

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

August, 1912.

The Month.

Holy Com-
munion the
Central Service. IN the *Northern Churchman* for May last (its sub-
title is the "Church Chronicle for the Diocese of
North Queensland") there is published the first of
a series of articles on Eucharistic Fundamentals. The intro-
ductory article is stated to be "communicated," and so we
presume it is not to be regarded as official. We notice further
that it is published whilst the Bishop is absent in England, and
we are therefore hopeful that it is issued without approval. The
writer begins by pointing out that if the principle of fasting
communion be carried out and the hour of celebrating the sung
Eucharist be delayed until 11 a.m., there will be few or no
communicants at this Service. He notes further that this, as
a matter of fact, is the case, and records the fact that he had
recently visited three churches in London—St. Matthew's,
Westminster, with 400 people present and only one communi-
cant; St. Cuthbert's, Kensington, 500, with no communicants;
and St. Saviour's, Ealing, 600, with two or three. We, of
course, simply give these statements as the writer's own illustra-
tions, without assuming responsibility for their truth.

The Essence
of a Right
Celebration. The writer then proceeds to take note of the
fact that to many people this seems a perversion
of the fundamental object of the institution of the
Holy Sacrament, contrary to the teaching of Scripture and the
English branch of the Church Catholic, and, in short, is the

expression of an entirely wrong conception of what the Eucharist was intended for. Amongst this class of people we gladly enrol ourselves. The writer then goes on to face the real difficulty of his position, and we venture to quote in full the paragraph in which he does it :

“ The question the writer seeks to answer, then, in this article, is this : Is a celebration of the Holy Eucharist with few or no communicants a right use of the Blessed Sacrament ? Are those of us who condemn such a use of it right or wrong in our disapproval ? The answer to this question must, of course, be guided by the conceptions we have formed on the primary object of the institution. Is it primarily a spiritual meal, or is it primarily, as the Prayer-Book teaches, ‘ a perpetual memory of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ ’ ? The teaching of Scripture and of the whole Church seems to be that the latter is primary—*i.e.*, that what is essential to a right celebration of the Holy Eucharist is what is essential to it as a commemorative Sacrifice, which is offered to God, before it is a communion offered to men. In other words, Sacrifice is primary, communion of the people is secondary. If that be so, then even five hundred communicants can add nothing to the intrinsic efficacy of the Blessed Sacrament. *That* consists wholly and entirely in our Lord’s self-oblation of the perfect Sacrifice of His Body and Blood as they are re-presented in the Holy Mysteries. To say that communion is secondary is, of course, very far from asserting that it is non-essential, and so of minor importance. In any case the priest communicates, not as the substitute for, but as the representative of, the congregation. But seeing that a right communion has, as its essential, reception of the communion fasting, ‘ save in extreme weakness,’ those other communicants present will have made their communions at an earlier celebration, or at some time during the week.”

We have quoted the whole paragraph because

| | |
|--|---|
| Sacrifice Primary, Communion Secondary. | we wish to call attention to the sentence in which sacrifice is stated to be primary and communion secondary, and we notice that this sentence is some- |
|--|---|

what modified as the writer proceeds. We hear from time to time a demand that the Lord’s own Service on the Lord’s own Day should be made the central act of Christian worship, and we confess we have a good deal of sympathy with the demand. But if the writer here at all represents the ultimate object of those who make the demand—and sometimes ultimate objects slip out in the wilds of the Australian Bush which are kept within bounds at home—we venture to ask our readers to con-

sider the point to which we are moving. First we have the definite reintroduction of the Mass, a definite return to the medieval condition. We cannot believe that the English Church at large wishes to take any such step. Secondly, we do not have the Lord's own Service as the central act of worship on Sunday. The Lord's own Service surely is the service which He instituted in the Upper Room the day before He died. Then all who were present communicated. Our Lord laid an emphasis upon that fact, "Drink ye all of this." Further, "Our Lord's self-oblation of the perfect sacrifice of His Body and Blood" was yet to be made on the hill of Golgotha, and to be made once for all. We take no delight in criticizing the view that another holds of the Holy Communion; we recognize that there is room within the Church of England for variety of teaching, but we are compelled to contend that the medieval doctrine of the Mass, which this writer most dangerously approaches, if he does not actually reach, is neither Scriptural, Catholic, nor Anglican. It is well to take note of that which, in this one case at least, underlies the cry for the Eucharist as the central service, and to be warned.

It will be noted in the paragraph already quoted, fasting communion is regarded as essential.

A little later in the article the writer speaks of it as "so clearly amongst those things held *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*." It is hardly necessary to argue the point here, but surely not one of the three essentials of Catholicity can be applied to the practice.

We have called attention, more than once, in these Notes to the indications that are apparent in the ecclesiastical sphere of real and earnest desires for greater unity. The recent combination of certain branches of the Methodist Church and the present movements in the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland are cases in point. But the tendency is visible in other spheres than that of

Fasting
Communion.

The Congress
of
Universities
of the Empire.

ecclesiastical organization. The Congress of Universities of the Empire just held in London is a proof that in academic circles, too, the need is being felt for closer contact and more effective co-operation. We say "contact" and "co-operation" advisedly, because we feel most strongly that each one of the Universities, both British and Colonial, must be left to do its own most suitable work in its own particular way. But, while admitting this to the full, we feel that much more may well be done than has hitherto been effected, in the interchange of ideas, and in such co-ordination of work as may facilitate the passage of students from one University to another. Politicians are devising ways for linking up the various parts of the British Empire into an organized whole. They may do well while they discuss fleets and tariffs to remember the great benefit that may accrue to the Empire from the closer union and co-operation of its great academic bodies.

The True
Function of
Universities.

The proceedings of the Conference will doubtless be published in due course, and will be read with keen interest by all who have these problems at heart. It may suffice at present to call attention to two speeches of especial importance for Christian citizens of a professedly Christian Empire. Lord Rosebery, in his characteristically brilliant and thoughtful inaugural address, laid emphasis on the fact that the highest function of Universities is to produce, not merely men of learning, but men of sterling character. It is quite true that a University should be a home of learning and research, where the brilliant scholar may find his most congenial sphere. But the great majority of students leave their *alma mater* to undertake practical work in the outer world—in spheres where learning may count for something, but character counts for everything. Believing as we do that he who has the mind of Christ, and whose life is one of loyal service to the word of Christ, alone has the secret of true excellence in character and life, we urge all who in any way, directly or indirectly, are able to strengthen the Christian influences brought

to bear on University students, to redouble their efforts, in the sure conviction that this is not the least of the ways in which the world may be won for Christ.

**The Problem
of the East.**

The other speech of special importance from the Christian point of view was that of Sir Frederick Lugard, Chancellor of the University of Hongkong. It was largely concerned with the problem raised by the impact of Western culture on Eastern minds. The problem is an old one for the Missionary, and now it is becoming a real one for the educationalist. Here, too, we have, for our part, no doubt whatever that Christianity, and Christianity alone, holds the key to the only possible solution. Western learning means for the Eastern student the uprooting of old beliefs, the breaking adrift from old moorings. If the older religious sanctions be gone and there are no others to replace them, it is not too much to say that he is as one "having no hope and without God in the world." The void created by the loss of an older faith must be filled by the presence of one that is better, if the last state of that man is not to be worse than the first. The problem is one that concerns the East in general, and China in particular. We venture to assert that what is true of the British Empire is true of the world at large. It is only under the sway of Christ that it can find its true welfare, and in the setting up of His kingdom the winning of the Universities for Him may play no slight and unimportant part.

**Evangelicals
and the
Universities.**

We have, advisedly, devoted considerable space to this question of the place of Christianity in University life. What we have had to say concerns all Christian men. We turn now to say more particularly an emphatic word in the same context to our own friends and brethren of the Evangelical School in the Church of England. The members of that school have taken a great and praiseworthy part in the evangelizing work of the Church; they were pioneers in social reform before Christian Socialism was born or

thought of. But they have, on the whole, been singularly and conspicuously neglectful of higher education, especially that of the Universities. In view of the requirements of the Archbishops that in and after 1917 men who are ordained to the ministry of the Church of England must be graduates, the question of the position and influence of Evangelicalism in both the older and newer Universities assumes new and striking importance. If our Evangelical friends do not during the next five years take up this question of the education of the clergy in a vigorous and practical way, they will lose one of the greatest opportunities ever presented to them. They will find that the training of ordinands has passed entirely into hands other than theirs, and they will only have themselves to blame if the clergy as a whole stand for doctrines and practices alien to those of the Reformed Church of England.

The fact that Nonconformist opinion in England
A Methodist is not uniformly sympathetic towards the National
Appreciation. Church gives force and significance to the following words, taken from a recent number of the *Methodist Recorder*. With the simple remark that we welcome most gratefully the warmth and cordiality of the passage, we allow its words to speak for themselves :

“We are quite sure there is something in the spirit and equipment of the Church of England now wanting in the Free Churches. For long years the Church of England has been elaborating its machinery; it has done this with deliberation, with the utmost care, and with a fine statesmanship, admirable in its insight and prevision. It has done very little too much, and nothing with ostentation. Quietly, and considering its ideals rather than the wishes of the many, it has found out ways, taken hints, and set its house in order. We are seeing the result, and we cannot but congratulate the men of God who have had power to discern the times and the seasons. Moreover, workers have been found, and plenty of them. The opportunity for work has been welcomed; it has been all the more readily and heartily welcomed because there was at least a touch of novelty. Never were there so many willing hands and warm hearts, laborious in the Church of England. This has befallen in an hour when we have found our workers bewildered among the infinite variety of calls, running here and there, busy oftentimes about nothing that really matters. There has come among us a mood of resentment upon the multiplicity of demands, and some have withdrawn

themselves, while others are much discouraged. It is here, we believe, the real root of the difference takes its vitality and shows its fruit. God is no respecter of persons or respecter of Churches. Them that honour Him He will honour; and in the Church of England a great development of spiritual vitality has arisen in these last years. It is finding its expression in work—in work peculiarly adapted to the needs of the hour. The Free Churches may look, in the future, to a greater vigour in the Establishment than has been known within the memory of any living man; and we should not be greatly surprised if the vigour be richer and better sustained than any displayed in all its past history. There are enormous resources at its disposal, and there are signs that these resources will be used to their utmost."

The decision of the House of Lords, though
The Thompson expected, has created for the Church a position of
Case. some serious anxiety. However the decision went, it was bound to be so. Some long and careful thinking will have to be done, and we are exceptionally thankful to the Archbishop of Canterbury for the cautious letter which he has addressed to the Church. At a meeting of the Representative Church Council an attempt was made to override the Archbishop's caution—an attempt which happily failed, and which involved those who made it in ignominious defeat. The Bishop of Manchester put the real question, "What is the law of the Church?" and until that question is answered, it is idle, and indeed unwise, to discuss the relationship of the law of the State to the law of the Church, or to suggest that the one is at variance with the other. We have referred to the subject here not because we wish to give a lead, but because we feel that it is unwise to be too dogmatic until we are sure of our way.

Many clerical readers of the CHURCHMAN will
Holidays and probably, when the present issue reaches them, be
Rest. either enjoying their annual holiday, or looking forward to it in the near future. May we commend to their notice a most wise and helpful article in the *London Magazine* for June, entitled, "Forty! the Dangerous Age?" The article is full of sound advice on general matters of health, but the particular to which we wish to call attention is, that for the jaded and weary man the holiday should be essentially a time of rest.

So many men act on the mistaken idea that the man who has spent the preceding ten or eleven months of stress and strain in more or less confined surroundings should spend his holiday month in vigorous athletic pursuits. He passes from one extreme to the other; his tired body is quite unfitted for these new and arduous occupations. The result is that he is even more done up at the end than at the beginning of the holiday, and enters on another year's work jaded and unrefreshed. We are apt to carry the strenuousness and strain of modern life into our holidays too. By all means let us get the good that air and sky, seaside and moorland, can give; but let it be a time of *rest*. It was our Lord who said to His tired servants: "Come ye yourselves apart . . . and rest awhile."



The Way of the Mystic.

A SKETCH.

BY THE REV. CHARLES COURTENAY, M.A.,

Chaplain of Holy Trinity, Rome.

IT is usual to begin a paper on the subject of Mysticism with a definition. I steel myself against the temptation for several reasons. There are too many of them already. The very best definition is bound to leave some important element out, and is like the effort to put into a medicine-glass that which would take a gallon measure to hold it comfortably. No definition, either, succeeds in satisfying anybody else. All depends on the point of view, and, as the possible points of view are endless, it stands to reason that every definition is doomed to partial failure. We may explain Mysticism, but we had better not attempt to define it. As for the definitions which exist, study them as contributions towards a definition, and you will have a mass of facts which are of exceeding value.

Having refused a definition, let me go on to circumscribe the inquiry. For Mysticism is like a long, swift river, which, clear enough in itself, is continually invaded by tributaries, mostly muddy ones, which give it a bad name, and make it difficult to navigate. I propose to divert these embarrassing influxes for the sake of the real Mystic river.

Let us eliminate the *Pathological Mysticism* which consists of nervous hallucinations. Disordered nerves may see and hear anything, and will cherish delusions under the notion that they are Divine.

Let us reject, too, those many *Self-Revelations* which come through suggestion. Many a man has hypnotized himself, and dreamed dreams and seen visions, all manufactured at home. Home-made products are not always good.

Let us rule out, also, the *Trance and the Ecstasy* which,

although sometimes valid, are hardly necessary to the ordinary Mystic. A Theresa, a Catherine of Siena, a Behmen, may be engulfed by the trance, and see uplifting things which may be Divine. St. Paul, too, may be caught up into the third heaven and revel in unspeakable glory; but such experiences are the exception for the few only, and can never be the Mystic's daily bread.

Let us drop, likewise, the *Occult*, the black or white magic, which has been too largely associated with Mysticism, and always to her hurt. To the ignorant, Mysticism and magic are convertible terms. It is a gain to know better. Mysticism has no need of formulæ and charms. St. John is worth a thousand Paracelsuses.

Let us abandon, further, all the *Extravagances of Theosophy*, so prevalent in the East, and now being so largely transported to the West, and which, while containing some truth, manages to associate with itself much error. While not denying the Mystic element in Theosophy, we should be sorry to regard it as pure Mysticism, or as Mysticism's complete expression.

We will eliminate, also, the *Ultra-Spirituality of the Christian Scientist*, which, in the claims of spirit, would deny all matter, and which, in spite of its full Mystic flavour, does genuine Mysticism no honour by wearing its garb.

We will dissociate ourselves, too, from what is known as the *New Mysticism*, which, with some undoubted truth, denies many of our most precious Christian truths, and, pretending to new revelations, leaves much of the Christian revelation stranded high and dry.

The fact that a man can be a Mystic bereft of all these things, and that he may be all the better Mystic without some of them, justifies me in ruling them out from a sober consideration of Mysticism proper. I am anxious to keep to essentials. Besides, Mysticism needs detaching from what, in innumerable cases, has brought it into disrepute. We do well, I think, to shake its roots free from all unnecessary accretions.

Having thus cleared the way, we had better now plunge

into the depths of our subject, and deal with the *Great Mystic Purpose*—the Mystic goal.

This answers the first question which springs to the lips of most when Mysticism makes its bow. What is the good of it? What is it driving at? Where does it lead us? And if the Pragmatist be right, the fact that Mysticism is of advantage, and can justify its existence by its fruits, is of supreme importance.

As a matter of fact, some of the best men and women that the world has ever seen have been Mystics, and have ascribed their practical piety to their Mystical methods. Hailing from all lands, of both sexes, of all degrees of learning, of all Churches, they have appeared as stars in the religious firmament, and have left the best of silver trails behind them, evident to our own eyes, in our own day and generation.

But I need not dwell on a fact that nobody disputes.

Let us see *What they Claim to have Attained* through their Mystic faith.

They claim to have received a *First-Hand Knowledge of their Lord*, so clear and definite that all doubt and uncertainty vanished as in a flash under the spell of the revelation to their souls. As the fog vanishes under the stroke of the sunbeam, so all their inner mists disappeared under the power of their new insight.

