

The Fraternal.

Vol. X.

APRIL, 1916.

LITERARY CONTRIBUTIONS for the FRATERNAL should be addressed to the Editor, Rev. F. C. SPURR, Regent's Park Chapel, N.W., and all other communications to the Secretary, Rev. E. D. deRUSSETT, Baptist Church, Harrow.

From the Editor's Chair.

The *Fraternal* makes a late appearance this month. It is the fault of none. The printer has had the copy since the middle of March, but owing to shortage of labour it has been impossible for him to prepare the number earlier. We must not complain. It all goes to the account of the War. The next number may also appear late.

The contents of the last number of the *Fraternal* appear to have been generally appreciated by the brethren, judging from the many kind words that have been spoken and the letters that have been written concerning the various articles. The present number will, it is hoped, be found quite as interesting. Dr. Wicks, Mr. Rushbrooke and Mr. Goldsmith French contribute valuable articles, which are very timely. These brethren place us under a great debt of gratitude on account of their kindness in so generously writing for the *Fraternal*.

With reference to the "Retreat" movement it is a little significant that Bishop Montgomery, of the S.P.C.K., has issued a book in view of the coming National Mission, in which he advocates a greater use of silence in the ordinary services of the Church, as a means of preparation for a great spiritual movement. One of the chief features of a "Retreat" is the use of *guided* silence and only those who have experienced it know its immense value. It would be a great thing for our ordinary congregations were a fuller use made of this strange power. The "rush" with which many public services are carried through is fatal to a real spiritual atmosphere.

MEMBERS WHO HAVE JOINED SINCE JANUARY 1st, 1916.—
F. W. Gusterson, London; J. Rigden Green, London;

D. Hayes, London; C. S. Morgan, London; A. J. Payne, London; R. W. Saunders, Upper Bangor; F. W. Schofield, London; J. Walton Young, London.

A Great Book on Mysticism.

"The Meaning and Value of Mysticism." by E. HERMAN.

6s. London: James Clarke & Co.

"Books on mysticism bore and irritate me: they deal with vague and shadowy conceptions, and their terminology is—well! there is no word for it!" That bitter criticism, uttered by a well-known preacher, expresses what many people feel about books on mysticism. And that there is some reason for their attitude can hardly be questioned. The works of Miss Underhill leave one with a feeling of grave dissatisfaction, while Mrs. Annie Besant's latest adventure into this field is marked by her usual dogmatism which vitiates all her work. To those who are annoyed with the generality of writers on mysticism the new book of Mrs. Herman's will come as a very pleasant surprise and as a great revelation. Those who have read her brilliant monograph on Eucken and Bergson will find in this new volume the same clearness of thinking and the same vividness of style which characterized the smaller book. It is a very broad and comprehensive study of mysticism, at once critical and fervent. It is as much a revelation of her own soul as it is a revelation of the real soul of mysticism. And this, to me, is one of its chief charms. The book has the especial merit of showing how a highly trained and cultured mind can have for partner a warm and glowing soul, whose heat is derived from fellowship with Christ. Emphatically this is a book of *Christian* mysticism, "a mysticism whose passion for intimacy for God is checked by the Christian sense of sin, based upon a deeply ethical conception of Salvation and Sanctity, and born of a vision of God as He is in Christ Jesus." While again and again conventional theology is attacked, the authoress is, in the best and truest sense, Evangelical. Complex and elusive as is the general theme, Mrs. Herman has presented it with amazing clearness. Not once, so far as I remember, has she taken refuge in a confusing mist of words. All is lucidly expressed, and this is no small thing to have accomplished. One of the main features of the book is its "testing of the spirits." The vagueness and follies into which would be mystics fall are dealt with in a refreshing manner. This is a piece of work that badly needed doing. The revival of Bond Street occultism is a menace alike to sanity and to Christianity. Mrs. Herman's book appears at the right moment. The breakdown of "rationalism" is being followed by a revival of interest in mysticism, and unless the movement is guided by the Christian facts and forces, it may become quite as mischievous as bald rationalism. I know of no book on mysticism which so admirably holds the balance of truth as this of Mrs. Herman's. It is a book which should be in every minister's library. It will bear reading over and over again. The chapters are admirably arranged. There is a bibliography, while the get up of the book leaves nothing to be desired. And it is marvellously cheap in price.

F.C.S.

Our Destiny as Free Churches.

By Rev. T. GOLDSMITH FRENCH.

It is very probable that we have inherited from our Calvinistic forefathers some of the fatalism which enters into all English life. It is perhaps doing it too great justice to couple it with the great Genevan name; but it may be said perhaps to have some sanction in his teaching. It is the idea that because of a great heritage concerning which noble things can be still said therefore our destiny is safe whatever happens. It would be well for us to put aside as a most subtle foe any idea such as this. History has one thing to teach us more clearly than any other and taught it once and for all in the story of the Hebrew people, that a great destiny may be so far self-thwarted as to disappear almost entirely, if not for ever. It is necessary then that we should rid our minds of any idea that, because the principles we stand for are sound and good, we with our organisations become sharers in their permanence. So much by way of warning.

Now, it is quite clear that long before the present upheaval, many minds in many quarters had begun to ask grave questions concerning the destiny of the Free Churches. It may be said that many of the disturbing facts which call forth those questions are not peculiar to us, but we must not make too much of that. We have to deal faithfully and frankly with certain observed facts, statistics, moods and movements; these seem strange companions but are probably more nearly related than we care to realise. Concerning statistics enough has been said by the President of the Free Church Council recently. Concerning what we have called moods, it is enough to say that wherever representative men were gathered together for conference the gravest expressions of uneasiness were always to be heard, and there was no lack

of facts for their support. These facts had nothing to do with statistical returns, they were more concerned with what we may call the morale of our Free Churches. The observed facts would probably be the most disturbing feature of all if it were politic to record them in print. They include the falling away from us of many of our devoutest and most thoughtful sons and daughters and the undoubted gain of Anglicanism at our expense. Doubtless there are cases of defection where it is possible to say that the seceder can be well spared, but that is a statement which needs to be used very carefully and with the utmost conscientiousness. All these disturbing facts have so far affected our corporate life—if we may be said to have any—that some of the shrewdest observers have predicted a long period during which we may expect as Free Churches to be in the trough of the waves. The same observers hold the opinion that the after-war conditions will greatly accentuate this depression movement and maintain it.

