

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

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine and Review

CONDUCTED BY
CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN OF THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. XXX.

(NEW SERIES, VOL. XI.)

LONDON : ROBERT SCOTT, PUBLISHER
ROXBURGHE HOUSE, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

1916

Robert Scott, Roxburghe House, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.

INDEX TO VOLUME XXX

SUBJECTS

PAGE		PAGE
<p>"Ambassador of Christ, The," by the Bishop of Chelmsford . . . 88</p> <p>Archbishop Leighton, The Spirit of, by the Rev. Canon John Vaughan . . . 453</p> <p>"As our Hope is," by Bishop Ryle, D.D. . . . 167</p> <p>Atonement in the Writings of St. John, The, by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, B.D. . . . 7, 136, 200</p> <p>Authority and Authorities in the Church of England, by the Rev. C. H. K. Boughton, B.D. 304, 384, 439</p> <p>Call of the Mission, The, by the Bishop of Chelmsford . . . 679</p> <p>Changed Relations of Science and Religion, The, by the Rev. Canon Bonney, LL.D. . . . 521</p> <p>Christ the Hope of the Nations, by the Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A. . . . 745</p> <p>Church, The, and To-day, by the Rev. C. Grant, M.A. . . . 766</p> <p>Church, The: The Need of a Fearless Message and a Definite Witness, by the Rev. S. A. Johnston . . . 431</p> <p>Church and Social Reconstruction after the War, The, by the Rev. Professor Bethune-Baker, D.D. . . 627</p> <p>Church and State, Report of the Archbishop's Committee on . . . 533</p> <p>Church of England and the Evangelical Spirit, The, by the Rev. J. R. S. Taylor, M.A. . . . 653</p> <p>Clergy and National Irreligion, by the Rev. C. D. Fothergill, M.A. . . 647</p> <p>Decree of the First Church Council, The, by the Rev. A. C. Jennings, M.A. . . . 295</p> <p>Emily Brontë's Poetry, by J. C. Wright . . . 660</p> <p>England and Rome, temp. Charles II., by the Rev. G. S. Streatfeild, M.A. . . . 57</p> <p>"Exceptional Case" of Cornelius, The, by the Rev. W. S. Hooton, B.D. . . . 489</p> <p>First Battle of Armageddon, The, by the Rev. Walter R. Whately, M.A. . . . 17</p> <p>Fulfilment of Prophecy, The, by the Rev. A. H. T. Clarke, M.A. . . 239</p> <p>George Wither, of Bentworth, by the Rev. S. R. Cambie, B.D. . . . 119</p> <p>"Glad Tidings of Reconciliation, The," by the Rev. E. Abbey Tindall, M.A. . . . 249</p> <p>Hooker, Richard and the Holy Communion, by the Rev. S. Harvey Gem, I and II . . . 183, 263</p> <p>Humanists and the Eve of the Reformation, The, by the Rev. S. Harvey Gem, M.A. . . . 757</p>	<p>Hooper, John, Bishop and Martyr, by the Rev. C. Sidney Carter . . . 513</p> <p>Impressions at Mass, by "W. B." . . 751</p> <p>Johnson, Dr., and His Times, by B. Braithwaite . . . 332, 395</p> <p>Kikuyu, and our Relations with Nonconformists, by the Rev. H. A. Wilson . . . 125</p> <p>Lacordaire, by the Rev. Alexander Henderson, M.A. . . . 776</p> <p>Liquor Traffic and State Control, The, by the Rev. I. Gregory Smith, LL.D. . . . 771</p> <p>Loveless Charity, by the Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A. . . . 37</p> <p>Message of the War to the Clergy, The, by the Rev. C. T. Wood, M.A. . . . 695</p> <p>Miracle and the New Testament, by the Rev. Marcus E. W. Johnson, A.K.C. . . . 634, 689</p> <p>Missionary World, The, 66, 143, 209, 274, 340, 405, 465, 528, 595, 664, 728, 786</p> <p>Month, The, 1, 81, 161, 225, 289, 353, 417, 481, 545, 609, 673, 377</p> <p>Naaman and Gehazi, by the Rev. A. C. Downer, D.D. . . . 424</p> <p>National Mission, and the Need of Instruction in a Method of Prayer, The, by the Rev. M. W. Conran, S.S.J.E., C.F. . . . 317</p> <p>National Mission and Missions, The, by the Ven. A. E. Moule, D.D. . . . 719</p> <p>Necessity of Dogma, The, by the Rev. S. C. Carpenter, M.A. . . . 582</p> <p>Need for Re-Asserting the English Character of the Church of England, by the Rev. Professor W. Emery Barnes, D.D. . . . 551</p> <p>Need of a New Ideal of Preaching, The, by the Rev. A. J. Tait, D.D. . . 701</p> <p>Need of Definiteness, The, by the Rev. Preb. Fox . . . 566</p> <p>Non-Communicating Attendance, by the Rev. A. E. Moys . . . 505</p> <p>Notices of Books, 71, 150, 214, 280, 345, 410, 471, 538, 599, 668, 734, 792</p> <p>Permissive Use of Vestments and Reservation, The, by the Rev. G. Estwick Ford . . . 43</p> <p>Poetry; The Secret of Peace, by William Olney . . . 438</p> <p>Prayers for the Dead: A Reply, by the Rev. Andrew Given, M.A. . . 588</p> <p>Publications of the Month, 79, 158, 224, 286, 351, 414, 479, 541, 607</p> <p>Reformers and the Communion Service, The, by the Rev. R. Mercer Wilson . . . 107</p>	

	PAGE
Resurrection of the Body, The, by the Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D.	177
Revelation, The Book of: Its Symbols and their Meaning, by the Rev. A. H. T. Clarke	495
Romance of the Catechism, The, by Miss E. M. Knox	193
St. Paul's Views of the Body and Death Contrasted with Plato's, by the Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D.	558
Samuel Rutherford and His Letters, by the Rev. W. J. Latham	711
Spiritual Problems of the Great War, The—	
I. The Call of the War, by the Rev. L. George Buchanan	97
II. The Cross Among the Ruins, by the Rev. E. A. Burroughs, M.A.	231
III. The Common Life of Men and Women, by Miss M. C. Gollock	359
Sunday School and Confirmation, by the Rev. F. S. Guy Warman, D.D.	28

	PAGE
Symon Patrick, by the Rev. Harold Smith, M.A.	575
Theological Reorientation, by the Rev. J. Kenneth Mozley, M.A. . . .	640
Theological Reorientation, A Reply, by the Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft, M.A.	706
Validity, by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D.	619
War and the Other World, The, by the Rev. A. Plummer, D.D.	
I. Introductory	173
II. Is there an Other World	258
III. What can be known about the Other World	325
IV. Can those who are in one World influence Those who are in the Other?	377
War Time Missionary Sermon, A, by the Bishop of Winchester	368
What do we expect from the National Mission? by Mrs. Ashley Carus Wilson	320
Will this War result in a Revival of Sacerdotalism? by Lieut.-Col. Seton Churchill	459

AUTHORS

	PAGE
Barnes, Rev. Professor Emery, D.D.	551
Bethune-Baker, Rev. Professor, D.D.	627
Bonney, Rev. Canon, LL.D.	521
Boughton, Rev. C. H. K., B.D.	
304, 384, 439	
Braithwaite, B.	332, 395
Buchanan, Rev. L. George	97
Burroughs, Rev. E. A., M.A.	231
Cambie, Rev. S. R., B.D.	119
Carpenter, Rev. S. C., M.A.	582
Carter, Rev. C. Sydney	513
Carus Wilson, Mrs. Ashley	320
Chelmsford, the Bishop of	88, 679
Churchill, Lieut.-Colonel Seton	459
Clarke, Rev. A. H. T., M.A.	239, 495
Conran, Rev. M. W., S.S.J.E., C.F.	317
Downer, Rev. A. C., D.D.	424
Ford, Rev. G. Estwick, B.A.	43

	PAGE
Fothergill, Rev. C. D., M.A.	647
Fox, Rev. Preb. H. E., M.A.	566
Gem, Rev. S. Harvey, M.A. 183, 263, 757	
Gilbert, Rev. T. W., B.D.	7, 136, 200
Given, Rev. Andrew, M.A.	588
Gollock, Miss M. C.	359
Grant, Rev. C., M.A.	766
Henderson, Rev. Alexander, M.A.	776
Hitchcock, Rev. F. R. Montgomery, D.D.	177, 558
Hooton, Rev. W. S. B.D.	489
Jennings, Rev. A. C., M.A.	295
Johnson, Rev. Marcus, E. W., A.K.C.	634, 689
Johnston, Rev. S. A.	431
Knox, Miss E. M.	193
Latham, Rev. W. J.	711
Lees, Rev. Harrington C., M.A.	37, 745
Moule, Ven. A. E., D.D.	719
Moys, Rev. A. E.	505
Mozley, Rev. Kenneth, M.A.	640

	PAGE
Olney, William	438
Plummer, Rev. A., D.D. 173, 258, 325, 377	
Pulvertaft, Rev. T. J., M.A.	706
Ryle, Bishop, D.D.	167
Smith, Rev. Harold, M.A.	575
Smith, Rev. I. Gregory, LL.D.	771
Streatfield, Rev. G. S., M.A.	57
Tait, Rev. A. J., D.D.	701
Taylor, Rev. J. R. S., M.A.	653
Thomas, Rev. W. H. Griffith, D.D.	619
Tindall, Rev. E. Abbey, M.A.	249
Vaughan, Rev. Canon John	453
Warman, Rev. F. S. Guy, D.D.	28
" W. B. "	751
Whately, Rev. Walter R., M.A.	17
Wilson, Rev. H. A.	125
Wilson, Rev. R. Mercer	107
Winchester, Bishop of	368
Wood, Rev. C. T., M.A.	695
Wright, J. C.	660

THE CHURCHMAN

January, 1916.

The Month.

1915—1916.

DARK and sad the year is ending,
And the feathery flakes descending
Shroud with white the corpse-like earth below ;
From the tower the knell is pealing,
And the shadow blue is stealing
O'er the graves all wrapt in silent snow.

Wait awhile—the skies shall lighten,
And the warmer suns shall brighten,
O'er green woods and tuneful meadow-lands ;
Wait awhile—the dead long hidden,
By the voice of Jesus bidden,
Shall come forth and sing, and clasp our hands.

A. E. MOULE.

The Outlook. What has the New Year in store for us as individuals, as a nation, as a Church? The question may be asked concerning things material and things spiritual. Materially—the reference is wholly to the prosecution of the Great War—the outlook is most hopeful. We have no sympathy with the pessimists and the croakers. Difficulty, suffering, loss of life, there will be, but the sacrifice will not be in vain ; it is a necessary element in the working out of the emancipation

of the world from the thralldom of German oppression and German tyranny. Of the final victory of the cause for which so many thousands of our bravest and our best have laid down their lives we have never had the remotest doubt; and the reason for our confidence is that we believe in God. Whether that decisive victory will be achieved in 1916, 1917, or 1918, no one can say; but by God's help it will come, and the spiritual temper of the nation will be no small factor in bringing it about. It was, indeed, more in relation to the spiritual than the material conflict that we asked our question. Is the spiritual outlook hopeful? Again, we are optimistic rather than pessimistic; because we believe that we are on the eve of revival, even if the first streams of the light of the dawn are not already visible. The night is passing. After nearly eighteen months of war there is coming to be, we hope, a more general recognition of the supreme claims of God, certainly on the part of individual Christians and the Church generally; and we believe that, in the nation at large, there is a feeling—weak it may be, yet of growing strength—that all is not right with us, and that there must be amendment of life. The connection between the spiritual life of the people at home and the success of our armies at the Front is more intimate than we are wont to imagine. The Bishop of Chelmsford, speaking recently of the power of prayer, remarked that it had been stated that there had been blundering at the Dardanelles, and some blamed our politicians whilst others blamed our generals for it. "He believed himself that if, when the war broke out, the Church of Christ in this country had gone on its knees, we should have been through the Dardanelles. But they had not prayed as they ought. They said they believed in prayer—but did they? Their lads were dying by thousands in this ghastly war, but yet the Church had not given itself to prayer." There is reason to hope and to believe that this apathy in regard to prayer is gradually passing away. Certainly the great prayer effort which marks the opening of the New Year is fraught with immense possibilities of blessing.

The careful arrangements made for the right observance of the Day of Prayer on the first Sunday in the New Year are of good augury. On the last occasion there was insufficient preparation, and the day passed, in too many instances, without sufficient realization of its importance and significance. The Church has learnt by experience. We are not to be rushed into observance of the Day of Prayer as though it were merely just one more special service with claims upon the attention of the faithful; it will be approached carefully, solemnly, and with due preparation, ever keeping in mind the greatness of the opportunity and the prevailing power of believing prayer. The two preceding days—December 31 and January 1—are set apart, the first as a "Day of Penitence and Self-Denial," and the second as a "Day of Preparation." In this connection some very solemn and moving words have been addressed to clergy and laity by the Archbishops and Bishops; and if in the parishes of the country a like spirit has been manifested, it can hardly be questioned but that a deep impression will be made. In any case, it is believed that a good beginning will be made; but, let it be remembered, it is only a beginning. If the country is to be saved, as we believe it will be, by the prayers of God's people, it is not one Day of Prayer only that will be required, but continuous intercession carried on, not on formal conventional or perfunctory lines, but in that same spirit of penitence, self-denial, and preparedness, which is to mark the appointed Day.

One of the most hopeful signs of this great movement assuredly is that there seems to be a general agreement that if it is to yield the most fruitful results the clergy must themselves be "prepared." There is no more important fact to realize than this: that clergy, ministers, and teachers generally cannot lead their people to a higher spiritual place than they have themselves attained. It is a solemnizing and humbling thought, but it is abundantly borne out by the facts of Christian experience. If

The Day of
Prayer.

Preparation of
the Clergy.

the pastor is to uplift the people spiritually he will only be able to do so according to the measure of his own spiritual attainments. If he be a man of low ideals, of small faith, of worldly ideas, and with little of true penitence in his own life, his shortcomings will hinder his work among his own people. If, on the other hand, he is constantly pressing towards the mark of his high calling in Christ Jesus; if he is a man of strong faith and earnest prayer; if he realize that he is not of the world even as his Master was not of the world; if in his own life confession and repentance find their rightful and appointed place, then he is able to rebuke and exhort his people, and by his ministry, in the power of the Holy Ghost, he will turn many to righteousness. The gravest responsibility, therefore, rests upon the clergy, and they need to be sustained by the truest sympathy and prayers of all faithful people. The Archbishops and Bishops severally have laid great stress upon the importance of the spiritual life of the clergy, and we feel confident that their efforts will meet with full response. We venture to quote in this connection the following impressive words by the Bishop of Manchester :

“The first steps must be taken by the clergy. We must disabuse our minds of all false issues. We have the strongest conviction that the war was forced upon us, but for all that we are not statesmen or historians called to decide who is responsible for the war. We are God’s messengers, ambassadors, prophets. ‘The Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophesy?’ It is for us to hear the voice of God and to speak the word which God puts into our mouths. . . . But if it is our part to pray, to comfort mourners, to minister to the wounded, to preach repentance, to prepare and make ready the way for a new England, are we yet organized on a war footing? Eighteen months of war will soon be over. Have those months found us awake to the opportunity, buying it up, fighting the powers of evil as men fight on the battle-field? It is so easy to reduce the call of the war to the saying of a few prayers, holding of a few special services and other routine functions: so difficult to convict ourselves of slackness, unreality, formality, deadness of heart, and lukewarmness in the service of God. These sins which are brought home to us in the solemn hours of a quiet day or retreat, the voice of God speaking to us through the horrors of this war should have brought home to us with as much vividness as if we had been lying in the trenches, or moving about amid the wounded and dying on the battle-field. Life would have been seen to be earnest there.

But it ought to have been no less earnest here. The Lord God hath spoken, but have we prophesied? or have we failed to prophesy, because we failed to hear? We have a month in which we may be preparing ourselves for the days of solemn prayer. If we do not repent, we shall not move others to repentance. 'What we have seen and heard, that declare we unto you.' A clergy moved to deep repentance will not fail to reach the hearts of the nation."

The Call to
the Nation.

The right observance of the Day of Prayer should prove a strong and useful preparation for the Call to the Nation which is to be made later in the form of a National Mission. The mere suggestion of such an undertaking must stir the hearts of everyone anxious for the conversion of the nation, and we trust that it may be carried through with conspicuous success. At first sight the practical difficulties in the way may seem almost insuperable, but we have faith to believe that they will largely disappear when once the Church as a body determines to become a great evangelizing force. It will be an immense assistance if the whole body of the clergy are so helped in their spiritual life that they can themselves become Missioners, not necessarily in their own parishes—although we think that that is the ideal plan—but in some other district to which they may be assigned. At present no plan seems to be decided upon, but the Committee which is sitting ought soon to be able to take the Church into confidence and let us know what they propose. The need for such a Mission is almost everywhere admitted, but the fact that it is necessary is surely evidence that in the past the Church has failed adequately to discharge its work. If the Church had bought up its opportunities; if it had constantly and consistently preached Christ as the One Eternal Saviour; if it had laid aside its haggling and disputings and given itself more whole-heartedly to the work of saving souls, should we have now to lament the prevalence of indifference to the things of God, and of open and defiant lawlessness and sin, which loom so painfully large over our national life? We think not. The Church needs revival and renewal alike in its own spiritual life and in its capacity as an evangelizing agency.

Dean Vaughan's
"Family
Prayers." * In the aspiration after higher things, attention has once more recurred to the importance of Family Prayer—a practice which at one time was the rule in Christian households, but now, alas! has sadly fallen into disuse. Can it be revived? We are certain it can, and already many heads of families are resolving to set up the family altar in their midst. One of the difficulties in the way has been the want of a suitable liturgy, and with the object of meeting that need Mr. Elliot Stock, in response to a widely expressed wish, has reprinted the very admirable volume of "Family Prayers" written by the late Dean Vaughan,¹ which is generally recognized by those who are acquainted with such books to be quite the most useful, sustaining, and strengthening volume of its kind. In writing his volume, the late Dean set before his mind a very high ideal. In his Preface he wrote :

"Such a work should be neither dogmatical, nor didactic, nor hortatory; neither diffuse, nor involved, nor abrupt; neither affectedly archaic, nor vulgarly modern; neither a compendium of systematic theology, nor a cento of phrases from the Bible, nor an imitation of Collects or Litanies from the Prayer-Book. It should be ample enough to prevent a wearisome frequency in the recurrence of each particular prayer, yet not so large as to forbid familiarity with its contents on the part of those who use it in their worship. It should be spiritual, yet sober, in its tone; not checking the breathings of the deepest and most experienced piety, yet involving no hypocrisy in its utterance by a more level and average Christianity. It should be general, yet real, in its language; expressing the soul's wants, not in their morbid or fanciful eccentricities, but in their daily and regular recurrences. It should be sound, yet catholic, in its doctrine; repelling no Christian by its exclusiveness, but seeking rather to promote that truest, that highest, that deepest unity—a unity not of form or formula, but of personal trust and spiritual devotion—which is more and more the aspiration of our age, and in which alone the divided and dispersed flock of Christ can ever on earth be regathered into one."

The quiet and beautiful spirit of this passage is reflected in the book itself; and the Prayers will be found to express in simple moving language the deepest longings of the human soul. We commend this volume to our readers; they will find it very precious.