They claim, also, to enjoy that *Blessed Intimacy with God* which is involved in His indwelling in the heart. Christ has been "formed" in them, and has taken up His abode within in a new and entrancing way. Their hearts have become literal temples of God, in the depths of which they offer worship, and hold communion, and exchange the most blessed of confidences. All is direct and close, and, overleaping the form, they succeed in getting at the very heart of things spiritual. They claim a veritable union with God.

They claim an *Inner Light* which is better than reason—a self-evidencing light which, like the pillar of fire in the wilderness, brightens the onward way. Only the pillar is within. It

is this inner light which, penetrating to the inside of truth, lays it bare to the spiritual apprehension. This is the "true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world," but which is only absorbed by the Mystic believer.

They claim a *Spiritual Sensitiveness* which, while it is quick to detect the shadow of error and sin, is always alive to that inner Presence which is so dear a possession. It reflects the Divine movements as the smooth waters of a lake reflect the glories of cloud and sunshine; only its heaven is always within.

They claim, by its means, an *Inner Calm* which is unruffled by the happenings of the outer world, and which continues even under the blasts of temptation and difficulties, for they are ever hearing the calming voice which says to their inner being, "Peace, be still."

They claim a *New Vision of their Lord* ever opening upon them, drowning in its pure depths the false charms of a disturbing world, and rendering them independent of much that the world considers essential to well-being. It may not be always, or often, ecstatic vision, but it is real enough to assure them that their Lord is there, and that they feel and know Him.

They claim a *New View of the World around them*, glorifying nature as a real symbol of the Eternal, and regarding things visible as vestures of the Lord their God. Everything is transparent to a Mystic, and the Divine shines eternally through. In every blade of grass, in the song of the bird, in the waving of the corn, in the splash of the wave, in the balanced cloud, in the storm and in the calm, they learn to see their God. It is God's world, not the devil's. Nature to a Mystic is a mirror of its Maker. They find—

"Tongues in trees, books in the running brooks,
Sermons in stones, and good in everything."

Now, these are great and stupendous claims, and require a great deal of proving. Happily, however, proof is unnecessary in the face of the general acceptance, for Mystics have been too long before the world for any scepticism to touch the heart of

their position. The greatest names in Christendom are the names of Mystics, and the story of their lives is just a revelation of the existence of these very excellences which they claim.

I can imagine someone saying, "But is not all this what every Christian ought to claim and possess?" Precisely so, and it is well to see this. As a matter of fact, there are myriad souls who, without knowing it, are pure Mystics, for Mysticism, stripped of its peculiar phrases, is essential Christianity and true piety. What do you hear but a Mystic of the Mystics when St. Paul cries, "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me," when he prays that "Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith"? And have you not the Mystic ecstasy when he is lifted to the third heaven, and hears unspeakable words? And who but an inspired Mystic wrote the epilogue of St. John's Gospel?

The inner life, the heart quiet, the first-hand dealing with God, the pressure of the Holy Ghost on mind and heart, the blessedness of the pure in heart who alone see God, the joy of union with Christ, the sweetness of communion, are they not all evangelical truisms dear to all our hearts, and instinct with the most blessed results? He to whom these facts are experiences, whether he knows it or not, is a Mystic, and is at home in the Mystical company.

No doubt there are some who deny this identity of Mysticism with Christianity in the interests of the former, as if it were likely to gain by such separation, and forgetting that Mysticism stands to lose more than it gains by its exclusion. If Mysticism *has* its differences, it had better shed them than stand proudly apart from the common faith. Mysticism, if etymologically a mystery, is not necessarily mysterious, and obscurity is never a recommendation to any truth. Having satisfied one inquiry, it is not long before another springs to its feet, and we are faced with a question which demands a full answer, namely, what are the *Peculiar Methods* which Mysticism uses to secure its undoubted results? And this we may deal with with some authority, for all Mystics enlarge on Mystical methods, although they have their differences like other folk.

To all, the road to God is as a *Mystical Ladder*, set up from earth to heaven, from imperfection to perfection. It behoves the aspiring soul to mount the ladder, and to press upwards in spite of its steepness and difficulty. No soul that is easily daunted will mount far, and the fearful is likely to come down, sooner or later, with a run.

The *first* stage of this Mystical ladder is generally known as the *Purgative One*. This is to us the better-known way of *Penitence*. Until a soul knows its vileness nothing can be done; all is at a standstill. And even when the soul's real condition is recognized, it will not avail unless confession be made to God, and the known sins are put away. The more thoroughly this stage of the ascent is achieved, the better the chance of climbing high. Here comes in that necessary *Detachment*, without which the soul cannot leave ground—the abandonment of the world, the flesh, and the devil.

The *second* stage in the ascent is the *Illuminative Way*, which answers to what we call *Conversion*, when the light breaks in, dispersing ignorance, and revealing, for the first time, the heart of our Father in Christ. All bonds break, and the inner being feels a delightful sense of liberty. Clouds float away, and we see the vision of a love which forgives all sin, and refuses not to become the innermost life of the soul. It is not mere intellectual illumination perfecting a creed, but an illumination penetrating to the depths, and irradiating the whole inner man. It is a light which turns to life in the soul which perceives and absorbs it.

The third stage is the *Unitive or Contemplative*, in which the soul draws nighest of all, and not only touches God but becomes one with Him in the most intimate of unions. Then comes the blessed vision of the Eternal, which melts the heart into love, and brings all the perfections of the Godhead into the heart. Absorbed, and almost lost in God, the soul walks on the highest of high places, and lives a life almost on wings. Then comes the experience of that truth that "He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit." Not that the union is so

complete that it requires no supplementing. It is complete in potentiality, but, in reality, it is the process of a life and needs an eternity to perfect it.

These are the stages, and it is easy enough to survey them, but positively to ascend is another matter. A student of Mysticism is not necessarily a Mystic; even an admirer of Mysticism may remain at the bottom of the ladder. More people look up at mountains than ascend them. The true Mystic is a celestial Alpinist. We must, therefore, look at the process practically, and see how the spiritual feat is to be accomplished according to the best Mystic teachers.

I rule out of practical politics some of the *Abnormal Methods* which at one time found favour, and which saner spirits have left far behind as utterly extraneous.

At one time the *Ascetic Method* was deemed a necessity, and the story of the Spanish Mystics is full of gruesome details of the horrible discipline to which they subjected themselves. We see, with a sort of admiring horror, *St. John of the Cross* kneeling on broken tiles, and using the discipline to such extent that soon he is seen kneeling in his own blood, with a circle of blood around his swooning body. We read of *Suso* wearing an undergarment with 150 brass nails, pointed and filed sharp, fitted into the leather bands affixed to it, and continually turned towards the flesh. In this he used to sleep. This and many other similar exercises he continued for sixteen years and all for the good of his soul. Such mortifications were the commonplaces of the early Mystic self-discipline, and they were deemed the very highway of holiness. But we have learned, learned better, that God has no pleasure in pain, and loves not to see His children create their own sufferings.

We rule out, too, the *Solitary Method*, which fancies that only by absolute physical separation from their fellows, from the world and its occupations, can holiness be attained. The method of the monk and the nun, who leave the world in the interests of their own souls, is not according to the Master's will. Better, surely, to live active, practical lives of benevolence,

and to walk through human highways, caring for others' souls as well as our own. Religious selfishness is not after the mind of the Master.

But in quite another category is that Mystic *Life of Self-denial* which is the Gospel method. For this self of ours needs curbing and biting like the untamed colt, and only by stringent methods can the true self emerge from that strange amalgam, which we call human nature. Modern thought may commend human nature as much as it will, but even the modern man takes care to keep it in its place, and to see that the human nature of others does not wander through *his* freehold. Human nature in society is a suspect, and is trusted no further than it is seen. How to deny self is what we are all learning, and blessed is the man who denies it wisely and rigidly, and succeeds in preventing it from breaking bounds. There must be a good deal of wise self-denial if we would mount the Mystic ladder.

Equally necessary is the *Life of Prayer*, which is the secret of all Mystic ascents. Every Mystic teacher enlarges on this condition, and most of us have learned much from their tuition on the subject. In fact, their books are largely treatises on the subject of prayer. Here the Mystic masters have excelled. Only their own hearts were their temple and oratory, in the midst of which their Lord was enshrined, not a God in the highest heavens, not a God without, but a God who dwelt within. There was no difference of opinion about this. It was the very centre of the Mystic faith. Christ was seated on the throne of their hearts, and they turned their desires and petitions thitherward. Their throne of grace was on the spot. A whisper could reach Him who sat thereon.

But there were *Degrees of Prayer* which the Mystics insisted on, and which marked out, as in gold, the spiritual progress. For prayer to the beginner and to the advanced and proficient are very different matters. There are those, to use St. Theresa's simile—taken, however, from others—who pray with all the strain of those who draw water by hand from a well; there are

others to whom prayer is as the drawing of water by windlass ; there is a third class who pray as the flowing of the river or the brook, free from all strain and stress ; but the best of all prayer is that which waters the soul with the ease and fulness of the showers of heaven. Clearly, the difference is in the presence or absence of the self-spirit in the praying heart, the open access to the God who visits it, and the welcome which the soul accords to Him.

In the earlier stage it is necessary to prepare the heart for prayer by *Meditation*, in which the mind broods on some truth which shall feed the soul and awaken the needful thirst and desire. Later on, the heart will start on its crusade of prayer without needing such stimulus.

At first, too, *Vocal Prayer* will be necessary to keep the heart within its proper boundaries, and to prevent it from straying. Later on, *Mental Prayer* will be found more easy without spoken petitions. Framed and shaped within the heart, there will be no need for them to come to the lips.

By-and-by the *Inner Silence* will deepen, and the full blessedness of silent petition will develop. Molinos puts the growth of silent prayer in this way :

“ There are three kinds of silences : the first is of words, the second of desires, and the third of thoughts. . . . By not speaking, by not desiring, and by not thinking, the true and perfect mystical silence is reached wherein God speaks to the soul.” And, again, he exhorts : “ Rest in this mystical silence, and open the door that so God may communicate Himself to thee, unite Himself with thee, and transform thee into Himself.”

The highest attainment in prayer is the prayer of *Contemplation*, in which the soul lies passively before God, and, abandoning itself to Him, waits for the voice, the revelation, the uplifting, the ennobling.

It is then that the soul is brought into full union with its Lord and enjoys communion, and responds in holy thought and deed. Then it reaches its earthly high-water mark of possible

attainment, and blossoms out into unutterable joy and the purest and most disinterested love to God and man. This is the Mystic perfection.

It must not be imagined that all is plain sailing to the Mystic. There are arid zones to traverse, where the soul must learn to trust without feeling, and live by faith alone. The will must be kept braced and steady, and there must be a constant practice of the presence of God. And the eye must be kept fixed on the blessed goal of union with God Himself in the innermost being, and without any necessary exterior help. All must be direct, immediate, and internal.

Of course, not all reach the final goal, many falling short of the full realization and the full abandonment. Some stop short at the end of the first stage; others succeed in getting no farther than the second. But it must be understood that to stay elsewhere than at the end is the fault of the seeker, not of the Lord.

It is time now that we turn our subject around once more, and consider another side of it. And we cannot do better than deal with *Mystic Dangers*, which lie in wait to trip up the devotee. For the Mystic way has its pitfalls and its precipices, and needs treading with caution.

There is, for instance, the very evident danger of *Illusion*. Divine voices *do* speak, but there are other voices not so reliable. Feelings are not to be made the foundations of things when they stand alone. And if we cannot safely trust our own impressions, still less can we trust the impressions of others. Inspiration is a glorious thing, but its counterfeits are too many and disastrous to be given too precipitate a hearing.

There is also the danger of *Undue Individualism*, for the Mystic is bound by his very creed to stand more or less alone. *His* experience is the deciding factor. *His* personal revelations are the decisive elements of his faith. It is not what God has said to the Church, but what God says to his own heart, which yields satisfaction to his soul. Christ in his own heart is the "last word" to him. He wants no other.

There is, moreover, the danger of *Over-Emphasizing the Less Essential*. The written Word, for instance, is apt to be crowded out in part as a revealer of truth, being treated, so to speak, as a second-hand teacher. The more ingenious Mystics are prone to over-refine on the deeper points of the unknown, and to leave the simple for the more complex. Reading the works of Dionysius the Areopagite is like wandering in a maze, and travelling over the incomprehensible. Behmen attempts to throw light on spaces which inspiration left untouched, and where one is obliged to follow blindfold. It takes a bigger amount of credulity than most reasonable men possess to swallow down many Mystical revelations.

There is no little danger also in the Mystical tendency to *Suffocate the Reason*. The man who learns solely by immediate vision is likely to look askance on the probing reason. Intuition is certainly a Divine method of insight, and, like the invisible rays at both ends of the spectrum, has undoubted heating and chemical powers, but it requires confirming in some rational way. Intuition may discover, but reason is necessary to prove. And right intuitions lend themselves to confirmation. This has been seen by many modern Mystics, who now insist on the province of reason being respected. They even call themselves "Rational Mystics." But not all are that; there are many irrational Mystics.

There is a danger, too—not at all a small one—of *Making Preposterous Claims*. "Union with God" is the goal of the Mystic, and not a few claim to have attained to this ecstatic union. And we can well believe it, seeing that this ought to be the normal experience of every well-taught and consecrated Christian, who is "in Christ." But when these Mystics proceed to claim *Deification*, and to be lost in the Deity, we find ourselves on strange ground. *Immanence* then becomes a heresy, and is pressed to alarming lengths which must react harmfully on the soul. "A man in Christ" does not lose his personality. Perhaps they do not mean what we think they do, but Eckhart's phrase, so often quoted—"The eye with which I see

God is the same as that with which He sees me"—needs some explaining to bring it into line with truth. It seems as if he believed in a fusion of personalities.

The danger of *Pantheism* is no imaginary one, although it may be overpressed, for loose language may easily involve all the heresies. In the Eastern Mystics we see it in full blossom. Whether our Western Mystics fell into Pantheism is an open question. They certainly skirted the edge of it. That God is in everything we freely admit, but that everything is God is another matter, which we deny. To identify God and His creation is not the Christian line of thought. Probably the new Mystical school which hails from America, and of which Emerson is the high-priest, is more heavily tarred than it knows with the Pantheistic spirit.

The fact is that when the heart is deeply stirred the speech is prone to become a little extravagant and wild, and if the Mystic in touch with God is overwhelmed with the glory of the vision, and the heart gushes spontaneously under the pressure of its great love to Him, we must not press words too far. There are many strange heresies in love-letters. Poetry is not to be weighed in the scales of drab and sober prose.

From dangers to *Safeguards* is an easy transition, and essential; for, with so many pitfalls besetting the Mystic way, it behoves us to fence and bank it well for the sake of security. So we shall do well to spend a few minutes in descanting on some necessary *Mystic Safeguards*.

The Mystic is not unlike the Marconi receiver. He raises his heart and spirit aloft to gather the Mystic messages from the distant and the unseen. But, inasmuch as alien messages may be gathered in, too, and recorded, he must somehow be "tuned" to reject all but the genuine and the true. And if it be possible to do this, he will be protected from mischievous intruders.

No doubt there are some ultra-credulous souls who want no safeguards, or, rather, will not welcome them. These are the **Mystical free-lances** who abandon themselves to every

impulse and fancy, and dub their flimsiest dream with the name of the Divine. It is such people as these who discredit any creed or system, and whose books float as scum on the Mystic seas.

Fortunately, the sane Mystic stands ever "on guard," and, challenging every "revelation," refuses to let them pass within the citadel until they can give the necessary password. There are, fortunately, several strong safeguards against illusion and delusion in this war of conflicting voices.

The *Bible* is one, and no destructive criticism can lay low its efficacy or weaken its defensive powers. He is a bold man, indeed, who dares to set up his vision, or his intuition, or his impressions, against definite and repeated revelation as set forth in The Book. It is God's dyke against the raging, beating, aggressive seas of error. It is the Divine *aqua fortis* which is to try and condemn all metal that is not precious and pure. "To the Law and to the Testimony. If they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no light in them." To desert Bible ground in the interest of supposed truth is to wander into bogs and morasses where foothold is not, and where ruin is sure.

