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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

June, 1916.

The Month.

"The New Religion."

The Bishop of London in his public utterances generally manages to use some phrase which "catches on," and his statement in Convocation that "the Young Men's Christian Association had formed a kind of new religion" has excited widespread attention. We do not gather from the report of the Bishop's remarks that he gave any very clear indication of what this "new religion" consists; and we should imagine that the National Council of the Y.M.C.A. would repudiate very strongly the suggestion that there was anything "new" in the religion which is being propagated by their workers among the troops in the home training camps, and at the Front. What, perhaps, is "new" is the way the precepts of Christianity have been put into practice, but even this is no markedly fresh departure. It has ever been the aim of the Y.M.C.A. to bring Christian principles and the Christian spirit into every part of a young man's life. It has cared for the needs of his body; it has sought to cultivate his intellect; it has provided for his social aspirations—in fine, it has taken the young man as he is, viewed his life and viewed it whole, and has sought to provide for his every need upon Christian lines. It had proved its capacity for such service to the young manhood of the nation long before the war broke out, as witness the highly successful work at the new headquarters in Tottenham Court Road, and at different large centres throughout the country. Its beneficent influence has spread also to all parts of the Empire, but for our present purpose we are thinking only of the homeland. When, therefore, war was declared and young men were volunteering for service in hundreds of thousands, what more natural than that the Y.M.C.A. should determine to apply and extend the principles

which have always characterized its work to the young men who were embarking upon an altogether new experience—life in the Army. There is no need to dwell upon the tremendous success which has attended the War Emergency Work of the Y.M.C.A.; all we are concerned with now is to show that this "new religion" is only the adaptation of old principles to modern needs.

"The Old, Old Story."

The Bishop of London went on to say that "the Church must be prepared in some similar ways to adapt itself in the future to the changed conditions"; and others are taking up the same theme, although not always very intelligently. Thus a writer in the *Guardian* says of the Y.M.C.A. that "they practise without professing" while "the Church has lazily professed without practising." The contrast is smart enough; but it is based upon a fallacy. The writer, like many others, is apparently under the impression that the Y.M.C.A., being an undenominational organization, has no creed to profess, but in this he is very decidedly mistaken. The creed it "professes" is at the root of all its undertakings and gives life to them all. The Y.M.C.A. is governed by no denominational standard, but it is essentially Christian in its basis, in its work and in its outlook. So far from the religion it teaches and professes being "new," it is very old, as old as the New Testament itself. It is "the old, old story of Jesus and His love," which Y.M.C.A. workers tell out to all whom they can influence, and it is this proclaiming of the Gospel in all its simplicity which has won the hearts of men in camp and trench. If, in the words of the Bishop of London, the Church is to adapt itself in the future to the changed conditions, it is before all things necessary that it should give the people the old Gospel, the Gospel of salvation from sin—sin's power, sin's punishment, sin's curse—through our Lord Jesus Christ. This the Church has largely ceased to do: hence its failure to reach men or to retain them. There ought to be no misunderstanding on this point. The mere imitation of Y.M.C.A. social methods will not effect much, unless the movement has behind it the life-giving principles of the Gospel of Christ. The Bishop of London related the story of a young man who came back from the trenches, and, finding the Church "as dull as ever," exclaimed, "This is not the place for me. I'm off to the Y.M.C.A." What made the Church "dull" to the young man? Lack of

ornateness in the service? Bishops and clergy make a great mistake if they imagine that a florid service is enough to satisfy men who feel a spiritual need. It is much more likely that the young man found the Church "dull" because it had no message for his soul; and we are convinced that the secret of the success of Y.M.C.A. meetings and services is to be found not so much in the bright and hearty singing, or in the atmosphere of true fellowship which ever characterizes them, but chiefly in the fact that they appeal to men's deepest spiritual instincts. Men are made to realize their sin and they are pointed to Him Who came to take away their sin, and this "old, old story of Jesus and His love" retains and ever will retain its fascinating power.

After the War.

A most interesting Report has been presented to the Convocation of Canterbury from a Committee of the Lower House, upon the question how the Church may best be prepared to meet the spiritual needs of sailors and soldiers returning to their homes and civil occupations when the war is over, especially with respect to worship, public and private. The Report goes into the question very thoroughly, and, except in one important particular, its suggestions are calculated to be of the utmost service. They are grouped under four heads. The first deals with the importance of the teaching work of the Church. It points out that men nominally Churchmen have forgotten most of the elementary religious teaching which they received as children; yet they are ready to learn, but "the teaching must be simple, direct, real and thorough." The Committee lay stress upon the importance of sermons which should be so planned as to ensure that the whole of Christian faith and duty is dealt with in proper order. They add this very important clause: "The teaching, if it is to be of real value, must deal with *vital religion*. It will, for example, serve no useful purpose if it merely explains the Creeds in a hard, dogmatic manner, or concerns itself with facts which are only of literary or historical interest. The aim should be to help men to think in order that they may know how to act and how to love." Other useful suggestions are offered (e.g. that there should be instruction in the difficult art of prayer), but the point of the greatest interest is the emphasis the Committee lay on *reality*. The second heading relates to Christian Fellowship, a matter in

regard to which the Church in so many parishes comes far short of the Christian standard. The following suggestions are much to the point:—"Church officials should be encouraged to do all that lies in their power to remove anything like an atmosphere of aloofness and coldness from the Church, and to extend a welcome to all who attend the services irrespective of their social position and the amount of their contributions to parochial funds. . . . Every communicant should be encouraged to undertake some definite piece of Church work, and the clergy should carefully avoid the appearance of regarding the workers as people who are under their orders." These last words are full of significance, particularly when it is remembered that the Committee consisted entirely of clergy. The third matter—"Public Worship"—will be dealt with separately. The fourth relates to the Prayer Meeting, and the Committee express the view that the devotional needs of the people will not be fully met unless frequent opportunities are given for united prayer outside the liturgical services of the Church.

> "The Church of apostolic days was not afraid to give to the congregation considerable freedom in the matter of prayer. In the prayer meeting men waited on God; they spoke as the Spirit gave them utterance, laymen taking their full share in the offering of prayer; and in answer to these prayers the congregation learnt what fresh duties God was calling them to undertake. We have lost much of the freedom which the apostolic Church enjoyed. The layman has for the most part to be content to listen while the clergy pray, and the prayers offered by the priest are generally some fixed form ordered by authority, and not the spontaneous utterance of his own heart."

The Committee recommend the revival of the prayer meeting, and we are persuaded that there could be introduced into any parish no better reform. The importance of this Report is self-evident: we only hope it will not be pigeon-holed, but will be acted upon.

Public Worship.

Where so much is excellent, we the more regret finding ourselves in complete disagreement upon one important point. The section on Public Worship urges that much might be done to raise the level of our present services, and in this we entirely concur, but the passage on other changes which should be made "if a real enthusiasm for public

worship is to be created in the hearts of the people" fills us with alarm. The Committee quote the words of the Archbishop of York: "We must try everywhere, patiently, gently, hopefully, to restore that holy service [the Eucharist] to its rightful place as the central act of the Church's worship," and then go on to say that "any change must, of course, be made with the consent and goodwill of the people, or it will defeat its own object. If the Eucharist is to become the chief service of the day it should be celebrated at a time which is not too early for those who have been tired by a heavy week's work, or too late for those who may wish to come fasting." They add that "no change in the customary ritual of the Church need be made," and that the change which they desire to see would, in their opinion, lose most of its value "unless the communion of the people forms an essential part of the Eucharistic act. Unless this is so, the great Sunday service will be incomplete, and fail to take its place as the chief service of the day." They also express the view that "the service speaks, as no other can do, of the love of God, revealed in the Cross of Jesus Christ, coming down to meet every need of men. It has a *converting* power which is all its own, and expresses far more completely than Matins or Evensong the joy of worship and of fellowship." They accordingly recommended and the Lower House adopted the recommendation by fifty-four to eight "that no arrangements for worship should be regarded as satisfactory which do not provide for a Celebration of the Holy Communion as the principal Sunday service, at an hour when the greatest number can be expected to communicate." This recommendation suggests a change which, if it be widely adopted, may have disastrous results.

"Principal Sunday Service."

We observe, first of all, that the phrase used by the Committee, "the principal Sunday service," is not the same as that used by the Archbishop of York, who spoke of "the central act of the Church's worship." The Archbishop of York may have meant what the Committee have apparently understood him to mean, but, strictly construed, his words do not necessarily carry that effect. We may, however, let that pass, and ask what is meant by this recommendation that the Holy Communion is to be the principal Sunday service? Is the celebration of Holy Communion to take the place now occupied by Matins? Is atten-

dance at it to be confined to those who intend to communicate? Or, on the other hand, is non-Communicating attendance to be encouraged? Convocation might have cleared up all these points, but it chose to ignore the practical side of the question and to content itself with the use of a phrase. The Committee lay stress on the act of communicating, but it is notorious that in Churches where the Holy Communion is celebrated as "the principal service," very few, if any, communicate at it; the service, to put it quite bluntly, is changed into a Mass. Is this the type of "reform" Convocation wants to foist upon the Church? If so, there can be but one answer: it will be resisted to the last by those whose love and reverence for the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and all that it means to them, make it impossible that they could ever be parties to a scheme for so completely changing the character and purpose of the Lord's own service.

The Problem of Criticism.

The Dean of Canterbury made a speech at the Bible League meeting on May 10, which was specially valuable as showing the true attitude towards Biblical Criticism of those who are not prepared to accept as accurate or conclusive all the much-vaunted "assured results." He frankly and freely admitted that modern criticism had conferred benefits upon the Bible: it had strengthened the position of the Bible in very many ways, and he instanced the discovery of the antiquity of the art of writing, and the work of Professor Ramsay,

> To put it quite plainly (said Dr. Wace), we have no objection to criticism, but we have a great objection to false criticism—and, in our opinion, an immense amount of German criticism is thoroughly false criticism. I should be very sorry to say anything at all to disparage the invaluable work German scholars have done contributing to the understanding of the New Testament. But I will be frank about German criticism, and what I say will be better understood now than it would have been three years ago. The great fault of German criticism is violence. The German gets hold of a theory and immediately thinks it is going to explain everything. The method is revolutionary, and there is that violence of disposition which we know animates Germans in other departments of life. It seems as if they can do nothing moderate.

The reference to the "revolutionary" methods is, of course, of high significance, and it may be hoped that it will receive more and more attention.

The Spiritual Problems of the Great War.

III. The Common Life of Men and Women.

I

THE common life of men and women will become a problem of magnitude directly the war is over, and men released from military duties return to resume those civil pursuits in which women replaced them on account of national exigencies. Certain difficulties were realized when in the first instance it became necessary to substitute the work of women for that of men even as a temporary measure, and though such difficulties have been largely overcome, yet it is recognized that the solution of the problem is merely postponed and that it, together with all the other after-war problems, must break upon us as soon as we are freed from dominating military claims.