¹ "Family Prayers," by J. C. Vaughan, D.D. London: Elliot Stock. Price 2s. 6d. net.

The Atonement in the Writings of St. John.

A SUPERFICIAL estimate of the writings of St. John tends to assign a very minor place to the Atonement in his works, whilst the general prominence given by St. John to certain elements of the life and teaching of Christ tends to obscure the importance which the death of Christ has for St. John in common with the other writers of the New Testament. Moreover, the general tendencies of the present age have gone far to deepen this impression. The present age has been described as "the age of St. John," in the sense that the spirit and teaching of St. John is laying its impress upon the mind of the present generation in a way that it has not done before, and the saying and the idea are used both to draw a contrast between the spirit of former ages, and also to infer a generalization which is only half true. The saying is used first of all to draw a contrast between the first age of the Christian Church, dominated by the spirit of St. Peter, the spirit of authority—*i.e.*, in the primitive and early middle ages; this age is then supposed to be followed by the age dominated by the spirit of St. Paul—*i.e.*, from the time of the Reformation onwards, when the truth of the Atonement, with its corollary, "the priesthood of all believers," became the central tenet of Christianity. In contrast with these ages is supposed to be the present age, ushering in the Johnian idea of Christianity, with its emphasis upon the earthly life and teaching of Christ, with its insistence upon the mystical union between Christ and the believer—a Christianity, in short, which lays no emphasis upon the death of Christ, and consequently assigns little importance to the Atonement.

The purpose of this essay is to show that the Atonement has a very definite place in the writings of St. John. It is quite true that there are certain phases of St. John's teaching which stand out very prominently, and which seem at first sight to have little connection with the Atonement—*i.e.*, such as the isolating of certain incidents in our Lord's life to bring out

particular ideas associated with the Logos, or the choice of certain signs to sift believers from unbelievers, and to bring the believers to a belief in Christ which should insure eternal life (*cf.* xx. 30, 31)—but a closer examination will serve to show that the fact of the Atonement is behind all the doctrinal teaching of St. John, and that the Atonement is strongly entrenched in all his writings.

The subject will be examined as follows:

1. In the Gospel: The Historical Fact of the Atonement.
2. In the Epistle: The Present Working of the Atonement.
3. In the Revelation: The Future Hope from the Atonement.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

I. *Introduction—The Atonement.*

The opening words of the Gospel (i. 1-14) are a résumé testifying to the truth of Christ as the Logos, and they summarize the truth which is worked out through the Gospel. Following immediately upon this prologue come the words of the Baptist as the Forerunner of Christ (i. 15-18), witnessing in general terms that Christ was both Messiah and Logos. This general introduction to the Gospel is followed by the story of the query from the Jerusalem priests and Levites (i. 19-28) as to whether the Baptist was himself the Christ. The succeeding verse, however (i. 29), tells of the first contact of the Baptist with our Lord, and the public proclamation of the fact is made by the Baptist in terms which reveal without ambiguity his conception of the life and work of Christ—*i.e.*, “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.” The phrase itself reveals quite a clear idea of what the Baptist considered to be the reason for the presence of Christ in the world, for “the Lamb” took the mind back to the prophecy of Isaiah (l. 7), which held in it both the sacrificial system of Judaism and the Paschal Lamb of the Passover, whilst “of God” revealed the source and reason for the coming of Christ. The concluding part of the phrase—*i.e.*, “which

taketh away the sin of the world"—is generic, explaining the purpose of Christ's presence in the world. It is a fact of deep significance, therefore, that the first words of the Baptist in testifying to the Person and Mission of Christ should be words which proclaim the fact of the Atonement. To the Baptist the Atonement explains Christ's Person and Christ's Life.

The same fact of significant import is to be seen in the narrative of the next interview with our Lord (i. 35-37). The Baptist and two of his disciples are represented as meeting "Jesus as He walked," and again the Baptist utters the words, "Behold the Lamb of God!"¹ Immediately, and without further parley, the two disciples follow our Lord. The fact of Christ as the "Lamb of God"—in other words, the fact that God had sent Christ into the world for the Atonement of men—was sufficient to make the disciples of the Baptist into the disciples of Christ (i. 41).

Right across the first page of the Gospel, therefore, is the Atonement witnessing to the purpose of Christ's coming into the world, and emphasizing that it is by the Atonement that men are brought to Him.

2. *The Method of the Atonement.*

The first chapter of the Gospel shows us that the Atonement explains the meaning and mission of the Person of Christ, but the chapters which follow go on to explain the method of the Atonement. In the second chapter occurs first of all the miracle of Cana of Galilee, the heralding sign which revealed that Christ could change a lower subject or nature into a higher. Immediately following upon this comes our Lord's encounter with the Jews in the cleansing of the Temple, which resulted in the demand for such a sign as would justify both the cleansing

¹ It has been stated that John the Baptist could not have really seen the "Lamb of God" in the Person of Christ, and that therefore John the Evangelist puts the words and idea into his mouth. Assuming, as we may, that John the Evangelist was one of the two disciples mentioned in i. 35, it seems somewhat gratuitous to think he misrepresents what must have been a most solemn impression made on him by the Baptist's testimony.

and the assumption of authority in the claim "My Father's house" (ii. 16). The answer of our Lord throws the first ray of light upon the method by which the Atonement is to be wrought—*i.e.*, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. . . . He spake of the temple of His body" (ii. 19-21). By His Death and Resurrection, therefore, the Atonement is to be wrought.

The same fact is developed more fully in the following chapter, in which is recorded the interview between our Lord and Nicodemus. The general drift of the conversation of our Lord in the interview seems to be the interpretation of the heralding sign of Cana, *viz.*, that man needed his nature changing from a lower to a higher (iii. 3), and that he needed a spiritual as well as a natural birth (iii. 5-8), all of which could be secured by Him who had shown His power in the changing of water into wine (iii. 16). The means, however, by which this change is to take place is now clearly stated in iii. 14, 15: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth may in Him have eternal life." The "lifting up" of Christ on the Cross is the method by which the Atonement is wrought; the Cross is the means by which the needs of personal regeneration are satisfied (iii. 7); the Cross is the way which leadeth to eternal life (iii. 16).

It seems quite clear, therefore, to assert that St. John has so far laid down that the Atonement explains the purpose of the Logos in the world, and that the method of the Atonement is to be through Calvary.

In the next two chapters there is no mention of the Atonement as such, but the narrative reveals certain general teaching which prepares the way for the next aspect of the Atonement—*i.e.*, its results. The interview with the Samaritan woman lays continual emphasis upon God's attitude towards the spiritual needs of man—*i.e.*, "the gift of God" to satisfy human needs (iv. 10), the offer by Christ of "a well of water springing up into eternal life" (iv. 14), the revelation of Christ as the One

who will show all things of God to man (iv. 25, 26). The whole incident thus reveals the beneficent attitude of God towards man's needs. The incidents which follow give the necessary obverse facts—*i.e.*, the way by which man with his needs can appropriate all which God offers. This is brought out first of all by the sign of the healing of the nobleman's son (iv. 46-54), which showed how faith in Christ procured the blessings of Christ. This fact is, moreover, emphasized by the healing of the paralytic (v. 1-18), which shows that a man vitiated by sin (v. 14) can also by faith secure what Christ offers. This general teaching only prepares the way for the next aspect of the subject, which is—the results of the Atonement.

3. *The Results of the Atonement.*

Having first of all stated that the Atonement explains the coming of Christ into the world, and then having proceeded to show that the Atonement was to be effected by the Cross, St. John now proceeds to show what results would follow from the Atonement. The first of the results is seen in chap. vi., and can be summed up as "the life of Christ offered to men."

(a) *The Life of Christ offered to Men.*—The course of the narrative shows that a considerable number of people had been attracted to our Lord by the three great "signs" which He had performed, and that their journeying had taken them beyond the area where food could be bought. In their hour of need Christ came forward, and by the miracle of the five barley loaves and two small fishes supplied their bodily wants. The "sign" revealed Christ as the Giver of Sustenance to men (vi. 1-14). The narrative proceeds, without interruption, to tell the incident of the troubles of the disciples on the sea of Capernaum, and "the darkness," the "great wind," and the "rising sea," all of which produced the fear of the disciples, are all a setting which heightens the position of Christ as One who can help man when weighed down and troubled by things of earth, and One, moreover, whose power can be seen working through earthly things (vi. 15-21). In Capernaum, however,

came the didactic application of the signs from the lips of our Lord. Christ first of all declares that they had been attracted to Him by the sign of the feeding of the five thousand (vi. 26), and urges them to work now "for the meat which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you" (vi. 27). This appeal to their inner nature drew forth the query which was in itself a half-confession of belief in Christ, "What must we do that we may work the works of God?" (vi. 29); and, "What then doest Thou for a sign, that we may see and believe Thee?" (vi. 30). In answer to this half-faith, which betrayed the longing needs of the Jews, our Lord declared: "I am the bread of life; he that cometh to Me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst" (vi. 35); and also: "I am the living bread which came down out of heaven; if any man shall eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: yea, and the bread which I will give is My flesh, for the life of the world" (vi. 51). These and such-like statements which appear in the words of Christ at Capernaum did not in themselves contain any difficulty. The Jews were brought up in an age which constantly used this simile, and they were traditionally taught by the Rabbinical writers to look to the Messianic era for gaining new life in this way; and their difficulty was only how to reconcile Jesus of Nazareth, "the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know" (vi. 42); how "this man" (vi. 52) could give them His flesh to eat, and thus implicitly proclaim Himself the Messiah. It is in answer to these questionings that our Lord declares: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have not life in yourselves" (vi. 53). The words are a plain declaration to the Jews that He Himself is the Messiah, and that the new life and strength which they expected from the Messiah were to be obtained from Christ. The form of the expression, however, points clearly to the death of Christ. This can be seen from the following considerations—*i.e.*: The Rabbinical writers constantly use the idea of the Torah being "bread from heaven" and "living water." Examples can be seen in such references as

Midrash Shir Rabba, 1, 2 : "As water refreshes the body, so does the Torah refresh the soul"; in Midrash Sifre, 84a : "As water gives life to the world, so do the words of Torah give life (*i.e.*, eternal life) to the world." Again, in Bab. Talm. Shabboth, 120a, and Midrash Beresbith Rabba, 70, reference is made to the "bread of the Torah" as spiritual food ; while in the Midrash Sifre, 12a, it is said that the Torah gives spiritual light to the world. It will at once be seen that, since such ideas were common property amongst the Jews, there was nothing new in our Lord's use of such similes as "living bread" and "bread from heaven"; what was new, however, was Christ's application of them to Himself—as we have seen above.

This brings us, however, to the second fact which has to be borne in mind, and that is that Jewish writers looked forward to the Messianic era, when the elect amongst the Jews will be present at the great Messianic banquet and will feed upon Leviathan. This can be seen from such a passage as the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, xxix. 3-8 : ". . . Then will the Messiah begin to manifest Himself. And Behemoth will show himself from his land, and Leviathan will ascend from the sea : and these two mighty sea-monsters, whom I created on the fifth day of the work of Creation, and have reserved until that time [*i.e.*, the Messianic era], shall then be food for all those who are left." The idea is no doubt a development from such passages as 2 Esdras vi. 49-52, Ps. lxxiv. 12-15, Zeph. i. 4, and Isa. xxvii. 7, which look forward to the time when Leviathan will be slain, and will become food for the triumphant Jews. Bearing these two current traditions in mind, we are at once able to appreciate the attitude taken up by the Jews with reference to our Lord's statements in St. John vi. ; but the point with which we are particularly concerned is their bearing upon the Atonement. That the statements in St. John vi. do refer to the Atonement seems clear. The phrases "bread from heaven," or the "bread of life," or "the bread of God . . . which cometh down out of heaven and giveth life unto the world" (vi. 32-35), do not in themselves contain the fact of

the Atonement, but simply the mystical element which is contained in the looking upon the Torah as the "bread of life." The other conception, however, of the Messianic banquet does carry with it the fact of the Atonement. In the Messianic feast, at which the Messiah was ruler, the Jewish elect were to feed upon him whose strength was betokened in the name Leviathan. But Christ bids His hearers at Capernaum to eat, not the flesh of a powerful enemy who held them in bondage, but the flesh of Him who offered Himself as their Messiah: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have not life in yourselves. He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life . . ." (vi. 53, 54). In other words, Christ points His hearers to the time when He Himself will be in the position of the slain Leviathan, with His body broken and His blood poured out; and when the "eating and drinking" of Himself will be a mark, not of victory over a powerful enemy, but a sign of the life of God which flows out through Christ to men: "He who feeds on My flesh and drinks My blood remains within Me, as I remain within him" (vi. 56). The close of the incident at Capernaum shows that the Jews generally were not yet prepared to accept the Messianic claims of our Lord which were involved in the statements made by Him, and hence the appeal made by Christ to the inner consciousness of the Jews when He met them in Jerusalem (viii. 17). This appeal, however, was only the prelude to the enunciation of the second of the results of the Atonement—viz., that by it the Spirit of God would be fully revealed and given to men (vii. 39).

(b) *The Gift of the Spirit of God to Men.*—It will be noticed that the expressions used in vii. 37, 38, fall into the category of those which were current amongst the Jewish writers, particulars of which were given above when dealing with our Lord's discourse at Capernaum. The simile that the Torah is "thirst-satisfying" and "life-giving" is applied by our Lord to Himself, but it is followed by the significant addendum of St. John: "This spake He of the Spirit, which they that believed on Him

were to receive : for the Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified" (vii. 39). It is a clear statement that the gift of the Spirit of God must be preceded by the Cross. There is a sense, of course, in which the Spirit of God has always been at work in the world, and the realization of this must have been greater while Christ walked the earth. Men could not fail to see and feel the Spirit of God working through Christ, and because of this our Lord could say to His disciples (as one reading puts it) that the Holy Spirit "abideth with you, and is in you" (xiv. 17). The full and perfect realization of this, however, was to come, not by the teaching of Christ, nor by the sublimity of His life, but rather by His death. In the Cross was to be found the means by which the life-giving properties attributed to the Torah would be showered forth from Christ, a life which came forth from God, and thus revealed the Spirit of God in men (xiv. 26, xvi. 7, etc.).

The narrative then proceeds to develop a third point, which seems the necessary correlative of the two points already considered. St. John has shown first of all that one result of the Atonement will be the offering of Christ's life to men, and that this will be accompanied by the gift of the Spirit of God to men; he further declares that the Atonement will be a witness to the identity of Christ and God, and that it will be a revelation of the Father.

(c) *A Revelation of the Father.*—The discourse of our Lord recorded in chap. viii. is uniform with the speeches given in chaps. vi. and vii., for the similes are parallel on each occasion. Here in chap. viii. our Lord again uses a simile which was current with reference to the Torah (*cf. supra*), and declares Himself to be "the light of the world," and that whoever follows Him "shall not walk in the darkness, but shall have the light of life" (viii. 12). The general trend of the narrative is to show that the man who believes in Christ will have an illumination which will completely alter his outlook on life, and that this illumination will come when Christ is admitted to control the mind and conscience of man. The justification of this statement

by our Lord is based by Christ on the unity of Himself with God (*cf.* viii. 16, 18, 26), but the truth of this latter assertion could not be grasped by the Jews owing to their limited and material outlook (*cf.* viii. 15, 19, 23). It was in answer, therefore, to this incapacity on the part of the Jews that our Lord declared: "When ye have lifted up the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I am He, and that I do nothing of myself, but as the Father taught Me I speak these things. And He that sent Me is with Me: He hath not left Me alone, for I do always the things that are pleasing to Him" (viii. 28, 29). The words are a plain statement on the part of Christ that the Cross will witness to the identity or oneness of Christ with God, and that the Cross therefore will give reality or effect to the teaching of Christ and to the purpose of His life. In short, it is the Atonement which will bear witness that God was in Christ—the Atonement will be a revelation of the Father.

This summary of the results of the Atonement shows how in the eyes of St. John the Cross of Christ is inseparably linked with the three Persons of the Trinity, and that, as is usual with this profound topic, the Christian enters into the knowledge of the Trinity by practical experience—an experience, however, which starts from the Atonement.

T. W. GILBERT.

(To be continued.)



The First Battle of Armageddon.

IS the present war Armageddon? The question is often asked, and is usually answered in the negative. The great Apocalyptic battle is commonly regarded as being still in the future. It may, however, be possible to establish a connection between the events of to-day and the prediction in Rev. xvi. 14-16 without deciding the question whether the latter does or does not await a future and more complete fulfilment. And I hope to show that such a connection, if it can be found, is not merely of theoretical interest, but of practical importance.

It appears to be generally taken for granted that the prophecies of the New Testament are mostly predictions of specific and single crises in history, and that all we have to do is to fit them into their right places, whether past, present, or future. And the impression seems to prevail that to introduce into their interpretation the idea of process is simply to evade their plain and obvious meaning. But a close attention to the phraseology of Scripture suggests a doubt as to the soundness of this belief. The "Coming of the Son of Man" is usually thought of as a crisis, and indeed in some passages must be so understood, but our Lord's reply to Caiaphas (Matt. xxvi. 64) shows us that there is a point of view from which it must be regarded as a process.

For, in truth, we are not compelled to choose between a "uniformitarian" and a "cataclysmic" view of history as depicted in the New Testament prophecies. The two views are complementary rather than contradictory of one another. The very antithesis between a crisis and a process is misleading; the difference between them is relative to the point of view from which they are regarded. A crisis is only a process looked at in a bird's-eye view.

Nor are we compelled to regard the events of prophecy—even when considered as crises—as being events which are only

to happen once in the course of history.¹ St. John himself has warned us against this error in his First Epistle: "As ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists" (1 John ii. 18). And in the next verse he explains why the appearance of an antichrist is not a single, but an oft-recurring phenomenon; it is because such an appearance is but a specific outbreak of the anti-christian tendency which is never absent from our midst. Prophecy, in fact, is mainly concerned with moral and spiritual principles; it is, primarily, not a programme of events, but a Divine philosophy of history. Our Lord Himself, while assuredly not ignoring the predictive element in the Old Testament, taught that the innermost meaning of prophecy was to be found, not in the rise and fall of empires, but in the two great fundamental principles—the Jachin and Boaz of the Old Testament Church—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart . . . and thy neighbour as thyself." Should we not derive more benefit from the study of prophecy if we laid the stress where our Lord Himself laid it, on the moral and spiritual principles on which God governs the world?

Now, since these principles of necessity illustrate themselves over and over again in history, there is a strong presumption that an event foretold in prophecy will prove to be one of a class. If we have been told that Armageddon shall come, we shall not hastily infer that there are not many Armageddons. We shall rather suspect that as a particular antichrist represents an outbreak of an ever-present tendency, so a particular Armageddon is only a violent crisis in the unceasing war of the great enemy against the kingdom of God, and is related to that age-long strife much as the battles of Ypres and Neuve Chapelle are related to the conflict that rages day and night, week after week, and month after month, on the long embattled front from Switzerland to the North Sea.

This contention is supported, I think, by St. John's use of the name Babylon for imperial Rome, and also by the language

¹ It is well to remember in this connection that a *series* of crises may be regarded as a process.

he uses in describing its fall. The term itself suggests that the part which Babylon had formerly played in history in relation to the Kingdom of God was now being played by Rome, and would lead to a similar *dénouement*, while many of the actual phrases used in describing the catastrophe are borrowed from Jeremiah's prophecy of the fall of Babylon, and Ezekiel's prophecy of the fall of Tyre.