Another safeguard against delusion is to be found in the *General Christian Consciousness*. A newspaper may boast and make capital of "exclusive information." A quack may hug to his mean little soul his own patent remedy. But there are no such exclusions in Divine revelations. There are, no doubt, "inner circles," where truth is clearer and more potent, esoteric ones who abide hard by the fountain of revelation; but we must not think of these as special favourites of heaven, admitted where others are rejected. All may be initiated, and the doors of truth stand ever open to any who may choose to enter. Truth is a matter for the many, and jurisdiction on the question of truth and error is a right of all the instructed. Judge, then, the folly of this man or that, who alleges a discovery of truth all his own, although running counter to the Church's creeds! It is individualism run mad. No doubt it ministers to the pride

of our original discoverer to have alighted on some hitherto unknown land of truth; but when he produces it, and lays it alongside the Christian map, it will be found to be either old territory or a bank of fog. This is why the findings of the Church at large must be taken into account, and why it behoves the Mystic to bring his inner revelations to compare with the general Christian consciousness.

A third safeguard is to be found in the *Human Reason*. It is easy to discount the probing power of the human mind, and to deny its application, but if it exists, it must not be denied a hearing. It has done good work in the past in bursting dream-bubbles and dismissing visionary rubbish, and it is as necessary to-day as ever. Not that it is infallible, or universally applicable, for, as a matter of fact, the Divine is often above reason. For my part, I should be reluctant to accept any revelation which violated Christian common sense. But then, you cannot deal with a man who believes "because it is absurd." A vision which brings us into conflict with reason, which violates the first principles of common sense, which lands us into the ridiculous and grotesque, is hardly likely to have emanated from heaven. This is why it is wise and necessary to use reason as a safeguard against Mystic error.

Another safeguard is to be found in the *Practical Test of Tendency*. A revelation which leads nowhere, which vanishes in smoke, which fails to achieve anything, stands condemned. And when all that the Mystic has to show for his truth is thrills of ecstasy, we beg leave to doubt his "truth." There is something lacking in the fire which cannot generate steam, and something defective in the steam which cannot turn the wheels. A Mystic revelation must approve itself by its works. Sentiments and feelings are excellent things when they grow excellent fruit.

My last words shall be devoted to the consideration of *What we Owe to Mysticism*. It is possible that we do not realize how great is the debt of the Christian Church to the Mystic.

Thus, *What a Witness it has borne to Spiritual Truth* throughout the ages, shining brightly in the darkest of dark

times! The student of history, looking back over the centuries, sees much black, and at times it looks all black, save for little light-jets here and there tracing out the Church's path. Invariably, I believe, it is the Mystic lights which relieve the darkness and make it visible. The Mystic has saved the situation, and preserved the spiritual truth which was in such signal danger of being extinguished by the ignorance, superstition, worldliness, and materiality of the dead Church. Run over in mind the living names of the past, the names of the outstanding Christians whose torch burned brightly, and you will see that they were the men and women of Mystic faith, and the lights that you observe are the heart-lights of indwelt and consecrated souls. They ran like a spiritual Gulf Stream, warm and isolated, amidst the chilly seas of doubt and error.

Again, what a witness Mystics have borne to the *Reality of Spiritual Experience!* Buried under a mass of formalism and superstition, religion had lost all its virtue and sap, until the Mystic came to live the inner life of faith and love, and to show forth the possibilities of the Christ life. They alone escaped from the outer and formal into the inner and vital. It was at their peril oftentimes that they ventured to fill the empty shell with a spiritual content, for superficial men love not to see deviations from the normal, and if they be men in authority their hands fall heavily on the reformers. It is true that some of them, like St. Theresa, were canonized, but for long the hand which later signed the deed of canonization was held suspended, as if to consign to prison or stake. Molinos died in prison after being trusted by a Pope. Madame Guyon was a suspect to the end.

Moreover, it is to the Mystics that we owe the *Science of the Spiritual*. It was they who mapped out the chart of the spiritual life, and counted the rungs of the Mystic ladder. Perhaps they over-refined in their enumerations, and subdivided to excess, but we have a large debt to their contemplative findings. Most of us owe much to these masters of the spiritual art who trod the way they explained and proved in

their own experiences the validity of their claims. For it was only as they looked back and surveyed the road already traversed that they put pen to paper, telling of the spiritual wanderings which brought them to the Throne. They wrote in blood and tears, but with sunbeams making rainbows amidst it all, which were to gladden the eyes of all the future ages.

We are thankful, too, for the *Spiritual Independence* which the Mystics proclaim. There is nothing which so vitiates the Christian position as the interposition of persons and things between the soul and God. The Roman system has elaborated this mediation to a science, subjecting souls to the whims and fancies and errors of ignorant men. It was the Mystic who prepared the way for the Reformation. Luther was led on to make his stroke for spiritual freedom by his study of that old anonymous devotional book, the "Theologia Germanica." And it was this tendency, inherent in Mysticism, which brought the Roman hand down so heavily on the Mystics of the past. To disregard the priest was the deadliest of heresies. Divine absolution, with the priest left out, was intolerable. Direction by the Holy Ghost, apart from human direction, was to be stamped out by fire and sword. It is true that some of the Mystics, notably the Spanish ones, managed to hold to both the spiritual and ecclesiastical, but even so it is not difficult in reading such works as the autobiography of St. Theresa to see how lightly the bond of the earthly director sat on them, and how free they were in their comments on the inadequacy of much that goes by the name of direction. In the midst of outward submission we see the free spirit bounding along its own course guided by the Spirit of Christ.

It is to the Mystics, too, that we owe our *Highest Ideals of Christian Experiences* in the Church of God. It is true that they cannot out-distance the Divine and apostolic ideals and commands, but they show us in a vivid way how real and practical these possibilities are. In their humility they touch the deepest note. In their joy that seems to us almost extravagant, in their simple, expectant faith, they put most of us to

shame. In their ecstatic love they show us the heights to which the heart can ascend in the power of the Holy Ghost. We see them sparing no pains, and putting into their religion their whole being. What we talk of they seem to enjoy. And throughout it all they show a marvellous disinterestedness. It is this which makes their writings so inspiring. Take up a book by Fénelon, by Madame Guyon, by St. Bernard, by the Lady Julian; read a sermon by Tauler, by Eckhart, by Smith the Latinist; read the lives of St. Theresa, of St. John of the Cross, of Suso, of Madame Guyon—and you feel as if you had been bathing in spiritual seas or had acquired a pair of wings. For let the Mystic be of whatever persuasion ecclesiastically, we immediately feel at one with him in these deeper experiences which strike below all differences. We meet at the spiritual root of things. We breathe the same Divine air.

Looking back over my paper, I am conscious of whole stretches of Mysticism leaped over. I see how terrible has been the compression, even necessary points being subjected to this drastic treatment. But then, what could one do with such multitudinous material? I fear, too, that in my effort to run out of the many Mystic fog-banks I may have run down some blameless truth. One must, however, take risks even in a Mystical introduction. Still, ventilation is good even if the ventilator be defective. One thing I am assured of is that Mysticism is a pressing subject, and will have to be reckoned with by those who stand in the forefront as ministers of truth. The knowledge of it is a necessary part of a minister's equipment, for, under a Mystic guise many of the friends and foes of our faith are drawing nearer, and it is well that we should have the penetration to discern the one from the other. If, in addition, Mysticism be a true thing and the Mystic method a Divine thing, then to ignore it must be fatal, to embrace it right and becoming.



The Relations between the English and Foreign Reformers.

BY THE REV. C. SYDNEY CARTER, M.A.

IN view of a recent public Episcopal pronouncement that the Anglican communion would certainly be rent in twain on the day on which any non-Episcopally ordained minister was formally allowed within its communion to celebrate the Eucharist, it may not be altogether inopportune to remind ourselves of the relations which existed between the English and foreign Reformers at the time of the Reformation, and more especially between the English and Swiss divines during Elizabeth's reign.

The English Reformers in the reign of Henry VIII. had been mainly influenced by the views of the German Lutherans, and the Thirteen Articles of 1538 were in consequence based largely on the Augsburg Confession of Faith. Under Edward VI., however, the influence of the "Reformed" divines soon predominated. Cranmer had adopted what was virtually a "Calvinistic" view of the Eucharist, and hospitably received the eminent continental refugees of "Reformed" opinions, who sought shelter in England. He had, Strype tells us, "a great and cordial intimacy and friendship for Peter Martyr," and highly valued the criticisms which he and Bucer had passed on the First Prayer Book, many of which contributed to remove the suspicion of "Lutheranism" from the Second Book of 1552. Cranmer's great aim, which he pursued throughout Edward's reign, was to obtain "one common confession and harmony of faith and doctrine," which would unite all the Protestant Churches, and remove any differences on the doctrine of the sacraments or on the government of the Church which existed amongst them. For this purpose he made repeated attempts to secure the presence in England of Melancthon, Calvin, and the leading foreign Reformers, to join in a general synod of all

Protestant divines. Insuperable difficulties, however, prevented the fulfilment of this scheme, although Calvin professed himself ready "to pass over ten seas if necessary" to bring about such a union.¹

The intolerant attitude displayed by the Lutherans in their unfriendly reception of the English exiles from the Marian persecution led most of the latter to avail themselves of the generous hospitality offered by the Swiss Reformers at Basle, Zurich, and Geneva. Thus the fellowship and intercourse which these English refugees enjoyed during their time of exile had probably done far more towards promoting a real and essential harmony of faith and doctrine between them and their "Reformed" brethren on the Continent than would have been accomplished by a general synod which Cranmer was so anxious to secure.

A close friendship with the Swiss divines was maintained almost throughout Elizabeth's reign, and a warm affection for all the foreign reformed Churches existed amongst English Churchmen till long after the Restoration.

Although Episcopacy had been retained in the Church of England at the Reformation, there is little doubt that practically all the early Elizabethan prelates regarded it rather as a matter of practical expediency and good order than as inherently necessary for a valid ministry. Cranmer had admitted in 1540 "that in the beginning of Christ's religion Bishops and priests were no two things but both one office,"² and Bishop Jewel, in replying to Harding in the "Defence" of his "Apology," uses the same argument. "It was enough," as Keble admits, for these Elizabethan Bishops "to show that the government by Archbishops and Bishops is ancient and allowable; they never venture to urge its exclusive claim,"³ and there is abundant evidence to show that the retention of Episcopacy in no way interfered with their full communion with other Reformed

¹ Cf. Strype, "Life of Cranmer," vol. ii., p. 159 (1853).

² Burnet, "History of the Reformation," vol. ii., pp. 281-286, *Records*, No. xxi. (1825).

³ Keble's "Preface to Hooker's Works," p. lix.

Churches which lacked this form of government. It was regarded in the same light as "divers ceremonies" as entirely a non-essential matter, the vitally important question being the unity of doctrine which they all held in common. Thus Bishop Jewel wrote to Martyr in 1562: "As to matters of doctrine, we have pared everything away to the very quick, and do not differ from your doctrine by a nail's breadth,"¹ and Martyr, in his reply, congratulated Jewel on the production of his famous "Apology," saying "that it had not only in all points and respects satisfied him, but had appeared to Bullinger, Gualter, and Wolfius so wise, admirable and eloquent, that they think nothing in these days hath been set forth more perfectly."²

Bishop Horn also informed Bullinger that "we have throughout England the same ecclesiastical doctrine as yourselves,"³ while the Bishops, in support of their petition to Elizabeth for the rejection of altars, refer to the eminent foreign "Reformed" divines as "the greatest learned men in the world."⁴

Archbishop Parker, who had never been in exile on the Continent and was considered to be very moderate in his reforming views, seriously entertained Calvin's proposal for a general assembly of Protestant divines, a project which was, however, interrupted by the death of Calvin. He referred to Calvin as an "orthodox clergyman," and much wished that either he or Martyr could have been procured to attend the "Colloquy of Poissy" in 1561 to defend the cause of the French Reformers against the Romanists.⁵

It is well also to remember that, although the "Reformed" divines had forsaken Episcopal government for their Churches, both Calvin and Beza, in writing to Cranmer, expressly acknowledged its lawfulness,⁶ while the Swiss divines opposed the English Puritans who were anxious to abolish the Episcopal order in Elizabeth's reign. Gualter, writing to Bishop Cox in

¹ Zurich Letters, i. 100.

² *Ibid.*, i. 339.

³ *Ibid.*, i. 135.

⁴ Strype's "Annals," vol. i., p. 237 (1824).

⁵ Parker Corresp., pp. 112, 147.

⁶ Cf. Cosin's Works, vol. iv., p. 409.

1573, says: "I wonder that they entertain such an aversion to the name of Bishops, which they cannot but know was in use in the time of the Apostles; and always, too, retained in the Churches in after-times: we know, too, that Archbishops existed of old, whom they called by another name, *patriarchs*."¹

So close was the doctrinal agreement between the English and Swiss divines that Calvin's "Institutes" were regarded as the orthodox textbooks at both Universities in Elizabeth's reign, while Bullinger's "Decades" were officially authorized by Convocation to be studied by every beneficed clergyman under the degree of Master of Arts.²

Even Hooker, who so successfully assailed Calvin's system of Church *discipline*, was a moderate Calvinist in *doctrine*. He carefully studied Calvin's "Institutes," and declared him to be "incomparably the wisest man that ever the French Church did enjoy."³ It is also evident that in his treatment of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, Hooker very closely followed Calvin's sentiments. "If any ask me," said Calvin, "concerning the mode (of Christ's presence), I am not ashamed to confess the mystery to be more sublime than my intellect can grasp or than words can tell. . . . In His sacred feast He bids me, under symbols of bread and wine, to take His body and blood, to eat and to drink; I doubt not but that He really offers and that I receive."⁴ Hooker practically re-echoes this confession when he says: "Let it, therefore, be sufficient for me, presenting myself at the Lord's table, to know what there I receive from Him without searching or inquiring of the manner how Christ performs His promise. . . . What these elements are in themselves it skilleth not, it is enough that to me, which take them they are the body and blood of Christ."⁵

In 1566 the Latter Helvetic Confession of Faith was drawn up, and Bishop Grindal, writing to Bullinger in the same year, informed him that "the pure doctrine of the Gospel remains in

¹ Zurich Letters, ii. 228.

³ Preface, "Eccles. Pol.," II. 1.

⁵ "Eccles. Pol.," V., lxxvii., 12.

² "Bullinger's Decades," V., xxix.

⁴ Cf. Cosin's Works, iv., p. 168.

all its integrity and freedom, in which we most fully agree with your Churches, and with the Confession you have lately set forth."¹

That this boast of complete accord in doctrine did not rest solely on the private opinions of individual Bishops or clergy was proved in 1607, when Rogers, a chaplain of Archbishop Bancroft's, published his exposition on the Thirty-Nine Articles, which he entitled "The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England," proving "the said Articles, analyzed into propositions, to be agreeable both to the written word of God, and to the extant Confessions of all the neighbour Churches Christianly reformed." His purpose, as he informed Bancroft, was that "all men may again see that we are still at unity both among ourselves at home, and with the neighbour Churches abroad in all matters of chiefest importance and fundamental points of religion, though our adversaries the Papists would fain beat the contrary into the common people's heads."²

In this striking treatise the teaching of each Article is expounded, and shown to agree with similar statements drawn from the "Harmony of the Confessions of Faith of all the Reformed Churches," which had been compiled in 1581, and in which the teaching of the Church of England had been represented by Jewel's "Apology." That this thorough harmony was also fully recognized by the foreign Reformers is evident from Peter du Moulin's statement made about the same time, when, in defending the French Reformed Confession of Faith, he says: "Our adversaries, under pretence that the Church of England hath another form of discipline than ours is, charge us that our religion is diverse; but experience confuteth this accusation, for we assemble with the English in their churches; we participate together in the holy supper of our Lord; the doctrine of their Confession is wholly agreeable to ours."³ In regard to the agreement in sacramental teaching between the foreign Reformed

¹ Zurich Letters, i. 169.

