

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

September, 1916.

The Month.

**The Bishop's
Surrender.** WHILE we admire the spirit in which the Bishop of London has consented to reconsider the question of allowing Women Messengers of the National Mission to deliver their message to their own sex in church, we deeply regret that he has felt compelled to surrender to what we consider to be a most unreasonable and a most unworthy agitation. The Bishop has the cause of the Mission most deeply at heart. "Nothing," he says, "must be allowed to harm the Mission," and for fear lest this controversy should affect it—as undoubtedly it would do—he takes all the blame upon himself and asks for a truce until his return to town, when his clergy can confer with him about the matter. When writing on the subject last month we expressed a doubt whether the General Council of the Mission, whose resolution first provoked the storm, would stand firm. As far as we know, the members have not yet met to consider the new position, but whatever they may do now will hardly affect the question if the only two Bishops—London and Chelmsford—who have announced their intention of allowing women to speak in church, under certain very stringent conditions, withdraw their permission. At the time of writing last month the Bishops had not come upon the scene, but almost immediately afterwards their decisions were published, and the storm burst in full fury. It was an excellent chance for the newspapers, and much was made of women being "allowed to preach in church," a reference which the Bishop of London declares to be "an unconscious or deliberate perversion of the facts." Mr. Athelstan Riley led the attack: the English

Church Union came to his aid ; and there was every sign of a bitter and prolonged controversy. This has now been arrested by the Bishop's letter, but it may be renewed at any moment.¹

If the facts had been fairly stated we feel certain
 A False
 Issue. that the opposition would not have lived a week.

But from the very first Mr. Athelstan Riley prejudiced the matter by raising a false issue, viz., the admission of women to the priesthood. He mentioned the existence of this feminist "conspiracy" in his protest to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, however, took no notice of it, but rebuked him for the tone and character of his letter. So few people had heard of this "conspiracy" that there was not a little interest felt in the prospect of seeing what evidence there was of its existence. At length Mr. Riley produced it. It consisted of a paper containing letters which had passed more than two years ago between a Mrs. — and a number of correspondents whose views on the subject were asked for. The circular, which emanated from — Rectory, was sent to Churchwomen believed to be favourable to the project, announcing that she was organizing an informal Conference "to discuss the question of the ordination of women to the priesthood," that she had written to about 150 people, and that she enclosed a summary of the answers received. Mrs. — received replies, of varying character, but 59 of those to whom the letter was sent returned no answer. Of those who did reply 17 are classified as "unfavourable"; 12 are "interested but not convinced"; 15 are "favourable, but will take no action"; 11 are "favourable, but not Churchwomen," and can, therefore, be left out of count; while 30 are favourable. It does seem to us most deplorable that an

¹ As we go to press the Bishop of Chelmsford's statement is also published. After stating what was proposed, he says:—"It seems incredible that such a course could have been opposed, but so it is. Party-passions have been aroused, controversy encouraged, and all this on the eve of the great movement which has been in our thoughts and prayers for months. Surely this has been the work of the devil. Yet what is to be done? The natural man would say, 'Resist the unfair agitation, largely begotten of ignorance and prejudice.' But such a spirit would surely wreck the Mission, for no blessing could rest upon it conducted on such lines. I have therefore decided that during the Mission I shall not sanction any woman telling her sisters of the Saviour's love, in any church in the diocese of Chelmsford."

attempt should have been made to bias public opinion on the very simple proposal of the Mission Council and of the two Bishops, by thus trailing across the path this very objectionable red-herring, and upon such very slender evidence.

But while for the moment the very reasonable proposals of the Mission Council and the Bishops of London and Chelmsford have been quashed, we hope the leaders of the Church will not be deterred from giving their serious attention, as soon as possible, to the whole question of the ministry of women. We believe the Church is depriving itself of an immense power for good, by not giving greater freedom to women to exercise the ministry with which they are specially and fundamentally endowed. We have no intention of arguing the matter out just now, but we venture to ask attention for the wise words of the foremost evangelist of the Church of England, the Rev. Prebendary Carlile, D.D., the Founder and Head of the Church Army :—

The Ministry
of Women.

If the war calls forth women's aid, why not the Church? While the Greek and Roman Churches use their devotion so freely, why should the Anglican drive their zeal to the Salvationists, Quakers, and other Nonconformist bodies, or banish them to schoolrooms or the open air, tending in the same direction?

Such holy persons as the Blessed Virgin Mary, Miriam, St. Philip's four daughters at Samaria, or St. Hilda (who, like Origen the layman, gave lectures on theology in Church to clergymen), would be gagged to-day by many Anglicans, while their help is so needed for purity of life and home. Must to-day's Maids of Orleans be burnt or beatified?

The carefully selected and modest women of the Flying Squadrons of the Church Army and of the Pilgrimages of Prayer are not women preachers and don't want to preach sermons. We have already a million a year, and yet not a tenth of the people are even communicants, much less workers, as all should be.

"Pulpits, prayer-desks, and chancel steps" are not desired by these devout souls, but they are willing for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake to be catechized in the Church by the clergyman in charge (as per Rubrics), that they may humbly pour forth from full hearts their timid witness for their Blessed Lord, feeling that thus they can best do their bit to bring this righteous war to a victorious end.

With Joel's prophecy (Chron. ii. 28) and St. Peter's words (Acts ii. 17) dare any modern Canute (misunderstanding St. Paul's hints for some troublesome women in Corinth) try to stem this tidal wave that bears upon its crest the promise of a Pentecost of Catholic and Apostolic days?

Let the Bishops, therefore, as soon as the National Mission is over, take their courage in both hands and, defying Mr. Athelstan

Riley and the English Church Union, prepare a scheme by which the ministry of women to their own sex can be more fully and more profitably exercised "in Church or elsewhere."

We have received from the Rev. W. L. J. Sheppard, Rector of St. Thomas', Birmingham, the following letter:—

"The Consultational."

I am very glad that you drew attention to my suggestion of the Consultational in "The Churchman," and thank you for the very full summary of the plan which you gave. Perhaps you will allow me to point out, in answer to your friendly criticism, that a long Mission experience has clearly proved to me, as to many others, that however plainly and faithfully the Gospel is preached, there are always many hearers who do not understand the plan of salvation, and who need personal dealing to bring them to Christ. One of our grave mistakes, as ministers of Christ, has been to preach the Gospel, and stop at that. There is nothing in the plan I proposed to prevent an anxious soul coming to the clergy for help "immediately after the Gospel message has been delivered"; there is no necessity for anyone to wait for the next Consultational, as you seem to imply. Nor is the use of the Consultational by any means limited to those seeking salvation; it provides a way by which people, who otherwise would never do so, can consult their clergy on all kinds of spiritual matters. After all, a method must be largely tested by its results, and after nine months' experience of the Consultational I can bear personal testimony to the blessing and help which have been brought by its means to many souls. For the sake of any of your readers who are interested in the matter, may I add that a full account of the method is given in a little pamphlet, "How to See Conversions," price 1d., published by the National Church League, 82, Victoria Street, S.W. ?

Mr. Sheppard's explanation removes one of the difficulties to which we called attention, but he has not convinced us of the wisdom or the necessity of setting up "The Consultational." In the experienced hands of Mr. Sheppard, no doubt, the scheme works well, but all have not his experience, and the setting apart of a special time and place—this we understand to be the essence of his proposal—for people to come and consult their clergy "on all kinds of spiritual matters," is liable to degenerate into something akin to the Confessional, and may give rise to abuses which all spiritually minded men would deplore. Our view is that a clergyman should be accessible at all times to his people, and that the best place for these private interviews is the incumbent's own house, or, better still, where it is practicable, the house of the inquirer. But we would not willingly say a word to discourage any means that may be found useful for bringing men and women into personal relationship with Christ.

“A Consecrated Book of Devotion.” We congratulate the Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to prepare proposals for the revision of the Prayer Book Psalter upon the reasonableness of their Report (S.P.C.K., 1s. net). Any drastic changes in the text of what the Committee themselves declare to be “at once a consecrated book of devotion and a great English classic” would be widely and justly deprecated, and we note with much satisfaction that the revisions and emendations they propose are of the slenderest character, and will not appreciably detract from the spiritual pleasure and profit which the devotional use of the Psalter affords to the reader. The Committee consisted of the Bishops of Chester and Ely, the Deans of Ely, Norwich and Wells, the Master of Magdalen College, Cambridge (Dr. A. C. Benson), Dr. Mackail and Dr. Navine, and it is a pleasure to be assured that they conducted their revision “on strictly conservative lines.”

We have taken into account (they say) the original Hebrew as interpreted by the best modern scholarship, the Greek of the Septuagint and the Latin of the Vulgate, the successive English versions from the Great Bible of 1539 down to the Revised Version of 1885; and we have not overlooked the numerous minor alterations—insignificant individually but considerable in the aggregate—introduced into successive editions of the Psalter, whether deliberately or by the carelessness or caprice of the printers, both before and after the enactment in 1662 of a fixed text of verbal and literal accuracy in the manuscript “Annexed Book” of the Act of Uniformity and the printed “Sealed Books” copied from that MS. But we have proposed no change in the text which did not present itself to us as necessary towards intelligent devotional use of the verse or passage in question.

The Committee point out that, from the generation in which it was first issued down to the present time, the Prayer Book Psalter has been accepted, to the exclusion of any other version, by the practically unanimous feeling of the Church of England as satisfying the requirements of a book of public devotion. Moreover, the strength of this feeling has increased as the lapse of successive generations has rooted that Psalter more deeply in memory, tradition, and association, and has accumulated sanctity round the very forms of its language. “For,” they add, “words are not dead, but alive.” On the other hand the Committee reminds us that in the Psalter, as in all translations executed by the imperfect scholarship of the sixteenth century, there are a certain number of demonstrable errors. To these they have given their attention, and a very interesting list of suggested changes is the result. These are indicated in an Appendix, but, as the Committee says, the amount and scope of the changes can only be fully gathered from perusal of the Psalter as a whole, and we prefer, therefore, before

commenting upon them, to wait for the text of the Revised Psalter, embodying the alterations which will be issued shortly by the S.P.C.K. Meanwhile we congratulate the Committee upon the completion of a very useful piece of work.

“A Curse and Not a Blessing.” The Bishop of Oxford is proving himself a thorn in the side of the English Church Union. The President lately made certain proposals regarding the rearrangement of the service of Holy Communion, including changes which the Bishop himself would welcome, but his sense of loyalty compels him to hold his hand. The following passages from his August letter are of remarkable significance:—

So far as this movement is a movement to restore the free action of the Church in regulating our common worship, and so far as it is a movement to educate the opinion of the Church as to the direction in which changes should be made, there is everything to be said for it, and nothing against it.

But it is in fact rather a movement to encourage the clergy to make these changes on their own responsibility, without any change in the law of Church or State, it being hoped that the Bishops, or some of us, will be persuaded at least to connive by silence. Such a procedure will, I cannot doubt, bring a curse and not a blessing. The Church, by a lamentable failure of loyalty to its Master, has submitted, and continues to submit, to a quite excessive tyranny of the State in matters which do not fall properly within its province. But it is not only a matter of State control. Every clergyman, on every occasion of undertaking a spiritual charge, makes and signs before the Bishop a solemn and quite explicit promise, “In public prayer and administration of the sacraments I will use the form in the said Book prescribed and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority.” It is quite one thing for a priest to insist on obeying the Book, or even on using his liberty where the Book is silent, even against the will of the Bishop. It is quite another thing to claim to disobey the order which we have pledged ourselves to follow. To violate a solemn undertaking constantly renewed is to subscribe to the “scrap of paper” doctrine which we are fighting Germany in order to repudiate. And I feel sure that no individual Bishop has the power to substitute any other order of service for that provided in the Prayer Book.



The Need for Re-asserting the English Character of the Church of England.

IN the two last chapters of the Book of the Revelation St. John writes of a City which "comes down out of heaven from God." A description at the same time so simple and so august baffles at first the intelligence of the reader. He does not realize the fact that this City is set up on earth, nor the further fact that it has to do with the earth as it is. Yet St. John connects the City in decisive words with human history, both past and present. The names of the tribes of Israel, God's ancient people, are inscribed upon its gates, and the kings of the nations bring their glory into it. To the nations of the world it is a beacon and a guide; they walk in its light. In it the kings of the earth acknowledge an authority higher than their own; they pay it homage; they bring their glory into it.

This is a splendid picture of the work and of the glory of the Universal Church, the Church which has the uncontested right to call herself Catholic. Her Catholicity is marked by a characteristic which had never marked any city which St. John had known. Her gates are open without any thought of shutting. The nations pour into the City without hindrance.

St. John has given us an Ideal of the Catholic Church which is higher than any which is now realized among us. On the other hand, it does stand in harmony with some of the great facts of Christian life to-day. One in particular should be emphasized. The City of God—the Universal Church as St. John saw it—is a mistress which claims the homage of the nations and in turn confers benefits upon them. The nations as nations and their rulers with them have a great part to play in the Kingdom of God.

If we ask, *How are nations to do this*, surely history, and pre-eminently the history of our own country, supplies the answer. Nations serve the Catholic and Universal Church by means of National Churches. These as parts make up the whole, as many regiments make up one army. In a truly National Church we learn the Catholic spirit, and so we are taught to confess with full understanding, *I believe in the Holy Catholic Church.*

The nations and all the gifts that each particular nation can bring are needed for the Universal City of God. But the gifts are not material gifts—not tribute, nor revenues—rather they are moral and spiritual gifts which can only be rendered by Frenchmen as Frenchmen, by Russians as Russians, by Englishmen as Englishmen. National Churches, as far as they are true to their character, gather tribute of these national virtues and national talents, and so pour them into the Treasury of the Universal Church. The fervid and yet logical piety of the Frenchman, the mystic strength of the Russian, the plain, practical religion of the Englishman—these separate gifts are nursed by the Church of each land. Christ is well served in each of these; it is not His pleasure to lose *one*. The great *Fact* of Nationality is to be accepted in the sphere of Religion as well as in other important spheres. God made all nations of one blood, but He made them—nations!

The spiritual capacities of Englishmen are to be drawn out for the service of the Master by the action of a National Church, a true Church of England which consists of Englishmen, understands Englishmen, and appeals to Englishmen. Through such a Church alone can the Universal Church gather the full tribute of our nation for Christ.

The Universal Church then delegates to the Church of England the duty of gathering all that is distinctly English into the service of the King of the Church. How must the English Church perform her task? How must she foster the plain, practical religion which is to be hoped for in our countrymen?

(1) By a great appeal to the understanding and to the affections of our fellow-countrymen. The Church of England must persuade and win Englishmen. To a certain extent it is done. It is needless to point to our Bible and Prayer Book in the Mother Tongue. But perhaps it is not as fully recognized that even before the Reformation many books of devotion were in circulation *in English*. The principle of our Church from long ago has been to sing God's *praises with understanding* and to interpret what is read from the Scriptures.

