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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

January, 1913.

The Month.

Islington.

UNLESS we are altogether lacking in the prophetic gift, the Islington meeting of 1913 will not only be worthy to rank with its predecessors, but it will be notable in itself. The topic for discussion, "Church and Nation," and the names of the speakers who are to deal with its various aspects, not only suggest a meeting of real interest, but indicate a breadth of view which must make present-day Evangelicalism in the providence of God an ever-increasing force in the life both of the Church and the nation. Evangelicalism has no need to apologize for itself; it has its message strong, clear, and true for the perplexing age in which we live, and we are glad that that message is to be proclaimed once again on the Islington platform. We venture quite confidently to congratulate the Vicar of Islington on the wisdom and the good fortune of his latest effort to serve the Church.

Divinity Degrees.

The period of mere privilege is passing, and it ought to pass. We do not mean that privilege to render effective service should be taken from any individual or any class, but we do feel that, as far as possible, all men should have the privilege of service, if they be worthy of it. If that is true of service, it must be true of honour; and so we come to the question of Divinity degrees. Our Nonconformist brethren have rendered splendid service to theological study; a glance round the shelves of any clergyman's library,

even that of the most determined opponent of Nonconformity, proves it in a moment. Is it possible to withhold from them the highest honour that the two premier Universities of the British Empire can confer? We feel that it is not, and so we rejoice that there is real prospect that the degrees at both Universities will soon be thrown open. Narrow sectarianism will lose, but we believe that theology and religion will gain. Reunion of English Christianity seems to be drawing nearer on more sides than one. We unite in social service, in missionary enterprise, and in the search for truth. Unity in the search for truth will mean in the long run unity in the finding of it—that is, unity complete and real—and in that particular direction the removal of old-time restrictions at Oxford and Cambridge will help.

In this particular respect the year 1913 opens with very good omens. Cambridge, by the unexpectedly large majority of 109 votes, has spoken in favour of the abolition of older restrictions. Congregation at Oxford has dealt with the twofold question of theological examinerships and the opening of the theological degrees. The decree enabling others than priests in the Church of England to examine in the Honour School of Theology was passed by 133 votes to 28; the decree abolishing the ancient limitations on the Divinity degrees was passed by 153 votes to 35. At Oxford this vote of Congregation is not the last word. Convocation has still to have its say in the matter. We can only trust that, in view, not only of the weight of solid argument by which these decrees are backed, but also of the eminent character and judgment of the distinguished men who have supported them, Convocation will not feel called on to reverse these decisions of Congregation. We trust, too, that the sentiment of the two older Universities will not be without effect on the future policy of the University of Durham. Some there who hesitated to support the movement were confessedly waiting for a lead from Oxford and Cambridge. It is no longer possible for Durham in this matter to take the lead; she may now, at any rate, be well content to follow.

A Friendly Warning.

It may not be inopportune in this connection to address a word of counsel and of friendly warning to our brethren of the Free Churches. The situation is not free from complications. Nonconformists who are keen about this question of the Divinity degrees will doubtless, as they have already done, appeal to the general principles of Christian brotherhood, and will urge fair-minded Churchmen to act in a friendly and accommodating spirit; but they must remember that Churchmen are also pressing this plea in the matter of the Welsh Church. Brotherliness and kindly consideration cannot be sought from one side only. They must be extended from the Nonconformist to the Anglican, if there is to be any possibility of better feeling and fuller co-operation. The proposal to rob the Welsh Church of its ancient endowments and seriously to cripple its work is one that is warmly resented, and bitterly opposed, not only by Churchmen, but also by much of the best Nonconformist opinion in the country. A general attitude of taking all and giving nothing is not one on which a structure of future harmony can be reared. Nonconformists who are determined to rob a particular branch of the Church of its lawful means of support have no tenable ground whatever for asking Churchmen in the Universities to surrender old and long-standing academic privilege.

The Creed in the Pulpit.

Canon Hensley Henson, whom we cordially congratulate on his appointment to the Deanery of Durham, has recently issued a volume of sermons entitled "The Creed in the Pulpit." Not the least interesting part of the book is the somewhat lengthy preface in which he justifies the claim for a frank and "critical" treatment in the pulpit of the fundamental truths of Christianity, and deprecates the treatment recently meted out to Mr. Thompson by the Bishops of Winchester and of Oxford. With the claim for full investigation in the light of all the help that archæology, history, and criticism can afford, we are in the fullest sympathy. We also agree that the clergyman should aim, not only at being

conversant with, but at being able to discuss the treatment which their great topics are receiving in the Press and on the platform of the present day. But we cannot help feeling that Canon Henson, like so many others, speaks on the assumption that "criticism" utters one voice only, and that a negative one with reference to older beliefs. For example, he says that "Mr. Thompson's 'Miracles in the New Testament' is a scholarly and careful attempt to apply *accepted principles of Biblical criticism* [the italics are ours] to the documents of the New Testament, especially to the so-called miraculous narratives of the Gospels and Acts."

"Accepted Principles."

"Accepted principles of Biblical criticism" is surely a misleading description of the method prevalent in Mr. Thompson's book. "Accepted," perhaps, by those who take a purely negative line, leading naturally to negative results, and who regard the conception of a non-miraculous Christ as axiomatic. One cannot deny that this is the general tendency of much recent writing, but it may be questioned whether the tendency can maintain itself on strictly philosophical and scientific grounds. It is at once too rigid, too narrow, and too dogmatic. A truer criticism will aim, not so much at absolute negation of what is old, but rather at the proper correlation of it with the new. In a recent leading article on "Scientific Methods in Education," the *Times* says :

> "Science is simply knowledge systematized and correlated. The scientific habit is simply the habit of correlating every new fact of experience with all that is already known, checking the new by the old and the old by the new, and synthesizing the whole, as far as is possible, for each individual into a coherent conception of the general frame of things."

A better method of criticism than that which prevails in many quarters to-day will give fuller attention to "checking the new by the old."

The Need for Caution.

There is too great a tendency to assume that the "last word" is the final truth. There are three particular departments of Biblical investigation, in which, while welcoming fuller light, we may well be cautious

about the whole-hearted acceptance of prevalent theories. In the sphere of the Old Testament, the different use of Divine names, as the criterion for the discrimination of the Jhavistic and Elohistic documents, is being so seriously questioned, that a suspense of judgment may well be called for. In the sphere of the New Testament, the attempt to conceive Christ purely from an "eschatological" point of view may fairly be said to have over-reached itself. It may have enabled us to do more justice to the apocalyptic background of some of our Lord's discourses and to the apocalyptic element contained in them. But we shall do well to "correlate" all this with the older views of His Person and His Work. We are also face to face with the attempt to trace much of St. Paul's distinctive teaching to the influence of contemporary mystery religions. Here, again, we may admit to the full the interest and the perfect reasonableness of the investigation. But we shall do well to "correlate" our results with the older view that finds the main background of Paulinism in the Old Testament, and its main sources in the teaching of Christ, and in this way, possibly, to arrive at a richer synthesis and correspondingly truer conclusions.

Picture Shows and Sunday.

The picture show is now a well-established form of popular entertainment, and it is much to be hoped that it will not become a menace to the religious life of the nation. The question is being raised, and will doubtless continue to be raised with increasing frequency: "Are these shows to be opened on Sundays?" We have no hesitation in affirming that, in their right place and under proper conditions, they are thoroughly to be commended. One locally, at least, is known to us, where the advent of the picture show has meant a diminished attendance at the public house and a consequent improvement in the conditions of the streets at nights. But the proposal to open them on Sundays is quite a different matter. A representative meeting of actors has spoken in emphatic condemnation of such a step, on the general ground that the actor, too, must have his day of rest. Quite

apart from religious sanctions, which can only be expected to weigh with professedly religious people, and on grounds of national health and welfare, this increasing tendency to secularize Sunday ought strenuously to be resisted, and we hope that in every locality where the question arises, those to whom Sunday is pre-eminently the "Lord's Day" will join in common effort to maintain, not only its sanctity, but also its essential character as a day of rest.

Deacons and the Bible.

Once again the effort to vary the words of the question put to candidates for Deacon's Orders as to their attitude to Holy Scripture has failed. Frankly, we regret it; not because we have any wish to detract one whit from the authority of Scripture as the final court of appeal in matters of faith and practice, but because we feel that the question is ambiguous. We have no right to put an ambiguous question to young men at so solemn a time. Archdeacon Madden writes a wise little letter to the *Church Family Newspaper*:

"If by the words, 'Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament?' a Deacon is expected to thereby assert his belief in the literal accuracy of every word of the Holy Scriptures, then I think some change ought to be made in its wording. I certainly did not assert a belief in 'verbal inspiration' in the sense that every word of the Canonical Scriptures was inspired when I declared my assent, as a Deacon, to this third question. I did not read it so. I do not so read it now."

The Editors of this magazine, engaged as they are in training young men for the ministry, are quite clear that to the minds of some the question conveys the implication which the Archdeacon's letter suggests, and cordially agree that, this being so, an alteration is needed. Archdeacon Allen writes a full letter in the same newspaper, and his experience leads him to the same conclusion as ours. Surely, it is within the wit of man to frame a question which shall not be ambiguous, and which shall maintain cordial acceptance of the Sixth Article. We quote with complete approval Archdeacon Allen's final paragraph:

"I am not particularly concerned as to how the question shall be altered, but let there be substituted for it words which shall constitute a plain

question, which candidates can answer in a plain sense corresponding to the natural meaning of which the words convey to them, and, what is of great importance, to the lay people."

The "Vulgar" Tongue.

The word "vulgar" has lost its connotation with the centuries, but it still occurs twice in our baptismal service. To those who bring their children to Baptism in our poorer parishes it nominally means the rough language of the streets. It is a pity that it should be so. So the Committee of Convocation felt; and as there is, we trust, little likelihood of the children of the future being taught their Catechism in Latin, they proposed to drop the phrase. But Convocation would not have it so. "Vulgar tongue" represents an important principle, and we must have it, whatever it may mean to the working classes. A well-meant attempt at mediation, which suggested the phrase "mother tongue," was defeated, and "vulgar tongue" still stands. The Prayer-Book of the Church of England belongs to the people, and the "vulgar" tongue meant the tongue understanded by the people. The retention of the word is a breach of the rule that the word was intended to lay down. There is a conservatism which in the long run will tend to radical destruction, and the conservatism of the Lower House of Convocation is getting perilously near to it.

Evangelicals and the Problem of Ritualism.

By the Rev. E. C. DEWICK, M.A.,

Dean of St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead, and Teacher of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Liverpool.

THOSE who are able to watch the various types of theological students passing through our Universities and Colleges at the present time are familiar with one type whose career seems at first sight somewhat inexplicable. A lad comes up to college as an Evangelical by tradition, and, for some time at any rate, he does not come under the influence of any other school of thought. Yet from the very outset of his student-life it is manifest that he is drifting out of sympathy with Evangelicalism, and is being drawn, first towards what he describes as "Moderate Churchmanship," and, later on, to avowed High Churchmanship and Sacerdotalism. In the majority of such cases, it is evident that the motive which has determined this change of front is not primarily an intellectual one. It is not because he is convinced of the intellectual inadequacy of Evangelicalism that the lad transfers his allegiance to another school of thought. It is true that if his new position is challenged he will probably muster numerous arguments in its defence; but a keen observer will readily detect signs that these arguments are after-thoughts, the consequence, rather than the cause, of the newly professed sympathies. And however completely the student may be vanquished in controversy and appear for the moment to be silenced, the old tendencies soon reassert themselves with undiminished vigour. Clearly, then, there remains at the back of his mind some other motive which is the primary cause of his distaste for Evangelicalism and his craving for something else—something else which he thinks he will find in Anglo-Catholicism.

Now where are we to find the seat of this determining impulse? In many cases it may be traced with tolerable certainty to the æsthetic element in the lad's personality.

There are desires and emotions within him which seem to meet with but little response in current Evangelicalism. His love of beauty is not satisfied by "the barrenness of Protestant worship"; his musical and literary tastes are ruffled by the popular Evangelical hymn or the conventional Evangelical sermon. And as his "culture" is developed under the influence of college-life, these unsatisfied desires and emotions stimulate an initial "will to disbelieve" in Evangelicalism and an initial "will to believe" in some type of religion which appears to pay a greater attention to the æsthetic aspect of worship. When once an antipathy to Evangelicalism has been aroused in this way, it will normally grow more and more pronounced as time goes on, together with the corresponding passion for art and culture; till at last the breach with Evangelical traditions is complete, and another recruit is added to the ranks of the Anglo-Catholic party.

What is the right policy to adopt in dealing with students of the type we have been considering? It is obvious that arguments of a purely intellectual type will be of little use, for they do not touch the real point at issue. Even the highest type of spiritual appeal may fail to convince, because it does not appear directly to meet the need which is felt most keenly at the moment.

Two courses appear to be open. We may tell our æsthetic youth that Evangelical religion is so essentially and exclusively spiritual that art and culture do not properly fall within its pale, and, consequently, in the exercise of his religion he must forgo his æsthetic desires and emotions. In this case he will probably reply that he would prefer to forgo the exercise of a religion which imposes on him such conditions.

But there is an alternative course open to us—namely, to maintain that art and culture are not necessarily secular things, but are capable of being adapted to the service of even the most spiritual religion, provided that they are not regarded as ends in themselves, but simply as means to assist spiritual

worship. If we take this line, we shall recognize that in Evangelicalism there is room for a type of service enriched by art and culture, as well as for a service of plain and simple character. In other words, this means that the antithesis of Evangelicalism is not Ritualism, but only a Ritualism which is linked with High Church and sacerdotal doctrines.

This is the attitude which has been taken up (in practice if not in theory) by a number of Evangelicals in recent years. Stately music, surpliced choirs, embroidered hangings, are now used in many Evangelical churches, not because they are regarded as symbolical of any particular doctrine, but simply in order to gratify the æsthetic instinct. The incumbents of these churches would doubtless repudiate the title "Ritualist"; but, as a matter of fact, the practices thus adopted (if divested of doctrinal significance) differ from a more elaborate ritual in degree only and not in kind. There seems, therefore, no reason why we should not speak of such churches as representing a "Ritualistic Evangelicalism."

In some ways this affords ground for satisfaction. It is a good thing to demonstrate that Evangelicals are not tied to a rigid uniformity in the externals of worship. It clears the ground from secondary controversies and helps to concentrate attention on the doctrinal foundations which are of the essence of our position. A "Ritualistic Evangelicalism" is also to be welcomed, if it serves to convince the æsthetic type of Churchman that he need not necessarily join the Anglo-Catholic party in order to obtain full scope for his artistic sympathies.

But, at the same time, there are elements in this movement which give cause for some anxiety. There is, in the first place, the danger—almost too familiar to need detailed discussion—that a highly artistic and cultured type of religion should tend to foster an exaggerated idea of the importance of the externals of worship. An elaborate system of rites and ceremonies, however excellent, is always liable to attract to itself an interest so all-absorbing that its devotees are inclined to pay but little heed to that which alone is absolutely essential—namely, that worship

should be "in spirit and in truth." It would be hard to find in history any instance of a "Ritualistic" worship—Christian or non-Christian—which has not thus become corrupted with formalism and unreality; and it is not unreasonable to feel some misgiving lest a "Ritualistic Evangelicalism," however pure in doctrine, should suffer from the same cause.

But there is another feature in modern "Ritualistic Evangelicalism" which calls for fuller comment. Some of our brethren, in their desire to provide "nice services" without compromising their doctrinal position, treat the ritual they adopt as a mere ornamental appendage to worship, without any doctrinal significance at all. But the true function of ritual (whether it be of the simplest or most ornate kind) is surely to instruct the mind as well as to please the eye. The outward forms of public worship should be designed to suggest ideas in accordance with the doctrines taught by word of mouth. To this end, it is desirable that the ritual of our churches should be chosen, not merely because it is "the usual thing" in other churches, nor solely because it is artistic (though this will naturally be taken into account), but even more with a view to providing, so far as possible, an intelligible outward expression of the spiritual truths of our faith. Too often, new customs are adopted by modern Evangelicals simply because they are "nice," without regard to the fact that these customs normally and naturally suggest, to an impartial and thoughtful spectator, ideas which are really foreign to our doctrinal position. It is good to shake off the old blind horror of ritual quâ ritual; but unless our toleration be tempered with discrimination, the last error will be worse than the first.

