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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

April, 1915.

The Month.

Are we Satisfied?

ARE we satisfied with the moral and spiritual condition of the country at the present time? Soon after the war broke out a deep spirit of earnestness and inquiry, admittedly, came over the people. Almost every parochial clergyman one met had the same tale to tell. He was convinced that the war was doing much good; his church had never been so full; many were attending services who were rarely seen in church before; and the congregations were more attentive, more solemnized, than they had ever been. This was a great movement. Has it been maintained? We fear not. People have grown accustomed to the war, and are sinking back into their old ways. That, at least, is the opinion we hear from many who are in a position to know; and if it is true, it represents a very serious state of things. We have had nearly eight months of the stern discipline of war; bereavement has entered into many homes, and sorrow and suffering into many more, and yet the nation is not sufficiently sobered in its outlook. We all know that the influence of chastisement must have one of two results: it either softens or it hardens those upon whom it is laid. It ought thankfully to be noted that in not a few cases men and women, by and through the circumstances of the time, have been drawn nearer to God, and their spiritual vision has become clearer than it has ever been. This is particularly the case with soldiers who in many cases have responded gladly and gratefully to the appeals made to them

by army chaplains, whose splendid work among the men at home has hardly been sufficiently realized, and by other Christian workers. It may be said, we believe, without any exaggeration, that during their months of training hundreds and thousands of men who have since gone or will soon be going to face death in the trenches have given their hearts to God. But, alike among civilians and soldiers, the numbers who have thus made the great decision are woefully few compared with the vast masses who remain careless and indifferent, if not hostile, to the claims of religion. The general tone of the nation has deteriorated; it is not now spiritually inclined; it is essentially secular and worldly. Evidence of this may be discerned in a hundred different ways by those who will be careful not to be misled by surface appearances, but will be ready to go deeper. Even the tone of the Press is different. In many cases it is proud, boastful, and arrogant, when the times call for something very different. Whose is the blame? It cannot be apportioned with any accuracy, but we feel bound to add that the Church has not done all that it might do for the moral and spiritual uplift of the people. It has been a day of splendid opportunity, but only the few have taken advantage of it. The times of acute testing for the nation and for individuals is yet to come. Are we prepared, are we preparing, for them? Oh, that some Spirit-filled leader might arise, who would call the nation to humiliation, penitence, and prayer!

"New Puritans."

In thus expressing our sentiments we are not in the least perturbed by the risk of being included among those whom Mr. Ernest Barker in *The Times* of March 18 dubbed "New Puritans." We read his letter with interest—for it was exceedingly clever—but with real regret. The general line of his argument may be judged by the following extracts from his letter:

"There is no tragedy more tragic than war. There has been no war more terrible than this war. Unless we mix some laughter we shall crack.

If we falsify Nature's wise economy, and rack ourselves to the pitch of tragic intensity, we are undone. Let us not, like the Puritans of old, close theatres, or suppress race meetings, or even shut down alehouses overmuch. It will but lead to swift reaction. The Puritans were tragically earnest in the ten years before 1660. There were cakes and ale in abundance after 1660, and ginger was hot in the mouth."

"I have never been to a race meeting in all my life. I have been to the theatre on an average once a year. I cannot conceive myself going to either nowadays. But I can very well conceive better men than I am going to the play—and even to the picture theatre. I am even glad to see them going. After all, I feel something of the old world survives the Deluge. Men still go about the old streets in the old way."

"I love to think of Sir Thomas More dying with a jest. I long to think that my country, of which I was never more proud than I am now, can be as gaily gallant in great things as it can be mournfully serious in little things. I would have us meet the unseen with a cheer, and even with a smile, provided that no man is offended thereby."

The writer's views may well be quoted as an illustration of the gay and worldly spirit against which we feel bound to protest. Not that we would plead for severe austerity, nor would we lessen the amount of good, healthy laughter, but we urge that men and women should be led to face the serious facts of the life that now is, and of that which is to come. We believe that this war is God's call to the nation to forsake its sins and to turn to Him, and no minister of His should be changed from his purpose of pressing that call home upon the hearts and lives of the people by any fear of reproach. The faithful servant of God may be, and often is, called a "Kill-joy," whereas the message he has to deliver brings to heart and life, wherever it is received, the greatest joy of all—the joy of the Lord.

National Regeneration.

The consideration of the moral condition of the nation has led to many proposals for amendment. Sir Edward Clarke's appeal to the clergy to promise on Easter Day that they would abstain from all intoxicating drinks as beverages until after the war was well directed, but it has received scant support. Although we are certain that the man—be he cleric or layman—who entered upon such a course of self-denial would exercise considerable influence upon his

fellows, and especially upon those who most need the strength of example to help and encourage them, we feel that at the best it can only be described as a half-measure towards meeting a very real need. The Bishop of Worcester's letter, though not very happily conceived in its answer to Sir Edward Clarke, showed that something deeper is needed. "Would," he wrote, "that the National Church, which from its position has a particular right to speak (and I say this without the least disparagement of other bodies), would soon lead us by some comprehensive movement of recall to see that it behoves a great Empire to fit itself for carrying out the purposes of God, and that if it will not so fit itself, the reason for its power is gone. When such a course of national regeneration is put plainly before us, there will be no hesitation among the clergy of all sorts to pledge themselves to something more splendid than any promise directed against a single vice." We are thankful to the Bishop of Worcester for expressing the need so clearly, but it is permissible to ask whether he has pressed the same point upon his brethren of the episcopate. The Bishops are the natural leaders of the National Church, and they ought to make a move in the direction indicated. They have not done so, and it has been a great disappointment to many that as a body they have shown themselves so deficient in leadership in a truly spiritual campaign. The position is still in their hands, and we trust that the Bishop of Worcester may stir them to take some joint action in calling upon the Church at large to make a determined effort to bring about that national regeneration which is so much needed.

The Call for a Truce.

It will be extremely interesting to see whether the Convocations of Canterbury and York pay heed to the very strong feeling, which is growing and deepening in intensity, that in connection with the question of Prayer-Book Revision a truce should be observed until after the war. These great assemblies of Churchmen meet again this month, and, as at present arranged, the discussion on the

Revision proposals is to be continued. We much hope that wiser and better counsels will prevail, for it is most undesirable that internecine strife should continue within the Church, when on general questions the voice of controversy is hushed. If anyone supposes that the passing of Convocation's Revision scheme will bring any measure of peace, he is labouring under a grave delusion. Not peace but a sword will be given to the Church if Convocation proceeds; and the influence upon the non-religious world, seeing Church-people fighting among themselves at the moment when thousands of our brave fellows at the front are laying down their lives for their country, will be simply disastrous. There is no necessity to go over once again the main ground of the Revision dispute, but those who desire to see a simple and adequate exposition of the Evangelical position should procure a copy of a penny pamphlet issued by the National Church League, entitled "Revision and the Romeward Drift." The following passage from the author's conclusion is sufficiently expressive:

"As Churchmen we desire to stand in the old paths. We wish to be by the side of the saints of the Primitive Church and to meet with our Lord as His disciples met with Him in the Upper Room. We know no sacrifice for sins other than the One Offering on the Cross which can never be repeated. We know no Presence of Christ localized in the Elements—we find Him in our hearts when we communicate in faith. We are Christians, members of the Church of Christ which has no sacerdotal ministry, and we look to the one great Priest—our High Priest—to present us faultless before the Throne of God. We must fight against any alteration of the doctrine of our Prayer-Book. We cannot be parties to any betrayal of the solemn trust given into our keeping. . . . Regretfully many of us have been forced to oppose all Revision at this time because we can only have any Revision by the sacrifice of principles which have been entrusted to us by our fathers. We can only surrender these principles at the cost of loyalty to the highest truth. We dare not accept what is alien to our Book of Common Prayer and the teaching of Holy Scripture."

The grave nature of the issues at stake may readily be judged from the above quotation, and the more they are considered the more clear does it become that it would be monstrous to force upon the Church a quarrel of this magnitude at a time when the nation is at war.

Six Months' Grace.

Churchmen have every reason to be satisfied with the action of the Government over the Welsh Church Act. The delay in dealing with the Postponement Bill is, perhaps, unfortunate, but if in the meantime the Government are able to secure the concurrence of the Welsh Members, it may prove a blessing in disguise. At this critical time in our national history we cannot afford to keep alive any matter of domestic controversy. National unity is the one overwhelmingly important consideration at the present time, and it may well be hoped that under Mr. Asquith's kindly guidance the Welsh Members may be led to see the thorough reasonableness of the Government proposal. Rightly to understand the new Bill it is necessary to remember that there are two dates provided in the Welsh Church Act. There is "the date of the passing of the Act," and there is "the date of Disestablishment." Broadly speaking, the policy of the Act is that the date of passing is, as it were, a kind of warning, preparatory date, and the date of Disestablishment is the date on which the Act comes into full operation. Under the Act that date is the close of the war, and unless that were modified Welsh Churchmen would be compelled, even now, while the war is on, to make their preparations for the new order of things. The Church, for instance, as Lord Robert Cecil reminded the House of Commons, must set up new laws and new courts, and that can only be done by bringing into existence the legislative body provided in the Act. The Church has also to consider whether it will accept commutation or not, and the representative body to consider that must therefore also be brought into existence before the date of Disestablishment. Churchmen, again, have to make preparation for the cessation of their endowments on the date of Disestablishment. A very large sum will have to be collected. Leading Churchmen took the very best legal opinion they could get, and they were advised that if they were to be safe under the Act they were bound to take these steps before the date of Disestablishment. The Duke of Devonshire introduced a Bill to put the Welsh

Church Act on a level, in point of time, with the Irish Home Rule Act, but the Government, recognizing the unfairness placed upon the Church, hit upon a compromise. Their new Bill postpones the date of Disestablishment until six months after the termination of the war—thus giving the Church six months' grace in which to make the necessary preparations—and the Opposition on their side have undertaken not to bring forward in Parliament any proposal for the amendment or repeal of the main Act until after the new date of Disestablishment. This is a reasonable bargain, and we hope to see it carried into effect. We still hope, however, that at the proper time a determined effort will be made to repeal the Act.

The Date of Easter.

There was an interesting if somewhat inconclusive discussion at the Victoria Institute on March 15 on "The Determination of Easter Day." The opening paper, read by Dr. A. M. W. Downing, F.R.S., furnished a detailed and elaborate review of the astronomical and other questions concerned. He showed that our Lord's Resurrection took place on the Sunday after the Passover, and the Passover was held on the fourteenth day of the first month of the Jewish year. The first month of the Jewish year was regulated by the spring equinox—that is to say, it depended upon the progress of the natural solar or tropical year—and the Jewish months were natural months depending upon the actual observation of the new moon. But the week, the natural month, and the natural year, are three measures of time, mutually incommensurable. It follows, therefore, that if the attempt is made to keep Easter on the first day of the month, and near the full of the moon in the spring time of the year, the date chosen cannot strictly fulfil all the three conditions at once. Easter therefore fluctuates through a considerable period of time—actually five weeks. The problem, Dr. Downing explained, has been further complicated by the difference between the Julian and the Gregorian calendars. The Julian calendar, which is followed in the eastern countries of Europe,

assumes that the year is exactly 365¼ days in length, while the Gregorian, followed by the western countries, makes the length of the year nearly eleven minutes short of this, and the difference between the two calendars now amounts to thirteen days. This year, and next, it happens by a most unusual coincidence that Russia and Great Britain keep Easter on the same day, but that day in 1915 will be called April 4 in Great Britain, but March 22 in Russia. We imagine, however, that if any change is ever made in the direction of a fixed Easter, it will be governed, not by astronomical, but by practical considerations; and, indeed, there is much to be said from this point of view in favour of fixity. Dr. Downing practically admitted as much, but in summing up he showed the immense difficulties in the way thus:

"The lengthy explanations given in this paper may reasonably be held to be a strong argument in favour of a fixed Easter—a subject that has been again brought to our notice during recent years. And really there is a good deal to be said in favour of the practical convenience of the proposal, quite independently of the complications involved in the determination of the fourteenth day of a certain artificial moon. Without having the least sympathy with the changes in the week and in the month that have been proposed, we may heartily agree that Easter Day should be a Sunday in a fixed week. But it would be undoubtedly a breaking away from the system that has been handed down to us from the early days of the Christian Church, and the prejudices of those who look with dislike on all such changes would have to be overcome. Practical unanimity between Christians of all denominations, and of all nations and languages, would be very desirable, and very difficult to secure. But any independent action that would tend to our insular isolation in such a matter would be deplorable. It is stated that the late Pope (Pius X.) was prepared to give his favourable consideration to the project. The authorities of the Orthodox Church do not appear to have expressed their views on the matter. But if the proposal ever comes within the range of practical politics, it may be urged, from the astronomical point of view, that, as there is evidence that the original Good Friday fell either on April 3 (A.D. 33) or on April 7 (A.D. 30), the change to be effected should insure that Good Friday should be the first Friday in April. Easter Day would then be either the first or second Sunday in April. But alas! 'the time is out of joint.' All such proposals must now, it is to be feared, be relegated to the Greek Kalends."

We are not quite so hopeless. The reform is one that commands a large measure of support, and we should like to see it discussed more from the practical than the academic point given.

The Christ of the Gospel.

No. IV.—"ROSE AGAIN ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES."

BELIEF in the supernatural, if it is to be legitimate as well as genuine, has not merely to overcome the opposition of rationalism, the refusal to believe anything which eludes the understanding and defies explanation; it has also to avoid the temptation of credulity, the readiness to entertain conceptions which have no reliable foundation for their support. It is worthy of note that these two attitudes of mind, diametrically opposed to each other as they are, find common ground, nevertheless, in the mental process which gives to each its being: both depend for their activity upon prejudice. "The thing is possible, therefore it is," is the argument of credulity: "the thing is impossible, therefore it is not," is the argument of rationalism. *A posse ad esse* is the process of the one; *A non posse ad non esse* is the process of the other. Each process shows the same defect, the refusal to take account of evidence. Legitimate belief is the outcome of the sifting of evidence. True, it is as independent of ability to understand or explain the object of its activity as physical sight is, and it is ever moving into tracts unknown and discovering new realities; but for the direction of its activity it depends upon the use by reason of the finger-posts of evidence. And the question which reason asks before it bids belief move forward is not, What is the possibility of this having happened or being likely to happen? but, What does the evidence point to as having happened or being likely to happen? The refusal to accept that for which adequate evidence is not forthcoming must not be put down to a culpable absence of faith, nor is there a laudable presence of faith in the attitude which ignores evidence and acts independently of it.

Now, it is a striking fact that belief in the Resurrection of Jesus Christ won its way at the very beginning without the

assistance of credulity and in the face of strong rationalistic prejudice. There was nothing wrong with the evidence which was presented to Thomas. The men with whom he had companied for three years had not forfeited his confidence. Their testimony was that of eye-witnesses: they declared to him what they had seen. Moreover, it was not the testimony of an individual, but of the whole band of his fellow-Apostles; and it was confirmed by the women who owed their knowledge and joy in like manner not to hearsay and rumour, but to the evidence of their own eyes, ears, and hands.[1] There was nothing wrong with the evidence: indeed, short of the witness of his own eyes, Thomas could not have received more trustworthy testimony than that which was given to him. And yet in the face of it all he refused to believe. Why? The reason was prejudice, simple prejudice. The thing surpassed his understanding, it defied his power of comprehension, it transcended his experience: the thing could not be, therefore it had not happened.

Thomas was not alone in this rationalistic attitude. When Mary of Magdala related her experience to the Apostles, she was not believed.[2] The testimony of the two disciples to whom the Lord had manifested Himself on the road to Emmaus met with no better reception.[3] Indeed, the wonder and the joy were so overwhelming that not even the sight of the Risen Lord was enough at the first to secure unhesitating belief.[4] The experience was too good to be true.

Here, as it seems to me, is the explanation of the necessity of the empty tomb in the Resurrection of the Lord. Was it necessary in order that the Lord might survive death? Assuredly not, or we must abandon the thought of survival altogether. Was the empty tomb necessary in order that the Lord might receive the spiritual body? It seems unreasonable to imagine any necessary continuity of that kind, a continuity depending on the transformation of the actual atoms laid in the

[1] Matt. xxviii. 9. [2] Mark xvi. 11. [3] Mark xvi. 13.
[4] Matt. xxviii. 17; Luke xxiv. 41.

tomb. The mortal body grows and changes by the constant acquisition of new atoms, in such wise that the body of the man has no actual identity with the body of the infant; yet we find no difficulty in speaking of it as one and the same body in all its varied stages, because of the continuity of the *ego* which inhabits it. Moreover, while the atoms laid in the ground and reverently preserved from disturbance might conceivably be regarded as awaiting some new inbreathing of heavenly power, the idea ceases to have any meaning in the case of bodies devoured by animals or dissolved by the sea; and no theory of the resurrection body will suffice which is inapplicable even to one case. No, we cannot regard identity of atom as necessary for the resurrection body, and therefore we cannot regard the empty tomb as essential to the existence of the resurrection body of the Lord Jesus.

Wherein, then, lay the necessity? The phenomena of the Gospel narratives, to which we have drawn attention, seem to give the answer. We have only to ask what chance belief in the Risen Lord would have had amongst such an incredulous group of mourners, if they had found the tomb occupied by the Lord's body, in order to see at once the necessity. The empty tomb was necessary for the sake of evidence, for the purpose of assuring the disciples, for the object of producing conviction. The transformation of the actual body was an accommodation to the need of man.