² Rogers, "Thirty-Nine Articles," p. 24 (Parker Society).

³ Bingham's Works, vol. viii. 32 (1829).

Churches and the Anglican Church, a similar task was undertaken later on in the century by Bishop Cosin, in his "History of Transubstantiation," published in 1675. In this work Cosin gave numerous extracts from the Confessions of the foreign Reformed Churches, expressly, as he says, to show "how injuriously Protestant divines are calumniated by others unacquainted with their opinions, as though by these words *spiritually* and *sacramentally* they did not acknowledge a true and well-understood real presence and communication of the body and blood of Christ in the blessed sacrament, whereas, on the contrary, they do professedly own it in terms as express as any can be used."¹

With such a thorough accord in doctrine between the English and foreign Reformers, it is not at all surprising that the fullest inter-communion existed amongst their clergy. Several of the English clergy had been ordained according to the Presbyterian form of the foreign churches during their exile on the Continent, and were allowed on their return to exercise their ministry in the Church of England without any question of further ordination. We have also the record of a licence granted by Archbishop Grindal to a divine who had received Presbyterian ordination from the Reformed Church of Scotland, in which the Archbishop declared that "he had been ordained to sacred Orders and the holy ministry by the imposition of hands according to the laudable form and rite of the Church of Scotland, and since the congregation of the county of Lothian is conformable to the orthodox faith and sincere religion now received in this realm of England, we, therefore, approving and ratifying the form of your ordination and preferment, grant you a licence and faculty that in such Orders by you taken, you may and have power to celebrate the divine offices, to minister the Sacraments, etc., throughout the whole province of Canterbury."²

As a further illustration of the close unity that existed

¹ Cosin's Works, iv., 168, 169.

² Strype's "Life of Grindal," bk. ii., p. 402 (1821).

between the two Churches north and south of the Tweed, we find that soon after the accession of James I., a Royal Proclamation was issued stating that "the doctrine of the Church of England was agreeable to God's Word, and the very same which both his highness and the whole Church and kingdom of Scotland, yea, and the primitive Church professed."¹

In 1572, an Act of Parliament had ratified the orders of the foreign Reformed Churches by requiring all clergy ordained by any other form "of institution, consecration, or ordering" than that then in use, simply to subscribe the Articles of Religion before entering on their ministry in the Church of England."²

It is an undisputed fact, that for the first hundred years after the Reformation, ministers who had been ordained in the foreign Reformed Churches were allowed to join in communion, and undertake a cure of souls in the Church of England, on the simple profession of their public consent to the Established religion. Bishop Cosin, in contrasting the treatment meted out to English Churchmen by Roman Catholics and by the Reformed Churches abroad, states that, whereas the former "regard us as heretics, and would give us only the burial of a dog," the Reformed Churches "acknowledge us to be true Catholics, most willingly receive us into their churches, and frequently repair to ours, joining with us in both prayers and sacraments," and freely "allow us to bury our dead in their churchyards." "In all which regards," he concludes, "we ought no less to acknowledge them, and to make no schism between our churches and theirs, however we approve not some defects that may be seen among them."³

When we remember that, although the foreign Reformers did not condemn Episcopacy as unlawful, they yet deliberately preferred to return to a Presbyterian form of polity, which they considered more in accordance with primitive and divine order,⁴

¹ Rogers, *u. s.*, p. 22. ² 13 Eliz., cap. 12. ³ Works, iv., 337, 338.

⁴ "Certainly in the beginning the Bishops or Elders did with a common consent and labour govern the Church; no man lifted himself above another. . . . Now therefore no man can forbid by any right that we may return to

there is an irreconcilable divergence of opinion between a twentieth-century Bishop who declares that the Church will be rent in twain when a non-Episcopally ordained minister is allowed to exercise his ministry amongst us, and a seventeenth-century Bishop who affirms that a schism would be caused by refusing to allow him to do so.

There is, moreover, no good ground for supposing that the rule laid down for the first time in 1662, concerning the necessity of Episcopal ordination for performing ministerial acts in the Church of England, was in any way intended to strike a blow at the cordial relationship which had existed with the Reformed Churches abroad, or to reflect upon the validity of their ministry. Such a view is not only at variance with the express professions of many of the Caroline divines, but was also indignantly repudiated in the next century both by Archbishop Sharp and Archbishop Wake.¹ In this connection it is interesting to notice that a clause was inserted in the Act of Uniformity (1662) specially exempting "foreigners or aliens of the foreign Reformed Churches" from the heavy penalty inflicted on those presuming to administer the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper who had not received Episcopal ordination.²

There is every reason to show that the enforcement of exclusive Episcopal ordination in 1662 was simply designed at a moment of triumph, largely in a spirit of revenge and retaliation, in order to exclude from their benefices the Presbyterians and "sectaries," who had been the immediate cause of the overthrow of the Church during the Civil Wars and the grievous sufferings of her clergy during the Commonwealth. Neither was it surprising that English Churchmen should entertain no very friendly feelings towards Scotch Presbyterians, who regarded "prelacy" as absolutely sinful, and who, by their alliance with the English Puritans, had brought about the temporary

the old appointment of God, and rather receive that than the custom devised by men."—"Latter Confession of Helvetia" in "The Harmony of Protestant Confessions of Faith." Hall, pp. 249, 250. (1842.)

¹ Cf. Dimock, "Christian Unity," p. 42.

² Gee and Hardy, "Documents of English Church History," p. 610.

destruction of both Church and Crown ; while any friendly accommodation with the English Nonconformists was practically precluded by a heated party spirit of prejudice and suspicion on the one hand, and bitterness and recrimination on the other.

It is impossible seriously to maintain that the hostile and persecuting spirit displayed towards the English separatists of the seventeenth century can afford any precedent for the attitude English Churchmen should adopt towards their descendants to-day. In that age the idea of toleration was practically unknown ; and all parties, with the possible exception of the new sect of Independents, considered that those who wilfully departed from the established religion not only destroyed the unity of the Church, but also seriously endangered the peace of the kingdom. Nonconformity was in most minds but another name for sedition. The Caroline divines also, from their point of view, regarded the Dissenters as wantonly creating a schism in the Church by their own over-conscientious scruples in refusing to conform to prescribed rites and ceremonies, which they themselves admitted in no way affected fundamental matters of doctrine. But wherever the chief blame for the separation lay, it is surely not necessary that the Church to-day should continue to suffer for the sins and mistakes of a former generation.

We are now confronted in the home Church with several large organized bodies of Christians who agree in all essential points with the authorized doctrine of the National Church, but who lack, if not a regular, at least an Episcopal, form of government. What, in view of the principles and practice adopted by the Reformers towards the other reformed non-Episcopal Churches with which they were brought in contact, should be our attitude towards them ?

Although the Church in the present day is not bound to follow the precedents created in the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries, we have to remember that the peculiar character and position of the Anglican Church was given to it by the Reformers, who drew up its liturgy and formularies of faith ; and, as Rogers stated in the dedicatory preface to Archbishop Bancroft of his

book on the Articles, as long as the Articles remain unaltered, the teaching of the Church of England remains the same as at the Reformation. Thus, while there is nothing at present in the official teaching of our Church which condemns the ministry of other non-Episcopal bodies, there can be no warrant for exhibiting a spirit so absolutely opposed to the attitude and teaching of the Reformers by an unqualified denunciation of any real communion with them.

Surely the time has come for English Churchmen seriously to consider whether the custom and practice which prevailed for a century after the Reformation was not the "more excellent way," and to ask themselves how long a rule prescribed in a time of passion and prejudice is to be allowed to bar the way, if not to a final union, at least to a fuller and more real communion with our non-Episcopal brethren.



The Relation of Modern Evangelicals to the Catholic Party.

BY THE REV. W. ESCOTT BLOSS.

I.

DURING the last few years a great change has taken place among Evangelicals in their relation to the Catholic party. Many can remember the time when the introduction of even harmless practices excited opposition of the most determined character and was the occasion of disgraceful and scandalous scenes, which every Christian must deplore. The riots at St. Barnabas', Pimlico, and St. James', Hatcham, can be cited as typical cases. The opposition is still maintained by a certain section of Churchpeople, and is more pronounced in the North of England than in the South, yet the number of those who adopt this uncompromising attitude has steadily and continually decreased during the last few years, and the average Churchman to-day is prepared to tolerate the introduction of significant alterations in worship with little more than a formal protest. In many parish churches the whole character of the worship and teaching has been changed, and the objectors have formed a very small proportion of the congregation. The majority did not interest themselves sufficiently to care what was done. The alterations have been accepted as a matter of course, and their importance from a doctrinal standpoint has not been recognized. The incumbent has been a man of irreproachable life, an indefatigable worker, a godly man, who showed a keen interest in the welfare of the people; and other details have been regarded as matters of secondary importance. Through the carelessness and apathy of many Evangelicals an advance in ceremonial and teaching has been allowed to take place which would never have been tolerated had they shown an intelligent interest in the welfare of their Church.

Many causes have operated to produce this state of affairs.

The methods adopted to suppress ritual enlisted a great deal of sympathy with the men who were prepared to suffer rather than give up practices which they believed to be of Divine origin. The policy of the Church Association has unfortunately been frequently misunderstood, and consequently sharply criticised. Evangelicals to-day are often regarded as a party of mistaken enthusiasts, narrow in their outlook, who condemn any form of teaching which does not exactly coincide with their own. Modern toleration is in some measure due to the reaction from this extreme position.

A more powerful influence has been at work in the conspicuous piety of the leaders of the "Catholic" party. Their fruitfulness in good works was regarded as sufficient justification for their toleration within a National Church. A further stage has now been reached in the line of advance, and toleration is being merged into approximation. There is a marvellous attractiveness in an elaborate ceremonial, and a nature sensitive to the emotional type of religion will easily succumb unless some corrective is applied. The sacerdotal claim, which is capable of a strong logical justification, exercises a peculiar fascination, and by its offer of spiritual direction it appears to answer to a genuine need of mankind. It is always easier to follow the direction of others than to take pains to discover for ourselves what is the will or purpose of God. The difficulties in the way of the performance of this task increase the liability to forget that habitual direction of conscience is invariably associated with a stunted personality.

The piety of the laity is equally conspicuous. Frequent communions are the rule, and these, at least in the early hours of the day, are attended by a large number of communicants. The laity are prepared to give of their best to the Church, and the beautiful needlework and embroidery so willingly given to adorn the House of God is a sure indication of a sincere love for their Church and a desire to honour God by offering their best for His service. The manifold social activities for the welfare of mankind and the improvement of the conditions of life include

among their supporters numerous adherents to this school of thought. In this and many other ways there is much which is worthy of admiration and which calls forth our unstinted praise. At the same time it is only fair to notice that these characteristics are not limited to any one party. Evangelicals are equally ready, but their efforts are not always so noticeable.

These outward evidences of religion cannot fail to win sympathy with those who display them. There may be disagreement with their methods and teaching, but there is also a growing conviction that room must be found within the Christian Church for those who in their whole life and conduct exhibit the Christian spirit in such a marked degree.

A superficial survey or examination may lead to the conclusion that these differences are external; and, striking as they may be, they are relatively unimportant. But superficial judgments are, as a general rule, faulty; the crucial point is frequently overlooked; it lies far below the surface and does not attract immediate attention. The tendency for the various Church parties to draw more closely together has frequently been noticed, and it is highly desirable to foster this tendency; yet the cost of such an alliance must never be the sacrifice of those principles which are the life and soul of genuine Evangelicalism.

A more true estimate of the position will lead to the discovery that the wide differences in belief and practice are due to a radical cleavage, and the points of agreement are the results of an operating cause common to both and independent of these differences. The religious spirit is common to every form of religion; its method of expression varies according to the personality of the individual. In Christianity, the fruit of the religious spirit is a spiritual life; the Christian regards Jesus Christ as the source of this life. Union with Christ, and the partaking of His Spirit, will issue in good works. To attribute these "good works" to any other cause is a fatal error. If, then, it can be shown that they are due to this cause, and are not the legitimate fruit of sacerdotal teaching, then the ground upon which

Sacerdotalism commends itself to the modern mind is severely shaken.

For the sake of clearness, the matter can be put in another way: A person professes adherence to certain beliefs, he is faithful in the performance of certain ceremonial acts, and is conscious of a definite experience of fellowship with God. He goes on to interpret that experience as the result of conformity to a certain prescribed ritual. He honestly believes that his interpretation of the experience is the correct one. The point at issue is this: Is he right or wrong? May not his religious experience be due to another cause altogether? If once the experience can be clearly distinguished from the outward form or ceremonial act, the door is open for a closer examination of that experience. If, moreover, it can be proved that the experience is independent of the religious ceremonial, then the value of that ceremonial as a necessary means of grace will be proportionately decreased; then the good works and undoubted piety of the sincere High Churchman will no longer blind the eyes of the Evangelical and lead him to place an undue value upon what is, after all, an accidental feature, and which, if once admitted, would exercise an injurious influence upon genuine Evangelicalism.

II.

The teaching of the High Church party upon the Holy Communion and Auricular Confession will further illustrate this principle. Teaching upon other subjects could easily be adduced with the same end in view, but those named will furnish ample evidence for our immediate purpose.

The doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Communion determines the whole character of the ceremonial associated with that service. A communicant is taught to believe that Christ is really present under the forms of bread and wine; the deep impression which such a belief generates will be at once intelligible to any reverent mind. The greatest care will be exercised in preparation for this sacred service, the

act of reception will be performed with the greatest solemnity ; fasting Communion becomes an absolute necessity—there must be adoration if the localized Presence is a reality ! How can any communicant behave otherwise if he believes that his Lord is present upon the altar ? He goes back to his home fully assured of the reality of his fellowship with Jesus Christ, and will bear witness to the efficacy of the Sacrament in the celebration of which he has taken a part. Now, it is at once evident that his outward acts are the natural outcome of a certain form of teaching which he has accepted as true, but his religious experience is the result of his faith in Jesus Christ, and no one for a moment would question the reality of that experience. The experience is genuine, but the explanation is based upon a mistaken conception of the value of ceremonial acts. To some minds this distinction may appear artificial, but it is vital to a right understanding of the actual position of the so-called “Catholic” Churchman. The Evangelical equally insists upon the reality of fellowship with Christ in the Holy Communion ; his experience, too, enables him to testify that the service is a means of grace, but he attributes the efficacy of the Sacrament to faith, for him reception is a spiritual act, and therefore, if anything, a “more real” reception, for Jesus Christ makes Himself known in the “Breaking of Bread.” In both cases faith is the condition of blessing, and fellowship with Christ is the reward of faith.

The value of Auricular Confession equally depends upon the spiritual activity of the person who uses this so-called means of grace. The penitent is instructed to make a careful self-examination ; numerous manuals are published which contain questions suggesting sins of which the person may have been guilty ; a careful scrutiny of the life and motives for conduct is an essential part of preparation, and in some cases a written summary of the more serious sins is recommended. The kind of instruction given can best be illustrated by quotations from two popular manuals which have a wide circulation.

“As my Father hath sent Me,” etc. (St. John xx. 23). Our

Lord gave His "Apostles all powers that He exercised as Son of Man, that of performing miracles" (which power ceased when the need for them ceased), "and that of baptizing, celebrating, absolving," etc., the need for which still continues. These last powers they handed on to Bishops and priests of the Church. "In . . . Absolution, Christians are cleansed again from sin, and strengthened and gladdened by grace."¹

" Yes, I am going to God's Priest,
To tell him all my sin ;
And from this very hour I'll strive
A new life to begin.