This is no merely academic question. It is of grave practical import. For if the view which I have suggested is the true one, if the present crisis is to be regarded as an Armageddon, as a combined onslaught of great powers upon the Kingdom of God, our own part in it as individual Christians would seem to be larger and more complex than appears at first sight. No true Christian needs to be told that fighting and making shells are not the only services he can render to the good cause; that the task of Moses and his comrades upon the mount of prayer is fully as important as that of Joshua upon the battle-plain; but if we are really engaged in a great spiritual conflict to which the name Armageddon may be suitably applied, then, surely, no detail of our spiritual lives is without its bearing upon the final issue. All that we are and do counts in the great conflict. The weakest and most insignificant Christian who is overcoming in his own inner life and manfully taking his share in the strife against sin and Satan, is holding a portion of the great spiritual field for the Captain of his salvation, and is thereby actually contributing to the victory of the good cause upon the battlefield.

Why is the great contest which is foretold in Rev. xvi. 14-16 connected with Armageddon, or, rather (as the true reading seems to be) Harmageddon, the Hill of Megiddo? The literal geographical explanation I think we may safely dismiss. The whole of the Promised Land, from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean, would not contain the armies that would be engaged. Nor does the word Harmageddon really lend itself to such an interpretation. All the other place-names in the Apocalypse (except, of course, in chaps. i.-iii.) have a mystical, not a

literal significance. Jerusalem means the Church, Babylon means Rome, and the Holy City itself is "spiritually called Sodom and Egypt." It seems probable, therefore, that Harmageddon also is to be mystically understood, and that the key to its meaning, as in the case of the other place-names, is to be sought in the Old Testament.

Where, in the Old Testament, is the key to be found? We can hardly suppose that St. John is referring to Megiddo merely as the historical "cockpit" of Western Asia. Some particular battle must, I think, be intended, some battle of decisive import, in which a formidable military power, or combination of powers, fought against the people of God, and was defeated. And this battle can surely be none other than the defeat of the Canaanites by Barak, narrated in Judges iv. and v.¹

But why, among all the wars of Israel, should this particular conflict be chosen by the great Christian seer to represent the death-grapple of the Kingdom of God with the powers of this world? What were the peculiar and distinctive features which entitled it to this prominence?

In the first place, it was the annihilation by the chosen people—that is, by the Kingdom of God as then constituted on earth—of a great military power in a higher state of material civilization. Israel was still in the Bronze Age; the Canaanites were fully equipped with iron instruments of war.² Nothing in the prose narrative of chap. iv. is more striking than the way in which the writer recurs again and again, as if under a sort of fascination, to the iron chariots of Sisera. The same attitude of mind appears in chap. i.,³ where the iron chariots are spoken of as an insuperable obstacle to the progress of the invading Israelites.⁴ Is there any other instance in all history of a

¹ This is the view taken by Nestle in Hastings' "Bible Dictionary," article "Harmageddon."

² Israel was certainly in the Bronze Age at the time of the Exodus, nor is there either evidence or probability of a change at so early a period as Judges iv. and v. Such indications as we do find seem to point the other way.

³ As earlier in Josh. xvii. 16.

⁴ Chariots *not* specified to have been of iron (they are also stated to have been subsequently burnt) do not appear to have been regarded as equally formidable (*vide* Josh. xi. 9).

Bronze Age people inflicting a crushing and final defeat upon a people equipped with all the military resources of the Iron Age?¹

Nor was this the whole disparity between the two armies. Even with their own weapons the Israelites were very scantily equipped,² and it can hardly be doubted that they were enormously outmatched in numbers. There was, in fact, only one possible explanation of their victory: "the Lord discomfited Sisera."

Here, then, we have a picture of a great military power, arrayed with all the material resources of civilization against the people of God, superior in numbers, and operating on "interior lines," and yet, by Divine intervention, defeated and destroyed.

But this is only the military aspect of the crisis. So far, there is no reason to regard it as more extraordinary than Israel's deliverance from Sennacherib. Its primary significance for the history of Israel (which really means its significance for the religious history of mankind) has been pointed out by Professor G. A. Smith.³ He shows that the strategic position occupied by the Canaanites constituted a danger more serious than the mere subjugation of the northern tribes; it threatened an actual break-up of the nation. "The evil . . . was far greater than the oppression of Issachar; it affected the national existence of Israel, and its removal was the concern of all her tribes." For behind the political and military dislocation caused by the Canaanite occupation, there lay the centrifugal tendency so evident in the several tribes during this anarchical period, when "there was no king in Israel," and "every man did that which was right in his own eyes."

The gravity of the situation becomes more evident when we turn to the Song of Deborah and Barak in chap. v. It is here

¹ Earlier defeats of the Canaanites are not quite parallel. The chariots of iron (*vide supra*) seem to have been—previous to the battle of Megiddo—the deciding factor. But, even if this be disputed, that battle remains the decisive culmination of the long struggle.

² Judges v. 8.

³ "Historical Geography of the Holy Land," pp. 391-397.

literal significance. Jerusalem means the Church, Babylon means Rome, and the Holy City itself is "spiritually called Sodom and Egypt." It seems probable, therefore, that Harma-geddon also is to be mystically understood, and that the key to its meaning, as in the case of the other place-names, is to be sought in the Old Testament.

Where, in the Old Testament, is the key to be found? We can hardly suppose that St. John is referring to Megiddo merely as the historical "cockpit" of Western Asia. Some particular battle must, I think, be intended, some battle of decisive import, in which a formidable military power, or combination of powers, fought against the people of God, and was defeated. And this battle can surely be none other than the defeat of the Canaanites by Barak, narrated in Judges iv. and v.¹

But why, among all the wars of Israel, should this particular conflict be chosen by the great Christian seer to represent the death-grapple of the Kingdom of God with the powers of this world? What were the peculiar and distinctive features which entitled it to this prominence?

In the first place, it was the annihilation by the chosen people—that is, by the Kingdom of God as then constituted on earth—of a great military power in a higher state of material civilization. Israel was still in the Bronze Age; the Canaanites were fully equipped with iron instruments of war.² Nothing in the prose narrative of chap. iv. is more striking than the way in which the writer recurs again and again, as if under a sort of fascination, to the iron chariots of Sisera. The same attitude of mind appears in chap. i.,³ where the iron chariots are spoken of as an insuperable obstacle to the progress of the invading Israelites.⁴ Is there any other instance in all history of a

¹ This is the view taken by Nestle in Hastings' "Bible Dictionary," article "Harmageddon."

² Israel was certainly in the Bronze Age at the time of the Exodus, nor is there either evidence or probability of a change at so early a period as Judges iv. and v. Such indications as we do find seem to point the other way.

³ As earlier in Josh. xvii. 16.

⁴ Chariots *not* specified to have been of iron (they are also stated to have been subsequently burnt) do not appear to have been regarded as equally formidable (*vide* Josh. xi. 9).

Bronze Age people inflicting a crushing and final defeat upon a people equipped with all the military resources of the Iron Age?¹

Nor was this the whole disparity between the two armies. Even with their own weapons the Israelites were very scantily equipped,² and it can hardly be doubted that they were enormously outmatched in numbers. There was, in fact, only one possible explanation of their victory: "the Lord discomfited Sisera."

Here, then, we have a picture of a great military power, arrayed with all the material resources of civilization against the people of God, superior in numbers, and operating on "interior lines," and yet, by Divine intervention, defeated and destroyed.

But this is only the military aspect of the crisis. So far, there is no reason to regard it as more extraordinary than Israel's deliverance from Sennacherib. Its primary significance for the history of Israel (which really means its significance for the religious history of mankind) has been pointed out by Professor G. A. Smith.³ He shows that the strategic position occupied by the Canaanites constituted a danger more serious than the mere subjugation of the northern tribes; it threatened an actual break-up of the nation. "The evil . . . was far greater than the oppression of Issachar; it affected the national existence of Israel, and its removal was the concern of all her tribes." For behind the political and military dislocation caused by the Canaanite occupation, there lay the centrifugal tendency so evident in the several tribes during this anarchical period, when "there was no king in Israel," and "every man did that which was right in his own eyes."

The gravity of the situation becomes more evident when we turn to the Song of Deborah and Barak in chap. v. It is here

¹ Earlier defeats of the Canaanites are not quite parallel. The chariots of iron (*vide supra*) seem to have been—previous to the battle of Megiddo—the deciding factor. But, even if this be disputed, that battle remains the decisive culmination of the long struggle.

² Judges v. 8.

³ "Historical Geography of the Holy Land," pp. 391-397.

that we are taken into the very heart of the subject and shown the conflicting forces at work within the borders of Israel, the forces that worked for a bold and united resistance, and the forces that worked for lethargy and disruption. The Song concerns itself little with the actual fighting. It is really a recruiting song—not, indeed, a song written to stimulate recruiting, but an appraisalment of the conduct of the several tribes, according as they came or came not “to the help of the Lord against the mighty.” It deals, in fact, with two classes, the recruits and the shirkers.

Let us take first the list of recruits. How the reading of that splendid muster-roll strikes home to our hearts to-day! On the re-enacting of this ancient drama in our midst we have not space to dwell, but the thought of it should help to bring home to our minds the spiritual lessons which the Song of Deborah and Barak contains for every one of us.

Upon the most obvious of these lessons—the readiness of heart for God's service, alike among the governors and the people, which is twice commended in the Song, and, in particular, the willingness of the leaders to assume responsibility, to take “the lead in Israel” (ver. 2, R.V.), not from motives of pride and ambition, but as an act of consecration to God (ver. 9)—we need not, perhaps, enlarge. But we must not dismiss with a passing reference the allusion to Zebulon and Naphtali, who “jeopardied their lives unto the death in the high places of the field.” We shall miss one of the deepest lessons, not only of this ancient prophetic Song, but of the present war, if we rest content with admiring devotion such as theirs without seeking to imitate it. “He that loveth his life shall lose it” was not said solely with reference to martyrdom; it is a fundamental law of Christianity. The death to self, the surrender of all to God, which involves—if need arise—the surrender of all *for* God, is the claim made by the Gospel upon every soldier of Jesus Christ.

Has not the Church of God lost, in the soothing atmosphere of “a calm world and a long peace,” some of the military

instincts of an earlier and more strenuous age? And can we expect to see the spiritual hosts of wickedness give way to her attack, unless the warriors of the King of kings serve their Sovereign with the same devotion shown to-day by our sailors and soldiers to their earthly king?

We come now to the shirkers. These fall into four classes—Gilead (*i.e.*, Gad), Reuben, Dan and Asher, and Meroz. And we note at once that the first two names are those of Trans-Jordanic tribes. There had always been a danger that the river might prove a barrier between eastern and western Israel. Both in the time of Moses and in that of Joshua uneasiness on this point had been felt on the western side; and the controversy recorded in Josh. xxii. shows plainly that separation from the main body of Israel was regarded as practically involving apostasy from Jehovah. The fears of Moses and the western tribes had been allayed by the assurances of their eastern brethren, but it seemed now as though their apprehensions had been well founded. "Gilead abode beyond Jordan." The great battle was no concern of his, it was all on the other side of the river. The natural barrier had become a spiritual barrier. This was, perhaps, not so much deliberate selfishness as a vague feeling of aloofness; the sense of brotherhood had been weakened by geographical conditions. But the eastern tribes had deliberately chosen their geographical situation, in spite of a double warning, and a special responsibility rested on them *not* to let slip the sense of brotherhood. It is often dangerous to acquiesce too readily in divisions which may not at first sight appear to be of vital importance.

Gilead is strongly represented among us to-day. There are multitudes who stand aside from the great world-conflict between the kingdom of Satan and the kingdom of God because they do not feel that it is any particular business of theirs. Their own lives are quiet, comfortable, and prosperous, and they are not disposed to stir. They know that not far from their doors are misery and oppression and vice, but somehow it all seems very distant and unreal. The conflict is raging hotly, but it is no

special concern of theirs. "The Son of God goes forth to war," but they, like Gilead of old, refuse to follow in His train. And too often the conditions which isolate them from their struggling and down-trodden brethren on the other side are of their own choosing.

As far as outward action is concerned, Reuben might be classed with Gilead. But Reuben was not quite so indifferent as his inaction might suggest. He considered the question carefully, and even made good resolutions (vers. 15, 16, R.V.), but he never came. He could not make up his mind; or, rather—like his ancestor, "unstable as water"—he made it up only to unmake it again. His "resolves of heart," which ought to have followed, not preceded, the "searchings of heart," left him still inactive "among the sheepfolds." He said: "I go, sir," and went not.

The moral inertia of Reuben is not less fatal in its results than the indifference of Gilead. And the making of high resolves only to unmake them again is as potent to deaden the conscience and to paralyze the will as the refusal to make such resolves at all. Among the shirkers in the conflict between good and evil are many who once meant to enlist, but have never done so. Some of them, no doubt, are "waiting to be fetched."

Dan and Asher had not the poor excuse that might be urged by Gilead and Reuben. They were close to the scene of conflict. Why did they not respond to the call of Deborah and Barak?

The reason seems to have been that they were absorbed in mercantile pursuits (ver. 17, R.V.). The ships and the "haven of the sea" occupied so large a place in their hearts that the life-and-death struggle of the people of God against overwhelming odds seemed to them, by comparison, a small thing. They believed in "business as usual."

There is probably no sin which has bitten so deep into the vitals of Christendom, nor any that has done so much to hinder the progress of Christ's kingdom, as the sin of worldliness. On

its obvious and recognized forms I need not dwell. True Christians at least know what these are, and are usually more or less on their guard against them. But we are all liable to be taken off our guard by the insidious foe, because we do not fully understand what worldliness is. We flatter ourselves that we are unworldly because we stand aloof from the rush for wealth and the craze for perpetual amusement, but we forget that the cares of this world, as well as its riches and pleasures, have power to "choke the good seed, so that it becometh unfruitful." Our Lord's warning against mammon-worship was not spoken to the rich, but to the poor, and was followed by the words: "Therefore I say unto you, Be not anxious for the morrow." Yet multitudes even of Christian men and women are hindered by this anxiety about the future, coupled with the absorption in mundane affairs which such anxiety naturally begets, from taking their right place in the ranks of the army of Christ. "No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life."

Meroz, the last shirker in the list, is more difficult to classify, because we know so little about it. But the change of note in ver. 23 is unmistakable, and invites speculation as to its cause. Where was Meroz, and what was its peculiar turpitude, that it should be visited with a special anathema, for an abstention of which many others were guilty? The question does not admit of a confident answer; but there is some archæological evidence that Meroz lay very close to the scene of conflict, perhaps even upon the actual battlefield.¹ The inaction of its citizens was therefore—if the suggested identification is correct—a case of peculiarly callous indifference to the cause of Israel. The tide of battle rolled past their very gates; they heard the noise of war; they saw their brethren at death-grips with the oppressor; but the sight and sound of that dread conflict awoke no response in their hearts. "They came not to the help of the Lord against the mighty."

The curse pronounced on Meroz falls in the New Testament on all who act the part of shirker in the great battle of life. It

¹ Note also the position of ver. 23.

is not said of Meroz, or of the other defaulters, that they assisted the enemy. The charge against them is that "they came not to the help of the Lord." In such a war neutrality was a crime. But we shall do well to remind ourselves of the yet more solemn truth that in the great conflict between Christ and Satan, neutrality is *impossible*. "He that is not with Me is against Me." The shirkers count among the enemy.

But there is another aspect of Armageddon on which the Old Testament says little or nothing. Specially characteristic of the Apocalypse, even among the books of the New Testament, is the revelation of supernatural forces working behind the phenomena of Nature and history. In all the great world-crises where spiritual issues are involved, there are dreader powers at work than the sins and errors of men,—“the spirits of devils, . . . which go forth unto the kings of the earth . . . to gather them unto the battle.” There is a thrilling scene in the “Aeneid”¹ of which these words remind us. On the night that Troy was taken, Aeneas, as he strove amid the burning streets and tottering walls to rally his countrymen to the defence, saw a vision which convinced him that his efforts were in vain. The mortal mist fell for a moment from his eyes; the supernatural world became visible; the forms of the dread Olympian deities showed themselves among the storming-parties of the Greeks:

“ Apparent dirae facies inimicaque Troiae
Numina magna deum.”

It may be that if our eyes were similarly opened, we should be aware to-day of the presence of supernatural powers, both good and evil, in our midst. It is at least widely believed, particularly among soldiers, that the present conflict is not wholly one of flesh and blood, but that forces other than human are in the field.

But these are just the forces which the New Testament teaches us to regard as operating continually in the life of each individual believer. The angels are “ministering spirits, sent

¹ “Aen.” ii. 622, 623.

forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." The hostile "principalities and powers in the heavenly places" are the constant antagonists of the Christian in his daily life. The great war which from time to time breaks out in an Armageddon is waged perennially by the true Church of Christ militant here in earth. Her armies are always in the field; her gates of Janus are never shut. Enlistment in her ranks is not for a term of years, but for life; "there is no discharge in that war." Her members are all combatants, and every action of their lives is, or should be, an act of war.

Thus the issue of this great conflict rests—humanly speaking—like all other moral and spiritual issues, with the Church of God, and every spiritual victory won by each of her individual members is a contribution to the main result. And this is as true of the Church's outward activities as of her inner life. We shall make a grave mistake, even from a national point of view, if we postpone to a more convenient season the evangelization of our own people. Nations, like churches, are moral and spiritual entities; as nations they are lured to the slaughter of Armageddon; as nations they bring their glory and honour into the New Jerusalem; as nations they are judged by God; and a present national revival of true religion here in England would bring down a blessing upon our armies, and leave a decisive mark upon our fortunes in the great war.

WALTER R. WHATELY.



The Sunday School and Confirmation.

THE Sunday School, compared with the Prayer Book, is a modern institution. No rubrics concern themselves with it, liturgiology does not find it within its ken. But not least among the many causes which led to the creation and permanent maintenance of the Sunday School was the realization that the spirit of a particular rubrical direction was not being properly observed, the direction in question being that children should be taught the Catechism "until such time that they have learned all that is there appointed for them to learn." At first the Sunday School preceded or supplemented the Day School; now it has largely taken the place of it, and not only of it but in many places and in many circumstances of parent and godparent too. We may, and we do, regret this latter fact, but it would be fatuous to ignore it. Moreover times have changed in other ways as well: the curate "diligently instructs" the children of his parish, normally to say the least, not after the second lesson at Evening Prayer, but much more adequately than he could do it then, at other hours of Sunday by the vicarious ministry of multitudes of earnest and self-sacrificing lay churchmen. The Prayer Book method is not impossible, but it is at any rate seriously ineffective in the twentieth century. Seven o'clock in the evening is not the right hour for instructing children; the Parish Church and the presence of a large congregation is not a satisfactory schoolroom, and sometimes, be it said with all respect, the curate or his assistant is not the right person for the task. Catechizing at an earlier Evensong, when children only are present, has still its enormous value, a value which would be all the greater if its importance gained for it its right place in the proportion of parochial activities. But when all is done as it should be, there is still need of the Sunday School as one of the instruments, nay the main instrument, of training the young in general and of preparing them for Confirmation in particular.

Again, the Prayer Book says nothing of special preparation for Confirmation. But although Confirmation classes are not a matter of rubric or direction, there is abundant evidence to show that the Reformers, both in England and on the Continent, and indeed many who were still obedient to Rome laid serious stress upon the need of previous special preparation for the Rite.

