

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

July, 1915.

The Month.

WE have felt it right to give the full text of the The Church and the War. Pastoral Letter issued by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in relation to the war, and it will be found on p. 522. It is a pronouncement of extraordinary interest and importance, and one for which Church and nation alike have reason to be thankful. It sets out, with a precision which leaves nothing to be desired, the character of the call the war is making upon the nation generally, and upon Church-people in particular. It gives what the Church has long been needing—a strong lead—and if its precepts are followed, there will be such a mobilizing of the forces of prayer and service as has rarely been seen before. The Pastoral affords good evidence that the leaders of the Church are awaking to the force and urgency of national needs. For nearly eleven months the nation has been engaged in the most desperate war in our history; the British casualty lists recently published show our losses in killed, wounded, prisoners, and missing to be considerably more than a quarter of a million men; the war is costing the nation in money more than two millions and a half per day, yet even now the nation seems to find it difficult to realize the gravity of the position. The Archbishops' Pastoral recognizes that it is the duty of the Church to stimulate national service for national needs, but its main concern, naturally, is with the spiritual side of the question, and it is in this respect that the nation has fallen most lamentably short. In the early days of the war there was

some semblance of a turning towards God. Men and women looked grave when the possibilities of invasion were discussed, and the Sunday services in church and chapel, as well as special intercessory services on week-days, drew large congregations. Then came a reaction. People grew accustomed to the war, and resumed their old habits of life, and, we fear we must add, in many cases their old sins. In these circumstances the Church could not remain silent, and the Pastoral Letter comes as a solemn call to the Church and to the nation. It now remains to be seen what heed will be paid to it. The Archbishops have done their part; will the clergy do theirs? Upon them—the parish clergy—devolves the heaviest responsibility of all. Central efforts and central services have their value, but they will never touch the masses of the people. The faithful will give heed and respond, but the ordinary people can only be reached and influenced by their own parish clergy. It is good to know that there is a movement in every diocese for following up the Pastoral Letter, but it must rest with the clergyman in his own individual sphere to bring its wholesome admonitions to bear upon his own people. Local circumstances differ so widely that it is impossible any hard-and-fast rule should be laid down; a wide discretion must be left to the parish clergyman, so that he may take the course which seems to him best for enlisting the prayers and services of his own people. But if in each parish the clergyman will do his part faithfully and well, the combined effect throughout the country will be enormous. The greatest need of the hour is for the nation to be on its knees in penitence and supplication before Almighty God. We have lost our sense of the acknowledgment of the Majesty of God, and we must get it back again.

The publication of the Pastoral Letter was the
The Bishops' Resolutions. outcome of the deliberations of all the English Bishops at their Whitsuntide meeting at Lambeth. Their lordships are so often subjected to criticism for what they do and for what they leave undone that it ought frankly

to be recognized with gratitude that in this matter they have given great attention to the claims of the national crisis and have shown a genuine desire to help the nation in its hour of need. The question was very fully discussed at Lambeth, and three resolutions of real importance were adopted as follows :

“ 1. Being convinced that the present war is a supreme struggle on behalf of righteousness and freedom, this meeting of the Diocesan Bishops of England and Wales desires to endorse heartily the substance of the letter written by the Archbishop of Canterbury on May 15 to the Prime Minister, and calls upon the nation to concentrate upon the successful prosecution of the war the full power of its spiritual, moral, and material resources.

“ 2. As a means to this end, the Bishops offer to the Government the assurance of their desire to support and forward so far as they can, and with all the influence at their command, such measures as the Government may deem necessary in order to bring the energies and resources of the men and women of the country into fullest activity and combination.

“ 3. Above all, the Bishops call upon the clergy and all faithful people continually to give themselves to penitence, prayer, and waiting upon God, in face of the crisis which in His overruling Providence has been permitted to come upon the nations.”

We welcome these Resolutions for their robustness of tone and for their accurate gauging of the needs of the times. The counsel they offer is eminently wise, practical, and Christian, and we are glad to see that the namby-pambyism which characterizes the utterances of many good men who set out to advise Christian people as to their right attitude towards the war, finds no place in these Resolutions. The nation is engaged in a “supreme struggle” for “righteousness and freedom”; the very fundamentals of Christianity are at stake, and as a Christian nation we are bound by every consideration to pursue the war, at whatever cost, to a successful issue. The power of German militarism, which has deluged Europe with blood and covered the very name of Germany with indelible infamy, must be crushed, and until that has been done thoroughly and effectively there can be no thought of peace.

There seems to be an impression in certain quarters that, because Evangelical and Moderate Churchmen have expressed their satisfaction with the Archbishop of Canterbury's Statement on Kikuyu, they

A Kikuyu
Re-echo.

have thereby accepted the view he pronounced on the question of Church members receiving the Holy Communion, in cases of necessity, at the hands of a non-episcopally ordained minister. Nothing could be further from the fact. The Archbishop's dealing with the point was less definite than that of the Central Consultative Body, who said that they could not regard any such arrangements as consistent with the principles of the Church of England, but His Grace made it very clear that the practice could not be sanctioned. We quote in full, which we could not do last month, the passage in his Statement relating to it :

“I turn to what someone has described as ‘the other side of what is presumably a reciprocal rule’—namely, the sanction directly or by implication given to members of our Church to receive the Holy Communion at the hands of ministers not episcopally ordained. To imagine that the occasional admission of non-episcopalians, who in special circumstances seek the Holy Communion at our hands, carries or implies a corresponding readiness to bid the members of our Church, when temporarily isolated, seek the Holy Communion at the hands of any Christian minister, though not episcopally ordained, who may be within reach, to whatsoever denomination or system he belongs, is gravely to misapprehend the position and to run the risk of creating serious confusion. I realize that the proposed Scheme of Federation as a whole may be interpreted as prescribing by inference some limitations which would qualify the phrase I have used above. But this is not enough. The perplexity, especially for simple and untutored people, would remain. And if such a principle were once laid down it would be impossible to limit its operation to British East Africa, the region covered by the proposed Federation Scheme ; and so far as I can appraise and correlate the testimony given to me from China and Manchuria, from India, from Melanesia, and from Canada, the result of giving such advice in general terms would be, not only to create perplexity in administration, but to hamper and retard such measure of co-operation as is now happily in progress. It is a satisfaction to me to point out that the question is at present of an academic rather than a practical kind, for it became apparent in our personal communications with the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda that they are so conscious of the difficulties and perplexities which might arise that they have no wish or intention to give that advice to African Christians belonging to their dioceses.”

We cannot subscribe to this view of the question, nor do we believe that it will be generally acceptable to Churchmen. It seems to us to involve a practical denial, or—to put it another way—a non-recognition, of the validity of the Blessed Sacrament when administered by a minister not episcopally ordained.

That is a position which we feel bound to resist, and we venture to say that the Archbishop will be making a profound mistake if he allow himself to be persuaded that, because his Statement in its general terms and application has been so widely accepted, there is general concurrence in the passage we have quoted. If Episcopacy were of the *esse* of the Church, his view would be unassailable; but it is not, and we have to be on our guard against accepting any position which would imply that it is.

We are fully sensible of the difficulties in the way of a corporate body such as the Church Missionary Society's Committee giving official expression to its views on the Archbishop's Statement; but the document is one of such large importance and touches so directly interests in which the C.M.S. is so profoundly concerned that we are sure supporters of the Society throughout the country would have welcomed some declaration on the subject. It may yet come, and we hope it will. In the meantime we have the comments of the official organ of the Society, the *C.M. Review*. The "Editorials" dealing with Kikuyu do not, however, profess to give more than a "cursory examination" of the Statement with a "reflection." They are written, we are glad to see, in a sympathetic spirit, but we cannot share the writer's interpretation of the passage we have quoted in the paragraph above. Whilst showing a rather too ready desire to score off "another Evangelical paper" and the *Church Times*, he offers his own explanation, which is as follows: "The Archbishop's words make it perfectly clear that he neither vetoes non-episcopal Communion, nor forbids members of our Church to partake of them, nor censures the Bishop who takes no steps to prevent Church of England laymen in his diocese from so partaking." We can only regard this interpretation as a piece of special pleading which greatly surprises us. We recognize that the Archbishop's language was most guarded, but we find it difficult to believe that he meant to leave the

question open. We submit with every confidence that the only reasonable interpretation which can be placed upon the passage, when considered as a whole, is that the Archbishop meant his words to offer a distinct refusal of assent. We find ourselves in much happier agreement with the "reflection" of the writer in the *C.M. Review*. It is of great interest, and we quote it as follows :

"How much the whole Church owes to Bishops Peel and Willis, and to the late Bishop Tucker and the Rev. Dr. Henry E. Scott, of the Established Kirk of Scotland, for the catholicity of spirit and the conscientious care to safeguard the deep and paramount principles of ecclesiastical order in the scheme which they all had a share in preparing! That scheme has passed through the severest tests both in Scotland and England which could be applied, and we venture to say that the modifications called for to bring it into harmony with the criticisms of the best qualified and most authoritative judges both south and north of the Tweed are marvellously slight. Could such a thing touching questions which have kept Christians apart in the home-lands for centuries, and in which men feel intensely, have been accomplished anywhere except in the mission-field? We doubt it. The pressure of impact with the formidable forces of paganism and of Islam seems essential to bring Christian brothers together, to make them realize how much they are one in all essential things, and how deep and real is their mutual love, and to enforce the paramount duty of discovering some plan of present co-operation, and of preparing for the future unity of the local Churches which they are being privileged to found. Kikuyu has made history. The points which have been at issue in the controversies of last year may be called 'details,' but they have a strategic importance. They concern vitally the progress of the movement towards closer fellowship between the Protestant branches of Christ's Church, and any agreement reached concerning them will probably do more to foster that movement than any number of meetings to discuss the problems of unity and Church order, because it affects our Church's frontier at a spot where a strong mutual desire to fraternize exists. Incidentally, Kikuyu also illustrates the immense importance of missionaries studying and mastering Church problems, not only in books of Church history and ecclesiastical law, but as manifested in the current of contemporaneous opinion. Bishop Willis's *apologia* for Kikuyu was, we venture to say, a document of consummate wisdom and ability both in matter and tone."

Among the more recent indications of a growth
 of the spirit of unity among Christian men of varying
 degrees of faith and practice, the great meeting held
 at Queen's Hall on June 7 for the promotion of Family Prayers
 stands out as a most striking and happy example. The meeting

Growth of
 Unity.

was initiated and carried out under the immediate auspices of the World's Evangelical Alliance, and it drew together on the same platform some of the most representative men of all shades of opinion in the Church and Nonconformity. The Archbishop of Canterbury presided, and the other speakers were Field-Marshal Lord Grenfell, the Bishop of Winchester, Sir J. Compton Rickett, M.P., Lord Kinnaird, and Bishop Taylor Smith, whilst special prayers were offered by Prebendary Webb-Peploe, Dr. Scott Lidgett, Prebendary Webster, Dr. A. C. Dixon, and Canon Bickersteth. Among these names there stands out one of special significance—that of the Bishop of Winchester. By tradition and association Bishop Talbot has hitherto been more closely connected with the High Church School, and his presence, therefore, on an Evangelical Alliance platform is as welcome as it is expressive. Of course, he abates none of his professions, but his action is an altogether happy indication of a narrowing of the gap which so often keeps men apart, and of a growing desire for closer co-operation in good works among men of widely different views. It is a most refreshing illustration of progress in the cause of Christian unity, and we note it with exceeding great pleasure.

In spite of the clear undertaking that no final
 “Mass Vestments,” decision will be taken on the question of Prayer-
 Book Revision until the Houses of Laymen have
 been consulted, and that they are not to be asked to consider it
 until after the war, a large number of the laity are still pro-
 foundly concerned about the proposal to authorize, or not to
 forbid, the use of the Vestments. Sir Edward Clarke's
 “Laymen's Committee” met on June 8 to discuss the question,
 and unanimously passed the following resolution: “That any
 declaration by the Houses of Convocation that the use of the
 Mass Vestments ought to be permitted would encourage the
 ‘Romanizing tendency’ which the Bishop of Oxford has lately
 admitted ‘is prevalent and acute, and extremely strong in the
 Church of England’; would alienate the laity; would set up an

impassable barrier against co-operation with the Protestant Nonconformist bodies, and would destroy all hope of ultimate reunion with them; and would be a serious step towards the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church." It will be noticed that this resolution has been drawn with considerable care, and is clearly meant to meet any contingency that may arise. As we pointed out last month, it would be quite possible, under the terms of the "truce," for the Convocations to complete their work, and afterwards to go to the Houses of Laymen for their assent, which would be little more than formal. The resolution, therefore, is aimed at "any declaration by the Houses of Convocation," and we are sure it will carry weight. It will be a sorry day for the Church when the use of these Vestments is authorized, and we believe that the laity see more clearly than the clergy the extreme gravity of the position which would thus be created.

Dr. Sanday
and the
Virgin Birth.

Professor Sanday read a paper at the Annual Meeting of the Churchmen's Union entitled "On Continuity of Thought and Relativity of Expression," which appears in full in the issue for June 15 of "The Modern Churchman." Its chief interest centres in the startling exposition it gives of his views on the clause in the Creed regarding the Virgin Birth. Dr. Sanday admitted that he was suspect on the question. He had once said that he would not be a party to putting "nots" into the Creed, and some people had thought that he had changed his mind. But he has not. "I will not," he continued, "affirm everything in the Creeds—but that is different. That is precisely where I draw the line, and believe myself to be right in drawing the line." He believes that "truth lies in a *nuance*; and this—the difference between not affirming and denying—is the precise *nuance* in which I think it lies." Proceeding to explain "the real function" of the clause in the Creed about the Virgin Birth, he said:

"One of the greatest mistakes which men have made, and are still making, about God is in attributing to Him, in the ages of the past as well as in the

present, what I may venture to call a punctilious determination of the will towards securing the prevalence throughout the world of what we call 'literal' truth. All through the early ages of mankind 'poetical' truth has been the rule, and 'literal' the exception. This may be different from what we should expect. But anyhow it is plain matter of fact, and we must not shut our eyes to it. It is not for us to know the reasons for this particular characteristic of the workings of Divine Providence; they are beyond us, and belong to those vast rangings through time and space by which these workings are governed. It may well be that 'the times of this ignorance,' or of this latitude, are coming to an end. We are not concerned with the future, but only with the past; and in regard to the past we must resign ourselves not to know, or to know very imperfectly. Even we men, dull-sighted and fallible as we are, can see a multitude of reasons, short of its literal truth, for the prevalence of the belief in the Virgin Birth; it has been of immense and prolonged benefit to mankind. Even at this day it goes hard to let it drop out of our range of vision; and only (what some of us think) imperious necessity compels us to loosen our hold upon it. I should on all grounds, and in particular out of piety towards the past, refuse to deny the Virgin Birth. Those who will may think that I am splitting a hair in doing so. But I find myself able to *subsume the idea of the Virgin Birth under the yet larger and more important idea of Supernatural Birth*. I will venture to express my meaning in a phrase: it all seems to me to stand (*sit venia verbo*) for the *direct influx of Deity into manhood*.

"We are prepared for such a conception by our belief in Divine Immanence; it is no strain upon us to conceive of a supreme and unique act and form of this Immanence. And, with all possible deference for my revered friend, Dr. Swete, if we can conceive of it under a form that is in accordance with nature, that is far easier for some of us than to think of it under conditions that we should call *contra naturam*."

We have given this passage at length, as it is important to know exactly where Dr. Sanday stands. Whatever distinctions he may draw between refusal to deny and refusal to affirm, it is surely a fair inference from this passage that he does not accept the words of the Creed "Born of the Virgin Mary" in their literal sense. Between this and an outspoken denial of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth we see no practical difference. And yet Canon Sanday regards his own position within the Church of England "as absolutely loyal and absolutely inextinguishable"!

Some Thoughts on the Seven Epistles.

II.

ABOUT eighteen years ago, in the early spring, I passed through Smyrna on the way to Ephesus, or rather to what was Ephesus of old. From the tourist-yacht which carried a hundred and more English and Scottish visitors round the Ægean coasts of Greece and Asia Minor, on the way to Palestine, I landed on the quay of Smyrna, a scene of life and active traffic, and, after a brief lingering there, took train (strange was the paradox) and went inland to the Ephesian plain. It was an experience of moving interest thus to touch in one day two, the first two, of the Seven Churches. The contrast of the two scenes was striking and suggestive. At Ephesus, if the name may still be used, I sate on one of the stone seats of that great Theatre, still existing in large fragments, which once echoed so long to the name and fame of Artemis the Great, and looked towards the westering sun over a vast field of scattered ruins. In its midst was a hollow, thick with brambles and heaped with stones; it was the site of the once glorious Temple of the Goddess. The landscape was eloquent of utter abolition and depopulation. It was impossible not to connect it, at least in emotion, with the Lord's tender but awful warning to the Angel who did not keep his first love: "I will move thy candlestick out of its place, except thou repent."

Smyrna on the other hand shewed every sign of present life, pulsating in an immemorial scene of habitation. The city has its Christian Churches, and I believe, (it certainly had, in the last century,) its Evangelical Missions. This too it was difficult not to connect, in sentiment and suggestion at least, with the tone of the Epistle now before us. For to Smyrna and to Philadelphia, alone out of the Seven, the Lord has only good and comfortable words to say, and Gibbon himself cannot help remarking, in a tone not altogether cynical, though an accent of irony lingers in the sentences, that precisely those

two towns of the Apocalyptic group still, after all the intervening ages, remain alive.