But it is useless to try to live in the past. Language changes, meanings of words change, modes of thought change. Neither the English Bible nor the English Prayer Book can safely remain word for

word as they were in past generations. It is a principle of our Church to revise, as need arises, not only her translation of the Scriptures, but also the text of her Prayer Book. Many a word in a Collect which was vivid and full of colour in the seventeenth century is *dull* if not *dead* to many of our people to-day. Again certain forms of devotion in the Prayer Book have lost much of their power of appeal, while other forms which are *not* in the Prayer Book have proved their value to meet the religious needs which are felt to-day. The Church of England must do her utmost to teach all Englishmen to pray in words which they understand, and in words which when they are understood are powerful in appeal to those who speak our tongue. Prayer Book Revision is a first need among us in order that simpler souls may not go untaught by the Church how to pray. But in addition to an official revision of the standard text of the Prayer Book some provision must be made for elasticity in the use of the services thus revised. The amount and the kind of change in the jealously-guarded text of the Book which are likely to be generally accepted are not likely in the least to be sufficient and suitable to meet the needs of mission buildings in Lambeth or Bethnal Green, and in some of our neglected rural districts. There is a great opportunity for wise bishops and for wise clergy who will carefully consider the case of many English congregations which would hardly be reckoned Christian when judged by the more careful judgment of the Mission Field. The Act of Uniformity is no boon to them; they need not to be driven, but to be led gently to Prayer Book worship.

(2) And secondly, the Church of England ought to strive to make her appeal to *all* religious Englishmen. Her mission is given her by the Universal Church—or rather by the Lord of the Universal Church. Her duty is to make her appeal as wide as the Gospel of Christ. She must realize that the Church exists for men, and not men for the Church. She must be tolerant—and more than tolerant—towards differences of opinion and of practice among her members. The Church of England belongs to a race which is devoted to Freedom; which has done service to the world in the name of Freedom; which has been knit to the Gospel by the promise of spiritual Freedom. But Freedom presupposes many differences; free minds will not all take the same mould; and English minds by long enjoyment of freedom have learnt to tolerate one another's

differences in secular things. The Church of England must be content to minister to free men ; she must be content to suggest and to teach where others perhaps would command and compel. If the reproach be leveled at her that she becomes all things to all men, well, that reproach was leveled at the greatest of all evangelists (St. Paul).

She must listen in particular to the voice of the free men of Greater Britain. The Church of England is not confined to the English land : indeed, her strength lies largely in the vigorous branches which she has sent forth beyond the seas. The younger English peoples have " ten parts " in the Church. The claim must be allowed, and the needs and views of Dominions and Colonies must be allowed full weight. It is due to them for the rich and varied experience which they have enjoyed, which we cannot claim at home. One very important subject may be mentioned here as an illustration. From Canada and from Australia comes a strong voice in favour of Re-union in Church fellowship among men of the same blood and of the same language. This voice is truly English. It is our national good sense which cries out that no unreal barriers shall be allowed to separate Christian from Christian. In cases in which Re-union is too difficult or at any rate premature, the claim is raised for Co-operation at least between one body and another. The Kikuyu Conference of June, 1913, together with much for which it stood, has receded to the back of our minds owing to the pressure of an almost world-wide war. But *Kikuyu* must not be forgotten. The problems remain and the English love of comprehension and toleration remains. Our Church must justify its English character by returning to the task of removing all that perpetuates avoidable causes of division.

It is, for instance, to be remembered that our Church is committed neither by her history, nor by her ordinal, nor by her formulas to any rigid theory which forbids co-operation with non-Episcopal bodies. Rigidity is not a principle of the English Church, although it is not seldom exemplified in individual English Churchmen. We are not bound, for instance, by any principle to unchurch the Presbyterian kirk whether we meet her in Great Britain or beyond the seas. Nor ought the phrase " Catholic Practice," so easily flung in defiance and so loosely used, keep us from all acts of help and inter-communion. To take one case only which the war

has brought once more to the front with urgency. English generosity, no less than Christian charity, constrains us to lend our sacred buildings, where need exists, to other religious bodies. The fact that the English Church has never lost the ancient custom of consecrating her churches does not run counter to the charitable practice of lending churches from time to time for Presbyterian or Wesleyan worship. We do not depreciate the supreme value of the Book of Common Prayer by providing a temporary roof for those who prefer *extempore* prayer. Such action is not to be ascribed to mere careless good nature. Charity is a principle of Christianity, and *therefore* of the Church of England.

On the other hand, the Church of England must conform to the English love of order. Perhaps she has been fairly successful in answering to this condition in the past. Certainly our public worship has been orderly—even to stateliness. And this quality we certainly ought to strive to the utmost to retain. At times we are tempted to depart from it. We see some of our countrymen attracted to services conducted at white heat, when all orderliness is lost in fervour or apparent fervour. For a time and in certain circles such services have great success. But they can be only exceptional in the general scheme of the worship of the Church. The heart that cries out for the Living God has indeed its moments of almost childlike familiarity, but in the main it feels that worship means falling low on our knees in humility and in awe. Most souls experience the need of guidance and of teaching how to approach the Lord of All; the cry, *Teach us to pray*, rises again and again in the human heart, and the words which our Prayer Book gives us are felt to answer to our need.

But order in the sphere of the Christian life is a still more important matter even than order in worship. The Church of England shows those who look to her how to guide their lives. Baptism first—in infancy—at the earliest possible date, that Christ's claim upon each one of us may be acknowledged as soon as possible. With Baptism goes the appointment of sponsors, of persons who are responsible that the babe who has been baptised into Christ shall learn of Christ. And after Baptism—*Confirmation*. Those who have received Christ's blessing in unconsciousness must receive it again in full consciousness—and at the impressionable time of life—if possible, just when a general sense of responsibility is begin-

ning to grow. The girl who is beginning to help her mother, because she realizes that the mother needs her help, the boy who is beginning to think *either* that he must earn, *or* that he must decide on some occupation which will keep him longer at his books—these are they who should be encouraged and urged to come to Confirmation. And after Confirmation then the steady regular use of the Holy Communion to keep us in mind of our need of help in the spiritual life and to furnish us with that help monthly (it may be) or weekly—the bread which the Lord Jesus still gives us in remembrance of that great day when He gave Himself once for all. And then joined with this supreme blessing the solemn thanksgiving, the *Eucharist*, for this wonderful provision which Christ continually makes for us.

On this orderly scheme of Christian life the Church of England has hitherto insisted and will surely continue to insist. No doubt it has been severely criticized by many Englishmen and even by many of the deeply religious of our countrymen. But here we must face the difficulties of the situation, and decide to the best of our power between the claims of two conflicting principles—Freedom on one side, Order on the other. The State has had to face the same problem, and on the whole has dealt with it successfully. The Church need not despair. The Church must still cling to her scheme of Christian life—Baptism, Catechism, Confirmation, Holy Communion with all her strength. But two precautions must be taken. First, the scheme must be administered in its fulness heartily by men who realize that each ordinance is a strand in a cord of love by which the Master is drawing and holding us to Himself. Here we have not bare forms, not things of the letter, but sacraments, spiritual instruments. Only make clear to Englishmen that your talk of an ordered life within the Church means this and they will cease to be hostile to it. The Church must use her order simply as a spiritual force, and she will have power with our countrymen.

But again. This order is offered ; it is not imposed. Spiritual things cannot be dispensed with the rigidity with which the things of the world are sometimes administered. The Church of England must see with the eye of Christ and accept the fact that some deeply religious men will always, through misunderstanding or through misfortune, stand outside her order. And then there comes upon

the Church the Lord's command *not* to forbid the spiritual work of such men. Least of all can the English Church do it, since she is bound by all her history and by her native soil to the principle of Freedom both in Church and State.

The experience of our State may be used for the guidance of our Church. A National Church must not only teach her own people, but also *learn from them*. Just as the State is not too proud to learn, but moulds and re-makes its institutions from generation to generation as it learns from movements among its own people of the needs and capacities of its own people, so it must be with the Church of England. She has to look not only to the splendid heritage of the past, but also to the needs and opportunities of the present. She lives not for herself, but in order to present to Christ all that is best and most characteristic in the English people. Her ideal should be that of the sympathetic teacher who realizes that his pupils are growing up, and so need room and freedom. And behind all the sympathy and readiness to meet every spiritual aspiration, even, if its appearance be strange, must be the firm conviction that Jesus Christ in His saving and sanctifying power is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.

W. EMERY BARNES.



St. Paul's Views of the Body and Death contrasted with Plato's.

IT is interesting to the classical student to follow up comparisons between the theories on the above subjects that are found in classical authors and those in the Scriptures. The comparison that can be instituted between St. Paul and Plato as teachers on these sombre topics to a certain extent alleviates the gloom that encircles them. One of the speakers in the *Phaedo* says that the popular view of death in his day (390 B.C. *circ.*) was that the soul perished, vanishing like smoke or breath at the moment of its separation from the body. There can be little doubt that such a view was held by many of the writers of the Psalms, as well as by the Sadducees of St. Paul's own day. The two prevailing views of the body in Plato's day were (1) that it was a prison, (2) that it was a tomb.

In the *Phaedo* Plato described the soul as fast bound in the body, and said that it was through this *prison* that the soul must get its outlook on things as they are (83). In the *Phaedrus* he spoke of the deliverance of the soul from the thralldom of the body after initiation, which he described in the *Republic* as a means of purification. Clement of Alexandria tells us that many ancient divines bear witness that the soul has been joined to the body (*sōma*) for punishment and is buried in it as in a tomb (*sēma*). This view was popularized by the jingle *soma sema*, but the prison idea seems to have been more prevalent, Seneca, a contemporary of St. Paul saying, "Now I am detained in an earthly prison." Plato also called the body a vessel, or *skeuos* (see *Sophistes* 219 B). St. Paul followed him here saying that each man should know to possess his own vessel (*skeuos*) in holiness, etc. (2 Thess. iv. 4), and that "we have this treasure in earthen vessels" (2 Cor. iv. 7).

Again, we have the authority of Clement of Alexandria for the statement that Plato called the body an earthly tabernacle (*gēinon skēnos*). In his discourse on death, called the *Axiochus* and ascribed to Plato, we have the body called "earthly" (*geōdes*) and also "a tabernacle" (*skēnos*). Wisdom ix. 5, has "the earthly (*geōdes*) tabernacle," and St. Paul (2 Cor. v. 1) "the earthly house of the tabernacle," meaning "this tent-like habitation." In the *Timaeus*

the philosopher describes at great length the manner in which the human body is made, particular attention being given to the head, and the soul is fast bound in its frame.

In view of the incessant struggle between the soul and its body, and the troubles and evils that are caused by the latter, its mastery over the soul, and its hindrances to philosophic pursuits, the philosopher longs for release; and his life is nothing but a longing for death (*Phaedo* 63). In the meantime his one object is to release (*apoluein*) the soul as much as possible from the body, and make himself as far as he can independent of it. For he is convinced that he can know nothing purely or clearly, or employ his pure intellect when with the body, and that he will be the nearer to knowledge the less he associates with the body and is infected by its nature, and keeps himself pure from it until God shall release him. "And then being pure and freed from the folly of the body we shall be with people like ourselves, and shall know through ourselves everything that is genuine" (67). Compare St. Paul, "Now I know in part, but then shall I know fully as I have been fully known" (1 Cor. xiii. 12). "For I do not think," says Plato, "that it is permissible for one who is not pure to reach the pure"—a sentence which may have suggested the Pauline dictum, "all pure things are for the pure" (not "all things are pure to the pure") (Tit. i. 15).

The process of purification of the soul consists in separating the soul as much as possible from the body and training it to be completely independent and self-contained. If such a purification is complete the soul passes away at death completely delivered from the body and purified from its contact with it. Death is then a setting free of the soul from the body—a departure *from* the body. This latter phrase, "*apallagē tou sōmatos*," may be a parallel to St. Paul's phrase *apolutrosis tou somatos*, deliverance *from* the body (Rom. viii. 23), both genitives appearing to be objective. The state of the soul when freed from the body is called *gymnos*, or naked. The soul that is completely purified passes away to that which is immaterial like itself—the Divine, the immortal, and the intellectual. But the ordinary soul is so *weighed down* by the *earthly* and material that it is drawn back into the visible region (*Phaedo* 81).

We must now proceed to St. Paul's view. In the first place, he treated the body as a *weight*. "We who are in this tabernacle groan, being *weighed down*" (2 Cor. v. 5). In contrast to this weight of the

earthly house of this tabernacle there is to be an æonian *weight* of glory (2 Cor. iv. 17) for those who consider the invisible things. He then proceeded to give his *locus classicus* (2 Cor. v. 1-8) on the subject of the earthly tabernacle, its dissolution, and the new resurrection body. It may seem that he was influenced by Wisdom ix. 15. "For the mortal body weighs down (*barunei*) the soul, and the earthly tabernacle depresses (*brithei*) the mind (*noûs*)." But the inspiration of that passage seems to be the chariot simile in the *Phaedrus* of Plato where the charioteer of the soul is the *noûs* or mind, and where the recalcitrant steed representing the inferior part of the soul and the body combined acts as a dead weight upon the obedient steed who represents the higher part of the soul, and drags down the chariot of the soul to the earth. "For the steed that is connected with badness depresses (*brithei*) it and weighs it down (*barunōn*) to the ground" (*Phaedrus* 247 B). The Apostle's treatment of his body described in 1 Corinthians ix. 27, "I buffet and bring into bondage," reminds one of the discipline of the charioteer who gave the unruly steed, the body and its passions, to pains, so that it was *humbled* and fain to obey his will (254 E). It is because of the natural depravity and weakness of the body that man is humbled. And so St. Paul spoke of "the body of our *humiliation*" (Phil. iii. 21). But he did not despise it like the Greek philosopher. "Each man must know how to possess his vessel in holiness and honour" (1 Thess. iv. 4). For our bodies are a sanctuary (*naos*) of God, because of the indwelling Spirit, and therefore must not be defiled (1 Cor. iii. 17), but God must be glorified therein, because man was made originally as "the image and glory of God" (1 Cor. xi. 7). And the place for such image and glory is the sanctuary of God. The thought of the body as the shrine of deity is hallowing and restraining. But even so St. Paul regarded it as only a temporary structure. And the unquenchable desire of humanity, on account of the inner conflict between the higher and the lower principles, is to be delivered from this body of death. "Who will set me free from this body of death?" (Rom. vii. 24). The pagan philosopher felt acutely the miseries inflicted by the burden of the flesh, but St. Paul exceeded when he said, "We groan when in this tabernacle, being weighed down." He looked forward to the time when this earthly tabernacle or *tent-dwelling* should be taken down. It was a consoling thought to him that it was a provisional and not

a permanent structure. The same expression is said by Clement of Alexandria to have been used by Plato. St. Paul had no fear of any sort. In his case it was a true expectation, a genuine longing for the new day, the new body, the new life. In Colossians ii. 11, *et seq.*, he speaks of the putting-off of the body of the flesh by the spiritual circumcision of Christ. Such renunciation of the flesh at this present is the promise and potency of a complete conquest and future deliverance or liberation from the body. Even our Lord divested Himself of the body in order to make a show of the powers that opposed him. This is the correct meaning of Colossians ii. 15. "Stripping the powers" is meaningless; but "having stripped himself of his mortal nature" in its weakness to overcome them has some point. St. Paul's discipline of his body was severe. Here it is severer. "*Mortify* therefore your limbs which are upon the earth" (Col. iii. 5); "*put to death* the deeds of the body" (Rom. viii. 13). So far as this body was concerned, St. Paul would have echoed the wish of the pagan philosopher, "I long for death" (*Phaedo* 64 B). But death for the Apostle did not mean the beginning of a disembodied existence. He desires not only to put off the temporary and earthly, but also to put on the permanent and the heavenly, "our habitation which is from heaven," in which all that is mortal and corruptible will be absorbed. For having been clothed upon with this we shall not be found naked (*gumnoi*) (1 Cor. v. 3). The grain that is sown in the earth will not remain *gumnos* or naked (1 Cor. xv. 37). "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and when this mortal shall have put on immortality then . . ." The next words in 2 Corinthians v. 4 are difficult. "*Not for that* we would be unclothed" (R.V. and A.V.) seems wrong. Perhaps, "*Wherefore* we would not be unclothed" is more correct. The point is that the putting-off of the earthly body is a preparatory and necessary condition for the putting-on of the spiritual, but that an intervening state of nakedness is not to be desired. The Christian does not wish to be stripped of his body and left so. St. Paul could not but remember the celebrated vision of Er the Armenian at the end of Plato's *Republic*, and the description of the souls awaiting their new lives and bodies; and among these the soul of Thersites putting on the body of a monkey. St. Paul's picture of the dead appearing before the Bema of Christ, that each may receive (*komisetai*) the reward of the things done

by means of his body, reminds one of similar scenes in the *Republic* and *Gorgias* of Plato, in the former (615 B) of which this word (*komizoito*) is used. In the *Phaedo* (65) Plato spoke of the pleasures by means of the body.