When I confess with contrite heart
My sins unto the priest,
I do believe from all their guilt
That moment I'm released."²

The penitent comes to church at the appointed time, and audibly makes a confession of his several sins one by one. The priest, when assured of the genuineness of his repentance, pronounces absolution, and the person goes home fully assured of forgiveness. If asked to name the reason for his assurance, he will most probably ascribe his experience to the priestly absolution as "God's appointed means to pardon sin." Once again, Is this interpretation of his religious experience the true one? Criticism of the type of teaching contained in the quotations given above need not detain us now ; but, assuming these false statements about God's priest were really believed, the "Catholic" interpretation is a perfectly natural one. Our immediate concern is with the legitimate explanation of a religious experience. Suppose the penitent had made this careful preparation, and in his own room, or *alone* in the open church, had made this thorough confession of sin to God with full trust in God's mercy, and a reliance upon the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ, would his experience of forgiveness have been any less real? At least, it can be said that it ought not to have been. A great company of Christians have

¹ "Before the Altar," p. 110.

² "Catechism for Catholics in England," p. 30.

possessed this experience who would never think of making their confession in the presence of a priest. The penitent's experience must be distinguished from his practice; his practice is the fruit of belief in the efficacy of certain prescribed forms; his religious experience is the fruit of faith in Jesus Christ. The religious value of Auricular Confession is to be traced to the thorough heart-preparation which the individual must undertake; in other words, the religious value is due to the spiritual activity of the penitent.

III.

The immediate object of this inquiry is not to criticise the beliefs of a large number of our fellow-Churchmen, but to indicate the true value of modern "Catholic" teaching, which exercises such a fascinating influence over many minds. No good purpose will be served by the abuse of those whose views are different from our own, yet the secession of many of the younger Evangelicals is a loss which the party can ill afford at the present time; this secession is largely due to the genuine piety of High Churchmen and the attractiveness of a more ornate ceremonial. The radical opposition is lost sight of in the apparent agreement upon matters of primary importance.

The value of the Tractarian Movement can be better appreciated by the present generation than by the generation which has passed, or is now passing, away. The passage of time renders it possible to view events in their right perspective. The growth of ritualistic practices has been attended by a real deepening of the spiritual life, and this feature has been the secret of its striking progress. On the other hand, the net result has not been all gain; rather the Church has suffered serious loss, a large number of devout Churchpeople have gone to swell the ranks of Nonconformity, and the strength of these great Christian denominations to-day is in no small measure due to the Oxford Movement. The people were dissatisfied on account of the innovations; they ceased to attend their parish church, and attached themselves to some other Christian

community. They did not make any commotion; quietly and unostentatiously they withdrew, and, in consequence, their secession passed almost unnoticed. The Church to-day is face to face with the results of this movement, results which may well cause alarm and give rise to heart-searchings. These features should be remembered when the excellent work of the ritualistic clergy is held up for admiration. To-day when any protest is made upon points of ritual, it is not infrequently said of the objector, "He ought to go to chapel." Can any Christian body legitimately claim the title of Catholic, which would in this way exclude sincere and devout Christians from her membership?

In the course of the present discussion, the changes which have taken place in the type of service in the Evangelical Churches will at once occur to many minds; obviously an examination of this point would unnecessarily prolong the present inquiry; moreover, it would divert attention from the main issue and give rise to controversy upon what are, after all, side issues. It is not possible to lay down any hard-and-fast rules; the character and needs of each particular parish must be taken into consideration, and, after all, the teaching from the pulpit is a matter of considerable importance. The introduction of practices which add beauty and dignity to the service can be easily defended. On the other hand, care must be taken to exclude those elements which are directly suggestive of sacerdotal ideas. A general statement of this kind will be to many minds unsatisfying, but at the present stage of the controversy, and for the reasons just given, it is not, in the opinion of the present writer, wise to speak more definitely. "Let each be fully persuaded in his own mind."

The importance of making a clear distinction between religious experience and ceremonial is specially pronounced at the present time. Among the results of modern research are to be included the origin of many so-called "Catholic practices," and thoughtful men are repelled by a Church which retains customs which in their minds are inseparably associated with

superstition. The modern need is for a religion which is essentially spiritual; men demand a vital Christianity. This demand is the opportunity of Evangelicalism, and if the Evangelical party is to take advantage of the opening, she must be uncompromising in her refusal to allow within her ranks a type of teaching which is commended almost entirely by the personality of its adherents, but which has little affinity with modern thought. The Evangelical faith is the foundation of a strong, vigorous, and healthy life, intellectually and morally; it is a faith which will commend itself to the conscience of the average man; it is a faith which is identical with the faith of the New Testament Church—a faith which makes a powerful appeal to the heart of mankind.

“The Gospel,” said St. Paul, “is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth” (Rom. i. 16).



Some Thoughts on the Church of India.

BY THE REV. STUART H. CLARK, M.A.,

Vicar of Belper.

THE problem that India presents to the Christian Church faces us still in this year of grace 1912. It is this: How can the Church of India be made to gather native strength, so that it may be as indigenous, as racy to the Indian soil, as the Church of England is, let us say, to its own land, only in a richer, wider meaning of the term?

This may come about in one of three ways: The non-caste classes may one day be able to prove to the peoples of India the elevating power of the Gospel of Christ, when its force is widely felt over their large area for social, moral, and spiritual good. Or, from one of the northern centres of education, there may arise a religious leader who can focus the spiritual ambitions of India round the Person of our Lord. Or, again, some Indian Prince may, under the influence of Christian conviction, establish Christian institutions in his Raj; and the resultant blessing from God might point to him one day as the Christian ruler of a united Christian India.

Precedent for each of these methods could easily be found in the history of the Church; and a modern fulfilment in India even now may not be so far off as we are apt to think. The growing influence of the Christian masses in the Diocese of Madras might easily direct the religious impulses of India into wistful longing for the Christian's God. At any moment, from the Mission Colleges in the Dioceses of Calcutta or Lahore a leader might arise, with clear vision of the Person of Christ and of India's needs, who could lead her people into peace. It is possible that Central India might soon provide a Prince of exalted rank, who will take his stand as a Christian, and draw his people after him, through evangelization and education, into the fold of Christ.

It may be objected that the twin forces of Western civilization and Western faith have been omitted in this summary, but the sooner we realize that the Indian Church must stand on Eastern soil in Eastern hearts, the easier our task will be. India's evangelization will be done by her own sons. Our Western hold on India, religious and political, is, after all, only for the time. Our work will be complete when an Indian Christian King is acclaimed at Delhi, and an Indian Archbishop is seated on his throne. Then the amazing story will be truly written, and it will be seen how the destinies of that great land were placed for a while in trust with this little island in the Western Sea, and how, religiously and politically, we fulfilled our trust.

This we conceive to be the end ; but the end is far off yet, and meanwhile there is much to be done. Let us adjust our view.

1. First and chiefest stands the need of quick and living sympathy. Men of the mystic type are wanted more than most in India—men with sane, direct, intuitive sense of the realities that lie locked in bosoms, human and Divine. Such men are able to play upon the strings that control destiny. To them the vision of God in Christ is final and complete, and they move with naturalness and accuracy among the Divine mysteries. They cease to feel troubled about difficult details, when once they have seen something of what lies beyond. And all this knowledge enables them to move with equal ease amongst the secrets of the human heart. It simply lies open, and men rejoice to have it so, for love opens wide to love. A missionary once travelled for four days on the Indian Ocean. On board was a Hindu of high position, the Prime Minister of an Indian State, twice a guest of Queen Victoria at Windsor, in the train of his Prince. Night after night, on the clear, calm sea, long talks on the deepest things of God and man revealed a sympathy that could be felt. "I will pray daily for you," were the last words of the Hindu, "and we shall meet with God."

The higher educationist is a figure that looms large in modern missionary thought. In real life, a rather dour man

stands in the mental picture. Disciplined himself, he expects discipline and secures it. Order is Nature's first law, and so is his. Truths and facts of Faith are arranged in lecture-form under the enormous pressure of the task he has in hand, which is to draw out the best—physically, mentally, and spiritually—from the Indian boy. The work is done, and, as far as it can be, under present conditions, is grandly done. For devotion to it few can compare. But the task is growing far beyond his powers. Competition with well-equipped Government institutions presses harder year by year on heart and head. The evangel is in danger of losing its beauty and its joy in the severe outlines of its truth. Christian truth is not always easily recognized as "love in the head," nor its love as "truth in the heart." It seems as though the hostel work of Messrs. Holland and Tubbs at Allahabad has the future before it. There all the knowledge and sympathy of the private coach are at the disposal of the student, who seeks his responsible tuition in some central college, but who finds an able friend and counsellor at home whom he loves and trusts.

It is probable, too, that other methods of missionary work need more co-ordination in presenting this final and convincing appeal of Christian love. For instance, the medical man might join hands with the evangelist more frequently. A movable medical camp set up in the centre of a district that is being worked by evangelists, would give point and power to the spiritual message. To be able to say, "Take your sick yonder, a mile or two, for a deed of love, while you, strong ones, listen to a word of love from God," is a method that reminds of Christ. Or, again, the industrial mission might be more strongly developed to strengthen the pastor's hands, as he tries to advance the temporal as well as the spiritual welfare of his flock.

But love is at the heart of it all. Love is the wand of the enchanter that will rally Indian strength to the Indian Church.

2. In all our evangelization, Love with Truth will be the guiding motto, but in the development of the Indian Church

the emphasis will be the other way—Truth with Love. We must at all costs present the truth we see, orderly and complete, lest the Church develop on wrong lines ; but we know well that truth will never take its proper place without the welcome which love inspires.

For example, we are English Churchmen, and our convictions are not only our own, but they have endured the test of time ; and they must find acceptable presentation, if they are to have their place in the Indian Church that is to be. One great question before us is how to present effectively Episcopacy and Liturgy, our formal expressions of order and worship ; for we are convinced that these possess powers of endurance and continuity denied to other forms. We may be right or we may be wrong, but the appeal to history gives the verdict on our side, and we must be faithful to the truth we see.

But when we look at the facts, it is probably true that monarchical Episcopacy, as we understand it, is uncongenial to the Indian mind. His method of government from time immemorial is that of the *Panchayat*, which is most akin to Presbyterianism. Also there is no doubt that the Indian loves flowing speech as he loves flowing robes, and that the severely compact Collect is foreign to the whole temper of his thought and devotion. What, then, shall we do who feel that these things count in the long run ? As Bishop Montgomery suggests, we do detect a look of delicacy in the earnest faces of the younger denominations, and we wonder whether they will last.

With regard to Episcopacy, the challenge uttered by the Bishop of Bombay in a sermon at Oxford in October, 1908, must be taken up in deep earnest : “ I call upon the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge to set themselves to the task of studying over again the whole question of the origins of Episcopacy, with its bearing on the validity of ministry and Sacraments, and presenting to the Church a dispassionate, scientific, scholarly statement on the whole subject.” In all probability, the task has now been taken in hand by others besides the late Bishop of Salisbury, and the results will be welcomed by the

whole Church. Without attempting prophecy, one may for the present believe, from the tendency of modern research, that we are returning to the position of the older divines, Hooker, Andrewes, and Cosin. They saw that some Churches "have not that which best agreeth with the Sacred Scriptures . . . the Government that is by Bishops," and they "lament that men want that kind of polity or regimen which is best, and content themselves with that which . . . the necessity of the present hath cast upon them" (Eccl. Pol., III. xi. 16). But, on the other hand, they do not "press Episcopacy into the front rank of Christian verities," but maintain firmly that, while it is certainly necessary for the *bene esse* of the Church, it is not necessary for its *esse*. If the Church were to advance this plea lovingly and respectfully for the consideration of the Indian Church, with full conviction of its truth, we believe that Episcopacy would win its way by the very moderation of its appeal.

The same problem in another form presents itself for solution with regard to Liturgy. We probably all agree with the eminent divine who once said that if all men offered prayer always, as some men offer prayer sometimes, we should have no need of a Liturgy. But it is not so. The ancient prayers, "hot with the breath of all the saints," from David onwards, are our best support in public worship. Still, when all is said on this side, we need to get back to older ideals in public prayer. To quote from a recent well-known book: "When a trained congregation was interceding, the normal method seems to have consisted of three elements—(a) the bidding, or announcement of a topic of prayer, which might be extended into an address of several clauses explanatory or suggestive; (b) an interval in which prayer was made for the subject specified, either in silence, or in the form of some Litany or set of versicles; (c) a 'Collect,' summing up all the petitions so made in one public liturgical prayer said by the Bishop or priest."¹ If this be true, we can, with true historical continuity, offer the ancient

¹ "Some Principles of Liturgical Reform," Frere, p. 142.

freedom in worship that once was ours, but is, alas! ours no longer. It is quite true to say that our duty is to give India our best, and leave to them to make their own forms of approach to God; but the real question at issue is whether our English Liturgy as it stands to-day, is really the best that the West can give. There are sources of devotion in the Liturgies of the Greek Church which have been far too long unused. The doctrine of the immanence of God, rightly interpreted and expressed, will make a strong appeal to Indian hearts which are too often left cold by our methods of thought and speech to God concerning His transcendence. When we have given India the very best that the whole West can give, combined with the plasticity of our own ancient ideals, we may expect a warmer welcome to liturgical worship.

The truth is that we of the West have very far gone from original righteousness in the matters of our order and worship; and it will probably be found that the effort to adapt our methods to the spiritual "climate" of other lands will teach us lessons of no small value to the Church at home.

3. But the actual development of the Indian Church will probably proceed on lines that cannot as yet be clearly discerned. The contribution of the Anglican Church to the whole missionary enterprise is small compared with that made by other bodies. It has a keen cutting edge of devotion and of knowledge, but it distinctly lacks the weight of numbers behind it. All the more reason that the whole striking force should as far as possible combine; and it is through union with other missions that the Anglican contribution may be made to tell most forcibly in the Indian Church of the future. To take a concrete instance, the education of the people of the Punjab will inevitably become a matter of great importance, now that the centre of our power has been transferred to Delhi. Three educational institutions have already won great names—one in Delhi, in the south, under the Cambridge Mission; another in Lahore, in the centre, under the Presbyterians; a third in Peshawar, in the far north, under the C.M.S. Would

not a great accession of strength to Christian education arise from a federation of these three centres under the style and dignity of a Punjab Christian University? Many other instances of immense advantage accruing to the whole cause of missions by a combination of scattered forces might easily be given. They would all provide object-lessons of the reality of Christian comity, and at the same time give opportunity to each contributory stream to make itself felt in the future of the Indian Church.

So much for the relation of the mission bodies amongst themselves. Something may here be added in closing by way of their relation to the Indian Church. One well-known mission council seems to be organized on the principle of giving the Indian co-equal responsibility with the European—in other words, is trying hard to prove that unequal things are equal. A missionary will always, by force of character and training, dominate in council and in action. When the pace of the oxen is not and cannot be the same, is it wise to yoke them together, and expect no straining of the yoke? One section of the Indian Church is asking, and reasonably enough, for separate independent spheres, but side by side. Let the missionaries, they say, take over all the evangelistic, medical, and educational work; let us be responsible for the pastoral and industrial spheres of labour. Let us make our own mistakes, but we will make something else—a Church that an Indian can understand and love. The father has been carrying the grown-up son long enough, and the Indian's inability to stand alone is simply due to the fact that his father has not often let him try to walk by himself.

4. Such considerations as these will, we believe, further the end in view. The great command "Preach the Gospel" has been faithfully and wisely interpreted as involving educational, medical, industrial, pastoral, and literary work, all animated by the evangelistic spirit; but the winsome beauty of Christian life and love must shine through it all still more clearly, if it is to woo and win the Hindu heart for Christ. Our Anglican con-

tribution to the development of the Indian Church seems to need re-setting in the clearer light of modern thought, before it can take its true place in the spiritual history of India. And when it is so re-set, it will receive the careful attention that is its due, through a fuller co-operation with the work of other mission bodies in the same fields, and by a wiser recognition of the capacities of the Indian Church to develop on lines true to the genius of the Indian race.

National movements are in the air, and they are the sign of the times. Educational and social problems are being dealt with in terms of national life and aspiration, but they sink into insignificance beside the greatest problem of all—Religion. India is at heart religious. She is conscious of her spiritual powers, and aspires to spiritual development and dominion. Religion is of profound and final importance to the Indian mind. The great apostle of India will be the man who can capture and foster and focus the spiritual sympathies of India in one grand National movement, under the control of our Lord Jesus, the Captain of the world's salvation.