However, to the Smyrnæan angel is addressed this message of unalloyed love and praise. It follows the normal plan of the Epistles. The Sender first denotes Himself: "the First and the Last, who became dead, and lived again." Then He reports to the Angel, to this His "ministering spirit," human, and in the body, "sent forth to minister" at Smyrna "to the heirs of salvation," what He knows of His servant's "works." "Tribulation and poverty" surround and afflict him, "but he is rich," in faith, hope, and a first love that is not lost. He is assailed by the "blasphemy," the railing, against him and his Lord, of "those who say they are Jews, and are not, but a synagogue of Satan"; Jews by race, but utterly alien from Abraham's and David's faith and hope, rejecters of Messiah, persecutors of the Israel of God. From them, or at least from powers instigated by them, a fiery trial, a storm of violence, was about to strike the Angel and his flock. The Enemy, mysterious energizer of sinning man's hostility to truth and light, was soon to put out his permitted personal force against them, as against their Lord before them. They, "some of them," were to taste the terrors of a pagan dungeon; to feel the stern tests of the cruelty of man, to be "tribulated," beaten down as on the threshing floor, for a season. But it was for a season only. "Ye shall have tribulation ten days." Perhaps that limit was to be literal. More probably it was symbolical; the number stated, so much, no more, was to signify the watchful control of the supreme Love over the awful yet subject Powers of hell. Not one "day" beyond their King's permission, beyond the limitation of His gracious wisdom, should the saints suffer.

As for the Angel himself, it is intimated that he is to be the sufferer in chief. The ordeal of death awaits him; even as, long before, the same sovereign Master, "in the days of His flesh," (then also in the hearing of John,) had warned Peter that by death he should glorify God. "Be thou faithful unto death, and

I will give to thee the victor-wreath (τὸν σιέφανον) of life." Then follows the final utterance of "the Spirit," the message which, taking occasion from Smyrna and its Angel, passes out from them to "the Churches" and all their members, even to us here and now. It speaks as ever to "the overcomer." It accosts the Christian who finds himself face to face with the central Power of evil in his seeming triumph, and with the sting of death. And it bids him be serenely sure that he, overcoming in the Overcomer, hidden in the Christ who is stronger than the strong man, and over whom death, alike the first and second, can have dominion no more, shall "never die." "Over such the second death hath no power" (Rev. xx. 6), no "authority" (ἐξουσίαν), no warrant to arrest and bind. He shall not "see" it, he shall not "taste" it. His Lord shall lift him immeasurably over it into the deathless bliss.

So we have traced this short, pregnant missive along its lines of sympathy, forewarning, and immortal promise. As we noted above, they are all radiant with approving love. This Angel has already his Lord's "Well done, good and faithful servant" spoken to him, this side the grave. Who more absolutely and firmly than he would say that all his fidelity, all his persistent loyalty under restraints, and burthens, and hostilities, was "of grace"; that all the power he felt, and his people felt, to meet the dark invisible Persecutor in victorious peace, and to persist in obedient holiness through the martyr's death, was "not his own but *given*"? For surely it is so always, by a beautiful law, with the disciples of the Crucified. The more conscious the man is of a faculty of spiritual victory, the more he feels in his hands a gift of strength which lays perils and temptations under his feet, the more he knows, in a deep intuition, that this is *grace*. That wonderful word, so easily and so lightly usable in conventional or in controversial connections, can spring, under the experiences which really test the soul, into a splendour of meaning new and blissful. The believer, surprised over himself, sees in it the expression at once of his own entire inability to stand and to endure, by his

own resources, and also of the illimitable supply which the supreme Kindness keeps always alive within him. He knows more than ever that he *cannot*, in the very act of realizing how greatly, how victoriously, in him, his Lord *can*.

But none the less that Lord loves the result of His own goodness as it takes shape in His servant's receptive personality. He rejoices over His own overcomer; He loves the human heart which loves to use His grace; He "crowns" with the wreath of Immortal joy and power the sufferer who, not only after His example but in His enabling life, has won his way through one anguish or another to the face of God.

Some particular treasures of truth and love call for notice in the Smyrnæan letter. Let us take them up, briefly but reverently.

I. "*The First and the Last, who was dead, and lived again.*" We think here with humble gladness of the Lord's undying memory of His death, as He thus claims in one breath eternity and the experience of the grave. Let the disciple called in any way or degree to suffer remember always with deepening gratitude that he belongs to a Master who, to save him, *and to have him*, consented to be the supreme Expert in pain, in mortal pain. He consented for us to feel the tortures of an outraged body and the deeper woe of an unfathomed solitude, as of a forsaken soul. In common life there is no sympathy like that of one who, coming to handle our broken hearts, perfectly remembers the breaking of his own greater and nobler heart in its time, and tells us that he remembers it, and so, and only so, can *really* enter into ours, and *reverence* our tribulation, knowing what pain is.

So it is here with the suffering Christ. The same tone breathes in the words of sacred cheer that follow; in the recognition of the "tribulation," and the "poverty," and the cruel "railings" and contradictions, and again of the dire assaults of the enemy, and the horrible "prison," and the martyr's last ordeal. The tone is not that of mere pitying kindness. It is the voice of a sacred fellow-feeling. He who speaks *knows all*

about it in His own person. He was, (and therefore He is, in the sense of that grand saying, "Suffering passes; to have suffered lasts for ever,") the supreme Expert in distress, the Prince of sufferers. And He overcame, we remember, not by any forth-putting of His latent Deity, but as the perfect Human Believer, taking His Father at His word of promise. "For the joy set before Him He endured the Cross, despising the shame."

2. "*The devil shall cast some of you into prison.*" We must not forget this recognition of the personal action of the unseen "Ruler of the darkness of this world." Externally, of course, human beings would seize and immure the bodies of the persecuted. But another Person would stand behind them and act through them. Trench remarks on these words that on many scenes of the history of persecution they cast a lurid yet useful light. They explain the more than normal, the super-human, wrath and malice of the assailants, as in the strange and moving story of the sufferers of Lyons and Vienne; the Evil One had "entered into" the unhappy evil ones. And the thought is not merely gloomy. Rather, it prompts a certain pitying extenuation of the human criminals. It helps sufferer, and student too, not to think their sin less dreadful, but to think of them more patiently, without *hatred*, and to look up to the Throne the more directly for judgment upon the *ultimately* guilty will.

It is impossible, at least to myself, not to apply the thought to some black phenomena of the War under which, as I write, the world is groaning. The unutterable outrages recorded, and with ample proof, in Belgium, and not in Belgium alone, are they not indeed, in a sense by no means conventional, *Satanic*—as in spirit, so in origination? The contempt of plighted faith, the profound and calculated dissimulation, and then the almost demented hatred which has possessed a great nation on a sudden, does not all this look the same way, to causes hidden in the outer darkness? And to me the thought brings help, as it brings the suggestion to pray for triumphant retribution not

merely, or mostly, upon a guilty State but upon "the Enemy that hath done this."

3. "*And I will give to thee the crown of life.*" I make no long comment on this radiant promise. I do little more than point to it, and bid my reader and myself let that word of immortality sink in till it meets the soul which is made for endless and blessed life. The Speaker has right to His utterance. For He is He who "was dead, and lived again" for ever. He stands close by us as He speaks, yet beyond the grave. Look at Him, till His dying and deathless glory, in its self-evidencing power, possesses mind and soul. And then already, by faith in Him, armed with His word here given you, overcome death before you die.

As we close, it is interesting to recall what is at least a possibility—I think that it is more—the identification of this same Angel of the Church of Smyrna with a noble name in Christian history. If, as I for one incline to think, the Revelation dates itself in the reign of Domitian (81-96), not in that of Nero, it is possible to identify the chief-pastor of this Epistle with Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, bishop of Smyrna, beloved and revered of all men, who at last, in 155, in very advanced old age, certainly older than eighty-six, was burned to ashes in the Smyrnæan stadium. I do not attempt to develop the case for identification, which is well stated by Trench in his book on these Epistles. I accept it here only as an interesting possibility, and as most certainly a grand and moving *illustration* of the Epistle. In this view I close this paper with a chapter (§ 9) of *The Martyrdom of Polycarp* (one of the most beautiful among the scanty relics of the earliest post-apostolic literature)—the passage which describes one great incident of the final scene. I use my master Lightfoot's version of the Greek :

"As Polycarp entered into the stadium, a voice came to him from heaven : 'Be strong, Polycarp, and play the man.' And no one saw the speaker, but those of our people who were present heard the voice. . . . When he was brought before him, the proconsul enquired whether he were the man. And on

his confessing that he was, he tried to persuade him to a denial, saying, 'Have respect to thine age,' and other things in accordance therewith, as it is their wont to say: 'Swear by the genius of Cæsar; repent, and say, *Away with the atheists.*' Then Polycarp with solemn countenance looked upon the whole multitude of lawless heathen that were in the stadium, and waved his hand to them; and groaning and looking up to heaven he said, 'Away with the atheists.' But when the magistrate pressed him hard, and said, 'Swear the oath, and I will release thee; revile the Christ,' Polycarp said, 'Fourscore and six years have I been His servant, and He hath done me no wrong. How then can I blaspheme my King who saved me?' "

“ Face yet awhile the transitory strife,
And I will give to thee the crown of life.”

HANDLEY DUNELM.

An Answered Prayer.

YEAR by year the men who care most deeply for the things of God have been asking how the world could be roused from its careless self-complacency, its craving after new sensations and pleasure, its dallying with lighter forms of religion, its general easy-going attitude towards God's commandments. The answer has been hard to find. On the one hand there is the increasing regard for the brotherhood of man, as manifested in missionary or settlement work; but on the other the general feeling of spectatorship, the impatience of strong vital teaching either from the Church or in the school, the disregard of Sunday, the general laxity of life. Then on a sudden everything changed. The prayer and the anxiety of the watchers for God was answered, but in God's way, not in their way. His judgments went abroad, and men found themselves face to face with reality at last. Pleasure and pain receded into their lawful place, and the conflict for an ideal, for something far beyond pleasure or pain, became the absorbing influence of the universe—mercy and honour on the one side, lust of power on the other.

The struggle hinges, as all great struggles have hinged, from Cain's day even until now, upon the answer to the question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Prophets, priests, and kings, by word and deed, have proclaimed the claims of God and man, and cried aloud in undaunted succession all down Old Testament times, whether men would hear or whether they would forbear. John the Baptist, in New Testament times, reopened the question, and the struggle continued until it reached its climax and its highest intensity in the sacrifice on the Cross. There for ever and for all time the answer was given in the fulness of self-sacrifice by Christ Himself; and there, in the shadow of the Cross, lies the second great question-mark of the world, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

But despite Christ's answer by word and by self-sacrifice the struggle continued, and still continues, even to the crucifixion of the nations in the Armageddon of to-day.

It is not the present crucifixion, awful as it is, which causes the gravest anxiety, so much as what is to follow so soon as the struggle is over. By God's mercy, we believe the ideals of liberty and honour will prevail as certainly in this twentieth century as on the battlefields of Belgium and the Netherlands under William the Silent three centuries ago. What is of moment is whether, as after Mount Carmel, the victory will, as it were, die away into itself, or whether, as at the Reformation time, light will spring forth, and a new dayspring from on high visit us.

Our anxiety is justified because the men who are dying on the battlefields are the very men who are most needed in the crisis. They are the men of the new generation, the men who would have worked out in practice the ideal of mercy and honour which they cared enough for to be willing to give their lives for it. Moreover, it is not only they themselves, the finest of their race, who perish in the trenches, but the generations never to be born who are perishing with them, the children to whom they would have given birth, and whom they would have inspired with the same lofty ideals, the same tone of self-sacrifice and honour.

Whilst they perish, the shirkers, the men who turn upon their heels at the question of enlisting, remain, and will remain, to hand down their tone of idle spectatorship to the children to whom they are giving and will give birth. How can the moral issue of the victory be carried into effect if the men who hold it strongly enough to die for it are taken from us, whilst the onlookers, the men who talk and criticize, continue in fullest measure in our midst?

This forecast would be heavy enough were it not for three considerations. We know and have proved to all time that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church. We know that the lifting up of the honour of a plighted truth, of the brother-

hood of man, of the joy of self-sacrifice, cries out from generation to generation—cries out the more forcibly as the confusion of the conflict dies away, and appeals year by year more and more to the judgment and imagination of the men and women of the hereafter than to that of the men and women of to-day.

In the second place, we know that the world-agony is calling forth a rebirth of prayer, and will, we believe, in turn call forth a rebirth of repentance. In silent waiting upon the intensity of Christ's love, such prayer and such repentance cannot wait in vain. An agony of suffering, followed by an agony of prayer, must be answered by a spiritual revival in which, if we do not hear the very footsteps of the Master Himself, we yet hear the footsteps of men who love and follow Him—the footsteps, above all, of men like St. Paul, equal to the present strategical moment, capable of directing and seizing the newly opened world-centres for Christ.

But there is a third thought. Whilst the flower of our youth and manhood passes from us, the flower and youth of our womanhood remains. By God's unparalleled gift to women the spiritual impulse of the future generation lies far more in the tone of the women than in that of the men. It is the atmosphere of the nursery and of the home, the influence which a child breathes during the first formative years of its life, which forms his character and determines his outlook on the future. Looked at from this point of view, we ask what will be the impress upon the coming generation given by the womanhood of our race to-day.

The answer from the world of womanhood might have read darkly enough a few months ago. It seems only yesterday that the walls of St. Paul's Cathedral and Westminster Abbey were moaning with the refrain of the Suffragette Litany, and the world from end to end was asking what it all meant. Was it a sex war, a rebellion, a breaking of home ties and influence, a craving for sex aggrandizement and power?

But whilst some read darkest augury, others read still farther—saw, beyond the zeal run riot, a golden thread of

unselfish devotion to a cause, a golden thread of responsibility towards the white slave and the oppressed, and believed that by God's mercy the movement might at last turn to the glory of God and the glory of the race.

The women's prayer for recognition and power has been answered, but, like the former prayer, in God's way, not their way. It has been answered by a crucifixion, by a carrying away of their dearest and best, and it is at long last, through streaming tears, that they see the vision of a wider outlook of work and power opening before them. Countless pathways of service hitherto rendered by men are now thrown open to them in trust. God only knows, if the war lasts longer, how much more work, how much more responsibility, will be thrown upon them.

Taking these three factors into consideration, what is the outlook for the future? The war is still too heavy upon us for any definite answer to be given, but we know that there is opportunity and that there is hope ahead of us. Unhesitatingly, the fire of self-sacrifice among men has kindled as fierce a fire of self-sacrifice among women—nay, even fiercer, because so far comparatively little outlet has been found for it. And wherever there is self-sacrifice there is a first element of the following of Christ, and, through the following of Christ, of finding gain through loss. It is eternally true that "he that loseth his life shall find it," and "except a grain of corn falls into the ground it bears no fruit." Our danger is lest, in our zeal for self-sacrifice, we should forget the one essential element, "for My sake," the element which alone burns with the intensity of eternal life.

Thank God, we see on all sides writ large evidence not only of self-sacrifice, but of a depth of devotion, a reaching out of longing hands from the world of women into the very presence of God Himself!

With this one thing needful, the sense of sin forgiven, working itself out in self-sacrificing following of Christ, may we not lift up heart and soul, and believe that there is light and

hope ahead of us? As the generation of the women of our Empire purifies and strengthens, as their already manifested craving for purity, honour, suppression of white slavery, defence of the poor and the oppressed, finds its lawful level and takes its lawful place, may we not hope that it will receive a further inspiration, and that the mantle of the martyred soldiers which is falling will be taken as a sacred trust, and that our women will go forth with renewed spirit, not only into the well-worn pathways of life which have always been theirs, but also into the pathways now for the first time opening before them?

Such new pathways cannot be entered lightly, such new responsibilities cannot be shouldered without a sacred consciousness of those who have gone before—still more, not without a consciousness of the responsibility all too soon descending upon the children in the nursery to-day. Who can look upon the little lads of the preparatory school without a feeling of the deepest responsibility and seriousness? Children as they are, we know that long before their time they must step out into the world, must take their places in the ranks left empty. Facing these facts, the materialism, the affectation, the spectatorship, the shrinking from pain, and frivolity, of the past generation, will be lost in the longing that the life-giving power, the life-giving wisdom of God may descend upon us and upon our children. Let us, therefore, instead of fixing our eyes upon the darkness of to-day and the apprehension of to-morrow, remember that “in quietness and in confidence will be our strength.” Let us joyfully lift up the hands that hang down and strengthen the feeble knees, say to the women who are of a fearful heart: “Be strong and of a good courage: behold, your God cometh, even God with a recompense; He will come and save you.”

E. M. KNOX.



Joseph Glanvill on Catholic Charity.

IN 1667 Joseph Glanvill, Rector of Bath, preached in London. The full title of the sermon is as follows: "Catholick Charity, Recommended in a Sermon before the Right Honorable the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London: in order to the abating the Animosities among Christians, that have been occasioned by Differences in Religion."

In closing the brief account which I gave in the *CHURCHMAN* for May, of the sermon preached by Benjamin Laney, Bishop of Lincoln, with its undisguised prejudice and transparent sophistry, I quoted the words of the wise man: "He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him." It seems to me, as I read this sermon on Catholic Charity, that Joseph Glanvill may well be taken to represent this even-handed and truth-seeking neighbour. But before we listen to what he has to say, let us glance at the man and his history.