Whatever may be the exact nature of the problem when it unfolds to us, and however complicated and confused it may be, one thing at least is certain—there will be no reversion to former conditions, that is to say to conditions precisely as they were before the war. There will at least be modifications of those conditions; some changes made since the war began and now regarded as temporary will be confirmed; some now regarded as assured will be abandoned. Or, if some conditions now prevalent in the new occupations of women should become permanent, other parallel conditions will be correspondingly readjusted so that their new occupations may be pursued without physical and moral detriment to themselves. A curious process of transference has been going on in a dual manner: men for the most part have been pressed into tasks of physical endurance and toil, for shopwalkers and city clerks have gone to the trenches; yet women have not only replaced such in their respective placid occupations but they have also been pressed into strenuous work, both as field labourers and munition workers. In all this transference, with one exception, no clear line has been marked out as to what is and what is not men's and women's work respectively in the needs of the hour. For while men, at any rate for the time being, have vacated work which has not the qualities of manliness inherently in it, women not only have replaced them in the gentler callings but have also assumed tasks

hitherto tacitly regarded as beyond their physical and nerve capacity. The exception referred to, however, is of paramount importance, for beyond a shade of doubt the present conditions indicate that the race considers that women have no place on or near the field of battle save as nurse or comforter, and the unanimity of such a belief proves that a fundamental distinction exists between the permanent occupations of men and women. The instances on record during the last twelve months of women fighting while their country inch by inch was wrested from them, while emphasizing the desperate courage of an abandoned hope, does not nullify the exception. For it is indisputable that however much in other directions their duties in life now interlace and overlap, even if because of sin in the world, men will fight and take life for the sake of all they hold dearest, women have no place as participants in violence. In this respect, without any merit in themselves, and with no journey consciously attempted, they have " arrived " before men at the inheritance of a portion of the Kingdom of Heaven.

It is not only in professional or industrial life that a problem awaits us ; the whole subject of the common life of men and women has entered a new phase, and especially is this the case in the primarily higher and all-including plane of Church life. If here the true spirit can be found, if here the true standard can be set and the true unity be exemplified, then from the Church downwards and outwards can a permeating idea be set in motion to secure truth and fellowship. All the relations of men and women are " up for inspection " now (with those that are personal and domestic this article has nothing to do) ; and the Church which ideally is as young as it is old, as new as it is ancient, has got its witness to deliver.

It is impossible that the swift course of social changes which the war has brought should not touch the subject in all departments of life. For however wearily the war may have dragged by land and sea, and however despairingly the paralysis of hope deferred may have smitten cheering prospects, yet all the while the swiftness of social changes, changes of mind and changes of habit, has been phenomenal. Only the irretrievably prejudiced can refuse to acknowledge this, and while they, the immovables, constitute together with the reactionaries a menace to the solution of any problem, it is our duty now to look beyond them to what has got to be done. There are, of course, numbers of persons who do not trouble them-

selves about any problem one way or the other because they never stay to think, nor can they put into terms the change which has come to themselves and which is affecting their outlook. But, like all others who are heartily grateful when some one else sorts their minds for them with a neighbourly solicitude, directly the changed condition and course of life is expressed for them they respond, and take their place among that mass of persons who, however haltingly, are striving to bring in a better day—a day of the will of Christ in all human relationships.

Can it be said, however, that the common life of men and women is one of the *spiritual* problems arising from the war? Assuredly, and for two reasons. One, because the problem takes its origin in the fact that "In the beginning . . . male and female created He them": the problem has accordingly been submitted to us for solution in the Divine purpose—it has not been sought out by ourselves. The other reason—because in the revelation of God in Jesus Christ lies the solution, and in that revelation alone the evolution of any problem, even of those now arising with new insistence out of the hideousness of war.

If this be so, the whole subject ought to pass from the region of controversy into that of problem, and men and women ought to be at work upon it in the quiet of the divine Presence as serious students, corporately in an exchange of mind, individually in an exhibition of conduct, and flame and prejudice should die down as unworthy of the cause and of the hour. But the problem has got to be so solved—and that quickly; here is no opportunity for intellectual indulgence, for statement and restatement; here is something to be done.

The claim put forward in this article is that whether the problem is set forth in terms of religious or of social life, it must be faced on a basis of common sense, and that at the moment for all concerned temper of mind is more important than definition of view. If puzzled objectors or disputants or investigators—whichever they be—approach the subject, and one another, with the determination that the Kingdom of God demands that the good with good shall not be at cross purposes, a plane will be reached on which movement to solution is possible. Christian temper inevitably produces harmonized problems.

It is true that vexing problems disappear through miracle

sometimes; it is even possible that the one before us now may do so; that the ugliness of discussion concerning the highest of relationships may be dispersed as mists or fogs vanish in a freshening wind. There has been too much prayer made by the many to doubt such a possibility; there is too deep a sense of corporateness abroad to tolerate divisive contentions; and most of all, the hand of God is on Church and nation alike, pointing to repentance and to hope concerning every trouble that has clogged us. We may, therefore, well be prepared for even our most optimistic anticipations being outstripped by Divine action exceeding in speed and in completeness of effect every hope we may ever have framed. And such a change may come about in ways familiar to us all, as when some great issue, seen unexpectedly from a new angle, takes on another shape and content, and the consent of all is suddenly obtained to what previously was a separating factor. It may be so here again, and we must ever leave space for interposition in all our thinking. Nevertheless, allowing for this, the probability remains that it is through conduct we shall march to destiny, and that it is conduct and temper which will gradually solve the problem before us.

We must not delude ourselves into thinking that a lull in a storm necessarily means that the storm is over, nor that the rise of further complications involves the removal of those previously existing. The previous difficulties remain, to which are added fresh difficulties, and it is as impossible to ignore the past as the present. Indeed, we have all had so much experience of late months in looking at unpleasant facts, individual and national, that we ought to be prepared to look with candour and courage at a delicate question on which so many issues hang.

For there is a common life which men and women have to live, a common task which they have to share, a common past for which they have to atone, and a common future which they must prepare for the younger people amongst them. A common life there has always been, but now former conditions have changed and former standards and measures are now inadequate. The circumstances round men and women have changed, and the problem is one of adaptation to circumstance, not trespass of function. Any theory of adaptation to circumstance might well be dangerous were there not visible elements which indicate plainly the rule of God in the coming of His Kingdom, and so long as that be seen and steadily

obeyed adaptation can proceed without anxiety. Indeed, the trouble largely has been that in this, as in many similar questions, we have noticed a change which we attributed to persons before we observed that it was a change of circumstances which primarily had moved the persons. Hence, without distinguishing between causes and effects, origins and expressions, forces and individuals, we have taken sides and judged vigorously to the confusing of thought and the clouding of truth.

However, we stand on cleared ground—ground clear from prejudice and presupposition alike—when we affirm that it is for conduct we are now asked in solving any of the difficulties which still surround and lie behind the common life of men and women in the world. If this be so, we must reach down to the springs of conduct which find their source in character. Thence we can begin our approach, and we shall not be able to get a better formula to express our purpose than in Tennyson's words—

> Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control,
> These three alone lead life to sovereign power.

II

As a spring of conduct self-reverence differs fundamentally from self-esteem or self-complacency. It is both original and ultimate, for it can in its turn rise only from that image of God in which we are made—" the inalienable right of every man "—and it must last to the end, for the value of a human personality has been placed beyond computation. Self-reverence, then, is the recognition of what God intended men and women to be, of what they are potentially, and of the inward standard by which they must live, and it exacts precisely the same toll from a man as from a woman. If men and women are self-reverencing they will never lend themselves to one another, spirit, soul, or body, for any other purpose than the true purpose of God. Self-reverence does not permit spiritual indulgence, moral weakness, mental abdication, and it forsakes at once those who decline from the level of Divine intention. The Rev. H. J. C. Knight says in one of his books: " When once we grasp that for us the highest and best we know alone is open to us, life resolves itself into a series of struggles to be absolutely and

inflexibly true to that highest and best." This is the life of self-reverence, for it is that higher life which witnesses both to our origin and our destiny.

Dull-souled mortals no doubt would say that such a standard is unattainable. But this is not so, either for the few individuals with aspirations or for the bulk of men and women as a working principle, and since working principles are more popular and better understood by our nation than lofty aspirations, it is in this latter classification that we must test our theories. Self-reverence becomes a working principle when it governs men and women who, in co-operation as to obtaining a solution, are approaching their problem from opposite sides. It is not to be confused with an expressed reverence each for the other—indeed, this is the point where we have missed our way—but rather is it of each for each, for himself, for herself. Without pausing to give reasons or analyse causes, the reverence of men for women, from the bygone days of pedantic and unreal forms of chivalry to the protectiveness of the supposedly weak by the supposedly strong, has passed or is rapidly passing away. And the reverence of women for men on a basis of their greater intellectual qualities or social status has passed or is passing also. Since, however, no relationship can be sound which has not respect and reverence for its basis, what substitute can be found for that which changing days has radically changed? Surely, the same thing essentially, but purged of dross, a reverence which because it dignifies and enhances self-personality reverences other persons.

It would be easy to say that such a type of person would be intolerably priggish, that men and women would pass through the world as wooden and unresponsive as the dolls of our childhood, and many a plain issue has been obscured by a cheap laugh. But we are here talking of living men and women, thrust into competition or its equivalents in effect, whose common life must henceforth be spent in association which will be largely of the nature of experiment; thrown on new levels of comradeship with new expanses of liberty not yet "pegged out," a common life in which it will be needful to discipline contiguity of all kinds, mental, moral, and spiritual. The tone of the corporateness at which we all aim will be set by the pitch of our individual self-reverence.

This common life has come to us. It is not to be fussed over

nor to be perpetually theorized about. It will contain at least as many comic as pathetic incidents. It will have to be lived very simply and very straightforwardly. But in the end, the measure of success will be the measure of conviction that self-reverence, mutually existent, producing common-sense thinking and common-sense action, will lead to "sovereign power."

Self-knowledge has been much increased through the war, and has shown up unsuspected strength and weakness of character. Therefore the hour is good for common life to begin on a larger scale. It is difficult, if not wholly impossible, to get any related view of what is happening in the character of human beings. The pessimist can paint his picture true in thin washes of decadence and despair; the optimist can deify human sacrifice and endurance; the "moderate man"—the much-despised middle man of bartered thought—will be pessimist and optimist in turn, or whenever he is not thoroughly muddled in an attempted reconciliation of contradictory facts. But whether they can be related now or not, streaks of character hitherto unknown in certain persons are manifest everywhere, and the Day which is declaring many things declares also that we are more or less than we previously thought ourselves to be. Self-knowledge has grown by bounds as men and women have been hurried at a giddy speed from one experience to another, and have discovered new capacities and flaws in their own "make up." This growth is of course a great gain if men and women are going to be thrown together in board-room and workshop, in Church and State, in profession and trade, and are yet going to preserve all that is best in their original relations as men and women. Without fuller self-knowledge contiguity might have had many dangers, but with it there need be no fear.