But St. Paul, of course, did not believe, as Plato did, in either a transmigration of the soul into other bodies, or a state of nakedness of the soul. For such a state is covered by the new body. His simile of the germ of life in the seed putting off the husk, which is cast aside as useless, and becoming robed with a covering of greater beauty, "because God gives it a body, its own body to each of the seeds" (1 Cor. xv 38), throws light upon the passage in 2 Corinthians. The resurrection is not a resuscitation of the material body. That must be destroyed and cast aside like the useless husk. But there will be a new body, and it shall be our own body, given us by God, immortal and incorruptible and adapted to the new environment, the new powers of the soul, and the new life when we shall be "at home" with Christ. To that perfect communion this present body is a bar. "We are confident," he writes, "that while we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord." For this our walk is through faith and not through visible form. We are confident and well pleased to get away from the body (*ekdēmēsai*) and to get home (*endēmēsai*) to the Lord. Socrates in the *Phaedo* describes his departure as an *apodēmia*, a being away from home, and says it is made "with good hope." Cf. Romans viii. 21. "The creature is subjected to vanity (or death?) in hope." St. Paul (Phil. iii. 20) denounces those whose thoughts are fixed on the things of this world, for "our citizenship is in heaven, from which we expect as Saviour our Lord Jesus Christ, Who will change (transform) the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of His glory, according to the working of His power." This transformation implies a new appearance and a new dignity. The word *metaschematizō* occurs only in St. Paul's writings. It is a Platonic word. The Apostle eagerly awaits this change. He warns us "not to grieve the Holy Spirit in whom ye were sealed unto the day of *apolutrosis*" or deliverance (Eph. iv. 30). Then our complete deliverance will be effected when we have put off completely the old man by death, "the old man which waxeth corrupt after the lusts of deceit." This practically means the lower nature, in which the body, which is subject to corruption, is included.

Though "our outward man is decaying, our inner man is renewed day by day" (2 Cor. iv. 16). The same thought of deliverance from the bondage of corruption, i.e., slavery to the deeds of the body which is waxing corrupt owing to the wear of life and the results of its own impurity occurs in Romans viii. 21. For such a state of advancing corruption is the prophecy of a complete dissolution. On the other hand, there is the glorious hope of "the new man" created after God's likeness, after the image of his Creator (Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 9). For we all with unveiled face, reflecting as in a mirror, are changed into the same image, as by the Spirit of God (2 Cor. iii. 18). For He (the Lord) is the image of God (2 Cor. iv. 4). This change, however, is not of the body, but of the new man, the *kainos* (Eph. iv. 24), the *neos* (Col. iii. 10), the *esother* (2 Cor. iv. 16). This is the new personality which has been created in us by the Divine Spirit within us after the likeness of God, the new being, or *poem*, *poiema*, created in Christ Jesus for good works (Eph. ii. 10). This new personality requires the putting-off of the body of the flesh for its full development. The day of the deliverance *apolutrosis*, is therefore desired.

Many things might have induced the Apostle to look forward to such a deliverance and to cry out as the natural man for deliverance from "this body of death" (Rom. vii. 24), this body which has the seal of death as well as the seal of the Spirit upon it. But the chief inducement was the reflection that there can be no lasting peace between the principles of the flesh and the Spirit. "For the flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh, and these are in mutual opposition" (Gal. v. 17). This subject is finely illustrated in Plato's *Republic* (439 E). There the principle of appetency is always in conflict with the principle of reason. The lower desires contend against the reason, striving for the mastery like two adversaries. And the unhappy man is torn in twain (440 B). This is a parallel to the passage in Romans vii. 22, *sq.*, where St. Paul, speaking as the natural man, says: "In my inner man, my conscience, I gladly agree with the law of God; but I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind and making me captive to the principle of sin which is in my members." Hence a violent and forcible repression of the natural instincts and impulses was required. But the moral law was powerless to enforce its authority, owing to the flesh (Rom. viii. 3). Plato felt the same

difficulty, and gave the high-spirited principle, the will, as an ally to the reason against appetency in the case of an internal trouble or discord of the soul, otherwise the lower principle would dominate the life and nature of man. St. Paul took strong measures with his body to keep it under, lest he should be ruined by it (1 Cor. ix. 27). He desired that Christ should be magnified in his body, either through life or death (Phil. i. 20). Therefore he bore about in the body the putting to death of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in his mortal flesh (2 Cor. iv. 10, *et sq.*). This magnifying of Christ in St. Paul's mortal flesh does not imply any future development of the body, but the exhibition of the same living principle of self-sacrifice which Christ manifested in His death. The life of Christ is made manifest in the body when the passions are not indulged but presented a living sacrifice, a service of the rational principle which controls them (Plato, *Republic* ; Rom. xii. 1).

This is to continue until the day of deliverance *from* our bodies (Rom. viii. 23). Until then we must ever experience "the slavery of corruption." The body like the law are both good, but each has its day, when it must cease to be. Both have their work to do, and when that work has been completed both are removed, because they can be done without. Deliverance from the law when a higher principle is introduced that supersedes it is good. Deliverance from this body when it is to make room for a higher and more spiritual organism—the heavenly body, or "the habitation from heaven"—is equally good. That body will be our real home, not like this "tent-dwelling" (2 Cor. v. 1), but will be adapted to the new powers and circumstances of its inhabitant spirit, because it is from heaven, and not of man's making. As grace has superseded law in its narrower sense, so this resurrection-body, this heavenly home of the spirit, shall supersede this "earthly body," the "mortal flesh," this temporary tent-like dwelling. Deliverance from this body in God's own time is desirable because it means freedom from the painful experience of the inner contest described in Romans vii., which is due to the body's opposition to the higher aspirations of man. While in the body man must regard it as the temporary shrine (*naos*) of the Holy Spirit, and the tabernacle (*skēnos*) sacred but passing of the human spirit (cf. John i. 14), and we ought so to live as in the body but not of the body, its master, not its slave.

Deliverance from the body and its "cabin'd, cribb'd, confin'd" existence, its infirmities and weaknesses, would not be unwelcome to one who had been so long a martyr to "a thorn in the flesh" (2 Cor. xii. 7), and had so long endured the antagonism of the flesh against the spirit. His own treatment of his body was stern and unrelenting. He purposely, I believe, avoided the phrase "resurrection of the body," using the phrase "resurrection of the dead" instead. Why then should *speiretai* and *egeiretai* in 1 Corinthians xv. 44 be rendered "it is sown" and "it is raised"? Does *it* refer to *anastasis* or to a body implied in *anastasis*? Would it not be more in keeping with the Apostle's thought to say, "a natural body is sown," and "a spiritual body is raised"?

Finally with regard to the meaning suggested for *apolutrosis tou sōmatos*, viz., deliverance from the body, we have a parallel in *apolutrosis tōn parabaseōn*, deliverance from sins (Heb. ix. 15). The word occurs in sense of deliverance simply in Hebrews xi. 35, and in Ephesians i. 14, of the deliverance of the possession, the people of God, presumably from sin and "the body of sin" (Rom. vi. 6). In none of these passages does St. Paul refer to a deliverance of the body "from its frailty and mortality" (Grimm). Again, there is an interesting use of *apolutrosis* in Irenaeus' *Adv. Haer* 1, 9, 5, in connexion with *skēnē*, play or drama, viz., "the *apolutrosis* is wanting to the piece." Here the meaning would be the closing scene. In this sense the deliverance of the soul from the body would be a grand finale or close of the mortal scene. In conclusion, we think that there is some reason for holding that the deliverance St. Paul speaks of in Romans viii. 23 is not that *quâ corpus morte liberatur*, but that *quâ nos liberamur corpore* (*pace* Bengel).

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.



The Need of Definiteness in Faith and Action.¹

IT is hardly necessary to demonstrate that success in any movement whether religious or other, depends largely on the definiteness with which its efforts are directed. Notwithstanding its derivation, I do not wish to use the word *definite* as denoting mere limitation. It has a positive as well as a negative sense. It is inclusive in proportion as it also excludes. Nor do I need to press the importance of the topic at the present time when we are being called to face responsibilities as grave as any that our Country has ever known. If the coming Mission is to be what we pray it may be, it must be definite in scope and detail. Repentance does not come by preaching generalities. It is an empty hope which does not get beyond speculations. And yet it is from this very fact that some of the gravest difficulties of the Mission arise.

The Bishop of London speaking lately in Convocation about the literature of the Mission, said that three classes of tracts and papers had been prepared to suit three types of Churchmanship, one which he called Catholic, the others Evangelical and Broad. He hoped that this would tend to unity. But it could do so only by erasing what was distinctive in each, and so producing indefiniteness and probably failure. I address brethren who, by the name given to their Union, profess a Churchmanship which is Catholic in a very different sense from that used by the Bishop, and is Broad in quite another way than that of those to whom he applied the name. As Evangelicals we hold to the Apostolic verities which were restored to our Church and Country at the Reformation, and have come down to us since through a succession of great divines, unrivalled for piety, learning and sound judgment. We have no difficulty in defining our faith, and by it our policy. Jewell and Usher, O'Brien and Goode, Romaine and Ryle (only to mention very few) would have lived and written in vain if we were in any doubt to-day what Evangelical doctrine is and what Evangelical life ought to be. Indeed our position has become more distinct by the very divergencies, increasing within later years, which have developed in other schools of thought within the Church.

¹ Paper read before a Conference of the Clerical and Lay Evangelical Society for the Diocese of Carlisle.

While Evangelicals have kept to the old paths, the successors of the Tractarians are trending to a pseudo-Catholicity which includes much that was never covered by the old definition *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. They have, however, no lack of distinctiveness in doctrine or objective. They know what they want, and the way to work for it. Their literature frankly uses language which cannot be mistaken. The Sacrifice of the Mass, the Sacrament of Penance, Purgatory, Indulgences, Adoration of the Virgin Mary and Prayers to the Saints, are plainly taught in many recent books with a large circulation, written by clergy professing to be still members of the Church of England. We may dislike these ideals, but we are left in no doubt as to what they mean, and what is the object of those who desire them. Their efforts correspond with their beliefs. They are earnest, aggressive, persistent. They lose no opportunity for using their influence, and yield to no scruples and doubts in doing so. In short, they are definite both in their faith and their actions, and they mean to use the National Mission to secure their ends.

Quite in an opposite direction, a more modern divergence is increasing, but this is definite chiefly in its negations. It is disintegrating rather than constructive. The faith "once delivered to the saints," as every later generation has supposed, is now said to have never existed in any fixed form. Even if there has been some continuity of thought during the past, it has always been, and is still, subject to relativity of expression. At least, this is the latest opinion of a much honoured University Professor once known for his attachment to Evangelical principles. And it represents, more or less, the views of a large number of good people both in the Established Church and the Free Churches. In other words some personal element, conscience, reason, emotion, or even imagination, becomes more or less a rule of faith and a guide of life, or as it used to be called, a "verifying faculty." The old sense of the stability of the Holy Scriptures, their integrity and veracity, and consequently of the authority of the Lord to Whom they bear witness and Who bore witness to them, has to be modified to meet modern views. Much that was intensely sacred to our fathers has been thrown into the melting pot, and that not by the infidel or agnostic, but by professing Christians. Rejection of the supernatural excludes the fact of the Resurrection as much

as that of the Virgin birth, and there are many pulpits in which both these facts are ignored even when they are not openly denied. The result is, of course, a lack of that definiteness which both we and the so-called Catholics claim, though there is at the same time a very distinct substitution of humanism for super-humanism, of the psychological for the spiritual, and of defective science for true knowledge. It is still uncertain how far the Mission will appeal to this school. They would welcome it no doubt if it brought social reform and freedom from the theological restraints which the Church has hitherto imposed on her clergy.

It is not surprising that the Evangelical body has been to some extent affected by the attrition of these two opposite forces. Those who can look back over as many decades in the Ministry as I can will realize that a good deal has been altered, or perhaps we should say adopted, amongst Evangelicals since we were ordained. Most of us hold the same vital principles as our fathers did, but our methods both of preaching and practice have changed in regard to definiteness. Our conduct of public worship, for example, is very different from what would have been seen in the churches of McNeile and Miller, the elder Bickersteths and the Brighton Elliotts. I do not say that it is less devout or sincere, but it is more showy than spiritual, more extrinsic than intensive. So far as one, who is now more often in the pew than the pulpit, may judge, our witness is less definite than it was formerly. There is less doctrine and Bible exposition in our sermons, which often seem to have been hurriedly prepared. In my youth I heard more about conversion and covenants, sin and salvation than I do now: more about justification and peace with God, judgment both here and hereafter, Christian assurance and experience by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. We are frightened by that much misunderstood word "dogma." We think that we must adapt ourselves to present-day tastes and feelings. We have followed rather than led. With the best intentions this was a great mistake.

People are much more likely to be convinced by those who temperately express strong convictions than by those who keep what is called an open mind, which, as one of the many stories about Archbishop Temple relates, was in his opinion much the same as having no mind at all.

There is a movement among some of our younger men which

incurs this danger. I would not call it a secret Society, though in some respects it has the appearance of one. Its general attitude is one of impatience with the definiteness of our position as it has come to us from those known as the Evangelical fathers. It is ready to surrender with non-essentials much also that used to be thought essential. The Evangelical teaching which remains is consequently weakened, and cannot have the vigour and vitality of that which springs unadulterated from the fountain head.

If the divergencies or developments to which I have referred affect no revealed truth, and if they come fairly within the principles of our Church, as set forth in the Prayer Book and Articles, then in such a crisis as the present, it is a waste of time to discuss them, and it is far worse to be divided or to quarrel over them. But if we are convinced that they touch the foundations of the Christian faith, that they contradict the teaching of "God's Word written," as read in its natural sense, then loyalty to Him, Who is there revealed, and to the Church of our fathers, which has taken that Word as her Rule of Faith, compels us to meet with a firm and definite refusal all that obscures or disparages that faith. Moreover, surrender of any fraction of this heritage is in such a case as foolish as it is wrong. Each concession invites further demands, and refusal becomes more difficult at every later stage.

I am profoundly convinced that the success of the National Mission will depend mainly on the purity and plainness of its witness. To bring in the second-hand furniture of Rome will be as fatal as to employ the clipped coinage of Anglo-German criticism. Disaster must come from either, and a Mission that failed after elaborate profession and preparation would be worse than no Mission at all. If we could all agree to determine, as St. Paul did, not to know anything among our people "save Jesus Christ and Him crucified," if our fellow Churchmen on each side of us were willing to drop everything else but that which the Holy Spirit has taught in the Word, and unite with us in preaching "Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God," then such blessing would come that all England could not hold it nor the world beside.

Will my readers bear with me, if I illustrate my plea for definiteness in two or three particulars.

I.