We may go further still in this line of thought. It does not appear unreasonable to believe that a similar explanation is to be found of certain other characteristics of the risen body of the Lord—characteristics which lasted, at all events, for the forty days of His appearances to His disciples. That is to say, these characteristics were peculiar to His body for the special purposes which it had to fulfil, and were in no way declaratory of that which is to be the normal experience of the believer. I refer to such phenomena as the wound-prints, and to such experiences as eating and drinking. Does anyone believe that the loss of a limb will find some counterpart in the spiritual body? These

features of the resurrection body of the Lord present difficulties to our intellects, but the evidence for them is abundantly sufficient, the possibility of them is beyond our province to question, and the reason for them appears entirely adequate.

But to return from this digression, the Risen Lord was offering Himself to men for the faith which was to be the victory that was to overcome the world. If for this purpose the body in the tomb had to be transformed, the tomb to be emptied, and the body itself to be adapted for a time to the temporary sojourn amongst men, we have no objection that we can legitimately offer, with the one condition that the evidence is reliable. Let the issue be clearly stated. We can have no sympathy with the man who says that the thing was impossible, therefore the evidence is unreliable. And the objectionable feature of the rationalistic attack on the supernatural in the Gospel records is just this, that it starts with the prejudice against the thing, and then has to find some means of making away with the evidence.

The testimony to the empty tomb of Jesus Christ is such that no history could logically survive if it were rejected. The historical evidence of the Resurrection is as strong and complete as any evidence could ever be for anything; and the Risen Lord involved for the disciples the empty tomb. The fact that they found the tomb empty was one of the principal ways in which they were prepared for the shock of seeing the Risen Lord: they could never dissociate the one from the other. But, with the progress of thought and the advance of science, we of a later age can look back upon the necessity in a different light. We can see that it was necessary, not for the Lord, but for the disciples. Yet while this permits us to shift the focus of thought, and to acknowledge the possibility of a real belief in the Risen Lord which does not subscribe to the Apostolic interpretation of the empty tomb, it does not therefore follow that we can regard that interpretation as being no longer of any importance. If the transformation of the Lord's earthly body was necessary for the production of conviction then, the testi-

mony to the fact remains equally valuable as part of the historical evidence now.

In this connection the question may fairly be asked of those who reject the Gospel interpretation, as to what other adequate explanation they can offer of the triumphant belief in the Risen Lord. Do they leave the sacred body in the tomb, or in the possession of friends of the Lord, or in the possession of His enemies? Whichever way it is, the difficulty of explaining how the conviction was produced that the Lord had risen seems as insuperable as it is needless. If the body remained in the tomb, or was removed by enemies, the Apostles' witness could have been immediately disproved. If, on the other hand, the report of the soldiers represented, not a clumsy device, but actual fact, then either the triumphant testimony of the early disciples was a mere cloak under which they concealed their sorrow, or we must imagine that a matter of tremendous import at a time of popular excitement[1] was successfully kept as the bosom secret of the two or three who, so we must suppose, managed to evade the guards, steal the body, spread the false report, and produce the conviction that it was true. And this problem has to be faced, not because the evidence for the traditional explanation is inadequate or unsound, but because that explanation surpasses man's comprehension. So does the origin of life.

Although it is the fact rather than the significance of the Resurrection of our Lord that we are considering, a brief reference may be permitted, in conclusion, to the place which the fact occupies in Christian apologetic. The evidential value of the Resurrection must not be regarded as consisting in the mere fact of the manifested survival of death; for it is recorded of others that they experienced this, and the experience was not accepted in their case as a declaration of Divine Sonship. In like manner the miracles of the Lord are not, regarded by themselves, proofs of His Divine being; for it is recorded of others that they, too, performed miracles, and no such significance was

[1] Matt. xxvii. 62 *ff.*, xxviii. 12 *ff.*; Luke xxiv. 18.

attached to them. Moreover, did not the Lord Himself promise that His disciples should do even more wonderful works than He had done?[1]

St. Paul's message to Timothy puts the fact of the Resurrection in its true relation. He bade Timothy remember, not the mere fact of the Resurrection, but "Jesus Christ risen from the dead."[2] It was the personality of Jesus which gave its evidential value to the Resurrection, as also to His miracles. It may be true—nay, it is true—that the Resurrection was a glorifying of Jesus, but it was so only because Jesus was the glory of the Resurrection. It was the fact of His wonderful personality, life, and work which made it possible for the Resurrection to be accepted as the seal and declaration of His Divine Sonship.[3] It was in accordance with the spirit of holiness that He was declared the Son of God with power by the resurrection of the dead.

ARTHUR J. TAIT.

[The fifth article in this series, "Ascended into Heaven," will appear in the May issue of the CHURCHMAN, and will be contributed by the Rev. A. W. Greenup, D.D.]

---

[1] John xiv. 12. [2] 2 Tim. ii. 8. [3] Rom. i. 4.

Dr. Fairbairn—a History and a Moral.

THIS "Life of Dr. Fairbairn" will be widely read among Nonconformists, for Dr. Fairbairn was heart and soul—was to the very essence of his being—a Nonconformist. It was not, as some may imagine, that being a Presbyterian in Scotland he naturally, when he came to England, found himself a Nonconformist. He never was a Presbyterian. He was as much a Nonconformist in Scotland as he was in England. And the "Life" will appeal to the Nonconformist; it will appeal to his spirit and his ideals.

But I hope the "Life" will be even more widely read among English Churchmen. Yet if they read it, will they understand it? Much against my will, I am obliged to answer, No. And if I am asked, Why? I reply, Before you can understand, you must have knowledge, and before you can have adequate knowledge, you must have at least a measure of sympathy. The knowledge to which I refer is not such as can be obtained from studying a man or a cause or a society from the outside. It can only be acquired by living with people, within their circle, in their mental, religious, political atmosphere, and that for a considerable period of time—a qualification which a very small number of English clergymen possess with regard to Nonconformity. Then, besides being heart and soul a Nonconformist, Dr. Fairbairn was essentially a Scotchman; and, at any rate so far as religion is concerned, it is exceedingly difficult for the average Englishman, and especially the average English Churchman, to understand the typical Scotch mind in religion.

Why would I have the "Life" widely read by Churchmen? For this reason: because I believe that to a very striking degree it reveals certain ideals of ministry, of the Christian ministry, which it would be to the immense advantage of the average English clergyman to cultivate. This is my chief, I might even say my sole, object in commending a very careful study of it to my brother clergy.

Dr. Fairbairn was a man of great and many parts. He was a real scholar—the late Lord Acton once told Viscount Bryce that he considered him to be the most learned man in Oxford; he was an exceptionally hard thinker; he was a philosophical theologian of really very considerable weight; he was, of course, a very strong politician—though here, at any rate by outsiders, his position was far more often misunderstood than it was correctly estimated; but, beyond and above all these activities, Dr. Fairbairn was first and foremost a trainer of men for the pastoral calling. He was himself "a pastor who was also a teacher." No man had a higher ideal of the pastoral function, and no man ever worked more strenuously to make this ideal a reality. After having for many years discharged the duties of a pastor, he accepted a call to train men to discharge pastoral duties as efficiently as possible. For the rest of his life—though amid many other and various activities—he practically devoted himself to one object: how he could improve, and increase the efficiency of, the Nonconformist ministry. Of how extremely successful he was in this object the testimony is abundant.

No man ever entered the ministry with fewer external advantages. A child of poor parents, he left school at the age of ten. For the next four years he was an errand-boy; then for four years he worked with his hands as a stone-cutter's apprentice. At the age of nineteen he entered the University of Edinburgh. How he supported himself there for three years would be a mystery to anyone but a Scotchman. The funds for this were partly supplied by the Church to which he belonged —that of the "Evangelical Union"; they were also obtained by his own exertions, by preaching engagements on Sundays, and by taking "temporary pastorates" during the vacations. Contemporaneously with his studies at the University, it should be added, Fairbairn was attending theological classes at the Evangelical Union Hall in Glasgow. At the end of three years he left the University without taking his degree—possibly from want of funds to pay for it. Three years later—that is, while he was in the midst of the work of his first pastorate—

Fairbairn went as a student to Berlin for twelve months. This one year, in addition to the three years spent between the University of Edinburgh and the Evangelical Union Hall in Glasgow, seems to have been the only period during which he received instruction. For the rest of his education he relied entirely on his own efforts. How strenuous these must have been is proved by the verdict of Lord Acton already quoted. The fact is that with Fairbairn learning and working, assimilation and expression of knowledge, were always going on side by side.

Already in his student days he seems to have highly developed two of the essential qualifications of the efficient pastor. The first of these was really earnest evangelical preaching; the second was an intense love for souls, a devotion to the highest welfare of individuals. On pp. 19 and 20 we have an account of his preaching at this earliest stage of his career from one who was then accustomed to hear him: "His sermons were full of matter and abundant in allusions and illustrations, literary, historical, and poetical, drawn from widely different sources, ancient and modern, that seemed to lift us up into a larger world than we had been living in. . . . Yet he was a thorough evangelist, and revivalist even, in the best sense. He was full of fire, and spoke as one consumed with the one passion of winning souls to Christ and the Christian life. However far afield he might seem discursively to lead us, in, say, the first half of his discourse, it was only that he might with greater effect bring us face to face with Christ, and the issues of life and death bound up in our relations to Him."

Fifteen years after this, when he was minister of St. Paul's Street Church, Aberdeen, he had two congregations to whom he preached two different kinds of sermons. Of his morning congregation and sermons Sir W. Robertson Nicoll writes: "One was struck by the grave, subdued air of the worshippers. Most of them were evidently poor, though decently clad. Not a few had drank the cup of sorrow. They had found life a

'sair fecht.' They needed consolation and strength. They turned to Fairbairn's pulpit weather-beaten faces, brows furrowed with care. . . . The most beautiful thing, as it appeared to me, in Fairbairn's character was the way in which he set himself to succour, to uplift, to inspire the flock committed to his care. . . . The preacher knew what his hearers were thinking and needing, and what they had experienced" (pp. 80, 81).

The evening congregation and the evening sermons were both very different from those in the morning. The congregation then was drawn from all over the city, large numbers of members of the University being generally present. The sermons, which were entitled lectures, were upon subjects to which even then Fairbairn had given special study, and upon which later he became a recognized authority. Among other subjects upon which he lectured were the following: "The Conflict of Faith and Doubt"; "The Scientific and Religious Conceptions of the World—need they exclude each other?" "Inspiration and Revelation"; "The Credibility of the New Testament Record"; "The Jesus of History and the Christ of Christianity."

I lay stress upon this double work of Fairbairn's to show how he felt he was a debtor, to show that he felt he owed a duty, both to the unlearned and the learned. He carefully considered how he could supply the needs of more than one class of hearers, and by strenuous work he became extraordinarily successful in this double task. He fed the spiritual life of the devout, while he strengthened the faith of many seekers after truth. Unless he had had an intimate knowledge of the mind of both classes, and unless by constant study and strenuous pastoral visitation he had been able to preach from both a full knowledge of theology and an equally full knowledge of human nature, he could never have accomplished what he did. As another instance of the same double capacity I may cite the following: In 1884, when he was Principal of Airedale College, on the outskirts of Bradford, Fairbairn addressed a

letter to the working men of that great manufacturing town, inviting them to a course of "Lectures on Religion." To this the response was so wide that Horton Lane Chapel—one of the largest places of worship in the borough, and situated in its most populous part—was crowded each Sunday evening with a genuine working-class audience to the very doors.

Fairbairn's first regular pastorate was at Bathgate, a little country town half-way between Edinburgh and Glasgow. He went there when he was twenty-two, and remained twelve years. It was during these years that he laid the foundations of his future usefulness and influence. If any young clergyman wishes for convincing proof of the importance of the use he makes of the early years of his ministerial life, let him read and ponder over the twenty-eight pages which describe Fairbairn's work at Bathgate. So far as externals are concerned, few places could be less attractive. The place itself had no natural beauty, and the congregation consisted of small farmers, miners, quarrymen, and a few small tradesmen. Yet many of these men "were acute if not very well informed theologians," who "provided him with a healthy and stimulating atmosphere." In one of his earliest letters from Bathgate he speaks of being "as busy as possible: visiting, writing, and preaching are the orders of the day." "It was there," his biographer says, "he set himself to lay the foundations of all his future work. . . . He ordered his time with Spartan strictness and economy. . . . It was his custom to rise at 5.30 a.m., to work until 8.30, and then, after breakfast, until his dinner-hour at 2 p.m. The afternoons were generally spent in visiting his flock, and the evenings in classes and meetings. It may be said that there is nothing unusual in this. I am not so sure. I have long had, and still have, a somewhat extensive knowledge of the younger clergy. How many of them study six hours a day, or even three, before their midday meal? How many books which require 'study' do they, on an average, read in twelve months? How many will take the trouble to acquire a foreign language in order to increase their field of knowledge? How many of them realize

that the days may come when, from the sheer force of circumstances, their possible hours of study must be curtailed? I would go further and ask, How many incumbents in the Church of England encourage their young assistants to continue to be serious students? We read that Fairbairn "allowed nothing to interfere with his morning studies," and that "he must have spent a large part of his slender income before he was married in buying books." The way in which the majority of the younger clergy economize in books is certainly not to their advantage. Within eleven years of his entering the ministry Fairbairn's library consisted of nearly 2,000 volumes, many of them in foreign languages.

There is one episode in Fairbairn's life at Bathgate which, from its effects upon his later career, cannot be passed over. His theology was at first undoubtedly narrow. I have not space here to describe its contents, which are given fully in the "Life." A narrow theology is to any man a dangerous theology; it is especially so a hard student and a hard thinker—though these two qualities are not by any means always combined in the same person. After Fairbairn had been five years in the ministry, he confessed to a friend that "he had not an inch of ground beneath his feet"; in other words, his faith in what he had hitherto believed and preached had gone. He took a bold step: he resigned his pastorate, and went for a whole year as a student to Berlin. The school of theology there in 1865 was not what it is to-day. The influence of Hegel was still predominant in philosophy, and Fairbairn's own philosophical position showed at least traces of Hegelianism to the last. At that time Dorner was making theology at once more personal and more ethical; also Hengstenberg was then championing a conservative attitude, both with regard to orthodox belief and Biblical criticism. All these men had a strong influence upon Fairbairn, who at the end of twelve months returned to his pastorate with his faith absolutely restored, and with a theology far richer than he had known in earlier days. An epitome of his old faith and his new (on pp. 39-41), given in his own words, is a very

striking example of genuine self-expression. It shows how manfully he had "fought the spectres of the night, and laid them." One or two sentences may be quoted: "Theology was reborn, and with it a new and higher faith. God seemed a nobler and more majestic Being when interpreted through the Son; the Eternal Sonship involved the Eternal Fatherhood, and the old controversy as to their consubstantiality took a new meaning when the Son was conceived to be as necessary to the Deity as the Father. . . . Man, too, was so interpreted as to be invested with fresh majesty as an individual, and as a race he had a unity which made his fall and his redemption at once more possible and more reasonable. . . . Nor could the old narrow notion, which made salvation rather an affair of a future state than of this life, survive in the face of these larger ideas. Redemption concerned both the many and the one, the whole as well as the parts, the unity as much as the units. Man had collectively suffered loss, and collectively he could be saved. Hence his social as well as his personal recovery followed as a matter of course; only the rebuilding of the City of God, which had fallen down, could satisfy Him who had made the citizen, had planned and built the City." Quite apart from our agreement with the doctrines here expressed, we must admit that this is a very striking confession of faith from a young man of twenty-seven years of age. It is no mere acceptance of a conventional creed, but one which has been arrived at as the result of much labour and very earnest thought. It is a striking testimony to the value placed upon Fairbairn's ministry, and to his people's entire trust and confidence in him (even through theological change and restatement), that they kept the pastorate open during the time he was away, and welcomed him warmly on his return.

During the latter part of Fairbairn's ministry at Bathgate he wrote regularly for certain religious journals; he also became an occasional contributor to the *Contemporary Review*. Yet he never allowed his literary work to interfere with his preaching and visiting; on the contrary, he no doubt felt—what many

another minister has felt—that a certain amount of so-called literary work compelled him to make clear the contents of his mind. To put oneself into a position to be freely criticized is an excellent remedy for loose thinking and slipshod composition, two vices all too common among ministers of every branch of the Christian Church.

If Fairbairn stayed twelve years at Bathgate it was not because he was compelled to do so, for while he was there he received several invitations to more important churches. He refused all these until there came a call from Aberdeen. Upon his work there—where he remained five years—I have already touched. It was certainly a wider sphere than Bathgate, and one which offered far more opportunity of exercising the powers which he had cultivated and developed. During these years we find the same devotion both to study and pastoral work. Neither the one nor the other was neglected. But he was now beginning to be known more and more as a man of unusual power, one whose opinion demanded at least the most careful attention. If there was one point about his theological position from this time onwards more striking than any other it was the combination of a very definite evangelical creed—in the best sense of the word evangelical—with a demand that theology should be free, that it should not be confined by either the traditions of the past or by the party shibboleths of the present. The following is an extract from an article he wrote to the *Contemporary Review* in 1876: "It is an evil thing for any Church to fall behind the intellect of a country, or to float out of sympathy with it in its most earnest and religious endeavours to discover whatever of God's truth Nature or Man, Scripture or Science may reveal. It is a thing no less evil for any Church to swear by the standards of the past, when its faith has been permeated and almost transformed by the thought of the present. . . . The question for the Churches to consider is, whether they are to estrange and drive into unwilling antagonism men who are Christian at heart, but are too conscientious to subscribe a burdensome and oppressive creed, which pledges to

many things they do not and cannot believe, or by a timely removal of the more antiquated and obnoxious portions to draw these men into sympathy with the evangelical thought, and community with the religious life of the nation" (p. 68).