When we begin to ask for causes a number of suggestions spring at once into mind, gathered from many sources during quiet conferences of many months. A few of them are worthy of record, and again of conscientious examination. To begin at the centre, the first of them perhaps is the comparative failure of Churchmanship—(to borrow a word)—no-where possibly so clearly discerned as now. Little interest is anywhere taken in the affairs of the Church as such, and this means that we have a large number of purely preaching stations. Let us hasten to add that this would be by no means an undesirable thing if at the same time no attempt were made to keep up a conventional Church life, or to put it in another way, if the idea of a local Church were frankly abandoned in favour of what we may still call a preaching station. The writer himself believes that the number of such centres for the proclamation of the one message will have to be increased, but he also believes

equally firmly that to attempt to organise a church at each of these stations has been, and still is, one of our greatest perils.

But the question is not one of organisation, it is essentially this—what value is set by the average member of our Churches upon the status, privileges and responsibility of membership? That question frankly asked and answered would probably cause no little surprise. Let us say at once that everyone can recall in a moment individuals to whom the ideal of a Church, with all its companion ideals of status, privilege and responsibility is very dear, and a formative influence in all they do. But to a large extent it is true that these are of an older generation. The link which binds the younger to the Church to-day is more often to be found in what we may call religious hobbies. Give them a little patch of garden of their own to cultivate and they are zealous early and late in their task. But for the larger garden, the all inclusive holy ground, with its central purpose, and its central Person, there is far less regard than is either sound or safe.

This is but one of many symptoms and the causes alleged are manifold; they cannot now be dealt with at any length. Some of them lie directly in our own hands, many of them lie in that outer atmosphere in which we are concerned as citizens.

For the moment, it is rather with the many suggested remedies that we are concerned. These can only be set out under a few brief general headings, for example; a restored theology (that is, a reversion to older types) a re-stated theology (that is, a quest for a new dogma in place of the old), and not least—a new Pentecost. It may fairly be said that these three points comprehend nearly all which is suggested save perhaps for one thing, namely, a fuller entry of the Church into the many present problems of social life. It is sufficient to say that so far as individual cases are concerned each one of these suggestions has facts in its

support, and each one also can produce many instances of failure. Personality counts for much, but let us say very emphatically that if we are to concede that what is called the personal equation is the deciding factor either for success or failure, we have gone a long way towards admitting that essential rightness or truth play quite a secondary part in the matter. Be that as it may, it is possible to find instances where an old theology, older even than the orthodox as we commonly know it, is undeniably powerful and successful; just as these are cases where a re-stated dogma, built especially to meet the modern mind, abjectly fails. We are led to the conclusion that the reception given to any theology is not a criterion of its rightness or wrongness. So also stands the matter as regards social enthusiasm; the ultra democratic church is very often distinguished by one feature only, that apparently, democracy has no use for it. We may go on with instance after instance of this kind; they simply serve as a warning against generalization. With regard to the remedy offered by the promise or hope of a new Pentecost, that is beyond all calculation; we dare not be-little it, but we should do well if we talked about it less, and spent more time in fulfilling as many of its conditions as we understand.

Apart from all these matters we do well to look across the confused face of things to certain indubitable defects in our own Church order, method and conditions. A few of these might call us to halt. We name great names or things when we begin to talk of our history and our destiny, freedom and the right of private judgment, simplicity, fidelity to scripture. These are mighty things; yet we need to be aware lest we do virtual wrong in their name. Look for instance at the testimony which we give to the community regarding central things. Few of us would deny that we desire unity, and that that unity can only rightly come round the central Person and fundamental facts of our faith. That Person and those facts we profess to find expressed in the exceedingly simple

symbol of the Lord's Supper. Purged from all the undesirable elements which purely ecclesiastical dogmas have added to it, it is the one centre for a visible actual community; it expresses in its completeness such a unity as cannot be attained by sitting side by side at the feet of the same human teacher, or joining in some common admiration for the genius of an exceptional preacher. Let us say bluntly that the congregations—all too common in latter days—which gather round influential teachers are often no more in essence than what we may call—Listening Clubs. There is not in them, of necessity, any element at all that belongs to the great Church of Christ in its proper conception. Therefore, if at the points where a true unity is possible, we Baptists fail, as it may be feared we do, what have we left? Nothing but the proclamation of a message varying in fidelity to truth, varying also in force and attractiveness. See then where we stand for whom this Magazine is issued; we belong to an association of Churches committed—as they would claim—to the central Person of Christ, and His sacrificial work. Yet for all that there is one thing that apparently we either cannot or will not do, that is, to express our unity in Him by united gathering at His Table for the one, all inclusive, symbol of our faith. The years come and go, individually we take our part in protestations concerning ex-communication by other Churches. We consider ourselves entitled to express an opinion upon the matters involved in such an Anglican controversy as that which gathered round the name of Kikuyu. Yet we hardly feel as we ought that in this we are entirely impudent, crassly and profoundly impudent; we who cannot meet unitedly for the great symbolic memorial of our redemption really have no standing or right to join in judgment upon ex-communication when practised by others. The thing which we condemn is implicitly and deeply ingrained in our own method and organisation, and the present writer has no doubt that until this deep seated ill

is removed we are shorn of half our strength. To a great extent the community at large has a right to say to us—Look at home! This matter is sufficiently crucial, and has been sufficiently stated to show what we have to do within our own borders. It is perfectly futile to plead fidelity to conscience—anyone can plead that—and it is equally disastrous to imagine that even if we observe this disunion no-one else does. It is not necessary that it should produce protest and revolt, it is enough that the atmosphere which it creates is bad for us, and bad for the community. Hence, we are inclined to say almost emphatically that we need as our special problem for war time, to consider not so much what we can do for the community—call it The World if you like—but rather to ponder the deeper question, whether we are really fit to do anything excepting to maintain preaching stations, where the eternal word is expounded in every degree of truth and effectiveness, ranging from inspiration of a very real kind, down to the mere vapourings of vain minds. When therefore we consider our destiny and ask gravely shall we live through the great years of re-construction which come with peace, we remember that there is a prior question—are we fit to live? Have we not good reasons to see to it that the weight of importance is shifted from our teaching function with its various meanings, to our place as a true portion of the Holy Catholic Church?