Let us pray that, called of God, he may soon arise.



The Healing of the Man Possessed with the Legion.

By REV. J. A. WOOD, M.A.,

Warden of St. John's College, Lahore, Punjab.

THAT Dr. Plummer, in his "Commentary on St. Luke," should give nine different justifications of our Lord's action in the healing of the man with the legion is sufficient proof of its difficulty of interpretation, and yet there are points in the narrative which seem hardly to have received full attention.

Our Lord's sympathy with the sufferer and His exhibition of authority are clear enough, but we would to concentrate attention on three points :

1. The method adopted with regard to the sufferer.
2. Its relation to the swine.
3. Its rightfulness as regards their owners.

The evidence of observers in different parts of the world as to demonic possession, combined with the witness of modern psychology as to multiple personality, incline us to accept the literal meaning of the Gospels as a reasonable statement of the man's actual condition; and therefore the problem before the Master was to disentangle the man's true personality from the demons, who had possessed themselves of a lodging within it. Its difficulty is well illustrated by the use of the pronouns in one sentence of St. Mark—"He besought him much that He would not send *them* away out of the country." The demons had so invaded the personality of the man as to make him dread a complete separation from his evil co-partners. St. Mark also emphasizes this in the form in which the answer to the question, "What is *thy* name?" is given—"My name is Legion, for *we* are many." We have here, then, a case of diseased personality, which had to be cured in spite of itself, and it needed the most tender and reverent handling if the damage done was to be repaired.

1. The method adopted began with the question, "What is thy name?"—a question designed to recall the man to true self-consciousness once more. The second step was the granting of the request that the devils might be allowed to go into the swine, securing as it did an objective proof of the reality of deliverance. The refusal to allow the man to remain with his Deliverer was a third. The violated personality must make use of its deliverance, and stand complete and entire, without any morbid fear lest, apart from the immediate presence of Jesus, the danger might return. The last step in the process was designed to secure its permanence. The man was bidden to repeat the story, that his own confidence might grow thereby. In this repetition, the fact that he had the story of a visible and well-corroborated sign to give, saved him from any risk that he might be persuaded that he was himself a victim of self-deception. The direction that he was to proclaim the matter showed on Jesus' part a complete absence of any fear that the people of that time and place would find in the circumstances of the cure anything inconsistent with a display of Divine mercy and goodness; and such a direction would further help to keep the man in contact with human fellowship.

2. As regards the swine: I should be inclined to say that the best commentary is our Lord's own remarks when speaking of the love of God for sparrows: "Are ye not of much more value than they?" (Matt. vi. 26; Luke xii. 24); "Ye are of more value than many sparrows" (Matt. x. 31; Luke xii. 7). This second being combined with the statements: "Not one sparrow shall fall on the ground without your Father," and "Not one of them is forgotten in the sight of God." Man is of much more value than many swine, and two thousand of them do not make an unreasonable price to pay for the rescue of one human being. The animal creation is given to man, and it serves man involuntarily by sacrifices which men can make consciously one for the other, or for God.

3. Lastly, there remains the question of the owners of the swine. It is important, I believe, to keep our minds alive to

our excessive individualism, which makes us forget primitive collectivism. The fact that the whole body of the inhabitants beseech Jesus to depart may well incline us to believe that this great herd of swine was the joint property of very many, and that the loss to any individual was small. Now, in exchange for that loss, the community had been rid of a very serious danger and nuisance, thus described by the different Evangelists:

“Two . . . exceeding fierce, so that no man might pass that way.”

“Oftentimes it had seized him, and he was kept under guard, and bound with chains and fetters; and, breaking the bonds asunder, he was driven of the devil into the deserts.”

“No man had strength to tame him. And always night and day, in the tombs, and in the mountains he was crying out, and cutting himself with stones.”

The removal of such a danger must have brought a wonderful sense of relief to every home; and if not a few of the men grumbled at the loss of their pigs, the women and children must have felt they had been delivered from a terrible ogre. Those who were engaged in what, by Jewish law, was an unlawful practice were compelled, without leave being asked, to make a contribution for the great relief of the whole neighbourhood, and the special deliverance of a man whom they had often tried to subdue and failed. Their willingness to suffer for the good of their own community was tested, and they failed. Had our Lord as Son of man the right to make the test? Godet's remark is that this is one of those cases where power to execute the sentence guarantees the right of the Judge. [*Cf.* “but that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins: then saith He to the sick of the palsy, Rise up and walk.”]

Every act of a ruler and leader of men, whereby public opinion is educated and brought to a higher level, demands a more or less unwilling compliance from some, in order that others besides themselves may benefit; but if the leader is to wait till all agree with him before he acts, nothing will be done.

I should therefore say that the action on Christ's part exhibits a willingness to assume responsibility for a community, and to act for them in a way in which at their best they would be willing to act; while His departure shows that, when they failed to respond, He did not force them to continue in a path of unselfishness when, after seeing its results, they deliberately refused.

To sum up :

1. As regards the man : The action of our Lord showed (1) reverent care for human personality, akin to His unwillingness ever to *compel* men to believe; (2) the most careful adoption of means to secure that the restoration which had been wrought might be maintained. [*Cf.* the command to give food to Jairus's daughter.]

2. As regards the swine : He asserted man's sovereign rights in creation, their death being justified by the service rendered.

3. As regards the owners : Our Lord made an heroic call on their nobility, testing their willingness to suffer loss that another might gain; and, at the same time, He conferred upon their community a large and real benefit. On their refusal to respond, He acted on the principle He Himself laid down—that the Christian messenger, where definitely rejected, is to retreat.



The Recovery of Baptism.

BY THE REV. J. D. DATHAN, M.A.,
Chaplain H.M. Dockyard, Bermuda.

BROUGHT up under Evangelical teaching, and for practically half a life-time a member of an Evangelical congregation, the Faith of the Gospel in its simplest and purest form has been familiar to me from my youth. To mention the pastor's name to whom I was a listener for many years would be to mention a name honoured far and wide for whole-hearted devotion to God and to His command to evangelize the world. Now, on looking back and thinking over what was learnt from this teacher, amid much—very much—to be thankful for, there appears one defect—never, in all the many sermons that I have heard from him, can I remember one reference to the Sacrament of Baptism, except to warn us against the error of thinking that in our Baptism we were regenerate. What we were to believe about the Sacrament was never told us. Baptism was, of course, regularly administered in the church, but, except for that fact, the Sacrament was practically unrecognized, and one who only listened to his teaching might very well have come to the conclusion that Baptism had no place in his theology—never was it made the basis of encouragement or appeal to his hearers.

Now, it is to be feared that this defect is not an uncommon one in evangelical teaching. Look through many of our writers, listen to our speakers, whether appealing to the unconverted to accept the mercy of God in Christ Jesus our Lord, or to God's children to rise to the possibilities that are hidden for them in Christ, the fact is the same, the Sacrament of Baptism—the fact that their hearers have been baptized—is ignored. Yet surely the Sacrament of God must have some bearing on such matters—must be capable of being used as a means to further these objects.

Why is this? With some, perhaps, it is the rebound from the false sacramental teaching which has put the Sacrament in the wrong place, and attributed to it effects which do not attach to it. To avoid this they give Baptism no place at all.

With some it arises from a feeling that such an act as Baptism has something unspiritual about it, and is out of place in spiritual religion.

With some it arises from uncertainty about Baptism—they are not certain what it means, especially in the case of infants, and therefore, though in obedience to the orders of their Church they baptize infants when presented, they are silent about it in their teaching.

With some it arises from the honest conviction that Baptism has no bearing on such things as conversion or holiness, looking on Baptism almost entirely as our act, and, so regarding it as an act of man, they can find no encouragement as to the acts of God upon it.

Now, this silence about Baptism is disastrous in two ways: On the one hand, it gives our brother who teaches what he calls the Full Catholic Faith a great advantage. People do want to know about Baptism, and finding that Evangelical teachers are silent about it, or at the most are only prepared to say what it is not, they turn to those who are prepared to give them definite instruction on the subject. This our Catholic brother can supply. He has his doctrine of Baptism clear-cut and definite, and is able to back it up with what at first sight seems clear proof from Scripture and the Prayer-Book. Is it to be wondered at that, under these circumstances, people are swayed by the teaching of the man who has definite opinions?

On the other hand, Baptism is of no use to the Evangelical, while it is to his Catholic brother. The latter can, and does, ground his appeals to his people on the fact of Baptism. At a definite time new life, with all its blessings and powers, was conferred on them, and they now have only to make use of that which was then ingrafted. Baptism is in his hands a ground of assurance and appeal, which it is not to the Evangelical.

How can we remedy this, and so restore this Sacrament to its rightful place in our thoughts and teaching that it may be used by us as a ground of confidence for our people, whether we are trying to lead them to the blessing of assurance, or to encourage them in their pursuit of holiness? In recovering the

Sacrament for this use we shall be going back to and following good precedent.

We shall be following the precedent of our Reformers. They held strong views on Baptism, and were not afraid to appeal to it as a ground of assurance and confidence of the blessing of God. Cranmer says: "He that is baptized ought to believe that in Baptism he doth in deed and in truth put Christ upon him, and apparel him with Christ." Bradford: "A man regenerate—which we ought to believe of ourselves, I mean that we are so by our Baptism, the Sacrament thereof requiring no less faith." And, to go back to Scripture, we find St. Paul making much the same use of Baptism in his epistles: "So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death. Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death" (Rom. vi. 3, 4). "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (Gal. iii. 27). "Buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God" (Col. ii. 12).

How can we proceed to bring our use of this Sacrament into line with these precedents? The first thing would seem to be to bring forward prominently the fact that Baptism is an act of God, that in the Sacrament He does something to us, and that that fact is the most important thing to consider. *Our* part is important, but secondary; the act and intention of *God* is the first thing. It is the Divine acts in redemption that are the rock of our confidence, upon which we can rest our souls in peace; and until we have restored Baptism to its proper place among these, we can never use it as it should be used. To give our Catholic brother full credit, he does this. His doctrine of regeneration in Baptism may be untrue, but at least it holds up to us clearly and decisively the fact that in Baptism there is an act of God for our profit and blessing, and until we replace his false idea of what this act is by the true one, there is no ground for wonder if his teaching sways people.

What, then, are we to say that this act of God does for us which can be made a ground of confidence and encouragement

to our people? Perhaps some words from our Articles may show us: "The promises of forgiveness of sin, and our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed" (Art. XXVII.). Now, if these words are true, surely we may use the act which does this as a means of assurance and ground of encouragement.

The anxious, troubled soul we can refer back to the moment of Baptism. Here is an act of God by which the forgiveness, of which you feel the need, was not merely promised, but definitely signed and sealed over to you individually. From that you may be sure He will not draw back, and may, with full assurance, claim the gift of forgiveness which He thus made yours.

Again, in the hours of weariness in the struggle after holiness, to this same act of God we may point back as a source of encouragement. Here is an act of God assuring you of the help that you need. The promise of adoption to be sons of God by the Holy Ghost was made and signed and sealed to you in your Baptism; surely, then, He who did this act, and thereby sealed this promise to you, will, on your seeking them, give you the gifts and graces needful for you, if you are to be in character a worthy son of God. All was included in the one act and deed, and you have only to arise and claim the heritage thus made over to you by Him who is faithful.

Along some such lines as these Baptism may be made of use to troubled and anxious souls, and this Sacrament of God restored to its right place and use in the Christian life; and, instead of being a mysterious, unintelligible act, divorced from all practical bearing on daily life, take its place again as a means of grace, fruitful in daily assurance and comfort.

Possibly at first such use of the Sacrament would be regarded with suspicion. Past neglect would have its revenge by causing such teaching to be regarded as dangerous because of its novelty, but gradually, by its reasonableness and spirituality, it would win its way, and this Sacrament of God, after years of neglect, **at last come to its own, to the joy and blessing of His Church.**

Religion and Education.

BY THE REV. P. R. PIERCE, B.A.

AN important dignitary of the Church, preaching some time ago on behalf of the poor of East London, is reported to have stated that East End workmen would laugh at people who said that East London was being transformed by free libraries, better sanitary arrangements, or even hospitals.

No doubt there are a good many such East End workmen, and we thank God for the vast number of Christian men who are convinced that Religion is a more important factor than Education in the progress of man. But while we are thankful for this side of the picture, we must not close our eyes to the other side. We have also to face the fact that there is a large class of men who think differently—a class with whom the clergy, as a whole, come into less real contact, men who are out early in the morning, coming home from their business late at night, and are therefore rarely met by the clergy in their visitations, and who seldom think of entering a place of worship.

We meet a man of this type now and then—when he falls sick, or meets with an accident, or is out of work. We get into conversation with him, but find it difficult to get at his views on Religion. He is difficult to draw out, partly because he feels that his views will not coincide with ours, and he is afraid of hurting our feelings, and partly because he is not quite sure of his own ground, and will not give himself away in argument. He has gained from some source, perhaps from his friends at work, or from the Secularist speakers in the park, a vague impression that Religion is on the wane, that it has had its day, that it has ceased to be the greatest power, the most important factor in the progress of man, and that nowadays one must pin one's faith to Education. It is quite certain that he would *not* laugh if he were told that libraries and schools and sanitary arrangements were transforming, and would further transform, London. But he might possibly laugh, or shake his head in-

credulously, if he were told that Religion is, has been, and will be, a greater factor in the progress of man than Education. In such a case it is necessary first to get our man to state what he really means by the progress of man. It will probably be found that progress to him will mean the bettering of the conditions under which he lives and works, the steady ablation of slum districts, better housing of the poor, the acquisition of parks and open spaces, the enactment of laws of health with powers to enforce them, hospitals, infirmaries, sanatoria, free meals to hungry children. He will think of shorter hours of labour, old age pensions, State insurance, the facilities for Education, by means of which the brilliant poor are enabled to climb to the top rung of the ladder. These, he will tell you, constitute real progress. There will also come to his mind the enormous advance made by science, art, literature, medicine, and engineering.

This is what he means by the progress of man, and for all this he will give thanks to Education, and by education he will mean secular as distinguished from religious education.

Now, this is the type of man that is to be found abroad. He is a sample of only too many thousands. He is constantly met by pastors whose experience will harmonize with the foregoing. Now what have we to say to him?

We will tell this non-religious man first that in his definition of the progress of men he is right as far as he goes, but that he does not go far enough, or, rather, that he does not go deeply enough. We, as Christian men and women, are bound to agree that health, happiness, and wisdom are magnificent ends at which to aim, and that the attainment of them is real progress. We give an equally hearty welcome to hospitals, libraries, and healthy homes, to schools and scholarships, but we urge that the attainment of *virtue* is a far greater achievement, and one that is infinitely more necessary than even the great improvements that we have mentioned. In addition to being accomplished, healthy, and comfortable, a man must be good, and this, we say, can be accomplished only by Religion. By Religion we mean

Christianity. It is a mistake to think that to improve the conditions is an infallible means of improving the man, although we admit that it affords opportunities by which he may, and frequently does, improve himself. But, on the whole, improvement in conditions, in surroundings, is a proof of internal progress. A man's habitation is often the index to his inner self. We shall be at once told that the improvement in the habitation has been brought about by Education, that Education has influenced the inner self, and is therefore the internal cause of the external improvement. We admit it, but we say, not the inner, but the *inmost* self has yet to be reached. With all the glorious results of science, art, literature, medicine, and engineering, there is still something lacking. Man has not yet reached his highest point. His education, to be complete, must be not only intellectual, but moral. It should not be necessary for us to labour this point. The main purpose of Education nowadays is to fit a person to earn his living in a certain trade or profession, and although the pursuit of secular studies may encourage patience, industry, and self-control, although the conscience and the will undoubtedly may be improved by many lessons, still, a man may be perfectly fitted to follow a calling and yet not be a good man. He may be a scientist, a man of letters, an artist, a physician, or an engineer, and yet not be what we may term a moral man. Is this not a fact? Is not this often the case? Do we not know that a man, with all his learning and accomplishment, may be selfish, passionate, conceited, or unrestrained? It is because the very secret springs of his being have not yet been touched.