The first is the question of Authority. We know exactly how our Church has defined it, and we know how others on either side of our position have deviated from it. We have heard from Anglican clergy the Roman quibble about "the Church before the Bible," and the inferences which they have drawn from it. We are familiar also with the suggestions of those who regard the Old Testament as largely a collection of myths, and talk about the Judaism of St. Paul. Our people also hear a good deal of the same sort. But have we been careful so to teach positive and constructive truth about the Bible, that such inventions, which, as an ancient Preacher has told us, are the instinct of fallen man, have no effect but to excite pity and prayer for the inventors?

My connexion with the Bible League has not only shown me how widespread is the weakening of that old regard for Holy Scripture, which was the priceless asset of former days, and also how the poison has filtered down from the lecture room to the pulpit, and the press, and then to the people, but it has shown me as well how the mischief may be tactfully and effectively met. There has been a welcome response to our efforts, and in some quarters signs of a healthy reaction.

With this same object I would urge my brethren to encourage in their parishes more devotional and textual study of the Bible, and of the accumulating evidences, external and internal, of its integrity. With this let them promote the revival of family worship, including the reading of the Scriptures, preceded by a collect or prayer for the illumination of the Holy Spirit.

It is true that we can no more define Inspiration than we can define Incarnation. But we can assert the fact of one as positively as we can of the other. And we can affirm with assurance that the Inspiration of the Bible is not merely a form of human genius more or less highly developed, but is a demonstrable phenomenon, just as we affirm that by the Incarnation we have not merely a Saviour, but a Saviour Who is Emmanuel.

II.

My second point has reference to the Person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ. It may seem strange that after more than

three hundred years of an open Bible there should be a single Englishman who should have any misconceptions on such a topic. And yet they are frequent. Some of us affirm that on each occasion when a priest celebrates the Eucharist, Christ is present in the consecrated elements, and that a sacrifice is thereby made for cleansing of sin, as that on Calvary. Others who refuse this, go in another direction and assert that it was part of His humiliation on earth to be subject to the current errors of the day, and that at least in His eschatological teaching He was misled by Rabbinic influences. I have been told by several well-known Evangelical clergy that they could not accept His witness to the Old Testament as a supreme standard, and that His references to Moses and Jonah as historical persons were not enough to prove the fact.

It is certain that if the Messengers of the Mission are under either condition of such thoughts, their preaching of Christ will have little effect.

We want something much more divinely definite. Many of us who do not err in either of these ways fail to preach a full Christ. Their sermons do not give to Him the prominence which the Bible gives. References to the Messianic hope in history and type, psalm and prophet, are rare or incidental. The effectual grace of His Atonement, the power of His Resurrection, and yearning for conformity to His life, which fill so largely the Apostolic letters, have a much smaller place in our discourses than they should have. I often hear and read sermons in which the figure of the Saviour is dim and indistinct, and there is little said of Him to convict the sinner, comfort the inquirer, or build up the believer. And yet it is only that witness to Him and the exceeding riches of His grace, such as the first preachers gave, which the Holy Spirit will honour with like results. These results are as possible even now as then. The ages have not altered the divine character or the divine conditions. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and to-day and for ever.

The same as He was in the glory which He had with the Father before the world was, the same as on the Cross, for God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, the same in the Resurrection, which declared Him to be the Son of God with power, the same now upholding all things, the same as He will be when He comes for His saints, and when He comes by His divine authority

to judge the nations of the world. Indeed there is no subject in Scripture from the beginning to the end described more fully, more definitely, or with such emphasis and precision, than the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. He is in everything first and last, Alpha and Omega, the author and finisher of our Faith. Only by the preaching of that Christ can men be saved, and Ministers who fail to preach thus, sin against Him as much as they do against their own souls and the souls committed to their care.

III.

One other subject only can I refer to now. But this equally with the former is one about which there is no lack of instruction and definition in Scripture, though it is not often recognized as fully as it should be. If there can be no revival without the preaching of Jesus Christ, certainly there cannot be without the power of the Holy Spirit. None of us, I presume, wherever we are in the Bishop of London's category, would deny the personality and functions of the third Person of the Holy Trinity. Yet I am sure there is a good deal of vagueness of thought and consequent silence in our ministry about His presence and work.

It is true the word "spiritual" has become very common, especially in the literature of the Mission, but it is often used with ambiguity, and writers do not make it clear whether by it they mean the spirit of man or the Spirit of God. No such indefiniteness exists in the Scriptures. While we use the word sometimes quite apart from a religious sense, and sometimes in a quasi religious sense to describe human emotions not necessarily controlled by the Holy Ghost, the real spirituality of which the Bible speaks cannot be mistaken. The spiritual man is one who has been born again and is dwelt in by the Spirit. Nothing can be more precisely described than the distinction which St. Paul draws in 1 Corinthians ii. between the spiritual and the "natural man." But the whole subject is far too large for me to deal with here, I can only suggest some definite points which need to be emphasized with reference to the Mission and for the consideration of my brethren.

- (1) The Personality and Character of the Holy Spirit.
- (2) The condition of His coming and to whom He is given.
- (3) The threefold purpose for which He has come, and its relation in each aspect to Christ. (St. John xvi. 8-11.)

(4) His witness to Christ, and in and through the believer as the Spirit of Truth and Life.

(5) His communication with human intelligence, feeling and will.

(6) His action in quickening, directing, fruit giving, sanctifying, enabling and evidential.

IV.

There is much more that I might be tempted to say in the same direction, but I trust that I have sufficiently maintained my thesis. A great opportunity lies before the Church of England, not so large indeed as might have been taken, but large enough to tax all its powers. But the Church will fail if it loses its balance by lack of God-given definiteness. Its equilibrium will not be found by leaning to one side or the other, or to each in turn. Safety can only be assured under the direct and definite guidance of the Holy Spirit, as He has given it in the Sacred Scriptures. It is this central line which Evangelicals believe that they hold. That they do so is no cause for self-praise. It is rather a call to greater responsibility, a fuller consecration, and a stauncher steadfastness. The truth we hold is no discovery made by us; we hold it because God has made it known; and we hold it, therefore, in trust for Him and for our fellow men.

Dr. Forsyth has lately said well :—" Christianity is a statement about a self-given God and not a seeking religion; a statement which conveys the knowledge of His relation to us, and expresses our relation to Him; a statement, therefore, which has its source in Him and not in us."

And again :—" A Church that lives on its sympathies rather than its beliefs, upon sentiment rather than justification, has neither power with God nor permanence with men."

If others can show that wherein they differ from us they do so on the same Authority as that to which we submit, and that by this Authority we are in error, either by defect or addition, then straightway let us repent and thankfully accept whatever truth we have neglected. But it must be God's own truth as He gave it of old. To no other authority dare we yield. "To the law and to the Testimony" is our watchword, as it was of our fathers; so that "whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby,

is not to be required of any man as an article of the Faith." And if that which we hold and preach is according to the Word of God, and if we have neither added thereto nor taken aught from it, then let us go on in confidence, as better men have done before us, unmoved by frowns or favours, and let the grand old words which our fathers so often sang be ours also.

O make but trial of His love,
 Experience will decide
 How blest are they, and only they,
 Who in His truth confide.

Fear Him, ye saints, and you will then
 Have nothing else to fear ;
 Make you His service your delight,
 Your wants shall be His care.

H. E. Fox.



Simon Patrick.

SYMON PATRICK, Bishop of Ely, took an important part in Church life in the seventeenth century. He was born in the reign of Charles I; grew up under the Long Parliament and Commonwealth; held an important London living, after the Restoration; obtained a bishopric at the Revolution, and lived well into the reign of Anne. His autobiography, written near the close of his life, but based on many earlier notes and memoranda, is of great value. It gives a very favourable impression of the writer—a sincerely religious man, of sound learning and judgment, strongly attached to the Church of England, but no bigot.

He was born in 1626, at Gainsborough, where his father was in business. Both his parents were thoroughly godly. His mother used to make him read to her three chapters of Scripture every day, whereby, reading six Psalms when their turn came, the whole Bible was read in the course of a year. His father constantly prayed with his household night and day, if at home; if he were absent, his wife did so. He was undeservedly called a Puritan, because as there was no sermon in their church on Sunday afternoons, he used sometimes to go to a neighbouring church, or else would read a sermon at home—but they were Sanderson's sermons! "Being thus educated," says their son, "I had an early sense of religion, blessed by God, implanted in my mind, which was much increased by my attending to sermons." He had learnt shorthand as a schoolboy, and his father made him take down the sermons in church and read them over when he came home.

His father suffered a good deal in the Civil War at the hands of both sides, so that his son's education was a difficulty. But in 1644 he took him to Cambridge, having letters of introduction to Cudworth and Whichcote of Emmanuel, two of the leading "Cambridge Platonists." They, however, said they were full, but recommended Queens', which was newly filled with Fellows from Emmanuel. It had been a strong Royalist College, and there had been many ejections. Here Patrick entered as a sizar, but before long attracted the attention of the Master (President), Herbert Palmer, of whom he speaks highly. He gave him some copying to do, and made him College scribe, which added considerably to his

income. He was soon after made a scholar, and afterwards a Fellow, taking his M.A. in 1650-1. He came greatly under the influence of another Fellow, John Smith, the youngest of the Cambridge Platonists. Among other things he spoke to him about absolute Predestination, which he had always felt a difficulty, saying that he could never answer the objections against it, but was advised by divines to silence carnal reason. Smith told him that his objections were good and sound, and as he says, "made such a representation to me of the nature of God, and of His goodwill to men in Christ, as quite altered my opinion, and made me take the liberty to read such authors as settled me in the belief that God would really have all men to be saved, of which I never after made a question, nor looked upon it as a matter of controversy, but presumed it in all my sermons." Smith died in 1652, at the age of thirty-two. Patrick preached his funeral sermon.

The College statutes required the Fellows to take Holy Orders when two years Masters of Arts. Patrick, having occasion to go to London, "knew no better" than to go to a classis of presbyters there and be ordained by them. But not long after he met with Hammond's book on "Ignatius' Epistles," and Thorndike's "Primitive Government of the Church," and was fully convinced of the necessity of episcopal ordination. Finding that Bishop Hall was still living in retirement near Norwich, he and two other Fellows, taking another friend as a witness, went over there and "were received with great kindness by that reverend old Bishop," who examined them and gave them many good exhortations, and then ordained them in his own parlour at Heigham, near Norwich, April 5, 1654. Such private ordinations cannot have been uncommon during this period, though we generally hear of them only when those so ordained afterwards came to distinction, such as Lloyd, Bull, Dolben, Tenison.

About 1655 Patrick left Cambridge, taking a chaplaincy in the house of Sir Walter St. John (grandfather of the future Lord Bolingbroke) at Battersea, where he was very happy. But, some time after, the living of Battersea, which was in Sir Walter's gift, fell vacant. There was some delay in filling it; several men came to preach trial sermons. But finally Lord Chief Justice St. John, Lady St. John's father, told her they could not do better than offer it to their chaplain. The outgoing vicar also favoured him. But

Patrick himself was in great fear of being rejected by the "Triers"—the commissioners who had to be satisfied that any man nominated to a benefice was able and fit to preach the Gospel. He knew that he was not exactly an orthodox Puritan, but he was persuaded to accept, and a London minister he knew promised to persuade the "Triers" to be very favourable. And truly they asked him no hard questions, but chiefly what evidence he could give of his conversion; and being satisfied that he was a good man, they admitted him. He at first, however, felt the care of souls so heavy a burden as to think of giving up; but he found the assistance of God beyond his expectation.

At the Restoration many ministers began at once to use the Prayer Book. Some of Patrick's parishioners wanted him to do the same, but he thought it best to prepare the way by a few sermons on the lawfulness and usefulness of forms of prayer. He took to using the Prayer Book on July 22, 1660. This caused no trouble, as he had won the good opinion of some of the best people in the parish, who knew previously something of his mind; for from his first coming to be their minister he had always personally received the Communion kneeling.

In 1662 he was elected President of Queens' College; but a Crown nominee, Dr. Sparrow, finally secured the post, after a troublesome lawsuit, in which Patrick had all sorts of difficulties thrown in his way.

Patrick had, of course, no difficulty about accepting the new Prayer Book. He was offered in September the living of St. Paul's, Covent Garden, vacant by the ejection of Dr. Manton. He got a dispensation to hold Battersea also, not knowing how the air of London would agree with him, or how acceptable he would be to the parish. He, however, put his brother, afterwards Master of the Charterhouse, into Battersea, allowing him all the stipend.

In 1664-5 there was a very hard frost, lasting from Christmas to the month of April; soon after it broke, the plague broke out. In May, Patrick went into the country for his health, and to see his parents; on his return in July he found that the plague had already reached his parish. He, however, kept to his post, and found himself mightily supported and assisted in doing his duty cheerfully. When his well-to-do parishioners, who had all left London, returned, they thought most highly of his devotion. He did a good deal of

reading at this time, which was interrupted by the Great Fire, when a friend of his insisted upon his sending his books to Battersea for safety, and he was a long time getting them back. In 1668 he wrote a controversial book against the Nonconformists. Within the next few years he became a Royal Chaplain, Canon of Westminster, and Dean of Peterborough. In 1675 he married, after a courtship with a strong element of romance.

They had some difficulty at St. Paul's, Covent Garden, in disposing of the large offerings at the Communion. After providing for all who were sick and in great need the surplus was allowed to accumulate, till at last it reached £400. Patrick consulted the churchwardens about its application to some pious or charitable use according to the rubric. They wanted it given to the poor, but he said this meant relieving the poor rate, and so giving to the rich. He proposed the purchase of £20 yearly to be settled on the curate who should read prayers morning and evening, for ever. They objected to this, but gave way when he talked of appealing to the Bishop's decision. Prayers were already maintained by a voluntary contribution at 10 a.m. and 3 p.m., to which the gentry and better sort resorted; but according to this trust prayers were to be read also at 6 a.m and 7 p.m. in summer, that servants might resort to them.

Patrick was offered the vicarage of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, but declined it, recommending Dr. Tenison, who was duly appointed. From this time Tenison and Patrick were hand and glove.

In 1681, at the Archbishop's request, they began a weekly Communion at Peterborough Cathedral. Patrick, as Dean, preached several sermons persuading to frequent Communion, which he afterwards turned into a treatise answering the common objections to it.

He came to the front during the controversies of James II's reign. In 1686 he and Dr. Jane, Dean of Gloucester, took part in a controversy with two Roman priests in the presence of the King and Lord Treasurer Rochester, whom the King was pressing to change his religion, and who insisted on first hearing arguments on both sides. Of course neither side convinced the other.

In the same year Tenison and Patrick were called upon to assist at the deprivation of Samuel Johnson, Vicar of Corringham in Essex, who had been chaplain to Lord Russell, and had done his

best to refute the current Church doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance to royal commandments, which had been held even by Tillotson and Burnet. He had now just written an appeal to the soldiers in camp at Hounslow, not to fight against the religion and liberties of their country. He was brought to trial and sentenced to be deprived of his orders, set in the pillory, and flogged at the cart's tail; this was duly carried out. The commission for depriving him consisted of Bishops Crewe, White, and Spratt, Bishop Compton of London having been suspended. Stillingfleet, Dean of St. Paul's, declined to have anything to do with the matter. Twelve London clergy, including Tenison, Patrick, and Williams, were called upon to assist. These three excused themselves on various grounds; Crewe wanted them sent for, but the others thought it unnecessary. The commissioners failed to strip Johnson of his cassock, which was afterwards held to invalidate their action. The new vicar intruded into his living was driven out by the parishioners. At the Revolution Parliament declared both sentence and deprivation to be illegal; Johnson waited for no legal rehabilitation, but, in Newcourt's words, "restored himself both to his orders and to this living, which he enjoyed till his death."