It is probably fair to say that in all this subject one side has much to unlearn and the other much to learn, and that this is the price to be paid for a harmonized common life. It is easy still—and very frequent—for a man to talk in a broad-chested way of "what a man thinks" when he is in the midst of a common task. It is equally easy, and very frequent, for a woman to introduce the insistent note of "and women also." Either is fretting and both should be needless. A little more self-knowledge and a little fuller acceptance of the doctrine of "like passions" would make it plain that no one delights either in usurpation or in invasion, and however

little we care to be drawn into definitions, these are the two terms which in the minds of many describe the present situation. Self-knowledge is an antidote to antagonisms, since knowing ourselves better than before we know equally our resemblances to others, and from such a base can at least be reasonable about them.

As Christian persons with—it is to be hoped—a hatred of evil we shall in our desire for self-knowledge tend to lay emphasis on the evil to be dreaded rather than on the good to be appreciated. And self-knowledge must include a sense of sin and of the horror of falling into it. Equally also must emphasis fall on pure endeavour, not only nor chiefly on the negative of fear and dread, but on the positive of holiness, the pursuit of which needs perfecting in the fear of God. And it is inconceivable that men and women each taking up their call to common life, each self-knowing in a new degree, should not with courageous humility stand and work together, each alive to the sources of weakness and of strength.

When self-reverence and self-knowledge are called to action they appear as self-control, and this not in the sense of negation or suppression, but of that highest and best for which we strive. It is a virtue which does not consist in restraint, and it may as readily drive the timid who would run away back into the hottest part of battle as it would curb the lip or limb of the veriest fighter that was ever born. It is disciplined activity, that is all.

Poise means much in delicate situations, and though honours may not outwardly fall to the self-controlled, they become in reality the umpires of the world. Possibly life would be somewhat tame if all were to this extent self-controlled, and it would be as cruel to them as hurtful to the race if men and women might not break out in venture and prospect and plead for newer, better things. But in the end, "sovereign power" rests with self-control, for when the storm is dying down for very exhaustion, the steady voice will be able to be heard and the strength will be fresh still to arbitrate and judge. The self-controlled do not spurt nor falter; only when their work is done, then they are gone.

If not in its highest form in the few, the measure of self-control in the many, arising in part from the new moral and social responsibilities which the war has brought, will be a great asset in the solution of our problems, for it will enable us without sulking at non-appreciation or jibbing at delay to press on with steady purpose,

ready for " the thorn-road " if only the " mount of vision " can be won.

It would be of little use to write at this moment in our history as a Church and a nation of any virtues or qualities in the abstract. We are up against hard facts and realities of life, with consciences aroused, and neither sermon nor message that is not in terms of life and of human experience has any value for us. The National Mission is focusing for us as Churchpeople the bitter lessons of the war. The old moral and social problems challenge us freshly, even while we are strained under the burden of a great national load. New problems rise thickly to make their claim upon our energies and faith. Through them all, whether old or new, we know that a voice is calling, and that it is the voice of the Lord in the heat of the day. And we begin to learn that what we are listening to, whether here at home or on the fields or seas of battle, is the call to subordination of personal to general good. It is France which so largely has helped us to hear this call. " Yes, one suffers," said a French war widow in September, 1914, " but it may be the little ones coming after us will suffer less." And only the other day the parched French gunners at Verdun emptied their water-bottles to cool their guns rather than risk the issue of the battle by satisfying their own thirst. For once—and perhaps for ever amongst us—the cause of common good is seen to be greater than the sacrifice which purchases it, and the opportunity of vindicating this great principle is before us again in working out the common life of men and women.

It is easy to see just now that all that is implied in the term is no abstraction, but a call to service, to work, to conflict, and all for *the sake of others*. The blots and stains, the barriers and obstacles which men and women could not remove alone, they must in contrition cleanse and assail together, making the religion of Jesus Christ the secret and the open power of a purified nation. It is in a common life of Christian dimension that they must fulfil their task, and in the last resort it is a thing not to talk about, but quietly to do.

M. C. GOLLOCK.

*** Previous articles in this series have appeared as follows :—

I. *The Call of the War*. By the Rev. L. George Buchanan (February).

II. *The Cross Among the Ruins*. By the Rev. E. A. Burroughs (April).

A War-Time Missionary Sermon.[1]

[By the Bishop of Winchester.]

"It shall be built again with street and moat, even in troublous times."—Daniel ix. 25.

"Enlarge the place of thy tent and let them spread forth the curtains of thine habitations; spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes."—Isaiah liv. 2.

An author of some distinction in the literature of fiction said the other day, speaking for himself and for a friend who is known throughout the English-speaking world, "We feel unable to write now; things are too big for us." There is reverence in the speech; such reverence as was more outspoken in the ancient, holy words "Be still and know that I am God." "Let all the earth keep silence before Him." "Thy way is in the sea and Thy paths in the deep waters, and Thy footsteps are not known." Yet at such a time as this the true attitude of the Church and of her members is, I suppose, that of Habakkuk: "I will stand upon my watch and set me upon the tower, and will look forth to see what He will speak with me."

Nor can this expectancy be wholly silent. There may rightly be some attempt to discern the signs of the times. Least of all can this be wrong if in straining to see new indications of God's purpose we guide ourselves by remembrance of His works and "wonders of old time" and by the knowledge which He has given us of His abiding purposes.

The cause of Missions, the cause of the Gospel, suffers heavily to-day. The auspices may seem against us. But were things brighter, we may well ask, 117 years ago, when your fathers took up, with the gallantry of Christian faith, the forlorn hope of Evangelization? What in those days was the "home base"? What were the instruments and methods available? What were the open doors and highways of communication? The contrast is full of heartening suggestiveness. But, all the same, things are dark to-day. We must not deny it, nor ignore it, nor miss (as the world so strangely does) the signs of God's chastening Hand. Missionaries

[1] Preached at St. Bride's, Fleet Street, E.C., on May 1, 1916, at the 117th Anniversary of the Church Missionary Society.

in places are interned or impeded. Communications are poorer and more perilous. Reinforcements must needs be smaller, since many who would have been our volunteers have heard the sterner calls of war; some will never return to take up the purpose which in others, we hope, will gain depth and simplicity from the experience of earthly chivalry. In the ears of many of our women the call of suffering to be tenderly cherished is too loud to leave opportunity for other voices. If this were all, the heartening statistics of the year might well make you feel that there was much more cause for thankfulness than for fear. Your accepted candidates are only fewer by six, your contributions actually increased by £24,000. Alas! we know that it is not all. We cannot forget that Europe, the great trustee of the Gospel, has become also Europe the great stumbling-block, or scandal, to it. What must the nations think and say of Christendom? "Christian" nations tearing out each other's vitals; Christian spirit, and the Churches which embody it, wholly unable to forbid or to stay the strife; force worshipped and triumphant; and, above all, a spirit of hatred, and even a glorification of that spirit, as almost the new commandment of the latest age; Christian ministers, if we may judge by reports of German pulpits (and are our own entirely free?) uttering words of deadliest rancour—these things must tell for evil: must perplex and baffle the friendly, must give great occasion to the hostile. The Name of Christ is blasphemed through us. Heathenism may well reply to our missionary call—"Physician, heal thyself."

Perhaps there is more yet to be reckoned in. Are our own thoughts absorbed by the reports and anxieties and efforts of war? Are prayers that might have gone up for the great missionary cause displaced for those which plead for the urgent necessities, and fears, and hopes of this appalling struggle?

The outlook is clouded; the hindrances real.

Yet I know that I speak true when I say that to the question "Are you discouraged?" there comes up from your hearts, genuine and unaffected, the answer, "No." If that reply were prompted only by the instincts of faith and simple duty, it would be worth much, breathing the spirit and witnessing to the power of the Kingdom whose "banner, torn yet flying, streams like the thunderstorm against the wind."

But I would submit to you that it is more than instinctive. In

a time of shaking the things that are not shaken will remain. Can we already see grounds of reason which justify the instinct? My belief is that we can. Let us consider.

1. We have emerged from a period before the war of easy self-contentedness and apparent stability: one of those times in which men say, "To-morrow shall be as this day, and yet more abundant"; when "all the earth sitteth still and is at rest," a time when our enlightened present felt able to look back with complacency upon the strifes and tragedies of the past; when civilization seems to stand by its own equipoise and solidity. There are no times more dangerous than those. They put statesmen off their guard. They conceal the strength and possibilities of evil. They dispose men to forget God: to leave out of account His Providence. Threatening symptoms here and there, the forebodings of thoughtful and close observers, even a half-acknowledged feeling that things cannot go on long as they are, are not enough to affect greatly the general influence of such a time.

But the explosion comes, the volcanic forces find their outlet, and the lava streams out to deface and scorch the lands. The challenge to patriotism and the stimulus of response at first engross men's thoughts. But the conviction quietly forms that, noble as are the opportunities which the storm time gives for individual or national prowess and patience, we are confronted by what is in its essence an explosion of evil; it changes all the values and credits; we cannot trust what we trusted; we must take stock afresh; we must strike deeper. Against evil rampant we must look round for good. From a world of tumult we look upwards to God. The upward look is, perhaps, at first baffled: God seems silent or powerless; and we are tempted to deny Him, and to turn to the idols of iron and gold. But this is not the main effect. "Amidst all that," said a N.C.O. to me, speaking with quaint thought and expression of the hideous *mêlée* of a charge against machine guns, "you feel that there must be a Supreme Being." The feeling grows that all this must mean something, and something great, else all is moral chaos. It is the very nerve of faith which is touched. Meaning or no meaning for the world's history and for human lip! that and nothing less is the issue. And so it is that through the mists there is half discerned the mighty reality of the just, patient, and loving Will of God. It is at work in judgment, but through judg-

ment for good. God has a meaning through it all. That is one strong reason for courage, strong but indefinite.

2. Dare we go on to ask what He means? Surely we can tell in part by the effects. He compels us to understand again the moral issues. The old struggle of good and evil is revealed; the profound antagonism between them cannot be overlooked nor disguised by a network of refined criticism and appreciations of the better and the worse in all things. We see the evil; we can detect its roots; self and selfishness, individual and corporate; covetous desire; self-worship and self-confidence; the envy and the hatred which selfishness breeds; the trust in visible things; the contempt of the invisible. So far as we see these things avowed and adopted by our enemies, so far as we can conscientiously say that we ourselves and our Allies are against them, so far it is well, and we are at peace with our own conscience and grateful for a noble opportunity. But it is only shallow thought and foolish complacency which can stop there, and not go on to own that we too have had and have our part in things which, full-grown in our enemies, we recognize and detect.