We therefore conclude that the lack of Education may be the cause of intellectual mistakes, but that the lack of moral education will be productive of something quite different—namely, the absence of a standard of right and wrong, and consequently an erroneous view and judgment of self. There must be a standard of right and wrong by which the conscience may judge and the will may act. Can Education supply this standard? Can Education set up an ethical ideal, a perfect norm? It

cannot, nor does it profess to do so. Can moral education set up a standard? It may in the abstract. But man needs a practical standard, a concrete example, one that will touch the facts of experience. From whence can it be supplied? Christianity can supply, and does supply us with a perfect ideal in the life and teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ. Before the advent of Christianity, the command, "Man, know thyself" could be but imperfectly obeyed. But now, measuring ourselves by the standard of the life of the Blessed Master, we are able to take a correct measurement of ourselves. But the man who has received no religious education is without a perfect ideal, and what is the consequence? He has learned much about the things around him, but he knows not yet, that which he ought above all things to know, about himself. He cannot see that he has sinned and come short of the *reputation* (may we so translate $\delta\delta\epsilon\gamma\eta\varsigma$?), the character of God, the Great Example. Secular education apart from religious education will produce a false self-conceit.

We say, then, that the first step in the progress of man must be to know himself, to see himself in comparison with the perfect ideal.

Having had a view of himself, and keeping constantly before him the life of Christ as this ideal, he may then begin a progress along the best lines, the lines of humility, self-denial, and love, and he will find that not only does Christianity point out a line of right conduct, but that it also supplies the motive power in the knowledge that he is *loved* by an Almighty Creator and Father, Whose revealed will and purpose make for the best interests of the whole of mankind.

We have tried to show that moral education requires a theology. But this is also the need of purely intellectual education. It needs a theology, natural or revealed, or both. As the moral in man seeks some knowledge of the law-giver who has placed within him a law which conflicts with the law of self-preservation, so the intellectual demands a first cause uncaused. **This dual need Religion is able to supply.** The intellect, more-

over, through Philosophy, studying the nature of experience as the whole, seeks to find the ultimate unity of all things, ending where Religion begins, with the unity of creation and the Creator. Our non-religious friend will say: "All your arguments, then, amount to this—that you think Religion can make a man good without the aid of Education. But surely no man is wholly uneducated, for life itself is an education." "We grant you this," we say in reply; "but it is possible for a man who has had no schooling to become, under the influence of Christianity, a thoroughly good and moral man. There are many good men who cannot tell one letter from another. But," we add, "can you find me an educated man who can be good without the aid of religion?" "Oh, plenty," replies our friend, and at once he challenges us with the fact that there are many good-living people who are professed unbelievers, or who, at any rate, are indifferent to the claims of Religion. That is true. But can a man live to-day without coming in contact, in some way, either with Religion or, what is equally important, can he live his life without being influenced by, and partaking of, the results of Religion? Is it not well-nigh impossible to be entirely unaffected by the influence of Christian life and thought?

Much of the credit that is claimed for Education is really due to Religion.

Although it has done much to improve man's lot, twenty centuries of Christianity, and in particular three centuries of the open Bible, has done more. The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation, but is like leaven, hidden, but effective, causing its power to be felt in an ever-widening area.

Religion has been, and still can be, of the greatest service to Education, and Education has been the handmaid of Religion. They should never be separated. The college chapel is as necessary to real progress as the lecture-room. True Religion should be the centre of college life. Religious services need not be a tedious waste of time; even though they may seem so at times, one cannot estimate the value of *daily contact* with the Great Standard. The influence may not be felt at the time,

but it will be there, and in times of stress and temptation, the benefit from contact with holy things will be gloriously manifest.

But alas! signs are not wanting that this Religion of ours is not valued by the rising and the newly-risen generation. In the ever-widening circle around London, schools spring up, splendidly built, excellently equipped, and well staffed. Handsome libraries and museums rise up on all hands. But what is the proportion of *men* who think it of first importance to build, equip, and endow a church, and what the proportion of men who ever give the matter a thought at all? We have in this great belt, half-finished, poorly-furnished churches, galvanized mission halls, understaffed parishes. They are left to struggle on as best they may. Surely this is an index of the way men are thinking to-day. They look upon Education as absolutely essential, and upon Religion as a non-essential. Something is wrong somewhere, either with the Church, the clergy, or the public. Very likely in all three. But if people were begged less often to come to church and more frequently and earnestly to come to *Christ*, perhaps the fault in all three might be eradicated.



Books Ancient and Modern.

BY THE REV. CANON R. B. GIRDLESTONE.¹

THERE is a text in Ecclesiastes which appeals to the heart of every school-boy. It tells us that "of making many books there is no end, and much study is a weariness of the flesh." If this was true hundreds of years before our Lord came into the world, how much more do we realize it in this twentieth century? Before drawing the self-evident moral, it is natural that we should look back into antiquity and ask, What is the origin of books? who wrote the first book? and why did he write it?

The object of books must have been to preserve and hand down a Record; to confirm and correct oral tradition. The human memory was very good in primæval times and amongst Oriental peoples. They had not many distractions, and they had not much to learn. All was done by word of mouth, accompanied by symbolical gestures. At last writing began. It is first referred to in the Bible in Exodus xvii. 14: "Write this for a memorial in a book (or, in the book)." But writing was no new thing in the days of Moses. We can still see on the walls of old Egyptian buildings sculptures of ancient scribes, note-book in hand, dating back from patriarchal and pre-patriarchal times. Long before the days of Amraphel, who was the contemporary of Abraham, there was writing—we might say printing or stamping—on clay in Chaldea; and there is considerable likelihood, judging from some of Dr. Hilprecht's finds, that the art was antediluvian. Probably numerals came first, and nature's decimal system was speedily developed, as we can see in the code of Hammurabi. The word for "counting" in Hebrew and other Oriental languages also means "writing," and a "number" is also a book. We still use the word "account" in both senses. Man is by nature inclined to gesture-language, and pictorial characters which everyone could under-

¹ An address given at a lay and clerical gathering, July, 1910.

stand would soon become conventional. At length a rough alphabet was evolved with many pictorial aids, these last being gradually dropped. It is interesting to compare the most ancient Chinese characters with the most ancient Chaldean or Accadian, in order to illustrate the origin of writing. Of course, much would depend on the material on which a record was to be preserved, whether clay, skin, or papyrus, and also on the implement with which the figures or letters were written or stamped. The Bible will be found to contain a good deal of information on these subjects if it is carefully studied. The book or list of the generations of Adam (Gen. v.) may be compared for its structure with some of the oldest Babylonian documents. As for its contents, it is simply Noah's ancestry, written down instead of being merely preserved by oral tradition. Our Anglo-Saxon fathers wrote upon slips of beech (*bōk*), whence the name *book*, but nothing has proved so imperishable as baked clay or pottery.

A student of the British Museum catalogue of Babylonian objects—an excellent shillingsworth—will stare with amazement at the narrative of literary activity in patriarchal times, and will wonder over the libraries, catalogues, letters, reports, grammars, treatises, and other records of those ancient days. Reading was very common in those times. Professor Petrie is reported to have said lately that it was more common then than in Europe some two hundred years ago.

In the days of later Eastern Kings—*e.g.*, Nabonidus—there was a great revival of ancient learning, and sometimes the little squeezed-up documents of the patriarchal age were misread. Some serious chronological mistakes followed in consequence, and these have only been corrected during the last few years, largely through the watchful labours of Mr. L. King of the British Museum. The result of his work is that old Babylonian dates have to be brought down considerably.

Reverting to the text with which we began, the moral is that, as we cannot read all the books which come out, even in our own language, we must choose the best; and what are they?

Some five-and-twenty years ago (1886) Sir John Lubbock (now Lord Avebury) ventured to give a list of a hundred books in a lecture which was summarized in the *Pall Mall*. It is interesting to turn over the document as it was originally drawn up, and as it stood corrected in 1904. It is prefaced by an excellent paper by J. R. Lowell, and some strong words of advice by Carlyle; then comes the list itself, with comments by the late King, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Coleridge, and others. Then follows a scathing criticism by Ruskin, given in facsimile, and by a series of other literary men. In his final list Lord Avebury deals fairly with his numerous critics, and removes some misunderstandings.

What is the book which stands first? It is the BIBLE. This had been accidentally left out in the report of the original lecture, but now it stands in its true place. Let me support this estimate from the words of H. M. Stanley, slightly condensed, also contributed to the *Pall Mall*: "You ask me what I carried with me to take across Africa. I carried three loads, but as my men lessened, one by one they were reluctantly thrown away, until finally, when less than 300 miles from the Atlantic, I possessed only the Bible, Shakespeare, 'Sartor Resartus,' Noric's 'Navigation,' and a nautical almanack for 1887. At last I had only the old Bible left." He gives the complete list with which he started, and a very interesting one it is. Let me add the testimony contained in his autobiography. "Solitude taught me many things, and showed newspapers in quite a new light. There were several subjects treated in a manner that wild nature seemed to scorn. It appeared to me that the reading of anything in the newspapers, except that for which they were intended—namely, news—was a waste of time, and deteriorative of native force, and worth, and personality. The Bible, however, with its noble and simple language, I continued to read with a higher and truer understanding than I had ever before conceived. Its powerful verses had a different meaning, a more penetrative influence, in the silence of the wilds. I came to feel a strange glow while absorbed in its pages, and a charm peculiarly

appropriate to the deep melancholy of African scenery. . . . I flung myself on my knees, and poured out my soul utterly in secret prayer to Him from whom I had been so long estranged, to Him who had led me here mysteriously into Africa, there to reveal Himself and His will. . . .”

The Bible is of never-ending interest and value, partly because it is a growth, historical and prophetic, but chiefly because it appeals to our spirits. Our Lord marked out its main stages: (i.) “the beginning,” to which we owe the law of marriage; (ii.) “the fathers,” of whom came circumcision; (iii.) Moses, to whom we owe the Law of God; (iv.) Samuel and the prophets. Then comes the New Testament. It is all alive, and all on the side of truth, and, being the work of prophetic men, it claims to be inspired and to be written for all time. It is not surprising to find that the issue of the Books of the New Testament gave a great stimulus to the art of writing, and that thousands of copies of the sacred Books were speedily put into circulation. The Early Christian writers did not “give us the Bible,” as some affirm; they received it from the original authorities, studied it, lived it out, and passed it on, and often died for its truths. The issue of the “ante-Nicene” Library is a great help to us all, being of a healthy tone and far removed from the littleness of some modern discussions. It contains the remains of some seventy writers.

The age of printing lifted the veil which had fallen on the mass of the people. Manuscripts and block-books gave way to the use of movable type and (in these last days) to stereotype, electrotype, linotype, and photography. The works of the Reformation period are now regarded by us as “ancient”; soon the labours of the Victorian age will follow, and we shall find ourselves in a world of manuals, digests, reprints, selections, cyclopædias; cheap series load our tiny shelves, price sixpence, threepence, one penny, so that for a pound an artisan can get a complete library! What a revelation of mental activity is to be found in the *Times* “Literary Supplement,” or in the *Times*

Book Club, or on the Railway Bookstall! Again and again one says, "What shall I choose?"

I venture to say, do not despise a book because it is old. It may be described in a second-hand list as worn, shabby, weak in the back, slightly cracked, dead—in fact, rather like its writer! but after all, good writers, ancient and modern, are God's gifts. We may learn from their style, from their method, from their actual teaching. I look round on my bookshelves: I see the Bible in many tongues; I see Plato, Aristotle, Herodotus; I see the ante-Nicene Library; I see Luther and Melancthon, Cranmer and Hooker, Pascal and Leibnitz and Locke; I see Shakespeare and Tennyson and Keble; I see Butler and Bunyan, Carlyle and Charles Lamb and Isaac Taylor (the elder), Bacon and Argyll, Ruskin and De Quincey, and Emerson and Macaulay—these, and a hundred others, look out upon me as old friends. The most modern books are not always the best. We have to go by contents rather than by the pictures on their front. We want what will stimulate our better nature and not leave an unpleasant taste in our mouth. Sometimes we want to be taken out of ourselves by a story, sometimes by a hard book which will draw out all our powers. Speaking generally, any book which sends us back to our Bible with renewed zest must be good; but as for books which make us shrink from the Bible—it is cheapest, in the long run, to shut them up at once.



The Missionary World.

NO month is fraught with greater issues at the Home Base of Missions than August. It is the month when most of those who bear the responsibility of leadership—whether central or local—are taking rest. It is pre-eminently the time when “the Voice from Heaven” can be heard. Only those who have tried it know the test and strain of administrative work for Missions, the constant mass of details backed by the vast masses of the undone. It takes a high degree of resolution to reserve time, week by week, for adequate recreation, adequate thought—we had almost written adequate prayer. Then come the holiday weeks, rich in recuperative opportunities for body, mind, and spirit. They are preparatory for ensuing work. Those—now numbering many thousands—who use the monthly *Paper of Subjects for Intercession and Thanksgiving*, issued from the Church Missionary Society’s House by the Rev. C. C. B. Bardsley, will welcome the following topics which he suggests :

“THANKSGIVING.—For the gift of holidays; for the beauty and glory of all God’s works; for friends; for books; for the opportunity of hearing in fresh ways God’s voice.

“PRAYER.—That through the wise use of the summer rest-time tired workers may be recreated, in order that they may return to their posts with freshness of strength in mind, body, and spirit.

“That in the stillness of the rest-time, and through the gentle working of the Holy Spirit upon men, problems which now seem very difficult may find solution; hindrances may be removed; minds may receive fresh light; all wrong prejudices and misconceptions may be lost; and all projects not in line with the will of God may be laid aside.”

Not a few of us will link these intercessions with individual names.

* * * * *

The big missionary quarterlies bring us their wonted stimulus in the current numbers. It is difficult to express what the cause of Missions already owes, for instance, to the *International Review of Missions*. Men who think deeply and

widely are contributing their best to its pages, so that, upon one subject after another, light is being focussed from many sides. Those who have been doing close comparative work upon the series of articles on "The Growth of the Church in the Mission-Field" are amazed at what is learned as the work amongst the Bataks in Sumatra, amongst the varied races in West Africa, and now amongst the Koreans, is surveyed. The current number contains a valuable paper on "The Educational Situation in India, and its Bearing on Missionary Policy," by Sir Andrew Fraser, and also a singularly interesting discussion of "The Chinese Church in Relation to its Immediate Tasks," by the Rev. Ch'eng-Ching-yi, whom many will recall as a speaker at the Edinburgh Conference.

* * * * *

But it is not invidious to single out, as the paper of the hour, that dealing with "Ten Years' Missionary Finance," by Mr. Kenneth Maclennan. At last we have what goes to the heart of Home Base problems, and touches the centre of our need. Of all the Edinburgh Conference Reports, that on the Home Base has always been held to be the least satisfactory. Even the *International Review of Missions* has not given us a first-rate Home Base article so far. Now we have a careful summary of financial facts, leading up to a strong discussion of the causes and needs of the present situation. Mr. Maclennan urges that "the ultimate problem in the finances of Missions hinges on the thoughts of the Boards about their work." He believes in the great mission of the existing societies as those who are to interpret to the Church "the thought of God about the world." The stimulating and searching words should be pondered by every committee member before the winter's work begins.

* * * * *

At a recent meeting of a missionary committee it was suggested that the late Bishop of Oxford's sermon on "The Safeguard of Judgment" ("Studies in Christian Character," pp. 14-31) was full of illuminating suggestion for workers.

The volume is well suited for devotional reading during holiday-time. The sermon specially referred to, though avowedly dealing with conditions of University life, is singularly adapted to meet the present situation in missionary centres.