The Sunday School, therefore, forms an important part of the Church's machinery in the matter of preparation for Confirmation, not ordained by the Prayer Book, but in complete consonance with its spirit. That preparation is twofold, spiritual and intellectual. These two are, of course, not contradictory, not mutually exclusive, not capable even of being taken alone, but complementary and auxiliary to each other. At the present moment an effort is being made on all sides to increase the intellectual efficiency of the Sunday School, and there is serious risk that its spiritual value may be lessened, or even occasionally lost sight of. In the judgment of the present writer, that spiritual value is not only in itself the most important factor, but in the experience of life the most effective and fruitful. Nothing, not even the intellectual efficiency of the highest type of secondary education, can compensate for the slightest spiritual loss. It is the joy and duty of all of us to welcome the efforts at Sunday-School reform now being made in so many directions, but it is equally our duty to guard jealously the spiritual influence of our schools in winning the children for the faith of Christ, and in training them for its fuller privileges and responsibilities.

For Confirmation the Sunday School renders important service in both the intellectual and the spiritual sphere; it is mainly responsible for most of the earlier training, and it is supplementary to the special preparation classes. But this is not all its office: it is in most town parishes—I have little experience of the country—the main source of the supply of candidates. I am no half-hearted supporter of the Day Schools of the Church, convinced as I am that the teaching of the Faith must always have a prominent place even in secular education,

but my own experience goes to show, and care has been taken to supplement that experience with the experience of others, that the most fruitful source of candidates for Confirmation is the parish Sunday School, with all its drawbacks and despite its many and admitted defects.

It is now my business to bring Confirmation into relation to the Sunday School in more detailed fashion. There are certain questions to be asked and answered. First of all, if it is the main source of supply, how can it be made a more natural and effective source? Again, at what age are we to expect candidates to pass from the Sunday School to Confirmation? Are there any steps that we can and ought to take to see that children are retained in Sunday School or, at any rate, in connection with the Church until they reach that age? During the period that they are in Sunday School before Confirmation, how can we best train and teach them? And finally, and as usual, not least importantly, can the Sunday School or some "Dépendance" of the Sunday School help us to retain them after Confirmation, that they may be, for all the days to come, consistent and devout communicants of the Church?

1. We get most of our candidates for Confirmation from the Sunday School. Can we get more? Can we get them more easily, more satisfactorily? We shall get them more easily, more naturally, and probably more of them, in those parishes where the parish priest not only gives to the Sunday School its right place in the activities of the parish but is himself found in his right place, and that not infrequently, within it. Men's services have probably increased the efficiency of the Church's work amongst men to a considerable extent, but they have unquestionably tended to rob the Sunday School. The presence of the clergyman *in* the Sunday School is the essential link in the chain—I do not believe I am speaking one whit too strongly—which binds the children of the school to the larger organization of the Church, a chain which my clerical brethren must make into a cord of love, or they will break it. He may open with prayer, or he may only walk round and get in the way, but he

ought to be there, and to be there often. Again, the children's service, probably monthly for each section of the school, plays no unimportant part. The Reformed Sunday-School movement is a little against the "monthly service." The young Sunday-School teacher who has spent a week or more in a college, and therefore knows all about it, is generally somewhat contemptuous both of the service itself and of the way in which it is conducted, but when the Reform movement has cut its wisdom teeth it will get over that.

The divorce of Church and Sunday School is a real danger, especially up here in the North and, like all divorce, is to be deprecated. Now and again incompatibility of temper arises between the two, generally because they do not see enough of each other; sometimes, it is true, when they see too much. The maintenance of right relations, as in marriage, demands considerateness on both sides.

It is necessary to remember also the personality of the teacher. I disclaim all hostility to the Reform movement, but in the long run the love of the child for Christ and for the Church of Christ is going to be won by the real *love* of the teacher, be he or she as effective as possible in other respects, rather than by elaborateness and beauty of machinery. A kind heart is a better thing than a sand tray. Perhaps a kind heart and a sand tray is best of all. That Sunday School will send most candidates to Confirmation where the clergyman of the parish is known and loved, where the personal equation of the teacher is at its highest value, and where the most real efficiency is sought and won.

2. At what age shall the children come? There is no answer to this question. Bishop Temple is reported to have said, and the statement is characteristic enough to be true, that you may just as well confirm by *weight* as by *age*. But though the question cannot be answered, there are guiding factors in the situation which help to an answer. Let there be no hard-and-fast rule. The circumstances of modern life, the temperament of the child, the character of its home and past—all these

things, and others, will help the discerning pastor of souls to interpret the meaning of "a competent age," and of "years of discretion." Hard-and-fast rules will only lead him astray; experience and the study of the psychology of childhood and of adolescence will together give him guidance. The changes of the centuries are in this particular significant. The early medieval Church confirmed at what to us seems an inordinately early age. The later age, which has become the common rule of modern life, was not an invention of the extremer Protestants. The unreformed Church began to see that the complexity of life, even in that day, demanded preparation and delay.

The Catechism of the Council of Trent laid it down that "the Sacrament of Confirmation can be administered to all after Baptism, but yet it is less expedient that this should be done before children have the use of reason. Wherefore, if it should seem that the twelfth year is not to be waited for, it is in the highest degree proper that certainly this Sacrament should be deferred to the seventh year," fairly implying that in many cases at least delay until twelve should be the rule. After the Reformation, we find so sane and catholic a prelate as Lancelot Andrewes putting the following question in his Articles of Inquiry by Churchwardens: "Whether do all parishioners receive the Holy Communion thrice every year at the least, whereof the feast of Easter to be one, and have all, being at the age of eighteen years, duly received or not." The obvious inference is, that Bishop Andrewes did not consider the neighbourhood of eighteen years as too advanced for Confirmation. Bishop Cosin writes: "They should not be confirmed so young as they used to be, but when they are of perfect age, and ready to be admitted to the Holy Communion, which is between fourteen and sixteen" ("Cosin's Works," vol. v., p. 488). Most modern experience supports this earlier testimony. Confirmation, with all the special preparation for it, and the real blessing of the rite, comes with tremendous helpfulness to the boy or girl, free of school and starting in life, subject to new temptations from without, to new feelings, aspirations,

desires from within. The parish priest cannot know all his children; the parent, who ought to know best, is often, alas, more obstructive and misleading than helpful; the wise and loving Sunday-school teacher can often give advice, and ought to be asked for it, which may make all the difference between a real Confirmation and a travesty of the rite, which not only hurts the child but injures the Church. Every unfit and immature candidate for Confirmation is a centre of dangerous influence. Confirmation is a mere form, which may be neglected; a mere ceremony from which nothing is to be expected. It is sought from wrong motives or from none, and the blessing of the Spirit of God is lost because it is not asked for.

3. Assuming, then, that the conditions of modern life are such that it is inadvisable to urge children to be confirmed until they are clearly of *really* competent age, it is part of the function of the Sunday School to retain them and to train them until they reach that age. The retention of elder scholars has always been one of the most serious difficulties in Sunday-school work, and among them especially the retention of those who pass the normal Confirmation age without, for some reason or other, being confirmed. The precocity of modern youth, the lack of discipline in the home, and the multitudinous interests which crowd the lives, even of children—all these things are against us. For us there is the general effectiveness of the school, and there is the personality of the teacher. In some cases, the Bible-class away from the school represents something a little more grown up than school itself. In others, nothing is gained by such separation. In some parishes, an organization outside the Sunday School, something on the lines of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavour, may be decidedly useful. The words, "something on the lines" are used advisedly. The Christian Endeavour movement presents certain difficulties in Church of England use. But a gathering on a weekday of young people, largely managed by themselves, but fostered by the clergy, will often make the religious life of

those concerned a reality, providing candidates for Confirmation and workers in the Church's service as the days go by. If an organization of this kind is to fulfil the purpose in my mind, it must *not* be in any sense a communicants' union or confined to communicants.

4. The next question immediately arises. The children are in our Sunday Schools, how can we best train and teach them? The teaching of the Bible has been considerably simplified and made much more attractive during these last years. New and better books, new and better machinery in the way of pictures, maps, etc., have helped not a little to this end. But in many and many a parish still, unless common rumour misleads me, the teaching of the Church Catechism, essential to the preparation for Confirmation, is attractive neither to teacher nor to scholar, and is sometimes either ineffective or omitted. Many efforts have been made during the last few years to remedy this. Some of them, in my judgment, have overshot the mark. A whole year's course on the Church Catechism, the lessons given consecutively Sunday by Sunday, is probably too great a strain both for teacher and for taught. Eleven lessons on the Lord's Prayer and twenty-seven on the Sacraments, however excellent the lessons, do seem in better place in a theological college than in a Sunday School. It may be old-fashioned to prefer variety and to intersperse Bible lesson with Catechism lesson, but sometimes the older fashions are the best. Too much of even so good a thing as the Church Catechism may nauseate both teacher and scholar.

Again, although it *is* possible to make the teaching of the Church Catechism attractive to the children, it is *not* possible unless the lesson is carefully prepared. The "getting up" of a lesson in a book can never be as effective as the "talking of it over" in a teachers' preparation class. In most cases the best qualified teachers are most regular in attendance at such classes. What can be done to find a remedy? If the parish priest attaches obvious importance to it, and if he takes trouble over it, part of the remedy will be found. If it is crowded out by

the less important social activities of the parish, put off, postponed, and depreciated, little wonder that teachers are absent. In a particularly difficult parish, where weekday gatherings of teachers were almost impossible, a preparation class for teachers was carried on for some years after afternoon school on Sunday with the majority of the teachers always present. It meant additional work for the clergy, additional self-sacrifice for the teacher, but it was worth it.

In the minds of some the St. Sulpice method of the Catechism has been brought into competition with the Sunday School. Is not the suggestion worth considering of a weekday greater and lesser Catechism conducted alongside the usual Sunday-School activities? The suggestion is not novel; it has been tried, and the effect has been good.

The final question now arises. How are the newly confirmed children to be retained? The answers to the question are as trite as the question itself. *Now* comes the test both of *past* teaching and of *past* influence. The shepherd of souls who begins to worry himself about his young people at adolescent age, and *only* begins then, will find abundant cause for his worry. The loyal Churchman of seventeen and twenty-one years is generally the loyal Churchman of fourteen, but a few years older. To retain *young men* and *young women* we must win *children*. All this is hackneyed indeed, but it is too important to need apology. Again, the early communicant years must be carefully watched. Such a gathering of young people as I have already referred to will be a real help in this direction, in some ways more easily used than the more ordinary communicants' union or guild. Two smaller suggestions are worth the making—one, that an annual letter should be written either by the Sunday-School teacher to every child who has been confirmed in their class and after it, or by the incumbent to those whom he has prepared for Confirmation or, better still, by making these two alternatives complementary to each other. The second suggestion is that a special service should be held each year, to which a particular invitation should be sent to

every confirmer, say, of the past ten years. The going over of the parochial Confirmation book in the meeting of a parochial staff or of a body of Sunday-School teachers might mean the recovery of some sheep of whom in the larger flock we have lost sight. Without entering upon a vexed question, it is important that young communicants should not be excommunicated in fact, though not in intention, by the sometimes impossibility of making presence at Holy Communion fit in with the ordinary avocations of their lives.

So this paper must end. It has raised more problems than it has settled, but perhaps its purpose is served if it helps us to realize the existence and the gravity of the problems raised. A new era in Sunday-School work is beginning. We have made mistakes in the past, we shall make them again in the future; but those that we shall make will be fewer and will be less serious if we are aware of the difficulties that face us in the work of winning the children for God, and bringing them both to the full enjoyment of their Christian privileges and the full realization of their Christian responsibilities. *Sit finis scribendi, sed non finis quærendi.*

F. S. GUY WARMAN.



Loveless Charity.¹

“And if I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and have not love, it profiteth me nothing.”—I COR. xiii. 3.

NO two things impressed the heathen world with the power of Christ to elevate and transform fallen humanity more than the goodness of the primitive Christian Church to the poor, and its readiness for martyrdom. It used to be said that the Roman mob under the later Emperors only demanded “Panem et circenses,” bread and the theatres, to keep them contented. The Christians were ready to share their last crust with their brethren, and if necessary went singing to be butchered in the arena in order to make a Roman holiday. The heathen philosophers of the period felt that the poor were not worth attention at all, and no Faith in the world was important enough to die for. So the Christians were a marvel. But there were dangers. Anything that stirs admiration tempts cheap imitation. The jewellery of the Rue de la Paix costs hundreds of francs, and so one can purchase something very like it for a hundred pence, made in Birmingham. Shallow Corinthians may well have been driven to their knees by St. Paul’s light but incisive touch. The ecstatic tongue-talker, the eloquent scholar, the faith-filled organizer, the open-handed philanthropist, the unshrinking ascetic, must have been, first well-nigh bewildered, and then awed into a new and nobler ambition as the seed of the Word fell into good ground. So we are in this chapter to talk of futile philanthropy and meaningless martyrdom.

“If I share out all my goods morsel by morsel, but have not love, it profiteth me nothing.”² Here is a man who doubles the charitable fifty per cent. of Zacchæus,³ who even equals the Lord’s standard for the young ruler,⁴ and yet is left with the conviction of having gained nothing by it all. There is a tone of disappointment in the sentence, something of the bitterness of Malachi’s audience, who

¹ A devotional study from “The Practice of the Love of Christ,” by the Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A. London: Robert Scott. Price 3s. 6d. net. See review on p. 76.

² Deissmann’s rendering. “St. Paul,” p. 182.

³ St. Luke xix. 8.

⁴ St. Luke xviii. 28.

said it was vain to serve God,¹ and something of the perplexity of Asaph, who felt that he had cleansed his heart in vain.²

And the whole matter stirs us to further inquiry. What is wrong with philanthropy? The question is modern as well as ancient. Well, to begin with, the larger the giving the more perilous the question of motive becomes. Barnabas is admirable, Ananias is pitiable. *But Ananias is just Barnabas gone wrong.* "There, but for the grace of God, goes Joseph Barnabas," must have been at any rate the silent sentiment of that great and good man, as he saw the tragedy of the first penal death in the Christian Church. For Cyprus was far away, and few would have been the wiser if he had kept back something. Barnabas stood. Ananias fell. But in a sense Barnabas, by his generosity, was the blameless occasion of the fall of Ananias.

We must take heed how we give. There must be a pure motive behind it. When the missionaries first found their early success among the Kitkatla Indians of British Columbia, one of the troublesome hindrances which they had to eliminate was the custom of the potlach. This was a contest between two wealthy chiefs or members of a tribe as to which could give away most—a kind of "Beggar-myself-in-order-to-defeat-my-neighbour" competition. The result was most harmful, and the giving was pure bravado.

Charity is not necessarily Love. The words were synonymous when the translators completed our Authorized Version.

But is the charity ball a particularly high-souled institution? Is the charity bazaar specially marked by spiritual features and sisterly love? Nay, more, are not dubious practices frequently condoned with the reflection, "It is for a charity"? The giving which substitutes guineas for pounds in order to head the list is technically charity, but is it Love? Men have before to-day given largely to a scheme in order to hector and harass the promoters of it. Charity may exist side by side with extraordinary uncharitableness.

We may see an illustration of St. Paul's courage in laying his finger on a sore spot like this. "If I give to feed the poor and

¹ Mal. iii. 14.

² Psalm lxxiii. 13.

have not Love, it does me no good," says the apostle; and yet he was just floating the greatest charity scheme of the early Church—the collection from the four provinces for the poor Christians at Jerusalem.¹ And, as he very well knew, he was asking for funds from men who were at law with one another,² and were full of envy and strife and factions.³ He frankly tells them that that loveless giving has no fragrance and no fruit. This is because men count for more than money. He is almost more concerned for the Corinthian givers than for the Judean receivers. He is willing to imperil even the success of his scheme if only he may reproduce their first Love in the hearts of the Corinthian converts. Christian charity will not grow where hatred flourishes, yet men strive to cultivate them side by side sometimes. In one of our weekly journals there was to be found not long ago a series of vindictive utterances and bitter threats against our present unhappy foes. This was immediately followed by a page containing an appeal for patriotic funds headed in large type, "The Greatest of These is ——." The word was left blank, perhaps through a faint twinge of conscience, but assuredly charity was not Love in that connection. It is only another form of the great mistake which our foes made in attempting to bludgeon the world for what they called the world's good. But the world has recoiled in alarm from the untender and chilly touch of their fist of mail. "We only want to do you good; we have a world-mission," cried our foe. But the philanthropy of the cannon and the sword is not easy for human nature to digest. Charity must be balanced by Love. Good intentions must be proved by considerate actions. Charity is not counted, but weighed. The widow's gift proved heavier than the charity of the Pharisees who had previously devoured her house—because there was Love in it. The slumming which became fashionable a score of years ago was in many cases pitifully loveless. Before that, again, Charles Dickens held up Mrs. Pardiggle and Alderman Cute, with many others, not because they thought nothing about poverty, but because they thought so little of the poor. He complained, not that they left the poor alone, but that they would

¹ xvi. 1.² vi. 6.³ iii. 3.

not leave them alone. He felt that, rather than go in an un-Christian spirit, they had better not go at all. Charity may be extraordinarily blind to the hunger of human nature.

Oliver Twist asking for more is, after all, something more than a shame. He is a symbol. "Better is a dinner of herbs where love is than a roasted ox with hatred at the table."¹ What Oliver Twist wanted was not really more gruel, but more love. He could have lived without the one, he could hardly exist without the other. And the whole edge of the satire consists in the fact that the hungry boy is neglected by the guardians of the poor, and is punished by the relieving officers for asking to be relieved. Until, when the time comes that the Poor Law agents are preparing to launch him into a career, he can only break down and sob out that he is "so lonely, so very lonely." Now, against what was Dickens declaring war? Not against the thoughtless neglect of the poor, but against the heartless relief of the poor. "The reformers," says Mr. Chesterton, "in creating many other modern things, created a modern workhouse, and when Dickens came out to fight, it was the first thing he broke with his battle-axe." It has been the misfortune, many people would say the mistake, of much organized charity, whether national or private, that people in great need have nearly always been repelled by its apparent and frequently real lack of love. Limited liability companies are said to have no souls; the State and even a society are often satisfied to have no heart; it is not included in the bill. When Oliver Twist tried to thank his kind benefactress, Mrs. Maylie, it was because "her charity had rescued him from misery." Yet all his life he had been a Charity boy, but Charity with a capital "C" had left him miserable. There is only too often all the difference between home and a Home, and that difference is usually love. There are, of course, many fragrant exceptions to this; and these pages are not intended as a sour censure upon existing efforts which are always well-meaning and often noble. But when we turn to the Divine Pattern in the Gospel page, whose history was summed up in after years in the phrase, "He went about doing good,"² we see that charity and Love always

¹ Prov. xvi. 7.

² A cts x. 38.

went together with Him. His touch was tender. His word was winning, His smile was sweet. His sympathy was never hard.

“ Give me the power to feel
 For hearts that I would heal;
 Give me the power to see with sight like Thine :
 But most of all give me
 The power to love like Thee,
 O Love Divine.”

Again, Charity may be an excuse for lack of service. There are many folk who will gladly give a subscription to a needy cause because they cannot bear to look at sorrow. They contribute in their drawing-room, but they could not bear the touch of dirt in the lodging-house. Says Henry Drummond, in the finest interpretation of this chapter that most of us know, “ It is a very easy thing to toss a copper to a beggar on the street, it is generally an easier thing than not to do it. Yet Love is just as often in the withholding. We purchase relief from the sympathetic feelings roused by the spectacle of misery, at the copper’s cost. It is too cheap, too cheap for us and often too dear for the beggar. If we really loved him we would either do more for him or less.”