A concrete illustration—not strictly drawn from the sphere of ritual, but closely associated with ritual—may serve to make this point clearer. At the present time, when an Evangelical church is restored, the architect employed is almost always one whose ideals of architecture are framed on those of the medieval church. In other words, his aim (in so far as he is allowed a free hand) is to design the general artistic scheme of the church

so that a magnificent "altar," enriched by the costliest ornaments, is placed in such a setting that it at once attracts the attention of the observer. This was the ideal of a church in medieval times; and rightly so; for it provided a clear outward expression of the ideal of medieval worship, focussed as that was upon the sacrifice of the Mass. Now it is of course true that the chancel of even the most "up to date" Evangelical church differs widely in its appointments from the medieval type of chancel; nevertheless, everyone who has watched the general trend of the changes made in the chancels of our Evangelical churches during recent years will admit that these changes have almost invariably been in the direction of the medieval ideal. Again and again the Holy Table has been raised upon steps, vested in rich embroidery, and adorned with handsome ornaments, till its general appearance is far more suggestive of a medieval altar than of a communion table such as used to characterize "the Churches of the Reformation." Undoubtedly we all welcome the change in so far as it increases the beauty of the sanctuary; but it is worth noticing that this exaltation of the Holy Table is generally far in excess of any attention devoted to other features of the church, which are often thrown into relative insignificance as a result. Now consider the effect of this upon an impartial observer who may happen to enter such a church. His eye is at once drawn to the "altar," the general appearance of which is such as to imply that around it the worship of the Church is gathered, as it were around a shrine. Will not this further suggest to his mind (if he is of a thoughtful disposition) the idea of a Divine Presence localized at the altar, and of a sacrifice offered there by a priest? These were the ideas which the medieval architect intended his chancel to suggest; and he designed it accordingly. Our Anglo-Catholic brethren, also, who aim at medievalism in doctrine, rightly imitate medieval designs in their churches; for they know the didactic value of external effects.

But what of ourselves? Is our Evangelical worship, in truth, focussed so predominantly on the ministry of the Sacra-

ment at the Holy Table, that the ministry of the Word at lectern or pulpit is of quite secondary importance? For this is the natural impression suggested by internal appointments of some modern Evangelical churches. Or again, is it really the case that our doctrinal principles have been drifting during the last few decades away from those of the Reformation, so that our present position is nearer to that of the High Churchman and the Sacerdotalist than to the position of the Reformed Churches? For this is the conclusion which is often drawn—and not without apparent reason—by those who have marked the general trend of recent church restoration and alteration under the Evangelical school.

As with the designs of our chancels, so with other aspects of the Ritualistic movement. Every new custom or ceremony adopted by the Anglo-Catholic party has been denounced by Evangelicals; but in many cases, after the lapse of a few years, these denunciations have given place to imitation—which is the sincerest flattery. Surpliced choirs, coloured frontals, turnings to the East—these and many others are cases in point.

Many a thoughtful layman, as he takes note of these things, asks, "Quousque?" He will tell us that we have met the advance of Sacerdotalist Ritualism with a mere show of conservatism, which has not availed to conceal the tacit surrender of one after another of the old strategic points; and he inquires, When and where is this policy of retreat going to end?

Surely it is time that we Evangelicals took up a more constructive line of action in face of the problem of Ritualism. If (as we believe) Evangelical Churchmanship is a living, growing, creative power at this time, why should it not exercise a definitely formative influence upon the externals of its worship? Instead of borrowing indiscriminately from an age whose ideals are foreign to our own, let us recognize the need for a more independent (and, in the long run, a wiser) policy. Such a policy would be guided by a determination to retain—or if necessary create—only such outward forms of worship as are best suited to express what we believe to be the New Testament conception of worship and religion.

But how could this constructive policy be carried out in practice? A full answer to that question is one which it would be rash for anyone to attempt who (like the present writer) has no claim to possess the artistic temperament. But much may be gained if we can only bring ourselves to realize that here is a real problem confronting Evangelicalism at the present time. And I would submit that one of our great needs is a rising school of church architects and artists who are at heart Evangelicals, and keen to express Evangelical ideals through their art. It is only with the help of such men that our school of thought can truly meet the needs of the æsthetic type of student, such as we have described above.

Perhaps it may be well (even at the risk of provoking hostile criticism) to mention, by way of illustrating the general principles advocated above, one direction in which a constructive policy might prove to be of advantage to Evangelicalism. It concerns a problem which (to the knowledge of the present writer) has been exercising the minds of a number of our younger clergy for some time past—namely, the position of the officiating minister at Holy Communion. In itself, this is, no doubt, a small matter; but viewed in the light of history and of modern controversies, it can hardly be dismissed as of no account.

Now, most of us, I imagine, are desirous that the outward form of our Communion service should express as clearly and simply as possible the Reformed doctrine of the Sacrament, which we believe to be in accordance with the mind of our Lord. We should wish the emphasis to fall upon the idea of spiritual communion and thanksgiving by the whole congregation, rather than upon the person of a sacrificing priest, or any actions performed by him as a mediator between the people and their God. With this aim in view, let us ask ourselves what is the most seemly position for the officiating minister to adopt? It is natural enough that our first instinct should be to select for our answer one or other of the two positions with which we are familiar in the present day; but if we can divest our minds from the influence of traditional custom, we shall, I think, come to

the conclusion that the most natural and the most reverent position—from the Evangelical point of view—is to stand on the farther side of the Holy Table, facing the congregation. If we were not so accustomed to the sight of the North-side and Eastward positions, I doubt if either of them would strike us as particularly artistic or reasonable. It is true that the Eastward position is well adapted to express the sacerdotal idea of the Eucharist and the mediatorial office of the priest, but otherwise it seems a strange perversion of true reverence that the minister should turn his back upon the congregation in whose midst the Divine Presence is promised. As for the North-side position, it was intelligible enough when adopted at a movable table placed (as the more advanced reformers desired) "in the body of the church," but when the Holy Table is placed altar-wise it is generally admitted that the North-end position is somewhat lacking in dignity. So long as the table is of moderate size, this is not so noticeable; but where it is large and magnifical, after the pattern of an altar, the North-end position, viewed from the nave, cannot fail to strike the thoughtful observer with a sense of incongruity. Indeed, the growing tendency to adopt the Eastward position may probably be traced in some measure to this cause.

Under these circumstances, I would suggest that it is worth while for Evangelical Churchmen to consider whether a "Westward" position for the celebrant might not be the most suitable and seemly for the purpose of expressing our ideal of the Lord's Supper. Such a custom need not involve any meanness or barrenness in the appearance of the chancel. It is true that the Holy Table would be placed at a little distance from the East wall, and that the conventional ornaments might require some modification. But this arrangement, if designed by a competent architect, need not detract anything from the dignity of the sanctuary, while at the same time it would ensure an "openness" in the actions of the celebrant which is often endangered by the Eastward position.

It will perhaps be said that the present rubric, directing

the "North side" position, is incompatible with the suggestion made above. But we know that as a matter of fact that rubric has been decreed by high authorities to be consistent with the Eastward position. Under these circumstances, is it not permissible to suggest that if the phrase "North side" can thus be made to mean "West side," there is no reason why it should not equally well be made to mean "East side," so that the position advocated above should be at least on the same footing as the Eastward position?

Nothing is further from the writer's wish than to suggest that the Evangelical school should adopt this or any other new custom hastily or without due consideration of its disadvantages as well as its advantages. To disregard either the wishes of our congregations or the injunctions of those set in authority over us would be a course unworthy alike of Christians and Churchmen. The suggestions made above are intended simply to indicate the possibility of meeting the Ritualistic movement in the future with a more intelligent and more constructive policy than that which has characterized the past.

Nor is it the purpose of this article to encourage a general growth of "Ritualism" (in the sense of an elaborate system of ritual) within the Evangelical school. A ritual of some sort is indeed necessary for any form of public worship (unless that of the Quakers be an exception); but a complex display of rites and ceremonies is foreign to the English taste—at least of the male sex. If Evangelicalism is to win the allegiance of the best type of English Christianity, its public worship should normally be grave and simple in form. At the same time, there is (as we have endeavoured to point out) no necessary antagonism between Evangelicalism and Ritualism; and a "Ritualistic Evangelicalism" seems to be really needed at the present time, in order to meet the wishes of those whose æsthetic nature craves for greater luxury in sight and sound than is offered by the average Evangelical service. There appears to be no adequate reason for refusing to grant them their desire within the pale of Evangelicalism; but, in view of past

history, it may not be superfluous to express the hope that our "Ritualistic Evangelicals" will not in their turn become exclusive, and look down with contempt upon their brethren whose tastes are simpler or more puritanical.

It is, after all, largely a matter of temperament whether we appreciate or dislike elaborate ritual; but there is one point on which all Evangelicals may surely agree, and that is, that the outward forms of our worship, whether ornate or simple, should not be prompted merely by the motive of imitation, but by the desire to express with the utmost clearness the Evangelical ideal of the Christian religion.

1912.

Provision by the Way.

By the Rev. A. J. SANTER, M.A.

UPON the threshold of the dawning year
Two messengers stand ready to attend
And me, by God's appointment, to befriend
And bid strong confidence take place of fear.
In them His own sweet Presence doth appear,—
Fulfilment of Love's promise, "to the end."—
O'er hill or dale, where'er my path may trend,
Their aid and comfort are for ever near.
Fallen, the hand of Mercy doth restore,
Fainting, the arms of Goodness me embrace;
I lie in peace on "restful waters'" shore,
And feast in joy spite of my foe's grim face.
And Death's dark vale is but the opening door
To my dear Lord's eternal dwelling-place.

The Church and the Poor.

A SERIES OF HISTORICAL SKETCHES.

By W. EDWARD CHADWICK, D.D., B.Sc.

I.

I. Introductory.

WE are constantly being told, and apparently with much truth, that no subject is of wider interest at the present time than that which is usually described as "the social problem." The term is an unfortunate one because it is so vague; and vagueness of terminology is generally either an excuse for loose thinking, or leads to looseness of thought. Actually what should be meant by "the social problem" is two very closely related problems: first, that of right relationships—how to secure that the relationships between individuals, classes, and even nations, may be what they should be; secondly, that of the right use of the possessions and opportunities of life. Both these problems are, of course, ultimately problems of character, and if they are to be satisfactorily and permanently solved, they must be approached from the point of view of character. In short, they are *moral* problems. And this is why it is the Church's duty to do what in her lies to help to solve them.

A very little reflection will show that these are actually the two problems which enter into all our dealings with the poor, into all our attempts to help them, or to assist them to help themselves. Our relationships to them and their relationships to us and to one another must first be rightly conceived, and then rightly discharged. Also our opportunities, including the physical, intellectual, and spiritual possessions of life, must be rightly used toward them; we must also try to teach them to use their opportunities with true wisdom.

The chief work of the Church is to be a witness or exponent, in life and teaching, of the Christian faith—that is, of the

doctrines or principles of Christianity. The object of this and the following articles is to try to show, by a series of brief historical sketches, the importance of a firm conviction of the truth of the Christian Creed—the sum total of the doctrines of Christianity—as the only adequate inspiration and guide to any effort to solve the two problems I have already described.

As an example of what I mean, let us consider the problem of right relationships in the light of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Because I believe in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity I believe that within the Godhead there exist certain primary or fundamental and Divine relationships,[1] and that therefore these (as being within the Godhead) are infinitely sacred. Also, because I believe that man was made in the image of God,[2] and that man was made a social being with social capacities,[3] I am justified in seeing a likeness between Divine and human relationships. Hence all *legitimate* human relationships are sacred. Thus one chief object of the work and teaching of the Church must be to try to make all legitimate human relationships actually what they should be.

As a second example, we will regard the use of the opportunities, including the possessions of life, in the light of the doctrine of the Incarnation. What is the meaning, or, shall I say, the chief issue, of the Incarnation? Is it not the sanctification of everything upon which human nature depends and which ministers to its right or true development? And this will include not only all the opportunities of life, but also all the physical materials, as well as the physical, intellectual, and moral forces of the universe.

As I wish to pursue the historical method, I may here point out a connection between the influence of two great Christian teachers and the two doctrines I have just cited. That the Church in our own country to-day is taking a far wider and deeper, and, I would add, a far more spiritual interest in the welfare of the people, and especially in the welfare of the poor, is largely due to the teaching of Professor F. D. Maurice and

[1] John v. 20, xv. 26, xvi. 13. [2] Gen. i. 26; Eph. iv. 24.
[3] Gen. ii. 18.

of Bishop Westcott. But to what, more than to anything else, is the great, and, I believe, the still growing, influence of these two leaders due? To this: that both approached the subject from the point of view of *Christian doctrine*. The social teaching of Professor Maurice arose from his profound belief in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and his equally profound insight into the practical issues of this doctrine. Similarly, the social teaching of Bishop Westcott arose chiefly from his insight into the meaning of the Incarnation and its inevitable consequences.

Both Maurice and Westcott were great theologians, and both were extremely able Christian philosophers *before* they became Christian social teachers. I mention these facts here simply as examples of the truth of the thesis I have already implied, that what is termed Christian social work (and of this work, that on behalf of the poor is the chief part), if it is to be wisely done and with permanently good results, must be the issue of a real faith in the whole Christian Creed. Of the actual work done by these two great teachers I hope to speak in later articles.

II. The Old Testament.

In a historical survey of the Church's efforts to help the poor, and of her teaching upon the duty of making efforts to do this, where should be our starting-point? "With the New Testament," would at first sight seem to be the natural reply. But actually we must go farther back than this. I have shown elsewhere[1] that if we would have an adequate conception of Christianity, we must not regard it as beginning with the coming in the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ into the world. The Incarnation is not the *first* event, it is rather the greatest event in the history of Christianity.[2] For the Incarnation there was a long Divinely ordered preparation; and the issues of it, though immeasurably great, are even yet incomplete. Among the greatest factors in the preparation for the Incarnation stands the

[1] "Social Relationships in the Light of Christianity" (Hulsean Lectures). p. 94 *et seq.*

[2] Westcott, "Study of the Gospels," p. 47.

teaching of the Hebrew Prophets. In this teaching the need of right relationships between class and class, and the necessity for a wise discharge of the responsibility of opportunities and possessions, hold a prominent place. A great part of the contents of such books as Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah deals with the duty of social righteousness, with the claims of social justice. Hence a satisfactory answer to the question, What is the teaching of Christianity upon our duty to the poor? must, at any rate, take account of the teaching of the Prophets of the Old Testament.[1] It cannot, I think, be denied that Christ assumed in His hearers a knowledge of this teaching—in fact, that He based His own teaching upon it as a sufficient foundation. He assumed it as certainly as He assumed a knowledge of the Ten Commandments and of the obligation to keep them. Only when all this is remembered will the wonderful completeness of Christ's teaching be recognized. St. John the Baptist was the last representative of the old line of the Prophets of Israel, and everyone will admit that his work was essential for the work of Christ. But the Baptist's message, as given in detail in the third chapter of St. Luke, is just a series of demands for social justice.

I am not going to dwell upon the teaching of the Old Testament Prophets. All I would say in reference to it here is, that when we speak of "the social teaching of Christianity," their teaching must be included as an essential part of this. And as Christ assumed a knowledge of their teaching in His hearers, so must those who profess to work in His Name be careful to see that not only do they possess this knowledge, but that they are careful in their dealings with others to act according to this teaching.

[1] "Our Lord deliberately took His stand on the Old Testament. . . . Our Lord assumed all that the Old Testament laid down. The Law and the Prophets had been struggling after the establishment of a great social system on a strong moral basis. The Old Testament is full of teaching about wages and human life, full of doctrines of social and individual righteousness. . . . Christ could assume all this, and He did assume it. He takes it for granted. It is the point at which He starts." (From a recent address by the Bishop of Oxford.)