Few more interesting clerical careers come before us at the period of the Restoration than that of Glanvill. Had he not been cut off in the prime of life, he must inevitably have reached the highest dignities of ecclesiastical office in the latitudinarian atmosphere of King William's rule. His clerical life began under the patronage of Francis Rous, a stanch Cromwellian, and Provost of Eton, whose chaplain he became in 1658. On the death of his patron in the following year, Glanvill returned to Oxford. Two main influences moulded his thought—namely, the philosophy of Descartes and Cambridge Platonism. Of this intellectual training his earliest literary effort, "The Vanity of Dogmatizing," published in 1661, when the author was but twenty-five, was the logical outcome.¹ In early manhood he

¹ "The Vanity of Dogmatizing" was recast in 1665, and published as "Scep̄sis Scientifica." Of this work Hallam writes: "Few books, I think, are more deserving of being reprinted" ("History of Literature," vol. iii., p. 361). Lecky fully endorses Hallam's high opinion both of this book and of Glanvill's position in the world of thought. As a divine he considers that "he has been surpassed in genius by few of his successors" ("Rationalism

regarded Richard Baxter with almost extravagant admiration—an admiration that he never lost, although, from an ecclesiastical point of view, the two men went different ways.

On the Restoration, Glanvill conformed, and became Rector of Wimbish in Essex. In 1662 he followed an ejected minister as Vicar of Frome Selwood in Somerset. In 1672 he exchanged this for Streat and Walton, in the same county, and in the same year became Chaplain to the King. Five years later he was made Prebend of Worcester. Meanwhile, in 1666 (the conscience of the Church was then strangely tolerant of pluralism), he accepted the important cure of the Abbey Church at Bath. Here he died in 1680, in the forty-fifth year of his age.

As an original thinker Glanvill takes a very high place among the men of his day. His talent was recognized, and his influence increased, by his admission in 1665 to the sacred circle of the Royal Society.¹ His voluminous writings have left the world in no doubt as to his views. With respect to his position as a religious teacher, we may quote his own words: "Contenting myself with a firm assent to the few practical fundamentals of faith, and having fixed that end of the compass, I desire to preserve my liberty as to the rest."² His undisguised latitudinarianism, his scientific vein, his hostility to traditional scholastic philosophy, and his connection with the Royal Society, combined to bring him under the suspicion of radical disbelief. As a consequence, his teaching was bitterly attacked by good but mistaken persons, who had not the wit to understand him.³ He

in Europe," vol. ii., p. 81 *et seq.*) Principal Tulloch is not quite so lavish of praise. See "Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy," vol. ii., p. 444 *et seq.*

¹ Glanvill wrote a defence of the Royal Society, and published it under the title of "Plus Ultra."

² "Plus Ultra," p. 139.

³ The ringleader of his critics was one Henry Stubbe, a well-known physician, practising in Glanvill's own parish at Bath, who violently attacked the Royal Society generally, and Glanvill in particular, as likely either to uproot Christian belief, or pave the way for the re-establishment of Popery in England. Glanvill sent John Evelyn a complimentary copy of his "Plus Ultra (the vindication of the Royal Society). In his letter of thanks to the donor, Evelyn speaks of Stubbe as "your snarling adversary" ("Diary," vol. iii., p. 204). Stubbe was accidentally drowned near Bath in 1676, and

did his best to disabuse them. "I have been preaching," so he writes to a friend, "twice a day to angry mobs, plainly, affectionately, extemporaneously, but have done little good." The fact is that in his writings he, like Pascal, attempted to make philosophic scepticism a plea for religious faith. This method of argument is familiar to us of to-day.¹

Glanvill's literary style places him in the front rank of contemporary writers, whilst for originality of thought he stands almost, if not quite, alone amongst his brethren of the working clergy, his real place as a religious thinker being with Henry More and his brother Platonists. This statement may be emphasized by the fact that his works contain remarkable anticipations of the electric telegraph and other inventions,² and that he devoted himself, in the distinguished company of Henry More, to psychical research. It is in connection with this side of his work that we have to face the fact that a pronounced latitudinarian devoted some of his maturest energies to the task of proving the reality of witchcraft and apparitions. His book on this subject, "Sadducismus Triumphatus," was well known in its day, and still holds its own amongst the curiosities of literature. His object in writing it may be given in his own words: "There is no one that is not very much a stranger to the world but knows how atheism and infidelity have advanced in our days, and how openly they now dare to show themselves in asserting and disputing their vile cause. Particularly the distinction of the soul from the body, the being of spirits, and a future life, are assertions extremely despised and opposed by men of this sort; and if we lose these articles, all Religion comes to nothing."³ If, then, he can prove his point by concrete instances of persons holding commerce with the unseen

interred in the Abbey Church, "his old antagonist, Mr. Glanvill, preaching his funeral sermon" (Birch's "Life and Writings of the Hon. Robert Boyle," vol. i., p. 58.

¹ As, for example, in "The Foundations of Faith," by Mr. Arthur Balfour.

² See "Dictionary of National Biography."

³ "Sadducismus Triumphatus," part ii., p. 1.

world, and if apparitions cannot be explained away, the materialist, *ipso facto*, is refuted. And is there not an important Society engaged at the present time in an attempt to establish the reality of apparitions and voices from the unseen? It may well be that, when we read the stories of witchcraft and necromancy to which Glanvill gave credence, our first feeling may be one of blank amazement that a man of his intellectual calibre should have volunteered authority for their support. We must not, however, forget that belief in witchcraft, though on the wane, was still very active in his day, and that only a few years before the appearance of "Sadducismus Triumphatus" Sir Matthew Hale, as eminent for his Christian character as for his judicial distinction, condemned two unhappy women to death for the crime of witchcraft.¹ Nevertheless, the history of literature contains, perhaps, no more singular phenomenon than that of "Sadducismus Triumphatus" from the pen of a man the natural bent of whose mind was toward universal scepticism.²

¹ This was in 1665. "Sadducismus Triumphatus," in its present form, was not published till 1681, the year after Glanvill's death; but it was practically a reproduction of "A Blow at Modern Sadducism," which appeared in 1668. One of the stories of demoniacal agency contained in "Sadducismus Triumphatus" is, at this day, quoted by distinguished members of the Psychical Society as an unrefuted, if not altogether reliable, instance of unseen personal forces of mischief at work, and as furnishing support to a belief in the existence of the Poltergeist—Anglicè "hobgoblin." See Sir W. F. Barrett's very interesting book, "Psychical Research," p. 205. It is not unworthy of remark that Glanvill, in dealing with the subject of apparitions, etc., resorts to the theory of the fourth dimension. If I am not mistaken, the hypothesis of a fourth dimension is coming to play an important part in discussions that relate to an unseen, spiritual world. My readers may be entertained, if not enlightened, by the following specimen from Glanvill's treatment of the fourth dimension: 'And that I may not dissemble or conceal anything, although all *material* things, considered in themselves, have three dimensions only, yet there must be admitted in Nature a Fourth, which, fitly enough, I think may be called *Essential Spissitude*; which, though it most properly appertains to those Spirits which can contract their extension into a less *Ubi*; yet by an easy analogy it may be referred also to Spirits penetrating as well the matter as mutually one another: so that wherever there are more *Essences* than one, or more of the same *Essence* in the same *Ubi* than is adequate to the amplitude thereof, there this Fourth dimension is to be acknowledged, which we call *Essential Spissitude*.'

² Dean Hensley Henson, speaking of the almost unquestioning belief of that day in witchcraft, remarks that "it is difficult for us at the present day to understand how such barbarous superstition, sound religion, theology, and

But to turn to the sermon on Catholic Charity. The sermon is worthy of attention, not only on account of its intrinsic excellence, but also as the work of one who did as much as any man to pave the way for that Act of Toleration which was passed within ten years of the preacher's death. The whole tenor of Glanvill's writings was against religious persecution. The right of private judgment in matters of faith never had a more convinced advocate. The sermon before us is a thoroughly characteristic utterance, for it gives full play to the preacher's latitudinarianism, and the only logical outcome of its teaching is that no man has a right to dictate to another what he should believe. We can well understand that a man of Glanvill's convictions was constrained to speak his mind on the great question of the day; how, after waiting some years and seeing nothing done to repair the ravages of disunion, but much to aggravate them, he could no longer keep silence. At last he spake with his tongue.

In the foreword prefixed to the sermon the writer informs us that one reason for its publication was that its catholicity of thought had roused resentment in some quarters. His sole aim, he assures the reader, is to recommend one of the greatest, yet one of the most neglected, duties of Christianity; "and I am sorry that our divisions have brought things to such a pass that men take it ill to hear of charity." From the foreword we further learn that, in publishing, something has been added which, through lack of time, was not contained in the sermon as preached. There is, I think, no doubt that the reference here is to the concluding paragraph, which, it must be admitted, somewhat clashes with the main thought of the sermon. In these closing sentences he admits that toleration may be carried too far. Any religion whose principles endanger the safety of the State must expect the enmity of the State. "I shall only

moral thinking, could coexist in the same individual" ("English Religion in the Seventeenth Century," p. xiv). He instances Jeremy Taylor and Richard Baxter. He might have named Joseph Glanvill and Henry More, who actually collaborated with Glanvill in the compilation of "Sadducismus Triumphatus."

say that so much toleration as may consist with the interests of religion and public safety may be granted. But such a liberty as is prejudicial to any of these should not be expected." In these words Glanvill seems to hedge and safeguard his position against the objections of brother-Churchmen less liberal-minded than himself. We, who have so completely outgrown the spirit of forcible repression, may wish that this addition had not been made to the sermon as it went forth to the world in print. We must, however, bear in mind that Glanvill's England had not forgotten the political intrigues of Queen Elizabeth's days, or the Gunpowder Plot of the first James's reign. Nor, indeed, were signs wanting throughout the reign of Charles II. that Rome had not abandoned her design of bringing England back to the feet of the Pope. We know better than Glanvill, in 1667, could have known how imminent was the danger; for three years after the preaching of this sermon Charles avowed himself, in the secret Treaty of Dover, a Roman Catholic, and bound himself by promise to Louis XIV. to support the policy of Rome; while, a few years later, the second James deliberately set himself to carry that policy into execution. Can we wonder that nothing is more characteristic of Restoration theology than the dread of Popery, and the unanimity with which all parties in the Church, High, Low, and Broad, alike, repudiated the teaching and principles of Rome?¹ It was surely as sharing these sentiments that Glanvill added to his sermon words which admit the possible need of penal law and statutory proscription.

The preacher took for his text 1 Pet. i. 21, "See that ye love one another." He begins by deploring the feuds of this "tottering and broken age." Strange, indeed, that Christians should have so much in common, yet spend their time and strength in quarrelling. "Our God is one, and we have the same common Saviour; we profess one Gospel, and believe the same Creeds; we have the same Sacraments and the same

¹ See, for example, Overton, "History of the English Church," 1660-1714, p. 352.

fundamental Ordinances ; and since we are agreed on these, what is there left that is worth the heat of a dispute ? What can justify a division ?” The root-mischief is that “the Christianity of most Christians is (if I may so speak) quite another thing from the Christianity of Christ.” Quoting profusely from the New Testament, the preacher urges that the duty of love is not inculcated “in half-sentences and doubtful phrases, in fancied analogies and far-fetched interpretations, but in plain commands, in repeated advices and passionate commendations, in earnest entreaties and pressing importunities. . . . Our unhappy first parents lost Paradise by aspiring to be like God in *knowledge*, and if we endeavour to be like Him in *love* we shall be in the way of gaining a better Paradise than they lost.” We must beware of counterfeits. “Here I dare to say that the happiest faculty to preach plausibly, and pray with fluency and eloquence, to discourse devoutly, and readily to interpret Scripture, if it be not joined with a benign and charitable spirit, is no participation of the God-like life and nature.”

It is love, we are reminded, that, more than anything else, commends the Christian religion to those who are without. “And were Christendom Christian in this regard, and the professors of the true religion truly religious—that is, abounding in that charity and goodness which Christianity enjoins—our religion would spread its wings through the world, and all contrary professions would lie in the dust before it ; whereas the divisions and fatal feuds of paganized, degenerated Christendom are now the great partition-wall between us and the heathen world ; yea, they are more particularly the great scandal of the Reformation, and make us the scorn of those of Rome.”

But Glanvill, the representative Broad Churchman of Restoration days, will make no terms with Rome. “O that they who speak and pray much against the BEAST would not prove instrumental to uphold his throne ! We expect and hope for glorious times when the Man of Sin is fallen” ; but the glory of those times will not consist in “ecclesiastical triumphs, external rule, or clerical dominion, but in the universal restora-

tion of the Church to its primitive simplicity and purity." It is not declaiming against the Pope as Antichrist, and "spitting the fire of rage against the infallible Chair," that will bring in the millennium. "There is nothing that could be so effectual a blow at the root of Antichristianism as the exercise of charity and catholic goodness. And when we see these take place, then we may triumphantly sing, 'Babylon is fallen.'"

The means, it is urged, to "sweeten our spirits and to remove the animosities we are apt to conceive against the persons of dissenters" is to "acknowledge worth in any man. . . . And we must take care that we make not our own relish the measure of worth and goodness." It is pride that leads us astray. "Let us take care that we deny not God the honour of His gifts and graces, or proudly fancy that He has given us the monopoly." Men may find work enough in their own hearts without falling out with their neighbours over differences of opinion. "And it seems to me such a kind of madness, as if a man should be picking causeless quarrels with his neighbours about a chip of wood or a broken hedge, when a fire in his own house is consuming his goods and children. Such frenzies, and much greater, are our mutual enmities and oppositions, while we quietly sit down in our unmortified affections."

Such enmities are unreasonable, as well as sinful, on various grounds.

"Love is a part of religion, but the opinions for the sake of which we lose charity are none. The necessary principles of Faith lie in a little room. . . . Religion consists not in knowing many things, but in practising the few plain things that we know." The preacher quotes from the words of our Lord, St. Paul, St. James, the Epistle to the Hebrews, Philip the Deacon, and the prophet Micah, in proof that "the fundamentals of belief are few and plain."

Charity is certainly our duty, but many of the opinions about which we fall out are "uncertainly true." There must be something wrong if we have failed to discover that we are not infallible. Let men consider that in many things they err them-

selves, and therefore shall have need of the charity of others. "There is none of us, I hope, so immodest as to say or think that he is mistaken in nothing; if any do, that person errs more than most of those whose error he censures. Interpretations are infinite, and there is no sort of men less agreed than commentators. All opinions plead Scripture, many pretend to reason, most to antiquity. . . . Every man differs from almost every other in something, and every man differs often from himself in many things. Age hath altered our judgments, or we are children still."

Consider, again, that "Christian love is necessary, but agreement in opinions is neither necessary nor possible. 'Tis true we are commanded to hold the unity of the Spirit, and that is necessary; but this is in the essentials of faith and life, in which all good men are agreed. . . . 'Tis a frequent wish with some that all men were once of one mind; but then it must be theirs, for they would not judge it reasonable upon other terms. They may as well wish that we were all of one age, complexion, humour, and degree of understanding."

Be it remembered that error springs from an infirmity of the understanding, and not from perversity of the will, "for no man is willing to be deceived: so that they ought not to be objects of our hatred, but our pity. . . . We are all pilgrims on our way to the Jerusalem that is above. If some will go in this path, some in the other, these in a circuit, and those among the rocks, we may be sure 'tis because they know not the danger and inconveniences which they choose. . . . We may lament their unhappy mistake, but must not beat or throw stones at them for it."

Allowance must be made for education and authority. "For let us consider how easily we receive the first impressions, how deeply they sink into our souls; childhood refuseth no folly, examines no absurdity; education makes it anything. The first is entertained as best, and whatever offers after is execrated and despised, if it be not like it. . . . Far the greatest part of men are slaves to the principles in which they were bred, and

our constitution, infirmity, and circumstances, are such that very few can help it."¹

These sane and enlightened maxims are followed by some cautions equally sensible.

"Beware of inordinate admiration and love of any sect." This will lead to contempt for those who differ, and ministers to self-appreciation and Pharisaism. "They look upon the rest of Christians with an eye of pride and scorn, and affectedly thank God that they are not like these publicans. . . . They heap up teachers to themselves, and doat upon their own Apostles. . . . This is a *precious* man, or that is a *Gospel-preacher*; such an one is very *powerful*, and such an one is very *sweet* and *spiritual*; and oh, how beautiful are the feet of those messengers of good tidings to them, while they assure them by the marks of their own sect that they are God's peculiar and chosen people. Which fondness were not so mischievous, if, at the same time, all others were not counted reprobates and castaways." Through this spirit of partiality and man-worship "endless enmities are begun and charity is destroyed, and the foundation is laid for cruelty and persecution, and God's goodness, which is to His whole Church, is wronged by being narrowed, and Christ's blood is undervalued, and the greatest part of His purchase is by these men given to the devil."

Next, the preacher warns his readers to "avoid eager, passionate disputes. In these charity is always lost, and truth seldom or never found." Here is recalled the apologue of the sun and the wind contending for the traveller's cloak. The fiercer the wind, the more tightly was the garment wrapped; warmed by the gentle, insinuating heat of the sun, it is not long before the traveller is glad to put off the cloak. "This is the likeliest way to prevail upon dissenters."

Thirdly, "Beware of zeal about opinions, by which I mean all the propositions of less certainty or consequence." Nothing

¹ Glanvill here reproduces an argument he had used with great effect in "Scep̄sis Scientifica" (the Vanity of Dogmatizing), p. 95. See a quotation in Hallam's "History of Literature," vol. iii., p. 361.

has done more mischief than indiscriminating zeal for matters of opinion as distinct from matters of faith. "This man is ready to burst till he hath given himself vent ; and the other is as impatient till he hath contradicted what has been said. Both are zealous to proselyte [*sic*] each other, and neither can be contented with a single contest till the public be disturbed." Those who follow the preacher's counsel will "exercise their *zeal* upon the necessary, certain things, and their *charity* about the rest. . . . They will converse indifferently with all persuasions without wrangling and discord, and exercise their charity towards the good men of any sort."