And this is where the preacher of the love of Christ has a standing advantage. We must never forget the warning of James the Lord’s brother about giving homilies without help, but nevertheless Christ’s servant is often able to say, “ Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have give I thee.” And in the words of Dr. Stalker, “ While ordinary benevolence may feed the hungry and clothe the naked, evangelization enables the poor to feed and clothe themselves.”¹ St. Paul, a few years after this, told the Philippians that he rejoiced in the lavishness of their giving, not because he desired gifts, but because he sought fruit that might increase to their account—interest that should accumulate for the principal they had invested. That kind of giving profited them something. And this spirit of outpoured love may be, and should be carried out far and wide through all men’s lives. To quote Drummond again: “ We may lavish love upon the poor where it is very easy, especially upon the rich who often need it most, most of all upon equals, where it is very difficult, and for whom perhaps we each

¹ “ Ethic of Jesus,” p. 328.

do least of all." It will not do to be known as a Christian philanthropist in the city, and as a "screw" in the office, and a snarler at home.

Christ must shine through our charity, and we must in our service be recognized by others as "members of His body"—His fingers felt in our touch, His eyes seen in our face, His tones heard in our voice.

HARRINGTON C. LEES.



The Permissive Use of Vestments and Reservation.¹

WHEN I had the privilege of being invited by your committee to read a paper before this society, and proposed a subject, I was asked by your secretary if I would be willing, instead of the suggested subject, to deal with the question of Prayer-Book Revision on the lines of my recent article in the *Record*.

To this request I gladly acceded for the following reasons :

1. The trial through which we are now passing is making, and will increasingly make, the fullest demand upon the spiritual resources of the nation. The Church in this land must be strong and united as it has never hitherto been if an adequate response is to be given to this demand. The men who through daily peril have come into close touch with the fundamental realities of God and their own soul, duty, and death, will return to us as a leaven of life for the nation if the Church is fit to receive them and to use them. What, then, are they to meet with when they come home after the war? A national Church involved in miserable wrangling about ecclesiastical garments and other accessories of worship, or a great, united army of the living God, doing its utmost against unrighteousness and ignorance and error? We should therefore welcome every opportunity of trying to understand one another, in order that by mutual concessions, on the basis of honesty and loyalty to our Church, we may remove existing causes of dissension, and line up shoulder to shoulder against the common enemy.

2. The Birmingham Clerical Society, consisting as it does of men of all shades of opinion, is just the kind of body that can most hopefully discuss possible grounds of reconciliation, and help to shape a wise policy that shall be generally acceptable.

The substance of the proposal which I have made in the *Record* is that we should put an end to the state of confusion now prevailing in the Church of England by rendering lawful,

¹ A paper read before the Birmingham Clerical Society, September, 1915.

but not compulsory, the use of vestments ; and that, in order to safeguard the distinctive doctrine of the Church, a declaratory rubric of a very definite and specific character should accompany the rubric permitting such use.

To this suggestion strong objection has been raised, both by Evangelical clergymen and also by a highly influential body of Evangelical laymen whose opinion, as the Archbishop of Canterbury has freely acknowledged, is deserving of the most careful consideration.

The ground of their objection is that the use of the vestments of the Roman Mass would conspicuously deface the primitive character of the Anglican service, and would give countenance to the introduction of other Romish doctrines and practices that were rightly rejected by the Reformers as incompatible with Holy Writ. In a word, it is the symbolical character of the vestments—that they signify Romish doctrine—which renders them objectionable.

This contention has much to be said in its favour. The very simplicity of our Anglican Communion Service is, for many of us, one of its greatest merits ; and it is also true that we run great risk of fostering Romish error within our Church if, without a very definite and adequate safeguard against such error, we permit the use of accessories of worship which are so intimately associated with distinctively Romish doctrine. There are, however, on the other hand, certain considerations that ought to have weight with us.

1. It is not at all clear that all who use vestments do so for the sake of the Romish doctrine that may be associated with them.

In a recent speech at the Salisbury Diocesan Synod, Chancellor Bernard said : “ I cannot shut my eyes to the growing demand for more ceremonial in the great central Christian act of worship, for more approximation to ancient order, for more freedom. It does not proceed, as is sometimes represented, from Romeward tendencies, but from that kind of religious temperament which needs fuller outward expression than is at

present given to it, and has already taken it in its own ways, sometimes extravagantly and disobediently. . . . I wish those friends with whom I am personally in sympathy would realize that the true danger to the Reformation settlement is not in such concessions as these, but in attempting to enforce uniformity where we know by experience it cannot be enforced."

Testimony to the same effect is borne by other men of wide experience. Ought we not to hesitate to act upon an assumption which may be more general than the facts of the case really warrant?

2. The present condition of ecclesiastical anarchy cannot continue. And yet to enforce the existing law against all who are breaking it is out of the question; the Church as a whole would shrink from such a course, even if the episcopal veto were abolished to-morrow. There seems to be no way of obtaining order except to recognize and make room for that diversity of self-expression in worship to which Chancellor Bernard has referred, and to fall back upon the honesty and loyalty of the clergy in general not to allow this concession to become a door to let in the errors of Romish doctrine which the Church of England has definitely rejected.

3. If, as I shall presently endeavour to show, there is reason for believing that in many instances vestments are used by men who hold Romish doctrine, the reasonable course for us to adopt is to devote our energies to dealing with the doctrine and with those who propagate it; not to spend our strength in attacking the vestments because they are used by these men as the outcome and sign of their doctrine.

The atmosphere of a village is laden with smoke arising in part from many harmless hearths, but in part also from a fire which is ravaging the village. The villagers do not concentrate their energies upon blowing away the smoke, but they discover the houses that are burning and do their best to put out the fire there. Some of the smoke, indeed, is the outcome and sign of the destructive fire; but even in that case it is the fire that receives their attention, not the smoke.

Speaking generally, the clergy are intelligent men who are able to discriminate between distinctively Roman and distinctively Anglican doctrine ; they are also honest men, incapable of wilful duplicity ; they are also loyal men, true and faithful to the Church whose ministers they are. There are, no doubt, exceptions to this general assertion, but the statement nevertheless represents the facts as a whole. It is, therefore, on the clergy as a body that we must rely for an advance out of our present miserable situation ; on their intelligence, their honesty, their loyalty—an advance that shall result in a new condition of things in which it may be possible for those who like it to use lawfully a more elaborate vesture and ceremonial than is now permitted, and for our Church nevertheless to retain in all their integrity those Scriptural doctrines which distinguish her from the Church of Rome.

But if the latter of these two results is to be secured, and secured so definitely that those of the clergy who are not loyal members of the Church of England, but hold and teach distinctively Roman doctrine, shall find it impossible to misrepresent the concessions as to ritual, and shall even be constrained to leave us altogether, it is imperative that we should be prepared to embody in a new declaratory rubric a statement of doctrine which shall be so definite that its point cannot be evaded, and which, whilst adding nothing to the doctrine which is already expressed in the Prayer-Book and Articles, shall yet have this special merit, viz., that it shall plainly declare what is the mind of the Church to-day.

Let me now try to show the need for this re-affirmation of doctrine.

I have before me, as I write, a large number of service books and manuals published for use in the Church of England, varying in bulk from 647 pages to 19 pages, many of which have obtained a considerable circulation, and all of which in one way or another give expression to doctrine which is as definitely condemned by the Church of England as it is definitely taught by the Church of Rome. Passing over such things as transub-

stantiation,¹ adoration of the Sacrament,² the invocation of saints and angels, and a very pronounced mariolatry,³ I ask you to concentrate your attention upon that doctrine which, although it may not so strikingly appeal to the popular imagination, nevertheless lies at the very root of the difference between the Church of England and the Church of Rome—viz., the doctrine that in the Holy Eucharist the Lord Jesus Christ is offered as a sacrifice for sin.

Let me quote a few passages on this subject from the books I have mentioned.

1. From "Divine Service" I take the following statements and prayers :

(a) "The bread by anticipation is called a 'pure, unspotted, undefiled host,' because all the prayers that go before and follow the consecration have reference to the moment of consecration, when the Victim becomes present and is offered to God" (p. 85).

(b) "The sacrifice of the altar is necessarily pleasing to God of itself, since the Victim there offered is 'that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, whom God the Father hath sealed,' of whom He also said, This is My beloved Son" (p. 85).

(c) "*Requiem.*—A method of offering the Holy Sacrifice for the rest and peace of the faithful departed. *Secret Collects:* (i.) *For a woman deceased*—'Let the soul of Thine handmaid N., O Lord, be delivered from all sins by this sacrifice, without which none can be set free from transgression: and grant that by this service of atonement she may obtain everlasting mercy.' (ii.) *For many deceased persons*—'We beseech Thee, O Lord, favourably to behold this oblation which we offer unto Thee for the repose of the souls of Thy servants: and grant that that which Thou hast vouchsafed shall be healing to the quick may likewise become help and pardon to the dead . . .'" (p. 111).

¹ "Let us Pray," pp. 32 and 64; "Catholic Prayers," pp. 3 and 106; "Divine Service," p. 378.

² "English Catholic's Vade-Mecum," p. 79; "Let us Pray," p. 27, etc.

³ "Christian's Companion," p. 62; "May Blossom," throughout; "Catholic Prayers," p. 182; "Emmanuel," p. 12, etc.

2. From "The English Catholic's Vade-Mecum" :

"O Holy Father . . . receive this pure sacrifice which I, Thine unworthy servant, offer unto Thee . . . by the hands of Thy priest, for my numberless sins, offences, and negligences, for all here present, and for all faithful Christians, quick and dead . . ." (p. 45).

3. From "Let us Pray," a book of instructions and prayers, published by the Society of SS. Peter and Paul, which is simply a copy of a Roman Catholic book entitled "Simple Prayer-Book" :

"The bread and wine are changed by the operation of God the Holy Ghost, at the consecration, into the Body and Blood of Christ, who then offers Himself again to His Eternal Father for the salvation of mankind." . . . "Both on Mount Calvary and in the Mass the Victim (that which is offered) is the same—the Body and Blood of Christ; and the Priest is the same—Christ our Lord, who offered Himself on Calvary through the executioners who put Him to death, and who offers Himself in the Mass on the Altar through His priests, who say the words of consecration. So the sacrifice of Calvary and the Mass are the same sacrifice, only the manner in which they are offered is different. On Calvary our Lord's Blood was really shed, and He really died; in the Mass His Blood appears to be shed, and His death is represented" (pp. 12, 13).

We may note, in passing, the strange intellectual blindness of those who teach such doctrine as this; for since the sacrifice of Calvary is *the death* of Christ, how can the Mass be the same sacrifice if in it there is only *an appearance of blood-shedding* and *a representation of death*, and not the reality in either case?

4. From "A Book for the Children of God" :

"And still His body is given; still His Blood is shed: not over and over again, but *eternally*. The Sacrifice of Calvary lives on in the Sacrifice of the Mass. The Mass is not one Sacrifice and Calvary another. It is the same Sacrifice" (p. 119).

5. From "The Christian's Companion" :

"After the Consecration you may say, 'O Eternal Father,

accept this Holy Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ Thy Son, which was once offered to Thee upon the Cross, and is now offered upon our Altar " (p. 30).

6. From "A Catechism for Catholics in England," a work which is "inscribed to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Provinces of Canterbury and York, with unbounded reverence and regard for their holy office":

"What is the Christian Sacrifice?"

"The Christian Sacrifice is the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ really present on the Altar under the forms of bread and wine, and offered to God for the living and the dead."

"Is the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist the same as the Sacrifice of the Cross?"

"The Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist is the same as the Sacrifice of the Cross, for Christ, who offered Himself once for all on the Cross, and now presents Himself before the Father in heaven, also presents Himself by the hands of His priest in the Holy Eucharist on earth" (p. 35).

7. From "Children at the Altar":

"When present at this service . . . (1) We join with the priest in offering the Christian Sacrifice. (2) We worship our Lord Jesus Christ on His Altar-Throne" (p. 5).

"Jesu, in Thy dear Sacrament
Thy Cross I cannot see;
But the Crucified is offered there,
And He was slain for me" (p. 41).

These extracts are, I think, sufficient to show that a considerable section of the clergy of the Church of England—the men who use such service books and circulate such manuals—are habitually teaching the doctrine that in the Lord's Supper the Lord Jesus Christ is being perpetually offered to God the Father as a sacrifice for sin. Whatever inconsistency and self-contradiction may be involved in their statement of this doctrine, the fact of their asserting it is beyond question.

In sharp contrast to this whole conception of the Lord's

Supper, I desire now to state the doctrine of the Church of England, and the clear teaching of Holy Scripture on which that doctrine is based.

I cite first the 31st Article of Religion, and ask you to note carefully both its title and its contents :

“ *Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.*”

“ The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual ; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.”

In this Article two points are to be specially emphasized :

1. The Oblation of Christ is declared to have been *finished upon the Cross*. This declaration of our Church condemns any and every assertion to the effect that the sacrifice of Christ is in any sense continued or perpetuated, or reproduced in any way whatsoever. It was “finished upon the Cross.” There was then an end of it. The *fruits* of it are eternal, but *the Oblation itself has ceased*.

2. Asserting in the most comprehensive and explicit terms the *uniqueness* and *perfection* of the sacrifice of Christ *upon the Cross*, our Church in this Article condemns “the sacrifices of Masses” as blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits, on the ground that Christ was therein said to be offered for the living and the dead to have remission of pain or guilt. It doesn't the least bit matter what name we give to the ceremony, nor what the circumstances attending it may be. The thing which is so scathingly condemned is the alleged offering of Christ in it as a sacrifice for sin ; and it is so condemned because it practically denies the *finality*, and therefore the *perfection*, of the atoning sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross.

And this Article does not stand alone. Equally clear—and in some ways more forcible still—is the teaching conveyed by the Prayer of Consecration. The distinction between the Lord's

Table, at which the Holy Communion is celebrated, and the Christian's altar, on which the sacrifice of Christ for the sin of the world was offered, is most effectively, though undesignedly, exhibited in the rubric before this prayer and the opening sentences of the prayer itself.

The Rubric.—"When the priest, standing before *the Table*, hath so ordered the bread and wine . . ."

The Prayer.—"Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine only Son, Jesus Christ, to suffer death *upon the Cross* for our redemption; who made *there* (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world . . ."

Here we note three most significant assertions :

(i.) The officiating priest at the Holy Communion stands before *a table*.

(ii.) It was *on the Cross* that Christ offered the sacrifice of Himself.

(iii.) That sacrifice was *one*, and *once offered*; it was also *full, perfect, and sufficient* for the sins of the whole world. It cannot, therefore, be offered again in any sense whatever, nor can it be continued.

Indirectly, but no less definitely, is the same truth taught in the two exhortations when the minister gives warning of his intention to celebrate the Holy Communion.

In the former of the two it is stated that the Sacrament is to be received "in remembrance of His meritorious Cross and Passion; whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins." From this it appears that the Lord's Supper is not the sacrifice of Calvary, nor a continuation of that sacrifice, but *in remembrance* of it; and it is not in or by the Sacrament that we obtain remission of sins, but by Christ's meritorious Cross and Passion, and *by that alone*.

In the second exhortation the memorial character of the Sacrament is again emphasized: "And as the Son of God did vouchsafe to yield up His soul by death upon the Cross for

your salvation, so it is your duty to receive the Communion *in remembrance of the sacrifice of His death.*" Attention is also directed here to the fact that the sacrifice of the Cross was the sacrifice of Christ's death. Now, death, at all events, is a fact about which there is finality. The process of dying may be regarded, if you please, as continued or perpetuated, but the act of death is one and final. By defining the sacrifice of Calvary as the death of Christ, our Church effectually disposes of any notion of the continuance of that sacrifice. Death cannot be continued. It is a single, momentary experience. If words are capable of conveying ideas, it is clear that the teaching of the Church of England is that the oblation of Christ for the sin of the world is a thing that happened once in the past, and that there is no continuance whatsoever of it in the present time.

And this doctrine of our Church is in strict accordance with the teaching of the New Testament. Here I may be permitted to quote briefly from a book on the New Testament doctrine of the Holy Communion, a revised edition of which I have recently published.

In chap. vi., which deals with the sacrificial aspect of the Holy Communion, an exhaustive examination is made of the passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews in which the words "We have an altar" occur; and it is shown that these words, in their context, cannot possibly refer to the Communion-table, but can only be interpreted of the Cross of Christ. The chapter concludes as follows :

"We thus see that there is nothing whatever in the New Testament to suggest or to support the idea that in the Holy Communion there is anything of the nature of a sacrifice, except the offering of praise to God, alms for the poor, and similar acts of service or of fellowship, all summed up in the offering of ourselves as a living sacrifice. Even in the highly figurative language of the Revelation there is no mention of anything that can suggest the idea of a continuous presentation in heaven of the sacrifice of Christ, with which a eucharistic sacrifice on earth may profess to be in union. The altar in

heaven is not an altar of burnt sacrifice, but a golden altar of incense (Rev. viii. 3), symbolical of the prayers of God's people, not of the atoning sacrifice of Christ. The vision of the Lamb as it had been slain, *in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures*, is but the expression in emblem of that which the choir of the redeemed express in song—the triumph and the glory of the self-sacrifice of Christ. It is not the presentation of Christ's passion before God which is symbolically depicted in this scene, but the praising of Christ's passion by those whom it has won, and the victory of Christ's passion in unsealing the sealed book of the mystery of life.

“The idea that in heaven our blessed Lord, as the High Priest of the good things to come, is standing at the heavenly altar on behalf of all (Paschasius Radbert, quoted by Gore, “The Body of Christ,” p. 189), is an idea that is wholly contrary to the teaching of the New Testament and the Creeds. Consider, for example, this representative passage from the Epistle to the Hebrews: ‘And every priest indeed standeth day by day ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, the which can never take away sins: but He, *when He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God*; from henceforth expecting till His enemies be made the footstool of His feet’ (x. 11-13).

“So also the Nicene Creed: ‘And ascended into heaven; *and sitteth on the right hand of the Father.*’

“The offering of the atoning sacrifice that alone can take away sin, whether as regards the accomplishing or the presentation of that sacrifice, has been so perfectly, and therefore so finally, completed that nothing more of it remains to be done in heaven or on earth. The Eternal Father does not need to be reminded of it. It is only we sinners, for whom that sacrifice was offered, that need to remember it continually for the saving and the satisfying of our soul. Therefore, ‘to the end that we should always remember the exceeding great love of our Master and only Saviour, Jesus Christ, thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by His precious blood-shedding He

hath obtained to us, He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries as pledges of His love, and *for a continual remembrance of His death*, to our great and endless comfort.'"¹

It must, I think, be now plain to most of us that the doctrine of a eucharistic sacrifice for sin, which we have seen expressed in the books to which reference has been made, flatly contradicts the plain teaching of the Church of England, and also that of the New Testament on which alone it is based. That teaching acknowledges one sacrifice for sin, and only one—a *sacrifice as final as death*: a sacrifice, therefore, which cannot be continued or perpetuated; a sacrifice that can never be repeated in any sense, because the work to be accomplished by it has once for all been fully and perfectly completed.