By the time Fairbairn had been some four or five years in Aberdeen, it became evident to his friends that he was desirous of taking up more definitely teaching work, and of making this the chief purpose of his life. He was offered the professorship of Apologetics in the Glasgow Evangelical Union Academy, but this he declined. He applied for the professorship of Moral Philosophy at both the Universities of Aberdeen and St. Andrews, but in each case he was defeated, though his supporters numbered among them such men as Geddes, Milligan, Robertson Smith, Lindsay, Blackie, Max Müller, Muir, Dorner, and Tiele.

In 1877 he was appointed principal of Airedale College, belonging to the Congregationalists, which had just moved into new and much larger buildings at Manningham, a suburb of Bradford. There Fairbairn entered upon what was to be his life's work—the all-round improvement, the raising of not only the ideal, but the actual efficiency, of the Nonconformist ministry. In this he was eminently successful; in fact, so successful that when it was decided to build Mansfield College at Oxford, it was unanimously felt by the leading men among the Congregationalists that he was the one man who should be invited to be its first principal. It is with his work at Airedale and Mansfield that, quite rightly, the greater part of the "Life" is concerned. The ideals he set before both himself and his students at both colleges, as well as the methods he pursued in order to realize these, should be carefully studied by all who have at heart the greater efficiency of ministerial work. Into this period of Fairbairn's life I do not propose to enter, for in writing this article I have had a very definite, if limited, object. In fact, I have no hesitation in saying that what I have so far written may be regarded as a text upon which I now wish to preach a short sermon.

Dr. Fairbairn was a striking example of the combination of the intellectual and the pastoral—a combination by no means common. He had cultivated and so knew both these sides of the work of the ministry as few men have done. It was in the combination of these that lay both his strength and his influence. It is the almost general divorce of them that is the real secret of so much of the terrible ineffectiveness of ministerial life to-day; and to this is also due not only the ineffectiveness of the ministry, but the general weakness of the influence of all the "Churches." Unless this divorce can be healed, this weakness will be actually accentuated in the future. We cannot deny that to-day there is a wide separation in both thought and life between the Universities and the working clergy. The Universities apparently do not understand what the parochial clergy need; at any rate, they do not seem to be at much pains to supply it. On the other hand, the working clergy have little sympathy with the teaching of theology which is to-day being given in the Universities. I think I may speak with some degree of knowledge, for I spent four years at one of the new Universities and then three years at one of the old, graduating in both. I have also, I fancy, kept in somewhat closer touch with both than the majority of the parochial clergy. The help I obtained from either—and I think I made at least an average use of the opportunities of doing this—has not been, so far as my practical work is concerned, very great. But I shall be told that there are the theological colleges, both at the Universities and elsewhere, whose object is to supplement their work. I never passed through one of these, but I have had to try to help a good many young men to become efficient clergymen who have done this.

I believe the chief cause of failure lies here. Very few of the men who are teaching theology either at the Universities or at our theological colleges, have had any long experience of pastoral work. Fairbairn had had at least seventeen years experience of pastoral work in a responsible position before he began to train men for the ministry. I will leave on one side

the professors and lectures on theology at the Universities, and I would ask, How many men are there teaching in the theological colleges belonging to the Church of England who have had anything like that length of pastoral experience? Theology, so far as I can see, is at the Universities regarded rather as an extremely interesting field of study, than as a science which is of enormous, indeed infinite, importance in the art of conduct. The last thing I would be guilty of would be of undervaluing learning. The Church cannot have too learned a ministry. But a knowledge of men is equally important with the knowledge of books. "Ars artium regimen animarum," said Gregory the Great, and much to-day may be learnt from his "Pastoral Rule." In his seventeen years of pastoral experience, Fairbairn learnt what the ministry needed in order to be helpful to the ordinary man, and he set himself to supply it. It is all very well to say that a man learns this from experience. True, I admit, but I also ask, At what cost? I remember a shrewd old Yorkshire woman's opinion of this. I was at the time senior curate on a large staff. Her view of some of the junior curates was one day forcibly expressed by her saying that she would have no more 'prentice lads practising over her. The chief aims of an ordinary theological college, so far as I have been able to discover them, seem to be two: first, to enable men to pass their ordination examinations, and, secondly, to furnish a devotional atmosphere. Both aims are, I admit, not only excellent, but indispensable; at the same time, by themselves, they are quite insufficient. Before a man is admitted to one of the most responsible of all positions, he should have had some training in the practical discharge of its duties, and that by one who has himself efficiently discharged them. Among these "duties" I should place, first, at least some ability to deal with individuals, whether men, women, or children; and, secondly, the power to put a subject intelligently before a mixed audience, in at least such a way as to obtain their attention. Without these two capabilities the fullest theological knowledge, and, I would venture to add, even personal devoutness and true

spirituality, are sure to be ineffective. A third power which the clergyman should cultivate is an insight into the current thought of the age, a knowledge of what is at the present time interesting the average man. I constantly come across two classes of men in the ministry: the first, and by far the smaller, class consists of learned men who have never been taught to make their learning effective; the second, and much the more numerous, class consists of men so devoid of learning and so generally inefficient that the man or woman of average education is certainly not influenced by them. Yet there was a time when many of the men belonging to both classes might have become efficient clergymen—the time covered by their stay at the University and the theological college and that spent in their first curacy. The men themselves are often greatly to blame, for many of them have done practically no serious study since they were admitted into priest's orders. But had the *influence* under which they passed these years been different, the men might now have been very different.

I only hope this history of the early years of Fairbairn's life may open the eyes of some to see what, with as small advantages as it is possible to imagine, a man who is really in earnest about his work may accomplish; also that it may prove that intellectual and pastoral efficiency must go hand in hand if the Christian ministry is to be a real power for good.

W. Edward Chadwick.

Political and Religious Ideals.

ONE comes frequently, of recent years, within hearing of the contention that it is the business and the duty of the State to make its legislative programmes conform to and embody religious ideals. Particular measures of reform are advocated on the ground that the line of action they inculcate would, in the case of individuals, be the religious and Christian line—and State action, no less than individual action, ought to be religious and Christian. In every legislative enactment which makes, or seems to make, for the greatest good of the greatest number, some advance is accomplished towards bringing in the Kingdom of God; and conversely, every one who cares for bringing in the Kingdom of God ought to favour any legislative programme which makes, or seems to make, for the greatest good of the greatest number. From the proposition (which of course is not here in dispute) that the mutual relations of man ought in the last resort to be regulated by the religious and Christian spirit, a quick passage, or rather flight, is made to the proposition (much more highly disputable) that by legislation this desired end can be achieved; and so we are carried on to the conclusion that religious and political ideals are, or should be, one and the same thing.

The contention is attractive—the more attractive, at its first blush, in proportion to the greater nobleness of the mind to which it is presented. Plausible, also, it must be pronounced. But is it sound? Perhaps its very attractiveness and plausibility make it all the more incumbent on those whom it magnetizes to examine it, in order to see whether they are not yielding assent to it too soon. Not even the prospective delight of forcing on the divinely-appointed Golden Age with the sharp weapon of law—not even the captivating winsomeness of the idea of Christianizing the State, the idea under whose spell so many young men see visions and so many old men dream dreams to-day—should make us refuse to consider the fundamental

possibilities or impossibilities involved. Can religious ideals be realized in the political sphere, in the State as commonly understood?

Leaving aside for the moment (to return to it presently) the question whether political and religious ideals are, or can be, the same, the primary consideration is the familiar one that the State bases itself in the final issue on force. The consideration is not by any means new; still, it is worth while to set it down. The fact, as stated, is obviously indisputable. The State bases itself in the final issue upon force. However great the likeness, however absolute the identity, we might ultimately find between political and religious ideals, this would none the less be true; and this coercive element in all State action makes it impossible that any adjustment of one man's attitude or action towards another, resulting from the State's decision, should be of religious quality or rank. The State, in all its legislation, in all its administrative edicts, in everything that, *qua* State, it does, assumes a clash of interests, a conflict of desires and antagonisms, between individual and individual, between order and order, between class and class. It comes into existence and does its work, in fact, simply because there is not a sufficiency of voluntary action to keep things straight. Parliamentary laws, together with all the rest of the weapons which the State employs—the policeman and the Courts of law standing in reserve behind—*make* men do what, without compulsion, they cannot be depended upon to do. Laws may be thoroughly beneficent and wise; for the members of the community they are, nevertheless, the moment they are entered upon the statute-book, a command which rules all voluntary, and consequently all moral, action out. The State does not correct or purify, but supplants, the activity of the will. The choice between two alternatives is no longer available; and the sources of actions correspondent to the laws are henceforth in the laws' suggestions and prescriptions, not in individual minds. However many times such a legislating process be repeated, however far it be carried, it can do nothing at all to bring about a fulfilment of the religious

ideal. For the very conception of such a fulfilment involves the idea of choice, on the part of those who fulfil, between two courses—a better and a worse; and it involves, further, the idea that the choice is made on moral grounds, *because* the one chosen is the better and *because* the one repudiated is the worse. Religious ideals are fulfilled when a man, becoming conscious of clashing between his own interests and another's, resolves the discord in the way which the sense of right dictates. Religious ideals are fulfilled when a man, with power to hurt or to help his brother, determines to help him, not because he must, but because—standing mid-way between the two alternatives, with no external force moving him to right or left—the inward forces move him to restrain the power of harming and to bid the power of helping go free. The utmost that State action can accomplish is to produce an outward condition of things *looking like* what religious motives and religious inspirations would produce. It can bid men (and secure their heed to its bidding) do what, if religious ideals possessed them, they would do. But imitation, perfect as it may be, is imitation still. And in the very act of saying "You must," the State disables itself from any fulfilling of religious ideals as regards the relations between man and man. For the essence of a religious action is that it springs, not from without, but from within.

Up to this point, however, it has been allowed, for the purposes of the argument, that political and religious ideals may be taken as being one and the same. All that has been said is reinforced tenfold when we turn to a critical examination of this fundamental point. For a careful consideration of it must lead to the conclusion that political and religious ideals, so far from being the same, are and must remain entirely distinct. Political ideals, in fact (and this quite apart from the coercive methods through which alone they can be realized), can never correspond, and for that matter ought not to correspond, with the ideals which religion sets up.

It is not necessary, in order to make the point, to elaborate

theories of the State and its functions. Certain broad statements—statements which will not be disputed, and which are sufficient for the present need—can easily be made. Clearly enough, political ideals involve on their negative side restraint of mutual harm, though this, of course, gets us no farther than a policy of mere *laissez-faire*. On their positive side, political ideals involve such an attitude on the part of one man toward another as shall prevent any hindrance to the harmonious and successful working of the whole social body; and in all probability the most advanced social reformer would claim that within the four corners of some such definition his programme can find room. Certainly it is the well-being of the *whole* that political ideals are, in their very nature, set to further; the State has no title to find out this or that individual, this or that set of individuals, and lavish upon one or the other any special favour; indeed, the idea of the "collective body" is the dominant idea in the reforming programmes of our time, and it is precisely the most eager advocates of political change who strike most insistently upon that single chord. It is not the State's business to choose out some particular man, or to press home upon its conscience the question how far it can stretch its activities in the direction of promoting his welfare. Further, for such self-sacrifice on the part of individuals as is implied in the adoption of the indicated attitude the State has a right to call, but not for any self-sacrifice other or greater than this. An individual may be summoned to subordinate his particular interests, in certain respects and up to a certain point, to the interests of the "whole"; but this demand must not be pushed too far, lest what is given to the "whole" with one hand should perchance be taken away with the other, and reform, overreaching itself in the effort to achieve an exaggerated completeness, be all undone again. As to all this there would probably be no dispute. In fine, the State has the right of calling upon each one of its members to do his duty, and other right it has none. Moreover, into the reckoning up of what this duty is there enters the question of the average moral standard of the time,

since the conception of the collective "good" and of what may be demanded for its attainment must not be stretched farther than the limit which this standard fixes; and the supreme consideration is always with how restricted a demand the situation may be met.

But this is no adequate statement of the religious ideal concerning the relations between man and man. According to the religious ideal, a man, precisely in proportion to his comprehension of what the religious ideal really is, will outrun mere obligation; minister of his substance even when he might, without incurring actual blame, withhold the grant; seek out opportunities of assisting his fellow-men rather than sit idly until an opportunity (so close and clamorous that it is no more an opportunity, but an order) is thrust upon him; work, as it were, overtime in the service of his brethren, and volunteer for tasks which he might ignore if he would. The State can do no more than summon a man to perform his duty; the man who has seen the greatness and the glory of the religious ideal knows that when he has performed his duty he is an unprofitable servant still. In a way, this is religious commonplace; all the greater pity, then, that so many, in their ardent proclamation of the supposed identity between political and religious ideals, seem to forget it. And the moment the commonplace comes into the circle of light, the proclamation, ardent as it may have been, must surely fall silent from a shamed sense of being futile and false. The man who is governed by religious ideals practises a whole range of "extra" virtues which at the same time spring from and react upon a definite religious culture, but for which the State, being what it is, has no right whatever to call. He does, one need not hesitate to say, many things which, as a matter of actual obligation, not even God has imposed upon him, but which he imposes upon himself. Over and above its strict demands, the religious ideal offers many suggestions which the religious man, in proportion to the intensity of his religiousness, will heed, even though, if he did not, no forfeiture of his religious status would be incurred. Nor does the average

moral standard, in matters of men's mutual relationships, form any part of the religious man's concern. The question with him is not how little will content the demands of the situation, but how much he can give and do without impairing the moral and spiritual reserves within his own nature on which, ultimately, his power of giving and doing depends.

Any attempt, therefore, at identifying religious and political ideals—any attempt at putting the idea of their identity into practice and using it as a guiding principle in legislative affairs—involves one of two things, or very possibly both of them together. This for the first: If religious ideals as to men's mutual relations are appreciated in all their fulness, if those who assert the oneness of religious and political ideals really seek to force the second up to the level of the first, a quite intrusive and irrelevant element is introduced into political controversy—the presence of this bringing about in its turn a by no means surprising irritation in many of the combatants, causing them to take up a much more thoroughly *non possumus* attitude than they might otherwise do, and so in the end retarding the upward movement instead of spurring it on. It is idle to blink the fact that the religious ideal does not appeal to everybody: it is idle, also, to blink the fact that those to whom it does appeal have no right whatever, as members of the body politic, to force even an outward obedience to it upon those whom it fails to win; and it is no matter for wonder if the man who is willing, or reluctantly willing, to do what the State has a real right to demand, but is in no particular hurry to do any more, should chafe—even to the point of postponing submission to the rightful demand as long as possible—when controversialists call upon the State to exercise a compulsion which it is *ultra vires* for the State to put forth. This is human nature. The hand often closes automatically when too much is asked. And it is well worth while for those who talk of the identity of political and religious ideals to ask themselves whether, by stretching the doctrine of the State's monitory rights over its members too far, they are not really retarding that progress

which all the members of the State may legitimately be called upon to further. In all probability much of the bitterness of current political controversy enters in because the presence of an irrelevant intrusion is felt and resented upon the field. Political and religious ideals are one, but if words have meaning, this signifies that the State has the right to impose upon a man, as an absolute duty, what religion itself rather suggests than commands. Little wonder that not a few men make angry protest against what is really an injustice in religious guise.

Alternatively with this—or concurrently with this, for, in point of fact, both results stand out clearly for those who have eyes to see—the theory of identity between political and religious ideals, the effort at making the theory good, involves an actual degradation of religion, a dulling of religious aspiration in the real sense, a growing forgetfulness of what religion is. Between the two results, indeed, a real connection exists. We have noted that to press the theory makes political controversy more acute. Under that increased acuteness of controversy it becomes clear that the theory cannot really be pushed to its end ; yet the theory, having been started, must be maintained ; and the way of escape from the dilemma lies in abating the demands which the theory is supposed to make. So, while an endeavour is still made to force the political ideal to the higher level, the religious ideal steps down from its throne to meet it as it comes. The psychological process is natural enough, and may easily enough go on unrecognized by the nature in which is its home. From the assertion that political and religious ideals are one, it is an easy step (with practical conditions, so to say, pushing from behind) to the assertion, or at least to the inarticulate feeling, that religion has no other ideals than these which can, and that with so much difficulty, be embodied in readjustments of the social state by political means. And, indeed, the definite assertion has been heard not seldom in recent years. It is not surprising that, if religious ideals are to be embodied in the political sphere, any constituents of the religious ideal as hitherto cherished to which circumstances will

not grant such embodiment—all those "extra" virtues spoken of before—should be, by the instinctive desire of the human mind for consistency, relegated to the background and ignored. They will not fit into the scheme. They cannot be packed, as it were, into the one vehicle wherein everything we are going to take with us must find room. And naturally, then, that definite religious culture—that movement of man's nature back and forth upon the greatness of God's, to take in and give out again whatever of God's nature it can—out of which these "extra" virtues come and upon which they react, tends to be neglected more and more. For the source of what is but secondary must, of course, be but secondary itself. So religion presses out from the centre to the circumference, from the inward to the outward—not, as is fondly imagined, to *take in* the circumference and the outward as additions to its range of influence, but to *leave* the centre and the inward behind, relinquishing there the grasp it once possessed. So there fades out of religion spiritual passion, aspiration, prayer. So does religion become Materialism's ally and minister. There is no need to dwell on the evidence that this process is going on in the religious world to-day. The fact is patent to any unprejudiced observer who will go below the surface and put himself to the trouble of a little hour's careful watch. The strangest thing, from this point of view, is that those who most loudly make the demand for a realization of religious ideals within the political sphere do so because of their professed desire (of course, a desire quite sincerely felt) to make religion a more powerful thing, a thing of wider range, and therefore a thing surer of its place, in the modern world. "Say that political and religious ideals are entirely distinct, and you make religion such a small, limited, inactive affair, out of all relation to the practical concerns of life!" so runs the cry. Well, one need not stand on the defensive here. Rather may one fling a counter-challenge, and say: "It is your theory of oneness between political and religious ideals that reduces religion's range, restricts its view, changes it into no more than a morality which weighs itself out

in a grain-by-grain miser's fashion, turns it forcibly away from those infinite sources whence larger and more generous activities might flow!" The upholders of the theory may go forth, as they believe and declare, as champions to vindicate for religion a place in the modern world. But they fight with hands which they themselves have fettered, with weapons to which they themselves have given a blunted edge. If religion be forced into such a wedlock as is implied in the doctrine that political and religious ideals are one, then it cannot be but that religion will wear less shining robes and maintain less royal state than she did, and, for the sake of an apparent immediate practicality, forfeit much both of that intrinsic imperiousness and of that intimate communion with what is hidden behind the veil, which made her so great before.