III. The New Testament.

The social teaching of the New Testament has of recent years been so fully treated that there is no need for me to dwell upon it at any length. There are, however, a few points upon which it seems to be important that stress should be laid, and therefore that attention should be called to them.

First, in our Lord's teaching as given in the Gospels. Here I would notice four:—

1. When He spoke of the blessing of poverty,[1] we must not imagine that He was thinking of the kind of poverty that meets us daily in the slums of our great cities, and against whose causes and results we are continually waging war. Much more probably the words were addressed to those who "belonged to what we should call the well-to-do artisan class, with excellent prospects, open-air life, hard work, . . . with the consciousness that by an honest day's work they could earn a good day's wage . . . who could pray, 'Give me day by day the bread for to-morrow,' with the sure sense that they were praying for something within the reach of those who would work, and could trust in the ordinary order of the Divine Providence."[2] Have we a single trace in the Gospels, in Palestine,[3] of that hopeless and often helpless and rightly-termed "degrading" poverty of which our own country offers so many examples at the present moment? At the same time we must remember our Lord's definite injunctions to alleviate every kind of misfortune which prevents people living a full and thoroughly useful life.[4]

2. Christ's conception of life is full and complete. He says: "I came that they may have life."[5] He does not speak of physical, and intellectual, and moral, and spiritual life. He knows that for its fulness each of these factors of life is largely dependent upon the fulness of all the others. He views life synthetically—*i.e.*, as a whole, and not analytically, as we are

[1] Luke vi. 20. [2] From an address by the Bishop of Oxford.
[3] Luke xv. 14 refers to a "far country."
[4] Matt. x. 8. [5] John x. 10.

apt to do. Christ is essentially the "Life-giver" in the most comprehensive sense of the word. He bestows physical health, intellectual wealth, and the highest moral power. To use a modern philosophical term, Christ is an "Interactionist." Under present conditions He teaches the interdependence of the spiritual and the physical, and of which His own incarnate life is the outstanding example and witness. Consequently, Christ teaches the need of adequate sustenance for the *whole* of human nature, if the true work and entire purpose of life is to be accomplished. A careful study of the Lord's Prayer, especially of the connection between its successive clauses, will prove this.[1]

3. Christ teaches the immense importance of a suitable environment for the true development of life. This is the lesson of the Parable of the Sower, the first and most fully recorded of His parables. In the statement of the parable the failure or success of the embryonic life, or that which contains the life-principle, to fulfil its purpose is entirely attributed to differences of environment. In the explanation of the parable the same truth is again emphasized, but it is somewhat differently conceived. While in the first the environment may be said to be the individual nature into which the life-principle enters, in the second it is the environment of the hearer with the seed implanted in him.[2]

I am well aware of the tendency at the present time to lay a disproportionate stress upon the influence of environment, with the consequence that the sense of personal responsibility is weakened and self-effort is discouraged. But there is a great difference between doing this and attaching a *due* importance to environment. To-day there is certainly one school of social workers who fail to attach even a sufficient importance to this factor in the problem. This being so, it is essential that we should remind ourselves that while Christ does not over-

[1] Maurice's "Sermons on the Lord's Prayer" were published during the troublous times of 1848.

[2] Matt. xiii. 20: *ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπαρείς, οὗτός ἐστιν κ.τ.λ.*; Luke viii. 12: *οἱ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν κ.τ.λ.*

estimate, neither does He under-estimate, this factor. He attaches to circumstances their proper weight, and evidently in His opinion this is not a light one.

When we turn from the Gospels to the Acts and Epistles, and see the organized Christian society at work, we find the two-fold problem of right relationships and the proper use of possessions at once confronting those in authority. But we also find the great leaders of the Church acting in each difficulty as it arose, strictly in accordance with the principles either enunciated or assumed by Christ. In fact, the social teaching of the second part of the New Testament may be regarded as simply the practical application to definite cases of the principles laid down by Christ.

It is important to remember that both the first recorded dissension and the first recorded sin among the members of the Church arose in connection with the subject with which we are dealing. The way in which the dissension is dealt with is extremely instructive. I refer more particularly to the *qualifications* which those who were to deal with the matter must possess. These are three: (1) They must have an unsullied reputation, their character and conduct must be beyond accusation;[1] (2) they must be full of the [Holy] Spirit, they must be really religious men, under the highest inspiration and guidance;[2] (3) they must be "full of wisdom,"[3] they must be "skilful" through recognizing the necessity of obeying the Divine laws which govern human and so social welfare. Here we have clearly laid down once for all the essential qualifications of those who are to be responsible agents in what we may term the social work of the Church.

The incident of Ananias and Sapphira is not less important. Their punishment was severe because their sin was not only so great, it was also so comprehensive, and might so easily become

[1] Acts vi. 3: ἄνδρας ἐξ ὑμῶν μαρτυρουμένους.
[2] πλήρεις Πνεύματος.
[3] καὶ σοφίας. On the Biblical meaning of this word see my "Pastoral Teaching of St. Paul," p. 358 *et seq.*

epidemic.[1] Their sin consisted in their desire to be regarded as saintly without the cost of self-sacrifice. They desired to be held in high repute, and at the same time to give way to avarice. To take an adequate part in the social work of Christianity demands a much higher degree of self-sacrifice (and that not only, indeed not chiefly, in money) than most people deem necessary. It is easy to simulate, and so to obtain, a reputation for desiring to do good.

One very important lesson to be learnt from the Acts is, that frequently the bitterest opposition is roused against Christian work because this endangers and diminishes nefarious pecuniary gains or interests. It is when these are lost or jeopardized that the most bitter persecution ensues. St. Paul experienced this both at Philippi[2] and at Ephesus.[3] Now, one chief part of our work among the poor is to remove temptations which are placed before them—*e.g.*, to intemperance and impurity, by means of which other people enrich themselves—*i.e.*, through the poor being led to spend on these temptations their hardly-earned money. Frequently to-day the chief opposition to Christian social work emanates from those who have invested their capital[4] in these degrading trades, and who see that as this work prospers their returns diminish.

Though there are many other passages in the Acts to which I should like to draw attention, I will mention only one, and that very briefly. It is not always remembered that it was upon a distinctly philanthropic mission that St. Paul visited Jerusalem for the last time, and in fulfilling which he risked his life.[5] I only cite this to show of how important a nature he regarded this part of his work, a fact to which ample witness is borne in his epistles.

The social teaching in the apostolical epistles is very full,

[1] "Ananias has a great many descendants. . . . If they were all swept out of the Church as he was, there would be a number of pews occupied by 'leading citizens' empty and hung with black" (Dr. Maclaren, *in loc.*).

[2] Acts xvi. 19 *et seq.* [3] *Ibid.*, xix. 26 *et seq.*

[4] Workers in the temperance cause especially must be prepared for this opposition.

[5] Acts xxiv. 17: "I came to bring alms to my nation and offerings."

but here again I must dwell briefly upon only a few points. What must be chiefly remembered is that everywhere it will be found that, directly or indirectly, Christian social duties are taught as simply the inevitable issues of a belief in definite Christian doctrines or principles; they are regarded as the natural results of these.

The incarnate life of Christ upon earth was one consistent expression of a combination of two great principles—the inspiration of love and the responsibility of stewardship. The magnificent social teaching in Rom. xii. and xiii. is really an application of the principle of complete self-sacrifice (or love) demanded in xii. 1. But this verse was evidently written under the inspiration of xi. 36: "For of Him, and through Him, and unto Him are all things," and also of the appeal in the words, "by the mercies of God"—that is, by the tendernesses, the practical evidences, of the Divine Love. But this is the love which unites the Persons of the Trinity within Itself, and is the essential attitude of the Trinity towards man, as revealed in the infinite sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ, a sacrifice in which each Person in the Trinity shares.

The so-called practical teaching in the three last chapters of the Epistle to the Ephesians is (as in Rom. xii.) introduced by the word "therefore," which must point back to the doctrinal teaching, the principles, enunciated in the first three chapters. And even in these so-called practical chapters we constantly find St. Paul falling back upon some great doctrine as the source of an exhortation.

No sayings of St. Paul's are more frequently quoted than that which runs, "If any man will not work, neither let him eat,"[1] and that about not being weary in well doing.[2] But how many who quote these remember that both are prefaced not only by the words "we command you in the Name of the Lord Jesus"[3] (which must mean all that the Lord Jesus may and ought to be to us), but that in each case the word "brethren" is also prefixed? It is in this word "brethren" and in the term "the

[1] 2 Thess. iii. 10. [2] *Ibid.*, iii. 13. [3] *Ibid.*, iii. 6, 12.

Name of the Lord Jesus" that the appeal to principle is seen. Work, and especially work for others, is a sacred duty, a responsibility, because "My Father worketh until now and I work";[1] and not because of any utilitarian reason, but because we must do the will of our Father Who worketh, and copy the example of our Brother in Whom our right to the term "brethren" lies.

Similarly, the social teaching of the First Epistle of St. Peter is everywhere referred back to great principles—*e.g.*, to the principle of love, of humility, and of stewardship, each of which is a principle which governed the actions of Christ Himself. Then the responsibilities, the mutual services of a corporate life, are enjoined because God did not purchase for Himself a number of isolated individuals, but "a people,"[2] who as a people are to give the witness which only a corporate life can give, and which is the most powerful and convincing of all forms of witness. Our Lord stated that it was the mutual behaviour to each other of those who professed to follow Him that should prove their right to be termed His disciples.[3]

I pass to the Epistle of St. James. Its special key-note is struck in the fifth verse in the words, "If any of you lacketh wisdom, let him ask of God." Wisdom, which is the skilful conduct of life, comes from the revealed will of God. Wrong conduct, and this will cover both wrong relationships and the wrong use of possessions, is a transgression against the eternal Divine law of righteousness. The man who would "be blessed in his doing" (and of this "doing" social intercourse is a large part) will be a careful student and follower of this law, which, so far as it is concerned with the treatment of our fellow-men, is gathered up in the precept, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Where this precept is kept there will be no oppression of the poor. Jealousy and faction offend against the ideal wisdom, that which has a heavenly origin. Pride is yet another offence against the eternal law of righteousness. I need not go farther, for it is clear that in this epistle, if from a somewhat different point of view, we have the same lesson—viz., the inspiration

[1] John v. 17. [2] 1 Pet. ii. 9. [3] John xiii. 35.

and guidance of social conduct by great and eternal Divine principles.

Thus the social teaching of the New Testament is that right conduct consists in obedience to the Divine Will; and the Divine Will is expressed in the life and teaching of Christ, Who is the wisdom of God—that is, the revealed Will of God manifested in a human life which, if truly individual, was also concerned from first to last in the fulfilment of social duties—a life whose primary aim was to establish a right relationship between man and God, and then to get men through their sanctification by His Spirit to use aright—that is, with a full sense of high stewardship—all the gifts and opportunities with which God had entrusted them.

[The next article will deal with efforts to help the poor up to the time of the Reformation.]

The Prayer-Book Dictionary and the Ornaments Rubric.

By the Rev. CANON NUNN, M.A.

THE publication of the new Prayer-Book Dictionary has come as a boon to the Church. Its appearance is particularly opportune. The Reports of the Houses of Convocation of Canterbury and York have, after long delay, been recently completed.

The Report of the Sub-Committee of the Upper House of Canterbury led the way. The preparation of an historical memorandum was committed to five Bishops, whose views, however, had been previously in various ways given to the world.

The conclusions reached were in accordance with the prepossessions of the Committee.

The chief conclusion reached by them was announced in the following terms :

"We feel bound to state that our own study of the facts leads us to the conclusion that the Ornaments Rubric cannot rightly be interpreted as excluding the use of all vestments for the clergy other than the surplice in parish churches, and in cathedral and collegiate churches, the surplice, hood, and cope."

They were not prepared to pronounce for or against the use of vestments, so they allowed themselves to suggest that an Act of Uniformity might admit of diversity.

This illogical position was supported by a number of arguments founded upon maimed quotations, and much confused and incomplete information, largely coincident with, if not derived from, statements made by the late Mr. James Parker, or from the more recent works of Dr. Frere.

The Report was adopted by the Upper House, and resolutions approving of a "diversity of use" were passed. The Report was hailed with acclamation by those who had adopted

the use of vestments. They claimed it as a spiritual pronouncement, which justified the position that they had long taken up.

The Lower House of Canterbury adopted the conclusions of the Report without much public discussion, and with few dissentients. This was to be expected from the composition of the House, which is chiefly made up of Deans, Archdeacons, and representatives of Chapters. There are seventy-five Archdeacons alone, and only some fifty-six proctors for the clergy.

The Lower House of York followed to a large extent the example of Canterbury, though its composition is more favourable to the representation of the beneficed clergy.

When the Upper House of York was reached, there was some show of an independent consideration of the questions raised. But certain proposals were made by way of compromise or concession. It was suggested that a white vestment or chasuble might be permitted, if accompanied with "safeguards." But no proper examination of the conclusions and arguments of the five Bishops was attempted.

After long delays, the proposal for a white vestment was set aside. The voting was equal for and against.

Had the York Convocation followed the example of Canterbury, there would yet have remained the Houses of Laymen to be consulted, and finally the approval of Parliament would have of necessity been required, according to the King's Letter of Business.

The Church was, however, spared the misfortune of the possibility of its being reported that "the Church of England by representation" had resolved to seek to go behind the Reformation. The old saying, "Clerus Anglicanus, stupor mundi," might in that case have received a new interpretation.

But by the strenuous action of five of the northern Bishops time for reflection was secured. The Prayer-Book Dictionary has now done for the Church the work that ought to have been done in Convocation. The Report of the five Bishops has been thoroughly examined and sifted. We speak of it as the work of the five Bishops.

Some admirers of the Report would assign to it greater importance. The Rev. Paul Bull, of the Community of the Resurrection, of which Dr. Frere is the Superior, writes thus in one of the "Manuals for the Million": "In 1907 the House of Bishops appointed a Committee of six of the most learned bishops in England to investigate the question. After examining all the evidence, these six Bishops report that vestments cannot rightly be excluded."

The Rev. Dr. Dearmer, who is reckoned, along with Dr. Frere, among the "experts," writes thus: "The Sub-Committee of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury has presented its Report on the Ornaments Rubric drawn up by seven of our most learned Bishops, in which the new knowledge has been most ably summarized."

As a matter of fact, the Report of the Lower House of Canterbury described the Report of the five Bishops as "drawn by two members of the Bishop's Sub-Committee."

The Report thus variously described is examined with scrupulous care in the Prayer-Book Dictionary by the chief editor, Canon Harford, in two articles, one on the "Ornaments of the Minister," and another on "Ritual Law."

Before, however, this examination is made, opportunity is given to the advocates of the vestments to state their case. The Rev. Vernon Staley, a well-known authority, presents an article on the question of the Ornaments Rubric, describing the *prima facie* case, as usually set forth. In support of this, it is commonly alleged that the Rubric means what it says. "The Ornaments Rubric is a sufficient guide." In this article it is admitted that, notwithstanding the efforts of some to advocate a previous date, the Rubric refers to the ornaments of Edward I.'s Prayer-Book. The Rubrics of this book are given in full, and it is maintained that whatever may have been done subsequently to modify these Rubrics, the present Rubric, made in 1662, carries us back to the First Prayer-Book. The article concludes by referring to a work of Dr. Percy Dearmer for a description of the vestments which the writer holds to be lawful, and to the

Report of the five Bishops as conclusive authority in the matter.

The other side of the argument is then taken up. It is pointed out by Canon Harford that, as maintained in the Ridsdale Judgment, the Ornaments Rubric was originally a note of reference to the Act of Uniformity of 1559, which Act is the first item in the contents of our present Prayer-Book, though very commonly omitted by the printers.

The Act governed the Rubric as it appeared in 1559, and governs it still. The Rubric, therefore, cannot be "taken by itself." It must be viewed in its historical setting.