It is not my intention to discuss here the ethical position of the Anglican clergy who, in the face of this, habitually teach the doctrine of a eucharistic sacrifice for sin. It will, however, be evident to most people that if, for the sake of peace and order, and as a reasonable concession to the legitimate desire for greater dignity and more elasticity in worship, it is thought desirable to permit the use of vestments, this concession is certain to be misrepresented, whilst these men remain in the Church, unless the true eucharistic doctrine of the Church is securely safeguarded by a declaration which shall expressly repudiate this error of a eucharistic sacrifice for sin, and reaffirm that particular element of Anglican doctrine which the use of vestments would otherwise be claimed to discredit.

The declaratory rubric which I have suggested is as follows: "Although the use of the above-mentioned vesture is made permissible as an aid to the devotion of some within the Church, and as in their sight lending dignity and solemnity to their worship, it is nevertheless explicitly declared that no countenance is in any way given, either by the use of such vesture, or by any other changes in this Order, to the doctrine that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is offered in any sense whatsoever a sacrifice for sin. For we are taught in Holy

¹ Ford, "New Testament Doctrine of Holy Communion," pp. 43-45.

Scripture that the death of our Saviour Christ upon the Cross is the one, only, perfect and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world ; which sacrifice itself can never be repeated, nor does it need to be supplemented by any further sacrifice for sin."

The value of this declaration is that it focuses into one pointed statement, to be placed in the very forefront of the Order of Administration of the Lord's Supper, the doctrine of the Church of England that the sacrifice of Calvary is the one, only, and final offering for sin, and that there is therefore in the Lord's Supper no sacrifice for sin.

In doing this it emphasizes in other important matters the difference between Rome and ourselves. For since there is in the Lord's Supper no sacrifice for sin, there is obviously no need for a miracle to be wrought by God the Holy Ghost in order to lay on the "altar" the Divine Victim who would be required for such a sacrifice. Transubstantiation is thus rendered superfluous, and so are all the theories, named or unnamed, which are akin to it. Moreover, since there is no further sacrifice for sin, there is no need for an order of sacrificing priests to minister at the Lord's Table ; for there is nothing there for sacrificing priests to do. The Christian minister, we may remind ourselves, is, according to the New Testament, the "overseer," or the "elder," or the "minister," of the congregation ; he is never spoken of as a sacrificing priest (*ιερεύς*).

This declaration would also furnish an exceedingly helpful test by which an honest man could settle for himself whether he could conscientiously remain a beneficed or stipendiary clergyman of the Church of England ; and by which a Bishop could assist a doubtful clergyman of his diocese to make his position clear.

It has been said to me that it is hopeless to expect the adoption of such a rubric as this. But why ? In face of the teaching which I have shown to be prevalent in the Church *in spite of the statements to be found in the Prayer-Book and*

Articles, the need for such a rubric is imperative ; for it would simply be suicidal on the part of loyal churchmen to permit the use of vestments, having regard to the significance that is notoriously attached to them; without a safeguard at least as adequate as this rubric would afford. And no honest and loyal churchman can take exception to its terms, for it contains no new doctrine ; it merely concentrates attention upon the existing doctrine of the Church of England that relates to this particular subject, as the Prayer-Book in many places exhibits it.

The acceptance of such a rubric as this, accompanying the permissive use of vestments, would draw together into one strong, united body the hosts of Church-people whose tastes may be infinitely various as to the accessories of worship, but who have this in common, that they are genuinely loyal to the doctrine of their Church.

On the subject of reservation of the Sacrament very few words will suffice. In some of the manuals from which I have already quoted, forms of devotion are supplied for the service of "Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament" and for "Visits to the Blessed Sacrament." It is hardly necessary to say that these Roman devotions are unlawful in the Church of England. If, therefore, it is thought fit to permit reservation for the more speedy administration to the sick, it is imperative that this should only be where the administration to the sick immediately follows the celebration in church ; and that the carrying of the reserved elements to the sick shall be absolutely without ceremony or publicity, so that no opportunity may be afforded for adoration of the Sacrament.

Considering, however, the gross abuses, contrary to the spirit and the letter of Anglican doctrine, which now prevail in certain parishes in this matter of reservation and adoration of the Sacrament, it is far preferable that a very short Order of Administration for the Sick should be compiled, to be used in cases of urgency, and reservation continue to be wholly prohibited.

England and Rome, temp. Charles 33.

HERE is a sermon, printed in 1682, which brings us, as it were, into personal touch with the most interesting political career of Charles II.'s reign—namely, that of Anthony Ashley Cooper, first Earl of Shaftesbury. The sermon was preached by S. J. (Stephen Jay), Rector of Chinner, in the County of Oxford; its title, "Daniel in the Den; or, The Lord President's Imprisonment and Miraculous Deliverance."

In order to understand the position of the preacher and the allusions of the sermon, we must glance at the history of the remarkable man who is the hero of this remarkable discourse. It is impossible to sketch the history of his career even in the briefest outline, but to understand something of his character and of his attitude to the questions of the day is essential to our purpose. Few men, probably, who have acted a prominent part in the history of our country have been more maligned. It is now generally agreed that the portrait presented by Lord Macaulay, especially in his essay on Sir William Temple, is a gross caricature. Lingard, as a Roman Catholic, is naturally hardly fairer than Macaulay. Even Green, in his "Shorter History of England," fails to do him justice. All alike they bear ungrudging witness to his talents, but leave upon our minds the impression that those talents were systematically used for the advancement of unworthy ends and to gratify his own personal ambition. I believe that an impartial study of his career leads to a different conclusion.

Throughout his life Anthony Ashley Cooper was the champion of political liberty and religious toleration. Politically, his ideal was a limited and constitutional monarchy. Distrust of Charles I. made a Parliamentarian of him, and he remained the friend and counsellor of Cromwell until the Protector showed unmistakable signs of his aim at absolute power. In 1659 he joined General Monk in his design for placing Charles II. on the throne of his father. Upon the Restoration, his extraordinary and versatile ability at once made its mark, and step by step he occupied, one after the other, the highest places open to an English subject.

On the King's return he was forthwith made a Privy Councillor; in 1661 he became a peer of the realm; 1662 saw him Chancellor of the Exchequer; and in 1673 he was raised to the position of Lord Chancellor, from which, however, falling under the royal displeasure, he was dismissed in the following year. In 1679, after some years of varying fortune and unvarying conflict, he was appointed President of a Coalition Council. It was whilst occupying this position that he was committed to the Tower on a charge of treason. His release, in Stephen Jay's judgment as miraculous as Daniel's deliverance from the den of lions, is the subject of the sermon entitled "Daniel in the Den."

In an age of intolerance, Shaftesbury was the consistent friend of religious toleration. If he made an exception in respect of the religion of Rome, it was because he regarded that religion as the enemy of political liberty. That he had good reason for this belief was made clear by the course of events. Every form of dissent that, in his opinion, threatened no danger to the State was sure of his sympathy and protection. As to his own religious views, it would be difficult to say whether he had any. The story went that, on being catechized by a lady as to his religious opinions, "Madam," said he, "wise men are but of one religion." "And what is that?" pursued his interviewer. "Madam," he replied, "wise men never tell." His liberal and comprehensive sympathies were political rather than religious, and his determined antipathy to the Papists was rooted in the conviction that the religion of Rome and Absolutism were something more than akin.

In pursuing his aims, Shaftesbury cannot be acquitted of double-dealing and want of principle, and the close of his career was discredited by recklessness and violence. We must not, however, in forming our judgment, shut our eyes to his environment. Think of the Sovereign whose subject and servant he was; examine the conditions under which his work was done. He was the patriotic Minister of a Sovereign who betrayed his kingdom's honour and his kingdom's religion; who, from the first years of his reign, was in the pay of Louis XIV., England's natural enemy. Shaftesbury had been the friend and adviser of Cromwell, when that great man almost dictated terms to Europe;

now he was the servant of a master who brought England to a depth of dishonour that filled every lover of his country with indignation. Shaftesbury was fully conscious that his influence at Court acted as a check on the King in his discreditable career, and if sometimes he stooped to unworthy concessions, we must not judge him harshly. Who that reads the history of Charles II.'s reign can censure Shaftesbury's determination that, if he could not save his royal master from selling himself to the King of France, he would save his country from the tyranny of Rome?

It was to this object that the closing years of his life were almost exclusively devoted. In 1670 Charles entered into a secret treaty with Louis XIV., by which he bound himself to an alliance offensive and defensive with France, at the same time, and as part of the arrangement, offering to declare himself a Papist and to use his best endeavours to Romanize his kingdom, on condition that the King of France would provide him with a subsidy of a million sterling per annum. To all save Lords Arlington and Clifford, themselves Papists, the King's change of religion was kept secret. In a moment of drunken confidence Shaftesbury learned this secret from Lord Arlington. This proved to be the parting of the ways between Shaftesbury and his Sovereign. He was both staggered and humiliated by the discovery, and from this time forward he was, above and before everything else, the leader of Liberalism. Good reason had he to say that the King had "brought his affairs to that pass that there is not a person in the world, man or woman, that dares rely upon him, or put any confidence in his word or friendship." Is it any wonder that, in dealing with such a Sovereign and such a situation, Shaftesbury should have been led into desperate measures in his efforts to protect the country from Papal aggression. The King was childless, and likely to remain so; his brother James, a bigoted Papist, was next in succession to the throne. It was this fact that henceforth dominated Shaftesbury's political programme, and his last years were devoted to schemes and projects for the exclusion of James, the King's brother, or any Papist, from the throne of England. At the close, therefore, of his career he figures as little more than a Protestant agitator, ready, whether by fair means or foul, to promote the end he had in view.

In these last years he set himself to fan the flame of Protestant zeal throughout the country, even lending his powerful influence to the support of Titus Oates in his mendacious tale of a Jesuit plot against the life of the King. It was now, too, that he made the fatal mistake of openly espousing the cause of the Duke of Monmouth, the eldest of King Charles's bastard sons, and supporting his claim to be Charles's successor.¹ Few things are more remarkable—indeed, unaccountable—in the history of those times than the reaction of popular feeling in the King's favour, and even in that of James, during the last three years of Charles's life. It was as a consequence of this reaction that Shaftesbury was arrested on a charge of high treason for suborning false witnesses in the Popish plot, and committed to the Tower. This is the imprisonment of the Lord President alluded to in the title of the sermon now before us. His release was due to the fact that London now, as ever, stood faithful to the causes for which Shaftesbury was fighting. As a consequence of this similarity of views, the Middlesex Grand Jury on November 24, 1681, ignored the Bill of Indictment. This led to Shaftesbury's immediate release, and here is the miraculous deliverance claimed by Stephen Jay for his hero. The triumph was short-lived. Shaftesbury plunged with desperation into schemes for defeating the policy of the Court, but the resuscitated royal power was too strong for him. After concealing himself for a while among London friends, he sought safety in flight. Disguised as a Presbyterian minister, he travelled to Harwich, and thence, on November 28, 1682, crossed to Holland, where he died in the following January.²

Before turning to the sermon we must recall two facts. First, England was permeated with the profoundest dread of Roman Catholic supremacy, and, in consequence, had lent too ready an ear to the lies of Titus Oates and his confederates. "How they

¹ Shaftesbury's espousal of Monmouth's cause, instead of that of the Prince of Orange, is, I believe, one of the unsolved mysteries of history.

² "Sleep, thou most active of mankind! oh, make
Thy last low bed, and death's long requiem take!
Thou who, whilst living, kept'st the world awake."
Elegy on Lord Shaftesbury in "Raleigh Redivivus."

must have hated popery !” says Lord Rosebery, to bring William from Holland and the Georges from Hanover, all as un-English as they could be.¹ Secondly, the action of the Grand Jury in acquitting Shaftesbury had been enthusiastically welcomed in London, always a strong centre of Protestant interests, and the release of their hero had been hailed with wild delight. Bells were rung, bonfires were lighted, and a medal was struck in Shaftesbury's honour, his bust and title on the obverse, the reverse bearing a representation of the Tower of London, with the sun emerging from a cloud. The inscription, *Lætamur* (“We rejoice”), and the date, November 24, 1681, add significance to this act of homage.²

These facts will help us to enter with sympathy into the frame of mind in which the Rector of Chinner composed his sermon. Stephen Jay was a convinced believer in the Earl of Shaftesbury and the cause he championed. He has nothing but good to say of him. The very quotation from Scripture on the title-page proclaims the worth and virtue he is about to celebrate: “Innocency was found in me; and also before thee, O King, I have done no hurt.”

The sermon is prefaced by an epistle dedicatory to the Right Honourable Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury, late Lord President of His Majesty's most Honourable Privy Council. In this preamble Shaftesbury is compared to Lazarus, because by reason of him many of the Jews believed in Jesus. It follows (and we almost shrink from saying it) that in Shaftesbury's master, King Charles, is found a parallel to our Blessed Lord. Shaftesbury

¹ “These monarchs knew that they were not chosen from affection, or for their qualities, certainly not for their attractions. They were taken as necessities, almost odious necessities, to keep out a Romanist dynasty, which represented something to the people that was more odious still.”—“Chatham: His Early Life and Connections,” p. 198.

² This medal was the subject of one of Dryden's most powerful satires, to which he gave the title of “The Medal,” dedicating it to the Whigs, of whom Shaftesbury was the acknowledged leader. It was Dryden's practice to side with success. Having composed some noble lines, “Heroic Stanzas,” to the memory of Cromwell, he welcomed Charles with his “*Astræa Redux*.” His description of Shaftesbury, whether in “*Absalom and Achitophel*” or “*The Medal*,” is the work of a bitter partisan. A good account of the circumstances that led to the arrest and release of Shaftesbury will be found in Sir Walter Scott's Introduction to “*The Medal*,” Scott's “*Dryden*,” vol. ix., p. 409.

himself is addressed in the most fulsome terms as the champion of Protestantism. "It is certain, My Lord, that every Turn of your Head, Glance of your Eye, Motion of your Hand, Step of your Foot, is a vexation and a Plague to your Enemies the Papists, who believe your very Shadow so fatal to all their Contrivances and Aims that whilst You live they Shrivell and Wither. Your Breath strikes confusion to all their Plots, and therefore no wonder they have variously consulted your Death, as well as your Great Master's: Lazarus must dye also. . . . Praised be God, who hath frustrated (hitherto) all their Hellish attempts both against your Sovereign and Self. May His Majesty live for ever, a sure Defender of our Faith and Church. And may your Lordship live, too, the Dread and Eye-sore of the Enemies of its peace." Had the preacher been acquainted with State-secrets, he would hardly have represented Charles as "the Defender of our Faith and Church." Alike in this dedication and in the sermon itself, the writer ignores the fact that there had been an open rupture between the King and his Minister, and that the subject was in virtual rebellion against his Sovereign. From first to last the King's interests and wishes are treated as identical with those of Shaftesbury. The picture, therefore, presented by Stephen Jay is quite untrue to history.

The text of the sermon is Heb. xi. 33: "Who through faith stopped the mouths of lions." Daniel, representing the Earl, is held up to admiration as an example of high birth, perfect beauty, good breeding, praiseworthy abstinence, sublime wisdom, merited promotion, exemplary piety, at the same time as anxious for the advancement of those who brought honour to their God by refusing to worship the golden image. The golden image, it is hardly necessary to say, is the power of the Pope. As applied to Lord Shaftesbury, such language was gross exaggeration, but the charges of profligacy constantly brought against him were the baseless inventions of his enemies. "Shaftesbury's private life was one of rare purity for the age!"¹ "He was temperate by nature and habit. . . . His hands were clean. He stood far above his contemporaries in his scorn of personal profit."²

¹ "Dictionary of National Biography."

² Green's "Shorter History of England."

“ How happy is that Prince whose affairs are securely lodged in the ministration of those who had rather die than betray their Sovereign by an ill act; no, not by easy humouring him in his sin, and sooner resign themselves into the hazard of his utmost displeasure than to flatter him in designs so dishonourable to God, pernicious to himself, and opposite to their principles and consciences.”¹

The preacher urges that in one respect the plotters against Daniel stand in honourable contrast to those who had conspired against Shaftesbury, in that they stopped short of suborning false witnesses. “ Be it remarked, to the honour of these eager conspirators, that the height of this feverish rage did not dis-temper them into the distraction of perjurious revenge. . . . They will not damn souls to destroy bodies. Their very heathen conscience boggled at the hellish practice. 'Tis enough for Rome and Hell to boast such impious customs and to produce such frightful monsters.” If such have found their way to England, “ O God, may these vermin return again to their own home, and no longer infest our air with their infectious breath.”

The attacks of these informers are in reality directed against God. “ Nor can an arrow be shot against piety without hitting God Himself directly in the face. . . . The malice that wounds a saint would destroy Deity, if it could.” We may see a picture of Lord Shaftesbury in Daniel's relation to the conspiring nobles of Babylon. “ The trepanners begin to sneak about the Lord President's lodgings. Malice degenerates them into eaves-droppers; they creep up and down under his very windows. If the casement chance to fly open, the project thrives, their hopes swell, and the blood capers in their veins. . . . And what know we but some were so impudent as to steal upstairs and peep through the very keyhole to discover but the first motion towards a genuflection. . . . Brave Belteshazzar, how little do we know what various passions agitate thy sacred breast at this time!” How flesh and spirit may have striven for the mastery! The preacher

¹ It was notorious that Lord Shaftesbury had not only opposed the King in the matter of his brother's succession, but had done his utmost to check the King in respect of personal expenditure, and especially in the extravagant grants lavished upon his mistresses.

seems to hear their voice, and records their words. The spirit is the first to speak, and thus concludes its soliloquy: "I'll venture an ingorgement into the bowels of the lions, ere they shall glory over mine apostacy from my religion and my God." The argument of the flesh follows, and is a really fine specimen of rhetoric and casuistry, concluding thus: "Mayest thou not offer up the purer sacrifice from the secret altar of a flaming heart, and be safe? What an advantage hast thou to baffle the conspiracy by a mental devotion, and to countermince the villanies of their cursed policy by locking up thy soul in itself!" The spirit prevails over the flesh, and celebrates its victory in a very beautiful prayer, which, however, ends with something of an anti-climax: "'Redeem Thy Church and people'— But here a noise interrupts him. The confederates cry out amain: 'Treason, treason! a traitor against our King and his law; away with him to the lions! Darius himself cannot save him.'" The nobles proceed to accuse Daniel to the King.

"Now is the King almost dead with sorrow. The fatal news more wounds his royal heart than the prisoner's; he hath not a better subject in the kingdom, who must now be rent from his bosom by a stratagem." Daniel is not allowed to be carried off to the den without convincing proof of his Sovereign's affection. "How do I see the great Darius hugging him in his arms!" Stephen Jay is nothing if not dramatic. The King addresses Daniel at some length: "Daniel, my dearest Daniel, the brightest star that ever illustrated a Prince's Court! the faithfullest servant that ever bless'd a master. . . . I am distress'd for thee, my dearest Daniel. How willingly could I uncliothe myself from these vain badges of majesty to *pass into spirit* with thee, were it not that I stay behind to sacrifice hecatombs of thine enemies to thy ghost. . . . But stay, may not thy God meet thee in the den as (I have heard) Shadrach's did in the furnace; and methinks I have faith to believe He will."