Tenison and Patrick took a leading part in the opposition to the Declaration of Indulgence, May, 1688. Many meetings were held about it; at one on May 11, at the Master of the Temple's, it was agreed "that the bishops should be desired to address the King, but not upon any address of ours to them. For we judged it best that they should lead the way and we follow them." This shows clearly how the credit rests quite as much with the London clergy as with the bishops. The clergy did not wait for the bishops' lead, but pushed them in front of them. At another meeting on the 13th, it was resolved not to read the Declaration. It was arranged to sound all the London ministers; if they were of the same mind the Archbishop promised to petition the King not to exact it. Tenison and Patrick canvassed the west part of London, others taking other parts. On the Thursday, May 17, they met, and gave account of nearly seventy who promised not to read it. Patrick wrote out a fair list of these and took it to the Bishop of Peterborough, who carried it to Lambeth that night. Whereupon the Archbishop sent notice for all the bishops in or near London to come to Lambeth next day, and notified Tenison and Patrick that it was

fit that they should keep it as a day of fasting and prayer, to beg God's direction and His blessing on what was intended. Between ten and eleven they with Dr. Grove went over to Lambeth, and found Tillotson and Stillingfleet there, besides the bishops. There was considerable discussion about the right way of proceeding and the wording, and it was not till six that the bishops went to Whitehall, and as the King was out, they could not see him before nine. Patrick and his friends stayed at Lambeth till eight, but then had to leave, and did not hear the result till next day. This account shows clearly why it was that the bishops acted so late. It was not so much to assemble as many bishops as possible in London, as because they were waiting for the decision of the London clergy. Yet the "Seven Bishops" usually get all the credit, the active part taken by Compton of London being forgotten.

On the Sunday, the Declaration was not read by any considerable person; but the Dean (Bishop Spratt) sent it by one of the minor canons to read in the Abbey. (The ordinary account makes Spratt read it himself.) At St. Margaret's it was refused. In the middle of the week Patrick went to keep his residence at Peterborough, where he did what he could to prevent the reading of it, and found the clergy everywhere inclined to follow the lead of the London clergy. He says he regarded it as a great providence that the clergy were not enjoined all to read it on the same day, but those in London on May 20, those in the country a fortnight later: whereby they had opportunity to hear what those in London had done and the reasons for their refusal.

Here I detect a flaw in Mr. Balleine's "Layman's Church History." He makes the incumbents of his two parishes in Kent have no opportunity of consulting others. But it is morally certain that all clergy anywhere near Canterbury knew more than a week before of the line taken by their Archbishop, Sancroft, and their Dean, Tillotson.

Patrick was still at Peterborough when the news came of the acquittal of the bishops. "The bells rang from three o'clock in the morning till night; when several bonfires were made, with tabour and pipe and drum, and a great part of the night was spent in rejoicing."

Patrick had, unlike many old acquaintances and friends, no difficulty in taking the oath to William and Mary. In September,

1689, he was appointed, at Bishop Lloyd's suggestion, to the see of Chichester. He gives an account of his visitation in 1690—interrupted by the French fleet attacking Hastings.

He took a prominent part in the attempted revision of the Prayer Book in 1689. This has never had justice done to it, its weakest points having been attacked and its good points ignored. It was intended to meet Nonconformist objections, in hopes of bringing in many of them. The proposed changes in the Litany were mostly decided improvements. It proposed to recognize foreign Presbyterian orders, and to have a hypothetical form of reordination of English Presbyterians. But the whole thing fell through, as it was clear that the Lower House of Convocation would never accept it.

In 1691 Patrick was translated to Ely. He was one of the chief instruments in the revival of Church life which marked the latter years of the seventeenth century. He was one of the original founders of the S.P.C.K., and so strong a supporter of the S.P.G. that it is supposed to be in compliment to him that all Bishops of Ely are *ex-officio* members.

He was strongly opposed to the Bill against Occasional Conformity, holding that it had no religious object, and that "it struck at the very best of the Nonconformists, who, looking upon us as good Christians that had nothing sinful in our worship, thought they ought, upon occasion, to communicate with us ; but imagining they had something better in their way of worship, could not leave it, but adhere to their dissenting ministers. This I took not to be an argument of their hypocrisy, as many called it, but of their conscientious sincerity, and therefore thought they ought to be tolerated in this practice, which might in time bring them over to us, as I know it had done some worthy persons."

It is clear that Patrick did not regard the rubric at the end of the Confirmation Service as absolutely excluding Nonconformists from communicating in our churches.

Patrick was a great writer, best known now perhaps by his commentaries, which are still of some value. He died May 31, 1707, and is buried in Ely Cathedral.

HAROLD SMITH.

The Necessity of Dogma.

“**H**E that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches” (Rev. ii. 7). It will be obvious that I am proposing to make an unusual application of these familiar words. They are generally claimed by those who may, without prejudice, be described as modernists, and sometimes by those more than modernists, those futurist sons of the morning, who, in their conviction that the night is far spent and that the day is at hand, would cast off the works of dogma, and put on, a little breathlessly, the armour of enlightenment. They are not, I think, very commonly employed to indicate the necessity of maintaining the Catholic and Apostolic Faith.

But it is part of my purpose, both now and always, to claim that liberty and Christianity are identical, that the freedom of man and the Gospel of Christ are the same thing. We pray every morning to Him Whose service is perfect freedom, and St. John reminds us that our Lord said, “Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.” We attain our full stature, our perfect liberty, we become what God means us to be, only when we hear and comprehend and assimilate the truth of God.

And in order to assimilate as much as may be of the whole truth of God, we must listen not only with our own ears, but with the ears of our fathers. “O Lord, we have heard with our ears, and our fathers have declared unto us, the noble works that Thou didst in their days, and in the old time before them.” Those Christians who happen at this moment, or at any moment, to be what we call alive, are only a very small part of the whole Church. We may not disfranchise the departed, and refuse to hear their evidence, simply because their experience and the record of it is earlier in date than ours. If dogma is founded upon facts, let it be founded on all the facts. If we are going to “hear the Church,” let us hear the whole Church.

For what is dogma? It is the experience, digested, recorded, classified, of Christendom. It is the result of the impression made by our Lord upon His servants. It is what the friends of Christ have thought about Him.

I.

There are three things that I desire to say. And the first is this. *Christian dogma is a fact, a phenomenon, that we must take into consideration.*

The great miracle of history is that Jesus, the Nazarene, has been able to project Himself forward into the world's life. His effect on human character has included the lives of persons of every imaginable kind: men and women, young and old, wise and foolish, ambassadors and children, kings and mothers, the lusty soldier and the crippled girl; a Paul, a Mary Magdalene, a Joan of Arc, a Thomas More, a Wesley, a Dr. Johnson, a Father Stanton. He has led to the production of writings so different as the Gospel of St. Luke and the *Summa Theologiæ* of St. Thomas Aquinas, the *Imitation* and the *Pilgrim's Progress*, the *Great Charter*, and the *Book of Common Prayer*. And all this has been born of the conviction that "Jesus is Lord." There are many things that might be said about the weakness and sinfulness of the Church of Christ, and if any reader is thinking of some of those things now, let him believe that I would join with him in acts of penitence. But it remains a great miracle—the greater as we know more truly the frailty of the material it has had to work upon—that the organ of divine salvation, which began when God did not abhor the Virgin's womb, is still surviving. The Christian religion has apparently been destroyed time after time by the ingenuity of its opponents and by the badness of its friends, but it is still here to-day. "One Jesus, Whom Paul affirmed to be alive." Yes, and He is still alive, because a young man, Onesimus, or Francis of Assisi, or William Smith, has just been converted by His grace.

II.

This dogma was an inevitable fact. You may regret it. You may wish that what you think is the simplicity of the Sermon on the Mount had never been encumbered by the metaphysics of the Nicene Creed. For my own part, I do not for a single moment agree that the Sermon on the Mount is simple in the sense of being non-theological, or that our Lord's Gospel can ever be separated from a true belief about His right to speak it. But so far as metaphysics are concerned, as a plain person to whom metaphysics are always rather difficult, I will agree that it would have been nicer

(I use a foolish word on purpose) if the amount of metaphysics could have been smaller. But it was impossible. The early Christians were entirely convinced of the fact, which is entirely true, that in religion you must use the whole of the faculties that God has given you, intellect and all. Religion is to some extent connected with the feelings, and to a much larger extent connected with the will. But the only complete description of religion is that it is an affair of the entire personality.

Remember what happened. The Church began, as you can read in the twelfth chapter of 1 Corinthians, verse 3, with the simple confession that "Jesus is Lord." Then came the heretics. A few of them were perhaps seekers after notoriety. A few of them were men of evil life. But the great majority of them were simply questioners, men who had hold—an exaggerated hold—on some one side of a Christian doctrine, and wanted to know whether room could be found in Christianity for the thing that they felt to be important. And the Church had to find an answer to their questions. The Church had to dig down deep into the wisdom of the Bible and the treasury of its own experience of Christ to find the answer. So came the Creeds.

It was not in the least that the Church was possessed with a lust for making definitions. The Creeds are defensive in their origin. For example, a man named Arius arose, and said that our Lord was only to be called divine in some sense inferior to that in which the Father is divine. St. Athanasius at once perceived that the whole doctrine of Redemption was at stake. For a being who is less than Very God of Very God may teach and lead and help. He may bring a message down from Heaven. *But he cannot bring divine Redemption, he cannot recreate humanity.* So Athanasius fought for the true faith, and so the famous Creed of the Council of Nicæa was made as a bulwark of the Gospel. But the thing for which Athanasius fought was not his own idea. It was not simply the private opinion of a clever man. It was the charter of Redemption for our children's children. The simple Christian of to-day, who trusts in Jesus only for salvation, owes it indeed to Jesus only that he has means of grace or hope of Heaven, but he owes it to Athanasius and those like Athanasius that the faith of Jesus has been preserved until to-day.

Or take that other Confession of our Christian Faith, which is

commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius, though it has much more connection with St. Augustine and the Latin-speaking Church. You perhaps do not like it. It would help a little if you realized that Morning Prayer, the service in which it occurs on thirteen occasions in the year, was never intended to be the general public service of Sunday morning, to which all manner of worshippers, instructed and uninstructed alike, should come. But it would help still more if you realized, as perhaps indeed you do, the meaning and history of the document, how every sentence of it is the actual answer to some question that actually was asked, how it bears from end to end the dints of actual conflict, how it has as a matter of historic fact preserved the faith.

The Church cannot undo the work of the great Creed-making centuries, the fourth and fifth, any more than it can undo the Reformation, any more than Europe can deny the French Revolution, or any other organization can deny an event which has left a permanent mark upon its life. It is not only that I *ought* not as a Christian to abandon Christian dogma any more than a soldier ought to lay down his rifle. It is that as a Christian I *can* no more abandon Christian dogma than I can shake off my arms and legs.

The Church can re-interpret? Yes, of course it can. Just as Athanasius re-interpreted the faith expressed in the New Testament and loosely current in the Church of his day, so we must re-interpret the ancient Creed of Christendom and express it to the men of our own day in language that they can understand. But always we begin with what the Spirit has said to the Church. The Historic Faith lays down the lines along which our Christian thinking will go. We hold it modestly and humbly. We know that it is not—that no human language ever can be—more than an approximation to the whole truth of God. Of course all theological language is of a metaphorical character. No one supposes that “Personality” or “Fatherhood,” or any other such term, has no more meaning, no fuller and richer meaning, in the divine sphere than that with which we are familiar in the human sphere. But the human language is a sufficient approximation to the truth. No one supposes that when you have said, with Christian theologians, that there are in Christ two Natures in One Person, you have exhausted the whole of what our Lord knows about Himself. But it is enough—

and it is vital for our Christianity—to know that He is Very God and Very Man.

III.

My last point is this. *Christian dogma is the analysis of Christianity, a formula which Christian men will find it easy to remember, by which Christian men will live.*

Our religion is not a religion of mere aspiration. It does not consist simply of saying "Lift up your hearts," or "There is a good time coming," or "Perhaps after all it will be all right." It is a Gospel. It is *News* of something that God did. The "faithful saying" is that "Christ Jesus *came* into the world to save sinners."

St. Paul, when he was casting about for a formula which would exclude idolatry and the infection of belief in evil spirits, had no difficulty in finding what he wanted. "No man can say that Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Ghost." Only in the atmosphere of that Holy Source of all Christian life can you take the sacred formula upon your lips.

St. Athanasius, when confronted by a heresy which, as Mr. Balfour has pointed out in an eloquent passage of his *Foundations of Belief*, would have inflicted irremediable impoverishment upon the Christian Faith, fought strenuously and victoriously for the formula which you find in the Nicene Creed, "Very God of Very God, Of one substance with the Father, By Whom all things were made." Without that, there is no Redemption.

We in our day are confronted by a double fact. On the one hand we find people who think they can be Christians without anything to stand on. Of course they are parasites; they are really living on the Creed of Christendom. But what they *say* is that their religion consists in going about and doing good. God forbid that I should impugn the reality of their goodness. It is the most difficult problem with which I am acquainted that a few strong souls appear to win through life without the Christian Creed. But I have not the least hesitation in saying that for very many it is only a fine weather faith, which will not help them to face the real Cross when the real Cross comes.

And on the other hand we find people, especially poor people, who are the vast majority of the population of Great Britain, who in nearly all the affairs of life are accustomed to live by formulas.

“Mustn’t grumble” is the dogma of the poor. Magnificently patient, but theologically quite inadequate.

What the Church has to do is to teach a few—a very few—of *the right formulas*, to make Christian dogmas what they are meant to be, the saving knowledge of the simple man. Religious education ought not to consist, as it too often does, of imparting historical and geographical information, of instruction in the dimensions of the Temple or of the distinctive tenets of the Pharisees and Sadducees. It consists of a few Christian dogmas, “Jesus is Very God of Very God,” “I believe in the Holy Ghost,” “Every parishioner shall communicate at the least three times a year, of which Easter to be one,” “Ye shall bring this child to the Bishop to be confirmed by him,” “The things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul’s health.”

We are thinking of Reconstruction, and the Church of England is preparing for a National Mission. The fundamental success of such a Mission depends of course on its effects on character. But if the Church is going to reach the people, if it is going to begin to have the desired effect on character, it must deal more largely in simple Christian formulas—the old formulas, or new ones which mean the same thing—which men can learn, and remember, and use as they go about their work.

S. C. CARPENTER.



Prayers for the Dead: A Reply.

THE object of the following paper is to show that there is no prayer in the New Testament for the individual saint who has fallen asleep in Christ Jesus, nor can any such prayers be found in the Christian Church till about the year 150 A.D. Such being the case, can such prayers be lawful now? Yet there is one prayer for all saints who have fallen asleep in Christ Jesus, taught by Him Who is "The Lord of the dead and the living," and is breathed all through the New Testament. It is a prayer that meets and fully satisfies the longing of the heart of the Christian mourner, and greatly helps him in his spiritual life. Indeed, it is needful for the full spiritual life of all Christians.

I.

There is no prayer in the New Testament for the individual, asleep in Christ Jesus.