What has to be faced, in fine, is the fact that the influence of religion in the political sphere must be for the most part indirect. It is not suggested for a moment that such an influence may not exist. "Then you contend" (so runs the usual objection to such ideas as have here been advanced) "that religion must remain without influence upon politics, that it cannot elevate political ideals at all?" Not so. The contention is that the connection of religious and political ideals must be indirect, and, further, that it need be no less real for that. Of course, the presence upon the political field of the man inspired by religious ideals is all through assumed. It may be as well to say it, spite of its obviousness, since a charge to the contrary is the handy stone so many have accustomed themselves to fling. There is no implication that the man who elevates religious ideals above political is out of place in the political arena. The opposite implication, indeed, is the one that naturally emerges. It is assumed that he takes his political place. And through the presence and spread of religion in and by means of religiously inspired personalities there must inevitably come a raising of that average moral standard upon which legislation depends, and which legislation cannot in the last resort outstrip. If religious ideals as to men's social relationships, attitudes,

ministries, be cherished; if, still more, they be voluntarily put into practice by those who profess to hold them, the conception of those relationships and attitudes and ministries, as it is framed in the community's general sentiment, becomes nobler; for a little leaven leavens the whole lump, even though at the lump's outer edges the leavening be less marked than at the centre. In fact, it is just those dominated by ideals impossible of realization there who do the best service—albeit, perhaps, an unrecognized one—upon the political field. One of the most valuable forces in politics is the force of those who see what politics *cannot* do. Whatever direct and immediate political service lies within their power they will perform with at least as much zeal as anyone else. But it is by them that the range of political possibilities spreads out more widely. Within them dwells their secret; and while that secret will not proclaim itself upon the political housetops, nor seek to make itself part of the ordinary political stock-in-trade, something of its magnetism will go out from it to many who, all unknowing, touch the hem of its robe. And the true political influence and service of the Church is to send into the political field men who have the call of more than political ideals sounding in their ears, and who realize that, let political ideals go far as they may, religious ideals will still be beckoning from shining heights ahead.

Impatience with all this is often noble. But it is mistaken nevertheless. And though the contrary view may temporarily—for the hour in which enthusiasm for a Kingdom of Heaven set up by violence blinds the eyes—seem more attractive, yet just in proportion to a man's sense of the religious call will he feel in the end that the stated view is indisputably true. Religious and political ideals are fundamentally distinct, and under this present "dispensation" (if one may recoin a word from the old theological mint, and give it another value) must so remain. And it is in the interests of both political and religious progress that they should be so conceived. For—to close on a paradoxical note—the recognition of their distinctness is the surest way to bring about the utmost possible approximation of the two.

HENRY W. CLARK.

Liberal Evangelicalism: What it is and What it stands for.[1]

II.—WHAT EVANGELICALISM IMPLIES.

ENOUGH has been said to show that the Evangelical position is fundamentally and essentially religious and doctrinal. Primarily it has no special concern in other matters. We steadily refuse to define our standpoint in terms of ritual, for instance. We know that we are commonly misunderstood as a section of Churchmen who are conspicuous for a prejudice against elaborate ceremonial and spectacular worship.

This is quite wrong. The most elaborate ceremonial need not *necessarily* conflict with our views in the smallest degree, for our whole standpoint is purely spiritual, and in theory it may be expressed outwardly, according to the needs of the worshipper, in the plainest and homeliest way or in the most striking and even dramatic fashion. But *in practice* we find ourselves in conflict with much of the prevalent ritual.

This ritual is objectionable to us not because it is ritual. We recognize fully that the artistic makes a strong appeal to many minds, and we protest earnestly that no attempt must be made to condemn Evangelicalism eternally to a drab and dull form of worship. Ritualistic Evangelicalism is in no sense a contradiction in terms, any more than, for instance, is Patriotic Socialism. It may be that some day Evangelicalism will develop a ritual of its own, even more striking and picturesque than that to which it now objects.

It is not mere prejudice or personal taste that makes us view with anxiety the type of service seen in some of our churches to-day; it is principle. We believe that these things from which we dissent are the by-products of doctrines which cut across the fundamental truths for which we stand.

[1 It may be convenient to state that the CHURCHMAN is not necessarily identified with all the views set forth in this series of papers. They are contributed by one of the ablest writers amongst the younger Evangelicals who is entitled to be heard.—ED.]

Let us say again that we are not indulging in an onslaught on the opinions of other people, but only seeking to make clear the position for which we stand, and we will now venture to illustrate our point.

Take, for instance, the use of the sacrificial vestments. Our deep-rooted aversion from these things originates from no Puritanical prejudice. Anything which lends dignity and solemnity to the Eucharistic Feast is, in our judgment, most proper. But these particular garments have a peculiar significance. Their users would be the first to admit that this is so. They are valued by those who employ them simply because of their significance, and we should be wronging those from whom we dissent if we accused them of throwing an apple of discord into the Church for no real reason.

They are the insignia of a view of the Holy Communion which we firmly believe is derogatory to the Sacrifice of Christ on Calvary. We know that they are used with the intention of identifying our Communion Service with the Mass in the Roman Church, and, without going so far as to say that all who use them in our Church hold sacramental views identical with the Romanists, we do believe that, at the very least, they suggest a dangerous approximation to those views. And what is the Roman view? We quote from a standard Roman Catholic work:

"The Will of Christ, to manifest His gracious condescension to us in the Eucharist, forms no less an integral part of His great work than all besides, and in a way so necessary, indeed, that, whilst we here find the whole scheme of Redemption reflected, *without it the other parts would not have sufficed for our complete Atonement.* . . . In this last portion of the great Sacrifice for us" (*i.e.*, in the Eucharist) "all the other parts are to be present, and applied to us: in this last part of the objective Sacrifice, the latter becomes subjective and appropriated to us. *Christ on the Cross is still an object strange to us:* Christ, in the Christian worship, is our property, our victim. There He is the universal victim—here He is the victim for us in particular,

and for every individual amongst us; there He was only the victim—here He is the victim acknowledged and revered; there the objective Atonement was consummated—here the subjective Atonement is partly fostered and promoted, partly expressed."[1]

We do not propose to discuss this view in any detail, but only to point out that any suggestion that the Holy Communion contributes in any way to the completion of the Atonement is something which we could not accept without lying to our own souls and committing treachery against our most intimate and precious belief. It is for this reason that the sacrificial vestments are an offence to us—because they are part of the machinery employed to advance these sacramental views.

Or take, again, the High Anglican practice of Sacramental Confession. Here we have a practice which comes into direct collision with our belief. Though the dark history of this practice would naturally make us extremely cautious, yet this is not the *basis* of our objection to it. Many good things have been abused. But we stand for the positive truth that the redeemed man is a child of God. Christ is to Him so intimate and near, that we have not only no need of any human intermediary in our transactions with God, but we feel that any such intervention argues a lack of confidence in Him and slights His love.

So we might go on illustrating that the Evangelical recoil from many of the tendencies in our Church to-day is based upon root principles, and not upon morbid fear of Rome. But we turn from this distasteful subject to something more congenial.

We pointed out in the previous paper that the heart and core of Evangelicalism was belief in the complete efficacy of the Death of Christ to achieve for us pardon and deliverance from our sins and to unite us to God, and that the knowledge of our forgiveness and acceptance by God is the surest thing of which we are conscious.

[1] "Symbolism or Doctrinal Differences," by J. A. Moehler, ed. 1906, pp. 238, 239.

We are not only jealous for this truth in such a way as to make us repudiate everything which conflicts with it in the smallest degree, but our loyalty to it operates in another way. It has bred in us a strong sense of spiritual kinship with all who agree with us on this point. We feel we are of the same blood with them. They have found pardon and peace at that Cross; they worship the same Saviour; their experience of His peace and power is identical with ours. To deny our brotherhood with them would be equivalent to denying our Parentage. We differ from them in many ways, as do the children of any earthly family. Our tastes are dissimilar; our ways of expressing ourselves are diverse; our sense of the proper proportion of many important matters differs, often sharply, from theirs; but this we can never lose sight of: they are our kith and kin. Our common birth cries out for a closer union; instinct draws us to them. Just because of the Holy and Blessed Thing which we have in common with them, we deplore everything which stirs up contention, for we feel that it is the Voice of the Father within us which cries out: "Ye are brethren. Why do ye these things?"

This is the mainspring of the increasing movement among us for closer union, and it is this which makes us lament the family quarrels which keep us apart, and are such a fruitful cause of scandal and spiritual ineffectiveness. We do not expect for a moment that we shall ever all see eye to eye. This would mean the sacrifice of all individuality. But a better understanding, a closer union, issuing in a federation of all Evangelical Christians, is surely not too much to hope and pray for. Can we not work together and pray together? Nay, may we not, at least, from time to time invite them to kneel with us at the Lord's Table? When we read the arguments against such intercommunion, we must candidly say that what is to us most striking is the absence of proper perspective displayed by the objectors. From arguments which suggest some grave defect in Nonconformists which imperils the soul, they range down to objections which are mere petulance.

We are quite well aware that our Nonconformist brethren frequently display animosity against us, and in extreme cases have gone out of their way to hinder our work. But even if this were universally true of them, it would be no excuse for our refusal to show a better and larger spirit. Happily, this is by no means true of even the majority of them. Could better proof of this fact be given than by the Welsh Nonconformist protest against the Disendowment of the Welsh Church—a country, be it noted, where the tension between Church and Dissent is far greater than anywhere else? Furthermore, the plea for closer spiritual fellowship would only have force with the spiritual element in Dissent, and not with the rancorous and political party.

But we must leave these points and pass on to others.

We uttered our caveat above against identifying Evangelicalism with Protestantism, not because we have the least hesitation in accepting the title, but because the two terms are in no sense synonymous. There is a Protestantism which is certainly not Evangelical, but rather rationalistic; and, as we have said, the High Churchmen and Low Churchmen of old time were Protestants to a man, from Laud down to Hoadley, but they were not Evangelicals. But Evangelicalism, as a matter of fact, is essentially Protestant. We must pause over this for a moment.

The term "Protestant" has been extraordinarily mishandled lately. Abuse and ridicule have been heaped upon it. Happily, however, "the man of independent mind, he looks and laughs at a' that." Mere abuse and hard words have no weight with him at all. He knows perfectly well that the charge that "Protestantism is a bundle of negations" is historically false. We cannot dwell upon the great truths for which the Reformers stood and suffered, but we must note two of their fundamental contentions—justification by faith and the right of private judgment. Both of these are principles common to Evangelicalism and Protestantism. Hence we are essentially Protestant. The former truth, we saw, was the central truth to

us, and the latter is the inevitable corollary from the former. For if personal faith is essential to salvation, it is clear that such faith cannot be forced; it must arise freely and spontaneously. Church and priest must stand aside, and each man must meet his God and Saviour alone. But if the individual is thus responsible for himself, he must be allowed a free conscience, for a responsible agent must have freedom of action. True belief is a voluntary act. Mere assent or unintelligent acceptance can be generated to order, but not faith.

Consequently, freedom of conscience or the right of private judgment is a necessary deduction from the doctrine of justification by faith.

We are not going to discuss at this point the limits and the extent of the authority of Bible, Church, or Creeds, but we wish to emphasize here this important point: the soul, conscience, mind, must be free. Many factors will contribute to the formation of decisions, but if God and man hold the soul responsible, that soul must have perfect freedom of choice, to accept or to reject.

Now, without dwelling further upon this fairly obvious point, we wish to say that it is just this doctrine of the right of private judgment which is the link between us Liberal Evangelicals and the Broad Churchmen. Reason and conscience, we have said elsewhere, are the great guides to truth with the Broad Churchman, and we, too, admit this. As a matter of fact, we give much more weight to certain factors which contribute to the formation of decision than they do, but the principle is common to us both.

Perhaps it is true to say that the right of conscience has been somewhat obscured amongst us, that our opinions have become somewhat hardened, and there has been a nervousness respecting inquiry and criticism. Apprehension of this kind may be well excused, but the privilege of private judgment must not be lost.

We do not, as a matter of fact, consider that there is any peculiar virtue or exceptional value in modern thought. Like

the ships of Tarshish, which brought gold and silver, ivory, apes and peacocks, to King Solomon, modern thought has mingled its contribution of good things with the ridiculous and the bizarre. But we do believe that the process of revelation is still going on. The Divine Spirit, Who guides into all truth, has not finished teaching us: the Lord, Who had many things to say, has not ceased to speak; former times were not "able to bear" all His utterances, and our own time and future times will hear more and more of His words if we listen, if we are teachable. Hence the process of weighing and sifting and testing and discriminating must go on.

The right of private judgment, then, is a sacred part of our inheritance; it gives elasticity and buoyancy to our thought, so that we need not be the dull and backward boys in God's School.

We Liberal Evangelicals, then, are prepared to give play to the right of private judgment; we are determined to "try the spirits," to prove all things, and hold fast that which is good. We are Evangelicals anchored fast to certain fundamental truths by a long rope. Those truths are true for all time; they are as dear to us as they were to our fathers, though we view them, perhaps, from a somewhat different angle. The mountain in the moonlight, at daybreak, at noontide, and at sunset, presents a somewhat different appearance. Who will dare to dogmatize as to when it is most beautiful, or as to which light makes it most majestic? The old truths abide, but the light in which we see them is different from the light which illumined them to those who went before, and the light in which those who come after us will see them will differ yet again from ours.

But we are modern men. Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever—unchanging in His love and His saving grace. But He is not the same in a like sense as is a beautiful piece of statuary, with its perfect but motionless limbs and immobile face. He is expressing Himself to-day; His Divine Spirit is teaching now—not only the old truths, but new truths too. The new is not always the true; very often it is false and crude. But why should we, therefore, fear? The Holy Spirit

is ours to guide us into all *truth*, and if we have faith in that guiding there is no place for fear. Christ has opened our eyes in many senses; we still only "see men as trees walking," but as the years roll by the vision clears.

Is not the spirit of inquiry, yes, even of criticism, a cause for thankfulness? No man can deny it but he who has misgivings about the certainty of the faith he believes, he who has a lurking dread that something he accepts as true may prove false on inquiry, he who has a Bluebeard's Chamber in his heart.

But surely such anxiety is both discreditable to us and dishonouring to God? We do not mean to suggest that anything but disaster and shipwreck awaits the person who without compass or chart embarks upon the sea of present-day inquiry and criticism. But we do mean that the man who has a living faith and a personal experience of Christ in his heart, and who trustfully asks His guidance and help, can go forth upon that voyage of discovery certain that he will not only not lose that which he has, but that he will gain a deeper and a fuller knowledge of the things belonging to the Kingdom of God.

Nothing is more fatal to a robust faith than the disquieting and haunting dread that things most surely believed among us are not reliable. It may be found on inquiry that readjustment is needed in some directions, that criticism and new light compel us to rearrange our thoughts and express our belief in different terms. But if this should prove to be the case, nothing can shake our personal faith in Christ and our assurance of our union with Him, for no logomachy, nor logic, nor philosophy, can overthrow that which we know from our deepest personal experience to be as true as our own existence.

"Let us once and for all have done with the apprehension that that which shines and burns among us as the very life of our life, closer to us than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet, can ever be 'disproved,' 'refuted,' or filched from us in

any way, by the digging up of an old scrap of papyrus, or the ingenious lucubrations of some German professor." So writes one of the great prophets of our day.

We need therefore have no apprehensions. This dread that faith is crumbling to pieces, and that we are soon to be left floundering in a sea of doubt and despair, is simply the creation of an hysterical imagination, fostered by timid and anxious souls who certainly *appear* to have misgivings about the security of their religion. We have no such fear. Christ was not unwilling, in the days of His flesh, to meet the honest inquirer, and why should we fear for Him to-day? The Lord who said "Handle Me, and see," would not to-day deny the right of those who would try and examine Him, His claims and His power.

X.

Resurrection, in the Midst of Life.

"As dying, and, behold, we live."—2 Cor. vi. 9.

THERE are occasions, amid the vicissitudes of life, when the extremity of suffering, anxiety, or suspense may be likened to the deep darkness which precedes the dawn of a new spell of hope: and these occasions, these crises, mark a fresh departure of growth in grace and whole-hearted consecration.