After a sleepless night, Darius rises early and goes in haste to the lions' den. "How nimbly do I see his royal feet pace the streets while yet his affections lacquey before him, and are impatient for the first tidings." To the King's cry, "Is thy God

able to deliver thee?" Daniel replies in a sermon of considerable length concerning God's goodness and his own innocency, "though the chapel-door is not open, and Darius is content to be his auditor in the porch. . . . The King never heard one that better pleased him, and the very lions themselves seem to understand it."

The prophet is then miraculously ejected from his subterranean prison. "The sermon, now finished, has the effects of thunder. The seals are rent away, the stony door of the chapel flies open, the preacher is hurled, he hardly knows how, into the royal presence, where he finds the King heaven-stricken too. An ecstasy of joy had ravish'd away his senses, and he talks distractedly, 'Ah, Daniel, art thou indeed my very Daniel? May mine heart believe what mine eyes see?' then stands like a statue (his rolling eye the only index of his life): is astonish'd, and admires what he cannot express. At length, recovering himself into majesty again, he thunders out his dreadful mandates, and orders the execution of his own and the Lord President's enemies." Then follows a realistic and gruesome description of the fate of the conspirators, of which the following sentences may be taken as a specimen of the whole: "The lions all together tip off the King's health and Daniel's in the very heart-blood of their enemies; they leave not a drop behind, and should any chance to drivel down their beards, they lick them clean again, and make a clear riddance and quick despatch. So let all Thine enemies (and Thy people's) perish, O Lord!"

As a matter of curiosity, one would like to know whether a copy of this discourse ever reached the great man in whose honour it was preached. One can imagine the cynical smile that would play over the careworn features of the sceptical philosopher, who for more than twenty years had fought the real enemies of his country, but was at last beaten, and was soon to die in dishonoured exile.

G. S. STREATFIELD.



The Missionary World.

WE referred last month to the need for a proper sense of perspective; for that long look at circumstances, present and to come; and for the perception that pierces through the material to the spiritual. Once again on the threshold of a New Year—new, probably, with a newness this world has never known—we are indebted to the *International Review of Missions* for its "Missionary Survey of the Year," which occupies over seventy pages in the January number. Here, indeed, is perspective here is hope, here is strong confidence, for here, in the desolateness of wrecked purposes that were otherwise overwhelming, we are led to see that even now "the building of the eternal kingdom of truth, righteousness, and love in the hearts of men goes silently on." Through the courtesy of the editor we, in common, we believe, with other magazines, have been sent an advance note from the conclusion of the survey, which we print in full, recalling that

"The hour is darkest near the dawning, and afar
We catch the glimmer of the morning star."

* * * * *

Here is the extract referred to:

"The preceding pages (pp. 2-69) record much serious loss. The work of German missions in India and Kamerun, and of British missions in the Turkish Empire and in German East Africa, has been for the time almost completely interrupted. In other parts of the mission-field there has been serious disorganization, depletion of staff, and restriction of work. Postponement of plans for advance and the practice of the most rigid economy have been the rule throughout the entire mission-field. . . . Hundreds of devoted men and women have seen the work built up by the unselfish labours of a lifetime apparently swept away in the flood. Many more have had their plans upset and the realization of their hopes indefinitely postponed. Bitterness has entered into the relations of those engaged in the service of their common Lord. The moral prestige of Christendom has suffered a blow from which it will take long to recover.

"But the record of the year is not all dark. Through the dark clouds there are gleams of sunlight to strengthen faith and quicken hope. The injury to mission work has been by no means so general and widespread as might have been anticipated. In important mission-fields such as Japan, China, and, except as regards the German missions, India, work has been continued for the most part on normal lines. In many instances where loss has come, the hour of trial has revealed unsuspected loyalties and called

forth unwonted sacrifices. It is most encouraging that in so many fields the returns for the circulation of the Scriptures in 1914 should show a remarkable increase on all previous records. In all the principal mission-fields of Asia fresh vigorous efforts have been made to reach the people with the Gospel, and have met with a cheering response. While war has raged in Europe, there has been in many parts of the mission-field a quiet growth of a deeper corporate life, a drawing closer together of the different missionary bodies, and a steady progress in the formulation of wise missionary policies. . . . In all these things we can trace the signs of the working of the Spirit of God, and they are an assurance that even amidst the distraction and turmoil of war the building of the eternal kingdom of truth, righteousness, and love in the hearts of men goes silently on."

* * * * *

We have been informed that the customary section on the home base will not appear in the survey, as given in the January issue of the *Review*, but will be reserved for the April number. We who are held responsible for this part of the missionary task dare not allow ourselves to regard it as a struggle for survival. Rather are we free creatures, freely receiving the gift of life, that we may breast the tide in faith and hope, and not be overborne in the strength of its adverse flow.

* * * * *

We presume that all our readers are following closely the Conventions which the C.M.S. is arranging in over one hundred centres in England and Ireland, supported as they are with appropriate publications and guided with wise counsel from Salisbury Square. Undoubtedly they are links of a great chain or springs in a great channel uniting the needs of man with the power of God. They are not to be regarded as of value to the society primarily, though they are, we doubt not, absolutely essential to its existence, because of their object; rather are they indications of a hunger and a thirst which God is creating in His Church which nothing will satisfy save the coming of God Himself. The Rev. C. C. B. Bardsley wisely asks us to seek "revival" rather than "a revival," a term round which a certain spiritual connotation has grown up. We know not in what form or manner we shall be "revived," what conviction of sin, what penitence, what sacrifice, what reformation of method and lifting of ideal are requisite; but we know we need "revival," and we know its source and that its centre must be the Blessed Person of the

Saviour of mankind. We commend, in particular, the suggestion given in the *C.M.S. Gazette* that little groups of missionary workers should meet for prayer for "revival." We may have the simplicity of children in our method, and their directness in our approach to God.

* * * * *

From a circular issued by them, it is evident that the Board of the London Missionary Society is conscious of its great responsibility in coming to a conclusion during December which is referred to as "of great moment for the future of the society," and which will evidently affect policy to a large extent. The circular further says: "It is of tremendous importance that at this hour the action of the Board shall express the Will of God." That in clear and straightforward language is the issue before every missionary board or committee just now. The decision of the L.M.S. will be taken while these pages are in the press, but our prayers and our sympathy can follow the result, even if they be too late to share in the process. We are indebted to the L.M.S. for reminding us in the same circular of the notable words recently used by Lord Bryce: "The one sure hope of a permanent foundation for world peace is in the extension throughout the world of the principles of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

* * * * *

Pending their conclusion, we have refrained till now from commenting on two noteworthy articles which have been completed in the *C.M. Review* for December. That by the Bishop of Uganda entitled, "The Educational Problem in Uganda," appears in the November and December numbers, and gives a full account of an educational conference composed of European and native members held at Budo from April 17 to 26. The wisdom of allowing the Church at home to get this clear insight into the educational problems of the Church abroad is altogether to be commended. Whether the course adopted be approved in all instances or not, the revealing of the situation will be welcomed by everyone, and we shall all feel we have some share now in the task which awaits the Bishop and his staff. We are especially glad to read that the "danger of having an educated laity

and a less educated body of clergymen " is so fully recognized. This is a danger common to many parts of the mission-field, and one which should arrest the speech of those who are apt to question the necessity for higher theological education. Bishop Willis concludes finely by saying: " The end is not yet; but this first educational conference has at least given us glimpses of the far distant goal and of the path by which we must travel in the struggle of God."

The Rev. G. T. Basden is less fortunate in presenting his subject—" Denationalizing a Primitive People"—inasmuch as his article was published in October and December; nevertheless, he succeeds in carrying forward the interest. His treatment of the subject has the demerit of being defensive, and he is sensitive to the ill-informed criticism dealt out to Government and missionary alike. But his paper has not only a present illuminative value, but a permanent worth for all those who wish to understand the inevitable social changes which Western civilization introduces among primitive peoples through new methods of government, travel, commerce, education, and clothing. Part of the value of the paper as a piece of evidence lies in the fact that Mr. Basden illustrates all his general contentions by his own intimate knowledge of the Ibo country in Southern Nigeria.

* * * * *

Missions Overseas, the eighth annual review of the Central Board of Missions for 1915, derives its distinctiveness this year from special articles on the missionary Church in Australasia and in particular from a sketch on the " Historical Development of the Anglican Church in Australia." At a time when the heroism of sons of Australia and New Zealand on the classic shores of the Ægean is stirring every heart, it is fitting that we should be reminded of the origin of that Anglican Church founded by men no less heroic in another way. To the average Churchman it would seem almost a fairy-tale that less than one hundred years ago Australia was an archdeaconry in the Diocese of Calcutta, and even this arrangement was an advance in organization. We cordially agree with the Bishop of Goulburn in his saying: " The material for the making of Australian manhood is magnificent ";

“ national character ” is already apparent, is “ rapidly setting,” and the Church has a unique influence in “ fashioning the mould and fixing the types.” A full study of this survey of Australasia, occupying not far from one-half of the whole report, and including studies of the Bush Brotherhood, the Melanesian Mission, the Presbyterian Churches, the Foreign Missions of Australasian Methodism, the Australian Board of Foreign Missions, and the Australian agency of the London Missionary Society, will knit the hearts of Churchmen to the strong new peoples of the Southern Seas. Before turning from *Missions Overseas*, we call attention to the brief, pregnant contribution of Bishop Brent, of the Philippines. Has he not touched once more on the inner problem of the Church, and does he not indicate in his suggestive way the path to tread? But the whole report will surely be carefully read.

* * * * *

The December number of *China's Millions* contains the last journal received from Mr. James R. Adam, giving an account of a seven weeks' tour among the hill tribes of Kweichow. Few men have been privileged to reap so great a harvest as this faithful missionary, who was recently suddenly struck by lightning in his home in China and instantaneously killed. In his own district he had seen the baptism of 6,449 of the poor despised Miaos in twenty years, and at his death there were 5,590 communicants, 42 evangelists, 29 school-teachers, 2 colporteurs, 3 Bible-women, and 323 unpaid helpers. He was a true father to the simple people among whom he worked. A second heavy sorrow has befallen them in the death shortly after of the Rev. S. Pollard, of the United Methodist Mission. This is an almost overwhelming blow for the Christian tribesmen, and they specially need our prayers. The story of Mr. Adam's life and work has been graphically told in a booklet called “ Some an Hundredfold,” which can be had from the office of the China Inland Mission.

G.



Notices of Books.

THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH; THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS. By the Rev. Henry Barclay Swete, D.D., D.Litt., F.B.A. London: *Macmillan and Co.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

In his latest work Dr. Swete publishes the substance of courses of lectures given at Cambridge in 1913-14 to classes consisting chiefly of candidates for the ministry of the Church of England. The first half of the volume deals with the Holy Catholic Church; the second half with the Communion of Saints. Dr. Swete writes from the point of view of the High Churchman and Sacramentarian. The Catholic Church to him, and those who think with him, consists only of those who have received Holy Baptism, the laying on of hands in Confirmation, are communicants, and possess and recognize the Episcopate. Others may have the Spirit of God, may be leading holy lives, may be zealous in good works and missionary enterprise, but they are "separatists," "voluntary associations," "religious societies." They are not "churches," though by virtue of their baptism members of such "societies" are members of the Body of Christ. "As a matter of convenience or of courtesy an inexact use of the name—*i.e.*, Church—may pass unchallenged; but it is important to note that, as a matter of fact, the societies known in England as 'The Free Churches' have little in common with the local churches of the Apostolic age" (p. 16).

In the first chapter "The Notes of the True Church" are set forth as six in number—*viz.*, Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, Apostolicity, Visibility, and Indefectibility. Under the first of these "notes" we read that "A unity which is ultimately spiritual is compatible with much variety" (p. 14). This is good, and true. It is sad, therefore, on the opposite page, to find the question raised as to whether "Christian societies started since the sixteenth century by leaders who broke away from the communion of the historical Church" may "belong to the unity of the Church." Apparently the sole reason for their exclusion is that "they neither possess nor recognize the Episcopate, and, with the exception of the Presbyterians, they have abandoned the other orders of the ministry and the principle of succession." This would be tolerable if there were evidence that the Lord of the Church had left behind Him "a constitution, or even the outline of a constitution for the new society." But the learned writer assures his readers that with regard to "instructions from Him relating to the organization, the ministry, the worship of the future Church," "we have no record of any such provision, and no hint that it was made." "The working out of details was deliberately left to the Apostles and to the future Church, taught and guided by the gift of the Spirit of Christ" (p. 6). The reader may be pardoned in asking, "To what limit in the future Church was this work committed?" Did the power of "working out" the details end in the early centuries, or did it extend to the sixteenth and twentieth? Is it not conceivable that God had a plan wider and more generous than the cast-iron system of episcopacy? And if He has given His Spirit and vouchsafed His blessings to non-episcopal Christians, what right have those who differ from them to place them outside "the Catholic Church"?

The writer is much nearer the truth, and the mind of Christ, when he says (p. 30): "The men who in the second century confessed their belief in the 'Holy Church' . . . believed themselves to belong to a Society which was distinguished from every other society in the world by the note of holiness: by belonging to God, and bearing the impress of His likeness." Yet on p. 40, in discussing the Catholicity of the Church, the author declares that "The Catholic Church is the great Society which embraces all the baptized, exists through all the ages of the world, and maintains the whole sum of revealed truth and inherited order"; but, on p. 41, adds: "The title 'Catholic' . . . must be denied to bodies which, however great their spiritual efficiency, do not fulfil the necessary conditions of genuine Catholicity"—viz., "retain the great Sacraments, the doctrine of the Catholic Creeds, and the succession of the historical Episcopate." And the reader asks: "How shall we find the concord of this discord?" "The Church of Jesus Christ opens the door to all comers, but all who enter must accept Apostolic doctrine, and submit to Apostolic order and discipline" (p. 50). This may be a comforting contemplation for the satisfied Sacramentarian, but it is not in harmony with the Word of God, the liberty of the Gospel of Christ, nor the formularies of the Church of England. On p. 70 we read that the teaching of the Lord in St. John vi. was "spoken, of course, with reference to the spiritual or heavenly food which is received by faith; but the Eucharist is the appointed means of receiving it." This is an ingenious twist to the Master's instruction. There is a touch of patronage in the words (pp. 72-73): "It is to be thankfully acknowledged that the Holy Spirit works in communities which do not follow the ways of the historical Church."

Dealing with the work of the Church, the writer sounds a necessary caution (p. 103) with regard to "greater self-restraint and more patience in investigation, . . . and a sobriety in judgment which refuses to publish to the world hasty statements in regard to questions that cannot be settled without long examination, or even until the results have been tested by the experience of more than one generation."

In discussing "The Church in its Relations," the question of "the individual" comes up first for treatment. It is an important matter, for it deals with radical principles. The writer states that "it is, in fact, only an exaggerated individualism and an exaggerated collectivism that are incompatible. . . . Christianity has room for both, each in its own place" (p. 121). Emphasis is laid upon individualism thus: "Further, and above all, each member of the Church must, by the act of his own will, turn to God in a life of conversion, without which the Communion of the Sacraments avails nothing" (p. 123). There might be much more to the same effect, and the book would suffer no loss.

In the second half of the volume the theme is "The Communion of Saints." The phrase is first examined in detail—first, as it occurs in Holy Scripture, then in early Church writers, and finally in the Western Church. Then follow two chapters dealing with the Communion of the Saints with God—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and the Communion of Saints in the Church Militant—in the Sacraments, in the Spiritual Life, in Visible Fellowship. Questions of burning importance are raised in the fourth chapter—"The Communion of Living Saints with the Departed."

The views of the fathers in the early centuries, on the Condition of the Faithful Departed, are very minutely set forth, and the following section—The Interchange of Prayer—concedes, as “natural,” that “the dead in Christ pray for the living” (p. 221); and declares that while “Biblical evidence is slight” in support of the legitimacy of the living praying for the dead, yet “the question whether the prayers of the living avail for the dead is answered with no uncertain voice by Christian antiquity from the end of the second century onwards” (p. 223). It is noticeable that in this connection the *locus classicus* (2 Tim. i. 18) is claimed as the “one petition for a departed saint” to be found in the New Testament. While prayer for the dead is “left open” to the discretion of members of the English Church “at their private devotions at home or in church,” “at the present day it is used by a large minority, or perhaps even a majority, of well-instructed Churchmen, who at the same time loyally acquiesce in the exclusion of prayers for the departed from the authorized form of public worship, until such time as it shall please God to restore them to us” (p. 230).

The Church of England “has since 1563 condemned, root and branch, the practice of invoking the Saints” (p. 241). The author sounds a caution to which some might give heed: “The invocation of departed Saints is a practice which is neither primitive nor universal, and which has been found to be dangerous. It is earnestly to be hoped that no false sentiment may lead members of the English Church who realize the need of closer communion with the holy dead to fall back upon so precarious a way of attaining it” (p. 244).

THE PRESENT CONTROVERSY ON THE GOSPEL MIRACLES. By F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D. London: S.P.C.K. Price 3s. net.

Christian apologists usually adopt one of two possible attitudes towards the opponents of the Gospel miracles. Either they affirm that these lie outside the province of natural science, which, in the investigation of natural phenomena, may approach but must not cross the border-line between the spiritual and the physical, or they argue that the rapid extension of scientific discovery and the wonders of its practical application create a hope of an ultimate explanation of the Bible statements. For the former a lengthy catena of the expressed opinions of eminent men of science might readily be compiled; for the latter we must resort to the works of distressed theologians. Dr. Hitchcock vacillates between the two positions, but the weight of his argument leans to the contention that some day science will confirm the miracles.

Philosophical argument should avoid inconsistency. We cannot justify the evangelists against impugners of their veracity, while according to convenience we take the liberty of modifying their records. If the destruction of the barren fig-tree and the swine of Gadara are “parables which have hardened into miracles” (p. 78), the case for the miracles as historical facts is given away. If the wonders wrought by Christ were “allegorical deeds,” or “hieroglyphics of the faith” (p. 79), disbelief in the miracles is warranted. Upon such assumptions the miraculous must be eliminated from the Gospel narratives, whether or no the elimination affect the Gospel message. Behind these doubtful defences, faith cannot long survive.

Oscillations of thought are the inevitable outcome of such treatment of the authorities. Dr. Hitchcock teaches us that "the key of these miraculous interventions may be in the astonishing use of natural means, the remarkable use of natural resources and forces" (p. 56); later he rebukes those who "bring these occurrences into line with natural law" (p. 88), for "according to this view the miracles of Jesus would only be relatively miraculous" (p. 89); afterwards he reverts to the acceptance of this hypothesis, averring that "aware of our limitations and our ignorance of both the forces of nature and the properties of its matter, we do not feel compelled to regard miraculous occurrences . . . as violations of that order" (p. 127).

To sustain the natural explanation resort is made to the most recondite and questionable speculations of modern science. Beset with difficulties of its own, "science has been compelled to assume the existence of this semi-material and semi-spiritual fluid, intangible and imponderable world" (p. 128) —*i.e.*, the ether. This assumption, difficult to imagine, impossible to demonstrate, casts a vivid light, so Dr. Hitchcock informs us, upon the resurrection of the body, which is not to be regarded as "a restoration of the identical material and ever-changing molecules which compose the body during life, but as the conservation of the permanent and *etheric* element which gives the body both life and form" (p. 128). The statement is not remarkable for lucidity, but apparently the body of our Lord remained in the grave, while astonished disciples witnessed in their midst the "etheric element"! Comment would indeed be superfluous. The evidence collected by the Society for Psychical Research is adduced to prove the power of mind over matter, and spiritualism to show the realities of devil-possession. The facts and their interpretation are both disputable. Their support is not helpful.