Every reader of THE CHURCHMAN must have read with deep interest Dr. Plummer's paper on "Prayers for the dead" in the June number. We may be sure that whatever can be said on the subject has been said by so learned a theologian. Strange as it may seem, he is able to quote only one passage in the New Testament in favour of this practice. It is a statement that is quoted by every one who writes to uphold it. It is found in 2 Timothy i. 18 where we read of Onesiphorus "The Lord grant unto him to find mercy of the Lord in that day." There is, according to Dr. Plummer, some doubt as to the relevancy of even this one statement, as it is doubtful if Onesiphorus was living or dead at the time St. Paul made it. If alive, the statement was no connexion with the subject. We shall suppose he was dead, and show that, even on this supposition, it does not uphold the practice but, on the contrary, is totally against it. Before all else we must arrive at the grammatical meaning of the statement. First, as to the word, "*mercy*." There is much confusion in the use of this word, owing to the fact that it is used in the English Testament in two totally different senses. Dr. Davidson in his Commentary on *Hebrews* on "*Merciful and Faithful High Priest*," says, "*Merciful* means compassionate, and the shade of meaning belonging to *mercy* in modern English, of sparing the guilty,

forms no part of the old sense." It is in the sense of "sparing the guilty" that it is used in the prayer—"God be merciful to me the sinner." Here the word translated "mercy" has no connexion with the word in St. Paul's statement. In margin of R.V. we read, "Be propitiated." In the statement we are considering "mercy" means compassion, and so in almost every statement in the New Testament where it occurs. If we bear this in mind as we read the New Testament, much light is thrown on many passages, for example St. Matthew v. 7, and especially Hebrews iv. 14 to 16. After saying "We have not a High Priest Who cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities; but One that hath in all points been tempted like as we are, yet without sin," how appropriate is the exhortation, "Let us, therefore, draw near with boldness unto the Throne of grace, that we may receive *compassion*, and may find grace to help us in time of need." Grace includes forgiveness and all else we can need.

Let us again quote St. Paul's words as thus amended, "The Lord grant unto him to find compassion of the Lord in that day." On our supposition that Onesiphorus is dead, if the sentence had stopped at the second Lord it would be a prayer for His soul in the intermediate state; but St. Paul does not stop at Lord, but adds "*in that day*." This gives a totally different meaning to the sentence. Suppose some one did me a great kindness and it is quite impossible for me, in my present circumstances, to make any return, but I know that I shall be able to do this on some future day, and promise so to do, I could not possibly affirm my utter inability to do so *till that day*. So in the statement under consideration, St. Paul, by adding "*in that day*," the day of Christ's coming in Glory, affirms that his prayer for his friend's reward by Christ cannot be answered "*till that day*." We conclude, therefore, that St. Paul in these words declares that for some reason he cannot pray for Onesiphorus in the intermediate state, but prays that "*in that day*" the Lord will reward him for all his kindness to him and for his help in the Gospel. Thus we see that this statement of St. Paul, when rightly interpreted, not only gives no authority for prayer for those who have fallen asleep in Christ Jesus during the intermediate state, but is totally against such a practice. Now, as this is the only statement in the New Testament that Dr. Plummer is able to quote for upholding the practice, we conclude that there is no

authority from the New Testament for the practice of "prayers for the dead" as far as the individual is concerned. See 1 Corinthians iv. 5.

As for the statement that the practice was unknown in the Christian Church for the first 150 years, Dr. Plummer, as all scholars, agree to this. Is it possible, therefore, to suppose a practice to be lawful that is unknown in the New Testament and not found for the first 150 years in the history of the Christian era; and yet, strange to say, impossible as it may seem, such prayers are advocated by Dr. Plummer and many others!

II.

The Prayer for all Saints that are fallen asleep in Christ Jesus.

There is one prayer for "the dead in Christ," taught us by Christ Himself, implied all through the Epistles and the Revelation and which must have been the constant prayer of the primitive Christians. It is a prayer that meets and satisfies our love and longing concerning those taken from us. It is a prayer that brings us into real fellowship with the departed, keeping us ever in living touch with them till we meet again. It is a prayer, finally, needful for us to pray with ever-increasing reality, if we would live the full Christian life. That these words are not too strong concerning this prayer will soon be evident; but before stating what it is, I will make a few remarks that will lead up to it.

(1) All must acknowledge that all we can possibly know regarding the present state of the spirits of the departed, whether those dying in Christ or not, must be a matter of revelation from God Himself. Also, we may be perfectly sure that God has revealed to us all that it is good for us to know. To desire to know more than God has graciously revealed is no sign of faith, but implies doubt in the goodness and wisdom of God.

(2) What, then, is revealed as to the present state of those who have departed "in Christ"? (a) All true Christians on earth are in a real sense "with Christ and Christ with us." This fellowship with God in Christ is the source of all spiritual joy in God; but St. Paul says that the spirits of the departed are "with Christ in a state very far better" than anything we can have here (Phil. i. 23). How great, therefore, their "joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ" and constant spiritual refreshment! (b) We are not sur-

prised, therefore, that those who "die in the Lord" are "Blessed," that is, truly happy, and at "rest" (Rev. xiv. 13). (c) These rejoicing, happy spirits are called "the spirits of just men made perfect" (Heb. xii. 23). (d) And yet, with all this, we know that their present state is not that of full salvation, for the Salvation won for us by Christ is for the whole man, spirit, soul and body. Bodiless spirits; therefore, must ever be looking eagerly forward "to that day"—"the Day of Christ," the day of full Salvation—"the redemption of the body."

(3) We now come to the only prayer taught us in Scripture for "the dead in Christ." When we think with wonder and thankfulness of their being "with Christ" in a state "very far better" than that of the holiest on earth, of their being "blessed" and at "rest," and as "perfect," it is quite impossible for us to conceive, or to put into words any request but one, the one that is taught us by the Lord Himself—"Thy Kingdom Come." This prayer is breathed in all the epistles and is the last prayer in the Bible—"Even so, come, Lord Jesus." This is beautifully expressed in our Burial Service—"Beseeching Thee, that it may please Thee, of Thy gracious goodness, shortly to accomplish the number of Thine elect, and to hasten Thy kingdom; that we, with all those who have departed in the faith of Thy Holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in Thy eternal and everlasting Glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

(4) All this is corroborated by a special revelation to St. Paul. The Thessalonians, in their sorrow at the death of loved ones and in their distress as to their condition, sent to St. Paul for instruction, and, as he could not know anything on such a subject, except in so far as revealed to him by God, he writes—"This we say unto you by the Word of the Lord, that we that are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord, shall in no wise precede them that are fallen asleep. For the Lord Himself shall descend from Heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first, then we that are alive, that are left, shall, together with them, be caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air and so shall we ever be with the Lord" (1 Thess. iv. 15-17).

And now what follows? If anywhere in the New Testament we might expect to find authority for "Prayers for the dead," in the

sense that these words are so often used now—prayers for their “rest,” “refreshment” and even “purification,” all of which, as we have seen, they have in perfection, it will be here. But, no! there is no such injunction here. St. Paul concludes—“Wherefore comfort (or exhort) one another with these words,” or, as Dr. Moffat renders it, “Now then, encourage one another with these words.” That is we are to seek to realize and to be ever ready for the “Blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ” (Titus ii. 13; see also Phil. iii. 20, 21). What makes all this the stronger is the words that precede what has been quoted—“We would not have you ignorant brethren, concerning them that fall asleep, that ye sorrow not, as the rest that have no hope.” Most writers now-a-days on the subject would here add you can pray for them; but not so the Holy Spirit by St. Paul; for some reason, which must be for our good, no such exhortation is given here or anywhere else in the New Testament. Everywhere there is absolute silence.

It is such a “comfort”—“The comfort wherewith we are comforted of God” to think that our blessed dead and we have one and the same hope and prayer. We pray with them and, in this sense, for them. They pray with us and for us. Thus, indeed, we have fellowship with them and they with us. This is what the words of St. Paul with reference to the Holy Communion suggest, “*We proclaim the Lord’s death till He come.*”

“See, the feast of Love is spread,
 Drink the wine and break the bread
 Sweet memorials, till the Lord
 Call us round His Heavenly Board,
 Some from earth, from glory some
 Sevr’d only till He come.”

(5) The Advent of Christ for “The redemption of our body,” throws light on every portion of the revelation of God. If neglected, we are sure to fall into many errors. One great, we may say, the chief reason that is urged for “prayers for the dead” is the undeniable fact that some find repentance and salvation in Christ at the end of life, it may be a life of flagrant sin, like the thief on the cross. Surely, it is urged, for such there must be needed a time for further repentance than was possible here on earth, yea, for cleansing from life-long sin. Hence the doctrine of “Purgatory” and purification in any form.

Well, what light does the second Advent of Christ throw on this ? On that glorious day there will be many millions all over the world to whom the words of St. Paul will be blessedly applicable, " We that are alive, that are left till the coming of the Lord." Oh ! what a variety of Christian experiences ! Some have known and served Christ from childhood to old age ; some, for a few years ; some, for a few weeks ; some, for a few days ; some for a few minutes ; some even for a few moments, and yet all, without exception, will be " changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, and be caught up to meet the Lord in the air,"—" glorified together with Christ." All with wondering joy will join in the triumphant song " Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

And why is it that all will be glorified on that day, although their spiritual experiences will be so varied ? Because each one had " washed his robes and made them white in the Blood of the Lamb "—" The blood that cleanseth from all sin." It is true that they will begin the eternal state at different levels of spiritual experience, and each one will have much to learn throughout the eternity of bliss, but one thing they all have in common, or they would not be in the glory with Christ, they will be free from sin and, therefore, in soul-harmony with God.

(6) The Lord Jesus not only teaches us to pray—" Our Father which art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name. Thy Kingdom come." But adds—" Thy will be done, as in Heaven so on earth," thus fixing our thoughts on Heaven and its inhabitants. Who are they who are doing perfectly the will of God in Heaven ? We are apt to think only of the Holy Angels, but this is to limit the range of the prayer. Scripture is so written that one part throws light on another, so in Hebrews xii. 22 we read " Ye are come unto Mount Zion and to the city of the Living God, the Heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable hosts of angels," but we do not stop there, the writer goes on—" to the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are enrolled in Heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the Mediator of a new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better than that of Abel." In this is summed up all sinless beings. Thus, we see, as we pray the Lord's Prayer we not only pray for the day of full salvation, but are also led to think, not only of the holy angels, but of all who have believed in Christ as their Lord and

Saviour whether Old Testament saints, who believed in Him as their promised Saviour, or those who believed in Him as the crucified, risen and glorified Saviour, each and all are doing perfectly the will of God, and each and all the saints have one hope and one prayer in which we join—“*Thy Kingdom come.*”

(7) It may be said :—Well, after all, what harm can there be in praying for our loved ones with Christ even although the New Testament is silent on the subject and primitive Christians knew nothing of the practice ? It is strange that anyone who knows anything of the sad history of Christianity can ask such a question, for this addition to the Word of God by degrees developed into the awful doctrine of the figment of Purgatory and masses for the dead. When we deviate, however little at the first, from the revealed will of God, thinking ourselves wiser than God, we can never tell into what paths of error we may be led. What God has graciously revealed concerning our loved ones, who died in Christ, is amply sufficient to call forth our deepest thanksgivings and intensest praise, but it has left us nothing to pray for except the prayer the Lord Himself has taught us—“*Thy Kingdom come.*”—“*Almighty God, with Whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with Whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity ; we give Thee hearty thanks, for that it hath pleased Thee to deliver this our brother out of the miseries of this sinful world ; beseeching Thee, that it may please Thee, of thy gracious goodness, shortly to accomplish the number of Thine elect, and to hasten Thy Kingdom ; that we, with all those who are departed in the true faith of Thy holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in Thy eternal and everlasting glory ; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.*”

ANDREW GIVEN.



The Missionary World.

THE men who have guided or are guiding the affairs of China are a singularly interesting group. The *L.M.S. Chronicle* compares Sun Yat Sen, idealist and republican, to Mazzini; Yuan Shih-kai, the conservative and monarchical statesman, to Cavour; and the new President, Li Yuan-hung, soldier, patriot, and man of character, to Garibaldi. It is specially significant that the man who has been called by the President to resume that leading place in politics which he held in the first cabinet of the Chinese Republic is Mr. C. T. Wang, who writes an able article on "The New Conditions in China" in the August number of the *Missionary Review of the World*. Mr. Wang had to lay down his work as one of the national secretaries of the Young Men's Christian Association of China in order to respond to his country's call. He is a candid critic and at the same time a warm supporter of missions. "There is no question," he says, "but that what China needs uppermost is Christ."

* * * * *

Those who are rejoicing in the good news that Mr. Sherwood Eddy is at present carrying on evangelistic work in our British camps under the auspices of the Young Men's Christian Association, will welcome every fresh testimony as to the splendid way in which his recent work in China is standing and bearing fruit. Here is one case in point. A man who was impressed at the Tientsin meetings opened a Bible Class in his own house, calling in a Chinese Christian to lead it. The numbers began at five, but gradually the neighbours were interested, books were purchased and a circulating library started, a large bright room was fitted up for the meetings. More than eighty names are now on the Bible Class roll and the average attendance is forty; seven persons have been baptized besides the whole household of the originator of the movement, and a women's class of about thirty has been started.

* * * * *

Another item of interest about our soldiers is that Mission Study Circles with living textbooks are being arranged for them in India. Groups of some forty men are being taken to the mission centres—a hospital, a boys' school, a zenana mission-house—and given

some insight into the work. Further, they are not only taken to see missions in action, but some of the men have been used to give, through an interpreter, lantern lectures on the life of our Lord to Indian villagers, thus tasting for themselves the joy of missionary service. This work, which is true empire-building both in the earthly and in the heavenly sense, is being fostered both by the chaplains and by the Y.M.C.A.

* * * * *

Missionary giving since the war began has been remarkable everywhere. But perhaps the South Sea Islanders have exceeded all. In Fiji the native Christians have suffered considerably: food has been dear and scarce, and though the price of copra—their main export—has risen from £12 to £19 a ton, the crop has been poor and small. Their other sources of income have been diving for pearl shell and drying *bêche-de-mer*. Yet in one district of the Australian Methodist Mission where there are about 700 Christians, including the old, the sick and the little children, the giving averaged 4s. 6d. per head in 1914-15, and this year it has averaged sixpence more. Another form of giving is reported from Korea. The Christians of that country are now contributing, unpaid, more than 100,000 days yearly of their time for systematic evangelistic work. This is a "mission of witness" indeed.

* * * * *

A picturesque incident is recorded in an Indian Christian paper. The Metropolitan of India issued an appeal on behalf of the sorely tried Christian Church in Assyria. The Indian pastor at Clarkabad, in the C.M.S. Mission in the Punjab, was so moved that he set out with a donkey to collect grain from house to house from the Christian villagers for the sufferers in Assyria. He returned with gifts to the value of R. 113, which was sent to the relief fund.

* * * * *

Missionary societies at times appear to be insatiable bodies, as *The Challenge* recently pointed out. In April and May they are found rejoicing over last year's satisfactory income; by July or August they begin to express concern about next year's income and show reasons why it should be larger than the last. Dr. Herbert Lankester, in a recent number of the *Church Missionary Review*, stated that in the last twenty years the increase in the number of C.M.S. stations has been 50 per cent., of European and Colonial

workers 42 per cent., of native clergy and workers about 50 per cent., of adult baptisms nearly 300 per cent., of adherents (baptized Christians and those under definite instruction) 130 per cent. The number of single women on the staff has more than doubled. During the same period C.M.S. schools and colleges have increased from 2,130 to 3,676, scholars from 88,000 to 248,000, in-patients in hospitals from 6,400 to 43,000, and visits of out-patients from 418,000 to 1,270,000. These figures, and others which accompany them, provide an effective background of facts for those who will be advocating the cause of the Society this winter. But an even stronger appeal lies in the needs and opportunities still unmet in the great mission fields of the C.M.S. Expansion is a more stimulating plea even than the maintenance of growth in existing work.