It was after such an occasion, and one of rather extreme tension of distress, that the writer, many years ago, gained an experience of relief, as unexpected as it was welcome, in answer to much prayer.

It was on this wise: Psalm cxvi. came under his special study. Verse 15 was reached—"Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints." The familiar verse had in times past been selected as the text of a memorial sermon, after the death of an honoured parishioner. But now it was seen, with a sudden surprise, in a new light; a fresh meaning seemed to illumine it, and one in direct harmony with the key-note of the Psalm, "deliverance." Twice before, in verses 3 and 8, the term "death" occurs; and in both cases the reference is not to bodily death, but to a crisis of "trouble and sorrow" from which the Lord "delivered" the Psalmist. Surely the inference seems clear that "death" in verse 15 has the same significance. To refer it to the death of the body appears to mar the continuity of the sacred ode, as well as to make the term "precious" somewhat unmeaning. May we not believe that "death" here, as before, signifies an overwhelming experience, a deep spiritual depression, in the midst of life? And from this "death" there is a *resurrection*, a "newness of life" in a fresh plane of steadier mastery over life's ills. Yes, and a future of increased power for service rendered to the Deliverer, as well as a heartier tribute of thanksgiving and consecration to the Lord. And is not all this—this which constitutes a "death" followed by a resurrection—exceedingly

"precious in the sight of the Lord"? The proof that it is so comes out in the immediate context of this remarkable verse. No sooner is deliverance experienced from "death"—"the cords of death" (ver. 3, R.V.)—than the Psalmist exclaims, as one conscious of a new sense of liberty, "Thou hast loosed my bonds" (ver. 16). With loosened bonds, the liberated Psalmist exclaims: "O Lord, truly I am Thy servant; I am Thy servant." The privilege of serving is fully realized, and a resurrection of deliverance from "so great a death" (*cf.* 2 Cor. i. 10) is its source and strength. Further, praise, thanksgiving, and a new freedom in prayer (ver. 17) mark the life of the released soul.

Now this experience of "death" followed by a resurrection is not infrequent (in a greater or a lesser degree) in all earnest Christian lives. And it is well that we should thoroughly recognize it as a fact. Yes, and more; it is well that we should regard it as a definite outcome of "the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." The whole experience constitutes a *law*, and as such it was enunciated by St. Paul in one of those paradoxes we find him laying down in 2 Cor. vi., "As dying, and behold we live" (ver. 9). And we have a still more emphatic testimony to the fact in 2 Cor. iv. 10 (R.V.): "Always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our body." A very remarkable statement of the same principle occurs in the first chapter of this Epistle. St. Paul had been suffering overwhelming affliction and trouble, and he says of it (2 Cor. i. 9, 10): "We had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead: Who delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver."

We have stated that the principle which is the subject of this paper constitutes a law in the realm of *spiritual* experience. And in correspondence with this principle, which governs the Christian life, we may trace a *natural* law, discernible throughout the animated creation (whether in the animal or vegetable domain) whereby, in the midst of life, periodical conditions of

depression occur, varying in duration, succeeded by conditions of revived vitality. This depression, or suspended animation, constitutes a sort of *death*, followed by a revivified existence. The universal occurrence of sleep is the most obvious illustration; and under this head we may include the familiar fall of the leaf in autumn, succeeded by the bursting buds of spring.

Again, in the realm of common human experience, we may discern, in almost every worthy enterprise, that a stage is reached when there comes a sensation of depression, akin to despair, and the question has to be faced, "Shall I continue, or must I give it up?" Much depends upon our decision at this crisis. If we yield to the suggestion of despondency, character suffers, and future success in life is impaired. If we persevere, a victory has been gained, and strength of purpose is achieved. Shakespeare seems to have referred to this line of experience, and its successful mastery, in those familiar words:

> "There is a tide in the affairs of men,
> Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune."
> (*Julius Cæsar*, Act IV., Scene 3.)

Manifestly the allusion is to the inflowing tide. But this is preceded by the ebb, which falls lowest before the highest spring tide.

We will now return to our main subject, having fortified our recognition of the great principle "RESURRECTION in the midst of Life," by reference to wider laws of *Nature* and *Experience*, which seem to illustrate and prove the matter before us.

And we do this because, if, as we believe, the main principle that forms the basis of our whole line of thought is correct, it should throw light upon some prominent facts in sacred history. We select four, out of many more, as being of a leading character, or else as having become "bones" of contentious criticism. We think that in some cases difficulties of interpretation have arisen just because the main purport has not been clearly understood.

1. Our first illustration is that memorable occasion (Gen. xxii.) when God "did *prove* (R.V.) Abraham" by commanding him to offer up his son Isaac, the son of promise, the heir

through whom all nations of the earth were to be blessed. That this was a real command, and a real statement of fact, we cannot doubt. Under no other interpretation can we understand the words of high approval contained in verses 15 to 18, in which Jehovah founds His renewal of blessing upon the fact, "Because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son," and, again, verse 18, "Because thou hast obeyed My voice." This great event, the readiness of Abraham to offer up his son Isaac, which is frequently referred to in the New Testament, formed the eighth, and final, recorded revelation of God to this patriarch.[1] It was, in fact, a sort of climax of probation, so great, so overwhelming, so contrary to human conception, that only God Himself could have conceived it, and even He because He could say of Abraham, "I know him." Jehovah proved a faith the nature of which He knew, that He might make this faith in its tremendous issues and in its typical bearing monumental and unique. St. Paul and St. James refer to this event, the one to prove that the *faith* justified, the other that the *works* justified this "father of all them that believe."

And what was the whole gist of this great historic event? Life out of Death. In other words, Death and Resurrection, a foreshadowing of Calvary's Cross, and the deserted sepulchre on the third day. This is no vague conjecture. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews definitely tells us (Heb. xi. 17-19) that Abraham "offered up his only begotten son . . . accounting that God was able to raise him up from the dead; from whence he did also in a parable receive him back" (R.V.) *cf.* John viii. 56. "My day." "The fulfilment of all that was promised to him" (Westcott, *in loc.*).

2. Our second illustration is the casting of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego into the burning fiery furnace, by order of Nebuchadnezzar, because they refused to worship the golden image which he had set up (*vide* Dan. iii.). This

[1] *Vide* Gen. xii. 1-3, xii. 7, xiii. 14-17, xv. 1-6, xv. 18, xvii. 1-21, xviii. 17-19, and the passage before us Gen. xxii.

furnace surely typified death, and their deliverance was a foreshadowing of resurrection. And the fact that the flames burned their bonds and set them free, while not a hair of their heads was singed, affords a striking comment on the words of Psalm cxvi. 3 (R.V.) and 16 (*vide* above), "Thou hast loosed my bonds."

3. And now we recall the experience of the prophet Jonah. The Lord brought upon this disobedient messenger a severe token of His just chastisement. He "prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah. And Jonah was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights" (Jonah i. 17). Now, as though to silence all adverse criticism of this historic event, we have our Lord's double allusion to it in express terms (*vide* Matt. xii. 40, xvi. 4). And the former of these gives the clue to the nature of Jonah's experience. It was a death followed by a resurrection, and thus it became a type of Christ's dying and rising again for us men and for our salvation.

4. The fourth and last illustration brings us back to the Apostle Paul, whose words "As dying, and, behold, we live," head this paper. We can have no doubt that the carefully narrated experience given us in 2 Cor. xii. of the "thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure" (ver. 7) was a very real and memorable event in his life-history, and one which was very momentous in the great lessons it taught him. We know not what was the nature of the overwhelming and painful discipline, nor need we care to inquire. Enough is told us to show that the Apostle was deeply depressed; he had "the sentence of death" in himself. And out of this grievous affliction he might not be actually delivered in response to his reiterated prayer. But he received abundant answer in a far richer degree. He rose to a higher stage of spiritual living. And out of this "thorn in the flesh" is brought into existence the gracious assurance which formed a keynote of St. Paul's after life (ver. 9): "He said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for My strength is made perfect in weakness."

W. A. BATHURST.

A Great Irish Bishop.

IRELAND is the most hospitable country in the world. From the days of St. Patrick onwards she has called to herself foster-children from beyond the seas, and taken them to her heart, sealing them with the print of her own individuality, till she, and they, and the rest of the world, have alike forgotten that they were not her children by birth.

A recent book on "Irish Nationality" closes with a list of national heroes, "lofty figures whom the people have exalted with the poetry of their souls and crowned with love and gratitude." Third on the list—midway between "Kildare riding from his tomb on the horse with the silver shoes," and Owen Roe O'Neill, soldier of fortune and leader of forlorn hopes—stands the name of Bishop Bedell.

An alien both by birth and tradition, the representative of an alien Church, at a time when an outburst of popular fury wellnigh swept away both his Church and his nation from the face of his adopted country—what manner of man was this, who won for himself a place in the Irish heart where he is enshrined to this day?

William Bedell came of an English yeoman stock, and was born on Michaelmas Day, 1571; "his birthday," as his son and first biographer quaintly remarks, "presaging him an antagonist against the devil and his angels."

In early life he spent some time in Venice, as Chaplain to the English Ambassador, and won the admiring affection of many leading Italian scholars, including the celebrated Paul Sarpi. But he had been quietly settled for many years in a Suffolk village, when—through the recommendation of Milton's friend Diodati—he was offered the Provostship of Trinity College, Dublin.

"That a private country minister, so far distant and of so retired a life, should be sought for so public and eminent an employment" was strange enough; and a letter of Bedell's

shows how far he had been from seeking it. But after giving a number of reasons which moved him "to reject this offer," he adds:

"On the other hand . . . if God call me . . . I shall obey, if it were not only to go into Ireland, but into Virginia; yea, though I were not only to meet with troubles, dangers and difficulties, but death itself in the performance."

At length it became clear to him that the call *was* from God.

After a short preliminary visit to Dublin, he returned to England to fetch his wife and family on Michaelmas Day, 1627, his fifty-sixth birthday; and henceforward the life of St. Michael's warrior was one continuous conflict.

"The eyes of all men," says his son, "were upon him, the mouths of all opened against him. . . . His own nearest friends and relations were no small disheartening to him, as looking upon him and his actings according to the common vote."

It went about at first that he was "a weak man," "which," Bedell writes, with touching humility, "is most true." But those around him soon discovered that, with all his gentleness, this "weak man" would never yield one jot of what he believed to be right; and before long his wonderful power of winning hearts began to tell.

Of the reforms which are embodied to this day in "Bedell's Statutes," one which roused most criticism was his decree that "the natives of the country should be exercised in the reading of their own language, that they might be the fitter to convert their countrymen."

Suiting example to precept, he had already begun to study Irish himself; such an extraordinary proceeding, in the eyes of the Fellows, that a report spread about that he was a Papist in disguise! One Professor, "a man of great learning, zeal, and piety, but over-hot," went so far as to preach against him from the text, "Come out of her, my people."

The sequel to this sermon is told with delightful *naïveté*. Instead of taking any public notice of the affront, Bedell contrived "a private conference in the Professor's own chamber,

where they debated the business largely together, like scholars, all in Latin, without any witness unless a sizar, and parted good friends; and no more was ever heard of that matter, saving only that the Professor afterwards to some of his acquaintance gave the Provost the commendation of a pure Ciceronian as ever he had discoursed with!"

But no sooner had Bedell accomplished his initial reforms, and begun to live down hostility, than the call came to a new battlefield. In 1629 he was nominated to the bishoprics of Kilmore and Ardagh. "Thus," he writes to an intimate friend, in humorous deprecation, "your friend, who never dreamed of this or any other bishopric (more than to be Pope of Rome) is to have two bishoprics at a clap, being insufficient for one!"

He was consecrated on September 13, 1629, and set to work immediately to bring his two dioceses into some sort of order.

It was a herculean labour. The state of things is vividly summed up in Bedell's own words:

"The people almost all popish, the Irish without exception. . . . The (R.C.) Primate himself lives in my parish within two miles of my house; the Bishop in another part of my diocese further off. Each parish hath its priest, and some two or three a-piece. . . . Friars there are in divers places, who . . . by their importunate begging impoverish the people, who indeed are generally very poor, as from that cause so from their paying double tythes to their clergy and ours, from the dearth of corn and the death of cattle these late years, with their contributions to their soldiers and agents: and—which forget not to reckon among other causes—the oppression of the Court Ecclesiastical, which in very truth . . . I cannot excuse and do seek to reform. For my own, there are seven or eight ministers of good sufficiency; and, which is no small cause of the continuance of the people in popery still, English, which have not the tongue of the people, nor can perform any divine offices or converse with them; and which hold, many of them, two or three, four or more vicarages a-piece. . . . The Lord in mercy look upon His poor Church and this part of it as poor as any;

and my particular diocese poorly furnished of a Bishop—the comfort of whose heart is, God is rich in mercy to all that call upon Him."

To give any detailed account of Bedell's struggle to right the wrongs here set forth, would be like trying to describe in detail Hercules' battle with the hydra.

A man of peace, desiring to live in charity with all men, his hatred of injustice and oppression forced him into lawsuit after lawsuit, until "he called the law his purgatory." A scholar to the finger-tips, he let "the spiders take their pleasure in my study amongst my books," while he wandered in "many a hard, weary journey," across "mountains and boggy ways and loughs and rivers not passable by boat," from one end of his diocese to the other.

"The people generally, English, Scottish, Irish, gentle, simple, Protestants, Papists, welcomed him wherever he came. . . . He would not refuse the courtesies of Papists in these occasions, nor of Papist-priests, but sometimes hath taken up his lodging even in such men's houses, and very ambitious would they be of entertaining him as their guest."

We can picture the fine old man, "tall and graceful in his person," clad in "a long stuff gown not costly but comely," with abundant grey hair and long beard, "his eye not dim nor his natural force abated, having never used spectacles nor lost one tooth," moving amongst rich and poor with the same stately courtesy and winning charm.

His very failures were personal triumphs.

One of his bitterest opponents was a Dr. Cooke, his lay Chancellor, who, whilst acting ostensibly in the Bishop's name, was quite independent of his authority. In the Ecclesiastical Courts, Bedell was constantly striving to undo the evil done by his Chancellor, "both keeping," as he expressed it, "his own hands clean, and looking as well as he could to the fingers of Mr. Cooke." A sternly contested lawsuit resulted in a nominal victory for the Chancellor. Yet Bedell's son-in-law tells us how "in the year 1646 I met with Dr. Cooke by chance in London,

who spake as reverently of my Lord of Kilmore as any could do, and said he thought there had not been such a man upon the face of the earth until he tried him. . . . He seemed to me to bemoan his death, and was courteous and respectful to me for his sake."

On the whole, the extent of the Bishop's success—real, tangible success—is no less wonderful than is the resistance with which he had to contend.

From the beginning he had resolutely opposed non-residence and pluralism. In 1633 he set an example by resigning the bishopric of Ardagh, and within a short time he had actually succeeded in inducing the greater proportion of his clergy to follow suit.

His methods of dealing with individuals were a characteristic mixture of gentleness and shrewdness. We are told that he won over one eccentric scholar, who threatened to be a hopeless stumbling-block in the way of reform, by setting him to work on the construction of a universal language!

Then came the problem of how to fill the vacant livings. The Bishop's first test of qualification was an utterly novel one in the eyes of his contemporaries—knowledge of Irish.

"How," he would ask, "though they had St. Paul's gifts, could the ministers do any good unless they had the language of the people?"

Bedell had flung himself into the study of the Irish language with the same zest which had made him master of "Arabic and Chaldee" in his old student days at Emmanuel, and of Italian in Venice. As he had drawn up an English-Italian grammar for Sarpi, so now he compiled an Irish one for the use of his clergy—a unique, episcopal labour, which met with scant sympathy from the authorities. It was said that such practice "crossed with the law"; for were not the Irish "required to learn the English language and use English fashions?" But Bedell rejoined that "those people had souls which ought not to be neglected till they would learn English."

In vain his nearest friends "persuaded him to sit still and

not to strive against the stream." Undaunted by opposition, open or furtive, he held steadily on his way.

Of the greatest of all Bedell's services to his adopted country—the translation of the Old Testament into Irish—there is no space to tell here. How he selected to aid him in the task two "Papist" scholars, both of whom were converted in the course of their labours; how a dead-weight of opposition was brought to bear against the work, hindering and delaying it; how, notwithstanding, it was finished at last and on the brink of publication, when the Rebellion broke out and it seemed as if all was in vain; how, after being lost sight of for years, the MS. was rediscovered, and published in 1685; and how, at this day, it is being circulated by the Irish Society—these things form a romance of history which must be read elsewhere.

Whilst working at this translation Bedell compiled and published a short catechism in Irish and English, with prayers and portions of Scripture "containing the sum of the Gospel," which was read with eagerness even by the priests and friars. "And these things," says his son-in-law, "begot a great interest in the Irish nation, as if he had been the first and only man that ever God sent into Ireland to seek their national good, their spiritual and eternal welfare."

An astonishing number, not only of the peasantry, but of the priests themselves, were won over to the Protestant Church, and from these the Bishop selected ministers for his vacant livings.

In twelve years he had transformed his diocese. In twelve years more, what might he not have accomplished? With a band of fellow-workers, earnest and devoted as himself, he might have changed the whole after-history of Ireland. But from first to last Bedell stood alone, "a voice crying in the wilderness," crying down the centuries of what might have been—nay, surely, of what in the fulness of time is yet to be.