For all the nations, and not least for our own, we have to ask what is the great antagonist force which can hold the field against evil, enduring it, resisting it, overcoming it.

There is no answer but one. That force is the Kingdom of God upon earth, the force which He revealed, and wielded, and wields, Who came, in the power of it, to declare it and to set it up; the force which has its spring in love, coming out from God, Who is love, to find expression in the lip of man. Nothing else will do instead of this: not civilization, nor intelligence, nor culture, for evil may turn each and all of these into its agents and instruments. It is the force of the Kingdom which the Gospel proclaimed.

3. But then there is a third consideration which bears specifically upon our particular work. Forced by the war to face, and not shirk, the fundamental issues, we find, of course, that the scope is world-wide. Far more than Elizabethans we are in "spacious times." To think in Continents as we were lately bidden to do seems, as some one has said, already a belated thing. We can think no other than world thoughts of world issues. The Kingdom is one for all the kingdoms and peoples.

This experience makes us look back. We pick up anew our old

recollections of the way in which the purpose of God has worked. It has gone forward by chosen and prospered instruments—Abraham and his seed, Moses and the nation which he builds, David and Solomon, with the monarchy which grows into an Empire, and becomes for ever the symbol of the ideal Kingdom; Alexander and Augustus, broadening life out and binding it into wider unities so that thinkers dream of a city in which gods and men are one.

These are parts of God's ways.

But there is (more to our present purpose) another Divine method even more marked and striking still, sometimes interlacing the other, sometimes contrasted with it. It works by catastrophe; its way is to release, through outward disappointment and failure, more spiritual hopes. Take the conception of the City of God, of the spiritual Jerusalem: it rises out of the ashes of the town sacked by Nebuchadnezzar. With the final destruction by Titus it shows itself in fuller glory to St. John at Patmos. With the fall of the Eternal City it acquires in Augustine's hands a new concreteness as the dominant reality of history. It stood in the world, but not of it; at the very time when the invasions seemed to be shattering all unity into fragments it was there, a prophecy and a pledge of human unity in some far-off day.

And now we, who have talked so fondly of our "Christendom" and half identified it in our own thoughts with European civilization, extended into the great English-speaking civilization, now, in presence of Europe's Armageddon, the huge collapse of its security and self-contentedness, do we not look out upon a world which is quite plainly henceforth a single arena on which problems of universal interest are set to be solved, and issues are joined of gain or loss, progress or ruin to—nothing less than the humanity in which all the races have part?

The surface signs have been abundant: the service of our Indian fellow-subjects tendered and given for an Empire, whether or no it is beloved, is seen with respect, and does justice between its many races and religions: the alliance with Japan; the strong tension of the best American opinion about the moral issues and the immoral methods of the war; the transformation of the half-sentimental relation between the Dominions and ourselves into one of conscious and resolute joint service to a cause of lofty principle; these all are signs on the surface of the increasing unity.

But the matter goes much deeper than this. The world is challenged, by this awful catastrophe, to decide and declare by what principles it will live; to discover what forces it can rally against all too visible bulks and masses of material force and corporate selfishness. It has been fatally but gloriously plain that principles matter; that civilization cannot merely move by its own impetus, or stand by its own stability.

We may, I think, fairly claim that, in regard to all this, the thought that has been ahead of its time has been that which has come from the Mission-field. Such comprehensive survey of world possibilities, world dangers, and world opportunities as, to take a single name, Dr. Mott gave us in the decade before the war went some way to anticipate what has now become palpable. If the Christian Churches failed to make adequate response to such responses, their failure was less complete than that of the nations.

But that is of the past. It is to the future that we turn with straining eyes and beating hearts. What a wonderful opportunity for the faith of Christ! What a call to the barren to bear! What a challenge to enlarge the tent, to lengthen the cords, to strengthen the stakes! A world-wide task and a world-wide conflict.

Evidently there are two great ministries which the wide world needs in the Name of Christ. In both this Society can thankfully and hopefully claim a share.

They both touch closely the work for which we come together in prayer and thought.

1. The first, least easy to define, is that of influence, Christian influence upon the life of the nations, upon which we call their civilization, upon their historical growth, national and international politics, upon the behaviour of the stronger of them to the weaker, and so forth. We believe, with a belief which is stronger than ever now, that Christ is the fountain head from which justice draws its strength and equitableness, and loyalty its self-sacrifice, and patriotism its responsibility and self-restraint, and even war, while war lasts, its chivalry and honour.

If I were asked to name instances where this influence was being exerted (otherwise than by mere contagion of upright character and disinterested service), could I do better than point to what has been done under the auspices of this Society by Alec Fraser at Trinity College, Kandy, by William Holland at Allahabad, and now

at Calcutta—work frankly and intensely Christian, and yet conscientiously fair to other faiths—work which feeds the springs and nourishes the root of civilization and character; work which does our Lord honour by showing His power to elicit and stimulate and purify the best in India's life. I know the honour which the work has won from the ablest servants of the State in India, not too favourably disposed towards Missions, as such, by what they see to be its character-building results.

It is similar work by different methods and on a different plane that I saw done in Tinnevelly, at Palamcotta and Nazareth, by your own and the sister Society in building and purifying village life in India.

It is such work again, in a still more vaguely diffusive form, which is done in such noble Missions of Healing as those of Peshawar and Bannu.

The Kingdom of God is as leaven; and at home and on the world-field alike we must do our part to help the leavening, and recognize and help without jealousy the work of the leaven wherever we see it; to own it as His Who redeemed the world, that the power of His redemption might win the world to be such as He from the first made and designed it to be, in light, and goodness, and truth.

2. But the Kingdom of which the breath is the Spirit Who breatheth where He will and of which every man who anywhere feareth God and doeth righteousness is in a measure a servant, has yet for its appointed organ and instrument the society, company, body, and Church of the Redeemer. He founded it upon the Rock of His own acknowledged Messiahship, self-revealed and Spirit-witnessed in its supernatural and Divine fullness, and He built and builds it of those who, one by one, with heart and lips make confession of His Name. It was the work of the devoted Christians whose tradition of faith and piety you inherit to witness, in times when the truth was almost forgotten among we English folk, for that to which now war and peace alike testify—namely, that this Kingdom, this City of God, cannot be less than world-wide, must have its gates open day and night, must gather into it the desirable things of all nations, must recognize among its citizens no distinctions (except of varying kinds of honour and use) of colour, and race, and sex, and kind.

It is easy enough, when looking back, to see the crudeness of

the early efforts. They were like those of children, feeling their way, finding their strength. We can see how they lent themselves to irony such as that of the honest and genial Thackeray ; and that there was a certain truth in the charge that they went after blacks abroad, forgetting the abject intensity of white needs at their doors.

But with childlike dutifulness and simplicity they held to their principle—or rather to their faith. They were out for the salvation of souls. They stood for the equal value of every human soul, not because all are equally insignificant, but because each was precious in His eyes Who clothes with glory the single flower. But, in doing this, they stood implicity for the inclusion of every race in the City of God.

The amazing century which has passed since then has opened out for seeing eyes the magnificent possibilities which this implied, the enormous range of its meaning, and the inevitable necessity of it, if faith in a world Redeemer was to endure at all. But, if we do not mistake, the confusions and destructions of the war bring a new and stern compulsion to face the truth. If there are indeed world-wide issues of truth and right and freedom, there must be everywhere the witness of Him Who alone is Truth and Righteousness, Who alone makes free. Words of half-prophetic sort were spoken two years before the war by Dr. Vandycke, and are quoted by my noble and missionary hearted friend and colleague. Dr. Arthur Brown, of New York : " It may be that disaster and humiliation and weakness must befall the Christian forces, and they must be driven to some dreadful battlefield of Armageddon to make them stand together against the united powers of darkness and unbelief."

How passionately this must make us long for what is not within any human foresight of possibility—the world-wide witness of a world-wide Church. We cannot accelerate it otherwise than by our fervent prayers, and by the cultivation of the Spirit and temper (thank God, so much more common) which across divisions owns brotherhood, by which we can converge even if the meeting-point be far beyond the horizon. To do more might only shatter what we have. But let us, together where we can, apart where it must be so, keep doing the work of the Kingdom, keep bearing witness to the King, keep gathering in what the native races and the natives have to bring, keep building the walls of the City with the open gates.

Hold on, then, with your beautiful and Christ-blest work. Keep your anniversary in thankfulness and hope. Go out from it to persevere. You do not need for this such large and ranging thoughts as we have dwelt upon together to-night. The lives of the children whom you rescue from the pollutions and cruelties of heathenism into the innocence and happiness of Christian life; the women whom you build up into the purity of womanhood; the men to whom Christ through you teaches manhood, self-mastery, and patience, or who become in their turn His Evangelists and witnesses: these are your reward, and it is rich; these are also your evidence, and it is sufficient of the necessity and beauty of what you do.

But God fulfils Himself in many ways; and I have desired, in a time of confusion of face and perplexity, to ask you to descry indistinctly I know, but not uncertainly, that even out of the darkness the light breaks, and out of our narrowing troubles comes some fresh largeness of hope.

The War and the Other World.

4. Can those who are in one World influence those who are in the other?

WE now come to the question to which the previous questions have led us. In what relation do the inmates of the two worlds stand to one another? Can the inmates of this world be of any service to those who are now in the other, and especially to those whom they have known and loved? And is it possible that those who have gone before can render any service to those who remain here? It is very widely believed that, whether or no those whom we call the dead know anything about us and desire to help us, we certainly know nothing about them, and to suppose that we can do anything to help them is presumptuous folly, or at least idle superstition.

It is conceivable that they may be able to help us in more ways than one. They may be able to watch over us as guardian spirits, warding off temptations and other dangers, suggesting holy and wise thoughts, etc.; and this idea is sometimes cherished by bereaved persons and encouraged by poets and painters. The spirit of a dead mother is thought of as still watching over her surviving children. All this is credible. But we can most readily believe that the way in which the inmates of the other world always do us service is by praying for us. They prayed for us while they were with us, and we are confident that they wish to pray for us still. It is unreasonable to suppose that God would forbid them to gratify such a wish. He listened to them when, in obedience to His commands and walking by faith, they prayed for their brethren in this world. It is not likely that He would prohibit what He had commanded because, though our need of intercession for us remains as great as ever it was, the intercessors are now more fully in His Presence. Are the spirits of the just to take no part in the intercessions which are continually offered for us by the Divine Advocates, the Son (1 John ii. 1) and the Spirit (John xiv. 16; Rom. viii. 26)? "In the ancient Church it was a widespread opinion, if not an article of faith, that the dead in Christ pray for the living. . . . No belief which was not actually an

article of faith was more general or more deeply cherished in ancient Christendom" (Swete, *The Holy Catholic Church*, pp. 221, 222).