Lastly, "Beware of censuring and affixing odious names and consequences upon the persons or opinions of dissenters. . . . He that rails at his neighbour for his opinion wants only power to persecute him for it. . . . 'Tis but raising the cry of Arminianism, Socinianism, Popery, Pelagianism, and such like, upon them, and all other refutation is superfluous. . . . A true Catholic should not take any name to himself but that of a Christian. . . . If men would learn to be thus fair and candid to each other, our differences would be reduced to a narrower circle, and there might be some hopes that peace and love would revive, and flourish in our borders."

Hallam, the historian of literature, could say of Glanvill's "Scepsis Scientifica" that few books are better worth reprinting. I venture to affirm that few sermons ever preached from the Anglican pulpit are more worthy to be reprinted than this broad-minded, rational, well-weighed utterance on Catholic Charity, the gist of which I have endeavoured to give in this paper.

G. S. STREATFEILD.



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

V.—THE SACRAMENTS AND THE MINISTRY.

THE whole of life is permeated by sacraments. We fail to see and feel the sacraments of daily life because we are not heavenly-minded. A smile of welcome, a handshake, is a sacrament; every meal, every cleansing of the body, is a sacrament: to the spiritual man, a kiss of greeting or the waving of the hand is the sacrament of love and friendship. We are surrounded by sacrament, enveloped in its folds.

Just as these sacraments of daily life are meant to lift us up to the highest and best ideals in relation to our fellow-creatures, so the Sacraments of the Gospel were designed by Christ to lift us up into the closest and most intimate relation with Himself and our Father. Our bodies need two things for their health and vigour—cleansing and food; and our Lord accepted this commonplace of daily experience, and gave it a deeper and fuller meaning by applying it to our spiritual needs.

The beauty of the Sacraments of the Gospel is that their essence is so apparent, so easily grasped. The simplest Christian, even a young child, can seize upon the great meaning of washing in Baptism and the feeding of the soul in the Holy Communion. It is when we overstep the great meaning and begin to ask questions of secondary importance, as to the *how* and the *why*, that the confusion begins. Nay, perhaps it is rather when we think that we have discovered the *how* and the *why*, and begin to dogmatize and to lay down the law, that schism and dissension, quarrelling and persecution, enter in to disgrace our profession and make the sacred mysteries of our

[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.]

religion the centre of strife. The man who first theorized as to the operation of the Sacraments was a doubtful friend ; the man who first succeeded in getting his theory adopted as a dogma did a very ill service to true spiritual religion.

In theory, it should be enough for us to carry out our Lord's commands in simple obedience, leaving the Divine Spirit to interpret them according to our needs and experiences. We cannot imagine St. Paul lecturing his converts on the nature and character of the Presence in the Eucharist, nor St. John chopping logic over some pet theory of regeneration. It was enough for them to know that the sacred symbols were emblems of the Lord's Body broken and His Blood shed for man's salvation, that the spirit in that blessed feast was nourished with heavenly food ; enough for them to know that that Washing meant that they were Christ's own pledged people, and must walk as such, without curious questioning. But men will always ask curious questions, and they usually suffer accordingly, from the infant who investigates the coal-scuttle upwards. So all of us have to plunge into this pitiful controversy and take sides.

The two Gospel Sacraments—Baptism and the Holy Communion—bear a close analogy to the two Jewish Sacraments—Circumcision and the Passover. "Circumcision made without hands" was a phrase which no Jew would misunderstand. Baptism would do for him as a Christian what Circumcision did for him as a Jew. It would admit him into the Christian Church, and make him eligible for all the covenant privileges which belong to a Christian. Neither would "the washing of regeneration" suggest to him any difficulty whatever.

And with us to-day such expressions would lose nearly all their difficulty if Baptism were administered as in Apostolic times. Then it cost much to be a Christian. No man would dare to confess himself such unless he meant it from his soul, and it would be a duty sacred and awful beyond words to see that his children, baptized in the water at his side, were trained to know the Lord from their childhood up, and to call Him

Master and God with their lips as soon as they could frame the words.

Nearly all our difficulty about Baptismal Regeneration is due to our lapse from Apostolic method. Now anybody can walk into our churches, people who have to ask the way to their parish church, people who never use God's Name in reverence, to have their children baptized. Godparents make awful undertakings glibly, or stumble over their answers in such a way as to show that they have no idea what they are undertaking to do. And we allow such people to join in a service which was drawn up for God-fearing people, who realized their responsibility as the guardians of children who are "an heritage and gift which cometh of the Lord."

It is small wonder, indeed, that we are in difficulty to explain in what sense such children can be called regenerate. The hard cold facts of life shatter all dogmatic theories. Careless, godless, indifferent, blaspheming men and women were baptized and pronounced regenerate. How can this be interpreted in view of these facts? The word is watered down in its meaning, qualifications and mental reservations resorted to, and even the subtle theological mind, so seldom at a loss, is baffled to explain the difficulty.

What God has done for the unconscious child of unbelieving parents we cannot say, we can only hope. But this we do say—that we have no right to declare so positively that such a child is regenerate. This indiscriminate Baptism is one of the gravest scandals in the Church. It "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament," indeed, and makes it either a mere social formality or an enchantment. If it is legitimate to baptize in this haphazard way, then the priests of Cortes, who baptized the Tlascalan and Aztec infants, and then dashed their brains out, were not essentially wrong.

"What is the remedy?" it may be asked. We cannot enter into this, for we are not lecturing on pastoral theology. We fear that to deny "the rights of parishioners" to have their children baptized is a bold course which might lead to a grave

crisis between Church and State. This we cannot discuss. But we maintain that the difficulty concerning Baptismal Regeneration is not one for which our service can be blamed. The Gorham Judgment has made the situation bearable for us, for we cannot conscientiously evade the problem by giving the word "regenerate" a meaning which it never has either in Scripture or in primitive Christian writings.

Over the child of godly parents we have no scruples in pronouncing the splendours of its inheritance. We have no occasion to resort to verbal shifts and evasions. We accept the words at their face value. "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of My Father which is in heaven," said our Lord.* Can we, therefore, doubt that a God-fearing father and mother, desiring above all things the redemption of their child, will have their prayer heard? It may be granted at the time of baptism, it may be granted later, but as surely as God is in heaven it will be granted. As those believing parents have dedicated their child to Christ in obedience to His invitation, and in accordance to His appointed plan, so will He seal it as His own by the dower of His Holy Spirit. "This promise He, for His part, will most surely keep and perform."

Holy Communion, like the Jewish Sacrament it succeeded, is the Sacrament of edification. To the pious Jew the lamb, whose blood he had shed and whose flesh he was eating, not only recalled the deliverance of his people from bondage, but foreshadowed a greater and future deliverance—a deliverance from spiritual bondage and the power of evil. When the Lamb of God was slain once for all for sin, there was no more looking forward to a saving act yet to be performed. But there was need for a Sacrament whose essential purpose would be to make the soul look back to the great deed once for all done. So the Holy Communion was given in order that we might remember Him whose Body was broken and whose Blood was shed for our deliverance. That is the essence of the Eucharist.

Now, upon this we must enlarge. No intelligent Christian, whether Churchman or Nonconformist, holds that the Holy Communion is a mere commemorative rite (like, for instance, the laying of a wreath of flowers upon the grave of a dead friend). Such a defective view is still ignorantly attributed to Zwingli, sometimes by writers who ought to know better. In this wonderful service the heart, the mind, the soul, are all concentrated upon the atoning Death of Christ. As we kneel in adoring love at the Communion-rails we are in spirit translated to Calvary, and it is around His Cross that we are grouped, with hearts bowed in penitence, with heads bent in reverential awe, with souls alive and waiting to receive His benediction. As we receive the emblems of His Body broken and His Blood shed, there is poured into our hearts from His loving hands the stream of His refreshing grace, and we receive "forgiveness of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion."

If the catchwords of controversy must be used, then we Evangelicals, believing this, do believe, and must believe with all our souls, in the most real of all Real Presences at such a time. It is not that our Lord is any more present with us than when we are at work or asleep. He cannot be *more* present than present, but we are more fully conscious of His nearness than at any other time; our spirits are alert, the vision is cleared, and He is made known to us in the Breaking of Bread.

So sacred is all this to us that we cannot without regret turn to the controversial questions associated with the Holy Communion.

Such a view of the Sacrament as we have described is for us obscured, if not destroyed, by the extreme reaction towards medieval teaching which has become so common in our Church. The view that, owing to the repetition of certain words by the priest, Christ enters the elements, and is conveyed to us in some material way, is a conception so foreign to our whole thought that the objections to it based upon philosophy and Scripture are subordinated to the objection arising out of our religious

experience. It is difficult to correlate such a theory to our intelligence, but impossible to do so to our spiritual instinct; we have neither a mental nor religious point of contact with such a view; even if it were true, we cannot perceive what blessing could be derived from such a gift so given.

It is in much the same way that we regard non-communicating attendance. Such a practice cannot be of no spiritual value, for we assume that the worshipper is engaged in prayer, and so is receiving a blessing. But he is not joining in the act of communion, and, since all the other worshippers are there for that very purpose, we are really at a loss to know what specific blessing he expects to receive from watching other people do what he is bidden to do himself. But much more strongly do we feel that the whole Communion Service is evacuated of its meaning when it becomes a display before a large congregation at which only two or three partake and the rest look on. Whatever such a service may be, we know what it is not. It may be the "principal service," but it is not a Communion Service. Such a theory of the Communion, and such a service (apart altogether from the objections we have for them on quite other grounds), cannot be co-ordinated with our religious outlook; to us they have no religious value, no religious meaning.

The "principal service" is another popular phrase upon which we must touch, in order to explain further our position. To us Evangelicals the Holy Communion is in a very real sense the principal service. It cannot be anything else, for it is the commemoration of the saving Death of our Redeemer, the time of most blessed and most intimate intercourse with Him, when life and power, virtue and grace, pour into our hearts in an overflowing stream. It is the central act of worship, summing up as it does, and focussing upon our souls, the essential facts of our Faith. But what is "principal" is not prominent in the sense that it is open to the gaze of all. The principal things in every man's life—his love for his wife and family, for instance—are not the things that he advertises, nor does he discuss them with all and sundry; they are too intimate and sacred.

Hence, it is *just because* we feel that the Holy Communion is the principal act of public worship that we recoil from making it a public exhibition, and shrink from allowing non-Christians, indifferent and irreligious persons, to gaze at a service in which they have no part whatever. We admit the cogency of many of the arguments of the advocates of the "parochial Eucharist," but we dissent from their conclusions. Just because of its specific appointment by our Lord, just because it lies at the heart of our religion, just because it is the memorial of the blessed fact upon which our salvation depends, just because of all these and kindred arguments, we maintain that the godless and unbelieving have no place at the service whatever. We shield this principal thing from vulgar gaze, for to us it is desecration that the memorial of the sacrificial Death of the Redeemer of the world, the thought of which hushes our hearts into awful reverence, should be a public gazing-stock.

A few words must be added to explain the general views of Liberal Evangelicals upon the question of the ministry.

The government of the Church by an Episcopal form of ministry we regard as the most Scriptural, the most ancient, and the most convenient and effective, of all the methods which have been adopted. We therefore congratulate ourselves upon the circumstance that we are members of an Episcopal Church, for we love and value this link with the past, and we can imagine nothing which could induce us to part from it.

But some of our fellow-Churchmen have sought to strengthen the authority of the Episcopate by advocating the theory of Apostolic Succession. Now, if this theory were only a mere matter of sentiment or romance, we should not feel called upon to criticize it at all. But the deductions made from the assumptions are, in our judgment, so mischievous and so prejudicial to the cause of Christian Unity that we are driven to challenge Apostolic Succession at every point. We ourselves value the continuity of the present with the past, and the dignity of our ministry is much enhanced by its venerable

associations. But Apostolic Succession does not rest at this point. Not satisfied to prove Episcopacy an ancient, Scriptural, and efficient system, it embarks upon the ungracious and rash attempt to prove it the only legitimate and tolerable method of Church government.

The theory postulates that Bishops are the delegates of the Apostles; that by an unbroken chain of Bishops succeeding Bishops, Apostolic power and authority rests upon our Bishops; that no ministry unconnected with this chain is in complete accord with the Divine ideal, or possesses in full the Divine sanction. Hence we cannot be *sure* that we are members of Christ's Body (*i.e.*, the Church), nor *sure* that we receive sacramental grace, unless we are members of an Episcopal Church.

This theory has broken down hopelessly under the fire of historical criticism, and we rejoice at the collapse of a dogma which has proved to be the hotbed of bigotry, spiritual pride, and prejudice. No scholar now attempts to prove Apostolic Succession in its original form. One distinguished Anglican Bishop is bold enough to declare that it has not suffered by recent research! We admire his courage in saying this, but we note that, despite his assertion, he himself holds a view of Apostolic Succession modified in some very important points.

The arguments upon which it is based (like the stone of Sisyphus) never quite get to the top of the hill of proof.

The theory of Apostolic Succession seems to us such a petty thing that it would be a great obstacle to faith in a great and good God if it were true. We cannot think of God, whose mercy and love are infinitely wide, denying the assurance of His blessing to all forms of Church government except one—a form, moreover, not definitely enjoined in Scripture. We cannot think of God acting in this trivial way. History mocks it; everyday experience ridicules it. An Episcopal ministry we believe is the best, the most dignified, the most venerable. But we believe that the ministry in a Little Bethel, in both its functions of preaching and administering the Sacraments, is

as potent to save souls and to build them up as our own ministry.

Away, therefore, with all this schism-provoking talk of "valid Sacraments" and "valid ministries"! Such adjectives suit well the quibblings and the hair-splittings of the legal profession, but they are grotesquely out of place in reference to the free grace of the Father of us all, and they are falsified by the experience of ten thousand simple souls who have fed in the rich pastures of God, but know nothing of an Episcopal ministry.

Apostolical Succession we recognize as the eternal foe of Christian unity, and we say again we rejoice at its downfall.

X.



A Pastoral Letter.

BROTHERS AND SISTERS IN THE LORD JESUS CHRIST,

God is laying upon us, at this hour in our lives, a great trust. Never in the world's history have such things happened as are happening now. And our Heavenly Father trusts us to face the solemn hour in quietness and confidence, with unshakable resolve, in the power of prayerful hope.

The Bishops of our English Dioceses, at their Whitsuntide meeting, resolved, in words now made public, that we should do what in us lies to rally Christian folk to loyal service and to persistent prayer. At their united wish we give you this message.

After ten months of war we see more clearly than at first the greatness and the severity of the ordeal which is putting the spirit of our Nation to the test. What is at stake is not only the honour of our plighted word, but our safety and freedom, and the place entrusted to us among the Nations of the earth. The spirit arrayed against us threatens the very foundations of civilized order in Christendom. It wields immense and ruthless power. It can only be decisively rolled back if we, for our part, concentrate the whole strength of body, mind, and soul which our Nation, our Empire, holds.

We therefore look with confidence to the Government, deliberately chosen to represent us all, that it shall take, and take with courage, whatever steps it considers to be necessary to summon and control every possible resource which we have of body and brain, of wealth and industry. We solemnly call upon all members of the Church, and urge upon all our fellow-citizens, to meet with glad and unstinted response whatever demands of service or of sacrifice the Government decides to make. A great war righteously waged calls out that spirit of willing sacrifice with a plainness and an intensity which nothing else can rival. On behalf of righteousness and in our country's cause there is no one, there is nothing, too dear or too sacred

to be offered. God has so taught us. Let us obey. By what we give and by what we are, may His will be done.

But we have more to say, and it matters most of all. It is the office of the Church of Christ to quicken and to guide the spiritual forces on which the strength, the steadfastness and the nobility of the national spirit depend. Are these forces as alert, as watchful, as persistent now as they ought to be? We have cause to fear that they have languished a little since the earlier weeks of the War. A reaction comes, and it may be that the Whitsuntide message of the Holy Spirit's gift is falling upon ears which have become less swift to hear. The reiterations of many months have been allowed to mar and dull the eagerness with which we prayed when the leaves were yellowing last autumn.

We are girding ourselves afresh for the material conflict, and for providing whatever is needed to insure its full and final success, but we lack determination and persistence in the output of our spiritual force. Foremost therein we place unhesitatingly the power of prayer. Twice since the War began we have bid people set apart a day for solemn intercession. Successive Forms of Prayer which we put forth have been everywhere used to help and guide the spirit of prayer, which we trust has taken a wider range and found more free and varied utterance. What we chiefly need at present is not a new appointment of special days or a new set of published Forms. Rather we want a more literal fulfilment of the plain duty of "continuing instant in prayer." The duty lies imperatively upon all who profess and call themselves Christians, but it grows incalculably in weight by the solemnity of these tremendous weeks of tense conflict, of crushing bereavement, and of continuous suspense and strain. Are the Christian people of our land putting into the high service of prayer anything like the energy and resolution, or the sacrifice of time and thought, which in many quarters are forthcoming with a ready will for other branches of national service?