* * * * *

The *C.M. Review*, owing to the shortage of paper, is issuing only one number for August and September. But it is one of the best numbers we have had for some time. The editorial notes are gaining in strength and confidence; Mr. Bardsley contributes a welcome letter on the National Mission; Mr. Furness Smith reviews Dr. Stock's new volume of the "History of the C.M.S.," a wonderful record of the events of the last sixteen years; Dr. Stock concludes his most useful study of "Bishop Peel and the Diocese of Mombasa"; and, to name only two other articles, Bishop White of Honan has much that is worthy to say on "China—To-morrow," and Bishop Johnson of Equatorial Africa writes a discriminating paper on "Elijah II," the black prophet who has been creating such marked disturbance in the congregations of the Niger Delta Church. This is, by the way, the second "heresy" in the C.M.S. Churches in Africa within the last two years. There are elements of encouragement in the fact. We hope that a careful study will be made of these movements for the benefit of the whole Church.

* * * * *

More than once in these notes we have referred to Pastor Cheng Ching-yi, a welcome speaker at the Edinburgh Conference, 1910, the Chinese Secretary of the China Continuation Committee, a leader among his own people and a friend of many Christian workers in the West. A charming story is told of his earlier years. His brother-in-law was killed by the Boxers in 1900, leaving four motherless children, the eldest ten years old. Mr. Cheng, who then had

only a salary of \$7.00 a month, took the orphans under his care. He and his wife rose at four or five in the morning to superintend their studies and get them ready for school; on Sunday they took their foster children neatly dressed to church, which meant that Mrs. Cheng sat up late at night to attend to their clothing. This service has brought a full reward, for all the children are doing well.

* * * * *

Here is a picturesque incident from the Wesleyan Mission in Mysore. Scene: a street in a large city, a missionary and two Indians—one a pastor, the other a young evangelist—in the midst of a listening crowd. Presently an old Brahman begins to interrupt, but at last he is answered in a most disconcerting way.

At the edge of the crowd, craning his neck to see what was going on, stood a municipal scavenger, with his filthy broom in his hand and his filthy basket under his arm. Hearing the Brahman, he made bold to push his way through the crowd till he stood face to face with the old gentleman. "That's all very well for you, a Brahman; but what about us outcastes? We know you and we know these Christians. Did you ever open a school for us outcastes? Do you ever go among us? Have you ever touched one of us? They do; do you?" At this the crowd smiled broadly, and the old gentleman looked uncomfortable and tried to pass it off. But the sweeper with the broom was too near for safety and so he walked away, still talking. The crowd, bigger than ever, turned to hear the young evangelist testify passionately what Christ's touch had done for him, a poor outcaste.

G.



Notices of Books.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY: THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES.

By James Hardy Ropes, D.D., Hollis Professor of Divinity in Harvard University. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. Price 9s. net.

This Commentary is marked by those features of careful scholarship and laborious research which one associates with the series to which it belongs. Professor Ropes has not, probably, been hampered by considerations of space in dealing with the short Epistle assigned to him; and the result is extraordinarily complete, both in introductory matter and in comment upon the text. In connexion with the latter we remark a notable fullness of illustration and a minute exactness of definition in dealing with special terms and phrases. Some of the comments are, as the author expresses it, "of the nature of detached notes," and are given as such in the Table of Contents. There are seven of these, and they include, for example, dissertations on the reprobation of swearing and on anointing with oil.

Professor Ropes holds that the book is only an Epistle in form, and that it is, in reality, practically a "diatribe" in the technical literary sense of the word. Regarding it thus as a kind of popular moral tract, he finds resemblances with Greek compositions of that class, though he also admits there are differences, which he regards as significant of the development of such a form of composition in the hands of this Christian Jew. In style and method, he holds that there is a marked contrast to the Jewish Wisdom-literature, but he adds that with this literature, "in the deeper roots of our writer's thought, he has much closer kinship than with the Hellenistic diatribe." But he rejects the traditional authorship by the brother of our Lord. He admits that many think otherwise, but himself takes refuge in the theory of pseudonymous authorship, and repeats the oft-heard plea that this was a common and innocent practice of the age. We have not succeeded in finding in his remarks any more evidence of the innocence of the practice than we have discovered in other arguments of the same character elsewhere: but we notice an admission that there are instances in which it is not so easy to say that the author did not intend to deceive. Except in cases where the composition would be obviously taken by all readers to be purposely pseudonymous, innocence of intention is difficult to establish. It seems perfectly impossible to suppose such an open purpose in the alleged case of 2 Peter; and though the claim of special authorship is less elaborate in James, it seems improbable anyone else can be meant by the opening address. The practice may have been common enough, but if some of these distinguished scholars would search for real proof that it was regarded as innocent, we think they might be surprised at the lack of it. As it is, they appear to content themselves with repeating phrases about the "literary customs of the time," which degenerate into a mere parrot-cry. After all, it may not be safe to compare canonical writings with compositions of that order.

It may be noted here that this is not the only instance in which the Commentary mistakes assumption for fact, and treats as certainty what is no more than more or less fashionable theory. A prominent case of a similar kind occurs where he remarks in a parenthesis that 1 Timothy and Titus "are recognized as containing less genuine matter than 2 Timothy." But this is precisely what is *not* recognized, as may be found by turning to so recent a Commentary as that by Dr. Newport White on the Pastoral Epistles in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*.

The Introduction discusses all matters connected with James the Lord's brother with a minuteness that is perhaps unexpected in one who does not believe he wrote the Epistle, and goes over afresh the evidence with regard to the identity of the "Brethren of the Lord," deciding in favour of the Helvidian theory. But evidently the author is determined to miss nothing which will add completeness to his work. In line with this determination is the full description of Texts and Commentaries, and the section on the History of the Epistle in the Church. In this a notable feature is that he believes Hermas shows no knowledge of James.

Passing to the body of the Commentary, we are struck by the simple and suggestive character of the analysis of the writer's thoughts and of his aims in writing. There are very many points of detail which one would like to single out for special mention, either by way of commendation or, in some cases, of criticism; but at any rate, some reference should be made to three which are particularly named in the Preface. In the case of ii. 18 the explanation of $\sigma\upsilon$ and $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega$ does indeed seem to clear up much difficulty and is the essence of simplicity; while the reference in v. 7 ("the early and latter rain") is taken as indicating the locality of the Epistle's origin. In both these cases the author thinks important points have been generally overlooked. But in another instance he offers a solution of a textual problem which he believes is entirely new; and this is the most interesting and ingenious of all. Once again we find the merit of simplicity; for it consists in taking as it stands, in i. 17, a reading that everybody else has assumed must be false, simply because nobody has seen that its true interpretation might be η , and not η . This is the reading of the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS. (confirmed in 1914 by a papyrus fragment). The two succeeding genitives are then capable of explanation, and whether the explanation may commend itself or not, the particularly interesting point is that if Dr. Hort had seen such a possibility, he would not only have removed a unique stumbling-block to the view held by himself and Dr. Westcott in textual matters, but would, in so doing, have actually strengthened that view.

It is difficult to explain in a short space the author's treatment of some leading passages of the Epistle. His discussion of the relation of St. Paul and St. James is, like everything else, very thorough, and is in some main points wholly admirable; but we cannot agree with quite all that is said (it is stated that James "heartily dislikes" and "disapproves" of Paul's formula because he does not understand it, though he is not combating Paul or his doctrine); and we doubt whether Professor Ropes has improved upon the discussions of Sanday and Headlam or of Lightfoot in this matter. Nor are we quite sure of his ground in treating the references to "law" which the Epistle contains—a term which Lightfoot thought was used almost as a synonym for "Gospel." And in iv. 15 we wonder whether a "pious formula" is not too readily assumed to be of "strictly heathen origin" when the Professor himself warns us, but a few pages earlier, against supposing that resemblance implies literary dependence. But there will always be some points of doubt and disagreement; and the Commentary as a whole is unquestionably both illuminating and stimulating to thought and study, the fruit of exact scholarship and elaborate care.

OUR PLACE IN CHRISTENDOM. Lectures delivered at St. Martin-in-the-Fields, in the autumn of 1915, with a preface by the Rt. Rev. Lord Bishop of London. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

The importance of the subject and the eminence of the seven lecturers will cause attention to be drawn to this volume. But some disappointment

will be experienced at the space devoted to discussing our disagreement with the organization of the Roman Church, while so little is given to pressing questions of doctrinal controversy. Upon the former topic the book will be of value to any who are yet uncertain as to the Anglican position, but, if ever the Church of England is to exercise her legitimate influence in the country, more deliberate consideration must be given to the causes of our internal dissensions.

Canon Mason in his chapter on the *Unity and Authority in the Primitive Church* readily shows that the appeal of the earliest times was not to the claims of particular bishops or the primary of a single see, but to faithfulness to the Apostolic traditions of which the Scriptures give us the surest deposit. But our attitude to the Reformation of the sixteenth century is unfortunately expressed. "If we priests of the *Ecclesia Anglicana* vow at our ordination that we will 'teach nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation but that which [we] shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture,' it is not as sons of the Reformation that we take that vow, but, in Vincent's language, as 'Catholics who desire to show ourselves law-abiding children of Mother Church.' The form of the vow, of course, dates from the sixteenth century, but the spirit of it is the spirit of all the Fathers." The disavowal of the Reformers is insinuated in a subtle manner. We have been led by them back to Christ through the Scriptures. Of all men they would least desire to claim for themselves the affections of their disciples. But gratitude for their beneficial labours and loyalty to our historical lineage are not without value. The men who certainly recovered for us a forgotten truth of cardinal importance were enabled to do so because they themselves perceived the right use of fundamental principles in the correction of the moral and doctrinal uses that abounded in their days. This further portion of their work we cannot lightly lay aside.

In an interesting lecture upon *East and West* Dr. Frere touches a topic of grave concern to the possibilities of home re-union. "We are not now as convinced as we were, that a clear line can be drawn between what is of divine and what is of human origin, in such a matter as the hierarchy and constitution of the Church. We see the marks of divine appointment not so exclusively as men once did, in the words of our Lord or in the Scriptural precepts; but increasingly in the operation of the Holy Spirit working through the continuous life of the Church." Abandoning as no longer tenable the old defence of episcopacy and episcopal ordination as necessary to a true Church, this author makes his appeal to the history of the Church. The argument will satisfy those who desire to prove a foregone conclusion or corroborate ideas which have been independently formed, but can never demonstrate any theory. Good and evil are too much intermixed in all things human. Discrimination between them is not always easy. An ecclesiastical edifice built upon this sandy soil could not stand for long.

The four addresses contributed by Professor Whitney and Dr. Neville Figgis—the former writing upon *The Mediæval Church in the West* and *The Papacy and the Reformation*, the latter upon *Councils and Unity* and *National Churches*—are descriptive of times through which the Church of England has long since passed. In a measure they assist a better understanding of the difficulties of to-day; but modern problems are not derived solely by evolution from a former status, and the external forces which have helped to produce our perplexing dilemmas are insufficiently considered. Canon Scott Holland's essay on *The Nineteenth Century* is too vague for the generality of men who are unable either to study the history in detail or to memorize the facts.

The most notable contribution is that of the Bishop of Oxford. The

Intellectual and Moral Liberty in the Church is again and again declared to be utterly inconsistent with a sacerdotalism which separates priest and people. Any impairment of the liberty which rightly belongs to the individual is shown to spring from a lax standard of the demands of Christianity upon its adherents. But liberty can only be secured when also the doctrines of a Church are scripturally pure. The omission of this vital principle diminishes the usefulness of this section of the book.

Dr. Robinson concludes the course of sermons with an excellent account of *the vocation of the Church of England*. We stand for Freedom, Truth and Reality. A common forgetfulness of this fact can only be overcome by constant repetition. Here it is presented to us in clear and unmistakable terms.

From its own standpoint this volume is interesting and useful, but we could wish that the contributors had more carefully weighed the topics of current controversy, and directed their endeavours more pointedly to the crucial matters which are agitating Churchmen and being discussed in Convocation. The country wants to know what in respect of these is to be the "Place in Christendom" of the Church of England.

THE WORLD AND THE GOSPEL. By J. H. Oldham, M.A. London: *Church Missionary Society*. Price 2s. net.

It was a happy idea to issue a Missionary study book dealing with the present world-situation; and it was another happy idea to get Mr. Oldham to write it. His work as Secretary of the Edinburgh Continuation Committee and Editor of *The International Review of Missions* provides him with unique opportunities for acquiring knowledge which his well-known ability and spiritual fervour enable him to turn to good account for the benefit of the whole Church. Several Missionary Societies and Study Movements combine in the production of this book, and it deserves to be very widely used in the coming autumn in Study Circles. But it is not a book which need be confined to such a purpose. The suggestions for study are issued quite separately, and it is admirably fitted for private readers, whether "interested in Missions" or not. They will be strange readers if they are not interested in the book, at any rate—that is to say, supposing they are capable of serious thought as to the bearing of the great crisis of our age upon the future of the world and of the Church of Christ.

Mr. Oldham explains that the book is not concerned with the war, but he goes on to say that he does not think it could have been written as it is but for the war, though the things of which he writes were true before the war. That is to say, he writes of the critical condition of things which has for some time been developing, and which we ought no longer to be able to close our eyes to, or to pass by as none of our business. He rightly holds that the situation, as affecting Missions, demands a return to first principles—in which case we shall find in the missionary idea "the liberation and inspiration that we need." "The Church requires a more passionate, exultant, venturesome faith in the Gospel," and we ought boldly to assert the right of the Gospel to rule the whole life of the world.

This summary from part of the Preface gives the key-note of the whole book. Refreshing emphasis is laid upon the call to abandon a defensive attitude, and boldly to "push" the Gospel, if we may use such a term, in default of a better. And the picture only too truly drawn of modern social conditions emphasizes the call. One of Mr. Oldham's special points is that evangelization means more than mere proclamation, and is not a matter of arithmetical calculation of the number of workers, but of the lives lived by those who profess the Gospel. Hence the seriousness of our modern failure to represent Christ truly. The review of leading Mission Fields puts the

appeal in its true setting; and as one reads, the conviction grows that in every part of the wide world human thought is being prepared for the surrender of superstition and the acceptance of Christ. And this review of the field is illuminated by a skilful marshalling of illustrative facts, setting forth modern conditions of life in different parts of the globe. We notice that Mr. Oldham thinks the darkest side of "the life of those whom we seek to serve" has sometimes been too much presented in missionary reports and addresses; but he is too good a Bible student not to recognize that this is also predominant in the Bible picture of heathenism, and that in view of certain modern tendencies it needs to be emphasized as much as ever to-day. Indeed, he himself fully illustrates the condition of the world without Christ, and his whole book is a representation of its deep need and utter hopelessness apart from Him.

W. S. HOOTON.

DISCOVERY; OR, THE SPIRIT AND SERVICE OF SCIENCE. By R. A. Gregory.
London: *Macmillan and Co.* Price 5s. net.

This is a popular account of the relationship of science to practical life. Though it does not attempt to provide a complete record of natural philosophies and their triumphs, it gives the results of the work of the better known pioneers, and provides a mass of information for the general reader who is often badly informed in such matters. The aim of the author has been eclectic rather than exhaustive, but the facts are presented in such a pleasant way that we are carried on from page to page almost unconsciously. The necessity for thought is insisted on. A student may possess many examination certificates and yet be only a kind of text-book gramophone. Unless he also acquires the desire to see and do things independently, he knows nothing of the scientific spirit which asks for new knowledge gained by individual inquiry.