We have not used this last august term because of any associations of human dignity of noteworthy history attached to it, but only because we are bound to believe that the Holy Catholic Church is the one abiding community. Through all the years monarchies and heirarchies alike are but transient things; theologies even are in a state of flux perpetually; whereas the universal Church with its essential experience and faith has no relation to passing moods or impermanent powers. If we have anything in the shape of a

nostrum to suggest, capable of healing the manifold diseases of the world and Churches it is only by suggesting as we do that fidelity to the ideal of the Holy Church, the Body of Christ, is perhaps our one safeguard. Nothing else can do so much for us or deliver us from the pitiful chaos into which things Christian have come after 19 centuries of hope and endeavour. Visible unity is the all comprehending ideal, and with it must come devoutness, austerity, unchallengeable sanctity; all of them great terms, but all of them inseparable marks of the only Church which has any future. We may get what we will, and establish what records we like, multiply what activities may seem to be demanded, but if we lack these greater holier gifts we lack all. We belong to time, and to a very small portion of it, and lose our hold on Eternity. Our destiny is with the forgotten organisation of an ever-changing world.

Bishop Wilkinson's Preaching.

“There was no one who made one so entirely and vitally aware of the moving presence of a Spirit not his own. This was the marvel of his preaching. It brought the soul into the Presence. It brought the Invisible into full and urgent play. Yet how was this done? It was the personality of the man that brought it all about. He delivered the old message—the gospel message. We had all heard it a hundred times. But it had never before come home to us like this. Never before had we felt it to be a living thing that would lay hold and change us and regenerate and transfigure. *The man made it tell.* How was this? What made the manhood of the messenger so effectually an organ of Divine manifestation? I should say it lay in the remarkable combination in him of the mystical and the practical temper. He lived in direct and intimate touch with the

invisible world. This gave him his extraordinary power in private prayer and in public preaching.

But then, together with his mystical mood, involved in it, inseparable from it was a shrewd practical judgment that could hardly be surpassed. He was thoroughly business-like. He could push business through with excellent practical skill. He knew men, and never blundered over affairs, and took pains with little things, and ever kept his eyes on the business in hand. It was this that made him so amazing in his hold over the big laity of the West End. They would not have ventured to commit themselves so entirely to the mysterious emotion that he roused in them if they had not learned to trust him as a master in the practical judgments which they could thoroughly appreciate."

(CANON SCOTT HOLLAND in "A Bundle of Memories").

The Relation of the Minister with a Family to the Ministerial Settlement and Sustentation Federation.

By **PATERFAMILIAS.**

[The writer of the following is a country minister who sets out a case worthy of consideration. A valued official to whom the paper was submitted remarks, "If only our funds permit we should be only too glad to make provision for the children of needy ministers. Will the generosity of the denomination rise to it?—Ed.]

We understand that the Federation is a move towards the Connexional system of the various Methodist Societies. The aim has been to adopt what has been proved by long experience in these societies to be wise and beneficial. One of the earliest regulations which is almost inseparable from the Methodist Societies is that each minister shall receive from the Connexional funds a definite allowance for each child dependent upon him. The wisdom of some regulations

has been questioned at conference, and efforts made to modify or abolish them, but we have never read of even a suggestion being made at conference that this regulation should be abolished. Indeed we have heard Methodist authorities claim that no expenditure has made a better return to the Connexion than that which has been spent upon the children of ministers. It is a wholesome form of Christian Socialism. It recognises that the children of the godly are a heritage of the Lord. It also recognises that a minister's opportunities of increasing his income are severely limited and regards the whole Connexion as under an obligation to share in bearing the burden of the minister's family. The Primitive Methodists provide that each married man in addition to his stipend shall be allowed two shillings per week for each of his children under 18 years of age, born during his ministry. The Wesleyan Methodists allow six guineas per annum for each child. The writer once mentioned this subject to an ex-President of the Baptist Union. He sympathetically but despondently answered, "Our funds will not allow us to take the children into account." Is not this a reproach to the Denomination? Whilst the nation makes a definite allowance for the children of the soldier, shall our Denomination make no allowance from the Sustentation Fund for the children of its ministers? If we do not, we deserve to appeal in vain for suitable young men for the Ministry and Missionary Society. It is not enough to say that under the administration of the Fund each case will be carefully considered and the family responsibilities taken into account. In our judgment that will not meet the case. What is required is that a definite allowance be fixed for each child which shall be regarded as a first charge upon the Fund. We cannot expect the Fund to make at first such a liberal allowance as the Methodists, but can there not be a beginning, by making an allowance of a shilling per week for each child under 14 years of age to each recognised minister whose