In 1638 his wife's death shattered a home-life which, on the testimony of his chaplain, had been untroubled by "the least jar in word or deed." Three years later came the Irish

Rebellion, "the Babylonish captivity of the land . . . that overturned all."

The iron rule of Lord Strafford had been suddenly withdrawn; change and disquiet were in the air; and in October, 1641, the seething mass of discontent and unrest, which had long been fermenting secretly, boiled over like a witch's caldron.

Throughout Ireland the natives rose simultaneously against their rulers; and the rulers were hopelessly unprepared. A plot for capturing Dublin Castle failed by a hair's-breadth, but in other parts of the country the rising was as successful as it was unexpected. Everywhere the English settlers were thrust from their homes, stripped of all, and driven forth—young and old, men, women, and children—like a herd of frightened beasts.

One man only remained entirely unmolested—Bishop Bedell.

"There seemed to be a secret guard set about his house." The rebels told him that, "because he had never done wrong to any, but good to many, they loved and honoured him above all the English that ever came into Ireland, and he should be the last Englishman that should be put out."

As the Rebellion grew in strength, it grew in horror. Band after band of fugitives sought refuge in the Bishop's palace, "like Job's messengers," with stories of increasing terror. Some were almost naked, and the Bishop fetched "all the clothes he had in the world" and gave to them. Soon the house was crowded out, so that numbers were obliged to huddle together in the outbuildings. Then came tidings of ruthless massacres, followed by yet more hideous rumours of unspeakable tortures inflicted upon helpless Protestants; for the cry of "Down with the English!" had changed to "Destroy the heretics!"

Yet the "secret guard" still seemed to surround Bedell's household. In vain the rebel leaders sent threatening messages, commanding him to dismiss the fugitives. The palace was quite incapable of defence, but for a long while no assailants came near it in the daytime, though at night prowling bands of rebels drove off the Bishop's cattle, and sought to frighten away

the "poor English" in the outhouses, stripping them over again and menacing them with drawn skeans.

Some of the fugitives, with touching heroism, chose to leave their refuge "rather than bring any mischief to the Bishop"; but it was known that he refused shelter to none, and fresh numbers came pouring in.

At length the Irish gathered round the palace till those within were virtually imprisoned. But though Bedell could no longer relieve any from outside, his presence was like a talisman protecting those who were with him from violence and even insult.

Once, when a company of armed Irish were "rifling and tearing among the almost naked people" in the outhouses, their cries reached the Bishop, who "would needs go out himself to their rescue," despite the remonstrances of his friends.

Unarmed, but carrying "a long staff handsomely carved and coloured," which had been presented to him by an Irishman, he thrust his way into the midst of the howling rabble. Immediately they "left harassing the poor English" and drew back, but the next instant some of the more violent returned and "presented their muskets right against the Bishop's breast."

The scene stands out like a picture; the wild Irish kernes, drunk with their own outrages, the shrinking, cowering victims, and in the midst the one calm figure like a rock beaten by the surf. Laying his hand on his breast, he bid them shoot there if they chose, but offer no more violence to those who were under his protection. And as if awed by some unseen power, the assailants lowered their muskets and slunk away.

Until December 18 Bedell was suffered to remain at Kilmore, "like a man standing in the breach between the living and the dead." Vainly the rebels offered him a safe-conduct if he would leave the country. He still made answer that he could not desert his post. But at length, urged on by the Roman Catholic Bishop of the diocese, they took possession of the palace, and Bedell and his family became prisoners in name as well as fact.

At their earnest request they were allowed to remain together; and the whole party were conveyed—not unkindly—to the only place of strength in the neighbourhood, Loughwater Castle, "a tall round tower" standing in the midst of a lake.

In no way was it a deliberately harsh imprisonment; but the castle was in a ruinous condition, open to rain and snow, and the inevitable hardships and privations must have borne hardly on an old man. Yet, while the spirits of all about him gave way, Bedell remained "cheerful and joyful," so that "it was no small comfort to all the company to have such a champion."

How their captivity would end, none could tell. Day by day rumours from the outer world grew darker. It was said that the rebels had resolved to leave no "drop of English blood" in the country; and though the Bishop's gaolers still treated him with kindness and even reverence, their attitude might change at any moment.

Long since, when the call to Ireland first reached him, Bedell had responded to it as a soldier to the trumpet call which summons him to danger, perhaps to death, and his heart did not fail now. "To a Christian and a Bishop," he wrote, "that is now almost seventy, no death for the cause of Christ can be bitter." And death was very near, yet in no form of terror, but rather as a relieving angel sent to call the weary soldier from the heat of battle.

On January 7, the prisoners were suddenly and unexpectedly released, but to "such a liberty as," in the words of one of them, "was more dangerous than their former imprisonment." All around was bloodshed and desolation. The Roman Catholic Bishop had established himself in the palace at Kilmore; "so that he that was wont to give entertainment to others had now no place to hide his head but at others' courtesy."

Bedell found shelter in the house of an Irishman, Denis Sheridan, who, though a Protestant, was protected by powerful kinsmen. Fever broke out amongst the refugees crowded together in his house; Bedell's stepson was one of the sufferers,

and the Bishop insisted on taking a share in the nursing, until he, too, was stricken down by the fever.

Enfeebled by all that he had gone through—broken-hearted, some have guessed, by the evil that had come upon the land—the old man had no strength left with which to hold to life. His work was ended—in seeming failure. Shadowed by that failure, in an alien country, surrounded by enemies, he lay down to die.

And yet the story of those last days moves us less by its tragedy than by its tenderness, as if while we gazed upon a dark cloud-bank the sun should shine through, transfiguring the gloom into glory.

"In an alien country, surrounded by enemies." Say, rather, in a land which he had made his own by eternal conquest, surrounded by lovers.

His son tells us how, a little before the end, there came into his chamber one "that bore a great affection to him, and yet a zealous Papist." And "after some few words" (which he hardly could utter for tears) "he besought the Bishop, if he wanted money, or any other necessaries, to make use of anything that he was able to furnish him withal. To which the Bishop, rising up out of his chair, made return, thanking him . . . desiring God to requite him . . . and to restore peace to the nation, being hardly able to stand, and yet beyond expectation expressing himself without any faltering in his speech, which he had not done for a great while before.

"After this he seldom spoke, and but brokenly. Yet, being asked how he did, his answer was still '*Well.*'"

At the last his sons stood by the bed weeping, and "on a sudden looking up, even when death was already in his eyes, he spake unto them thus: 'Be of good cheer, be of good cheer—whether we live or die, we are the Lord's.' And these were his last words."

He had wished to be laid to rest beside his wife, in the shadow of Kilmore Cathedral. At first the priest in possession refused to allow a heretic to be buried in consecrated ground.

But in this one thing the Irish, good Catholics though they were, "would have their wills," and, overborne by his own followers, he yielded. So the little band of mourners made their way to the churchyard in strange company, for "the chief of the rebels assembled their forces together," and "would needs accompany him to his grave, not without some kind of pomp . . . Some of the principal of them would needs be the bearers . . . And so, commanding the drum to beat, as the manner is when a soldier is buried, and placing the musqueteers before the corpse, they thus conveyed the Bishop to his grave. And being come thither, the Sheriff told the Bishop's sons that they might use what prayers or what form of burial they pleased; none should interrupt them."

With timid caution—not unnatural, perhaps, under the circumstances, yet strangely at variance with Bedell's own fearlessness—the Protestant mourners refused to take advantage of this permission, "judging it neither needful nor prudent to attempt such a hazardous . . . office at such a time."

The prayers which went up round the grave of the greatest Irish Bishop broke from the lips, not of his fellow-Churchmen, but of those "other sheep" whom for fifteen years he had loved and yearned over.

"May my soul," exclaimed a priest who stood by, "be with Bedell's!" And from other voices there rose a cry, "Rest in peace; the last of the English!"

Over the grave they fired a military salute. And surely it was a fitting burial for him who had battled so long and valiantly with the Powers of Evil.

St. Michael's warrior had won his rest at last.

LILIAN DALTON.

Correspondence.

ST. PAUL'S DOCTRINE OF RESURRECTION.

To the Editor of the CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—I cordially agree with Mr. Routh in thanking Mr. Ford for his able and thoughtful paper on the Resurrection. The questions raised by him are in many minds, and are all the better for careful and reverent ventilation.

Perhaps we need to remind ourselves that in the Gospels we have simply the record of testimony to the fact, in its historic aspect, that the Lord Who was crucified had risen, and that His body was real, though changed. This was sufficient for the first disciples; they were assured of His risen life, and rejoiced. No explanation is attempted in the Gospels.

St. Paul shows in his Epistles that he had carefully considered the fact of Christ's resurrection in the light of the Christian hope, and also in view of those who doubted or objected to that doctrine. His preaching at Athens was of Jesus and the resurrection hope. He knew that heathen thought in his day considered that any existence after death was of a vague and shadowy kind, and of a lower stage as compared with the present life of man. He knew also that the Christian hope, founded on the resurrection of our Lord, revealed that, to the Christian, the life beyond was a larger and more perfected and glorious existence than the present. He faced the objections which might be urged against that blessed hope. In 1 Cor. xv. we have his clear statement that the body of the resurrection is not the same body which is laid in the grave, though mysteriously possessing a link or nexus with it. He uses an illustration drawn from Nature, in the history of the seed, and concludes that in the case of man the body which is of the earth, earthy, passes away, and that the body which abides is heavenly and spiritual, and in harmony with its new environment. This present corruptible body, he asserts, cannot inherit the state of incorruption. He asserts also that a mysterious and essential change will be wrought on the bodies of those who are alive and remain at the last great crisis in the consummation of the age—a change which shall make them equal to those who have already passed through physical death. Thus, according to St. Paul's teaching, at death this body of humiliation is past and done with, and that the Christian after death possesses a new and glorious body resembling in character the body of the Lord in glory.

The question may be reverently asked, Where lies the nexus linking the mortal body, "the earthly house of this tabernacle," with the spiritual body, "the building from God, not made with hands," eternal in the heavenly and spiritual regions? Are we obliged to think of the "heavenly body" as something prepared independently and apart from our living and essential selves, and brought to us as a garment to be put on? Surely not. It is life that forms the organism. It is life which is building up our present bodies ever in process of renewal. If the law be universally true that life expresses itself in the organism it forms, why may we not believe that even now, in this life, and under the veil of this mortal body, there is being

evolved "the body that shall be"? and that when we have "shuffled off this mortal coil," we shall pass into that new and higher life with a body already fitted for its new activities?

This thought is in full harmony with the seed and plant illustration of St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. Nature also presents us with still closer analogies in the life-history of the dragon-fly, the butterfly, etc. These, in their earlier stages of existence, have bodies adapted to their mode of life at that stage, yet during this period there is being formed a new body with new powers, which at a later stage is liberated and becomes the fitting expression of a higher and more perfect existence.

The pre-natal existence of man also affords illustration of the individual life evolving organs for use only in the life that is to follow. If, therefore, our life reaches beyond the grave, as we confidently believe, it is reasonable to believe also that the body suited to that higher stage is in process of preparation and evolution.

Thus we catch a glimpse of what may be the true nexus between the "natural body" of this present life and the "spiritual body," which is fitted for the "life of the world to come." Bishop Westcott, in his "Gospel of the Resurrection," speaking of death, says we conceive of it as interrupting the union of the body with the soul, "though perhaps quite wrongly." These added words suggest the doubt in his own mind as to the correctness of the ordinary conception of death.

Again, he reminds us that "there is nothing unnatural in supposing the power which preserves man's personality . . . in moulding the continuous changes of his present material body, will preserve his personality hereafter by still acting according to the same law in moulding the new element out of which a future body may be fashioned." He believes that "after death the soul will continue to act through an organization which is itself the expression of the same law as moulds all that we now call our body." He sees in the resurrection-body of Christ "not an extension of an existence with which we are acquainted, but the manifestation of an existence for which we hope."

There must, therefore, be mysteries in connection with our Lord's resurrection which are not to be resolved by our present knowledge of things unseen. The fact that His sacred body saw no corruption may well illustrate the words of St. Paul when he speaks of "mortality being swallowed up" or absorbed of life (2 Cor. v. 6), and of "this mortal putting on immortality." The mystery of the change from His body of humiliation to the body of His glory has not been revealed. It is beyond our present powers, and must be reverently left. We may not be able yet to harmonize all the several aspects of the resurrection into one perfect conception, but we believe that every fragment of truth has its own place in the perfect whole which one day will be revealed. Let us be willing to advance to a more perfect apprehension of the truth as light may be given upon the several aspects of the great fact of our Lord's resurrection and of the teaching of His great apostle St. Paul.

W. JEFFREY THOMPSON.

ST. PAUL'S VICARAGE,
TIVERTON.

The Missionary World.

THE lessons and ideas which are emerging from the war are applicable in many directions. Of these the interdependence of the nations and the disappearance of national isolation have an important bearing on Church life in its missionary aspect. If in modern days a war in Europe between six countries upsets practically the whole world, sees contests fought in all the oceans and on three continents, we may readily infer that every conflict in the old Church in the homeland will affect the young Church in the mission-field. Hence it is impossible to regard the first indications of fresh controversy about the Prayer-Book with other than real concern because of the ultimate effect in the mission-field. The details, though not the fact of the controversy, will probably be negligible out there; it is impossible to admit that the old-world tares and wheat of Church belief are to be perpetuated in the virgin soil of young Churches, and it is ever to be hoped that these same young Churches will, while preserving a continuity of life, insist on the use of indigenous seed for their own reaping, under the guidance of the trusted missionaries who work among them. The analogy we want to establish is this: that if "war" break out in one locality in the Church, who can tell where it may spread, what further issues it will raise as it rolls along, what spirit it will be conducted in, and what witness it will give to the young Churches as to the universal Church on whose behalf all the opponents will engage with equal conscience and ardour? The analogy, though capable of it, need not be pressed further; our concern is for one special point.

In all family crises, when conclaves are needful, the presence of the children is held, by tacit consent, to make mere contention unseemly and impossible. Our plea is that in the threatened and perhaps now inevitable recrudescence of Church controversy, the presence of the children—some of them very young—should be remembered, and only the gentlest and most

forbearing words that can carry truth be used. It is not too late, even now, to recall that at an early date in the life of the Church the presence of a little child in the midst was the reproof the Saviour adopted to still the champions for ascendancy.

* * * * *

The audiences at the great missionary anniversaries this month and next will probably be larger than ever, and the attention more critical and expectant. The continent of Europe, the United States, and it may be even the Nearer and Farther East, will take note of what is said. Perhaps never before have the speakers had so great a chance of speaking out the message of good-will. Not only can the message of love and of forgiveness find expression, but the belligerent and neutral nations looking on will be able to detect, with that sensitiveness which the war is developing in us all, whether hands unseen are being stretched across the chasm to grasp the hands of brothers on the other side. The cause for which the Missionary Societies exist—the Kingdom of God—is greater than the cause which rends Christendom at the moment. The societies will each have their own burden to bear, their own perils to share with their supporters; but who if not the Missionary Societies, with all their developed international relationships, can shoulder the greater burden and be mediaries between distracted brethren of conflicting Christian lands? The wounds of the Church of Christ can be bound up before statesmen have signed treaties; it may be that we are waiting for the succession of great anniversaries to do this for us through their selected speakers, who may be to the world not only the voice of the Church but of the Master. The spirit of the meetings will be as important as the spoken words. Is it not conceivable that at all the great meetings time should definitely be allotted for prayer for the speedy coming of a righteous peace and of a restored and deepened brotherhood?

* * * * *

Constantinople—there is probably at this moment no word of greater significance in the history of missions than this.

When the daily Press first announced that the forcing of the Dardanelles had begun, one of the most vivid of the many emotions of the war was stirred. The political and religious effects of such an undertaking cannot be separated. The status of the political capital of the Moslem world is directly threatened, and before these words have left the printer's hands the great city may once more be in the possession of Christian nations, and thereby a religious revolution be in progress. Such difficulties lie ahead that only the unwary would prognosticate; nevertheless, in the events which are now taking place, we see the immovable moved, the unchangeable changing, and the hand of God has done it. If the channel of the Dardanelles is tortuous, the current swift, the fortifications strong, so, in figure, are the difficulties before the Church of Christ as it sees the opening of the future in the Near East. Are Turkey, Palestine, Syria, Armenia, and Mesopotamia to be freed from Moslem rule? If so, will the new rule, whatever it be, let the Gospel have its way? Will "political considerations" be held to limit the operations of Christian Missions? Will the ancient Christian Churches, after centuries of suppression, be ready for the opportunity, or will their long waiting have turned them stiff? But if in this special bit of warfare modern appliances have accomplished almost impossible things, how much more may not the whole Church, freshly quickened by the Spirit of God, spring out to meet the dawning of a new day?

To the Christian the interest of Constantinople concentrates in the Mosque of San Sofia; in this building with its ineffaceable Christian tokens, comparable to the Church of St. John the Baptist in Damascus, is the pledge of the future for the Moslem world. The Church was built by Constantine the Great in A.D. 326; rebuilt more than once by his immediate successors, the building in its magnificence as we know it was for the most part due to Justinian, and dates from A.D. 537. The exterior has been much altered by the erection of minarets and walls since the conquest of the city by the Turks in 1403.

* * * * *

As many anticipated, so now it is proved that this war is driving a wedge into Islam—perhaps even to the heart. The call to a Holy War has fallen flat. India and Egypt have remained quiet while Turkey mobilized, Sunni has fought against Shiah, and in so doing each sect has had a Christian ally. It seems impossible now that the total political downfall of the Turkish people and their unwise leaders can be delayed much longer; the resultant effect on Islam itself remains to be seen.