* * * * *

The July number of *The East and the West* is full of varied interest and wide outlook. It is pleasant to find Bishop Gibson of South Africa, in his article on "The Training of South African Missionaries," quoting sympathetically from Dr. Hodgkin's article in *The International Review of Missions*. The Rev. C. F. Andrews makes a valuable contribution to the discussion of unity and co-operation under the unexpected title of "The King's Visit to Delhi." Canon Weitbrecht, Secretary of the Board of Missionary Study, ably advocates the study of phonetics in a thoughtful article written from a missionary standpoint. But the most useful paper in the number is that by the editor on "The Indian Religious Census," which gives in simple and lucid form the outstanding facts which missionary advocates need for use in addresses, study circles, or Sunday-school lessons. The number opens with an article by Sir Harry Johnston, whose strong statements as to "the value to the world of Christian Missions" are discounted by his meagre views of the Christianity which Missions exist to spread.

* * * * *

Jewish Missions, being neither wholly home nor wholly foreign, are not infrequently forgotten by the friends of both. Yet their claim on support is strong. The work, though strenuous and difficult, is full of encouragement, and the records of it are full of living interest. For the last twelve months—so we learn from the *Jewish Missionary Intelligence*—opposition amongst the Jews has been extremely strong, partly as a result of a rising sense of nationality among them. Yet there is everywhere a sense of the unsatisfactoriness of present-day Judaism, and a surprise at the results of Christianity at home and abroad. Many friends of the L.J.S. will no doubt gather

again at their Summer School at Swanwick from September 3 to 13.

* * * * *

Summer Schools, which are increasing yearly in number and in importance, ought to play a larger part in advancing the missionary life of the Church. Closely associated with them is the work of training leaders for Mission study circles for senior, intermediate, and junior work. The necessity for this is being slowly recognized on the Continent as well as in America and Great Britain. Besides the large Summer Schools, training centres are being arranged by the different societies at various centres. Wherever possible, a circle leader should avail himself of such an opportunity. From one point of view, a study circle is a very simple thing; from another, it is so important as to claim the fullest preparation. A few months ago, when a C.M.S. Exhibition was held in a Midland town, the preparation of stewards was undertaken by forty study circle leaders, all ready to hand. We are only at the beginning of what this movement may mean in the Church. It is urgent that the standard of work should be well kept up, and that, however useful subsidiary books may be under special circumstances, it should be remembered that each circle ought without fail to work through one of the unrivalled textbooks issued year by year by the United Council for Missionary Education. This year we are offered for adults a choice between an advanced book on educated India, by the Rev. C. F. Andrews of Delhi, and a simpler book on Outcaste India, intended for those who could not so readily profit by the other.

* * * * *

Next month we shall comment on various Winter Missions to the foreign field. This month we desire to ask special prayer for the Mr. W. B. Sloan of the China Inland Mission, and the Mr. S. D. Gordon of America, who are visiting the various sanatoria in China. Both of these servants of the Lord have ministered to many in the homeland. They will value our prayer on their behalf. One of the most fruitful ways of meet-

ing China's need would be the multiplication of spiritual gifts to the present devoted missionaries.

* * * * *

The Vacation Course for Missionary Preparation, to be held at Oxford from August 3 to 31, should also be kept in remembrance. The programme is a well-considered one, and gives promise of new things. Those who have traced the advance in ideals of missionary preparation since the Edinburgh Commission dealing with it began its sessions have indeed cause to thank God. Both in the home Church and on the mission-field there has been substantial advance.

* * * * *

The *Zenana* (the monthly organ of the Zenana Bible and Medical Mission) opens with a strong plea for women's hospitals in India. The Society reports, as the result of one year's work, 1,822 in-patients, 23,984 out-patients, and 70,341 attendances at dispensaries. The total medical staff of the Society in India, including doctors, nurses, Bible-women, and hospital assistants number eighty. But what has been done by this Society and others is as nothing in view of the need. "To meet an imperial need, such as that of the physical welfare of 150,000,000 women and girls, the present organizations are manifestly and pitifully inadequate."

* * * * *

Those who long and pray that the light and truth of God may be revealed to our fellow-Christians in the Roman Church will read with thankfulness an article in *The Bible and the World*, by the Bible Society's agent at Rome, the Rev. R. O. Walker. It tells of the opening of the new Pontifical Biblical Institute in that city, "to prepare Catholic professors and writers as specialists in Biblical science." There are twelve professors and at present about 125 students, and the Institute has a wide programme. "The latest Bible dictionaries, encyclopædias, and other works by Protestant as well as Roman Catholic scholars, are upon the shelves." Inscribed on the wall

is the motto of the Institute : *Verbum Domini manet in æternum.*

"The same motto," continues Mr. Walker, "as the courteous Director of the Institute reminded me, which stands engraved along the wall of the vestibule of the Bible House in London—'The Word of the Lord endureth for ever.' The coincidence is suggestive. Differences of standpoint and interpretation do not vanish; but love for Christ and for His Word must surely bring men together at last. Let us diligently study His life-giving Word for ourselves, and sincerely wish our Roman Catholic brethren every blessing as they do the same—'till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God.'"

G.



Notices of Books.

THE MUSTARD-TREE. By O. R. Vassall-Phillips. *Duckworth and Co.*
Price 5s. net.

The mustard-tree is the Roman Church, and its existence, beliefs, and sacraments form "an argument on behalf of the Divinity of Christ." But although this is stated to be the main purpose of the book, we are faced at every turn by special pleading, addressed to non-Roman Christians, on behalf of the author's communion with a view to their surrender to it.

The plan of the book is simple and direct. Each chapter presents, as a proof of Christ's Divinity, some feature of the Roman Church and faith. (1) The Roman Church itself, "written on the face of the whole earth," is the work of Christ and a witness to His Godhead. Christ prayed for the unity of His followers as a proof to the world; the Roman Church is God's "visible response." (2) The Papacy, with its surrounding magnificence and grandeur (which seem well-nigh to intoxicate our author), furnishes similar evidence. It represents the deliberate intention of Christ, who repeatedly identified Peter with Himself, and "placed him in the same position with regard to the other apostles in which He Himself stood to Peter." (3) The "Sacraments of the Dead" (Baptism and Penance), with the font and confessional, which everywhere proclaim them, again prove Christ to be God. "None save God alone could create the Sacrament of Penance." When Christ promised forgiveness of sins, He "foresaw the confessional at work." (4) The belief in Transubstantiation, in which "all the devotion of the Catholic Church centres," and which has been (according to Father Vassall-Phillips) "the faith of the Catholic Church at every period of her history," constitutes what he naively calls an "extraordinary" proof. (5) Devotion to the Blessed Virgin, which only *seems* to lack "express Scriptural warrant," provides "a great witness, that cannot be shaken, to the Godhead of her Son." Finally (6) the four remaining "sacraments," plus the "religious life," are evidential monuments to the power of that Lord who instituted them each one.

There is an introductory chapter on "Faith and its Evidences," and closing chapters on "Difficulties" (in the way of men becoming "Catholics") and "The Key to the Problem," which seems to be that, although *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus* is true, yet some non-Romans, in "*bona fide* invincible ignorance as to the divine claims of Catholicism," may be viewed by God alone as belonging to the heart or soul, even though not to the body, of the Church.

What he himself calls "the fascination of Catholicism" has unquestioningly cast its spell over our author's mind. With every possible indication of supreme delight he speaks of "the clouds of incense rising before the tabernacle of God, the music of the sacring bell, the raising of the sacred Host, the anointing of the weary . . . the picture of the Mother and the Child set amidst the flickering gleam of tapers, the murmur of the rosary, etc." Yet he is prepared to "concede frankly that there is no express Scriptural warrant either for the external pomp and circumstance of the Papacy to-day or for the gorgeous ceremonial of Eucharistic worship." Perhaps he had his own Chapter VI. in mind when he stated the difficulty presented to many minds by the suspicion of "sophistry" or "specious argumentation" in Roman propaganda. As an example of the distortion of the plain words of Scripture surely it would be hard to beat, yet he would like to go farther for *de Maria nunquam satis*.

The book is a steady, sincere, open appeal to English Churchmen and others to join Rome. Thus: "'Lord, to whom shall I go?' Is it to an impoverished Protestantism in all its vagueness and negations—to the Church called 'of England'? What shall we find there but the product of nationalism in religion, doubt and hesitation, a stammering voice and stuttering accents?" It is a Roman apologetic. It leaves us cold.

W. HEATON RENSHAW.

GREECE AND BABYLON. By Lewis R. Farnell. London: *T. and T. Clark*.
Price 7s. 6d.

There has recently been founded in the University of Oxford a Lectureship in Comparative Religion, and by the founder's wish the comparison is not to concern itself with the discussions of origins, but with the bringing into relationship the ideas and ideals of fully developed religions. The foundation of this chair will be regarded by some as another proof that the older Universities are unpractical and out of date. We venture to hail the new Lectureship as a real step in advance, and we do so from a Christian and a missionary point of view. A fuller knowledge of the old religions has taught us that, after all, they are the gropings of man after the God whom he does not know, and that our missionary method must be the method of St. Paul—the revelation of God ignorantly and sometimes immorally worshipped, through the Gospel of Christ. We shall never convert the world to our faith until we understand the imperfect faiths of the world. Hence we welcome the Wilde Lectureship, and we welcome, too, the first lectures in the series, Dr. Farnell's interesting book. It deals, it is true, with the religions of Greece and Babylon—religions which have gone for ever, but religions which have had their effect upon those which took their place, and some effect perhaps in language and thought, upon both Judaism and Christianity.

THE RESURRECTION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By C. R. Bowen, B.D.
Putnam's Sons. Price 6s. net.

This is described in the preface as "the first fruits of the author's New Testament studies." It is a *magnum opus*, and says much for the author's industry. It is a closely-written volume of nearly 500 pages, and there are many footnotes, displaying a width of reading which would do credit to Professor Bowen's favourite teacher, Paul Schmiedel of Zurich. The New Testament evidence is minutely examined section by section. St. Paul is rightly regarded as the greatest witness, and Professor Bowen believes that he held a spiritual theory of the resurrection of Christ and all believers, and that this is the real truth, which is seen overlaid with legendary accretions in all other writers. It will be fairest to quote verbatim: "The thing that 1 Cor. xv. says most plainly and insistently is that the resurrection of which Paul preaches has no relation whatever to the dead body and the grave. In fact, the whole discussion of the chapter is directed against certain in Corinth who have made just this mistake—which the Christian world has made ever since—of understanding resurrection to mean a rising in some way of the body that was put into the grave. The thing which Paul is here combating is the beginning of the conception which the Gospel stories present. . . . 1 Cor. xv. is the most forcible argument ever brought against the narrative of the Gospels" (p. 40). This is the net result of 150 pages devoted to Paul; but we have our doubts whether it is not upset by the simple statement, "I delivered unto you that which also I received," in which Paul affirms his agreement with the early apostolic preachers of "legends." St. Mark is next dealt with. On the story of the women at the tomb he writes: "If there seems less certain attestation for the episode of the women's experience at the grave than for most of Mark's material, the details of the narrative itself are such as to suggest legend rather than a transcript of actual fact" (p. 183). "In plain words, there is not the slightest reason to suppose that the women went to anoint the body, that the grave was found empty, or ever was empty. Every consideration, on the contrary, points in precisely the opposite direction" (p. 205). On Matthew's story of the guard we read: "It is entirely fictitious. It is from beginning to end without any historical foundation, owing its origin entirely to the controversy with Jewish opponents" (p. 267). Professor Ramsay will be surprised to hear that Luke is equally untrustworthy: "He offers many new elements in the narrative, all of which are unhistorical, save in the larger sense that they truly express the experiences of the Church in the first seven decades of its life. But the primitive tradition Luke has not entirely obscured" (p. 387). It is needless to add that "none of the elements of the Johannine story is historic" (p. 391). How, then, did the Resurrection legend arise? We are told on p. 456: "This is, after all, the great miracle—the impress of Jesus' personality on His disciples. It was so deep and strong, in a word, that they saw Him after He had died. This is the real secret of the appearances." We conclude by praising again the massive learning of the book, but for ourselves we still prefer the "simplicity of the Gospel," and remain utterly unconvinced by Professor Bowen's ingenious attempts at differentiation.

C. H. K. BOUGHTON.

THE GLORY OF THE MINISTRY. By A. T. Robertson, M.A., D.D. *Fleming H. Revell Company*. Price 3s. 6d. net.

An exposition for ministers of St. Paul's "apologetic for preaching" in 2 Cor. ii. 2-vi. 10. No words of praise would be too strong for the eight Bible readings of which the book consists. We quote from the preface: "My life is constantly with ministers. I know much of the struggles, ambitions, hopes, joys, and disappointments of preachers of the Gospel, both young and old. . . . It is not always easy in an unsympathetic atmosphere to preserve the right spirit and to see things as they really are. I have written this book out of love for preachers of the Gospel of Jesus. Someone may find tonic and ozone, as he comes close to the heart of his mission and life, in Paul's bracing words." Some clergy like to know of one or two good books to take on a summer holiday. We would suggest this. Dr. Robertson's paragraphs are characterized by a real understanding of the needs of those for whom he writes, and a wealth of apt quotations from the best writers, and, most important of all, they are of a high spiritual tone, and are fragrant of the Divine Presence.

EFFICIENCY IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By Archdeacon Cunningham. *John Murray*. Price 2s. 6d. net.

"In these pages I have endeavoured to follow out a line of thought suggested by the Report of the Archbishop's Committee on Finance, and to show how much may be done to increase the efficiency of the Church of England by new methods of administration, without the delay which is involved in going to Parliament for fresh enactments." The book deals with a wide variety of subjects: the Committee on Church Finance; the Presbyterian model; Convocation and the Representative Church Council; parochial affairs; diocesan administration; cathedral clergy; personal enthusiasm; public worship. Three sermons and a Charge are appended.

CHURCH UNITY AND INTERCESSION. *Evangelical Alliance*, 7, Adam Street, Strand.

Six addresses given at the central London meetings of the Evangelical Alliance during the universal week of prayer. The speakers are Dr. Charles Brown, Rev. W. Goudie, Rev. H. E. Lewis, Bishop Ingham, Rev. H. L. C. V. de Candole, and Rev. F. L. Denman. Bishop Ingham's address on prayer and world missions has some remarks on prayer quoted from Dr. A. T. Pierson.

Received: THE HONOUR OF HIS NAME. By Sir Robert Anderson, K.C.B. London: *James Nisbet and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. A warning against irreverence in using the Name of our Lord. THE SAIL OF THE SILVER BARGE. By Florence Bone. London: *Religious Tract Society*. Price 2s. 6d. A story for young people; specially suited for girls, and quite worthy of the Society that publishes it. SLIPPERY PLACES. By J. M. K., author of "A Letter for You," etc. London: *Religious Tract Society*. Price 1s. 6d. A set of excellent addresses for a Mothers' Meeting. STORIES FOR SUNDAY AFTERNOONS. By Annie S. Swan, May Wynne, Mark Winchester, and others. London: *Religious Tract Society*. Price 1s. net. Nicely written stories for little children. ARTISTIC LEATHER-WORK. By E. Ellin Carter. London: *E. and F. N. Spon*. Price 2s. 6d. net. MEMORIALS OF CANTERBURY. By Dean Stanley. London: *John Murray*. Price 1s. net. EMMAUS. By Right Rev. H. C. G. Moule, D.D., Bishop of Durham. London: *Samuel Bagster and Sons, Ltd.* Price 1s. net. SIN AND SALVATION. By Pastor F. E. Marsh. *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* Price 9d. net. THE TEACHING OF JOHN WESLEY, as gathered from his writings. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2d. SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF THE EARLY ENGLISH CHURCH. By Rev. Dr. Irving, B.A. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2d. WHAT IS "CHRISTIAN SCIENCE"? By Rev. G. R. Oakley, M.A., B.D. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2d. REFORM IN CHURCH FINANCE. By Rev. T. Allen Moxton, M.A. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2d. THE RETURNING KING. By Rev. J. H. Townsend, D.D. London: *Morgan and Scott*. Price 1s. net.