Church requires aid. Such a distribution would be consistent with the public utterances made in appealing for gifts to the Fund. It would give most effectual help to the man, who from the platform, has been most often paraded as the man most deserving help. If under the new scheme he be not re-elected it would help him to get another Church by lessening the hesitation often felt by the smaller and poorer churches in inviting a man with a family. And we must remember that it is the minister whose gifts fit him for serving the poorer churches who is under consideration. Unless this course be adopted the family man may find himself in a worse position under the new than the old conditions. At present he can remain in his church where he has loyal friends who have learned to love him and appreciate his work. Under the new conditions, the quinquennial election may come just at the time when the family burden is heaviest. One or two discontented persons who give little towards the support of the ministry and therefore never long appreciate it, may secretly persuade others. The minister is not re-elected by the two-thirds majority, his name is sent to the vacant churches as open for supplies with a view. At each church to which he is invited to preach he is asked, "What family have you?" And unless he can explain that so much extra will be allowed for each child, the man with fewer or no children will be chosen in preference. Thus the man to whom the following ordeal will be most trying, will be the man most likely to be called to face it. He may be stationed "as a minister in charge for one year." If he removes with his family the expenses will be heavy. The Church to which he is sent will not be likely to pay expenses, the Sustentation Fund, which could not make an extra allowance for children in the first place will not do so now. He will be impoverished or embarrassed by debt. If to avoid this he takes lodgings or journeys to and fro, he will not be able to do his best work. In three years time he may find himself "fired out" of the Baptist ministry not because he was inefficient, but because he has a family.

The Doctrine of the Atonement.

By Rev. H. J. WICKS, B.A., D.D.

In the great creeds of Christendom, recited constantly by myriads of people all over the world, the declaration is made that the Church believes in Jesus Christ her Lord, Who "suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried." That statement stands written in the creeds rightly. For the Christian Gospel is not a system of theological ideas excogitated from the brains of brilliant thinkers. Rather, it is a set of historic facts plus a divinely revealed interpretation of those facts. And its supremely important fact, its central doctrine, is that Christ died on the Cross as the sacrifice for the salvation of mankind.

It is of vital consequence to the Church that this fact and this doctrine should be constantly given its due place in Christian preaching and Christian thinking. If it be denied or obscured, we doom ourselves to spiritual languor and powerlessness. The experience of the Church and of the individual Christian confirms Godet's judgment that this doctrine "is the very nerve of the Christian life." "Christianity deprived of this," he says, "becomes nothing more than a sword with its edge blunted, powerless both in the hands of the missionary to strike down other religions, and of the private Christian to strike a mortal blow at the old man." The institution of the Lord's Supper shows plainly that the one fact which Christ supremely desired to keep for ever in the minds of His people was His sacrificial death. Preachers have sometimes failed to set it before the minds of men as they ought to do; but the Saviour Himself, by His own holy ordinance, is continually calling upon His disciples to remember His death. He is perpetually reminding us of the centrality of the Cross in the true Catholic faith.

But while it is of the utmost consequence that we should keep the great fact in memory, it is also most necessary that we should conceive aright its significance. We know indeed that men are not saved by holding orthodox views. Salvation comes by the right attitude of the soul to the living Christ. Nevertheless, the doctrine rightly understood is a powerful means for creating the true attitude. But it has frequently been distorted, misrepresented and misunderstood to the great detriment of Christianity. So treated it has wrought the gravest mischief, repelling thoughtful minds and creating hostility to the Faith. It is therefore a prime duty of Christian teachers to think carefully, to revise their ideas, and to speak advisedly on this most deep and most critically important doctrine.

In a brief article like this, it will be well to limit ourselves to a consideration of our Lord's own words about the Cross. It has been well observed that the Lord said less about it than His apostles, and that this is most natural since, of course, the recipients of a great gift will dwell more upon the wonder and the cost of it than the giver does. Nevertheless, it may be fairly maintained that substantially Christ and His Apostles give us the same doctrine. All their teaching on this matter is confirmed by the words of the Lord. So I confine myself now to this one question: What does our Lord Himself teach on this subject?

(1) He teaches that His death is His own voluntary act. He is the Good Shepherd who lays down His life for the flock. But that illustration might mislead us. The shepherd dies mastered by the wolf. It is not so in the case of Jesus. "I lay down My life. No man taketh it away from Me but I lay it down of Myself." Sacrifice He is. Victim He is not. He is not helpless when confronted by Jewish hatred and Roman power. Further, we read that Jesus began to show unto His disciples how that He must go unto Jerusalem and suffer many things . . . and be killed." He *must*.

Some deep inward necessity constrained Him to die. What was it? Does He tell us? Remember the thought which sustained Him when He was moved to cry out "Father, save me from this hour." It was that the corn of wheat must fall into the ground and die or be unfruitful. Even so His death was necessary to his work in the world. "I, if I be lifted up," He said, "will draw all men unto Me." If—it was to His mind a condition precedent to His becoming the Saviour of men.

Again, He says, "The Son of Man is come to give His life a ransom for many." It was, as Dr. Fairbairn says, *the* work He came to do. Christ does not explain how, but clearly He teaches that in some way His death will be the means of ransoming men, and in still plainer terms He declares that His blood is shed for the remission of sins. It is therefore manifest that according to Jesus His death is the means of our salvation. If now we try to interpret such words of Him who is for us the incarnate Truth of God, there are some ideas which ought to be dismissed at once. We ought not to say that God punished Christ for our sins. I venture to characterise that as a revolting idea neither countenanced by Scripture nor by the moral sense. We must also put on one side altogether all those misrepresentations of the Cross by which the idea is suggested that God is strict justice and Christ is pure love. That contradicts the New Testament teaching entirely. Christ is the image of God Whose glory we behold in His face, and the Apostolic view is that God establishes His own love toward us by means of the Cross, that it was the Father Who sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world.