The section of the Act upon which the whole controversy turns is, as is well known, the proviso contained in the 25th and 26th Sections. It runs as follows:

"25. Provided always and be it enacted, that such ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof, shall be retained and be in use, as was in this Church of England, by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth, until other order shall be therein taken, by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of her Commissioners appointed and authorized under the Great Seal of England for causes ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan of this Realm.

"26. And also, that if there shall happen any contempt or irreverence to be used in the Ceremonies or Rites of the Church, by the misusing of the orders appointed in this Book, the Queen's Majesty may by the like advice of the said Commissioners or Metropolitan, ordain and publish such farther Ceremonies or Rites, as may be most for the advancement of God's glory, and the edifying of His Church, and the due reverence of Christ's holy mysteries and sacraments."

The question to be decided is whether the Queen ever took "other order" in the matter of the ornaments, and, if she did, when was it taken, and in what manner.

It is now generally admitted that the Mass vestments disappeared almost immediately after the passing of the Act. This is acknowledged even by Dr. Frere. "It is highly unlikely that chasubles were used except in some inconspicuous places, partly because there is no evidence of use, and considerable evidence of general disuse; partly because of the general destruction of ornaments in the first year of Elizabeth, both by unauthorized action, and also by the highly authoritative action of the

Royal Visitation." The Royal Visitors gave instruction in the parishes as to the disposal of the Mass vestments and ornaments. There is no instance of their ordering a chasuble, the sacrificial garment to be reserved for use. In some cases the vestments were destroyed, in others sold, or turned to other uses. Yet the Visitors spared some of the copes. The cope had been allowed at the service of the Holy Communion under the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. It was, in fact, the Protestant alternative to the chasuble introduced by that book. It was not authorized by the old service books. It was authorized by the Act of Parliament, which established the First Prayer-Book.

The question then arises whether the removal of the Mass vestments was by the order of the Queen or in defiance of the proviso, which directed that they should be "retained" until such other order. The proviso had been inserted in the Act by the special direction of the Queen. Without it she would not have consented to the passing of the Act. That she, within the following year, permitted all the vestments, except some copes, to be removed from use and generally destroyed, without taking action against those who removed them, cannot for a moment be thought. The Queen's consent must have been given. We must expect to find that "other order" had been taken, under which the vestments were removed. Nor is it difficult to find the requisite order.

A careful historian, who wrote in 1838, before the days of the "Oxford Movement," thus describes what took place:

"The Act of Uniformity authorized all such habits as were statutably used in the second year of King Edward. Had nothing further been provided, a figure, venerable, but somewhat gaudy, would have been presented by the clergy in their eucharistic ministration, though at no other time. A subsequent clause empowered the Crown to make new regulations in this case. Elizabeth saw the expediency of resorting immediately to this authority. Her first year did not close before a Commission under the Great Seal issued Injunctions, which relieved clergymen from the necessity of appearing in Communion offices

or on any occasion, otherwise than had been required of them in Edward's fifth year. They were to wear ordinarily an academical dress, in their ministrations a surplice."[1]

It had been resolved that the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI. should be re-enacted with certain alterations. Those who were engaged in the work of preparing for this step clearly expected that the "other order" of the Queen would not long be delayed. Sandys, afterwards Bishop, wrote thus to Parker two days after the passing of the Act with reference to the proviso: "Our gloss—*i.e.*, interpretation—upon this text is that we shall not be forced to use them, but that others in the meantime shall not convey them away, but that they may remain for the Queen." These words were written on April 30. The Uniformity Act had been passed on April 28. The Royal Assent was given to it on May 8. The Act was to come into operation on June 24, and the Injunctions were given to the Commission on the same date.

We learn some important things from Sandys' letter. He understood that the Act ordered the ritual use of the Ornaments for the brief space of time before the issue of the "other order." But he thought that the clergy "meanwhile" would not be compelled to wear the vestments, the intention being simply that they should remain in evidence for the time, so that no one could carry them away. Their ultimate destination was to be fixed by the Royal Visitors, and the churchwardens were ordered by the 47th Injunction to prepare an inventory of the ornaments. But while this Injunction prepared the way for the removal of the ornaments of the Mass, the 30th Injunction ordered the ministers to use "the habits and garments and such square caps as were most commonly and orderly used in the latter year of King Edward the Sixth"—*i.e.*, in the year of the Second Prayer-Book.

Upon this Injunction a curious question arises: Did the Queen simply mean to reimpose the Rubric of 1552, under which both chasuble and cope were forbidden? Had this been

[1] Soames, "Elizabethan History," p. 26.

her intention, nothing would have been easier than to leave the Rubric as it was in the Second Prayer-Book.

But, judging by her actions, the Queen would appear to have desired to retain the use of the cope as a garment suitable for display, of which, as Bishop Burnett tells us, she was very fond.

This question of the favour shown to the cope should be fully discussed. Dr. Frere tells us truly that the "cope wearing" furnishes the "real clue" to the question of the Ornaments Rubric (*Church Quarterly Review*, October, 1912). When he goes on to say, "the continuous wearing of the cope has all along been an attempt to preserve as much as possible of the original order which authorized the vestments of 1549," he misstates the case.

The Queen had ordered the retention of the vestments, not of "as much as possible" of them. Her Visitors ordered their removal, making an exception in the case of some copes. There is no suggestion in the history of the times that the visitors desired to spare any of the Mass vestments. The retention of the Protestant alternative, the showy cope, was, as a matter of fact, favoured by the Queen. She herself countenanced the use of the cope at great functions, and it is possible that the indefinite language of the 30th Injunction was intended to leave an opening for this use. Her Visitors spared some of the copes, being probably guided in their selection by the character of their decoration. The Bishops in their subsequent "Interpretations" of the Injunctions seem to have regarded the cope as permissible, and in the Advertisements issued in 1566 the cope was finally recognized as allowable in cathedrals and collegiate churches.

Canon Harford goes somewhat fully into the question of the Injunctions, and further examines with great care the mistakes of the five Bishops with respect to the Advertisements, upon the validity of which the Privy Council grounded their condemnation of the vestments.

The two articles deserve the most attentive perusal.

How, then, we may ask, is this exposure of their mistakes received by Dr. Frere and his friends?

An article has appeared in the *Church Quarterly Review* for October, written by Dr. Frere, in which, while commending the Dictionary in certain aspects, he endeavours to belittle its conclusions on the ornaments question. There is no detailed objection to any of Canon Harford's statements of fact, or of his arguments; but an attempt is made to show that the opponents of the vestments are not agreed upon certain points, and on this ground they are, it is suggested, to be regarded as confuting one another.

"The three views," he writes, "are incompatible with one another, and the arguments in favour of them are mutually destructive."

The "three views" are as follows:

1. That the vestments other than those of 1552 never were legal, the familiar printed Rubric (of 1559) having no statutory authority, and being, in fact, inoperative.

2. That the law was altered by the Injunctions of 1559, especially the 30th, and its administrative enforcement in the Royal Visitation.

3. The Privy Council has decided that the law was first altered by the Advertisements of 1566.

"Thus," he adds, "the opponents of the legality of the Edwardine vestments are divided. They cannot agree as to the date at which they became illegal."

It is ingenious to represent the three parties holding these views as three opposing bodies in internecine combat. But will this description bear examination? The first of these views—*i.e.*, that the 1552 Rubric forbidding chasuble and cope, and ordering the use of the "surplice only," was intended to stand—does not appear to be tenable. The proviso must have been intended to make some change possible. The new Rubric simply repeated the substance of the proviso. There is no justification for describing it as a "fraud Rubric." The words to "be in use" must have had reference to ritual use. When Sandys said, "we shall not be compelled to use them," he could mean nothing else than "wear them."

The advocates of the vestments are never tired of attacking this contention that the Rubric of 1559 was a "fraud." They gain an easy victory. Those who hold this view should examine afresh the second section of the Act of 1559. This section rescinds Mary's Act, and restores the Second Prayer-Book, "*with the alterations and additions therein added and appointed by this statute.*"

Now, one of these alterations is, without doubt, that provided for in the proviso. It is a common thing to find that those who advocate the theory of the fraud Rubric pass lightly over the second section, and append to the clause re-enacting the Second Book the words of the *third* section, which prescribe to the clergy the use of the Second Book of Common Prayer, "with one alteration or addition of certain lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year, and the form of the Litany altered and corrected, and two sentences only added in the delivery of the Sacrament to the communicants, and none other, or otherwise."

The words "none other, or otherwise" are taken from the first Act of Uniformity (1549), prescribing the use of the First Book. The words in this Act (1559) must mean the same—*i.e.*, that no other book is to be employed.

The suggestion that the (1552) Rubric forbidding the use of anything but the surplice must be joined up to the words of the proviso, so as to make it unmeaning (if the words "be in use" are to be taken in their obvious sense), is not to be entertained.

We may, therefore, put aside the first of the three views and confine our attention to the other two, and ask, whether the "other order" was first given by the Injunctions, and the Visitation that enforced them, or by the Advertisements.

The alternative as put by Dr. Frere misstates the case. It is not held by those that oppose the use of the vestments that "the law was *altered*," either by the Injunctions or by the Advertisements.

They maintain that the law was *carried out* both by the Injunctions and the Advertisements. In dealing with the case the Privy Council Judges did not say that the law was first

altered by the Advertisements. They said that they were "not able to satisfy themselves either that the Injunctions pointed to the vestments now in controversy, or that they were issued with the advice required by the section of the Act of Parliament."

But they proceeded to say that they were "clearly of opinion that the Advertisements were a taking of order within the Act of Parliament by the Queen with the advice of the Metropolitan." Having some doubts as to the Injunctions, doubts which might have been removed had the new light since thrown on the subject been available, they preferred, without pronouncing upon the Injunctions, to rest their judgment upon the Advertisements alone.

It will be seen that Canon Harford has satisfied himself that "other order" was taken under the Injunctions and the consequent action of the Visitors. With regard to the Advertisements, it is plain that they confirmed and further explained the order given in the Injunctions and at the Visitations. So far from the two orders being opposed, they are complementary and confirmatory.

The facts upon this point are briefly summed up in the words of the chief of the Revisers in the year 1662, when the present Rubric was settled:

"Now, these Injunctions are allowed and confirmed by the Queen's Advertisements" (cap. i., art. 3), "and those Advertisements are authorized by law" (1 Eliz., cap. 2, sect. penult.—*i.e.*, the proviso. Bishop Wren, "Parentalia," p. 75).

It is, perhaps, too much to expect that these misrepresentations of the views of the Privy Council will cease to be made, however often they may be corrected, but the correction should follow sharply on the heels of the offence.

Some Thoughts on the Why, When, and How of Congregational Singing.

By HERBERT ANTCLIFFE, Esq.

THERE are three standpoints from which the question of congregational singing may well be viewed with both interest and instruction. The history of the people's part in the music of worship may be traced back to its earliest days, and its rise and decline at various periods discussed. Such a consideration cannot be otherwise than helpful, as a means of encouragement in those matters which are right and of correction where we may go astray. Of similar benefit is the consideration of the practices of the whole of Christendom, or of some branch of it, at various times and in various circumstances, for by this we are assisted in the fixing of a standard for our own practice.

As the author of the following notes is one who for many years has been engaged in the work of controlling and guiding the music of the public services which, by the direction of the Book of Common Prayer, we sing week by week throughout the year, and the notes were prepared for the assistance and instruction of various parochial bodies, he has confined himself to the directions of that book and the issues raised by such directions. From such standpoint he has endeavoured to answer, in a simple and intelligible manner, the questions with regard to congregational singing—Why? When? and How?

I.

Music, just the same as all other æsthetic or artistic adjuncts to worship, has three main objects or reasons for its employment. The first and greatest of these objects, which also includes all others, is that of the honour and glory of God.

When we employ this art in the exercise of our worship, we must employ it as an integral part of such worship—as a giving to God something without which the offering of the whole man,

of ourselves, our souls and bodies, would be incomplete. Man is endowed with certain talents, each in a greater or lesser degree, and a certain portion of those talents, or of the result of those talents, must be offered just the same as we offer a proportion of our money, our goods, and our time. There are few, if any, who have no musical ability of some kind, and consequently the use of a certain part of that ability becomes a necessary part of the worship which the majority have to offer.

The second object of the employment of music and other arts in our worship is that of assisting the devotion of the worshipper; of arousing his emotions and preparing them to receive impressions from higher sources. Music, if properly used, is one of the greatest aids to devotion.

Of no less importance is the third of these objects, which is that of the attraction of those who would otherwise not be drawn to take part in the worship of their Creator, or to listen to His Holy Word.

In different times, places, and circumstances, the method of putting into effect these three functions, of carrying out these objects, must of necessity vary very greatly. We cannot now use the same worship music as was used in the days of King David, nor even such as was used in the early days of the Christian Era; neither can we use it in the same manner. It is all but impossible that we in the Western Church should use the same music as do our brethren in the East, though with the growing similarity in many respects of the people of the East and West, it is possible the day is not far distant when we shall be able to do so. At present, however, our ideas, our senses and temperaments, our training, our very feeling for sound values and effects, as well as all the circumstances of our lives, are entirely different; and so are, and must be, our artistic and devotional methods.

Even in the same country and the same district circumstances may be so varied as to preclude any attempt at uniformity, even if such uniformity were desirable. The church set to minister to the needs of a poor parish, with an inconsiderable endowment,

cannot possibly have the musical part of its services conducted in the same manner as can the rich cathedral where all are anxious to assist. Nor does it seem to me at all desirable that uniformity in this matter should exist.

There is nothing more absurd—and therefore, more irreverent—than the attempts which are made at some churches, where exists the least opportunity of doing so, to emulate the places where opportunity and wealth lie side by side, and where simplicity such as is required in small churches would, as a rule, be ineffective and in meagre contrast to the surroundings of a large or ornate building. The objects for which music is introduced into our worship can best be achieved by adapting it to the circumstances of each individual place. What would in one place be a worthy offering, an aid to devotion, or a means of evangelizing those who do not hold the Faith, would possibly in another place be exactly the reverse.

There is a story, told, I think, by Longfellow, of a certain monastery where dwelt pious monks, whose singing was very bad, but who sang with such heartfelt fervour that the Angels thronged around each night, waiting to carry to the Throne of Grace the precious offering of humble hearts. One day, however, a monk from a distant brotherhood visited them, whose fame as a singer had reached from one end to the other of Christendom. When evening came the monks sat round and listened, thinking all the time that never before had *Magnificat* sounded so sweet in their monastery. But the Angels wept that night for the absence of any offering to carry to Heaven.

The moral of the story, of course, is that however good our music may be as an artistic achievement, as worship it is valueless without the heart. It does not by any means imply that bad singing, or bad art of any kind, is more acceptable than is good. On the contrary, it cannot by any be considered so acceptable, for we must not dare to offer to God anything but the best of all we have. But it does mean that whatever we offer must be our own, and must be the result of our own personal efforts.

It thus happens that the manner and extent of congregational singing must, and will, be different in every different church—cathedral, parish church, or mission room. There are, nevertheless, certain general principles which apply to all cases; and there are also certain general rules which should be observed by all, if congregational singing is to be what it ought to be. Certain responsibilities also rest upon each individual member of every congregation in this matter as in every other matter. Everything must be done decently and in order, even to our singing, and this cannot be done without each following certain rules and accepting certain responsibilities.

And the first of these responsibilities is to sing.

I have said that it is our duty to offer as part of our worship a certain proportion of the product of our talents; and as the ability to produce and to appreciate music is a very valuable talent, it must be included in our worship if such worship is to be complete. Of course, I do not say that music should form part of every act of worship, any more than the offering of money or goods forms part of every act of worship. It must, however, form part of the system of our worship, and be used frequently and regularly. With rare exceptions we can all make some sort of musical sound with our voices, and can join with others in singing a tune; and having this ability we are responsible for its use.

The second of our responsibilities is to sing with intelligence.

Now, to sing with intelligence, it is requisite we should have some knowledge of when and how to sing, and when and how not to sing, and it frequently happens that the latter knowledge is of greater importance than is the former. We all know the kind of person who boasts that he (or she) cannot sing, but can make a joyful noise. Since we have given up to a large extent the frivolous and often irreverent custom of using Bible phrases on every possible occasion, which was so very prevalent not many years ago, the boast may be expressed in somewhat different terms; but the intention is the same. Such a one is a

concrete example of how not to sing, either in church or out of it. It is quite possible to be selfish even in our devotions, and those who disturb the devotion of others unnecessarily by singing in a way that is objectionable to their next neighbours are indulging in such a form of selfishness.