Remember always that prayer means something even larger

and deeper than asking wisdom for our King and his Ministers, protection for our sailors and soldiers, comfort for the anxious and the bereaved, victory for the cause of our Nation and its Allies. Prayer implies a reverent sense of the Sovereignty of God, a hold even when we are bewildered in the darkness and confusion upon the certainty that He is set in the Throne judging right. And prayer means—for without this we dare not come into His Presence—the humble, deliberate, heartfelt confession of our sins : sins of selfishness and self-indulgence, sins of hardness and complacency, sins of sheer laziness and lack of thought. We have in days of quiet made too little of the claim of God upon our lives. Can we wonder that in stern hours like this it is hard to kindle afresh the deep and simple thoughts which we have allowed to grow languid and uncertain ? But such rekindling there must be. Give earnest heed to this most sacred of all duties. Set yourselves, even in the midst of the exigencies and passions of war, to be loyal to the spirit of Jesus Christ. Strive to keep openness of mind and soul for such message as the Holy Spirit may reveal to us at an hour when God is judging what is base and inspiring what is best in England's life. He may speak in the ordered ministry of word and sacrament, or in the roar of battle, or in the silence of a shadowed home. He does, for we have all seen it, give, to those who lie open to His gift, courage and understanding and patience and high hope. "O put your trust in Him always, ye people ; pour out your hearts before Him ; for God is our hope."

RANDALL CANTUAR.

COSMO EBOR.

Whitsuntide, 1915.



Anglican Teaching and the Twentieth Century.

II.

TO turn now to the Christology of the Church and of the twentieth century. When we come to the subject of Christology, we find that it is very fashionable now in many theological circles to openly deny those constitutive beliefs which were universally accepted as the explicit affirmations of the Creeds, and that the Church has been not a little shocked of late by what seems to be the surrender of the citadel of faiths of the Church on the part of some of her foremost teachers.

Years ago it was the habit of all earnest students of theological tendency to familiarize themselves with the works of the leading antagonists of Christianity, and the arguments of the infidels from Julian, Celsus, and Porphyry, and Bolingbroke, Hume, and Voltaire, to the casuistries of a more modern age in such works as Renan's "Vie de Jésus," Greg's "Creed of Christendom," and the more brilliant effort of "Supernatural Religion." These men were all of them actuated by intensity of conviction and ingenuity of suggestion, and, like the ablest of the German and Dutch critical theologians, especially such as Spinoza and De Wette and Vatke and Wellhausen, exhausted their philosophy and scholarship in undermining the foundations of Christianity, especially with regard to the authority and credibility of the Bible, the Deity of Christ, and the actuality of His Virgin Birth, His miracles and Resurrection. But they were all of them infidels. They gloried in their freethinking. They stood unabashed outside, and like daring foes brought up their batteries. They made no pretence to belief. When they tore to pieces the texts they hated, and protruded ingenious theories about the growth of myths and legends and clever explainings away of prophecies and miracles, the possibility of which they denied, they did it as the open foes of Christ and the Bible. But what has shocked the Christian world of late more than anything else has been the fact that the work of

undermining and denying the fundamentals of the faith of Christendom is now carried on, not by avowed foes, but by avowed friends. Suppose we take two examples: the one a leading German, the other a leading English Churchman. Perhaps the latest word in Continental Christology is Professor Loofs's "What is the Truth about Jesus Christ?"—the Haskell Lectures of 1911 (Scribner's, 1913). From the German viewpoint it is really a most moderate and acceptable presentation of the question, and he evidently claims no little credit for separating himself from the extreme rationalists who have carried on what is termed the "liberal Jesus-research," such as Paulus, Strauss, Baur, Keim, Renan, Volkmar, Schweitzer, and Wellhausen. Sanday pats him on the back as one of the best and most cautious of the Germans. He professes to approach the Gospel story in the spirit of scientific investigation, and lays down in his theorem nothing shall be "considered to be true by faith that historical science through the means at its disposal is forced to recognize as unhistorical." He then goes on to say that the three sentences in the so-called Apostolic Creed—"Born of the Virgin Mary," "The third day He rose again from the dead," "He ascended into heaven"—are examples of Biblical tradition that is material, unhistorical; and continues: "It is therefore, in my opinion, the duty of all honest friends of the truth among the leading Christians to accustom their congregations to the thought that not the whole of the Biblical tradition about Jesus is undoubtedly historical"! In the name of historical science he evaporates the so-called orthodox view of the Trinity, and the two natures in the One Person of Christ, and declares that "all learned Protestant theologians of Germany admit unanimously that the orthodox doctrine of the two natures in Christ cannot be retained in its traditional form"; and says: "All our systematic theologians . . . are seeking new paths in their Christology." I thought as I read this of the words of the inspired one: "Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall

find rest for your soul. But they said, We will not walk therein."

But to turn from Loofs and his characteristically Teutonic medley of the baldest rationalism and seeming Christian faith, to what more nearly concerns us as Anglicans, let us take the case of certain Oxford scholars who, in the work entitled "Foundations," have endeavoured to restate Christian belief in the terms of modern thought, and more especially of Professor Sanday and his famous letter to the Bishop of Oxford. The same curious phenomenon of mind greets us. Statements apparently orthodox, affirmations of the necessity of safeguarding the central truths, repudiations of any desire or attempt to undermine in any way the essentials of the faith, are combined with the freest admission of the imaginative or imaginary nature of some of our Lord's miracles (that is, that they are not historically true), and the repudiation in the frankest terms of the Virgin Birth ("I believe most emphatically His supernatural birth; but I cannot scarcely bring myself to believe that His birth was *unnatural*. . . ."); the Resurrection ("The question at issue relates to a detail, the actual resuscitation of the body of our Lord from the tomb. The accounts that have come down to us seem to be too conflicting and confused to prove this"—Sanday, p. 20); and the Ascension ("I do not think that the evidence is sufficient to convince us that the physical elevation of the Lord's Body really happened as an external objective fact"—Sanday, p. 15); and Streeter adds: "I know of no living theologian who would maintain a physical Ascension"—*i.e.*, in the sense of a physical body rising into heaven ("Foundations," p. 132).

In brief, Professor Sanday and some of the leading exponents of the modern Anglicanism, Fellows and Deans of colleges, frankly declare that they and a great body with them do not accept the Creed of the Church and the teaching of the Church of England as set forth in the Second and Third Articles—the Son, the Word of the Father, the Very and Eternal God, took man's nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, and

Christ did *truly* rise again from death, and took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things pertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith He ascended into heaven! In a word, what was once the abhorrent monopoly of the atheists and the rationalists seems now to have become the profession of unbelief on the part of outstanding Churchmen.

It is somewhat difficult to analyze the reason of this departure from the old paths, but it may be said that the causes are possibly these: First of all, and back of it all, deep down beneath it all, is unquestionably the letting go of the Divineness of the Scriptures, and the habit of regarding them as more or less human records. The attitude of the modern theologian to the Bible is practically identical with that of the former-day rationalists. It is handled precisely as any other book. There doesn't seem to be the faintest trace of their accepting as a categorical postulate "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." The *a priori* method of the believer who brings with him into the investigation of the Bible the belief that the Bible is the Word of God, and the Scriptures the Holy Scriptures, has passed, and there has come instead the *a priori* method of the modernist, who comes to his investigation of the Bible and theology with the philosophic prejudices against the miraculous and the liberal hatred of all that is orthodox and traditional.

Another thing is the extraordinary supremacy of German thought, and the incredible deference to German critical scholarship on the part of English-speaking theologians of all names and degrees. Dr. Sanday is not the only one who has dared to leap into the limelight as their champion. "It is surely a fact of some significance that the Protestant scholars of the foremost nation of the world for penetrating thoughtfulness, thoroughness, and technical knowledge, should have arrived with a considerable degree of unanimity just at this kind of conclusion." "Germany has been at work on these problems for more than a century, like a hive of bees." But anyone who had read even such a work as Loofs's "What is the Truth about Jesus Christ?" must come to the conclusion that much of the talk

about newest evidence and latest scientific research, and the historical investigation of the recent facts regarding the texts of the Gospels and the teachings and miracles of Jesus, is simply German credulity. They take all the theories of the infidels from the days of Porphyry to Celsus and Strauss to Baur, dress it up in a little philosophic verbiage, and call it scientific evidence and modern research; and our critical Anglican scholars—about whom, according to Sanday, “nothing is wanton, nothing supercilious, nothing cynical,” but with whom, apparently, a whisper from Loofs or Harnack is louder than a shout from St. Paul or St. John—fall into line, and, professing with the utmost conviction their regard for the central realities of the faith, parade in a very philosophic and approved style all sorts of anti-supernaturalistic conclusions.

But perhaps the strongest cause is the mistaken idea that the upholders of the faith are bound, as they never were before, to recognize the *Zeitgeist* of the twentieth century, and do everything that is possible to conciliate the man on the street—especially the man on College Street. They start with two amazing theorems. The first is that religion must make terms with philosophy (“Foundations,” p. 426). The second, that the more the supernatural is explained away or repudiated, the more the modern mind will become sincerely and humbly Christian. They assume that the only religion that the world of to-day will accept is one in harmony with science, philosophy, and scholarship. But the science, philosophy, and scholarship, of to-day, if not confessedly monistic, according to Professor James—who states that the old-fashioned Bible Christianity has tended to disappear in the British and American Universities—is certainly rationalistic, and all who know anything about the supremacy of Germany in these domains know full well that their science, philosophy, and scholarship, is avowedly anti-Christian. Therefore, they seem to argue, it is necessary for the Christian and for the Church to re-examine its foundations, and reach, if possible, that minimum of Divine truth which the semi-sceptic, the partially-agnostic, and the more or less

rationalistic layman and cleric will agree to, in order that everything may be removed that is distasteful to the masses. They seem to say: We have a Bible inspired, a Christ Divine, a Creed Apostolic—but what do you object to? How much of it can you not agree with? What portion of it causes offence? Which are the parts you would like us to cut out? We know you are of the age: you must therefore be philosophic. We know you are sensitively conscious of being modern: you must therefore be scientific. So here we stand, with ACCOMMODATION written all over us. We will explain away anything, *re-state* anything, abandon anything, in order to accommodate you.

But what is there, either in the Bible or in the history of Christian experience, to warrant the assumption either that religion must make terms with philosophy, or that the making of such terms will conciliate the philosophic? According to the New Testament, the very opposite is the case. The cleverness of the specially clever, and the scholarliness of the specially scholarly, did not qualify them, according to St. Paul, for reception of the truth, for the psychical man cannot receive the things of the Spirit of God (1 Cor. i. 18-31, ii. 4-14); and as to science and philosophy, he utters his earnest appeal that no one victimize us by the imposition of philosophy (Col. ii. 8), and that we guard the entrusted deposit of the Faith, resolutely avoiding the fallacies, scoffings, and disputations, of the pseudonymous gnosis (an inspired description of much that is taught in the German and American Universities!). As a matter of fact, a narrow little semi-infidel world of German leadership has been arrogating to itself for half a century the name of scholarship, and a somewhat servile world of American and British modernism has been trying to make itself worthy of that fellowship by accepting all its postulates and admitting all its conclusions.

When we turn from the Christology of modernism to that of the Church, we are struck with the contrast. The Christological atmosphere of the twentieth century is frankly Arian or semi-

Arian. It must be. It is, of course, quite possible for a philosophic mind to completely restate both the humanity and Deity of Christ, and yet acknowledge in some sense that He is both God and man. Yet how to assimilate the Anglican view of the Deity of Christ with the Loofs-Sanday denial of the Virgin Birth, the bodily Resurrection and Ascension, is a conundrum that only a Teutonic theologian can solve. It is the Schleiermacher-Ritschlian attempt to excogitate a Christology out of the philosophic consciousness concerning the "Urbild" or Ideal Man.

But the Christology of the Church is given forth with no uncertain sound both in the Prayer-Book and Articles. In the Second Article the Virgin Birth of the Everlastingly-begotten Son is stated to the effect that two whole and perfect natures—that is, the Godhead and Manhood—were joined together in one Person; and throughout the whole of the Liturgy, in the *Gloria Patri, Te Deum*, the Litany, the Creeds, the Collects, the Communion Service, the Deity of the Son of God is stated, not in language that can be plainly understood, but in language that cannot possibly be misunderstood. To those who have not read it, or who have possibly forgotten what they once read, the article by Liddon, in his Bampton Lectures, on "The Divinity of our Lord, or the Worship of Jesus Christ in the Services of the Church of England," is one of the most convincing pieces of argumentation it is possible to imagine. In an answer to the leading neologian of his day, Bishop Colenso, he shows that the Church of England, from beginning to end of the Prayer-Book, invokes Jesus Christ as Lord, and worships and glorifies Him as God, in not less than 283 different places, invoking Him as Lord, and Son of God, and Lamb of God, and Saviour of the World, no less than 83 times, and giving Him Divine honour equally with the Father and the Holy Ghost no less than 200 times. In addition to this there are the Doxologies of the Ordination and the Benedictions in various services, in the Name of the Ever-blessed Trinity. And what makes it most remarkable of all is that at the time of the

Reformation all appeals and addresses to any created being were rigorously excluded, an excision which has thrown into sharper relief the anti-Arian attitude of the Church.

A few words in conclusion. It seems to me that our foremost need as modern clergy is to go back to our Ordination vows and back to the Bible. One fears that we read *non multum sed multa*, and that in the pursuit of problems and questions we are side-tracked from the main object of our lives. We are too much ashamed of a child-like acceptance of the Word of God and the continuous preaching of the Living Christ and the Living Word. We are liable to preach a Christ after the flesh, who is a Leader, a Teacher, an Exemplar, rather than the Christ Divine who is the Saviour of the soul, and emphasize the salvation of the body rather than the salvation of the soul. The fallacies of Christian Science are working like leaven, and permeating the age-consciousness. Christian Science is supremely a religion for the body, and men forget that they can reach the bodies of people through their souls a thousand times better than they can reach their souls through their bodies. And it is the Divine plan, if St. Paul and St. Peter are to be trusted.

In the second place, it seems to me our duty is to get rid of the terror that the German-scholarship bogie has too long inspired. If a few leaders have retreated or gone over to the enemy, that is no reason why the rank and file should give way. There is a fine passage in Pascal's Provincial Letters which tells how he once stood alone and battled with terrific earnestness for the truth against the whole of the Port-Royalists. After an exhaustive argumentation, Pascal sank into unconsciousness through sheer physical exhaustion. These are his words: "When I saw those whom I regarded as the persons to whom God has made known His truth, and who ought to be its champions, all giving way, I was so overcome with grief that I could stand it no longer."

The supremacy of German thought in criticism and theology for the past fifty years has been simply appalling. Germany

has long imposed upon the world of theology and scholarship. She has strutted as a dictator. Her claim has been admitted. Her leadership has been accepted. Every bold advance of so-called "scientific research" on the part of the Germans, from Reimarus to Schweitzer, and from Schleiermacher to Harnack, has been marked by a retreat on the part of leading British-American theologians and scholars, and a surrender of the very citadels of criticism and theology. To-day pro-German literature is barred in Canada—not because it is clever, not because it is philosophic, but because it is disloyal. It is misleading. It poisons and unsettles the loyalist mind. It shakes confidence and evokes suspicion. It undermines and weakens the foundations of national life. And to-day believers ought to bar their minds to the reception of the Germanic theories—not because they are not willing to receive truths from every possible quarter, and to welcome every evidence that scientific criticism and theology can adduce, but because these Germanic methods and conclusions are false, and therefore, as disloyal to Christ and the Bible, they are worthy of all repudiation. For my own part, I would much rather give Nietzsche to a young minister or a theological student than I would Loofs. For Nietzsche, with his fiery loathing of Christ and Christianity, is blankly and frankly atheistic; but Loofs veils in academic and apparently liberal language the dangerous sophism of the semi-Divine Christ of German Modernism.

Our hope is that one result of this calamitous war will be the absolute collapse of the German supremacy in criticism, and a saner attitude on the part of British-American theologians towards German leadership. Our prayer is that as this war has given the overwhelming demonstration of the collapse of culture and philosophy as a force to regenerate a nation, so it will drive the Christians of this twentieth century, with its pretended goodness and pride of science, art, and civilization, back to the simple Word of the Living God. If to be philosophic is to be as rationalistic as the Germans, then we must dare to be unphilosophic. It was the Master Himself who said: "I thank

Thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven, that Thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding" (from the clever and cultured, whose pride and prejudice are the great spiritual disqualifications), "and didst reveal them unto babes." Surely our duty is to stand fast and be strong. A great door and effectual is open before our beloved Church, and there are many adversaries. But if we are only true to the Bible and the Church and the Christ of God, a vista of unimaginable power and progress will be revealed to the Church through her faith in the Revealed, the Redeeming, the Risen, the Reigning, the Returning Son of God.

DYSON HAGUE.



Some After-War Problems for which we ought to prepare.

THIS paper will be at once condemned on many sides as exceedingly premature and mistaken, for we do not know and we cannot tell what will be the exact situation after the war. The writer knows this quite well, and considers it highly probable that he will be anxious to recall a great deal that is here stated when peace is restored, if not before. But it seems worth while to make the venture, even if it has no other result than to make people think, because the issues of the present struggle are bound to be so stupendous and so far-reaching.

Already the horizon is heavily charged, and it should do us good rather than harm to set our brains, our imaginations, our hearts, to work on the large variety of new problems which we may have to entertain; to endeavour to marshal the many possibilities and probabilities of the future, and to look through them and to grasp what will be involved; to train ourselves, as never before, to take big views, large views, long views, of our changing life. And the writer is not alone in this view, for already different bodies of earnest people are seeking to fortify themselves for what must come by giving themselves to such thinking—*e.g.*: The General Committee of Women's Church Work at their summer meeting have taken as their topic for discussion "Preparation for the Work of Reconstruction after the War"; the Laymen's Missionary Movement has done even better, for they have issued a most inspiring "Message for the Times" under the title of "The War and the Future," in which they express themselves thus:

"The clouds of war seem to hide the peaks. We are failing to look at the great future beyond the war for which our men are fighting. . . . The war has brought to Europe the magnificent opportunity of a new beginning. It has broken the entail of the past. . . . Before the pressure of the old routine has numbed our senses, it is our duty to cut fresh channels in which the new tides of spiritual life may flow. Out of the collapse of civilization as we had known it, out of the utter failure of the ways of thinking and acting which in our self-sufficiency we had chosen, we may be led into a new and better world."