There are probably not many Christians who would care to dispute the reasonableness of this belief. Nearly all religious persons would be willing to admit the possibility that our fellow-Christians in the other world endeavour to assist us with their prayers for us, and that God hears such prayers. They would regard this as highly probable. It is the complement of this highly probable hypothesis that is regarded with suspicion, and in many cases with vehement hostility. That God allows the dead to pray for us, and listens to their prayers, is credible enough. But that He allows us to pray for them, and will listen to us if we do—that is incredible; and to practise such intercession is rank superstition and a foolish waste of time. It is probable that in a large number of minds there lurks the conviction that the practice of praying for the dead is Romish and therefore wrong. But it will hardly be maintained that all things which members of the Roman Church believe and do are wrong. Respecting nine-tenths of Christian belief and practice we and they are agreed. Let us look at the matter from other points of view. Let us look at it as a matter of common sense. One thing, and perhaps only one thing, is absolutely certain with regard to this question. Praying for the dead can do them no harm. Another is so eminently probable in itself, and has been so often proved true by those who have tried it, that it may be regarded as certain. Praying for the dead does good to the person who prays. Such a person is doing what he believes to be in accordance with God's will, he is praying for spiritual blessings to be bestowed on other souls, and he knows of nothing which requires him to believe that it is in accordance with God's will that such prayers are to be restricted to the souls of those who are still alive in this world. This would imply an enormous limitation; for the souls of the living are only a small fragment of those whom God has created and in other ways made His own. Nothing short of express prohibition would seem to justify such a limitation. Even if it could be made probable that such prayers can do no good to those who are prayed for, we may believe that they bring a blessing on those who offer them in good faith, just as we believe that the little child is blessed who, in all simplicity, prays that its

penny may be turned into a pound, that mother may be able to pay the rent (Luke x. 5, 6; Ps. xxxv. 13).

> Talk not of wasted affection, affection never was wasted;
> If it enrich not the heart of another, its waters returning
> Back to their springs, like the rain, shall fill them full of refreshment.
> (Longfellow, *Evangeline* ii. 1.)

And it cannot be made probable that such prayers do no good to those who are prayed for. Those whom we call the dead are still alive (Mark xii. 26, 27, and parallels, Luke xxiii. 43; Rev. vi. 9, 10, xx. 4). In this world, life means growth; whatever lives grows. An organism which ceases to grow, which ceases to replace by growth what has been lost by waste, is already on the road to dissolution, and death is only a question of time. We have no reason to suppose that it is otherwise in the other world. Souls which are alive are capable of growth, and are progressing towards the ineffable ideal set before them by Christ: "Ye shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matt. v. 48). The ideal is unattainable, but there is all eternity in which to be getting nearer to it. Is it reasonable to believe that our prayers can help the spiritual progress of souls that are with us in this world, and yet can give no help to those that have passed into the other? It would seem, therefore, that from the point of view of common sense those who pray for the departed have a good deal in their favour. Even without the few references to Scripture which have been inserted by way of confirmation, the case is a strong one.

Now let us look more closely at the evidence of Scripture. It is often urged that nowhere in the Bible are we told to pray for the dead. But there are other things which we regard as duties which are not mentioned in the Bible. The really relevant fact is that nowhere in Scripture are we *forbidden* to pray for the dead. We are told to pray for one another, and there is no hint that our intercessions are to be confined to the living. This total absence of prohibition is all the more remarkable because it is certain that more than a century before the Birth of Christ—perhaps much more than a century—Jews had begun to pray for the dead. This is plainly stated in 2 Maccabees xii. 39–47, a book about which English people are sadly ignorant, owing to the unfortunate fact that the majority of English Bibles do not contain the Apocrypha, although these Books are indispensable for showing the trend of Jewish thought between the latest records in the Old Testament and the

earliest in the New. From the Gospels we know that Christ severely condemned a number of beliefs and practices which had grown up among the Jews; but He nowhere condemns praying for the dead. It is difficult to suppose that He was ignorant of this practice, or that He would have been silent about it, if it is a mischievous superstition. The New Testament writers are equally silent about it, which is all the more remarkable when we remember how fierce at one time was the antagonism between Jews and Christians. St. Paul often taught in the synagogues, and it is unlikely that he knew nothing about such prayers. It is said that in Jewish liturgies prayers for the dead may be "at least as old as the time of our Lord" (G. Rawlinson; cf. Farrar, *Eternal Hope*, p. 216). St. James, who for so many years was President of the Church at Jerusalem, can hardly have been ignorant of the fact that some Jews prayed for the dead. Yet, when he directs that the elders of the Church are to visit the sick and pray for them, he does not add any caution about ceasing to offer intercessions if the sick person should die (James v. 14–16). St. John, who is also likely to have known of this practice, does say that there may be a person for whom it might be hopeless to pray; but this is not a dead person, but one who is so hardened against grace by a long course of deliberate rebellion that now he is incapable of receiving grace. Even in such a case St. John does not forbid intercession; he says that he cannot advise it (1 John v. 16). Thus, just in those places in which prohibition of prayers for the dead might not unnaturally have occurred, we do not find anything of the kind. Let it be assumed (what is not very probable) that none of these Jewish Christian writers were aware that some Jews prayed for the dead, still the fact remains that, when they write about prayers and intercessions, they never hint that these are to be restricted to the living. The still more important fact remains that Christ, who often denounces Jewish superstitions, nowhere includes praying for the dead among them. The argument from silence, which always has to be used with caution, is in this case of very real force.

The irrelevant argument that nowhere in Scripture are we told to pray for the dead is sometimes coupled with the equally irrelevant statement that nowhere in Scripture do we find an instance of praying for the dead. It is not certain that this statement is correct. There is a possible instance in the Old Testament, and a

rather probable one in the New. In Psalm cxxxii. 1, we have the prayer, "Lord, remember David in all his trouble," or, according to a better rendering, "Lord, remember for David all his anxious care," viz., all the anxiety and care which he suffered on Jehovah's behalf, especially in providing a sanctuary for Him in Jerusalem and in preparing for the erection of the Temple; "Now, behold, in my affliction, I have prepared for the house of the Lord" (1 Chron. xxii. 14). This prayer might be understood as asking God to bestow on *David*, who was dead long before this Psalm was written, blessings in return for what David had done for God during his lifetime. More probably it asks God to fulfil the promises made to David by blessing *Israel* with benefits. For the promises see 2 Samuel vii. 8–16; 1 Chronicles xvii. 23–27. In thus being open to two interpretations this prayer is like the petition in the Litany, "Remember not, Lord, our offences, nor the offences of our forefathers," which may mean either, "Requite neither our offences on *us*, nor the offences of our forefathers on *them*," in which case we have a prayer for the dead, or, "Requite neither our own offences nor those of our forefathers on *us*," in which case we have no such prayer. Possibly, as in other places in the Prayer Book, the framers made the ambiguity deliberately, so that those who used the words might include the dead or not, according to their beliefs.

In 2 Timothy i. 15–18, we have a twofold doubt, first as to whether Onesiphorus was dead when St. Paul wrote, and secondly as to whether "The Lord grant unto him to find mercy of the Lord in that day" ought to be regarded as a prayer, or as only a pious wish or expression of hope. Roman commentators and some Protestants answer both questions in the affirmative; most Protestants answer both in the negative. But if either question is negatived, there is here no instance of praying for the dead.

On the whole it seems to be probable that Onesiphorus was dead. The reasons for believing this are rather strong. St. Paul speaks of "the *house* of Onesiphorus" in connexion with the present, and of Onesiphorus himself only in connexion with the past. In the final salutations it is again "the house of Onesiphorus" and not himself that is saluted (iv. 19): in all the other cases it is the individual who is saluted. Again, the Apostle confines his desire for the reward of Onesiphorus' devotion to the day of judgment; he does not pray that he may be rewarded in this life, as the Elder

prays for Gaius (3 John 2). All this is natural, if Onesiphorus is dead; it is strange, if he is still alive. And it seems to be a little like splitting hairs to contend that "May the Lord grant unto him" is not a prayer but only a wish.

However, it is not of serious moment whether we accept Psalm cxxxii. 1, or 2 Timothy i. 18, as an instance of praying for a person who is dead. Let us set both on one side as doubtful. The case for the *reasonableness* of the practice, and for its *lawfulness* so far as Scripture can guide us, remains intact and very strong.

There remains the evidence of Church tradition. It seems to have been the experience of Christians throughout the world and through all the ages, until the Reformation, that these prayers are useful, and indeed necessary for the completion of the Christian life and the full realization of that Communion of Saints in which we all profess to believe. We pray for people, known and unknown to us, who live in distant lands under conditions very different from our own, about the details of which we are very ignorant. May we not pray for persons, known and unknown to us, who possibly are far nearer to us than those who now live far away from us, although they live under conditions still more different from our own, about the whole of which we are, and must always remain, almost wholly ignorant? The enormous majority of Christians, so far as we have evidence on the subject, have always believed, and still continue to believe, that we may. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum.* The question did not attract notice until a large number of Christians had died; perhaps we may say until the Christians who had fallen asleep had become "the majority." For the first century and a half we have little or no evidence about that and a great many other things that we should like to know; but from the second half of the second century our information is full and decisive. We have the express statements—in some cases several times repeated—of the Latin writers, Tertullian, Cyprian, Jerome, and their successors, and of the Greek writers, Clement, Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, and their successors; and what they tell us is supplemented and confirmed by abundance of inscriptions in the catacombs, which show us the kind of prayers which simple Christians offered for their dear ones who had gone before.

The evidence supplied by these writers and inscriptions shows that there is no reason for suspecting that the prayers for the dead

which are such a marked feature in ancient liturgies may be the interpolations of a later age. The writers tell us that such prayers were habitually used in the public worship of the Church; the inscriptions show us the prayers of private individuals; the liturgies show us the forms which such intercessions assumed, when set forms of worship had become established. In these the usual petitions were that those in the other world might progress in holiness and knowledge, and receive refreshment and peace together with those good things which eye hath not seen nor ear heard.

It was the mediæval abuses connected with this Christian practice which caused Reformers to abolish the public use of such prayers, along with the abuses which had gathered round them. In England they were retained in the Prayer Book of 1549, but (probably owing to foreign influence) were abolished in 1552, with the exception of one or two ambiguous expressions, which could be understood as including the dead if any one desired to include them. But the Articles of 1553 left the private use of prayers for the dead uncondemned. Article XXII, as originally drafted, condemned the doctrine *de precatione pro defunctis*, but the words were struck out before the Article was passed and published, which "shows that the Church of England deliberately abstained from seeming to express any condemnation of the practice of praying for the departed" (Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 538). But "the abandonment of public prayers for the faithful departed, however necessary or expedient that step may have been, could not but tend to lessen the hold of our people upon the oneness in Christ of the living and the dead" (Swete, *The Holy Catholic Church*, p. viii.).