But, says the humbler one who is afflicted by the possession of vocal organs whose sound is hoarse and harsh, what am I to do? You say it is my duty to sing in certain parts of the service, and yet I must not disturb the devotions of even my nearest neighbour, who is probably a person of æsthetic taste and keen ears. What am I to do? The only person who is not distressed at hearing my voice is its owner. The position is certainly not an easy one, and each case can best be settled better on its own merits than by any general rule. We may however, see how far general considerations will carry us.

First of all we may note that while we must not be selfish in singing to the disturbance of others, there is no reason why we should pander to the selfishness of those who consider they have higher or better tastes than others. If they are taking a proper part in the worship they will not easily be disturbed.

In order to give no offence to the weaker brethren in this respect, however, we may make some difference when we know they are near.

If those who are troubled with disagreeable voices make it a rule always to sing quietly, taking care to control their feelings, and also taking care to sing only at such times as the bulk of the congregation is singing, they will, I venture to say, disturb no one.

It may be remembered, too, that a rough or harsh voice, when joined with many others, often loses much of its unpleasant character, and rather adds to the quality of the general tone. The richness of tone which we often hear produced from large bodies of voices is partly due to the unevenness of certain kinds of voices. This may be seen by reference to the organ. On the organ are a certain number of stops upon which we depend for obtaining various effects or brilliance or weight.

If one of these stops alone is drawn, the sound produced is harsh and unpleasant in the extreme, and it is only when combined with the others that any good effect is obtained. So is it, too, with many voices. Often the voice, which alone is quite painful to listen to, when combined with other voices produces a not unpleasant effect.

In extreme cases the self-restraint required to be exercised by those who have disagreeable voices, or an incapacity for singing in tune, may be an exercise which will be beneficial to the person who, for the sake of others, refrains from audible worship. Such a case would, of course, be one of the rare exceptions which prove the rule that all must sing.

All this relates to the general principles of congregational singing; and we must now turn to the directions of the Book of Common Prayer.

II.

There are occasions when the whole congregation must refrain from singing, even when the service is being sung, and is in the main a congregational one. Service books, and particularly our own Book of Common Prayer, are somewhat inexplicit on this subject, which gives those who wish to do so an opportunity of demanding what they imagine to be their right to take an audible part in whatever is directed to be said or sung.

In Morning and Evening Prayer the people are directed four times to join in the saying or singing of the service—that is, in the Confession, the Creed, and twice in the Lord's Prayer. In the Order for Holy Communion the responses to the Commandments are marked to be said by the people, and after this there is nothing but the "Amens" until we come to the "Our Father" after the Communion. From this it may be inferred that the intention of the compilers was that the congregation should not join in the other parts, or else that the question should be left to the discretion of the one who is responsible for the conduct of the services. The latter is the usually accepted

inference, and is the one that appears to be productive of most good.

All responsibility for the arrangement and conduct of the services usually rests upon the incumbent, and so long as they are carried out in a lawful and decent manner it is our duty to conform to the arrangements made by him. A wise pastor will maintain a mean position between the too ornate and the too meagre. His congregations will have the opportunity of joining in the services sometimes with their voices, while they and the official musicians of the Church will not be refused opportunities of offering the higher and more precious gifts of finished art-work. Where an elaborate form of service music prevails it may be taken that the congregation not only may, but, as a rule, should, join in singing the psalms and hymns, the responses, and sometimes the canticles.

The members of the congregation have no more *right* to join in anthems and set services than they have the right to assist in painting and renovating the pictures in the church, or building the organ, or decorating the chancel or the altar. If they are invited to do so, it is well and good they should do what they can. If they ask and obtain permission to do so, equally well and good. But except in those places where they are directed by the Prayer-Book to take part, they are entirely under the direction of the incumbent or other minister in charge.

In this way we may even be using another gift—that of hearing—in our worship.

If we can by the intelligent use of the faculty of hearing—that is, by listening to the music in which we cannot take part—be made to realize something more of our responsibilities, something we have not realized, or not so fully realized, before of the beauty of holiness and the ugliness and ingratitude of sin, the use of that faculty will not have been in vain.

But it must be remembered that the faculty of listening requires more effort and more training for its proper and beneficial exercise than does any other of our faculties. If

we do not by our own attention and care meet half-way the efforts of those who take an active part in such music, all their efforts will, so far as we are concerned, be lost. Among musicians of to-day the art of listening is receiving very considerable attention; it might well receive more from the average half-musical Christian.

With regard to the practical side of the question, where the congregation are actually singing, we have already seen the need of self-restraint on the part of those who suffer (or make others suffer) from their own unpleasant voices. The same self-restraint is necessary for all, including those who have sweet and powerful voices, though of course in a different degree, and possibly in a different manner. Anything which tends to make a person noticeable is always undesirable, and may result in self-consciousness and irreverence. Fortunately this fault is not so common with those who possess fine voices, as they usually have other opportunities of exhibiting them, and reserve themselves for more appropriate occasions. But nevertheless it is a danger.

Another very desirable qualification for congregational singing is a knowledge by each member of his or her part. By this it is not meant that we are to constitute ourselves into a kind of unbalanced choir, and each decide whether we have soprano, contralto, tenor, or bass voices, and try and sing those parts accordingly. On the contrary, the proper part for the whole of the congregation is, with very few exceptions, the melody. And we can and ought to make it part of the regular preparation for our Sunday worship, as far as circumstances will permit of it, to learn the hymns as well as the psalms in which we are to take part. If the necessary time can be found for the purpose, it is a good thing to learn both words and music. By this means we grasp much better the message which they convey, or enter more fully into the meaning and intent of the words which by singing we make our own.

But whether we do this or not, in most cases we can learn the tunes, and thus join in the first verse as well as in the

subsequent ones. To help in this matter, the custom of having occasional congregational practices and rehearsals is a good one, and is the cause of a much greater interest and appreciation of the musical side of the services by those not officially concerned.

The habit of taking to church a book containing the tunes is not, in my opinion, a good or wise one. There is a danger in this of finding, to one's discomfort and annoyance, that the tune at which we are looking is totally different from the one that is being sung. Very few tune-books meet all circumstances, and there is nothing more unpleasant than to be singing the tenor of one tune while your neighbour is singing the treble of another! I have known such a thing happen, with an effect that is better imagined than described. To those who have only a small knowledge of music, too, the use of music notes may easily be a distraction from the sense of the words, in which case the employment of music would defeat its own ends. It therefore seems far better to learn as much as possible at home, and merely carry a small book of words as a precaution against lapses of memory.

It is not easy, for those who have heard it, to forget the striking effect of the singing of the several thousand people who attend the People's Mass at Cologne Cathedral every Sunday morning. For an hour or more, except at the moment of Consecration, this immense congregation sings hymns, all in unison, and without books or papers. The hymns, of course, are all familiar to those who attend this service regularly, and are probably learnt simply by ear and by frequent repetition, so that it matters little to them what hymn-book or edition is used by the organist and choir.

Such a state of affairs is, perhaps, neither obtainable nor desirable in the ordinary English parish church, but it is the outward expression of the right spirit of congregational singing. Personally, I think we should do much better if we got nearer to this method than we usually do in England.

Sometimes a very fine effect is produced by a large pro-

portion of the congregation being able to sing the lower parts — *i.e.*, the harmonies. Generally, it is not fine; it is execrable! Most offensive is the custom, now happily dying out, but only a few years ago a very common one, of singing a kind of impromptu "seconds," which fits the tune and its harmonies or not merely by chance. I have heard this done with a tune which itself was very simple, but of which the harmonies were very elaborate and expressive. The effect was so atrocious as to drive all other ideas from me for some time. What it would be to those unaccustomed to hearing bad music is a matter one does not care to imagine. It certainly would not aid their devotion.

If those who find the melody above or below the range of their voices know the part which is more within such range, there is little harm done by their singing it—if it is sung unobtrusively. If they do not know the part, let them be content to sing such portion of the tune as they can, or join in with their heart while letting their lips remain silent.

One difficulty which occurs sometimes arises from the fact that the melody which the congregation should sing is not always in the treble part. The difficulty is accentuated by the great demand for soprano voices which exists to-day. In the days when women's voices were unheard in church choirs, and the boys were outnumbered by the men, it was customary to place the chief melody in the tenor. We find this arrangement now in what are known as the "Festal Responses" as they appear in most books of music to the Church services as a whole. In these, while the treble voices of the choir are singing a fine merry tune, the tenors and the congregation should be singing the more sober melody which is also usually sung on other occasions.

This arrangement of parts is very often used in Gregorian or plainsong settings of hymns and canticles, both elaborate and simple. Many arrangements of the canticles to Gregorian tunes have the melody of the chant appearing in a different voice for each verse. In such cases the congregation should stick to the

chant melody, and leave the varied harmonies and decorative parts to the choir and the organ. The effect where this is done is, as a rule, very dignified and impressive, and the untrained singer has no difficulty in singing the simple tune allotted to him.

III.

And here I should like to put in a plea on behalf of plainsong, or, as it is sometimes called, "plainchant."

Because for certain parts of the service we revert to the freer, unmeasured music of old times, there is no necessity to discard entirely the music of our own time. In fact, much modern music is in reality plainsong, with aids to its performance in the shape of bars and time-signatures. Plainsong, in its broadest sense, is that type of music which is controlled by the sense of the words.

Oh yes, I know there are some who will cry out, "What about the modes—those old-fashioned scales which generally start on any note except *doh*, and finish anywhere but where we expect them to finish? And what about the terrible misaccentuation we constantly hear when plainsong is used to English words?"

Well, modal music is certainly something different from what we are, most of us, accustomed to. But modal music is not necessarily plainsong, nor is plainsong necessarily modal. Some of the most modern music, and some that is most rigid in its rhythm, is modal; while the essence of plainsong is its freedom of rhythm. Certainly, however, much of the finest plainsong music we have is modal—and grand music some of it is! To hear it sung as it should be sung is almost certain to result in a conversion to its methods, while for prose words its freedom is a great gain.

With regard to the question of misaccentuation, this arises usually from the fact that the reintroduction of plainsong, after its almost entire disuse for a couple of centuries, has been left mainly to faddists who have learnt the rules, but have never grasped the main principle that it is the words which must

govern the accent of the music, and not the music the accent of the words.

In a language such as Latin, to which practically all the ancient plainsong of the Western Church was originally fitted, it was easy to make rules as to the regular recurrence of accents. When we adapt it to an irregular language such an English, we have to a great extent to discard the hard-and-fast rules, and simply to use the most common-sense method which the circumstances suggest. In the matter of plainsong hymn tunes, however, accents are comparatively easy to deal with, as the metrical accents are the same as in English verse. Such tunes as "The Royal Banners forward go," "Blessed City, Heavenly Salem," "Jesu, the very thought is sweet," "All hail, adored Trinity," are absolutely suited to English words and to congregational use, and are popular wherever they are sung. Besides these there are many others equally well-suited, which grow in popularity as they become better known.

As a matter of fact, all expressive singing, and especially that of prose words, is to some extent based upon the principles of plainsong, and frequently the question lies simply between whether we are to have music avowedly adopted to freedom of accent, or that which measures each syllable and phrase as it is sung.

In prescribing music to be used to the services of the Book of Common Prayer, the compilers provided adaptations of the ancient plainsong only. Whether this fact makes illegal any other form is best left for discussion by liturgiologists. If it does so it is sincerely to be hoped that the law will soon be altered.

The question of hearty singing is a burning one between musicians and those who do not claim this title. A little discretion and tact will usually quickly settle it, for it will usually be found that all earnest people are really more nearly agreed than they imagine.

We often hear the remark that "the singing was so hearty"; or that it was not hearty enough, or it was too hearty; or some similar use of the expression "hearty singing." Such a use

of the term is a very bad one, and altogether wrong and inappropriate. Singing cannot be too hearty! But it can be, and often is, too lusty!

Hearty singing is singing that comes from the heart, and if our singing does not come from the heart it is better left out of our worship altogether.

There are two kinds of singing which may be contrasted with this, and which frequently, though quite wrongly, are commended.

One, which is the common failing of choral—that is, choir—music of a high artistic development, is the cold correct style which suggests the flawless but lifeless marble. The other, which generally occurs where large congregations meet to enjoy taking a part in the singing, is the loud and lusty style which comes from excited nerves and mere animal enjoyment. Both may be the result of a good original intention which has become warped in its application; but both are bad—which is the worse it would be impossible to say.

It is not only possible, but it is the only right way, to sing the fifty-first psalm, or the hymn "Lord, in this Thy mercy's day," or "By the Cross her station keeping," heartily; yet there is nothing in any of these which we should sing in anything but a quiet tone of voice and a sober manner.

Some hymn-books provide marks of expression, which, if used in a reasonable way, are excellent helps in grasping the meaning of the words and putting it into sound. Of course such marks as these have to be read with discretion. One very popular hymn-book had been ridiculed among musical folk for its many marks. These, when taken in a strict literal sense, make the singing sound very absurd; when read in a broad general way, and as suggestions rather than as directions, they can be made a great aid to good and expressive singing. As an example we may assume that the marks F (*forte* = loud) and P (*piano* = soft) follow each other rapidly in a single stanza. Sudden changes from soft to loud and from loud to soft would be both difficult and ineffective; but a gentle undulation of tone

from a little louder to a little softer, and *vice versâ*, makes the singing as expressive as the spoken word, and often more so. Where no such marks are inserted, the words and our own feelings must be the guide, and we shall not go far wrong if only we use our good sense and self-control.

The evangelizing power of music is not unrecognized, though that of congregational singing is perhaps not so well realized as it should be. In many cases it is much greater than that of choral or solo singing, or other kinds of music, and there are not a few instances where it has proved even greater than that of the spoken word, and of other forms of preaching and teaching.

Among some religious bodies fine singing and good instrumental music are made much of as a means to attract those who would not be drawn in by higher principles. This system is not without its good qualities, and we cannot afford to despise it. There is no doubt, however, that most of those who try to perform their religious duties vicariously, or who are content to spend their week-ends in idleness or secular work, are more attracted by good congregational singing than by any mere æsthetic attraction. Moreover, they are much more likely to be impressed by the meaning of words which they themselves sing, than by any words sung by others on their behalf—even assuming they can hear the words in the latter case, which cannot always be done.

Therefore, for this reason, as well as for the more personal ones, it behoves us to make the congregational singing as good as possible by singing, whenever proper occasions arise, with intelligence and devotion, and by encouraging and helping others to do the same.

In these ways shall we not only be learning to take part in the great heavenly and eternal song, but shall be joining here with the saints and holy angels in their worship, and doing something, small though it be, to obtain an answer to the prayer which we offer at our Lord's behest: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

Bergson's Psychology.[1]

By the Rev. Dr. GREGORY SMITH.

PROFESSOR BERGSON'S philosophy has many exponents in this country, none, perhaps, more lucid than Mr. Lindsay and Mr. Solomon. They have the art, not too common among philosophers, of making an intricate subject interesting generally. Long ago the prince of catechists "drew philosophy down from the clouds" to brighten and sweeten the lives of men. But in the chaotic time, when the inrush of barbaric hordes almost wrecked the civilization of Europe, the shy visitant fled for shelter to the student's cell, and there wove cobwebs. The days of ponderous folios in a cryptic phraseology seem far away now from us; but the old bifurcation thought and action is with us still. Philosophy, the ethereal element in the wear and tear of a material life, has too long been the peculiar property of a privileged few. But there are signs now, as we have been told lately by Professor Hobson, of a tendency to "democratize" knowledge, to make it more accessible to the many. The first step in this direction is to get rid of "the jargon of the schools," a very different thing from "the sweet jargoning" of birds in the woods, about which poets sing.