Thus, it is no individual, no wild opinion that we are in for a transformation on a scale which will baffle most of us for many years, and which we are only wise to seek to anticipate seriously. As the *Daily News* put it last April: "We are in the midst of the biggest shipwreck the world has ever seen. We are taking to the rafts and the lifeboats and everything we can lay our hands on. We are undergoing an experience which will leave none of us the same."

Turning now to the potential problems, they will be both national and international, some of them universal. All of them will demand a great deal of faith, of patience, of sacrifice. In a short paper we can but skim the surface of the horizon as we seem dimly to get a glimpse of it, hoping that sustained thought and closer investigation will reveal its clearer outlines to us.

I. The world as a whole will be facing a new life, a new relationship, which will give a different character to our missionary work. In the Laymen's "Message" this naturally looms very largely, and they say of it:

"Among the problems that will arise when the war is over, none will be more difficult than the race and 'colour' problem. It is not improbable that it may dwarf all others in importance. For the voluntary participation of Japan and India in a European war has greatly altered the whole aspect of the problem and given it a new urgency. Europe will be forced to find some other basis of relationship with Asiatic peoples than that of friendly and beneficent superiority. The complexity of the problem can hardly be exaggerated."

Every missionary student is feeling deeply the truth of this, and it is making missionary arrangements unusually perplexing, for much of the missionary programme may have to be reshaped. The Primate of all Ireland, in his opening address to the General Synod, touched on another aspect of the same problem, using language which merits quotation:

"The last report of the *International Review of Missions* tells us what is likely to be the effect of this great war on the nations amongst whom our devoted missionaries are at work. In Japan, for example, there is no doubt that the spectacle of great Christian nations engaged in a cruel conflict is making it much more difficult to commend the Gospel of Jesus Christ. But, on the other hand, in Japan our missionaries tell us there is a growing consciousness of the need of new spiritual forces in national life. They tell us

that they are brought face to face with an ever-increasing sense of want, and with a people stretching out their hands to try and find out God ; and they tell us, too, that amongst the various Christian denominations there is a growing sense of the need for unity and co-operation. In China the war is too remote to affect the people to any appreciable extent, and the chief disaster resulting from it has been the non-payment to the missionaries of their scanty salaries and the impossibility of making use of many opportunities for advance. In India the war has in many ways made ready a people prepared for the Lord. It has roused the social conscience, and is quickening a desire for social service. It has evoked the most wonderful spirit of affection for English rule, and it has bound together as never before Indian and Briton, Hindu and Moslem, Buddhist and Christian, into a common comradeship which must make it easier in the years to come to proclaim the Religion of the Cross" (*vide the Irish Times* for April 14).

These facts and features surely call for much reflection, not to say an examination of our Christian spirit. Well may the Church ask loudly : " Are we ready, are we willing, for these developments, for these changes? or how can we get ready?" The question is not so much one of forces, of men and women teachers and preachers, but rather, What is going to be our attitude to these races? Are we prepared to regard them as one with us, and to admit them cordially, welcome them, into our family circle? Is all contempt and disdain to be banished, and shall we readily give them the right hand of fellowship, and "love them as brethren"? We have much, very much, to learn on this point. We are verily guilty concerning these our brethren, to whom we give a poor apology for love. Happy shall we be if the war corrects us in this thing, and brings Christ more fully into our affections.

II. The *international problem* claims our attention next. The whole of Europe will emerge from a horrible melting-pot, and no one knows what the task of the geographers is going to be. But, important as territorial considerations are, there are other things more important.

The Bishop of London mentioned one of them in his address to his Diocesan Conference in May, saying : " We are looking forward, as Christians, one day to a great brotherhood of nations ; every Christian must pray from his heart, ' When comes the promised time that war shall be no more ?' for we must never

forget that God hath made of one blood every nation in the world." That means that we shall have to reckon with every kind of moral and commercial difficulty, for the fact that we have neighbours will be forced upon us with a fresh emphasis, in spite of our continued isolation in our island home. Who has carefully weighed the import of this? Who has tried to measure its inner meaning? The position has been partially sketched by Mr. J. Crowle-Smith in a notable article, in *Joyful News*, on "How shall we deal with the Drink Question?" In the course of it he says :

"Let it be remembered that Germany has reckoned upon the very difficulty arising in this country that we are now facing, and that our enemy is rejoicing to-day in the position in which we are finding ourselves through our drinking habits. Let it also be noted that when the war is over England will have to meet in her commercial life with a sober Russia, who, with her countless millions of population and great undeveloped national resources, aided by quick access to Western Europe through the Dardanelles, will prove a friendly rival of no mean order. Add to this a Germany freed of the military yoke, and so able to bend all her resources and abilities to the prosecution of her trade, and a France, clear of the terrible curse of absinthe, turning her attention more and more to developing her commerce, and you have a triple call on England to rouse herself at this time, and, no matter what the cost in money, to shake off the grip the trade has upon her."

I am far from saying that this gives us a complete idea of the European prospect, but it is enough to make any lover of England very jealous and very serious ; it is enough to compel the inquiry : "Are we, in the future, likely to be a redeeming, an elevating factor in European politics, or shall we be found ridiculing the moral programme of our neighbours and hindering their efforts to rise in the scale of civilization, and to adopt a new standard and new ways of living?" Out of this question there emerge two others :

First, can we, even now, begin to lay a foundation on which to build a European house, fortified on all sides against fighting and bloodshed? I am no dreamer (perhaps I do not dream enough), but it is reasonable to ask whether Christian people cannot make a supreme and widespread attempt to inculcate principles which will definitely check the merest suggestion of

any repetition of the present conflict? It may be beyond us, but shall we not be failing in our duty all round if we do not strenuously put forth such an ideal, and put it forth so persistently that not only will our own consciences be more than clear, but that the conscience of any aggressor-nation shall be unable to rest? I cannot help feeling that we shall be wholly right if, in season and out of season, we give war such a character that no honest, no self-respecting nation in Europe will be able to plunge into this kind of struggle without losing its honour and respect.

Secondly, have we any right to continue to be so careless and so lethargic, as a nation, on the Drink Question? Can we with safety, or even with peace of mind, let things be as they have been? Do not let us make too much of this, but for God's sake do not let us make too little, for it is no exaggeration to say that the drink has not only been slaying annually (according to much sober opinion) its hundred thousand in our midst, but has even in this crisis endangered the life of the whole nation. The two facts which rankle in my own mind more than others are:

(i.) The revelations of the White Paper. Take one example: The Director of Transport says that it takes three times as long to get ships fitted and ready to sail as it did before the war broke out. Twenty-two days, roughly, are needed instead of ten. "What this means we can easily fancy. It means, at the very least, the loss of a position. It may mean very much more: it may mean defeat."

(ii.) The control, the wrong control, which the Trade seems to have of some of the Press. I will not use strong, bitter words, but we must see that the situation in this respect is changed as soon as the war is over. It will be childish to a degree to take precautions against any revival of German militarism, if we calmly allow our working men to be the victims of a system which altogether checks their value to the State.

III. As the international problems do not stand alone, we have passed quite naturally into the national sphere, where

many great and perplexing difficulties will await us. Amongst them will be —

A. *Our brothers who return from the war.* They deserve special consideration; they will require special treatment, for two reasons at least.

(1) They have seen God, they have seen the Devil; and they will reappear in our midst mentally, physically, spiritually changed; not a few of them thoroughly unnerved, all of them serious and chastened. The bright, careless boy will be a man, thinking deeply, praying often, for he has had a vision of eternity. What a shock it will be if he find us trifling—indifferent to things that matter, giddy to a degree, keen on amusements, burning with lust and passions of a degrading nature, *our* characters undeepened, unspiritual! A recent remark of Dr. Clifford is much to the point: "It was said of Dante, as he moved among men, that he looked like one who had been in hell. The flower of our young manhood has looked into hell, and they will return with a fixed determination that the horrors of war shall end." Better still are the words of the Primate of Ireland in his address, already quoted:

"Is there not growing up amongst us a more serious realization of the spiritual meaning of life? Are we not learning as never before our need of God? Most certainly in the trenches; in the lonely hours of watching on our battleships, and in our hospitals, these our brethren are drawing nearer to God, in prayer and Bible-reading. As one very dear to me wrote me from the front a little while ago, 'When one is always within a few feet, or rather within a few inches, of eternity, you look at everything from an entirely different point of view.' And this we notice, not from fear or dread, but because the presence of God is felt in the still, small voice of God's Holy Spirit within; not in the thunder or in the roar of battle; not in the lightning flame of red artillery; but in the quiet hours of thought on the camp-bed or in the trenches. Oh that this spirit may inspire and infuse our lives at home, and leave us a nation bringing forth the fruits of righteousness, a people prepared for the Lord, so that all this awful sacrifice of our bravest and best may not be offered in vain!"

Verily it *is* our plain duty to make many honest efforts to beget this spirit; and we can all do something unto this end. We can use much influence to turn the thoughts and desires of men and women into deeper channels. We can make ready a

people prepared for these lads, possessed as they will be with realities and high ideals.

(2) They will want employment, and large numbers will find ordinary civilian life very irksome, to begin with. But they will have given of their best for us, and we must arrange to give them of our best. We must see to it that, at any price, the authorities provide situations, good situations, for those who have saved our land. Never let them have cause to regret the noble part they will have played.

B. *Then what of the women at home?* (a) The married ones: they are now receiving good money, according to the size of the family, some as much as thirty shillings a week. What, when the man returns and the money stops? He may make twenty or twenty-five shillings a week, or he may not. I do not like to think of the effect of this on thousands throughout Great Britain. (b) The unmarried ones: the never-to-be-married ones of every class of society. The number of men lost or hopelessly crippled may reach hundreds of thousands; the majority of them would have married, had homes and families. Can the young women face the inevitable? Can we prepare them for it? Can we foster their faith and trust? (c) The women now doing men's work: making ammunition at Armstrong's, sweeping the streets at Gateshead, conducting the trams in Newcastle, acting as commissionaires at Harrod's. Is it likely that they will meekly retire again into private life and amiably abandon their wages? Surely the impetus that is being given to the Women's Movement is very great, and we shall want something more than human wisdom to avert disaster and to keep the peace.

C. *There is also the problem of the commercial world generally, and the labour market specially.* Who that thinks fails to see a troubled or a surging vision in which he can detect such threatening terms as "reduced incomes," "severe taxation," "lack of employment," "restricted developments," "restrained building," "uncertain wages," "high cost of living" etc.? "I view," said a great authority in Trades Union circles, "the

future with real apprehension and alarm." Can we now so go to work that we create everywhere a happy faith, a real spirit of patience and content, which will protect us from strikes, riots, revolution?

D. *What of the relations between different classes?* If the war lasts another year, this will certainly be a great feature after the war. We are all being thrown together, sometimes in a very beautiful way. The constant intercessions together in church or in room; the closer and frequent association into which pastors and people are drawn, because so many homes and hearts are crying out for human sympathy and for the comfort of Jesus Christ. That is the best side of the situation to-day.

There is another way, a less religious way, of picturing it—viz.: (a) The working classes, who have been inclined to view with suspicion, perhaps with envy, classes above them, are learning that their own feelings, and attitude, and actions, have not been altogether justified. They are rapidly being inspired with a new respect for, and confidence in, those who occupy more responsible positions than themselves. This may call for a definite reconstruction in the programme of Trades Unionism. The agitator who has lived on class warfare will not have the hearing and the influence that he has already enjoyed, for good or ill. (b) On the other hand, will there not be a desirable, an encouraging, change in the attitude of the "better" classes towards the masses? All are meeting now a common foe, are cheering one another up and on, are co-operating in many ways, are feeling the warmth and strength of their common humanity. Shall we not soon hear the high in our land exclaiming to all others with great reality, "You are as good as I am," and the masses hesitating to exclaim, as of old, "I am as good as you are"? At any rate, surely the time is getting fully ripe for fostering and establishing a spirit of brotherhood which has a hitherto unknown reality about it, which, in fact, we can conscientiously term "Christian."

These are mere samples of the problems that lie ahead of us. Well may they cause anxiety—and something more than

anxiety. Let us set our minds to work on them, lest they take us unawares. Let us be strong and quit us like men, for as our days, so will our strength be. The demands on us, on our faith, our service, our devotion, our sacrifice, our wisdom, our prayers, will be immense ; but God means it for good, so let us be of good courage.

I am conscious that this very incomplete sketch and forecast will not be endorsed by all, but granted that I am mistaken in part, sure I am that life will have an altogether new meaning : it will possess an absolutely new character ; it will be entirely transformed ; we shall be forced on to new platforms, and our minds will of necessity have different work, and sometimes very difficult work, to do.

Our present duty, therefore, seems to be to strive after for ourselves, and to seek to plant or produce all around us, a new spirit, a new purpose, new thoughts, feelings and desires, with our eyes on Him who "is rising majestically in the centre of world history, the Light of life, the Lord and Leader of mankind." In short, the Church has a great opportunity. This country can be remade, if men and women are true. God grant that we do not fail as we did after the Boer War! We made great professions then, but what was their value? Ere this war ends the nation's heart will be plastic. The people will have renounced their regard for materialism. Christian workers will have a vast influence. May we have grace given us to win the people, and to wed them to that which is spiritual, eternal, and of God!

A. B. G. LILLINGSTON.



The Missionary World.

A GLANCE at the list of summer gatherings of the missionary societies and organizations in so far as they are publicly announced is reassuring as to the quiet confidence in which missionary work is being done. Following quickly on the official anniversaries in London, with their sober, earnest tone, we have reason to be thankful that the more popular annual summer gatherings are also to take place without interruption. Of these the two most notable are the Summer Schools of the S.P.G. and the C.M.S., to be held at Eastbourne and at Keswick respectively. The wide scope of the programmes gives evidence of the impact of the war in its world-aspect on the thought of the Church; such effect must deepen as the days pass on, and ultimately, we doubt not that it will produce a new conception of the task before us, and of the greater sacrifices we must make to perform it. Each of these two Summer Schools is setting apart one day for prayer. We understand that the applications for membership are more numerous than ever, (though the fact that military claims on accommodation at Ilkley has necessitated the transference of the C.M.S. Summer School to Keswick has somewhat cut down its numbers); and this means that what we term the "rank and file" of missionary work are undeterred from fulfilling their Christian duty by the difficulties they see before them. An important joint conference of younger clergy of the C.M.S. and S.P.G. will have been held before these pages pass through the press. Much is said, often without intentional unfairness, of the inadequate share which the clergy take in missions; such a gathering as this should produce a juster estimation of their position. Equally should an influential conference of the Laymen's Missionary Movement, to be held in June, also help to remove the accusation that the "laymen do not care." Possibly one of the most interesting gatherings of the summer is a combined conference of representatives of all the Free Church Missionary Societies; we are glad to see at this conference among the announced

speakers are Canon W. H. T. Gairdner and Mr. T. R. W. Lunt. The conference is suggestive to us of the Church of England. Our missionary societies may well note that, as this war enforces, allies co-operating closely in work as well as in spirit are indispensable for the performance of our duty to the world.

* * * * *

A peculiar interest attaches to the Conference of the Student Christian Movement to be held at Swanwick in July. Year by year this conference, with all its promise of young and ardent life for the ranks of the Church of Christ, has raised or kept up the standard of service and devotion in Great Britain. It will meet this year depleted in numbers so far as men students are concerned, for the Universities have poured out their best life for the service of their country. The students of Great Britain, France, Belgium, Germany, Servia, and now Italy, are freely paying in their own blood the price of liberty as they respectively conceive it. We must see to it that the movement, which is so dear to them, and which is of such value to us, does not suffer in any way which could be obviated either by our gifts or by our prayers. It has always been a brave body, and never braver than now. It will not be out of place in this connection once more to commend *The Student Movement* (93, Chancery Lane, W.C.) to the notice of our readers, and the more especially because of the notable paper in the May number by Professor D. S. Cairns on "The Message of Christian Apocalypse for To-Day," in which he shows

"how closely and vitally our Lord's teaching regarding His Second Coming bears upon the present great convulsion of human society, and how much encouragement it gives at a time when we surely all need it."

The Church as a whole has needed a man of Dr. Cairns' scholarship and spiritual insight to deal with the evolutionary and the apocalyptic aspects of the present situation.

* * * * *

The popular gatherings of the missionary societies, with all their elements of encouragement, must not blind us to those other more private gatherings where the real problems of

missionary administration have to be faced. Nevertheless, the spirit of the "rank and file" will help to solve difficulties and guide decisions. There is a healthy realization that the year 1915-16 will be momentous in missionary finance, and first to claim our sympathy is the C.M.S., with its deficiency of £23,000. The society's publications inform us that decision as to retrenchment or otherwise will not be taken before the July meeting of the General Committee, and the interval is being vigorously used to make known the position to the supporters. But ultimately it is on the Committee that the duty will devolve of interpreting the real significance of the society's position at home and abroad, the capacity of the members to render aid, and the Will of God to determine its course. This is a day of great things, and it will be the wish and belief of the whole Church that whatever course the Committee takes will be taken *greatly*. Once more, then, the conduct and the faith of others will be influenced by the C.M.S., which now, as formerly, does not live unto itself.