It is only Protestants, and by no means all of them, who have scruples about praying for the dead. The war is doing much for the dissipation of these scruples; and we may hope that before it is ended there will be a very general restoration of this Christian and Catholic practice.

A. PLUMMER.

Authority and Authorities in the Church of England.

II. Do We need an Authority in Religion?

THIS question has really been answered in the affirmative by the general argument which has preceded. But what has been already said will be confirmed by a consideration of the special case of religion. For if no authority is needed, it follows as the only possible alternative that reason unaided can give us all we want for our purpose. That this is the case has been the contention of the whole Rationalistic school, whether the English Deists of the eighteenth century or the line of philosophers on the Continent from Kant to Hegel and his successors, or, to name the best known modern exponent of the view, James Martineau. Rationalism is an extremely difficult thing to define. To the lecturers of the Rationalistic Press Association it means the antithesis of any belief in the Divine. Mr. Joseph McCabe[1] boasts that "modern Rationalism is a system which rejects both natural and supernatural authority, and is antagonistic to the orthodox Churches on every point . . . modern Rationalism declines all theistic belief." But if we set aside such a sweeping statement, we may fairly say that Rationalism in relation to religion may mean either that reason is a trustworthy authority, or that it is the exclusive authority. The former meaning has been with rare exceptions allowed by the defenders of revealed religion. The only exception which occurs to the writer is some of the early Quakers, who were strongly inclined to depreciate the rational faculty in the supposed interests of an "Inner Light" which they regarded as a supernatural faculty resident within the man, but quite distinct from him. That this was a mistake and a source of weakness is frankly admitted by a modern exponent of Quakerism, Mr. Edward Grubb. He tells us that "in Divine worship the ideal became cessation of thought, in order that the Spirit might come in and take possession. This brought forward, in public ministry, persons of a certain psychical temperament—whose sub-conscious life, lying near the surface, was readily brought into play—and kept in the background those who, little subject to these mysterious movements, were more accustomed

[1] Quoted in Drawbridge, "Common Objections to Christianity," p. 20.

to the conscious use of their minds." A little farther on, speaking of the failure of the Quakers to exercise a lasting influence, he adds, "It was not to be expected that the Friends should spiritualize the world with a religion that held cheap the mind of man." [1]

If Rationalist then be interpreted to mean one who believes in the trustworthiness of reason in its own sphere, and the duty of exercising it to its utmost limits, there can be no objection to Rationalism from the supporters of Revealed Religion, and the antithesis sometimes made between Reason and Revelation is fundamentally false. Reason is needed to apprehend Revelation.

But a Rationalist in religion is more commonly thought of as one who believes that reason can give us complete knowledge of God without any authoritative revelation by God Himself. Further, if our twofold definition of religion is correct, reason should be able also to tell us how to approach God, and how to order our lives so as to enter into communion with Him. Now, unquestionably reason can without aid from revelation obtain some knowledge of God—or shall we say at this point Ultimate Reality. It can, for instance, study nature; and it is not fair to introduce as an objection the Christian belief that nature is in itself a revelation. The invisible things of God are, since the foundation of the world, clearly seen, to wit, His power and Godhead, for they are perceived by the things that are made. So wrote St. Paul.[2] Similarly much can be deduced from the study of human nature and human history. The traditional arguments for the existence of God, ontological, cosmological, teleological, are quite independent of revelation. Nevertheless, the history of the Rationalist movement shows the failure of reason to be a satisfactory authority. Can a man by searching find out God? said an ancient writer.[3] History answers loudly that he cannot with any real certainty, which will be generally convincing. Rationalists differ as to whether God can or cannot be known, and whether the Ultimate Reality be material or spiritual; and if they think God is spiritual and can be known, there is still the alternative of Pantheism or Deism or Theism. There is no doubt also that reason, reflecting upon human life, can and has produced great ethical systems, which, though frequently divorced from religion altogether, might be viewed as methods of preparing man to

[1] "Authority and the Light within," 85, 86.
[2] Rom. i. 20: ἥ τε ἀΐδιος αὐτου δύναμις καὶ θειοτης.
[3] Job xi. 7.

meet God. Here again there are grave divergences, but it is not necessary for the present purpose to allude to the age-long conflict of Intuitionalism with Hedonism or its more refined modern equivalent Utilitarianism. It need only be said here that however excellent the precepts of a rational ethical system may be, it has nothing to say to those unfortunate members of the human race who are painfully conscious of the conflict in the soul between duty and selfish passion, and who vainly seek help in their moral struggles. As San Chi'u said to his master Confucius centuries ago, " It is not that I do not delight in your precepts, but my strength is inadequate." It appears then that Rationalism, as a system of religion refusing authority, stands condemned at the bar of history. " The truth is," says Professor Paterson,[1] " that the twofold argument of the patristic apologetic still holds—that our intellectual blindness, and above all our moral weakness, make a pathetic appeal for the direct help of God."

The same thought is reached along a different line by Forsyth. " When we are dealing with the holy, therefore, we are in a region which thought cannot handle nor even reach. We cannot go there, it must come here. We are beyond both experience and thought and we are dependent on revelation for any conviction of the reality of that ideal which moral experience demands but cannot ensure. Life is ruined if our greatest moral ideals are not fixed in the greatest reality; yet we have no means in our own power of any conviction of such fixity. The holy is both urgent and inaccessible. It is imperative, yet unapproachable. The situation is only soluble by a miracle." [2]

If it has now been established that we do need an authority in religion, it behoves us next to put together our ideas of authority and of religion in order to arrive at the qualities of such an authority.

Essential Qualities in a Religious Authority.

Religion we have defined as involving belief in God and a desire to approach him in order to hold communion. Authority, according to one definition, is control of an individual's thought and action by a knowledge larger than his own. According to another,[3] verbally different but fundamentally the same, it is " another's

[1] "The Rule of Faith," 105.
[2] " Principle of Authority," 7.
[3] Forsyth, *op. cit.* 354.

certainty taken as the sufficient and final reason for some certainty of ours, in thought or action."

Hence the first duty of an authority in religion is to tell us the nature of the God of whose existence we are conscious. He must be qualified for this task by possessing a capacity to know God himself and to explain what he knows to men. Now it is a matter of common agreement that personality can only be understood by personality. From the human side, therefore, one who is to be an authority on God to man must be himself man. But from the Divine side it is imperative that the supreme revealer of God should be God. None but one who shares the Divine nature can comprehend in all its depth and fullness [1] the infinitudes of the Being of God. Our final authority can only be a God-man.

The second duty of an authority is to convince us of the truth of its statements. The revelation of God to man by the God-man has to " strike home," and awaken a response of approval. It has to appeal to the logical prius.

But again, our authority has to help us in our approach to God, to show us how we may draw nigh and hold communion with Him. Here, however, lies a difficulty. One of the most persistent and undeniable facts about human nature is the fact of the divided conscience. There is moral struggle and failure. There is the ineradicable conviction of sin and the sense of remorse. Sir Oliver Lodge may say that the modern man is not worrying about his sins. But the literature of the world refutes him. Men do worry when some sudden crisis in their lives tears away the surface coating of materialistic indifference and reveals the reality of the soul within. Now it is to *this* man that God has to be revealed. And what if He be revealed as holy? *This* is the man who has to approach and hold communion with the holy God. And how dare the conscience with its load of remorse thus draw near? These are the questions for our authority to answer. The capacity to answer them requires that he be of a very exalted type. Let us listen to Forsyth's [2] statement of the full measure of the demand. " It means that the Revelation of the Holy can only come through Redemption by the Holy; that to us, ruined by sinful act, the only truth that represents

[1] Cf. Matt. xi. 27. It is this requirement which renders unsatisfactory the revelation in the Old Testament prophets, which, while true as far as it goes, is obviously limited.

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 8.

Him is an act; that the absolute reality of the active and mighty world in its actual case is expressible only in an eternal deed; that the holy nature of God comes home by no prophetic exposition, even through Apostle or Saviour, but only by the priestly act in which the saving person consummates; that it cannot be taught us, it must be created in us by that act; that the Cross is the creative revelation of the holy, and the holy is what is above all else revealed in the Cross, going out as love and going down as grace; that the Holy Spirit's point of departure in history is the Cross; and that while our justification has its source in God's self-justification of His holiness there, our sanctification has the same source as both." This long extract may seem to anticipate a little, but, taken as a whole, it embodies the answer to our questions. Our authority can only bring us to God by bringing forgiveness. He can only overcome the moral weakness by imparting strength. He must reveal by redeeming, and in so doing he is recognized as authoritative by the persons he has morally created afresh.

It has, incidentally, become clear what it is in man to which our religious authority has to appeal—from what part of him most of all there has to rise the approving recognition. The heart and mind do indeed respond to the Reason and the Love of God, but neither the emotional nor the intellectual faculties lie at the centre of our being. We are fundamentally moral. The will and the conscience constitute the very essence of us. It is therefore the divided conscience itself—of course as the centre of a rational and emotional being, not in isolation—which has to recognize the authority. The appeal is made to the sense of guilt. God "is known [1] as our redeemer into His holy kingdom, Whom we only know as we are thus known into life and knowledge. Therefore, what we contribute is not that judgment by previous truth, whereby we test real discovery, but rather the sense of being judged and saved. Ours is the need and the receptivity, the choice, the owning, not of a "must" but of an "ought," whereby we meet a personal presence and a personal effect, and to which we surrender and do not merely assent."

The Ultimate Authority in Christianity.

We come now to ask whether there is in Christianity any authority which satisfies the conditions we have been led to lay down, and our thoughts turn at once to the supreme figure in the Gospels.

[1] Forsyth, *op cit.* 184.

1. The purpose of this essay is not primarily Christological, and therefore it is not necessary to attempt to set down in detail all the reasons which have led Christians to regard the *historic Jesus as God Incarnate.* But it is perhaps desirable to allude to the main lines of evidence.