Without a certain amount of sympathy, criticism merely beats the air. If I seem less appreciative than others of one who is without doubt a keen and vigorous thinker, this is far from my intention. But the very qualities which lend a special charm to the Bergson lectures bring with them a special danger.

[1] "Essai sur les Données Immédiates de la Conscience," par Henri Bergson, Membre de l'Institut, Professeur au College de France. Paris: Felix Alcan.

"Matière et Mémoire: Essai sur la Relation du Corps à l'Ésprit," par Henri Bergson, Membre de l'Institut, Professeur au College de France. Paris: Felix Alcan.

"The Philosophy of Bergson," by A. D. Lindsay, Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College, Oxford. Dent and Sons.

"Bergson," by Joseph Solomon. Constable.

The brilliant sword-play, the swift flashes of thought, so quick as to look like intuition, the apt and vivid illustration—all this is rather dazzling. If the theorizings now and again lose touch with actuality and vanish into thin air, if a remarkable subtlety of discernment sometimes spends itself in gossamer work, if the philosophy is apt to be too deductive—these are the almost inevitable accidents of genius.

To build up a world-system; to measure the height, the depth, the totality of the universe, is a large enterprise—too large for even the lifelong absorption of a Spinoza. Sir Oliver Lodge, after quoting (*Hibbert Journal*, January, 1912) Mr. Balfour's "The End of Life is the Development of Spirit in Matter," seems to prefer "the Development of Self." Seldom, if ever, can one mind gain complete mastery over even one department of thought. To master them all, and to balance the bearings of each on each and on the whole, requires omniscience. If we try to get behind the world of phenomena into the absolute meaning of "things in themselves," we lose ourselves "in the holy jungle of transcendental metaphysics." One may believe that "nothing in the universe is isolated" without knowing how the parts are fitted together. But the conqueror sighs for new worlds to conquer. The captive bird beats her wings against the bars of her cage. The limitations of thought baffle the inquirer. The Positivist is right, that inquiry must start from what is palpable, though he is not right if he would make it stop there. The guessings of ontology stimulate, though they cannot satisfy. If it is rash to argue from teleology, it is quite as unscientific to say that there is not, cannot be, any such thing.

In psychology, the study of the component parts of human nature, we are on firmer ground. Here we have solid fact in the workings of heart and brain, something also solid even in the seemingly lawless vagaries of the will, so far as it manifests itself in conduct and character.[1] The inductive method, which

[1] Professor McDougall, in his interesting little volume "Psychology," defines psychology as "the study of behaviour." Williams and Norgate.

the *Novum Organum* resuscitated, like the Phœnix, from the ashes of Aristotelianism, is the only sure foundation on which to build. The medieval schoolmen were sound enough in their apparatus of deductive logic, but their analysis and induction were altogether inadequate. They were making bricks without straw. The question between necessity and responsibility, most vital of all questions, cannot be settled by *a priori* reasoning.

It is worth while to compare—sometimes to contrast—Bergson with Grote,[1] the Plato and the Aristotle of modern philosophy. The difference is often more verbal than real—in the way of expressing rather than in the thought itself. A difference in nomenclature is of small account, if the meaning is the same. "Brain cells" or "brain tissues," "connection" or "communication" between object and subject—word-variations such as these are nothing, so long as the fundamental truth is recognized that, though the growth of the several parts of the organism is vegetative and their operation mechanical, there is in the personality the responsibility of a self-centred choice, whether we call it "life-force" with M. Bergson or "spirit" with S. T. Coleridge. Both Grote and Bergson distinguish the two stages of sensation—the external, which is passive and unconscious; the internal, which is consciously active. Both hold that the merely material contact of, say, the hand with the table becomes perceptive only when a something else comes into play which is not material. That the external matter, acting on the body, should of itself produce sensation is, says Bergson, absolutely self-contradictory. Thus, even in the rudimentary stage of experience—the ἀρχη whence all else proceeds—something more than the mere impact of inert matter on matter is necessitated; something which is supplied by the co-ordination of heart, brain, will; something "mediated by a certain nervous organization, involving the co-operation of the entire self." So, again, Bergson argues that perception

[1] "Exploratio Philosophica," by John Grote, B.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Cambridge. Edited by Joseph Bickersteth Mayor, D.D., etc. The University Press, 1900.

is "selective" because it is not "continuous." Like Grote, he seems to think of language as indispensable to thought. Is not language only the shorthand, the labelling of thought?

Both philosophers, taking "action" in its widest sense, abstract as well as concrete, regard thought as the germ of action, as "nascent" or "inchoate" action. "Spirit as well as matter," Bergson teaches, "is involved in action." "Life is orientated towards action." "Mental operations can only be understood in their relation to action." Sir Oliver Lodge has reminded us "Life is an arena of conflict and struggle; it calls out vigorous exertion." We are told that in amœba irritability and contractility are simultaneous, and, as anyone can see, in a dog the bark and bite follow the emotive impulse and the conception instantaneously.[1] Grote and Bergson, while recognizing that the human organism is in its faculties, considered separately, automatic, insist that man is not an automaton. Both maintain that, though consciousness passes through successive changes, the self which experiences these changes loses not its identity. In Bergson's words, "The consciousness is one"; "Self is a living unity" ("C'est le même moi"), though modified continually by successive experiences.

With Grote as with Bergson, time is more subjective than space—a philosophic dogma which daily experience endorses, as Shakespeare knew when he spoke in "As You Like It" of time "ambling" or "galloping" according to the mood of anyone at any particular moment.[2] To Grote time and space are merely "conditions" of our existence. With Bergson the keynote of his argument against materialism is that the action of the spiritual element in man must be considered in time, not in space; as successive, not simultaneous; as differentiated by quality, not by quantity.

Memory is, perhaps, of all the functions of the brain, the

[1] *Cf.* Hartley's "vibrations in delicate nervous strings all over the body, brain and all," and Grote's "network of filaments."

[2] *Cf.*
"Sweet happy days, that were as long
As twenty days are now."
T. Hood.

most mechanical. It is well described by Grote as the "penumbra" of sensation. Even here, as in sensation, Bergson sees something at work which is not mechanical. The other parts of the organism co-operate. As a sensation evokes a memory, so memory makes sensation more intense. The shock of plunging into cold water or the slipperiness of ice is not always a sensation merely: it may be sensation intensified by recollection. And the will has to consent; it selects. For, as Bergson reminds us continually, everything in man's organism points to action, something to be done or left undone. "How was it?" means practically "How shall it be?" The Professor goes on to distinguish two kinds of memory: one, for instance, of a lesson learnt, another of the time and place, when and where it was learnt; or the memory which guides the muscular movements in bicycling, and the memory of a particular incident on the road. But the distinction, so far as it denotes a difference, is in degree rather than in kind. In all cases alike "the past is incorporated into the present." It is the force of habit, a very potent force, which makes one of these two kinds of memory seem to differ from the other. When habit has done its part, it lies dormant till some circumstance calls it up again. M. Bergson seems to demur to calling the brain "a storehouse of memories." And yet he holds that "similarity acts objectively like a force"—in other words, that the law of association (like to like) acts like the law of gravitation; and in his "Mémoire et Matière" we read, "La représentation est toujours là, mais virtuelle"—latent in the reservoir of the cerebellum, overlaid by more recent experiences. Indeed, he has described memory very happily as a *parqueterie*, a mosaic of sensations.

M. Bergson seems distrustful of logic. Instinct, he says, is less apt to err than reason. But the scope of instinct is very limited. Instinct works in a circle, immeasurably narrower than the range of reason; heredity is stronger in lower organisms than in the highly developed. The failures of logic come, not from any flaw in the laws of thought, but from the misapplication of them; not from the implement, but from the way of handling

it. If the premisses are sound, the conclusion must follow as surely as a sum in addition. The "if" lies in the inevitable incompleteness of the inductive process, which has been, and ever will be, the barrier to intellectual progress. The nearest approach to certainty is the ineffaceable line which demarcates right from wrong ethically. All else is the "perpetual flux" of Heraclitus; the theory of to-day is a bygone thing to-morrow. But this instability is no fault of the laws of thought. They rest on the elemental principle of identity or non-identity, and although similarity, however close, is not identity, to classify things by their likeness or unlikeness must serve for practical purposes. To depreciate logic is to open the door to any kind of mysticism, however unreasonable. It is to saw off the branch on which you are sitting.

It would help to clear the fog away if the several functions which are the province of the psychologist—several, though acting together in "the entire self," thought, emotion, will—were defined more clearly. We want more anatomizing in psychology. Bodily ailments, it is often said, can never be treated completely till the healer shall be able to see, as through a window, what is going on inside his patient. So in psychology. One is grateful to a thinker so acute, so profound as M. Bergson, for aiding the physiologists to do this.

It is not to be expected that even a really great philosopher can command assent on all points. Some even of his adherents may hesitate to follow M. Bergson's more daring flights. But he asserts the vital truth, that man is not a mere machine, not a motor-car without a driver. By reasonings educed from considerations of time and space, of quality and quantity, etc., he reaches the goal, which others have reached by a less circuitous route, that it rests with the self to open or to close the floodgates to the passions of the heart and to the speculations of the brain.

General Booth and his Mission.

By the Rev. A. J. HUMPHREYS, B.A., B.D.,
Curate-in-Charge of St. Paul's, Accrington.

GENERAL BOOTH was a man with a mission. He felt it his duty to "go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in." His mission was to the outcast and poor.

We may not always agree with the methods of the Salvation Army. They often seem too rough and crude for more sensitive souls; and the matter-of-fact way of putting certain doctrines does not always appeal to the more refined, and may shock or repel those who otherwise would be in sympathy with the objects of the movement. But all such criticism is on the surface, and does not touch the heart of General Booth's mission. Before we dare criticize, we must learn; we must see that our sympathies with the objects of the mission are quickened before we are in a proper position to judge of the methods. Every prophet has alienated some people; and a prophet's originality does not always appeal to the good folk who love the conventions. It may be that General Booth adopted the most suitable methods for the attainment of his object. At any rate, if we believe in the object, it rests with us to find better methods.

Now it is somewhat humiliating to find that still another prophet could find no home in the older organized Churches. One assumes here what is now commonly agreed—that the Salvation Army has done an enormously valuable and much-needed work, and has taught us the necessity of the Church seeking and saving the lost. William Booth was born in a Church of England family and baptized as a member of the Church of England, but he did not remain long in the Church, and was early attracted to the Wesleyans. But the Wesleyans have not so much kept alive John Wesley's evangelistic spirit as stereotyped his methods into a new conventional groove, and

William Booth believed that he could be of much more use preaching in the streets than addressing a respectable congregation as a local preacher; hence his severance from the Wesleyans. The Congregationalists pleased him no better, and, though he was ordained a minister of the Methodist New Connexion in 1858, the Conference finally threw him over in 1861 owing to his unconventional methods. Since that time he managed his own organization, although the title "The Salvation Army" was not adopted until 1877.

We cannot blame General Booth for his isolation. He had the same justification as John Wesley had in his day, although perhaps Wesley tried harder to keep in touch with the wider Church. But the isolation has not been in all ways good. The working-man has largely taken up his schemes of social reform, but neglected his form of religion; and in so far as the older Churches have not combined social reform with spiritual salvation they have been left stranded "high and dry." The great danger of our time is lest material welfare solely shall be sought by the working classes, while their spiritual welfare is not so much as thought of. This is, of course, totally alien from the spirit of General Booth, who taught that material welfare and spiritual welfare were almost inseparably mingled. He sought material improvements because he found that they were the necessary basis on which to build spiritual improvement. The conditions of life for thousands of our population are so degrading that it is almost hopeless to expect that the soul can be kept pure. Body and soul mutually influence each other: the foul body degrades the soul, and the foul soul degrades the body. Give a man food, air, cleanliness, and there is hope of a pure and spotless soul, just as a pure soul will, if the struggle be not too great, fashion for itself a pure and clean environment. It was this mutual interplay of bodily conditions and spiritual that lay at the heart of the great appeal, "In Darkest England, and the Way Out."

We cannot say what will happen now to the Salvation Army. For some time, at any rate, it will go on under the

inspiration of its great founder. But there are signs that its power has reached its zenith, and that henceforth, as a separate organization, it may wane. The real success of General Booth's work will be in the degree in which his spirit pervades all the Churches. Every Church should be a Salvation Army. Every Church ought to provide the link between the rich and the poor, the educated and the uneducated, the saint and the sinner, the spiritual and the material. It should not be necessary to form a separate organization for the rescue of the outcast, another for social reform, one for the rich, and one for the poor. There may be room for separate societies emphasizing certain necessary works, but they should all be within the one Church. Where the spirit of exclusiveness reigns, there you have Pharisaism, class-feeling, mutual distrust. The exclusive Church ceases to be Christian, for the Christian Church is the Communion of all faithful people.

Now this exclusive spirit is by no means uncommon in our churches, and this applies quite, or nearly, as much to the Nonconformists as to ourselves. Time was when the church was regarded as the place for the rich and the chapel the home of the poor. But in many places, with the growth of Nonconformist prosperity, the position is exactly reversed. Workingmen often say they do not attend the chapel because, perhaps, the deacons are those who grind them down during the week. One remembers a Nonconformist chapel where the deacons would not hear of a men's service because they would dirty the cushions. If the cushions are more important than the saving of a soul, can you wonder that men stay away from church? But many indications of this exclusiveness may be named. If a church is too richly upholstered, it does not look inviting to a working-man; it is not as comfortable as the plain, democratic bench. If the pew he enters has the name of the proprietor on the end, he wonders all through the service if he is keeping anybody else out of his seat—that is, if the proprietor has not already asked him to move farther along. He has perhaps received no welcome at the door, no hymn-book, no prayer-

book. Or, if he has the hymn-book, the hymns are often unknown and almost unintelligible, and the choir does the singing. The prayer-book is impossible to the man who has not been used to church, and, if there is no one by his side to show him, he flounders hopelessly amongst the services for the Burial of the Dead or the Churching of Women, and his dignity does not allow him to come again. When one hopes for a simple booklet of "Church Prayers and Psalms" to meet such cases as these, the publisher replies that "we are not allowed to sell this, by order of the Church authorities." Or if our friend can find his places in the prayer-book, he often wonders why he should listen to long chapters about military skirmishes at Michmash, or a list of apostolic salutations, or sing heartily about "the company of the spearmen" and "the beasts of the people," and throwing innocent children against the stones. Then perhaps, when the time for a good English talk comes, there is culture without zeal, poetry and rhetoric instead of exhortation and advice, or a political harangue against his own party in politics, or perhaps a languid dissertation about seemingly nothing whatever. Downy cushions, drawing-room pews, vicarious music, and flowers of rhetoric do not help, do not save, do not profit: they are vain.

One believes that the masses are not very far away from the Church of England if they felt they were encouraged to come, but too often they ask for bread and are given a stone; they seek the warmth of Christian brotherhood, and they find an icy chill. Progress has assuredly been made. The spirit of evangelization has taken hold of many of our Churches. The Church Army has imitated many of the good features of the Salvation Army, while it has kept closely in touch with the rest of the Church. It has pioneered much rescue work, and has coupled spiritual inspiration with regard for material conditions. The Church Army may yet do a great deal to revivify the Church, if it receives adequate support. At present much of its pioneering activity is crippled for want of funds. Work such as Mr. Watts-Ditchfield's in East London has received abundant

justification, but societies such as the Church Pastoral Aid Society, which make it their special work to help poorer parishes, have always an inordinately long waiting-list. Meanwhile, the clergy who most require help are often left unaided, and find it difficult to maintain the minimum of parochial organizations. Assuredly every Church is not a Salvation Army yet, and not often do we "go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in."

The lack of funds, the lack of buildings and workers, will always be a difficulty, but if we have our aim right perhaps we can always find some methods that are feasible. The churches need not be shut from one week-end to another, like great "temples of dualism," as an agnostic friend once called them, as witnessing to the uselessness of religion in daily life; nor will there be that irreligious severance between the spiritual and the secular that finds no room for clubs and games, social recreation, or meetings for the discussion of the great problems of industry and poverty. Almost every parish should have a mission room, where the folk who wish may have a simpler service, and energetic workers, who desire such work, find vent for their activities. Here may be centred the open-air service organization, popular lantern services, ragged school, clothing club, men's institute, and so on. A Church Army captain, or a curate, and a lady helper, would find ample work in nearly every parish, and the vicar would often find more scope for evangelistic work here than in the parish church.