* * * * *

Bishop Montgomery's monthly survey as given in *The Mission Field* shows that the S.P.G. is now beginning to face financial anxiety, and that the situation deserves "most serious attention." The first four months of the year show a shrinkage in income of about £14,000. No conclusions can be built on such a fact, but it is indicative of what may be expected by all societies with the advancing months of this year. While there is no disposition to despondency, there is every need to be alert. In a number given up almost wholly to this object the *Church Missionary Gleaner* states the case against retrenchment on the foreign side so that all can understand it.

* * * * *

After all, reinforcement for the missionary societies of our own Church is coming from fresh directions. The recent Missionary Convention of the Central Board of Missions held at Swanwick gave evidence of this. The spirit of the gathering was altogether excellent, and while, of course, the members of

the Convention were all identified with some one or more of the societies, yet the Convention itself had all that unity, zeal and heartiness that we are accustomed to identify with the meetings of the inner friends of particular societies. This missionary unity, now manifestly on the increase in our Church, must inevitably be the means of penetrating to heretofore inaccessible persons and neighbourhoods, and even if it should do nothing more—and its effect will not be negative—it will remove the last remnant of excuse for “not supporting missions” because they are advocated by societies and not by the Church. *The Chronicle* of the Central Board of Missions should be read, and as it only appears three times a year it will not claim much time from other missionary reading. The progress of the work of the Diocesan as well as of the Central Boards should be noted hopefully. Perhaps our readers do not know that by sending 2s. 6d. annually to the Publication Fund of the Central Board they will receive the Annual Report, *The Chronicle*, and all the leaflets and pamphlets issued during the year.

* * * * *

The Jubilee of the China Inland Mission has fallen felicitously. That it should have been celebrated in the early summer of 1915, after ten months of bitter conflict when the whole world is in the shadow of war, is significant for all other missionary societies. It may even be said to be providential; it is certainly prophetic. The Jubilee Report, presented at the meetings and given in *China's Millions*, with its story of the lark heard singing above the thunder of the guns at Neuve Chapelle, as recorded in one of the letters of “Eye Witness,” is moving reading. It seems incredible now, when Chinese Churches are undertaking missionary work of their own, that when this Mission was founded the interior of China was practically a closed land, and that the Mission to-day has over 1,300 stations and out-stations, over 1,200 chapels, and over 350 schools in places which then were all, or nearly all, closed to the Gospel. The first twenty-five years of work saw less

than 5,000 baptisms; there are now over 50,000 baptized converts. It is not, however, appeal to any statistical success that moves the Church as regards the China Inland Mission, but that spirit of faith first found in Hudson Taylor and then transmitted to those who came after him. As Mr. Walter Sloan said in his retrospect at the Jubilee Meeting, "The base of this work has been faith." The situation caused by the war is no more insurmountable than was the situation in China which faced Dr. Hudson Taylor in 1866, and the means of overcoming is the same.

* * * * *

While it is the heroic aspects of missionary work that face us chiefly at the moment, and we are attempting to grapple with imminent difficulties, there is a quiet work of preparation going on in other directions which must presently contribute to the greater efficiency of work at the home base and to a wider distribution of responsibility in maintaining it. This fact is illustrated by the growing place which is being given to women in missionary administration. Twenty women members were co-opted on to the Central Board of Missions in June, and of these some are to be placed on its Committee for home organization and literature, and, we understand also, on its Council for Missionary Problems and Policy. *The Mission Field* records a resolution sent up by the Incorporated Members and Members of S.P.G. in the Diocese of Manchester, in which was urged the desirability of securing such a change in the Charter of the Society as would allow women to become Incorporated Members; and the action taken thereon by the Standing Committee of the S.P.G. was sympathetic postponement for discussion after the war. The C.M.S. has recently appointed women as members of the Committee of Correspondence, which is practically the Foreign Committee of the Society, but subordinate to the General Committee, and they have for some time been members of the Funds and Home Organization Committee. The General Assembly of the United Free Church of Scotland has also sent down to its presbyteries for discussion an interesting Report

which proposes a large expansion of the place given to women both in home and foreign work. This is all change in the right direction.

* * * * *

A short note in the B.M.S. *Herald* opens up an interesting field for study, to which we may return at a later date. It is pointed out that the Baptist Missionary Society is rich in "Field Magazines," and reference is made to the Serampur *Students' Chronicle*, the *Yakusu Quarterly News*, the *Lualaba Letter*, the *Yalemba News*. It is suggested that enthusiasts at home would be more enthusiastic still if they read some of the "Field Magazines" in addition to the official organs at home. We do not doubt it, but many of us scarcely know of their existence, and few know how they can be obtained. Let it suffice for the moment that they are in existence, and that they point to the true home base for missions being in the fields themselves.

G.



Notices of Books.

THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC REVIVAL IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By Paul Thureau-Dangin. Revised and re-edited from a translation by the late Wilfred Wilberforce. Two volumes. London: *Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co., Ltd.* Price 3rs. 6d.

The large and well-written volumes in which M. Thureau-Dangin publishes his reflections on the religious life of England during the last century are interesting as the labour of a well-informed foreigner surveying from a distance some of the most fruitful epochs in our national experience. Frankly controversial in character, they present the Roman Catholic case in defence and eulogy of that Church. But they lack that discriminate use of material which is requisite for true history. The bare assertion that the adherents of the Papal community have increased in this country during the period under review from 160,000 to 1,500,000 is valueless until it is known how these figures have been ascertained, until they are estimated comparatively with the growth of population, and until such important factors as Irish immigration have been duly weighed. The depreciation of Evangelicalism by the omission of the names of the distinguished men of that school and of all mention of their great achievements while enlarging upon the ignorance or prejudice of their more humble followers, the bitter invective of "Arnoldism" and the Broad Church, and the silence concerning Roman defects, would be impossible to one not wholly absorbed in securing a party triumph. Nor would a prudent writer quote with exultation Macaulay's picture of the survival of the ecclesiastical and political pre-eminence of the Church of Rome when the New Zealand traveller shall "stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's," in sublime indifference to the complete falsification of this prophecy by the events of 1870, with the subsequent loss of Roman Catholic prestige in every country of Europe. It is not necessary to descant on these blemishes, for attention must be fixed upon the most prominent features of the narrative—the claim that the Oxford Movement was a terrible blow to the Church of England, the representation of the Church of Rome rising once more to an exalted position in the land, and the estimate of modern Ritualism as a hopeful nursery for Rome. The story compels us to form precisely opposite conclusions.

Newman was the outstanding personality of the first stages of the Oxford Movement. Not distinguished at Trinity College, but successful in his candidature for an Oriel Fellowship; leaning upon Pusey, Keble, and Hurrell Froude during the publication of the "Tracts for the Times," but self-confident in his sermons at St. Mary's Church; persuaded by political antagonism to the Government on Catholic Emancipation and the dealings with the revenues of the Irish bishoprics to become the pioneer of a religious revival; pursuing for years a difficult course without the chart and compass of settled convictions; subservient to a degree which astonished Pusey to the admonition of the Bishop of his diocese, yet resolute against the censure of all the Bishops, this remarkable man did not possess either

the stability, or the type, of mind which could successfully accomplish a vast spiritual revolution. In an age of rapid progress in every department of life an earnest seeker for truth was sure to command respect. To many fascinating gifts of attractive presence and manner Newman added the charming advantage of thinking publicly. Step by step the progress of his development was open to the gaze of all. Tentative solutions of perplexing problems, passing suggestions of plausible explanations of personal difficulties, skilful contrivances of argumentative subtlety, were presented with all the aspects of finality. The changes were rapid, but each temporary halt was deemed by many to be a permanent home. The publication of Tract 90 was the crisis. In it Newman applied to the Articles those rationalistic principles which he had been the first to condemn when applied to the Creeds. Here words must be construed strictly at their face value; there this necessity must be abandoned in order to circumvent the obvious and Protestant interpretation. Such a position could not be maintained; the author himself speedily surrendered it; the last endeavour to procure a *via media* had failed. Yet only 300 of his disciples accompanied him farther. The majority gave up their aspirations for the promised land of peace and certainty, and determined to abide in the wilderness of ruined hopes. Some extenuation may be found in the suddenness with which their idol withdrew his aid and direction. He abruptly stopped the "Tracts," threw up the *British Critic*, and stayed the theological conferences at Pusey's house and his own evening meetings with friends; after no long interval he ceased to preach in the University Church, and retired to Littlemore; then came the resignation of his vicariate, and finally his secession. Some enthusiasts, saying with Ward, "Credo in Newmanum," went with him. The more part remained, bereft of leader, in a very precarious condition in the Church of England. Condemned by the heads of houses at Oxford, by the Bishops, and by the courts of law, they were indebted for further tolerance to the liberal theologians they so much detested—Stanley, Maurice, Milman, Tait—who pleaded for intellectual liberty and deprecated the infliction of penalties upon opinions. Pusey, Keble, Manning, Church, Hope-Scott, Gladstone, and the others had little in common but the distaste of Protestantism. Their anti-Romanism differed in quality and extent. Facts refuted them. The controversy over the Jerusalem bishopric, the discussion upon Dr. Hampden's appointment to the See of Hereford, the ultimate decisions in the Gorham litigation, revealed the National Church as more true to the first Christian Evangelists than their *Apostolicity*, wider by far than their *Catholicity*, and more capable of producing the harmonious working of many divergent minds than their *unity*, while upon their own admission it had not been unsuccessful in promoting amongst its adherents *holiness* of life.

The Church of Rome received another valuable accretion when Manning seceded. Our author endeavours to exculpate him from the charge of ambition during his Anglican days. A character conative rather than meditative is apt to be unconsciously ambitious. Manning loved to live in the glare of the footlights. His career in the Roman Church amply justifies the statements of his biographer. His reception seems to have stirred within the bosom of that usually serene institution some faint desires of liberty. Brought up in the congenial atmosphere of freedom, the converts could

never wholly abandon the right of private judgment. The quarrels between the older Catholics and the new, between Errington and Manning, between the *Home and Foreign Review* or the *Rambler* and the *Dublin Review*, between Liberalism and Ultramontanism, between Manning and Newman, between the advocates of the Association for the Promotion of the Union of Christendom and its opponents, were evidences of a new spirit struggling for its life within the Church of Rome, but ultimately to be crushed by her unchangeable arbitrariness. The failure of Newman's efforts to establish another University in Ireland, the rejection of Pusey's Eirenicon, the restriction upon Roman Catholic students entering into residence at Oxford or Cambridge, were preliminary indications where victory would lie. The awakening of similar unrest on the Continent called for peremptory methods of restraint. The Ultramontanes engineered a great Council at Rome. Manning laboured assiduously. The declaration of Papal Infallibility astonished the world, but no longer was freedom of thought permissible in the Roman Church. M. Thureau-Dangin slides over the immediately subsequent loss of the temporal dominions, and the disrespect for all religious authority which has since that date overswept Europe. The Old Catholics in Germany marked how severely the Church of Rome had herself been shaken, and Mr. Gladstone in his memorable articles on "Vaticanism" gave utterance to the English conviction that by the repudiation of "modern thought and ancient history" the conversion of England to Romanism had become impossible. "I cannot persuade myself," he wrote, "to feel alarm as to the final issues of her crusades in England, and this although I do not undervalue her great powers of mischief." The cravings for union which Pusey had nurtured were dead. The great mass of the British people can never turn to Rome. There is nothing in the volumes before us to minimize this confidence. Twenty years afterwards Manning still felt the severity of the blow, when he declared that the Church of Rome was "stripped and cast out by all the Governments," and sought in Socialism and Democratism a recovery of the lost position and influence.

Ritualistic practices have indubitably gained ground in the Church of England during the last few decades, and in many places the character of the services has been entirely altered. This is due to the excessive latitudinarianism and the ultra-Protestant principles which have overcome the successors of the old Tractarians. The contention of the Broad Churchmen and anti-dogmatists that material penalties should not attach to errors of opinion has so pervaded the clergy, and is so acceptable to the laity in general, that resistance to lawful authority is not easily repressible, unless the individual is prepared to make such sacrifice as adherence to conscience demands, and to quit the society which repudiates him. But when the right of private judgment is strained to the point of insubordination to the Bishops, contempt of law, and disloyalty to the Crown, anarchical consequences vitiate the life of the whole community. Space compels a reference to the numerous details given by M. Thureau-Dangin to prove that by the adoption of such methods has the advance of Romish doctrine been rendered possible in the National Church. The crisis has been reached in the attempts of Convocation so to modify the Book of Common Prayer as to admit the regulated use of practices which repeated condemnation has

failed to restrain. But the task is a long way from completion. The consent of the laity, in Parliament in the last resource, has yet to be obtained. Should this be granted, the clamorous methods by which the victory will have been won display so deep a chasm at heart between the extreme Churchmen and Roman Catholicism that corporate reunion would still be impossible. Anglo-Catholics cannot go to Rome, for they know well that their cherished independence would be ill at ease in such a Zion.

The Roman Church has received a new status in the regard of the people. If this commenced with the secessions of 1845 and 1850, it was maintained for a generation by the close personal intimacies of the new converts with those who had been left behind. This adventitious circumstance no longer prevails. In so far as the labours of Manning and Newman persuaded the Church of their adoption to abandon its old exclusiveness, to throw its vigour into social and intellectual problems, and to co-operate with others of different persuasion for the welfare of the people, the change has been welcomed by the country, and Roman Catholics are free to exercise the influence which they win by merit and ability. But should Rome revert to her former standards, renew her old policy, or tyrannically misuse her liberty, the British nation may still be entrusted to resist her encroachments. Improvement in manners has quelled the disturbances, disciplined the excitement, and softened the asperities of bygone times, but Rome will never be allowed to resume a course which in the ages past has proved destructive of the liberties, and detrimental to the welfare, of the races she has ruled. Perhaps M. Thureau-Dangin's book is to be regarded as evidence that the Church of Rome has by no means abandoned former claims, but is preparing to reassert them at a favourable opportunity. Suspicion that this is the case is partially confirmed by recent events. But an embassy does not imply that we are consentient to the Papal policy, only that we deem it expedient to use the resources of diplomacy to protect our own interests. If Benedict XV. imagines that through the war he can obtain the restoration of the temporal dominions, or even secure the internationalization of the Law of Guarantees, he is deluded by a vain hope. The civilized world will not permit the Roman Pontiff to sway the sceptre of an earthly monarch, or to exercise immunity from the laws of the country in which he resides. The semblance of a "Catholic Revival" in England does not change the fixed determination to meet such claims with an absolute *non possumus*.

E. ABBEY TINDALL.

GOD'S STRONG PEOPLE. By the Rev. A. W. GOUGH, M.A., F.R.S.L.
London: *Robert Scott*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

A volume of sermons by the Vicar of Brompton is always welcome. Widely known as one of the most impressive preachers in London, Mr. Gough has given us here a very fine example of his work. There is a robustness of tone about his utterances which is most uplifting, and is particularly valuable at a time like the present, when a sickly sentimentalism is so prevalent. Mr. Gough's appeal is for strong men—strong in character, strong in obedience, strong in self-sacrifice, and it comes to us as a trumpet-call to meet the crisis with strength and action.

The volume consists of twelve sermons, representing the Vicar's discourses, at Brompton Parish Church on the Sundays of the present year from January 3—Intercession Day—to Easter Day, and a close examination of these pages reveals something of the secret of Mr. Gough's power as a preacher. He is not content with a superficial exposition of his subject; he goes to the heart of things, and he puts before his hearers the plain truth, with an independence and fearlessness that always appeal to strong men. The subjects of the sermons are sufficiently varied. Yet, with the utmost skill, the preacher finds even in such a subject as "The Marriage Feast of Cana" just the lesson he wants to enforce upon his people in relation to the war. As we read these sermons we feel that Mr. Gough views the great European conflict in its true perspective. He is under no delusion in regard to Germany's lust after world-power, and he sees the paramount importance of Britain determining to overthrow her infamous ambitions. To read his scathing denunciations of her brutalities and his vigorous plea for conducting the war with the utmost determination acts as a tonic; it braces one up and makes one feel what a glory it is to be an Englishman. Mr. Gough is himself a strong man, and for more than fifteen years he has preached two closely associated doctrines: "(1) That Christianity is a religion of strength, humane and masculine; (2) That Britain is intended by God, in a special sense, to be the home of a strong people." These doctrines find their exposition in this volume, and when he is preaching on the deepest solemnities—e.g., the Passion—there is a sense of "strength" running all through his discourse. As we read through these pages we marked a large number of passages suitable for quotation—there is not a page in the whole book that does not lend itself to this purpose—but we must content ourselves with giving one which, for beauty of expression and force of conviction, would be hard to beat. It is from the sermon on "Mastery in Passion," and after referring to the holy example of our Lord, he says:

"What tyrant nation, or what selfish superman, ever showed a masterfulness to equal this? If sacrifice means this, if this is its source, its still warm heart, is it not strength indeed? Is not sacrifice a force of higher vitality than greed?"

"The German thinks he is strong because he believes he can take what he wants. Christ shows us that the strength that comes down to deliver man, that dies to make life large and clean and free—the sacrifice that gives God what He wants—is stronger than all the selfishness that makes men sturdy slaves.

"So, again to-day the Cross comes into view most clearly to the men who are ready to do sacrifice. To them there comes a power of life they never knew in their selfish days, a masterfulness they never showed when their hands were strong to fulfil their own desires. And because men of this mind multiply daily in the land, counting but loss the things that were theirs that once they prized, Britain throbs already with the forces of a great resurrection.

"They seek—these men—no evasion of life's proof or of death's sharpness. They have taken the Cross.

"They are crusaders, not like their fathers of old, for an empty sepulchre, but for the Cross of Christ and all that it still means—for the glory of love, for liberty, for humanity, for justice, for the health and peace of the nations, for an England dedicated to and empowered for the discharge of its mission."