(*a*) The first striking fact about Jesus Christ is that in His self-consciousness there is no trace of a guilty conscience. He was truly human; He was possessed of all those emotions and desires which constitute in us occasions of sin; He was ignorant of the course of future events, and therefore experienced the suddenness of temptation which in our case lends it so much added power;[1] He was therefore tempted in all points like as we are, and yet He never fell into sin. The proof of this lies on the surface of the Gospel narratives. We do not lay so much stress upon the well-nigh universally acknowledged beauty of the character of Christ. It is true that John Stuart Mill in a famous passage of his "Essays on Theism" declared that mankind had done well in setting up as a standard of conduct that course of action which Jesus Christ would approve. But there are found a Nietzsche to assert the claims of a Superman with his principle that Might is Right (Is this the logical result of modern evolutionary ethics?), and a Schmiedel[2] to say that "my religion does not require me to find in Jesus an absolutely perfect model, and it would not trouble me if I found another person who excelled him, as indeed, in certain respects, some have already done. . . . So far, however, no one has shown me any one who was greater than Jesus in his own special field." We lay the main stress upon the self-consciousness of Christ. "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" was not merely a challenge to hostile and hypercritical Sadducees and Pharisees. It is of great value to us if it were only that, for it shows the confidence of Christ that even his enemies could find no fault in Him. But it witnesses also to the absence of a guilty conscience in Himself. From beginning to end of His life, "He moves[3] quietly about among men, mingles with them in all the ease and variety of social relations, yet as one who breathes another atmosphere than they, who dwells in a region of unbroken serenity, at peace with Himself and with God."

[1] Cf. Forrest, "Authority of Christ," 79, 80, where this point is beautifully elaborated. The evidence is, of course, the questions in which He sought information. It is not intended to deny that He possessed a power of prophecy in certain matters, e.g. His own death.

[2] "Jesus in Modern Criticism," p. 86. [3] Forrest, *op. cit.* 11.

Him is an act; that the absolute reality of the active and mighty world in its actual case is expressible only in an eternal deed; that the holy nature of God comes home by no prophetic exposition, even through Apostle or Saviour, but only by the priestly act in which the saving person consummates; that it cannot be taught us, it must be created in us by that act; that the Cross is the creative revelation of the holy, and the holy is what is above all else revealed in the Cross, going out as love and going down as grace; that the Holy Spirit's point of departure in history is the Cross; and that while our justification has its source in God's self-justification of His holiness there, our sanctification has the same source as both." This long extract may seem to anticipate a little, but, taken as a whole, it embodies the answer to our questions. Our authority can only bring us to God by bringing forgiveness. He can only overcome the moral weakness by imparting strength. He must reveal by redeeming, and in so doing he is recognized as authoritative by the persons he has morally created afresh.

It has, incidentally, become clear what it is in man to which our religious authority has to appeal—from what part of him most of all there has to rise the approving recognition. The heart and mind do indeed respond to the Reason and the Love of God, but neither the emotional nor the intellectual faculties lie at the centre of our being. We are fundamentally moral. The will and the conscience constitute the very essence of us. It is therefore the divided conscience itself—of course as the centre of a rational and emotional being, not in isolation—which has to recognize the authority. The appeal is made to the sense of guilt. God "is known [1] as our redeemer into His holy kingdom, Whom we only know as we are thus known into life and knowledge. Therefore, what we contribute is not that judgment by previous truth, whereby we test real discovery, but rather the sense of being judged and saved. Ours is the need and the receptivity, the choice, the owning, not of a "must" but of an "ought," whereby we meet a personal presence and a personal effect, and to which we surrender and do not merely assent."

The Ultimate Authority in Christianity.

We come now to ask whether there is in Christianity any authority which satisfies the conditions we have been led to lay down, and our thoughts turn at once to the supreme figure in the Gospels.

[1] Forsyth, *op cit.* 184.

1. The purpose of this essay is not primarily Christological, and therefore it is not necessary to attempt to set down in detail all the reasons which have led Christians to regard the *historic Jesus as God Incarnate*. But it is perhaps desirable to allude to the main lines of evidence.

(*a*) The first striking fact about Jesus Christ is that in His self-consciousness there is no trace of a guilty conscience. He was truly human; He was possessed of all those emotions and desires which constitute in us occasions of sin; He was ignorant of the course of future events, and therefore experienced the suddenness of temptation which in our case lends it so much added power; [1] He was therefore tempted in all points like as we are, and yet He never fell into sin. The proof of this lies on the surface of the Gospel narratives. We do not lay so much stress upon the well-nigh universally acknowledged beauty of the character of Christ. It is true that John Stuart Mill in a famous passage of his "Essays on Theism" declared that mankind had done well in setting up as a standard of conduct that course of action which Jesus Christ would approve. But there are found a Nietzsche to assert the claims of a Superman with his principle that Might is Right (Is this the logical result of modern evolutionary ethics?), and a Schmiedel [2] to say that "my religion does not require me to find in Jesus an absolutely perfect model, and it would not trouble me if I found another person who excelled him, as indeed, in certain respects, some have already done. . . . So far, however, no one has shown me any one who was greater than Jesus in his own special field." We lay the main stress upon the self-consciousness of Christ. "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" was not merely a challenge to hostile and hypercritical Sadducees and Pharisees. It is of great value to us if it were only that, for it shows the confidence of Christ that even his enemies could find no fault in Him. But it witnesses also to the absence of a guilty conscience in Himself. From beginning to end of His life, "He moves [3] quietly about among men, mingles with them in all the ease and variety of social relations, yet as one who breathes another atmosphere than they, who dwells in a region of unbroken serenity, at peace with Himself and with God."

[1] Cf. Forrest, "Authority of Christ," 79, 80, where this point is beautifully elaborated. The evidence is, of course, the questions in which He sought information. It is not intended to deny that He possessed a power of prophecy in certain matters, e.g. His own death.

[2] "Jesus in Modern Criticism," p. 86. [3] Forrest, *op. cit.* 11.

(*b*) After the sinlessness we notice a group of further colossal claims of Christ. He claims that other men should renounce their chosen life-work and devote themselves to His service, and His claim is at once allowed. "They left their nets and followed Him." [1] He claims to be a judge of men's actions, and practically says [2] that the standard by which men are judged is their attitude to Himself and His mission. He claims [3] to revise at will the sacred Old Testament revelation. "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time . . . but I say to you." He claims [4] to forgive sins. "The Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins." He claims to be the supreme and final revealer of God. "No man knoweth the Father save the Son and he to whom the Son is willing to reveal Him." [5] And, crowning all these claims, and lying at the base of them all, is the claim of a unique relationship to God as Son. It is true that Christ's disciples are to become sons of God.[6] It is true that He calls them brethren. But there is the impassable gulf represented by the difference between "My father" and "your Father," "My God," and "your God."[7] There is the fact that though He taught them to pray, He is never said to have prayed with them. He is among them, but not of them.

(*c*) Thirdly, we notice, as a natural accompaniment of these moral characteristics, the miraculous powers of Christ and the crowning miracle of the Resurrection.

What manner of man must this Gospel figure be? To St. Paul and the first Apostles, the Resurrection was the significant event, and St. Paul was only expressing the judgment of his contemporaries when he said that the historic Jesus was "declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead."[8] The modern man fixes his attention upon the problem of the Person, and Forrest is only repeating what many others have said when he writes,[9] "The phenomenon of a sinless manhood, of a perfect filial will, is only conceivable if the noumenal lay behind it and within it." The facts of the Gospels warrant the Christian belief that Jesus is God.

2. But now a difficulty must be faced. *What if the Gospel narratives to which reference has been made are no facts, but fiction?* What if the Gospel figure about which so much has been said should

[1] Mark i. 18. [2] Matt. xvi. 1, xxv. 40. [3] Matt. v. 21.
[4] Mark ii. 10. [5] Matt. xi. 27. [6] Matt. v. 45.
[7] John xx. 17. [8] Rom. i. 4. [9] *Op. cit.* 37.

be only a creation of an artist's brain ? What if Jesus never lived ? These are not unreal questions. There are those [1] to-day who find arguments to convince themselves—if no one else—that Jesus never lived. The line of reply in brief is that such a portrait as that of Jesus carries with it the evidence that it is based on reality. A preacher like the late Dr. Dale [2] of Birmingham could say : " I forget Matthew and Mark and Luke and John ; I see Christ face to face ; I hear His voice ; I am filled with wonder and joy." A Japanese youth [3] leaves his home, wanders down to Tokyo, picks up a copy of the Gospels and reads them casually, and Jesus stands revealed to him. " He is the Master I have sought all my life ! This is the day for which I have lived." A leader of the Ritschlian school like Herrmann argues at length that though the picture of the historic figure comes to us at first in documents, it becomes independent of them and self-evidencing. " If we have experienced His power over us, we need no longer look for the testimony of others to enable us to hold fast to His life as a real thing. We start, indeed, from the records, but we do not grasp the fact they bring us until the enrichment of our inner life makes us aware that we have touched the Living One. . . . The one thing which the Gospels will give us as an overpowering reality which allows no doubt is just the most tender part of all : it is the inner life of Jesus Himself." [4] Finally we may turn upon the sceptics in this matter and ask them what artist could have invented the character of Jesus Christ. Shakespeare could not have done it. There is no character in all his plays which really fulfils our conceptions of the ideal. A philosopher like Aristotle could not do it. The μεγαλόψυχος [5] of the Nicomachean Ethics, though there is much to admire about him, has been described as a prig. Certainly the obscure Jews who wrote the Gospels could not have done it. There is no alternative but to believe that the Gospel portrait is drawn from life. The miracle of imaginary documents would be greater than the miracle of a Divine Personality.

This line of argument is deliberately put in the foreground rather than the older one of the date of the Gospels and the credibility of their authors. Yet it must not be supposed that these older

[1] E.g. Professor Drews.
[2] Quoted in Slattery, " The Authority of Religious Experience," p. 49.
[3] *Op. cit.* 198.
[4] " Communion with God," 74–5.
[5] Bk. iv, c. 3, § 1123 b.

arguments are without their force to-day, though we cannot apply them quite as our fathers did. On the contrary, the Gospels have passed through the crucible of criticism and have come out triumphant. The date of their main sources is pushed back well into the life time of the apostolic witnesses, and there is abundant evidence for their genuineness as records of what our Lord said and did. Differences between them there are of course in detail, differences which in some cases give rise to the gravest problems; this is but to say that their authors were men and liable to error. But in their main substance they agree and carry conviction.

3. If, then, we may now assume that the Gospels give us a story of the Incarnation of the Son of God the truth of which is guaranteed both by its self-evidencing power and by the results of historical criticism, we may go on briefly to point out that the *Son of God constitutes the final authority in religion* for whom we have been seeking. As God He can perfectly reveal God. As man He can understand human nature and bring the revelation home to us. He also meets the requirements of our case in that He removes the spiritual darkness and moral weakness which beset us, and deals with the guilty conscience. Jesus fulfils that ideal of which we have already quoted Forsyth's sketch, showing that revelation can only come by a redemption which includes both forgiveness and new power. With this view Herrmann, though not quite so explicit, is in general agreement. Out of many pages two short passages, illustrating both the self-evidencing power and the work of Christ, may be quoted.[1] He says that "any one who feels the appeal of Jesus to his own conscience, must receive the impression that Jesus actually was what He claimed to be," and, a few pages farther on, after alluding to the influence which God exercises on us in Christ, he adds, "God brings it about that to do right ceases to be a painful problem for us, and begins instead to be the very atmosphere in which we live. Here then we find a thought which we have a right to hold to be an objective reality for every man, and we find this very thought working in us to make us certain of God."