* * * * *

The work of the American Missions in the Turkish Empire is too little known in this couutry. Possibly it is because the United States are outside the political turmoil of Europe that their relations with the Turkish authorities have been excellent. They have pursued a sympathetic and vigorous policy towards Moslems and Christians, and their magnificent educational institutions for men and women, together with their medical missions, have given them a real stake in the empire, from points on the coast such as Constantinople, Smyrna, and Beirût, to cities in the far interior. Ten American colleges, twenty high-schools, twelve hospitals and dispensaries, focus the work from which the missionaries' influence emanates. When these colleges include such institutions as the Robert Noble College and the American College for Girls at Constantinople, and the American College at Beirût, we can estimate the potency of the work done. In the March number of the *Missionary Review of the World*, Dr. James L. Barton, of Boston, U.S.A., contributes a valuable paper on "The War and Missions in Turkey," which should be noted by all who are making a study of the conditions in the Near East at the present time.

* * * * *

Within the last few weeks considerable concern as to the relations between Japan and China has been felt in missionary circles, for in the world to-day politics and missions are inextricably interlaced. The newspapers of the Far East have taken sides with vigour, some urging the integrity and dis-

interestedness of Japan, others detecting ulterior designs behind every action. The question which Japan has to face thus early is one which lies before the Allies if victory crowns their arms. Are fortresses taken and territories won to be held for the conquering nation, or dealt with in the interests of truth and justice and for the highest good of the world? The arguments which Japan might use now to justify her proposed relation to China, or an absorption of Chinese territory, are strangely like those which some of the Allies might use at a later date. As a writer in *The Challenge* on March 12 well points out, "higher national honour," "a chivalrous mind," "ideas of justice and equity," "fair play for every struggling nationality," should be strenuously kept to the front both in the utterances of the Press and of private individuals. We cannot afford to weaken our own power to resist temptation and to discern the speciousness of self-interested argument by condoning any failure in the line taken by Japan towards China. Japan has a great contribution to make to the world, but China, though still struggling towards self-development and self-expression, has at least an equal part to play. The Christian Church in China is full of promise, and we look with confidence to a future in which, influencing first the councils of its own nation, it will exercise a wider influence in the world—Japan and China side by side, not the smaller and stronger dominating the greater country which has made a slower advance.

* * * * *

We can only touch on a few of the points of special interest in the magazines of the month. The *C.M.S. Review* is more varied in matter than it has been of late, though we venture to question the profit of including in its pages summaries of articles in other periodicals which are by no means wholly Christian in their tone about the war. The *C.M. Gleaner* devotes two out of its sixteen pages to an effective diagram (whose usefulness to missionary speakers would not have been lessened had it been reproduced half-size) showing the relation between the income and the capital fund throughout the year.

The *C.M.S. Gazette* quotes a letter from a missionary of twenty years standing in Uganda, contrasting the statistics of the Roman Catholic Mission and of the Anglican Mission in Uganda. The C.M.S. Mission has 37 clergy, 4 doctors, 6 laymen, and 30 unmarried women, a total of 77. The White Fathers' Mission has 128 priests and brothers and 34 nuns; the Mill Hill Mission has 31 priests and 7 nuns—a total of 200. The Roman Catholics claim a total of 148,890 baptisms. The *Mission Field* (S.P.G.) reports an increase of £5,000 in the General Fund for 1914 (special contributions have, however, fallen off to the amount of about £9,000), and gives striking figures in connection with the Candidates' Five Shilling Fund worked by Canon Bullock Webster. In ten years a sum of over £30,000 has been raised for the training of missionaries. In 1914 there were 6,200 subscribers—487 clergy, 211 laymen, and 5,500 women — contributing a total of £3,203. The *L.M.S. Chronicle* gives two noteworthy instances of the advance being made by the society in its organization abroad (for China, see pp. 59-60; for India, see p. 65), and also give three instances showing good results from the war in Madagascar; a greatly increased spirit of tolerance and friendliness towards missions on the part of the French Government; an enlarged and deepened unity among the missionary organizations at work in the island; and a splendid spirit of self-sacrifice and generosity shown by the Malagasy workers and Christians. The Wesleyan *Foreign Field* introduces a new and useful feature in the shape of a page or two of short telling extracts from the *International Review of Missions*. The B.M.S. *Herald*, amid news from many of its fields, is able to report a great improvement in conditions at San Salvador. *The Bible in the World* is even more compelling in interest than usual; we note specially the account of Bible sales in Korea, with their successes and problems; a timely sketch of the Solomon Islands, now wholly under the British flag; incidents of Bible distribution at Port Said; and a delicately beautiful "Parable of Flowers" by William Canton. G.

Notices of Books.

THE RULE OF WORK AND WORSHIP. By the Rev. Canon R. L. Ottley, D.D. London: *Robert Scott.* Library of Historic Theology Series. Price 5s. net.

Canon Ottley has written a scholarly, thoughtful, and devotional treatise on the Lord's Prayer, marked upon every page by careful work, competent exposition, and reverence in tone. It is a book which throughout stimulates reflection. Clergy and laity alike will welcome this "feast of good things," which helps and encourages personal piety, missionary zeal, and social reform. Our Lord has given us the prayer as a type of acceptable worship; its petitions accordingly give direction to endeavour.

To critical questions Dr. Ottley devotes small space. Apparently he holds that the Lord's Prayer must be included amongst the *bis repetita* of the Divine Teacher, and that St. Luke's version is the earlier and more original; but it cannot be the last word to say that St. Matthew's "owes its somewhat expanded form to the fact that from the first it found a place in the public worship of the Church." Even the doxology, admittedly a late liturgical interpolation, was composed by someone, albeit out of existing materials. Ecclesiasticism is a reproductive, not a productive, force. Otherwise St. Matthew's text is clear and early. The *a priori* objections often made to the historicity of two accounts largely depend upon the mental proclivities of the student. If the prayer was only taught on one occasion, it is difficult to maintain the veracity of the Evangelists; if more than once, each version may be equally authoritative.

Valuable as are our author's remarks upon the Fatherhood of God, they leave upon the mind a somewhat invertebrate impression. The exposition of a doctrine of such infinite importance must commence from the fact that our Lord came into the world to convey from heaven a gospel unto man, and to supply through His own death the means of reconciliation of God with man. The notion of such a gospel carries with it by necessary implication the warning that by nature man has become unfitted for either work or worship before God. The removal of this incapacity must precede a right prayer. We need an Atonement first. It is insufficient to say that "only in so far as we have the mind of Christ, and share His spirit of dependence and trust, do we 'know' the Father and pray to Him aright." It is inadequate to explain that "only in Christ—only through incorporation into His Body by baptism—do we rightfully enjoy the privilege of adopted children, and have boldness to call God 'Father' and to claim His promises." Not that Dr. Ottley by any means undervalues the Atonement, but that it needs to be placed first. We draw near to the Father because we have "boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus." The assertion of this initial condition enables us more successfully to encounter the difficulties which arise from unanswered prayer, or from the contradictory petitions of different persons.

With full concurrence that the will of God is displayed in the unalterable laws of Nature, apprehended in reason and conscience, manifested in history, and revealed in the personality of our Saviour, there is still room to inquire

whether that Will is always exercising the powers of sovereignty, by insistence and compulsion. The petitions for the advent of the Kingdom and the performance of the Will must not be merged into one. The reality and the value of the freedom of the human will must be recognized. Since the Fall man *ab originali justitiâ quam longissime distet*, yet in the worlds to come the Creator, to His own greater glory, will be enabled to repose in His redeemed creatures such confidence as to entrust to them an overlordship over five cities or two. The liberty of man is not irreconcilable with the Majesty of the Divine Will. Shall we not be kings as well as priests? From permissible alternatives, man in perfected love and humble gratitude will ever strive to select the way of God's choice. In some faint manner such a relationship may be entered here. The words "as in heaven, so on earth," receive in application to this clause—for Canon Ottley prefers so to render them, rather than, with the Catechism of Trent, as relative to the three preceding requests—an intensity of significance when we conceive the Divine Will as supreme but not always dictatorial, authoritative but not always reliant upon force, unexpressed but accurately determined, anticipated by the fervency and devotion of the loving subject. We may pray for such purity of heart and intention that this power of anticipation may be ours, the while acknowledging that language and idea feebly comprehend the eternal verity.

One or two references to the sacraments are not sufficiently guarded, and it is a pity to assert so dogmatically that in the third and sixth chapters of St. John our Lord imparted teaching upon baptism and the Eucharist. But Canon Ottley's discussion of the sacramental bearing of the request for daily bread is an excellent and well-balanced summary of the views which have been held. The application of the supplication for pardon of sins to the topic of national confession is most opportune. Many details, too numerous for mention, are very precious. The book deserves to be widely read. Its study will prove beneficial to all who undertake it.

E. Abbey Tindall.

The Offerings made like unto the Son of God. By Walter Stephen Moule, M.A., Principal of C.M.S. Training College, Ningpo, and Archdeacon of Chekiang, China. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 6s.

There was a time when the exegetical instincts of British divines were guided by the maxim of a far earlier age, which taught that *In Vetere latet quod in Novo patet*. It is not necessary here to discuss the causes which have led to the modern oversight of much that our Lord meant when, speaking of the Hebrew Scriptures, He said "They are they that testify of Me." The fact of our loss is plain to all who have the will to see. Those who deplore it will welcome Archdeacon Moule's book, which worthily maintains the honour of a family name conspicuous for the happy combination of scholarship and spiritual insight.

The subtitle gives the clue which the author has well used for an interpretation explanatory of much that, without it, many expositors and critics have missed both in the history and ritual of the Chosen People. While the main purpose of the book is constructive as well as instructive,

it produces with cumulative value an evidential argument for the coherence. accuracy, authenticity—and in short the Divine authority—which the Sacred Writings claim for themselves. The method of the argument is wholly reasonable. The assumption that "we have in the Old Testament what it professes to give, the trustworthy record of a progressive Divine Revelation," is followed by careful examination of the details, with a view of ascertaining whether the claim is consistent with itself. Each statement is interpreted in a plain and natural sense. If the assumption were incorrect while the reasoning were sound, the inevitable result would be obscurity and confusion. If, on the other hand, no such result is discernible, but there appear rather "wonderful anticipation, and unlooked-for harmonies in the record, the probability of that assumption being true will be greatly increased."

The greater part of the book is occupied with a close examination of the Divine purpose in the Order of Levitical Ritual, including directions for the structure of the Tabernacle and its contents, the laws of the priesthood, and the character and object of the various sacrifices and offerings. Before this, however, the writer has carefully reviewed the history which led up to the remarkable conditions by which Jehovah had separated and developed a peculiar channel through which the Divine Revelation should be conducted to successive generations in a continuous and expanding course. The key of the whole is shown in the primæval promise of the Conqueror, born of woman, the Ransomer of the race, in whom the Abrahamic Covenant of universal blessing and the revelation of the great I AM should be fulfilled. Periods of silence are followed by times of fuller revelation. But there is no dislocation or incoherence. Each detail, as the writer forcibly shows, falls into its right place when regarded in its true relation to the origin and purpose of Revelation. Brief quotations can do no justice to a book so packed with minute description and close reasoning, but a few may illustrate its general character. In the chapter on the Covenant at Sinai there is a striking passage (p. 45):

> "It will be remembered that the words in which Jehovah announced His purpose towards the Israelites are adopted by St. Paul and St. Peter as expressing His purpose towards those who are saved by Jesus Christ. The ground of the salvation is in each case seen to lie in God Himself. The Israelites are addressed as 'the house of Jacob, the children of Israel,' reminding them that their position rests upon His sovereign choice. No less does it rest upon His work of power, 'Ye have seen what I did and how I bare you,' and its permanence and safety is assured by their connection with God Himself, 'I brought you unto Myself.' Even so in every particular is our salvation in Christ Jesus; it springs from an eternal choice; it has been wrought out by a Divine Saviour; it becomes individually operative through the Divine Spirit; and it brings us under the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, 'I brought you unto Myself.' Again, the responsibility incurred by the Israelites was that they should obey God's voice and keep His covenant. And so, according to the testimony of the whole New Testament, by the Gospel of free salvation in Christ Jesus we do not make void, but rather establish, the law."

A useful summary of the animal sacrifices is as follows (p. 148):

> "We believe that as Tabernacle and Altar, Priest and Offering, afford a fourfold picture of Christ, so the development of the last falls into a fourfold division, forming an Old Testament counterpart to the fourfold Gospel of the New Testament.
>
> "It is not difficult in a few words to express the distinguishing characteristics of each of the four:
>
> "The Burnt-offering is literally the offering that is made to ascend. Its distinguishing feature is the burning of the whole victim upon the altar, so that it is made to ascend in fire and smoke.
>
> "The distinctive feature of the sacrifice of Peace-offerings is the feast upon the sacrificial victim, which followed the offering upon the altar.
>
> "The Sin-offering is distinguished by the ritual use of the shed blood, which is here specially developed.
>
> "In the Trespass-offering the idea of restitution is illustrated and enforced.
>
> "We may, then, summarize the characteristic differences by saying that the four offerings respectively represent Acceptance, Fellowship, Atonement, and Restitution.
>
> "But while each of the four has its message clearly stamped upon it, it is no less certain that they are bound together by such common marks of identity as we have seen to exist among the Tabernacle, Priesthood, and Altar."

In the chapter on the Meal-offerings and Drink-offerings, in which the writer minutely examines the characteristic distinctions between them and those where victims were killed, while pointing out that the two are constantly associated yet contrasted, he says (p. 291): "This contrast between the Meal-offering and the other four offerings will become still more marked as we proceed to examine its ritual in detail. We draw attention to it at the outset as an indication that the Meal-offering is intentionally differentiated from the other four. We have seen that those four are 'made like the Son of God.' We conclude, then, that the Meal-offering is 'made like' something else." And this offering, as other expositors have held, he regards as representing human service.

A brief concluding chapter reviewing the later history of Israel closes with these striking words (p. 358):

> "The Temple was restored, but not in its former glory; the throne remained empty, waiting. The last prophets gave their message, and then silence fell till Jesus came, as in the old days there fell a silence before the great redemption. Now He has come and gone and left His record behind Him. We have it in the books of the New Testament. And Israel? What of Israel? There is no temple, no altar, no priesthood, no offerings, no prophet, no king. We do not need them, though we read their history with reverent awe, for we have JESUS CHRIST."

In the appendix there are some interesting essays on the Cherubim, the Shechinah, Psalm xxii., and the Peace-offerings, the doctrinal significance of Sacrifice, as well as its relation to the Synagogue and the Prophets. The last article, on the Chinese tradition of Sacrifice, is especially valuable as coming from one who, as a missionary in China, is intimate with the litera-

ture of that ancient land. The book should have a wide circulation. It will promote, we trust, the more reverent study of sacred facts too seldom examined with the sanctified scholarship which they deserve. We cannot doubt that the book will confirm in many minds the conviction of the supreme authority of the documents in which the Risen Lord "expounded" unto His disciples "the things concerning Himself," reminding them, as He had done before, that "all things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and in the Psalms, concerning" Himself. H. E. F.

DISCOVERY AND REVELATION. By the Rev. H. F. Hamilton, D.D., Professor of Pastoral Theology, Bishop's College, Lennoxville, Canada, 1907-1910. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

In this volume the author has tried to say a second time, and in a shorter and simpler form, what he has already said in the first volume and in the first three chapters of the second volume of "The People of God." The book appears as a volume of "The Layman's Library," and is written in the main from the standpoint of a scientific student of religious phenomena. Belief in one Almighty God is traced to two sources—the philosophy of the Greeks and the religion of the Hebrews. Before these two monotheisms appeared, the civilized world lay in the grip of polytheism. The monotheism of the Hebrews was earlier than, and different from, that of the Greek philosophers. In discussing the problem of the origin of the Hebrew belief in one God, the conclusion arrived at is that the Hebrew monotheism is not the result of any process of reasoning. Great emphasis is laid upon the religious experience of the prophets. Three chapters trace the history of the Jewish religion subsequent to this period. The relation of "that unique figure, Jesus of Nazareth," to the Jewish religion is such that, as a result of His work and teaching, the Jewish national religion was reorganized in such a way as to enable it to become universal. In chapter xi.—"Discovery and Revelation"—the writer passes to a higher point of view: while Greek monotheism represented a discovery of God by man, the Hebrew monotheism was a self-revelation of God to man; the Hebrew national religion and its outward forms were chosen by God to be the medium of this revelation, and they possessed unique privileges and Divine sanction: the Church of Jesus the Messiah is the sphere of salvation. The conclusion reached in chapter xiii. is that the Christian and the philosophical conceptions of God are two different systems of thought. Either one or the other of them must be held; they cannot be combined. "Mono-Yahwism" is a new term, and somewhat clumsy. It is an attempt to describe the monotheism of the Jewish prophets, who realized, not only that there was one Almighty God, but that the God known to all the world by the name of "Yahweh," the national God of Israel, is that one Almighty God.