For myself, I would be very chary also in the use of illustrations. They may so easily mislead. They may irritate the thoughtful hearer because, as he will clearly discern, there is frequently no real light cast upon the subject by the so-called illustration. And it has been wisely said that

although "truth embodied in a tale may enter in at lowly doors," yet there is "always the danger that a good deal that is not truth may enter in with it." But if an earnest enquirer should ask "Why was that death necessary to procure salvation?" a duly instructed teacher of the Faith might well make answer in humble and frank fashion somewhat thus:—I can give you partial explanations, but I cannot furnish a complete answer to your question. We are spiritual minors as yet. The wisest and most learned amongst us has not come to his majority. Now we see in a mirror darkly but by and by face to face. Now we know in part but then "the power of the eyes will be raised" so as to see more distinctly. We shall fully know then even as now we are fully known. But in all departments of our knowledge we seek to ascertain our facts first and afterwards we try to get their interpretation, nor do we reject facts even in the absence of a satisfying explanation. We cannot even devise a thorough explanation of so clear a fact as that we see one another when impressions are made on the retina. Consciousness is one thing. The retina is quite another. One is material. The other is immaterial. Their interrelation is a baffling psychological mystery, which no man can elucidate. But we must accept the unexplained facts. So we Christians, recognizing the Saviour as our infallible Master in things spiritual, receive from Him the fact that but for His death we should have been lost. We do rightly when we make it very personal, after the manner of St. Paul when he says "He loved me and gave Himself for me."

(2) Still the active human mind must search for explanation, and the truth is more powerful for life if, and as, we succeed in getting it. Pursuing therefore our enquiry, we find two other views of that death which our Lord offers. One is this—His Cross was the inevitable upshot of His work in the world. He was the Martyr hounded to death by His foes because of His loyalty to God and to duty. In the Gospels

we see three features of His conduct provoking bitterest hostility. He witnesses to truth against falsehood, exposing the so-called righteousness of the scribes. He declines to lend His sanction to the artificialities which are the curse of Pharisaic religion, stirring His men to a wholesome independence of thought and action, disregarding fasts and Sabbatic rules. He shows love for men whom class prejudice despises, by His habit of fraternising with those who are regarded as outside the pale of respectability. He exercises an influence too great to be disregarded. It is impossible to treat Him as a negligible quantity. He exposes Himself to deadliest opposition, and that culminates in the Cross—naturally, He being what He is and the world about Him being what it is. So Jesus paid the penalty of His faithful witness to the truth. He was *martus* in both senses of that word—witness and martyr. Thus He became the Example and Leader of men. Nor could He use His supernatural powers to evade the Cross. If He had done that, He would not have been the brother and pattern of all such as must needs suffer for the sake of righteousness. To be *that*, it was clearly needful that He should endure the natural effects of His fidelity, and He calls our attention pointedly to that aspect of His work. Peter says that He left us an example that we should follow His steps, and Peter does but echo His Lord. “If any man,” Jesus said, “would come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow Me.”

The other view is this. The Cross, according to the Saviour, is the glorifying of Himself and of His Father. (St. John XIII 31.) How does the Cross glorify God? The answer surely is that God is glorified when and as His Character is fully made known. “The heavens declare His glory,” the glory of His wisdom and His enduring power. But His glory is only fully revealed when His *love* is made manifest. “God establishes His love towards us in that

while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." That only becomes an intelligible statement when we keep in mind the full orb'd Christian doctrine as to the rank of Jesus in the scale of being, His infinite greatness as the Eternal Son of God, and when we realise that for us men and our salvation God gave that Son of His love to become man and to suffer the Cross. Love supremely reveals itself in sacrifice. But all God's bounteous and overflowing gifts involve no sacrifice. They do not impoverish the Infinite one whit. It is in the Cross alone that we see God making the costliest sacrifice for His fallen children. There alone we realise His love fully. That love is only revealed in the Gospel all whose sum^{is}, in the immortal words of Hooker, "that man hath sinned and God hath suffered." Therefore in the Cross God is glorified. What He is we never know till we see Jesus the Crucified Saviour of mankind.

(3) Now in all this lies partly at least, largely as I think, the answer to our question—Why did Jesus need to die for our salvation?

For as some one has finely and truly said, we have to distinguish between the love that gives and the love that forgives. Love that gives may more freely scatter its bestowments. Love that would forgive meets with graver obstacles. Pardon, pure and simple without any regard to the condition of the offender, would be disastrous to mankind, and forgiveness which is the making of a new friendship between God and man is *impossible* in the very nature of things apart from a true repentance. On the other hand, we may reverently say that if a man be penitent, God cannot but forgive him. Repentance is the one and only thing which He requires from offending man. He does not need to be persuaded to become merciful. He is merciful by His own nature, endlessly, infinitely, unspeakably merciful. Beyond all our power to conceive He is gracious. But the coming of His Son to our world, culminating inevitably in the Cross,

is the one great act by which God supremely reveals Himself to His creature, and it changes human hearts and lives as nothing else ever did or could.

Just because it is the cause of the great change in us, it becomes the means by which God is enabled to do that which He always longs to do. It is the ground of the Divine forgiveness. "We have our redemption in His blood, even the forgiveness of our sin."

I have been dealing with the profoundest of subjects, greatly daring, but not in the temper of one who vainly imagines he has sounded all its mysterious depths with his poor little plummet. Rather, I trust to be forgiven by the God of all grace and by my brothers in the holy ministry for any failure in discerning and setting forth the truth. But this is the best explanation of the great doctrine that I can see. It is well put in the words of Dr. Marcus Dods, "By being the source of fruitful penitence the death of Christ removes the radical obstacle in the way of forgiveness."

How shall we Think and Speak concerning the War?

By Rev. J. H. RUSHBROOKE, M.A.

The Editor has thrust on me a task of immense difficulty by exacting a promise to write a general article as to the attitude which Baptist ministers ought to take towards the War. It has been my duty for some time past to collect documents and information as to the meaning of this world struggle, and so many aspects of it call for consideration that I find myself seriously embarrassed. Two attempts to fulfil the Editor's wish have already been laid aside, and I now restrict myself to the presentation of a few points without any attempt at detailed discussion.