We quote this passage as a typical example of Mr. Gough's general style and manner, and we are confident that the clear thinking and true expression of which it is a type is much needed in the pulpit of to-day. These sermons are clear in their exposition, fresh in their thought, and uplifting in their influence. The volume is one that should be widely circulated.

SOME NOTES ON THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the Rev. H. J. CLAYTON, Special Lecturer to the Central Church Committee. London: S.P.C.K. Price 1s.

This admirable volume is described as "for popular use," and it is admirably adapted to that end. It is amazing how little even many attached members know of their own Church, and their ignorance is a source of weakness to themselves and to others. It is sometimes urged in excuse that the subject is one that needs much deep reading, and that the average man and the average woman have very little time for such a purpose. But that excuse cannot fairly be urged now, since Mr. Clayton's little book gives within the compass of 86 pages a really marvellous presentation of the principal facts of Church history. He has invested his story with so much interest that when once the book is taken up it will not lightly be laid aside until the last page is reached. Moreover, it is a work of permanent value; the attached Churchman who has this book on his shelves will find himself turning to it again and again, and he will never be disappointed. Mr. Clayton's first three chapters deal with the antiquity, origin, and continuity of the Church. Then he discusses its national character. "Is the Church," he asks, "still national?" and his reply is full of interest:

"From one point of view, indeed, the Church of England is not national to-day, for not everyone now belongs to it, because during the last three hundred years various bodies of people have separated from its communion, set up altar against altar, built chapels for themselves, received State aid, and collected endowments. This process of separation began in the sixteenth century, for in 1570 the Pope issued a Bull in which he called upon his followers to separate from the National Church. Thus came into existence the Roman Catholic schism in England. On the other side, at various times, and for various reasons, arose the Protestant Nonconformists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Wesleyans, and the rest. Yet it is well to remember that though every person in the land does not belong to the Church of England, there is real meaning in the statement that the Church of England belongs to every person in the land. It is still the National Church, prepared to minister to the members of each of the sects if they are willing to receive its ministrations. The incumbent of each parish, as an officer of the National Church, is ready to minister to all, to baptize, prepare for Confirmation, marry or bury, anyone in the parish.

"In spite of the fact that other religious bodies are at work side by side with the Church, it still remains the most national of them all, for the places are many, both in the country and in the slums of our large towns, in which the clergyman is the only resident minister of religion, so much so that the *Free Church Chronicle* recently admitted that there are at least 5,000 villages in England and Wales in which no Free Church service is ever held."

Endowments, education, extension, are other subjects dealt with; and it may be said at once that for its interest, its comprehensiveness, and its accuracy, the volume is one that is well calculated to stimulate and to deepen love for and attachment to the Church of England.

HOME PRAYERS CHIEFLY FROM THE PRAYER-BOOK, OR IN THE STYLE THEREOF. By the late G. F. Chambers, Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. The Book-Room National Church League, 82, Victoria Street, S.W. Price 1s. net.

Mr. G. F. Chambers was well known as a loyal and devoted Churchman, and many who knew him before his recent death will be glad to see a new issue at a cheaper price of the excellent compilation of family prayers which he published under the title of "Home Prayers." All familiar with the writings of Mr. Chambers will be prepared for the methodical form of its contents, which are designed to cover a complete month, and are adapted to a great variety of practical conditions and circumstances. The contents are chiefly taken from the Prayer-Book, or, as Mr. Chambers tells us, "in the style thereof"; and his hope in issuing the book originally was that it might encourage "the commencement or resumption of household worship." Some of the prayers in the very comprehensive collection which Mr. Chambers has given us deal with the personal, social, and domestic details of home life, and are not, therefore, to be found in the Liturgy; but this adaptation for household purposes is just what is wanted.

DAILY SERVICES FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES. By H. Pakenham-Walsh, B.D. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2s. net.

An excellent series of daily services for a week, morning and evening, originally compiled for the Chapel of the Bishop Cotton Boys' School in Bangalore, where Mr. Pakenham-Walsh is the head of the S.P.G. Brotherhood. The series are nicely thought out, saturated with the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer, and in every way suitable as a weekly course at any educational institution or community. An appendix gives all the Prayer-Book Collects. There is also a "Lectionary" for daily Bible-reading for the three terms and vacations of a year.

LESSONS ON THE CHRISTIAN'S RESPONSIBILITIES AND MEANS OF GRACE. By W. Hume Campbell, M.A. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

Very great attention is now being given to methods of teaching, and Mr. Campbell is himself engaged in investigating and inculcating such methods as seem to be commendable. We are being taught now not only what to teach, but, and even more, how to teach it, and this is no doubt great gain.

This present volume gives excellent lessons for scholars aged thirteen to fourteen, and makes a successful endeavour to adjust itself to the Church's year while using the sacramental teaching of the Catechism as a groundwork. Suggestions for arousing and stimulating the scholar's activities are plentifully made, and we are presented with what looks like a carefully worked out and valuable treatment of Christian faith and service. It gives "definite Church teaching" of a sane and acceptable type in a scientific

and attractive manner. An excellent course for what are called "Bible Classes."

THE CITY OF SAFED: A REFUGE OF JUDAISM. By Theodore Edward Dowling, D.D. *London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews.* Price 1s. net.

In his introduction to this interesting little volume the late Bishop Blyth wrote: "Safed is a centre of great interest to the Jews of the present day, and it is likely, from its position, to prompt the question in days to come: 'Tell me all that you can about the past history and influence of Safed.'" In twenty-three short chapters the author gives us concisely, but fully, a vast deal of valuable information about Safed itself, and incidentally throws considerable light on the history of Palestine generally, and on the Jews, their past and present in particular. No lover of Palestine, or of God's ancient people, should miss reading this little treatise. Whether dealing with the Mohammedan rule of the past, the Crusading period, the Jews in Palestine to-day, or mission work among them, Archdeacon Dowling is equally at home. There are twelve good illustrations, and there is an excellent summary of leading events chronologically arranged from the eighth century B.C. to the year before last.

WITH THE BIBLE IN BRAZIL. By Frederick C. Glass. London: *Morgan and Scott.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

The Rev. J. Stuart Holden, M.A., contributes a preface to this account of missionary work under the auspices of the Evangelical Union of South America, an undenominational society not, of course, to be confounded with the Church Society—the S.A.M.S. Mr. Glass has been working in Brazil for the last fifteen years, and has an interesting story to tell. Not the least interesting part of his book is the chapter in which he lets us into the secrets of his own life and relates some of his spiritual experiences. The account of the conversion of a Roman Catholic priest, now a pastor in the American Methodist Mission, is another fascinating chapter in a book that has not a dull page between its covers.

LESSONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT. Notes critical and expository on the passages appointed for Sundays and Holy Days. By the Rev. A. S. Hill Scott, M.A., and Rev. T. H. Knight, M.A. Part II. *Oxford University Press.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

Frankly, this is not the kind of work that we can commend to readers of the **CHURCHMAN**. It is chiefly remarkable for its advanced Higher Criticism. The authors would like these chapters read from the lectern, but we cannot think that this would really help to the better understanding of the Old Testament lessons, or tend to establish the confidence of the laity in the Word of God. But the collaborators have, from their own point of view, accomplished their task in a scholarly fashion. They are certainly not lacking in courage!

LORD RADSTOCK. By Mrs. E. Trotter. London: *Hodder and Stoughton.* Price 3s. 6d.

Lord Radstock's life was certainly a remarkable one, and those who met him, especially those who received spiritual help from him, will be glad that

this appreciation of his life has been published. The authoress gives us close details of Lord Radstock's personal life, his ancestry, parentage, boyhood, marriage, etc., all receiving attention. His almost unique individual ministrations in military and social circles among the highest classes of society in England, France, Holland, Sweden, Russia, India, and elsewhere, are described with sympathy and admiration. A large number of letters from friends in various parts of the world are reproduced. His strong, forceful personality; his deliberate self-denials; his separation from his sometime friends and interests—all go to the production of a character fiercely disliked and vehemently admired. He belonged to an "old school," but he did great things for our Lord.

ENGLISH CHURCH WAYS. By W. H. Frere, D.D. London: *John Murray*.
Price 2s. 6d. net.

This frank little book contains four lectures given by Dr. Frere, of the Mirfield Community, to "Russian friends" in what is now called Petrograd, in March of last year. The first aim of the author was to explain Anglican Church life to members of the Russian Church, and we have to say at once that he has done this in a very fair and interesting way. The special position of the Mirfield Community is, of course, well known in England, and some might expect this account of our Church life to be one-sided. But the works and faith of the Evangelical School in the Church receive fair comment and considerable appreciation, and it is by no means uninteresting to read an estimate of one's fellows, written in a kindly, frank manner by one who sees them from an outside view-point. Dr. Frere sees a blending of the best activities of the two forces within the Church, and the result is described as a "Catholic Evangelicalism" which has brought one-time rival parties into devoted partnership. We cannot swallow the whole of the book; but it is written in a spirit of Christian love and brotherliness which is its own commendation, and we enjoyed reading it.



Publications of the Month.

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

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

- THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE BIBLE.** Two volumes: Jeremiah—Malachi; Revelation. Edited by the Rev. James Hastings, D.D. (*T. and T. Clark.* 10s. each; subscription price 6s.) Two more volumes of a work of inestimable value for preachers and teachers.
- THE GREATER MEN AND WOMEN OF THE BIBLE.** Hezekiah—Malachi, Edited by the Rev. James Hastings, D.D. (*T. and T. Clark.* 10s.; subscription price 6s.) Quite the best work of its kind.
- BIBLICAL DISCOVERIES IN EGYPT, PALESTINE, AND MESOPOTAMIA.** By the Rev. J. Politeyan, B.A. (*Elliot Stock.* 2s. 6d. net.) A really valuable work, full of interest to Bible students, and confirmatory of their faith. Canon Girdlestone contributes the Foreword, and there are many illustrations.
- SEEING THE INVISIBLE.** By N. A. Ross, M.A., LL.D. (*Elliot Stock.* 2s. 6d. net.) A volume of sermons in which the note of the Evangel is clearly and sweetly sounded.
- RECENT DISCOVERIES ILLUSTRATING EARLY CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.** By the Bishop of Moray, Ross, and Caithness (Dr. A. J. Maclean). Lectures at Edinburgh Cathedral. Second edition. (*S.P.C.K.* 2s. net.)
- THE BOOK OF JUDGES.** By H. C. O. Lanchester, M.A. Another volume of the Revised Version edited for the use of schools. (*Cambridge University Press.* 1s. 6d. net.)
- THE CHURCH CATECHISM EXPLAINED TO CHILDREN.** By Mrs. McClure. (*S.P.C.K.* 2s. net.) This interesting volume is based upon notes taken of the Dean of Rochester's Catechizings at St. Peter's, Eaton Square. The volume is described as being "for scholars without a teacher." There are numerous illustrations.
- SOUND DOCTRINE.** By the Rev. Alfred Hewlett, D.D. (*C. J. Thyne.* 1s. net.)
- MODERN PHILOSOPHY AND THE INCARNATION.** By the Rev. O. C. Quick, M.A. (*S.P.C.K.* 6d. net.) A treatise drawn up at the instance of the Christian Evidence Society. There are six chapters—viz.: (1) "The Place of Dogmatic Theology"; (2) "The Need for a Revelation"; (3) "From Revelation to Incarnation"; (4) "The Incarnation and the Creeds"; (5) "Attitude of Modern Philosophies"; and (6) "Possibilities of Resuscitation."

GENERAL.

- JOHN WYCLIFFE AND JOHN DE TREVISA.** By H. J. Wilkins, D.D. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 5s. net.) An interesting examination of ancient records connected with Westbury-on-Trym, undertaken to furnish an authoritative answer to the question, "Was John Wycliffe a negligent pluralist?"
- THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN SOUTH AMERICA.** By the Right Rev. E. F. Every, D.D., Bishop in Argentina. (*S.P.C.K.* 2s. 6d. net.) A pleasantly written handbook. English Churchmen are very imperfectly acquainted with the problems of South America, yet no part of the foreign mission-field has more urgent claims. Bishop Every's volume should do much to arouse attention for the great continent.
- STUDIES OF NEW ZEALAND LIFE.** By Mrs. Wesley Turton. (*S.P.C.K.* 6d. net.) A slender volume, but packed full of good material.
- FRANKLIN KANE**, by Anne D. Sedgwick; **WHITE WINGS**, by William Black; and **MANALINE**, by G. K. Chesterton. Three volumes in Nelson's "Sevenpenny Series." **THE PANAMA CANAL**, by J. Saxon Mills; and **THE ISLAND**, by Richard Whiteing. Two volumes in Nelson's "Shilling Series." (*T. Nelson and Sons.*)

WAR LITERATURE.

- CHRIST AND THE WAR.** By the Rev. W. Heaton Renshaw. (*George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.* 3d. net.) These "very simple talks" were given at St. Peter's, Cheltenham, "Simple" they are, but they go to the root of things. The Archbishop of Armagh, in a graceful preface, says: "To dwell on the awful horrors of the present world-wide war might well drive us mad but for the glorious hope the writer sets prominently before us: 'Lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh'; and amid

all the warring and the wailing we seem to hear the echo of our Blessed Lord's promise, 'Surely I come quickly'—to set up a kingdom of which an old translation of the well-known passage in Isaiah tells us 'that there shall be no frontier to it, for it shall be world-wide.' These "talks" deserve a wide circulation.

UNDER THE FLAG. By the Rev. G. R. Oakley. (S.P.C.K. 4d.) These "talks to young soldiers" are direct and impressive. The first deals with Christianity and war; the three which follow, "Red," "White," "Blue," treat respectively of self-sacrifice, purity, religion; and the last, "Under the Flag," is in the nature of a summing up. The ecclesiastical tone is distinctly "High."

THE SOLDIER'S LITTLE SON. By E. M. Green. (S.P.C.K. 3d.) A delicate little trifle to show children that Britain stands for Right against Might.

THE ETERNAL GOAL. By the Rev. E. A. Burroughs, M.A. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 2d.) A welcome reprint of three notable letters to *The Times* on the spiritual issues of the present situation.

PAPERS FOR WAR-TIME. No. 33: "Peace with Empire: The Problem." By Edwyn Bevan, M.A. No. 34: "The Reasonable Direction of Force: A Plea for Investigation before War." By Louise E. Matthaei. (*Humphrey Milford.* 2d. each.)

PAMPHLETS.

A SPECULATION ON HYPOTHESIS IN RELIGION. By Sir Edward Russell. (*Williams and Norgate.* 1s. net.) An essay at once thoughtful and arresting. Bound up with it is another, entitled "The Way of all Salvation."

RAYMOND LULL AND SIX CENTURIES OF ISLAM. By the Rev. Dr. Weitbrecht. (S.P.C.K. 1d. net.) The subject of this pamphlet was the first missionary to the Moslems, and the six hundredth anniversary of his death is being commemorated.

A WOMAN'S HONOUR. By the Rev. Spencer Elliott. (S.P.C.K. 5s. per 100.) A straight talk on purity for men and lads.

CHURCH ASSOCIATION'S ANNUAL REPORT. (Buckingham Street, Strand. 1s.)

WHAT DO YOU GO TO CHURCH FOR? By S. W. (S.P.C.K. 4s. per 100.)

PERIODICALS.

THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES for April (*Humphrey Milford*, 3s. 6d. quarterly) has the following "Notes and Studies": "Early Ordination Services" (the Rev. W. H. Frere, D.D.); "The Synoptic Parables" (the Rev. J. W. Hunkin); "Judges vii. 3: Two Passages in David's Lament" (the Rev. W. Emery Barnes, D.D.); "Nestorius's Version of the Nicene Creed" (the Rev. R. H. Connolly, O.S.B.); "Notes on Apocrypha" (M. R. James, Litt.D.); "Evst. 234" (the Rev. C. Steenbuch); "Cramer's Catena on Matthew" (the Rev. Harold Smith).

THE ENGLISH CHURCH REVIEW for May (*Longmans, Green and Co.*, 6d. monthly) has articles by the Rev. T. A. Lacey ("The Invocation of Saints"); the Rev. C. H. N. Hodges ("Christians in Korea"); the Editor ("The Principle of Reparation"); Dr. Geraldine E. Hodgson ("The Passing of Silence"); and the Rev. Jesse Brett ("The King of Saints"). In the June issue the Editor deals at great length with "Kikuyu"; and the number contains articles by the Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, the newly appointed Editorial Secretary of the S.P.C.K., on "Village Life Two Hundred Years Ago"; the Rev. the Hon. Canon Adderley, on "The Need of Simple Church Teaching"; and others.

THE CHURCH MISSIONARY REVIEW for May (*C.M.S. House*, 6d. monthly) has articles by Dr. Harford ("Pioneers of C.M.S. Medical Missions"); Canon Hooper ("Difficulties of Translators"); the Rev. H. Sykes ("Jerusalem, August to December, 1914"); and others. In the June issue the Rev. H. Sykes continues his paper, the Rev. Dr. Zwemer writes on Raymond Lull, and there are articles dealing with the anniversary.

THE BRITISH REVIEW for June (*Williams and Norgate*, 1s. net) has several notable articles dealing with the war. Among the lighter contributions, the paper "Sword and Gown on the Isis and Cam," by Mr. T. H. S. Escott, will attract most attention. It contains some reminiscences of an Oxford now almost out of living memory, recalling the work of J. Y. Sargent and those who studied and taught in his day. The article also recounts the history of Oxford and Cambridge during the Great Rebellion, comparing their aspect then with the military conditions now prevalent in the Universities.