But apart from the mission room, or where it is not possible to have a separate mission centre, ought not the parish church to be more often a centre of evangelization and rescue? We have simple services for men, and they are good, but they are often not as much frequented as they might be, owing to their time being in the afternoon, when most men prefer to be free. They also isolate the men from the women folk. Combined afternoon services sometimes obviate the latter objection, but the afternoon is still not the best time. Would it not be possible, say once a month, to advertise a simple, popular service at the usual even-

ing time, and so educate the people to regular evening worship? The Prayer Book is confessedly a difficult book, and the Church would lose nothing by putting it aside occasionally, for definite evangelistic effort. On such occasions, if legal difficulties were raised, the Prayer Book service could be read half an hour before. How long is the Church to remain absolutely tied down to all the conventional uniformities of the past? We need occasionally new forms of expression, new and perhaps striking manifestations of the living Spirit within. We have got so stereotyped, so conventional, so icy. People think that the form is more important than the life, and life has so often to burst through the bondage of forms, and too often ends in schism. We need sometimes to get out of our old ruts and put definite evangelistic work first and foremost, even though the methods may not be entirely "correct," according to the rules that have been laid down.

It must not be forgotten that after all our statutory Prayer Book services imply a fairly high standard of Christianity in the worshippers. The services are probably ideal for the mature Christian; they are masterpieces of liturgical arrangement. But they are not suitable for those who have scarcely any elementary knowledge of the faith; they do not touch the dwellers in slum-land, the outcast, or the hostile. We have to supplement the services by suitable hymns; we ought also to be able to omit the most difficult parts.

Along with this definite evangelistic work we also need more social rescue agencies. It is the principle of medical missions that care of the body should go along with care of the soul, and we know that the care for a man's bodily welfare often predisposes the patient to listen to words concerning his spiritual welfare. General Booth tried to work on the same principle: it was his regard for social and material well-being that predisposed thousands to think of his spiritual message. If the spiritual message does not seem to result in concrete love for a man in all the relationships of life, the ordinary man thinks there is something hollow and superficial about it. He is very soon

ready to dub a man a hypocrite who asks him about his soul and leaves him to struggle. The struggle to live is an evil ever present; the evils that are understood are unemployment, disease, bad housing, under-pay, over-work, sweating. "Care for these things," says the man in the street, "and I will listen to you. If you do not care for these things, I suspect your good faith in the others." The Church is, undoubtedly, suspected in this way. The words and deeds of the Church do not seem to square with one another. The working-man has fully accepted the doctrine of St. James: "Faith apart from works is barren." By our works we have to show him our faith, and if we try to show him our faith apart from works, do we wonder if he calls it vanity?

Care for material welfare must go hand in hand with spiritual ministration, and the Church has enormous leeway to make up. Men have gone elsewhere for other gospels because the gospel of the Church has seemed to fail. It has been said over and over again during the last few months that General Booth's method in this direction has done more than anything else to make the working-classes believe that Christianity has still a message for them. It is this double message that we need to emphasize if the half-alienated masses are to be won back.

There is power in the old gospel yet, if we preserve its true balance. Our Lord went about doing good, spending what seems an inordinate amount of His time on bodily ministration; but by this method His spiritual message did not lose; rather, it gained a hearing, it gained force, because of the loving deeds behind. We need a revival of self-sacrifice, a revival of Christ-like love, a passionate care for men, an enthusiasm for their welfare—bodily, mentally, and spiritually. We cannot split men up into sections, and say, this section is our sphere. Men are living personalities, unities, influenced by every detail of their lives. They cannot get away from their bodies. Let us, then, take men as they are, and try, by God's help, to lift them higher.

"Till we have built Jerusalem
In England's green and pleasant land."

SERMON OF THE MONTH.

The Sorrows of Sin.

By the Rev. J. E. GIBBERD.

Num. xvi. 38: "These sinners against their own souls."
Job xx. 11: "His bones are full of the sin of his youth."
Lam. v. 16: "Woe unto us, for we have sinned."

THE rise of sin into consciousness, the change of an action and feeling from an unseemly into a sinful state by the word and works of the Divine Lord, brought into comparison with us and focussing on us the Divine idea of life, is an inward revelation. The true Light has shined, and nothing remains the same as before. In the light everybody and everything is in judgment.

Our subject is the action of sin in our own spirits. We ask what workings it sets up in our own thought, feeling, will.

For a sign Moses was directed to take up censers out of the fire and scatter the fire—for a sign before "these sinners against their own souls." The sin that goes forth from one returns into him like a fume which he scattered and that enveloped him. In every sin a heart commits there is distinct loss of power. Nor is there much remedy till the loss of peace equals the loss of power.

Sin is a fall. Something in the soul goes over when evil is wrought. "The heathen are sunk down in the net that they made; in the net which they hid is their own foot taken" (Ps. ix. 15). Honour falls; kindness falls; fidelity falls; purity falls; "wickedness overthroweth the sinner" (Prov. xiii. 6).

This is not speculation; it is experience. Whoever lends himself to the lower impulses of his nature strengthens the lower at the expense of the higher. He takes the oil from the useful vessel and puts it in a sieve. By expending his power on carnal propensities, on insincerities of mind, on evil affections, he loses power he will need faster than it leaks

away. The fall is deep; it is like a traveller over a glacier, whose sight is not trained enough to notice the slight depression in the snow, who rashly steps on it and falls into a crevasse. Sin is worse than a stumble. It may be a mistake, but it works out at a perilous price. A man may mistake his path, and the wrong one may lead through fields as pleasant as the right one; but he may mistake his way and walk into a slough. It is dangerous to miss the right path on Dartmoor, and it is dangerous to take the wrong path by the steps of the soul. The whole type of the man descends by sin: sin lowers him gravely.

But the worst side of sin as a fall is that it reverses the soul's opportunity to do well. If we had no capacity to do the will of God, we should have no power to disobey. If we had no liberty, we could have neither obedience nor disobedience. We could be creatures, but not children of the Father in heaven. So the fall into sin is a falling out with the Holy Father. Sin rejects His law; breaks up the smooth working of His reign; violates the order He has established. It depraves our own hearts, despoils our powers, creates havoc in our feelings. Where there ought to be the union of all faculties in one act of service to one Eternal Throne, there, instead, there is disturbance and distraction; the law that would have promoted order and good fruits remains to rebuke disorder and put corrupt fruits to shame.

Moreover, the fall by sin is on hard ground. The world is no bed of moss for breakers of law. God's laws are in our bodies and minds, in the world of stone and vegetation: not least of all in our social relationships. All around us the tares grow together with the wheat, and the wheat is the worse for the tares. The wrongs of one enter into the lives of several. The excesses of one cause trouble to many. The neglects of one overtax many. The veins of social life run the poison of social sins through the whole body. Let anyone ask what life might have been had the laws ingrained in it been observed. Or let the question be, What life may yet be if the power of sin in it might be destroyed? Above all, what may it be if a stronger

man took possession and ousted the old power? The pool might be clear if the scum were taken off the surface; but it would certainly be clearer still if the formation of scum were stopped.

"His bones are full of the sin of his youth," said one of Job's callers, who was more clever in detecting the work of sin in a man than in comforting the distressed. His words read as if his own bones had ached, and he had felt in himself the miserable legacy of a reckless youth. For sins of youth score themselves into the flesh, and often set up actual decay in the bones. Premature old age comes of misspent early years. A creeping misery overtakes the one whose youthful habits were contrary to mental, moral, and physical health. Sin is the most prolific cause of disease, and disease is the most prolific cause of mental depression. The fall which sin represents is a fall in the whole condition and character—the man is less of a man for it; he is less capable, less spirited, less intelligent, less reliable in judgment, less in moral force and moral influence. He falls below a moderate standard. His history is the tale of a falling-off. Often the very things he does to arrest his own descent quicken it; for when it comes he feels hardly used. He adds his consent to the thousand times ten thousand cries that "the way of transgressors is hard." Whether he ascribes his hard lot to his transgressions or not, he feels it hard. When his eyes are opened and he knows that his bodily frailty and suffering, his mental feebleness and spiritual ineptitude, are due to the sins he has left to grow unchecked, his misery is not lightened; for now he has himself to reproach. "I felt self-condemnation," says one who had come to see himself in the light of Christ.

But beside being a fall, sin contains the power of death. Sin in dominion is only conceivable with a lifeless spirit—lifeless, that is, for moral and spiritual functions. In all matters of Christian character, Christian faith, Christian zeal, a mind unawakened to the misery of sin's sway is dead while it lives. It is an organ that will not play a tune. This soul lives in the playground, in the kitchen, in the market; it is lifeless in the sphere of Divine fellowship, heavenly apprehension, eternal hope.

Men must discern the evidences of their own hearts. It is such a mere truism to say that the everlasting interests are the most interesting; that the elevating and sunshiny gifts are the most captivating; that the pencil of God on the canvas of humanity is the most capable and beautiful: yet the mind of sin finds no interest, delight, or glory. Some common trifle whose use and joy flickers for an hour and goes out is held in higher esteem than the heavenly treasure. What though those who have believed have found in Christ the pearl of great price, and in His service an occupation that is a way to the holiest? The mind of sin remains stolid and insensible. What though those who have believed have felt the power of an endless life thrilling them with new joy, new sense of worth, new energy, and giving a new and supernal direction to all their faculties and powers? The mind of sin remains unfeeling and lifeless about it all. Can a soul have a graver warning than its own apathy towards all that makes the purest, most generous, and noblest life? Can a soul discover its own dead state more than by finding its own indifference to the best in character? "When we were in the flesh, the motions of sin did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death" (Rom. vii. 5). To be dead towards God is death at its worst. One brings away from a place one wishes to remember a sprig of rosemary and plants it in his garden. It dies. Something does not suit it. Whether it be the packing, the atmosphere, the soil, or ignorant treatment, one thing is plain: it dies. The living thing shrivels and withers and droops. Its green leaves go brown and dead. The fibre that should be flexible is brittle. For a power has seized it that makes it perish. Something like sin has come to it, come in it. This dread power has expelled the better power by which it was fresh and sweet. And when the Divine impulses of a soul are extinct, when the spirit of love and goodness in it is paralyzed, when it never warms to the love of God in Jesus Christ, never grieves at the cost of the world's evil at Calvary, never aspires towards the open heaven of the resurrection unto eternal glory, something like death has come into it.

Sin is a fall—it carries a fallen nature, a death, a fall even

unto death. No one, therefore, should ever feel ashamed to have sorrow and to show sorrow for sin. There are occasions when a broken heart is more admirable than a cold, unfeeling heart. The woman who bathed Christ's feet in her tears came nearer the childlike spirit towards God than the Pharisee who disdained to countenance her presence. The youth or maiden who has never found a tear for the deadening spell of indifference, or the unruly imagination of carnal passion, or the wild unseemliness of ungoverned temper, or some subtler sin that destroys the sense of Divine kinship and suppresses the intuition of the Divine Presence, would find in the melting of the soul a place at the feet of Christ. For sin is something to be sorry for with a great sorrow. A heart for bubbles and business, for worldly bustle and boasting, for rivalries and quarrels, for vain show and showy attainments, for polite manners and polished appearance, and no place for serving God and honouring the Saviour who gave Himself for us, no place for helping and blessing one's fellows and neighbours, no place for kindling the love of God in children, is a heart that may well break. Alas for it if it go to death in so lifeless a condition, and have no better than a barren life to present at last to Him who loves righteousness and called His offspring to enter into the fulness and joy, the honour and power, of their childhood towards Himself! Peter's tears for his downfall are a better example than unconcern in lordly apparel. The grief of a penitent heart is a joy to the angels of God. Never be ashamed to mourn for sin; never be ashamed to show and confess sorrow for sin; never forget the sin of being unfeeling towards God; never forget the low condition of living for low aims. Sinners against their own souls had need bestir themselves before the shadows of condemnation envelop them. Give heed to the call of Christ. Rise out of lethargy; flee from procrastination; shake off unworthy reserve. Shun sin; shun a state that is itself sinful; shun a life given over to the action of sin—to its fall and its death; hate being a slave to its power, and, above all, a slave without a yearning for ransom. The soul that sinneth, it shall die. "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me?"

The Beatitudes.

By the Rev. W. C. GREEN, M.A.

THE Stoic sage, who paradoxes writ
Vulgar opinion striving to refute,
Plain minds surprised and silenced in dispute,
But not convinced, for all his subtle wit.
Came One with better wisdom from above,
Who utter'd from the Galilean hill
New doctrines of surprise, amending still
Laws of old time with larger lore of love.
Nor He convinced all hearers. Riches, might,
Pride, pleasure, tyranny, could yet allure
To scorn the sad, meek, lowly, peaceful, pure,
Who thro' reproach and pain pursue the right.
Yet, weigh all well, 'twill be the more confest
That whom He blesses are most truly blest.

The Missionary World.

CANON SIMPSON has recently been reported as saying at a missionary meeting: "I am a plain evangelical Christian, who happens to believe in the Church. That is our faith, and its bed-rock is a passion for souls." It is well that we should remind ourselves of this truth, as at the beginning of a new year we look out on the missionary task before us. Our Lord Himself has enshrined in the heart of Christianity a belief in the value of the individual human soul. This "passion" is derived direct from the unfathomable love of the Father for mankind, poured out through the Incarnation in a mighty stream from the Eternal Heart. The outer aspect of missionary work develops and alters from year to year. Political, economic, and social changes call for corresponding changes in external form; civilization and imperialism rightly associate themselves with

our missionary thought as citizens of the British Empire. Yet all these phases of the outer aspect of missions are secondary to the inner, fundamental, essential, central truth—that missions exist for the salvation of the souls of men and the redemption of their lives through our Lord Jesus Christ and His Cross. Men have at times set on one side the evangelistic work of missions, and on the other their upbuilding, educative force. But, in truth, these two are one in essence, not alternative nor mutually exclusive. The growth of the Kingdom has ever been from within, and the newer phases are the development of the forces at work since the first Epiphany. Yet in our realization of the upgrowth of native Churches, and of the call for educational work on a more adequate scale, it is good to remind ourselves that we are servants of the Redeemer of men, and that the impetus which the Church requires to thrust her forth to her task springs from the love, "so amazing, so Divine," which led her Lord to His Cross. Here, and here alone, is the impulse which can stir leaders and laggards to deeds. "Love," says Dr. Hort, "to be worthy the name, must be love at work; love governed by duty."

* * * * *

The consecration of the Rev. V. S. Azariah, as assistant to the Bishop of Madras, will take place in St. Paul's Cathedral, Calcutta, just as this magazine issues from the press. This is a step of far-reaching significance, and though some uneasiness has been felt in widely different circles concerning it, it is one which claims our most cordial sympathy and support. After the Indian Mutiny, Bishop Wilberforce desired to extend the episcopate in India. In 1861 the C.M.S. Committee urged that an Indian should soon be appointed Bishop in Tinnevelly. Ultimately the Indian episcopate was expanded through the efforts of Bishops Cotton, Milman, and Gell, but all the Bishops were Europeans, and for the most part practically State officials, ministering primarily to the British community. Thus a native Church-life sprang up as the outcome of missionary work separate from the English Christians of the same communion. The

situation is, and for the present must probably remain, a complicated one. It has been left to the Bishop of Madras, by persistent, courageous action, to secure the consecration of the Rev. V. S. Azariah to the Bishopric of Dornakal in the Nizam's Dominions, as the first Indian member of the episcopate. This tends greatly to discredit the false assumption that leadership in the Anglican Church in India should be reserved for Englishmen, and should do much to influence the development of native Church-life throughout India. The Rev. V. S. Azariah has many friends in England who will uphold him in prayer in view of his fresh responsibilities. His contribution to the realization of the need for deepened relationships between Indian and English fellow-workers at the Edinburgh Conference in 1910 will not soon be forgotten.