(1) First of all, we Baptists are not committed to the doctrine of "peace at any price," unless the words are interpreted in the sense which Dale gave to them in the famous speech in which he declared his adhesion to "peace at any price—even at the price of war." It is a simple matter of history that we have not adopted the Quaker position. We recognise that international harmony is a vast blessing, ardently to be desired and sought, and that war is horrible beyond description. After the happenings of the last twenty months we are more firmly convinced than ever that war must disappear from earth, and that the main effort of statesmanship in the realm of international relations must be directed to eliminating the possibility of armed conflict. But we are not bound by a narrow and literalistic interpretation of a few texts (*e.g.* "Resist not"), which can easily be countered by an equally blind interpretation of others—has not Bernhardt made great play with "I came not to send peace on earth but a sword"? Nor are we committed to the monstrous proposition that

offensive and defensive war are on the same moral plane, or to the view of "force" as essentially evil. We know or should know that peace is not a gift of God to be received apart from its appropriate conditions. In the personal life peace is dependent upon the repentance of the sinner; in social life on just relation between classes and individuals in the community; in international affairs on goodwill and righteous conduct between the nations. A greater good than peace is righteousness, apart from which "peace" has a purely negative and even a degraded sense. No inconsiderable share of responsibility for the collision of armies to-day rests upon "pacifists" who have never really studied the foundations of peace, or laboured to remove the conditions which made for conflict, and who now in the throes of the world-strife have little to offer but a negative, barren and unethical formula, which the conscience of their countrymen refuses to endorse.

(2) We have then to estimate the factors that have produced the present strife and to seek a just judgment. I write as one who hates war with all his soul, and who toiled hard to avert this particular struggle. It was my privilege for several years to serve on the Committee of the British Council of Churches for the cultivation of friendship between the British and German Empires. The responsibility of writing its official magazine was entrusted to me, and with others I took part in visits to Germany and in offering welcome here to representatives of the German Churches. All through that work we were conscious of the enormous dangers to peace represented not merely by political and commercial factors involving acute friction from time to time, but by deep differences of outlook characteristic of the Churches on the two sides of the North Sea. In Britain—and the same is true of the United States of America and many other neutral lands—ideals of peace governed the Churches as a whole; their tone was anti-militarist; they

warmly supported such efforts towards international organisation as were represented by Hague conferences and the increasing powers of the Hague Tribunal. Anything like glorification of war has been conspicuously absent from the British Churches for many years past. Our German brethren had another tone and outlook. Pride in their army, a patriotism that extolled military service as the first and chief of national duties, a suspicion of any extension of international authority, was characteristic of them. It must be remembered that on the British side the Free Churches represent nearly half the worshipping population of the land, and that the driving force in the British Council of Churches was largely that of the non-established communities, whilst on the German side the State Churches counted for everything, and the small Free Churches represented literally a negligible quantity. All through our work, therefore, we were aware that if unhappily a crisis should arise it was too probable that the German Churches' Council, whose members stood in such close relation with the State, would prove of little value. We held nevertheless to our work in the hope that time would permit of its achieving some success, and that close intercourse would lead to an approximation of ideals. The task was supremely difficult. We were out for world-peace and for friendship with Germany in order to end a serious menace to world-peace; but the other side were—to state the case mildly—not a few who regarded world-peace as a chimera, with at least some who would have been entirely content if they could have detached us from France and who could not understand that we wished to win new friendships without sacrificing old. That our special effort failed is no matter for surprise; the event has proved that we, and the very small group which on the other side shared our ideals, had never more than a desperate chance of success. The thought of the German Churches moved in another plane to that of our Churches. As to the particular

issues that led to the War there is little need to write. Dernburg, the Kaiser's special representative in Washington for many months, has in an article published this year admitted that time for reflection "was perhaps lacking on both sides" in August, 1914. That is the fatal fact, and Dernburg could not be expected to add what all the world knows, that time was lacking because Austria and Germany launched ultimatums with time limits, and every proposal of delay or suggested method of settlement was wrecked on the obstinate determination of Germany to force war. Bernhardi may not have been widely read in Germany, but his master Treitschke, has been widely read, and Bernhardi has done little more than to blurt out in concrete and clumsy fashion the meaning which the present generation of Prussian militarists had found in Treitschke and other teachers. The "scrap of paper" conversation should never be forgotten; there is more illumination in it than in a thousand other details. Harden, with his blunt avowal that Germany did make the war, and intended to make it, merely asserts what is unquestioned except by those who have political reasons for obscuring the facts.

To those who, in face of the story of the days immediately preceding August 4th, 1914, persist in casting responsibility upon Britain by pointing to earlier periods of diplomatic conflicts, I would answer in brief—(1) that I hold no brief for the faultlessness of British diplomacy, it is human; (2) that the main faults alleged—secrecy of procedure, etc.—do not affect the issue as between ourselves and our chief enemy; (3) that the suggestion that Sir Edward Grey strove for war or followed a course that must needs issue in war, is simply false; no truer lover of peace lives; (4) that the radical fault of this whole body of criticism consists in simple ignorance of fundamental differences of national and personal outlook. Arguments are based on the language of documents without the slightest appreciation of the fact that the temper of the

negotiators is far more important than what they wrote or said. Not half the story is yet told of Britain's efforts to find a *modus vivendi* with Germany from the days when Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's Government put forward its disarmament proposals to the colonial negotiations that immediately preceded the War. They who—against all the evidence—insist that Britain has played “dog in the manger” in respect of colonial acquisitions by Germany (and this is the most obstinate and widespread of all legends) may be referred to the articles of Sir Harry Johnson. Those who regard our resentment at the violation of Belgium as but a convenient pretext are unacquainted with the history of the nineteenth century, during which the issue of Belgian neutrality more than once arose and British policy was defined not merely against Germany but against France; nor have they any reply to the plain fact that at the moment of that violation we were bound by definite obligations—three generations old and repeatedly defined—as to the kind of assistance we should offer to Belgium. It is hard to understand the attitude of those who persist in unjust accusations of their own country; the cause of the Kingdom of God is certainly not furthered by the assumption that Britain is always and necessarily wrong.