THE CHURCH MISSION HYMN-BOOK: WITH LITURGIES. Compiled by Canon Barnes-Lawrence and Rev. W. J. L. Sheppard, M.A., London. *Robert Scott.*

Of making many hymn-books there is no end, but no one who has examined this collection will think the editors have been engaged in a work of supererogation. It contains only 151 hymns, but these have been most carefully selected and helpfully arranged. Naturally there are a considerable

number of those old favourites which must be common to every such book, but there are a fair number of new ones with tunes. It is mainly by the hymns of this latter class that one judges a new book. It is not so difficult to choose the well-known standard compositions as to make a selection from the quantity of material that lies outside these. And yet it is the newer hymns that tend to give any hymnal its distinctive character. Going carefully through the book, and noting these hymns and their tunes, we can confidently say that the compilers have performed their task with great judgment and success, and we commend the Church Mission Hymn-Book—which is on the lines of sober central Churchmanship—to the notice of those Clergy who from time to time conduct parochial missions, as well as to Incumbents who may be looking for a suitable collection for Mission Hall or for a supplement to the Church Hymn-Book for occasional use. The short Liturgies will be found most suitable and useful. The price of the book of words is 1d. in paper, 2d. in a stout cover, and 3d. in cloth, and the publisher will send a specimen copy for 1½d. Music and words, 1s. net, paper cover; cloth, 1s. 6d. and 2s. net.

KESWICK FROM WITHIN. By the Rev. J. B. Figgis, M.A. London: *Marshall Brothers*. Price 4s. 6d. net.

In this delightful volume—to which the Bishop of Durham contributes a characteristically graceful foreward—Mr. Figgis tells the story of Keswick as he has known it for the last forty years. And who could have done it better than he? As we turn over these pages we are reminded of many standard-bearers who have fallen—men whose praise is in all the Churches: Canon Battersby, C. A. Fox, G. C. Macgregor, Hector Mackinnon, Dr. A. T. Pierson, Hudson Taylor, etc.—honoured names that carry us back in grateful recollection into bygone years. But happily, before we close the book, there comes the reminder that Keswick is still very much alive, that the good succession does not die out, that the platform is as strong as ever, and that the influence of the great Convention continues undiminished. Those who are interested in the movement will welcome this review.

HEROIC LEADERS: GREAT SAINTS OF BRITISH CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. Dinsdale T. Young. London: *Partridge and Co.* Price 2s. net.

The popular Methodist preacher reveals in these forcible addresses, delivered to young people, the largeness of his heart. He has selected nine worthies—Bishop Ken, Thomas Goodwin, Archbishop Leighton, Philip and Matthew Henry, Richard Baxter, John Newton, Charles Simeon, John Keble, and Thomas Chalmers—and made striking use of the lessons to be derived from a study of their lives and teachings. Mr. Young avoids as far as possible theological controversies, but naturally enough here and there his sympathy with Puritanism can be detected, though he very truly observes that "there is a sorry side to Puritanism and a deplorable side to Catholicism." It is interesting to read that these sermons were absolutely "extemporary," not a single sentence having been written beforehand.

THE MODERN SOCIETY PLAY. By the Rev. G. S. Streatfeild. *S.P.C.K.* Price 2d.

Although only a 32-page pamphlet, "The Modern Society Play" contains much which should give pause to all patrons of the theatre. Mr.

Streatfeild has taken the Press notices of some of the leading dramas which have been presented during the last twenty years, and upon them bases a strong yet just condemnation of the grossly offensive tendency of the plays he specifies. He admits that they are the exception and not the rule, but he declares that not since the later decades of the seventeenth century have there been such plays "so calculated to undermine public morality" as these. It is because he believes that the women of England would, as a body, throw themselves heart and soul into a movement for the purification of the drama, and would make it a plank in their social and political programme, that he has always supported the cause of woman's suffrage, though wholly opposed to militancy.

THE PREPARATION FOR THE PASSION. By the Rev. James S. Stone, D.D., Rector of St. James's Church, Chicago. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 6s. net.

Under this title the author puts forth a study of the Incarnation and Virgin Birth of our Lord, and of His life from Bethlehem to Cana of Galilee. More than half the book is occupied with notes on the chapters of the Nativity (St. Matt. i. and ii.; St. Luke i. and ii.), though these are by no means the least important pages in a very valuable volume. As might be expected, the author has much to say about the nature of Christ and the person of the Blessed Virgin Mary. "The Incarnation and the Virgin Birth are eternal verities, and such verities are not affected by changes and differences of elucidation." "Throughout this book," he declares, "it is admitted that mystery borders the truths and facts with which it deals." In the course of the 440 pages the author enters freely into the reverent discussion of the many important questions embraced within the scope of the work, and shows a wealth of knowledge. The addition of a full index would have been a great gain.

PLAIN AND PRACTICAL LESSONS FOR CONFIRMATION CANDIDATES AND OTHERS. By the Rev. G. A. Tindall, B.A. London: *Elliot Stock.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

This is one of the most ambitious and assuming volumes recently put forth on this subject, for it runs to over 180 pages; but it contains much that is really useful. The Catechism is divided into three sections, and for each section there are six lessons, together with a recapitulation, making in all eighteen lessons and three recapitulations. The author estimates that "on the plan of a lesson each week the course covers a period of about four months; but whenever possible it would be well to extend this period, in order to allow time for necessary review work." The great blemish in an otherwise excellent book is just this—it is too long.

THESE THREE. By G. H. Knight. London: *Hodder and Stoughton.* Price 3s. 6d.

This is a volume of delightful devotional thoughts for the quiet hour. The author has gathered together the more notable of what may be called "Bible Triads"—texts where a triple presentment of truth may be found—and has drawn forth from them many a precious message. For instance, "A Trinity of Blessing" is found in 1 Tim. i. 2, "grace, mercy, and peace";

"Nothing, Everything, Anything," in Phil. iv. 6; "Threefold Consecration" in Lev. viii. 23, "right ear, right hand, right foot." The little book is written in a spirit of deepest devotion, and will succeed in its aim to make the Bible more precious to Bible-lovers, and Christ more dear to those who are His people.

THE REPROACH OF WAR. By the Rev. Canon Macnutt, M.A. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

In these four addresses, given on Sunday evenings in November, 1914, in St. Saviour's Cathedral, Southwark, we have a forcible presentment of some of the thoughts and lessons which are being brought home to the hearts of men and women during the war. Canon Macnutt has already attained considerable fame as a preacher, and these addresses will add to a reputation which is deservedly great. The titles are arresting—"The Reproach of War," "The Watch-tower," "The Day of Revelation," "Waters in the Wilderness"—and the treatment is marked by that high spiritual tone which is always found in the author's writings, and by much sound common-sense that is most needful in the present crisis.

FLOWERS OF GOLD. By Charles E. Stone. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 2s. net.

Under this title is put forth a series of forty talks to children. The titles are arresting and the treatment is attractive. The talks are suitable for children, without being "childish." In each case the writer drives some one point home, and makes excellent use of illustrations.

LAWS OF THE UPWARD LIFE. By the Rev. James Burn, M.A. London: *Robert Scott.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

This volume of addresses to men is designed to be a sequel to the author's earlier "Laws of Life and Destiny." There are eight excellent and most suggestive addresses, dealing with "The Law of Infection," "The Law of Sacrifice," "The Law of Recompense," "The Law of Accommodation," "The Law of Heredity," "The Law of Influence," "The Law of Competition," "The Law of Habit." Mr. Burn has proved that he understands the mind of men, and in his latest volume has put a most useful weapon into the hands of those who work amongst men.

SHORT STUDIES IN BIBLE SUBJECTS. By Willlam Dale, F.S.A., F.G.S. London: *Elliot Stock.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

It is rarely that one reads a book written with so fresh a touch as this. The style is easy, the subjects varied (ranging from "The Migration of Birds" to "Menephtah, the Pharaoh who was not Drowned"), and the interest is sustained. The author is a lover of Nature, and makes Nature speak. There is not a dull page nor a "study" without a plain message in the whole book.

THE LAW OF FAITH. With a Lawyer's Notes on the Written Law. By Joseph F. Randolph. *G. P. Putnam's Sons.* Price 6s. net.

This book is an exhaustive treatment of the "faith words" of the Bible, from the pen of a well-known author of legal works, and is the fruit of most painstaking labours extending over many years. Simply stated, the object

of the book is to answer the question, "What has faith to do with salvation?" The differentiation of the various "faith words" is pursued with the utmost care, and they are found to fall into five classes, which express primarily trust, belief, fidelity, hope, and assurance or certainty.

A MODERN MIDAS. By Mabel King. Stirling: *Drummond's Tract Depot.*

The authoress of "Idylls of the Poor," "Enduring Love," etc., has in this latest volume endeavoured to portray how easily false ideals may be mistaken for true ones, and to show that "success" under certain circumstances counts for nothing. It is an interesting story, with a plot that develops happily and ends in a satisfactory manner. It is full of good, sound teaching of a thoroughly healthy tone.

(1) CHILD STUDY, WITH SPECIAL APPLICATION TO THE TEACHING OF RELIGION. By the Rev. G. H. Dix, M.A. Price 1s. 6d. net.

(2) ILLUSTRATIONS FOR TEACHING THE CHURCH CATECHISM. By the Rev. G. H. Dix, M.A., and the Rev. H. A. Lester, M.A. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. net.

The first of these books should be read by every parent and teacher. It deals in a practical, common-sense way with the study of childhood. The second and smaller volume contains a number of blackboard illustrations for the assistance of those who have to instruct children from nine to eleven years of age.

MISSIONARY COLLEGE HYMNS. Compiled and arranged by Annie H. Small. London and Edinburgh: *Oliphant, Anderson, and Ferrier.*

Miss Small, who was at one time a missionary of the United Free Church of Scotland, and has more recently been Principal of the Women's Missionary College in Edinburgh, has compiled a hymn-book on distinctly original lines. The tunes are mainly Oriental—chiefly Indian—but they come, too, from China, Japan, Persia, Formosa, and other far-off places. The words are as weird as many of the tunes, and it is a little surprising even to find one from FitzGerald's "Omar Khayyám"! We fear that, beautiful as some of the melodies and poems undoubtedly are, they will hardly be agreeable to the taste of English people, though possibly eclectic gatherings such as Missionary Study Bands and Missionary Students may find them useful, and the preface shows how the collection may be used to advantage in Missionary Services of Song, etc.

ANTI-CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM. By the Rev. C. L. Drawbridge, M.A. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

Mr. Drawbridge's name is so well known as an apologist that anything from his pen is sure of a welcome, especially by those whose work it is to try and reach "the man in the street." In this book he has collected a great deal of evidence to show the attitude of Socialism towards Christianity, and certainly some of it is very startling. Needless to say, Mr. Drawbridge's replies to the objections he quotes are sensible and forcible.

Publications of the Month.

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

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

THE IDEALS OF THE PROPHETS. Sermons by the late Professor Driver, together with a Bibliography of his published writings. (*T. and T. Clark.* 3s. 6d. net.) In a preface which bears the initials of his successor, Canon G. A. Cooke, it is stated that Dr. Driver "has shown throughout his ministry that a modern Biblical scholar, one of the foremost champions of the new learning, a master in the science of language and criticism, could at the same time handle the Sacred Text with the reverence traditional among English people, and with his whole heart remain true to the Christian Faith, and fulfil his service as a loyal son of the Church."

OUR COMRADESHIP WITH THE BLESSED DEAD. By the Right Rev. J. P. Maud, D.D., Bishop of Kensington. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 2s. net.) Five addresses given at St. Martin's, Trafalgar Square.

THE GOSPEL OF HEALING. By the Rev. A. B. Simpson, D.D. (*Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* 2s. net.) A volume designed to show that "the healing of disease by simple faith in God is a part of the Gospel and a doctrine of Scripture."

A PLEA FOR THE THOROUGH AND UNBIASSED INVESTIGATION OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE. By C. H. Lea. (*J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd.* 1s. net.) A new edition, with special chapters on the Report on Spiritual Healing.

GENERAL.

THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC REVIVAL IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By Paul Thureau-Dangin. Revised and re-edited from a translation by the late Wilfred Wilberforce. In two volumes. (*Simphin Marshall and Co.* 31s. 6d. net.) An extremely interesting book, showing an intelligent Fernchman's view of an important chapter in our ecclesiastical history, written with a fulness of reference which leaves nothing to be desired.

HINDUISM IN EUROPE AND AMERICA. By Elizabeth A. Reed. (*G. P. Putnam's Sons.* 5s. net.) The author, believing that converts to Hinduism are being made among Christian nations "because of roseate misrepresentations," gives us in these pages a picture of Hinduism as it really is. A most informing book.

DISESTABLISHMENT AND DISENDOWMENT UNDER THE WELSH CHURCH ACT. By S. E. Downing, B.A., LL.B. (*S.P.C.K.* 6d. net.) A careful analysis of the Welsh Church Act, written with great ability by the Secretary to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

CROWNED WITH GLORY. By the Rev. G. R. Oakley, M.A., B.D. (*S.P.C.K.* 1s. 6d. net.) A collection of "stories of the younger Saints in the Prayer-Book Calendar"—viz., Prisca, Agnes, Agatha, Edward, Margaret, Faith, Katharine, and Lucy.

LONDON DIOCESE BOOK FOR 1915. Edited by Prebendary Glendinning Nash and Canon A. Glendinning Nash. (*S.P.C.K.* 1s. 6d. net.) Quite the best of all diocesan books, packed full of the right kind of information. No London clergyman or ecclesiastical layman should be without it.

KNOWN TO THE POLICE. By Thomas Holmes. (*T. Nelson and Sons.* 1s. net.)

MIGHTIER THAN THE SWORD, by A. Courlander, and THE HOUSE OF THE WOLF, by Stanley J. Weyman. (*T. Nelson and Sons.* 7d. net each.)

PAMPHLETS.

WHY I JOINED THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By a Layman. With Foreword by the Bishop of London. (*S.P.C.K.* 2d.)

MY PRAYER-BOOK. Compiled by the Rev. H. F. Tomkinson. With Prefatory Note by the Archbishop of Canterbury. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 3d. net.) Adapted for general use from "the Church Scout's Prayer-Book." We are sorry to see that it recognizes non-communicating attendance at the Holy Communion and also Auricular Confession. Truly the Archbishop writes wisely when he says "It will not suit everyone." We regret that he thinks "it will suit many."

WAR LITERATURE.

THE WAR AND RELIGIOUS IDEALS. By the Rev. C. L. Drawbridge. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 1s. 6d. net.) A very welcome book. Atheists have not been slow to lay this war to the charge of Christianity. Mr. Drawbridge, who is better fitted than any man we know to answer unbelievers, has given us a volume which deals with the many questions raised by the war in a spirit of reasonableness. There are three chapters—(1) "The German Ideal"; (2) "The Survival of the Fittest"; and (3)—best of all—"The Christian Ideal and War." To anyone troubled with doubts on this question, Mr. Drawbridge's volume may be warmly commended.

THE SHADOW ON THE UNIVERSE. By I. M. Clayton. (*Simpkin, Marshall and Co.* 2s. 6d. net.) A volume written to prove that "warfare engenders a process of physical degeneration which must eventually bring about the extermination of the human race." The discussion is more academic than practical.

CHRIST OR KAISER? THE GREAT WAR'S MAIN ISSUE. By Paul Tyner. (*Victory Publishing Company.* 3d. net.) The first of a series of pamphlets in the "Victory Series." The writer states that "this war is simply and certainly the duel to the death between Christ and Antichrist, between the Spirit of Truth and the Father of Lies."

PAPERS FOR WAR TIME. (*Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press.* 2d. each.) Six more of these thought-compelling pamphlets are issued, Nos. 17 to 22 inclusive, as follows:

Pharisaism and War. By F. Lenwood, M.A.
The Cure for War. By A. Clutton-Brock.
Our Need of a Catholic Church. By the Rev. W. Temple, M.A.
War, this War and the Sermon on the Mount. By Canon B. H. Streeter, M.A.
The Removing of Mountains. By the Author of "Pro Christo et Ecclesia."
International Control. By Professor W. G. S. Adams, M.A.

OXFORD PAMPHLETS. (*Humphrey Milford.* 2d. each.) Three useful additions to this series are issued:

The War and Theology. By Principal W. B. Selbie.
The Evolution of Thought in Modern France. By Ernest Dimnet.
Christmas and the War. By Dean Strong.

THE ROLL OF HONOUR. (*S.P.C.K.* 6d.) A broadsheet in red and black, with request printed at the top, "Pray for those who have gone from this parish to serve our King and country by land and sea and air," and then follows a blank space for the insertion of names. Every parish should possess a copy.

TREATING OUR SOLDIERS. By Archdeacon Gibbs. (*S.P.C.K.* 4s. per 100.) Essentially a tract for the times.

SLOWCOMBE IN WAR TIME. By J. A. Staunton Batty. (*S.P.C.K.* 6d. net.) Admirably adapted for "Study Circles," or for reading at Parochial Gatherings.

CHRISTIANITY AND WAR: A WORD TO TEACHERS. By the Rev. W. Temple, M.A. (*S.P.C.K.* 1d. net.)

MAGAZINES.

COMMENT AND CRITICISM. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 6d. quarterly.) With articles by Rev. J. N. Figgis, Rev. S. C. Carpenter, Rev. C. F. Rogers, Rev. T. Thompson, and others.

BRITISH REVIEW. (*Williams and Norgate.* 1s. monthly.) With articles by T. H. S. Escott, Vernon Sommerfeld, Paul Parsy, Eden Phillpotts, Major Rédway, and others.

ENGLISH CHURCH REVIEW. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 6d. monthly.) With articles by Canon Newbolt, Rev. R. W. Burnie, Rev. Jesse Brett, and others.

CHURCH MISSIONARY REVIEW. (*C.M.S. House.* 6d. monthly.) With articles by Rev. R. Wardlaw Thompson, Rev. W. S. Hunt, Rev. J. E. Padfield, and others.