* * * * *

"The Nearer East Aflame" is the dramatic title of an article in the *Missionary Review of the World* for December. The writer, Dr. J. F. Herrick, formerly of Constantinople, does not hazard any positive opinion as to the issue of the present struggle. He considers the war between the four States and Turkey to be secondarily religious, and primarily concerned with material gain. As an American, Dr. Herrick foresees with thankfulness the probable increase of Christian American influence in "what remains of the Ottoman Empire." To us, Christian peoples of many lands, the whole situation comes with a twofold appeal: first, for earnest intercession that the Conference now meeting in London may result in a just and reasonable peace, so that there may be no further extension of hostilities and no complications with other Powers; and, secondly, that the conflict of Christian and Moslem may rouse the whole Christian Church to face the facts of Islam, and to respond in a sense altogether new to the claim of the Moslem world upon the love and service of the Church. The news from missionaries in Palestine that "the country is quiet so far" shows how closely God is watching over His own in the outlying parts of the Turkish Empire.

* * * * *

It is as yet impossible to forecast in what financial position the missionary societies will find themselves on December 31, 1912, or March 31, 1913; but it is evident, from their various publications and from the appeals issued in the Church papers for the Christmas season, that there is as yet no perceptible lessening of the financial tension. The strain on faith is great. It is heart-stirring to take up, for instance, such a magazine for workers as the *C.M.S. Gazette*, and there to note the persistent, prayerful, illuminated work of the various departments; or the vigorous *Home Workers' Gazette* of the S.P.G., with its advocacy of a Forward Movement and its strong emphasis upon personal appeal, while Bishop Montgomery himself goes to and fro in the country leading conferences upon the subject; or to follow the Centenary Movement of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, as reported in the December issue of the *Foreign Field*, where it is fearlessly said: "This is no common time in the Church or on the Mission Field, and for the present common men and common methods are of little avail. The situation calls for the utmost that we can be and do by the help of God." As we face the great problem of the missionary financial situation, and bow our head before its discipline, we meet with those who aggressively affirm that the presence of this method or the absence of that shibboleth accounts for the limitations which prevail. For ourselves, we have no theory to offer; we sink back upon God. It is weary work to travel round and round the circle. Were there more money, there would be more offers of service; were there more offers of service, the money would flow in. The need—our need—of God is the one sure star of light before us. It is as we remember the other side of prayer—which is not mere asking, but receiving, finding, opening—that we shall pass through the darkness across the lintel to the open place beyond.

* * * * *

The early months of 1913 should find us steadfast in intercession for those now visiting the Mission Field for the purpose

of special investigation. News is privately to hand of Dr. Mott's first conferences with missionaries in Colombo, and there are indications that rich answers are already being given. Mr. Bardsley and Mr. Baylis are steadily pushing forward with their strenuous task for C.M.S. Miss McDougall, Classical Lecturer at Westfield College, and Miss Roberts, Headmistress of Bradford Grammar School, are, on behalf of the conference of women educators who met recently at Oxford, making a tour amongst girls' missionary educational institutions in India, with the hope of stirring women teachers in England to take a living interest in the Christian education of the women of the East. All these, and others from various societies, have responsibilites and opportunities which call for present intercession and a respectful hearing when they report to their various constituencies on their return.

* * * * *

In the Missionary periodicals for December we note the following articles as worthy of attention: Dr. Richter of Berlin writes an able account of the meeting of the Continuation Committee at Lake Mohonk in the *Missionary Review of the World;* in the *C.M.S. Review* we note the addresses at the Church Congress by Bishop Tucker and the Rev. A. G. Fraser of Kandy on "The Church's Duty to India and to Africa," and a paper on "The Contribution of Women to the Home Work of the C.M.S.," resulting from an investigation made at the instance of the Women's Home Committee; *The Bible in the World* has an account of the translation of the New Testament into Esperanto and also of Bible distribution in the disturbed area in the Balkans; *China's Millions* tells of "A Tour among the Aborigines in Kweichow," where a true work is done by native workers in spite of persecution; *India's Women* has a touching incident—"A little Child shall Lead Them"—from the Mission Hospital at Kien-ning; the *Student Movement* has a fresh sketch of "A Day's Work in a School on the Mission Field," by the Rev. N. Tubbs of St. John's Collegiate School, Agra.

* * * * *

A book entitled "When I was a Child," by a Japanese artist, Mr. Yoshio Markino, for many years a resident in London, is being widely read just now. It is written in captivating—though possibly assumed—broken English; it is illustrated by sketches which breathe the very spirit of Japan, and it gives a rarely beautiful picture of the home-life of a Japanese family of the *Samurai* class. It reveals to an unusual extent the personality of the writer, a typical Japanese, with the addition of a good deal of Western colour, not by any means always a gain. The book, though its transparent egotism is trying to many, would be of considerable value did it not contain a restatement of the ordinary Western challenge of the Christian position—we had expected something original in the problems of a Japanese — and somewhat lengthy strictures upon the work of missions as illustrated by the conditions prevailing many years ago in the American Mission School at Nagoya, where Mr. Yoshio Markino was a pupil. On the surface, these strictures carry the assent of the reader, and we have little doubt that the inexperienced missionaries whom Mr. Markino unfortunately knew best were, in their ignorance of the language and of Japanese customs, at times exceedingly unwise. Mr. Markino divides missionaries into two classes; it is noteworthy that the experienced ones were good, the inexperienced bad. It is manifest that a boy, hyper-sensitive and hasty in his judgments, watched with critical eyes men who understood him as little as he understood them. On point after point, the misinterpretation is so evident that without an animus against Christianity in the reader's mind the statements are bound to be discounted as soon as read. The book is a warning to missionaries to beware of all appearance of evil, and a caution against allowing responsibility to be prematurely assumed. The tragedy of the whole lies not in what the gifted writer thinks of missionaries, but in the fact that he has failed to feel the beauty and drawing power of the Divine Lord who, looking on a young man centuries ago with great possessions, loved him. Mr. Markino's

profound misunderstanding of the missionaries' Master is more pathetic than words can tell. It may be that at first some faultiness in His servants obscured Him to the eager boy, but the final responsibility for a maintained attitude lies not at their door but at his own. The book may furnish food for hasty critics of missions; it will certainly call out from missionary-hearted Christians much prayer for its blind but winning writer.

G.

Notices of Books.

THE TUTORIAL PRAYER-BOOK. By Charles Neill and J. M. Willoughby. London: *The Harrison Trust.* Price 3s. 6d.

For "The Tutorial Prayer-Book" there is a great future. We have needed such a treatment for a long, long time, and men who have been waiting for a prayer-book manual which they could recommend to their Sunday-School teachers and ordination candidates without fearing lest they should thereby send them towards Rome rather than Canterbury, have got just what they want. The whole ground is completely (not to say minutely) covered, and covered well. We have never seen better use made of what may be called the mechanical side of the apparatus of study, tables, analyses, text display, and the like, an enormous mass of information has been condensed to manageable size, and the editors are fully justified in claiming to have produced a work that is "comprehensive yet concise."

Excellent is the treatment of the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels for the Church year, each Sunday and Holy Day receiving separate handling, and Dr. Warman's section on the Thirty-nine Articles is a lesson in how to avoid waste of words, though we should not like to think that the Articles were so wholly negative as to do no more than condemn errors.

Indeed, there is just a little tendency throughout the book to be rather anxious to demonstrate what the Prayer-Book is NOT, but the amount of good, definite, positive, Church teaching is ample, and the book could easily have been published at twice the price. Buy it, use it, recommend it—for it is what we want. Men reading for Prayer-Book examinations will welcome it with delight.

OUTLINES OF PRAYER-BOOK HISTORY. By W. Prescott Upton. London: *C. J. Thynne.* Price 2s. 6d.

Mr. Prescott Upton's "Outlines" occupy nearly 400 pages, and are concerned mainly with the Communion Service and Vestments. The whole question is discussed in careful detail, ancient fathers, medieval service books, martyred reformers, parliamentary legislation, modern writers, are all cited, and the reformed position of our Prayer-Book is made quite clear.

The "Ornaments Rubric" receives considerable attention and explanation, and the facts are once again at the disposal of those who require them. It is a long and perhaps weary discussion—this wrangle about laws and clothes—and some of us would fain see it brought by God's grace to a peaceful end, but Mr. Upton has bravely tackled it, sparing himself neither time nor trouble, and we are grateful for the information which he gives us.

THE JOHANNINE EPISTLES. By the Rev. A. E. Brooke, Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. *T. and T. Clark.* Price 10s. 6d.

We welcome heartily this addition to the "International Critical Commentary," and none the less because Dr. Brooke remembers that St. John wrote to edify. To forget this, as Dr. Brooke says in his preface, is "unscientific." His commentary, in this respect, has much in common with the admirable lectures on 1 John, which Dr. Law published in his "Tests of Life."

Among other points which we have marked for special approval are the admirable concordance, the careful study of the text, and especially the note on "solvit Jesum" (may it not be Johannine even if not authentic in the Epistle?), the careful argument for the priority of the Gospel as an existing body of teaching, the treatment of the eschatology, of Harnack's brilliant study of 3 John and of the writer's claim to be an eyewitness.

This last point brings us to the question of authorship. Here Dr. Brooke hesitates, but inclines to the view that John the Presbyter, who was in some sense a disciple of Christ, wrote the two smaller Epistles and had some share in writing 1 John and the Gospel. The Presbyter was the apostle's redactor. Doubtless many students of the Johannine problem are looking in the direction of some such mediating theory as this. It recalls Harnack's "Gospel of John the Apostle according to John the Presbyter." But an hypothesis which is not worked out, however interesting, is of little help. We will only observe that in our view 2 John cannot be separated from 1 John.

The weakest point of the book is one which Dr. Brooke shares with most other commentators—an inadequate use of Revelation and the letters of Ignatius and Polycarp. More matter might have been gleaned from the two latter (*e.g.*, *cf.* ad Eph. xviii. 2 with 1 John v. 6), and very much more from the former. The striking parallels in the use of *νικάω* and *βαρὺς* are not even mentioned, and the occurrence of *σκάνδαλον* (Rev. ii. 10) is noted without comment. Nothing is said about the Nicolaitan controversy which probably dominated the whole situation, and there are many places where we would read this controversy into the Epistle, and differ from Dr. Brooke. For instance, does not "idols" (1 John v. 21) practically mean *idolothuta* (Rev. ii. 14)? The treatment of the relation of the Johannine Epistles and vocabulary to the Pauline is also inadequate. These points are of no small importance. They affect the whole interpretation of the three Epistles.

Now that we have had our grumble we may say that, though the commentary will not supersede Law's work, it is the best we know, and that Dr. Brooke's workmanship is, as we should expect it to be, very scholarly.

H. J. BARDSLEY.

THE CREED IN HUMAN LIFE: A DEVOTIONAL COMMENTARY FOR EVERY-DAY USE. By Maurice Clare. London: *Hodder and Stoughton.*

The keynote of this book may be found in the words of William Penn: "The humble, meek, merciful, just, pious and devout souls, are everywhere of one religion, and when Death has taken off the mask they will know each other, though the diverse liveries they wear here make them strangers." The Creed in human life is the mainspring of action, not a barren formula. The writer has here, by means of examples from ancient and modern thinkers, enabled us to realize the wide scope of the subject. He has, indeed, been "a weaver of materials gathered from many quarters, which in the present fabric may acquire a very different significance from that which was theirs in the original." We took up this book fearing that the subtitle was suggestive of dulness. Our fears were groundless. There is hardly a page from which some new thought cannot be gathered, and the quotations are so strung together that they form one harmonious whole. Unconsciously we are led along paths which are rarely trodden by the ordinary person, who is made acquainted with the minds of such diverse thinkers as Baxter and Newman, Pusey and R. W. Dale, St. Augustine and "George Eliot," indeed, all the wisdom from Plato up to modern times is here presented for our instruction and delectation. Externally, the book is everything that can be desired—good paper, good printing, good binding.

TYPES OF ENGLISH PIETY. By R. H. Coats. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark.*

Generally speaking, we have here the relation between doctrine and devotion. All religion being based on the assumption that man desires the Infinite and is capable of apprehending it, he is so made as to be able to find rest and satisfaction in nothing else. But he proceeds through different channels. The author sketches these with rare impartiality. He shows the distinguishing features of the three great types—Sacerdotal, Evangelical, and Mystic. Of the first he remarks that "Keble, Newman, and Pusey were among the saints of the earth, men of whom the world was not worthy, and who would have adorned the Church of Christ in any age." But the Evangelical type is not lacking in men of a high Christian standard. The strict impartiality of the author is seen in his treatment of the group of quietists like Fox, Barclay, and the Quakers generally, who eschew symbolism, and seek communion with the Divine by "tuning the Æolian harp of the human soul to such a pitch of harmony with the mind and wish of God, that to every chord He strikes our own will vibrate, making a blissful and harmonious response, like the music of the spheres."

In his concluding survey the author observes that strongly marked temperamental characteristics tend to gather into well-defined groups. Unitarianism, for example, is usually associated with the cultivation of the intellect; Roman Catholicism makes a special appeal to the sensuous and æsthetic imagination; while Quakerism is content with the purely spiritual. "One type of man demands what is unique, startling, and supernatural to assist his piety; another distrusts everything that is not abstract, natural, and universal. One approaches God best by means of vague reverie, another must draw nigh accompanied by a precise ritual. One man places the whole of virtue in some form of abstinence, another conceives it to consist in the

service of the State." Thus, in each case, we have a differentiated type of piety. But we have said enough to show the trend of our author. The folds are ample; the robe itself is one and seamless throughout. We need only add that there is a good index, and the book is well produced in respect of paper, printing, and binding. J. C. W.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE BIBLE. By J. Hastings, D.D. London: *T. and T. Clark.* Price 10s. ST. JOHN I.-XII. and I CORINTHIANS.

Another two volumes of this excellent series have come to hand. There is little to add to the commendation which we have been able to bestow upon the earlier volumes. The two sections of Scripture with which these volumes are concerned abound in great texts, and these volumes deal excellently well with them. We are glad to see that the discussion of I Corinthians xiii. 13 is headed "These Three abide," and that the common pitfall which suggests that faith and hope will disappear is avoided.

THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE CHRIST. By the Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2s. 6d.

A book by the author of "Clement of Alexandria" and "A Fresh Study of the Fourth Gospel" is likely to be interesting; and Dr. Hitchcock's new volume will receive a kindly welcome. In a thoughtful preface the author indicates the dangers of the present day—and they are varied and many; in the body of the book he is careful to point out where the remedy lies. "The spiritual lessons of the Fourth Gospel," he justly notes, "as applied to the present conditions of life and thought, are well calculated to lead men to Him Who alone can meet and satisfy the requirements and needs of the present age, and to Whom the future belongs." This is just the book to put into the hands of the younger clergy, who have such vital problems to grapple with in these days of unrest and unsettlement; it will enable them, in some measure, to meet those difficulties with greater confidence and resolution.

THE CHILDREN'S HERITAGE: TALKS TO THE CHURCH'S CHILDREN ON THE CHURCH'S FAITH. By the Rev. G. R. Oakley, M.A., B.D. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2s.

A well-meaning book, but (in our opinion) somewhat marred by the so-called "Catholic" tendency of the writer. The chapter on the "Holy Catholic Church" is particularly noticeable for the way in which "advanced" views are promulgated as though they were universally true.

PIVOTS OF PENITENCE, OPPORTUNITY, AND POWER. By the Rev. S. J. Sykes. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

This book is introduced with a preface by the Bishop of Hull, who commends it whole-heartedly. And, indeed, the book deserves to be considered for its clear and vigorous presentation of certain vital points connected with the Christian faith. Candidates for Confirmation, if they are not too young, would certainly be the better for mastering its contents. The book seems really helpful in a practical fashion.

S.P.C.K. ALMANACS AND CALENDARS.

The usual batch of calendars and almanacs, suited to every need and every purse. If the S.P.C.K. did nothing else, we should still owe the Society a great debt for their most useful publications. All that need be said is that they are as good as ever.