(3) Another issue on which clear judgment is demanded concerns the methods by which the war has been pursued. It would be affectation and hypocrisy to pretend that there have not been faults and wrongs on our side; war offers terrible temptations to undisciplined passion, and military service does not produce saints. But the superior persons who are content to say that recriminations are natural to war, and that every charge is met by a corresponding counter-charge, are acting contemptibly. Apparently they consider themselves absolved from the responsibility of judging because of the conflict of evidence—as if almost every verdict had not to be delivered in view of contradictory statements.

Against us—I pass over the wild rhodomontades of Sir Roger Casement, and the vague charges as to dum-dum bullets and so forth, and deal with genuine charges—there are two grave accusations of a definite kind. One concerns the treatment of missionaries in the Cameroons, and the other the “Baralong” incident. * The charges as to our treatment of missionaries have been fully investigated (I had a personal share in urging the Colonial Office to enquire, and found that the “urging” was quite unnecessary); the British report now given to the world is a decisive vindication. As to the “Baralong” incident, Sir Edward Grey has offered to have the matter brought to trial before a neutral court, but Germany prefers to keep it open. On the other hand what of the missionaries killed by German torpedoes? What of the thousands of non-combatants who have perished on the sea? What of the midnight murder by Zeppelins? What of Belgium? The charges are proven, even admitted and gloried in. Only the Belgian facts are in dispute, and there the proofs are overwhelming. Not to speak of Lord Bryce’s report, let anyone read the noble letter of the Belgian bishops to the cardinals and bishops of Germany, Bavaria and Austria-Hungary, dated November 24th, 1915, with its hideous array of facts, and its demand for impartial enquiry and justice. He does a monstrous wrong to our country who regards her mode of carrying on war as for one instant on the level of that of Germany. The German war book is now accessible to the public in an English translation by Professor J. H. Morgan, and unjust judgment is inexcusable.

(4) The War presents itself as on our side a necessary resistance to the world-rule of brute force unrestrained by moral considerations. “But the Germans say it is on their

*There have also been charges and countercharges as to the conditions and treatment of prisoners in detention camps in both lands. Here in the main the evidence demonstrates on both sides there was deficient accommodation in the early days of the war, and that individual officers in charge of prisoners have not acted well. But general charges of deliberate and systematic cruelty fail.

side defensive." Precisely, and the nation as a whole believes it to be so. I incline to write, "Thank God it does," for the situation would be intolerable if the German people had taken its stand on a full view of the facts. It was and is deceived, and its hatred rests on deception. The spirit of violence has been conjured up by the representatives of Prussian militarism, and has now passed beyond their control so that it menaces themselves unless they offer it an ever-enlarging satisfaction in new forms of "frightfulness."

We have to set ourselves against reprisals. And it is well to realise what is rightly meant by that. To meet new weapons and methods with similar weapons and methods directed strictly against armed forces and military posts is legitimate; to meet midnight murder of civilians and submarine assassination of sailors and travellers with like methods would be criminal. The British Churches are sound on the issue, but there are violent individuals in Parliament and elsewhere, and the national conscience and honour must be safeguarded.

Further, we have to take every advantage of the presence of innocent enemy aliens in our midst to display kindness and even generosity. There is no better investment in the interests of the future than time and effort spent in mitigating the lot of the "stranger within our gates" and especially of the interned in the camps, the monotony of whose days is soul-destroying. Indeed, I hold it a sacred duty of these terrible days to preserve every personal friendship that serves as even a feeble link between the hostile lands, and may hereafter help to build a bridge of national friendship.

(5) It cannot be too clearly recognised that in the nature of the case mere military success can never achieve the great ends for which the Allies are fighting. They wish to rid the world of the menace of militarism. But militarism is a disease of the spirit. In Germany its development is due to a vast illusion—one might say a double illusion, that the security of the land rests entirely upon armed force, and that attack

is the best means of defence. Once let it become clear to the German people that by its method security has been forfeited, and the lives and property of the people vainly sacrificed—in other words, that the militarist clique has failed to gain for the country the only benefits that might be regarded as commensurate with the tremendous sacrifices the system involves—the illusion will vanish, and the country will set itself to search for a better way. At present I do not see the signs of repentance in Germany (though there is increasing evidence that its rulers know that the extravagant hopes with which they entered upon war are doomed to disappointment), but future possibilities of calamity or blessing will largely depend upon the readiness of the Allies to respond at once to any change of mood and to make clear to the German that Mr. Asquith's formula as to the destruction of Prussian militarism never meant the destruction of a nation. Such destruction would in the long run prove impossible; if this were our purpose it would be as impolitic and eventually as ruinous to ourselves as it would be fundamentally unjust. There is a danger lest the passions aroused by a prolonged struggle, and the righteous resentment at the methods of our foe, should lead to the adoption of a policy, in war or trade, or both, of mere vengeance. In such a policy we could have no part or lot.

(6) I have no space for detailed reference to the problems of conscience just now raised by the Military Service Act. A few words are nevertheless needful. Clearly the victory of Germany in the present war would involve the militarism of all Europe, including our own country and our brethren who are opposing military service to-day—whether voluntary or under the terms of the recent Act—are unconsciously doing their utmost to fasten it for all coming time in far more serious form upon ourselves and our children's children. They must follow their conscience, and they stand or fall to their own Master; but I confess that the

attitude of many awakens in me an intense resentment. It is often tainted with a most unfortunate pharisaism, which entirely fails to recognise that a conscientious conviction of another kind has led multitudes of our young men to accept losses, wounds and death. When conscientious conviction involves such consequences its reality is indisputable. I freely and fully concede that conviction may in other cases also be genuine, but any man who finds conscience bidding him choose a way of comparative safety, ease, and even financial advantage, ought to make himself very certain that it is conscience that determines his choice. And we who cannot enter into the secrets of the soul are bound to insist that where the presumption of honest conviction is present local tribunals shall respect the freedom which the law itself acknowledges. The sneers of members of some tribunals at the plea of conscience have been discreditable, and with their attitude Free Churchmen can have no sympathy. Our claim for respect to our own convictions implies a duty to recognise the right of men of differing convictions the similar respect.

