. The "Emotions" treated of include joy, geniality, compassion, anger, and wonder.
- OFFERINGS MADE LIKE UNTO THE SON OF GOD, THE.** By the Ven. W. S. Moule, M.A., Principal of C.M.S. Training College, Ningpo. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 6s. net.) A volume of first-rate interest and importance. It is an "independent inquiry into the typical character of the history, etc., of the Mosaic ritual," and the writer's hope is that when the end has been reached the reader will be thinking no longer of the Divine origin and authority of the Scriptures (which will be evident to his own consciousness), but rather of the sufficiency of Jesus Christ for the salvation of the sinner." The writer does not hesitate frankly to state his position. "The reliability of the Five Books of Moses is assumed."
- PREPARATION FOR THE PASSION, THE.** By the Rev. James S. Stone, D.D. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 6s. net.) This "Study of the Incarnation and Virgin Birth of our Lord and of His Life from Bethlehem to Cana of Galilee" will prove of great value to all Bible students who will be at pains to discriminate. The volume represents a particularly wide range of reading.
- SHORT STUDIES ON BIBLE SUBJECTS.** By William Dale, F.S.A., F.G.S. (*Elliot Stock,* 2s. 6d. net.) These brightly-written and eminently readable "studies" should not lack readers. The study on "The Water of the Well of Bethlehem" pleases us much. The volume is rich in suggestion.
- LESSONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.** By the Rev. A. S. Hill Scott, M.A., and the Rev. H. T. Knight, M.A. (*Oxford University Press.* 3s. 6d. net.) This is the second part (Trinity Sunday to All Saints') of a work which has been widely approved. It contains notes, critical and expository, on the passages appointed for Sundays and Holy Days.
- SAVING FAITH, OR THE GREAT QUESTION ANSWERED.** By the Rev. A. Metcalfe. (*C. J. Thyne.* 1s. net.) A fourth edition of a work which deals faithfully and usefully with the difficulties, object, promise, effects, illustration, and influence of "saving faith." The Bishop of Durham contributes a warmly commendatory Preface.
- PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.** By W. Prescott Upton. (*C. J. Thyne.* 1d.) A scholarly exposition of the teaching of the Church, the Scriptures, and the early Christian Church on this much-discussed subject.

THE RULE OF WORK AND WORSHIP. By the Rev. Canon R. L. Ottley, D.D. (*Robert Scott*, 5s. net. "Library of Historic Theology.") Those who remember with gratitude the help they received from Canon Ottley's other volumes in this series, "The Rule of Faith and Hope" and "The Rule of Life and Love," will give a warm welcome to the present book. It finds a sufficient "Rule" in the Lord's Prayer, of which Canon Ottley treats with a ripeness of scholarship and fulness of exposition which leave nothing to be desired.

GENERAL.

WHO'S WHO, 1915. (*A. and C. Black, Ltd.* 15s. net.) This useful volume grows in bulk every year. It now runs to 2,375 pages, and it is not too much to say that every page is interesting. The short biographies tell us practically everything we want to know about the persons who have a place in this "temple of fame." The volume is indispensable as a work of reference, and the general reader may pass many a pleasant hour in examining its pages.

ON THE FACE OF THE WATERS. By Flora Annie Steel; and, **COME AND FIND ME.** By Elizabeth Robins. (*T. Nelson and Sons*. Sevenpenny Series).

ANTI-CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM. By the Rev. C. L. Drawbridge, M.A. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 1s. net.) An important contribution to the discussion written by one who has had a wide experience. Its main concern is with "class bitterness."

CHILD STUDY, WITH SPECIAL APPLICATION TO THE TEACHING OF RELIGION. By the Rev. G. H. Dix, M.A. With Preface by the Rev. H. A. Lester. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 1s. 6d. net.) "The first essential for success in religious teaching," says Mr. Lester, is "an understanding of" children. This useful little volume is the work of an expert, "whose practice is based on sound scientific principles," and all who have to deal with the training of the young will profit by reading it.

POLITICAL HISTORY OF SECESSION: TO THE BEGINNING OF THE CIVIL WAR. By Daniel Wait Howe. (*G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 15s. net.) A substantial volume which, while appealing most strongly to the people of the United States, will not be without interest on this side. It is explained that the author traces the causes, of which slavery was the chief, but by no means the only one, that led to the Civil War. He has arrayed his facts in such a way as to give them a new interest, and to enable the reader to understand the issues and the attempted compromises that antedated the final outbreak. Though a descendant of old Massachusetts stock and a veteran of the Union side of the Civil War, the author, it is claimed, has presented his subject with the impartiality of the true historian.

THE RELATION OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH TO THE MONARCHICAL CLAIMS OF THE ROMAN SEE. By the Rev. F. W. Puller, M.A. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 1s. net.) Another volume of the Modern Oxford Tracts.

WAR LITERATURE.

THE DIVINE REPLY TO GENERAL BERNHARDI'S CHALLENGE. (*Elliot Stock*, 6d. net.) "World Power or Downfall," such is the challenge, and the author of this interesting brochure answers it by expounding the meaning of "the image" of Nebuchadnezzar's dream. Whatever may be thought of his exposition, there will be genuine satisfaction at his conclusion: "From this detailed point of view also it can again be fearlessly asserted that Germany's idea of obtaining world power in and by the setting up a fifth great empire is but the vainest of dreams, and one—in the face of the distinct declaration of God's revealed purpose—without the remotest possibility of attainment in any lasting sense whatever (as designed and supposed by General Bernhardi and the Kaiser)."

THE CHURCH AND THE WAR. By the Bishop of Lincoln. (*Oxford University Press*, 2d. net.) A reprint as an "Oxford Pamphlet" of the Bishop's article in the *Political Quarterly*.

THE WORLD IN ALLIANCE. By Frank Noel Keen, LL.B. (*Walter Southwood and Co., Ltd.* 1s. net.) This book describes "a plan for preventing future wars," which is surely a little premature. Our first duty is to bring the present war to a successful termination.

THE CHRISTIAN'S WAR BOOK. Edited and arranged by Marr Murray. (*Hodder and Stoughton*, 2s. net.) A scissors-and-paste book, yet a very creditable piece of work. It brings together into a handy form the views on the war and its problems of a large number of Christian ministers and others.