Much in this book, as an appeal *ad hominem*, would be of value to some who in their perplexity would gladly lean upon authority for the maintenance of their faith. But these are encumbered by useless references to the oft-refuted theories of Leibnitz upon the pre-established harmony of matter and mind, or Geulinx's still more incredible variations upon the same chord. We cannot but express our disappointment with a book which manifests wide reading and skilful handling of the materials, and which would have been advantageous to many, if only the author's pruning-knife had cut out a few pages and occasional sentences.

STUDIES IN THE PSALMS. By the late Professor S. R. Driver, D.D. Edited, with a Preface, by Professor C. F. Burney, D.Litt. London: *Hodder and Stoughton*. Price 6s.

The present volume is due to a wish expressed by Professor Driver, shortly before his death, that Dr. Burney should bring together and edit his scattered studies on the Psalms. The book consists of three parts. Part I. is a reprint of the important article which Dr. Driver had contributed to the "Prayer-Book Dictionary" on "The Prayer-Book Version of the Psalter." Part II. consists of a series of articles which appeared in the *Expositor* under the title of "The Method of Studying the Psalter." Part III. is a selection of five sermons preached at different times in Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford.

Many who have hitherto known Professor Driver as a popularizer of

Higher Criticism in this country will be glad to read of Professor Burney's testimony as to another side of his activity. In a prefatory note Dr. Burney writes: "The research into the language and contents of the Old Testament, which formed his life-work, was for him no merely linguistic and literary exercise. He was always keenly conscious of the living voice of God speaking throughout the pages of the Scriptures; and he sought . . . not merely to lay down a sound basis of interpretation for trained scholars, but also to utilize the outcome of his scholarship for the furtherance of practical religion—to emphasize and make clear the spiritual gain which results from a sober and reverent use of the means and methods of Old Testament study" (p. vi).

For a fruitful study of the Psalms Dr. Driver says that four things are needed.—(1) An exact translation of the original text. (2) Some knowledge of the historical situation of the Psalmist. (3) A recognition that a Psalm is a unity, and must be interpreted so that its unity is preserved. (4) A distinction must be drawn between its original sense and its application. In the treatment of representative Psalms in this volume, Dr. Driver adheres to these results. Take, for instance, the second Psalm. He gives us a new translation of the Hebrew, discusses the probable circumstances under which the Psalm was written, gives a connected exposition of the whole Psalm, and adds: "The Psalm is Messianic, not by a direct prediction, but through its describing an *ideal* rule, which, in a larger and more spiritual sense than the Psalmist's words actually suggest, was fulfilled by Christ."

The "Imprecatory Psalms"—Psalms in which the poet utters impassioned prayers for vengeance on his enemies—have always been a stumbling-block to Christians. Dr. Driver, though admitting that such imprecations are not in harmony with the higher moral level on which Christ has placed us, makes several observations which will palliate the difficulty. For instance, he draws attention to the fact that these Psalms were written when the Psalmist was in distress and was crying to God for deliverance. Again, the ancients did not distinguish, as we do, the individual man; they regarded him as forming a whole with his family. So it was perfectly natural for a Psalmist to wish that his enemy's kith and kin should be implicated in his doom. Then, again, the enemies of Israel were the enemies of Israel's God. "When the righteous were oppressed and the wicked triumphant, it seemed as though God's rule were being set at nought, as though His cause were losing. It was not only allowable, but a duty, to pray for its triumph; and that involved the destruction of the wicked, who perished in their wickedness" (p. 221).

Altogether we are grateful to Dr. Burney for rescuing these scattered studies.

DOGMA, FACT AND EXPERIENCE. By A. E. J. Rawlinson. London: *Macmillan and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

This small book is noteworthy inasmuch as it echoes the religious sentiments of a small group of the younger scholars, who seem inclined to adopt the Modernist interpretation of Christianity without wishing to sever themselves from the orthodox Christian Church.

The last of the five essays which the book contains is entitled "Christian

Veracity." It is a reply to the Bishop of Oxford. The claim made by certain liberal theologians that the holding of unorthodox views was not incompatible with continuing in the ministry of the Church had drawn from Dr. Gore the following words: "We shall more and more lose both the reputation and the reality of sincerity, unless we repudiate, solemnly and directly, the claim which, as I think, is inconsistent with the veracity required in all public professions." Mr. Rawlinson argues, with much dialectic force, that the Creeds are used now, not as *tests*, but as formulæ of worship. They are "symbols of corporate worship, expressions rather of loyalty to Christ and His Church than of detailed orthodoxy, doxologies rather than declarations of individual doctrine." "It is not necessarily a dishonest proceeding to recite the Creeds in worship with a general intention of being identified with the historic faith of Christendom as a whole, even though an attitude of reserve be maintained in respect of particular clauses in the Creeds" (pp. 203-204).

This argument does not seem to me to carry conviction.

The third essay is entitled "Resurrection and the Life," and deals with the Resurrection of our Lord. Although admitting that the orthodox view is the "simplest hypothesis," Mr. Rawlinson says that it is "by no means the only one which is intellectually tenable." He rightly ridicules Canon Streeter's view, set forth in "Foundations," as being "even more difficult than the traditional affirmations" (p. 102). The author's own position is not less unsatisfactory. While affirming the reality of the Resurrection, he would leave the precise manner of it undefined. He would not affirm that the *body* of our Lord actually rose from the tomb. He says, "If the resurrection of the flesh is not in our case essential to the completeness of our being hereafter, why should the facts be otherwise with Him?" (p. 90). To every thinking Christian who does not claim to be a "liberal" theologian the answer is quite patent. There is a world of difference between us and the incarnate Word of God. If His body did not rise from the tomb, then what became of it? How are we to explain His manifestations after the Crucifixion? Was it only a vision of a disembodied spirit which wrought such marvellous transformation in the life and outlook of the Apostles? Anyone who can believe such an explanation of the Resurrection will believe anything.

The fourth essay discusses "Our Lord and the Future." It contains many thoughtful and true observations on our Lord's promise of His return, but in places is very painful reading. For instance, the "Advent Hope" is treated as a myth. "It is only by a liberal use of the principle of mental reserve that we can bring ourselves to sing such hymns as 'Lo, He comes with clouds descending,' or 'Great God, what do I see and hear?'" (p. 140).

K. E. KHODADAD.

THE PRACTICE OF THE LOVE OF CHRIST. Daily Devotional Studies in 1 Cor. xiii. By the Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A. London: Robert Scott. Price 3s. 6d. net.

There are some familiar passages in the Bible on which it would almost seem impossible that anything new could be said: though "the well is deep," skilful expositors like Mr. Harrington Lees astonish us with their facility

for drawing out of its depths the "living water." Here we have, drawn up from the profundity of 1 Cor. xiii., thirty-one sparkling, refreshing draughts from the well of life. On every page there is originality of treatment. Even a glance at the table of contents is not without its suggestiveness. Mr. Lees discusses the first verse of the chapter under the heading: "The Peril of Loudness in Religion." He does so in his usual orderly style. (1) *The Allusion*—to the gift of tongues; (2) *The Comparison*—"sounding brass or clanging cymbal." "St. Paul drily pictures a Christian service with Gallio or some other heathen magnate passing beneath the windows of Gaius on some Sunday morning, when the tongue-talkers were in full blast, and remarking that it was just like the din of the brass-worker's shop." Finally, we have (3) *The Application*. "Dazzling brilliance is not compensation for lack of tone and pathos and sympathy. There is a religious chatter which reminds the Bible reader of that Old Testament phrase, 'The strife of tongues.' It disturbs the soul without edifying it." No treatment of this chapter could at the present time pass the war by unnoticed, and, as might be expected, Mr. Lees has it in mind. He very truly observes that "it is a matter of extraordinary difficulty at times to maintain the fire of Christian patriotism without damping the flame of Christian brotherliness." Elsewhere he remarks upon the way in which the war has "taught the whole nation to work together," and how there has been "a weakening in the walls of class distrust," and he relates the Bishop of Stepney's pleasing story of the little girl in the East End who was used to bringing a bunch of flowers every Saturday evening to a German lady whom she loved and who, contrary to the lady's expectation, brought it as usual after hearing that her brother had gone down in one of our sunk cruisers. In this and other ways Mr. Lees keeps his expositions well up to date. These short chapters would make an excellent course of reading for a month at family worship. The practice of the love of Christ is a duty for every time and for all time, and its cultivation at this crisis is an excellent antidote to those ugly sentiments of suspicion and vindictiveness which, Mr. Lees observes, "are enemies in our midst." How true it may be we cannot say, but we heard the other day, on what purported to be good authority, that the German Emperor had given a copy of one of Mr. Lees's books, after reading it, to an English lady! If we were able we would commend this book to his notice!

ILLUSTRATIONS FROM THE GREAT WAR. By the Rev. J. W. W. Moeran, M.A. London: *Robert Scott*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

Here are over two hundred illustrations, culled from various sources, which are sure to be found useful by preachers and teachers at the present time, and which will form, as a whole, an interesting record of the war when the day of peace has dawned. There is endless variety. One paragraph tells how Canon Joynt's congregation at Gipsy Hill was asked on Easter Day, 1915, to give £400 for a motor ambulance. How their contributions totalled £542, and how a few days later a generous donor added £260, so that *two* ambulances might be provided. How a further gift of £200 from the same donor brought the amount up to £1,000, thus providing the running expenses of the ambulances. Reflections follow on the pleasure and privilege of generous giving. Another paragraph tells of the splendid charge of the

Irish Guards, after they had knelt for a moment in silent prayer. Another of how Vanderbilt set to work, when the *Lusitania* was torpedoed, to save the children, so that "in years to come he will be thought of and spoken of, not as the millionaire or sportsman who used to drive his coach-and-four from London to Brighton in the season, but as 'the man who saved the children.'" Another tells how the Archbishop of Rouen lent our chaplains two of his churches—a fine example of a man being "bigger" than his creed. Practically every illustration is made use of to point some moral or enforce some spiritual truth—as, for example, where, after referring to the neglect of Lord Roberts's warnings, the danger of neglecting the Divine warnings is pointed out; or where, after telling how the Ekites of Southern Nigeria have sent £25 to the Prince of Wales's Fund, there are suggestive comments upon the power of the Gospel in heathen lands. There is an index, which adds to the value of the book. We confidently commend it and predict its success.

SOME SPIRITUAL LESSONS OF THE WAR. Five Sermons by the Rev. Prebendary H. P. Denison, B.A., Vicar of St. Michael's, North Kensington. London: *Robert Scott*. Price 1s. 6d. net.

It is well known that the "view-point" of Prebendary Denison is not that of the majority of our readers, but this fact need not arouse any prejudice against his message in this volume. He touches with reverence and sagacity on some of the great problems which have had attention fastened on them by the war. This fact is in itself sufficient to give us an interest in these plain, practical discourses. About "The Cause for which we are Fighting" much has, of course, been written and said, but Mr. Denison, with "The Pillars of the Earth" as his text, discusses the question, and considers each of the "pillars" on which God has set His world—Trust, Truth, Right, Honour, and Chivalry. Perhaps the most striking of the five sermons is the one entitled "The Experience of History," in which, from the lessons of the past, we are shown how impossible it is to conceive of Germany winning this war and gaining her ambition to Germanize the world. He well observes that the attempt at world-empire made by Napoleon had gone a great deal further than pan-Germanism has got. "The German idea of world-empire is at present nothing but a wild idea; there are no signs of its realization. Napoleon had actually subjugated most of Europe; whereas Germany at present is but talking big. But history tells us that even if the German Empire had reached much larger dimensions than Napoleon's, the result would be the same." "He that dwelleth in heaven shall laugh them to scorn; the Lord shall have them in derision."

TALKS TO BOYS OR MEN IN THE MAKING. By James Logan, M.A., F.R.G.S., Principal of Rathmines College, Dublin. London: *Robert Scott*. Price 2s. net.

Happy indeed are the boys who are privileged to listen to such addresses as these, which (we are told in the preface) were delivered during the course of a school year. The author tells us that his book is "a protest against the 'Examination' ideal in education, supported by the fact that there are taught, or ought to be taught, in every good school, many things which examinations will never disclose." There are forty of these "Talks," all so uniformly excellent that it seems invidious to make a selection, but "The Making of a Gentleman" is quite delightful, and the one "To Boys Leaving

School" is full of sound common sense in the shape of twelve good rules. Perhaps some schoolmasters, seeing Mr. Logan's little book, will be inspired to attempt something of the same kind. Those who have to address Scouts or members of a Boys' Brigade will find plenty of suggestive topics and telling illustrations. We cordially welcome this volume, and hope that the author will be encouraged to give us another set of his helpful "Talks."

OUR OPPORTUNITY IN THE WEST INDIES. By Benjamin G. O'Rorke, M.A., Chaplain to the Forces. Illustrated. London: S.P.G. Price 1s. net.

"This book," we are told, "intended primarily for the use of Missionary Study circles, deals chiefly with the work of the Anglican Church in the West Indies and British Guiana." It is well written, and is adorned with some twenty-five illustrations. The account of the discovery by Columbus, his reception by, and dealings with, the natives, and their cruel treatment at the hands of the Spaniards, are briefly but tellingly set before the reader. The origin and growth of negro slavery in these islands is then described, the condition of the slaves, the struggle resulting in their emancipation through the efforts of William Wilberforce, Thomas Clarkson, and T. Fowell Buxton, and details of the various islands, being all charmingly narrated. There is an account of the prominent Bishops, and we are introduced to the various branches of Church activity in the islands. The book is pre-eminently readable, and cannot fail to interest. We would strongly recommend anyone who has any connection with the West Indies, or wishes to know anything of their history, to purchase this little volume, which contains so much suggestive information in such a compact form. It is indeed *multum in parvo*.



Publications of the Month.

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

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT. By J. K. Mozley, M.A. (*Duckworth and Co.*, 2s. 6d. net.) Mr. Mozley is no stranger to readers of the *CHURCHMAN*, and this volume (an addition to the "Studies in Theology" series) will be warmly welcomed for its scholarly treatment, its clear exposition, and its well-balanced arguments. It will not command universal assent, but it is eminently a book to be read and pondered. Mr. Mozley insists that "if the Cross is not the whole Gospel, it is the Gospel's centre and enlivening power."

FROM DOUBT TO FAITH. By Horace G. Hutchinson. (*Longmans, Green and Co.*, 1s. 6d. net.) A very moving and impressive story, and leads up to the conclusion that "the peace which passeth understanding is actually the portion of the Christian in this life."

FAMILY PRAYERS. By the Very Rev. C. J. Vaughan, D.D. (*Robert Scott*, 2s. 6d. net.) A most welcome reprint of a sustaining and inspiring volume of devotion. It should be in great request now that there are, happily, signs of a real revival of the family altar. [See "The Month," p. 6.]

A CHAIN OF PRAYER ACROSS THE AGES. Compiled and arranged for daily use. By Selina Fitzherbert Fox, M.D., B.S. (*John Murray*, 2s. 6d.) A new edition of a remarkable work which attracted great attention when it first appeared in 1913. It contains a collection of prayers gathered from the widest sources, extending from the time of Abraham to the twentieth century.

VISIONS FOR MISSIONARIES AND OTHERS. By Bishop Montgomery, D.D., D.C.L. (S.P.G., 1s. 6d. net.) A thought-compelling collection of essays, mostly reprinted from the *Mission Field*. The controversial note is not absent, but it is not obtrusive.

WAR LITERATURE.

THE FAITH AND THE WAR. Edited by F. J. Foakes-Jackson, D.D. (*Macmillan and Co., Ltd.*, 5s. net.) This is a composite volume, the contributors being members of the Churchmen's Union, and others who give their views on "the religious difficulties aroused by the present condition of the world." Among the writers are the Dean of St. Paul's, the Dean of Durham, the Rev. E. A. Burroughs, and the Rev. E. A. Taylor, none of whom, however, appears to be associated with the Churchmen's Union, and the following, who are described as members of that body—viz., Professor Percy Gardner (President), Canon Rashdall, Canon F. J. Foakes-Jackson (Editor), Canon Glazebrook (Chairman of Council); and Mr. Cyril W. Emmet. The essays cover a wide field of interest, and, allowing for the distinctive point of view, they are likely to be of real service. But they are "stiff" reading.

THE WAR AND THE KINGDOM OF GOD. Edited by the Rev. G. K. A. Bell, M.A. (*Longmans, Green and Co.*, 2s. 6d.) A similar volume to that just noticed, but the writers are of another school, and include Canons Goudge, Peter Green, Scott Holland, and Simpson, and the Editor. It supplies an answer to the oft-repeated question "Is Christianity discredited as a national force?"

THE CHURCH IN THE FIGHTING LINE. By the Rev. D. P. Winnifrith, with Preface by General Smith-Dorrien, and Foreword by the Bishop of London. (*Hodder and Stoughton*, 2s. 6d. net.) A most impressive story, most impressively told. The author takes us to the battlefield and gives us his experiences as a Chaplain in charge of an Infantry Brigade. The Bishop of London commends the volume as containing "a tale of simple heroism not often surpassed in history."

A MESSAGE TO THE NATIONS. By Mrs. Kilvington. (*Ward, Lock and Co., Ltd.*, 1s. net.) A volume which will appeal to all students of prophecy.

PERIODICALS.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH REVIEW (*Longmans, Green and Co.*, 6d. net), in its December number, reprints the Bishop of Oxford's article on "Is the Church of England worth Preserving?" and the passage on Kikuyu from the Bishop of Winchester's Charge. Professor Whitney, the Rev. H. U. Whelpton and Dr. Sparrow Simpson contribute articles on "The Episcopate at the Reformation," "The Sacrament of Penance," and "Christ's Revelation of God," respectively.

THE CHURCH MISSIONARY REVIEW (*C.M.S. House*, 6d.), in its December issue, has a good supply of Editorial Notes and the following articles: "Advent Thoughts by Missionaries in Moslem Lands": I. "The Future of Israel and Islam: is there a Connexion?" (F. Johnson, M.B., F.R.C.S.); II. "The Times of the Gentiles—Fulfilled" (Rev. W. Stanley, M.A.). "The Educational Problem in Uganda" (Right Rev. J. J. Willis, D.D.); "Denationalizing a Primitive People" (Rev. G. T. Basden, M.A.); "A War Chaplain's Experiences in Uganda" (Rev. G. R. Blackledge); "Mission Study among Boys" (S. Shoran Singha); "Some Memories of the Rev. John Rooker" (Rev. J. Rooker, M.A.).

S.P.C.K. Diaries.

We have received from the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge a selection of their admirable Diaries for 1916. *The Churchman's Almanack* is issued in several sizes, and in bindings of sufficient variety to suit all tastes. The information supplied, particularly in the larger edition, known as *The Churchman's Remembrancer*, is most valuable, and Church-people using these handy little books, so conveniently adapted for the pocket, will soon be posted up in regard to facts which every loyal son of the Church should know. The space available for daily memoranda, account-keeping, etc., is ample for all needs, and clergy especially will find these almanacks invaluable. The sheet almanacks are also very effective. Churchwardens may well have their attention directed to the "Parochial Offertory" book, which, if regularly kept, will be found most useful. "The Churchman's Calendar" and "The Prayer-Desk Calendar" ought to be in every church in the land. We heartily commend these publications, which are a credit to the great Society, and they are issued at prices from 1d. upwards, which bring them within the reach of all.