(7) Above all, the call to earnest prayer must be uttered and heard. It becomes increasingly clear that civilization has miserably failed, and that nothing will save the present or safeguard the future except a new hold on God. We ought to pray not for our victory—deeply as we hope for it—but for a spiritual transformation of our people that will make them fit to do effectively the work of God in the world; and then “the Lord do what seemeth Him good.” We ought to pray for the conversion of Germany that the great and now so sadly misused powers of its people may become an instrument in the service of the Kingdom of God. False thinking is at the back of this war, and above all a false doctrine of the State, from which our land is not free, though the doctrine has never gained here the exclusive dominance it has elsewhere; we ought to pray to be kept from idolatry. The resources of the Christian Church are not limited by the

visible and calculable with which politicians and statesmen deal; her faith is in God. She is called to wait upon God, to explore the resources that are in Him; may we not say, to challenge Him to prepare her and use her in ways adequate to the vast and urgent needs of the day? "The kind of world that emerges after the war," writes Mr. E. A. Burroughs, "will depend on the extent to which God comes in to overrule the evil; and that in turn on the extent to which our faith releases His power."

Prayer Union Notes.

By Rev. J. W. EWING, M.A., D.D.

The "Spiritual Welfare" of the Churches is a theme which may well engage the thought of members of the Prayer Union. Just now things are not going quite well with us. While figures are not everything, the statistics given in the new "Baptist Hand Book" cannot be ignored, showing, as they do, that during the past year the membership of our churches in the British Isles has declined by 3,176, and the number of our Sunday scholars by 13,941.

It may be that these decreases are in part due to special conditions created by the War—thousands of our lads having gone from Sunday Schools to the Army, and not all having been retained upon the roll, while many, both of our scholars and of our young Church members have died for their country—but there is a general feeling that such considerations do not at all account for the position, and that we really need a new spiritual quickening throughout the land.

Shall we not pray that guidance may be given to our leaders who are anxiously considering what may best be done to meet the situation? We must somehow get into closer touch with our Master.

When these notes appear, we shall be on the eve of the Spring meetings. From every part of the land our forces will be rallying for our great annual assemblies. What will be the outcome? Shall we separate, having simply tasted the pleasure of friendly re-unions, received the stimulus of inspiring speeches, and felt the thrill of a multitude? May God grant that something far deeper may result—the unsealing of fountains of spiritual power in many lives, and the enkindling of a new love and hope in the heart of the Denomination!

One of the brightest signs of to-day is the movement among our ministers towards quiet communion with God and one another, represented by the “Retreats” which are being held. Some do not care for the name, but it is difficult to suggest a better, and after all it is the fact that counts. One cannot forget Pentecost and its sequel; and one longs that to those who meet in the upper chambers of to-day there may come a new enduement of the Spirit of Christ.

There are great possibilities in the movement. Could not the ministers of a town arrange a retreat? Or those of a country? Someone may say “I can pray alone,” and it is true, but it is also true that there is a special promise attached to the prayer in which there is concert of desire and faith, the agreement of hearts attuned to one another and to Christ.

Another of the signs of the time is the call to union among diverse churches sounded by our own leader and friend, Mr. Shakespeare. It will certainly be a great gain if the Free Churches come together in a more sympathetic spirit, to work loyally together for the common ends of the kingdom, and to avoid the competition now so often hurtful. May the Spirit of all wisdom guide the Churches in their consideration of this large question!

The devotional classic I have chosen for this number is William Law's "Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life," a book which, appearing in the early eighteenth century, contributed to the shaping of modern English Christianity.

Law, born in 1688, was trained at Cambridge for the ministry of the Church of England, but on accession of George I. became a "non-juror," refusing to take the oaths of allegiance to the new dynasty and of objuratation of the Stuarts. He in consequence, lost all prospect of employment in "the Church."

Shut out from pastoral ministry Law turned to literature and, after some less-known works, produced in 1729 "The Serious Call." He was living at the time with the Gibbon family, as tutor of the father of the future historian and "friend and spiritual director." of the whole household. His book, which was a summons to religious reality, woke a responsive chord in many hearts, and Law was sought after by not a few disciples, chief among whom were the Wesleys. Through the Wesleys, Law influenced the great revival movement soon to break forth.

The keynote of "The Serious Call" is *obedience to the will of God*. Law places reason in a secondary position—we cannot understand our relation to God, but we may know and do His Will. This message was called forth by the special conditions of the time. It was the age of rationalism, and even in the churches faith and fire were dying low. Law sought two things—sincerity and practice. He demanded out and out fidelity to conscience and the Gospel. There was only one standard for ministry and laity. *All must be given to God—every day, every power, every possession.*

In its insistence upon fixed hours of prayer—the third, the sixth, the ninth—the book anticipates Methodist rules.

In its style it often recalls the "Spectator." It presents characters in dramatic form as imagined persons. When one reads of "Flavia" or "Miranda," of "Paternus" or "Eusebia," one is reminded of Addison and Steele.

But its dominating note is not the literary, but the religious. The book is intensely in earnest. The following is quoted respecting it from the annals of a later church movement. "Froude told me," says Isaac Williams, "that Keble once, before parting from him, seemed to have something on his mind which he wished to say, but shrank from saying. At last, while waiting, I think, for a coach, he said to him before parting: 'Froude, you said one day that Law's *Serious Call* was a clever (or pretty, I forget which) book; it seemed to me as if you had said the Day of Judgment would be a pretty sight.'"

A handy edition is that published by the F. A. Stokes' Company, with introduction by Dr. C. Bigg.