Consciously or unconsciously the author is a disciple of Ruskin, and believes in work being its own reward. He maintains that the greatest advances in science have always been made by men who undertook their inquiries into Nature without thought of proximate or ultimate practical application or pecuniary reward. The best kind of scientific research cannot be carried on in an atmosphere of commercialism, or where personal profit is the end in view.

The chapter on "Discovery for a practical purpose" will prove particularly valuable. It is shown that the applications of science, unless used for profitable objects, are regarded by the outside world as of little value, whereas all the investigations upon which modern industry has been built would have been crushed at the outset if immediate practical value had determined what work should be undertaken. Thomas Edison is an example of specialized research with a practical purpose. Lord Kelvin is another example: to him all sailors are grateful for his inventions for the preservation of life at sea, notably by means of his compass and sounding machine.

But we have said enough to show the trend of thought of this remarkable volume, and have only to add the book is embellished by eight illustrations done in the finest style of photographic art.

J. C. WRIGHT.

HAVE YOU UNDERSTOOD CHRISTIANITY? By the Rev. Walter J. Carey.
London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2s. net.

The Librarian of Pusey House (who is now serving as a Naval Chaplain on H.M.S. *Warspite*) is a vigorous and venturesome person. He is, ecclesiastically, one of those odd mixtures we heard described the other day as a

cross between a Methodist and a Romanist, with a little of the Plymouth Brother thrown in. This book fairly indicates the position of Mr. Carey and others who are cast in the same mould. He has much to say about conversion which might be said at City Road Chapel. At the same time he is a strong Sacramentarian, and evidently approves of Confession—though we remember that in another of his books he frankly admits that no Clergyman is justified in attempting to force people into it. He candidly confesses that since he cannot “leap the barrier of Papal claims” he intends to “make the most of the Church of England.” He reminds us of Dr. Little-dale’s *Plain Reasons for not joining the Church of Rome*, which were that you can get all that is distinctively Roman in the Anglican Church! He has no admiration for the great moderate section of the Church, and declares “they have no enthusiasm, no conviction.” He admires the Evangelicals and the “Catholics,” and looks forward to some working agreement between them. Amid much from which we differ there is a great deal of sound common sense—much that is profoundly true. He says that “many choirs should be converted or suppressed, possibly both.” He desires to see a simpler Catechism and a supplementary book of devotions, and he is dead against “stiffness” and the respectability of the conventional Church-goer, “that paralysing frock-coat and those new trousers which mustn’t be creased.” Whatever be our distinctive opinions the book is eminently readable. It comes from the pen of a man who is nothing if he is not downright.

- (1) WHY MEN PRAY. By Charles Lewis Slattery, D.D., Rector of Grace Church, New York. New York: *The Macmillan Company*. Price 3s. 6d. net.
- (2) THE DYNAMIC OF ALL-PRAYER. By G. Grainger Fleming. London: *Oliphants, Ltd.* Price 2s. 6d. net.
- (3) THE NATIONAL MISSION: HOW IT MAY BE CONDUCTED ON A BASIS OF “CALLING ON THE NAME OF THE LORD.” By the Rev. Marcell W. T. Conran, S.S.J.E. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

This order does not profess to be one of merit, indeed it would be exceedingly difficult to arrange these volumes in any such order. The first of them contains six addresses on the subject of prayer, and the thoughts in those entitled “All men pray” and “God depends on prayer” are somewhat off the beaten track.

To the second volume Dr. Andrew Murray contributes a telling though brief introduction, which he entitles “Back to the Trenches.” The work itself is described as an essay in analysis, and in twenty-five short chapters Mr. Fleming (who, by the way, is a Layman) deals with many aspects of the prayer life.

The third volume covers a great deal of ground. The author, who has just been awarded the Military Cross, is the author of “A Chaplet of Prayer” (S.P.C.K.), to which the Deputy Chaplain General, Bishop Gwynne, contributes a preface. The larger book before us is really an introduction to the new edition of the Chaplet. The method is new to us, and some may, like Bishop Gwynne, be prejudiced against it at first, but the fact that it has been the means of teaching many to pray compels us to give it consideration. The Hints on Mission Preaching are entirely excellent, and the Instructions on Prayer most helpful. Those who are taking part in the National Mission will do well to possess themselves of this little Manual and examine the Chaplet.

BIBLE BATTLES. By Lettice Bell. London: *Oliphants, Ltd.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

The author has a happy way of presenting old things in a modern garb, whether her subject, "Bible Battles," is precisely the best that can be given to the young is, we think, questionable. Beginning with Joshua, it proceeds to describe the conquest of Canaan in language after the manner of to-day. The deeds of David form a special feature, and make quite entrancing reading. Boys will rejoice to have this book, but they must not forget the good counsel at the end:

Fight the good fight with all thy might:
Christ is thy strength and Christ thy right.

A special feature of the book is the list of Scripture references, occupying no less than upwards of twelve pages, or between 500 and 600 separate items. The work is artistically produced, and the paper is good.

REVIVAL: THE NEED AND THE POSSIBILITIES. By the Rev. Cyril C. B. Bardsley, M.A. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

Once again Mr. Bardsley has placed us under an obligation, and has given us in these pages more thoughts, intensely spiritual and practical, on the subject of Revival. We could wish that every clergyman in town and country, and every seriously-minded layman, would read and re-read these pages. The National Mission draws nearer every day, and there are still many clergy who have never come into touch with aggressive methods, and are seeking guidance in thought and activity. Cannot there be found among us two or three godly laymen who will follow the example of the American gentlemen who have so generously circulated among us *The Fundamentals*, and who will in a similar way distribute widely Mr. Bardsley's *Way of Renewal, Studies in Revival* and this last work?

THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN. By Bertram Pollock, C.V.O., D.D., Bishop of Norwich. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 1s. 3d. net.

In these pages Bishop Pollock discusses the subject of the Brotherhood of Man. He draws attention, in the first chapter, to the significant fact that in the New Testament the word "brother" is invariably applied to a fellow-Christian and is never used in the sense of a universal Brotherhood. Having made this clear, the Bishop proceeds to examine the use of the word "brother" in the Old Testament, and to deal, further, with our Sonship to God and our Union in Christ. We turn to the last chapter on The Church and the Sacraments, and are gratified to miss some of the extravagances which are not unfrequently met with in Episcopal pronouncements. The Bishop truly says: "This is a special hour for making the most of Brotherhood," and if men are sincerely seeking, they will find it in Christ Himself.

CHRIST IN HOLY SCRIPTURE. By Francis L. Denman. London: *Oliphants, Ltd.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

There is a Foreword to this little work by Prebendary Fox, who correctly remarks that the writer deals with the greatest subject in the world, and does so with such knowledge and reverence in research, such simplicity and sincerity in exposition, as should carry every impartial reader with him. The fullness of the treatment compensates for the brevity of the book. The aim of the writer is to show that God has manifested Himself in various forms throughout the ages, and that "His goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." The Scriptures show that through the names of

Jehovah, God has made Himself known ; and the various names were employed as men were enabled to understand them. The veil of His Deity, finally, was fully revealed in Christ.

SPIRIT INTERCOURSE : ITS THEORY AND PRACTICE. By J. Hewat McKenzie. London : *Simpkin, Marshall and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

Here is the whole paraphernalia of Spiritualism. The demands made on our credulity are tremendous. There is no recognition of the Christian Gospel and, happily, no attempt to persuade us that this Psychic Science is compatible with faith in the Saviour of mankind. We learn that a National College of Psychic Science is shortly to be established in London, where instruction will be given and where there will be demonstrations by eminent mediums. No doubt at such a time as this many persons are in danger of falling a prey to error in their eagerness to pierce the mist and trace their dead. Christian teachers will do well to be ready to prove the futility of this so-called "Science."

THE SOUL-WINNER AND SOUL-WINNING. By Joseph W. Kemp. London : *Oliphants, Ltd.* Price 1s. net.

The American evangelist, Dr. Nettleton, once put the question : "What shall I wish I had done thousands of years hence ?" The reader of this little book is asked to put to himself and herself the same question. The result would be, the writer believes, the dedication of one's powers to this work as the leading aim in life. In a series of eight chapters the author, by quotations from scripture and from well-known modern evangelists, shows the conditions for soul-winning. He urges his fellow-workers "to take the sword of the Spirit, and wield it. It is like the sword of Goliath, which had been laid up in the sanctuary of which David said : 'There is none like it ; give it me.'"

WITH WHAT BODY DO THEY COME ? By the Rev. H. F. Waller-Bridge, M.A. London : *Kegan Paul and Co.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

This unpretentious little volume must be added to the number of those which have recently made their appearance, called forth, in some measure, by the wave of grief that has been passing over the land. Attention is drawn to St. Paul's teaching regarding the "natural" and the "spiritual" bodies. Death, Progression and Recognition and Union, too, come in for consideration, and while we are not prepared to commit ourselves to approving of every statement (as for example, that "Paradise is purgatorial in its effect"), there is much that is consoling to mourners.

CHILDREN OF SOUTH AMERICA. By Katherine A. Hodge. London : *Oliphants, Ltd.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

To this latest volume in the attractive "Other Lands" Series, the Rev. Alan Ewbank, the energetic Secretary of the South American Missionary Society, contributes a preface. In these pages the story of Captain Allen Gardiner is told again, and there is reference made to the splendid work of Mr. Barbrooke Grubb and other Missionaries of the S.A.M.S. The volume is enriched by eight charming illustrations in colour. A most suitable gift book or Sunday School prize.

SAINT PAUL. By Frederic W. H. Myers. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by E. J. Watson. London : *Simpkin, Marshall and Co.*

This poem is so well known that it needs no introduction. It first appeared in 1867, and between then and the death of the author, in 1901, six-

teen editions were published. Mr. Myers added as many as twenty-one new verses and discarded seventeen others. In the present reprint these have been replaced. A delightful Introduction, copious notes and indices add greatly to the charm of this well-printed edition.

SOME ANSWERS TO GREAT QUESTIONS. By the Bishop of Birmingham. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. net.

Dr. Russell Wakefield has set himself to answer seven questions—What is religion? Is there a God? What think ye of Christ? Have ye received the Holy Ghost? Is the Bible true? Is life worth living? Is Britain's part in the present war justifiable? Who has not heard one or more of these questions asked? Here are plain, sensible replies. Just the book to give to those who are beset with doubts.

THE PLACE-NAMES OF DURHAM. By Rev. Charles E. Jackson, M.A. London: *George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.* Price 5s. net.

Though primarily of interest to Durham folk, this handbook of derivations will be welcomed by those who like to read the history and legends of the past as they are preserved in the names of persons or places. Mr. Jackson's task has not been lightened by the fact that there was no Domesday Survey of Durham and that documents were not so carefully preserved in the county as elsewhere.

STUDIES IN LOVE AND DARING. By A. S. L. (Mrs. Hugh Jones). London: *Rider and Son.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

Striking and original, these sketches are founded on the minor characters in the Gospels and Acts. Many of the difficulties of the day are dealt with in an illuminating way.

Publications of the Month.

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

THEOLOGICAL.

THE PREACHER'S HANDBOOK. By the Rev. F. A. C. Youens, M.A. (*Robert Scott.* 2s. 6d. net.) Includes Sermon Notes and Notes on Sermon Preparation, and very excellent it is in both respects. A most valuable volume for younger clergy, and older men will find much in it to help them. The Notes on Sermon Preparation are wholly good; we like their tone, the suggestions are eminently practical and the spiritual purpose of the sermon is kept steadily in view. The Sermon Notes are full of brilliant ideas. A volume for which many clergy will be grateful.

THE TRAFFIC OF JACOB'S LADDER. By M. Rosamond Earle. (*Robert Scott.* 2s. 6d. net.) With a commendation by Dr. Stuart Holden, and a Foreword by the Rev. E. S. Woods, these "Letters from Switzerland in War Time" invite attention, and the reader will not be disappointed. They treat of a great number of questions of real interest to those who are seeking to cultivate truly spiritual views, and the writer's style is quiet, easy and pleasing. The relation of these questions to the war is not always intimate, but the incidents of the great conflict colour many of the letters. The thought is rich and the teaching deep. The title will not be strange to those who remember Francis Thompson's last poem, "In No Strange Land."

SUNDAY SCHOOL WORK. By Cuthbert Cooper. (*Robert Scott.* 1s. net.) This little book of points and suggestions for teachers and superintendents is confidently recommended by the Bishop of Chichester, and introduced to us by Dr. Greenup, who thinks it fills a niche of its own. The day of the

Sunday School is not passed; the work is being made more and more efficient; and teachers and superintendents will find Mr. Cooper's volume thoroughly useful both from its practical suggestiveness and its earnest sympathy

FAITH OR FEAR? AN APPEAL TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. (*Macmillan and Co., Ltd.* 3s. 6d. net.) A remarkable book, calling for the close attention of all concerned for the welfare of the Church. It is in five parts, contributed by different authors who have (1) a common devotion to the Church of England; (2) a common sense of the really tragic failure of the Church; (3) a common feeling that unless the Church really repents, i.e. changes her whole outlook on life, the National Mission can result in nothing but failure and disappointment; and (4) a common conviction that if the Church undertake self-reformation there lies before her a really magnificent opportunity. The writers and their subjects are Mr. Donald Hankey ("The Church and the Man"), Mr. W. Scott Palmer ("The Church and our Advance in Knowledge"); the Rev. Harold Anson ("Stumbling Blocks"); the Rev. F. L. Donaldson ("The Church and Labour"); and the Rev. C. H. P. Matthews, who edits the book, and whose contribution, "The Test of Living Experience," is, perhaps, the most vivid of all.

TALKS IN PREPARATION FOR THE NATIONAL MISSION. By the Rev. Canon A. W. Robinson, D.D. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 6d. net.) Addresses given on the Tuesdays in June at St. Martin-in-the Fields, Charing Cross.

IN STIRRING DAYS. By M. A. Bousfield. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 6d. net.) Letters to a Friend.

BEYOND THE VEIL. By the Rev. J. Merrin. (*S.P.C.K.* 1s. 6d. net.) A course of six sermons preached at Stratford by the Vicar—strong, tender and true.

THE BIBLE VIEW OF THE WORLD. By the Rev. Martin Anstey, D.D. (*Morgan and Scott.* 1s. 6d. net.) A valuable exposition of the abiding principles of Christian Truth, as applied to conditions of modern life.

"MINE OWN VINEYARD." By Marshall Broomhall, M.A. (*Morgan and Scott.* 1s. net.) A devotional book of real beauty, by a writer rich in spiritual experience.

BRIGHT TALKS ON FAVOURITE HYMNS. By J. M. K. (*R.T.S.* 1s. 6d. net.) "Bright" indeed they are, and Mothers' Meetings, for whom these "talks" are specially intended, will be greatly interested in them.

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY. By Eugene Stock, D.C.L. (*C.M.S. House.* 7s. 6d. net.) A supplementary volume—the fourth—to Dr. Stock's great work, bringing the history of the C.M.S. from the centenary year, 1899, when the third volume concluded, up to the present year. A marvellous piece of work, and every friend of the Society should procure a copy.

GENERAL.

LORD LOVELAND DISCOVERS AMERICA (by C. N. and A. M. Williamson); and **RODERICK HUDSON** (by Henry James)—two more volumes of Nelson's Sevenpenny Library Series. **THE EYE WITNESS**, by Hilaire Belloc—an addition to Nelson's Shilling Series.