4. If the foregoing arguments have established for us that Jesus Christ is the final authority in religion, we shall have been constrained thereby, also to submit ourselves to His guidance. But as soon as we have yielded ourselves to Him, we become aware of a

[1] "Communion with God," pp. 90, 103.

whole set of new problems. Perhaps it will suffice to indicate two far-reaching questions which immediately arise, and very briefly the lines of answer. If Christ is our authority, we must know whether there are any limits to His control over us, and how He exercises it.

With regard to the *sphere of Christ's authority*, we have to remember that we have hitherto been speaking of religion and ethics. We have argued that Christ is our authority on God, that He reveals God to us and gives us a moral dynamic whereby we are enabled to approach God in virtue of the possession of a God-like character. But does this religious and ethical authority of Christ make Him also an authority in every sphere? Is every pronouncement which the Gospels record Him to have made during His earthly ministry on history or science necessarily to be accepted as closing all further debate? The principle by which this question is answered arises from the fact that Christ's humanity included ignorance as one of its characteristics. Omniscience is one of the things which the data of the Gospels compel us to believe that Christ laid aside at His Incarnation. How He did so we do not know. It is part of the mystery of the Divine Personality. But the evidence as to the fact is clear. Jesus asks questions, and the obvious reason for asking them is that He wants information. Again, there is the classical statement,[1] "Of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." In one region only can it be fairly said that Christ claimed certainty and final authority, namely, in regard to the revelation of God and man's response thereto. Efforts have been made all down Church history to hold Christ infallible in every matter. Thus in the early Church we find most of the Fathers adopting various expedients to explain away His questions, and not infrequently being led thereby to take a Docetic view of His humanity.[2] The Gospels tell us all we know about Christ, and part of what they tell us is that in some things He was ignorant. If we reverently but frankly

[1] Mark xiii. 32.

[2] Cf. Forrest, "Authority of Christ," p. 52: "Cyril explains our Lord's saying regarding His ignorance of the end (Mark xiii. 32) as meaning that, though He knew it, He was not authorized to declare it. 'When His disciples would have learned what was above them, He pretends for their profit not to know, inasmuch as He is man, and says that not the very angels knew, that they may not be grieved at not being entrusted with so great a mystery.'" There is a catena of quotations on this subject from Cyril in Bruce's "Humiliation of Christ," pp. 366–72.

admit this, it will follow that Christ's dicta about history and science are not necessarily authoritative and infallible. It does not certainly settle the authorship of Psalm cx. that Christ referred to it as a Psalm of David. Not more can be deduced from our Lord's statement than that He was content to accept the current view.[1]

The other question is as to the *mode in which Christ exercises His authority*. The principle of the answer here is that the Christ Who lived and died also rose again, and is alive for evermore. He promised us the presence of the Holy Spirit Who is to lead us into all truth, to take of the things of Christ and show them unto us; and there is a real sense in which Christ Himself comes to us in the coming of the Spirit. The Spirit, indwelling in our hearts, tells us in detail how to submit ourselves to the authority of Christ. Sometimes He may guide the student's mind as he ponders over the recorded sayings of Christ, showing him how to apply them to entirely new situations. Sometimes He may call to mind the example of Christ and thereby open up new vistas of duty. Sometimes He may use the revelation of new facts to indicate the necessity of some startling change. So, for example, did the Spirit through the experience of Cornelius and his company guide St. Peter to understand that in Christ there was to be neither Gentile nor Jew, but all were to be one. Sometimes He may guide by personal leading, revealing Himself in holy intercourse in the inner chambers of the soul. Such perhaps is the meaning of "They purposed to go into Bithynia, but the Spirit of Jesus suffered them not."[2] The guidance of Christ by His Spirit is a reality of which they know most who humbly submit themselves to it.

C. H. K. BOUGHTON.

(To be concluded.)

[1] On this subject generally cf. Forrest, op. cit. passim.
[2] Acts xvi. 7.

Dr. Johnson and his Times.

II.

IN contemplating Johnson's social and club life, we enter upon what has been referred to as the second half of personality, viz., achievement.

Johnson was never a man who made much noise in public life. His arena was not the senate-house or the platform, but the club and the drawing-room: and it was in this tranquil sphere that he won much of his fame while living, and, as some will have it, nearly the whole of his fame after death. I cannot agree with this latter opinion, which is tantamount to claiming that, but for Boswell, Johnson's name would long ago have become a name only, or would, perhaps, have perished altogether.

Even as regards his fame in his lifetime, we must not forget that it was only in later years that he became celebrated for his conversational talents, which he could have had but little opportunity of exercising much before he was fifty-three years of age.

When and why did visitors, learned, noble and rich, begin to desire the acquaintance of the poor, shabby scholar, and to call at his mean lodgings in Gough Square and other unfashionable places? They had not yet enjoyed the flavour of his spoken wit, or felt the agreeable sting of his irony—perhaps had not even heard of it. The answer must be then: After, and because of, the reputation Johnson had gained by certain poems and essays that he had written, more particularly his "London, a poem in imitation of the Third Satire of Juvenal," his poem "The Vanity of Human Wishes" (published ten years later)—"two of the noblest poems in the language," Lord Rosebery called them in his Lichfield speech: his Parliamentary Debates, published by Cave in the *Gentleman's Magazine* under the title of the "Senate of Lilliput"; and other papers in the same journal. These may be regarded as the first steps on the ladder of fame.

Then, but not till Johnson was thirty-eight and had spent some of the best years of his life in drudgery and poverty—drudgery and poverty which he was still to endure for many more years—came out the Prospectus of his Dictionary: also the *Rambler*, a bi-weekly paper something after the manner of Addison's *Spectator*. Eight

years later followed the publishing of the Dictionary ; and the degree of " Master of Arts," conferred upon him by the University which his poverty had compelled him to leave without that honour. Why was that degree conferred ? Was it because he was known to be a brilliant talker, and a distinguished figure in London society ? Not at all : but, as the Diploma runs, because he was " doctissimus "—a very learned man, and was bringing out a work that would give beauty and stability to his native language.

I do not harp upon all this with any view of belittling Boswell's book or Johnson's extraordinary powers of conversation, but simply to point out that it was as a man of letters that Johnson first achieved intellectual distinction, and—if I may prophesy—it will be as a man of letters that from the intellectual point of view his name will ultimately remain distinguished.

However this may be, it is the social and conversational aspect of Johnson to which I would now direct attention : and, perhaps, this can be done best by describing two or three little scenes in his life.

Even after the publication of the Dictionary Johnson, though no longer obscure, was still poor, and had but little time, perhaps not even the clothes, for mixing much in what is called polite society. It was probably not till after he had received his pension, when he was fifty-three years of age, that he had the leisure and the means to go out much into the world. The celebrated Literary Club, founded by Sir Joshua Reynolds and Johnson, the scene of so many of his argumentative triumphs, did not come into existence before 1764, when Johnson was fifty-five. About this time, however, he very rapidly *did* make his mark as a man to be listened to, whether you liked it or not. Most people did like it, and in fact took considerable pains to get the chance of listening to him. We need now take no further trouble about accounting for his fame during life : it would be labour wasted. He *was* famous : he had *arrived*, as the French say.

Here is a scene which his friend Bennet Langton witnessed one evening at the house of a Mr. Vesey. The company, he wrote to Boswell, consisted chiefly of ladies, among whom were the Duchess of Portland, the Duchess of Beaufort, Lady Lucan, Mrs. Boscawen, Lady Clermont and others of note. Among the men present were Lord Althorp, Lord Macartney, Sir Joshua Reynolds, Lord Lucan, Mr. Pepys, and Dr. Barnard, provost of Eton. The instant that Dr. Johnson was announced and had taken a chair, the whole com-

pany began to collect round him till they became four or five deep; those behind standing and listening, over the heads of those that were sitting near him. At the club he always compelled the same kind of attention, and had no rival; though Goldsmith sometimes entered the lists with him and generally got a bad fall in the combat.

What, then, was this wonderful Talk of Johnson's that rendered him supreme among his fellows? Ah! you must read Boswell and Mrs. Piozzi to answer this question; and, even then, you may possibly be disappointed, for the manner, the voice, will be wanting. It is not too much to say that no reported conversation of any wit that ever lived comes up to the expectation of those who have heard of the extraordinary impression the original made upon those who listened to it. I think, however, that in comparatively modern times Johnson, and Sidney Smith, of all celebrated talkers, have best stood the test of repetition. Sidney Smith's vein was of the lighter, more jocular type: Johnson's of a heavier, more dogmatic, order, peculiar to himself. In all his reported utterances, you will notice especially three things—promptness, lucidity, and force. He is never at a loss—though Goldsmith used to say, when Johnson paused for a moment after his customary, "Why, sir . . . "—"now he is thinking which side he shall take" (for Johnson was a "beggar to argue"): he is never obscure: he is never weak. Boswell once, in trying to defend hard drinking, took refuge in the maxim, "In vino veritas," which might be translated "One can generally believe a man when he is drunk": to which Johnson retorted: "Why, sir, that may be an argument for drinking if you suppose men in general to be liars. But, sir, I would not keep company with a fellow who lies as long as he is sober, and whom you must make drunk before you can get a word of truth out of him." At another time Johnson was told of some man who maintained there was no distinction between virtue and vice. "Why, sir," replied Johnson, "if the fellow doesn't think as he speaks, he is lying; and I see not what honour he can propose to himself from having the character of a liar. But, if he really *thinks* that there is not distinction between virtue and vice, why, sir, when he leaves our houses—*let us count our spoons.*" Johnson's retorts were not always of the politest: as when he said to rather a dull opponent who had observed meekly, "I don't understand you, sir": "I have found you an argument, sir, but I am not obliged to find you an understanding." Or when

he calmly told the Lady Abbess of a convent he once visited in France: "Madame, you are here not for the love of virtue, but from the fear of vice"—a remark which she confessed she should remember as long as she lived. Or again, when he said to a gentleman, who was quite needlessly lamenting that he had lost all his Greek; "I believe, sir, that happened at the same time I lost all my large estate in Yorkshire." But, whatever faults may be found with Johnson's remarks, you will not find them lacking in point and vigour; nor will you ever find him exercising his wit at the expense of morality or religion.

How did he acquire this rare precision and force in conversation? There is no secret about it. It is the old story; labour, pains, trouble, that is all: we should add, of course, combined with great natural ability. He told Boswell all about it: that, all his life, he had taken the utmost care, before speaking, both as to matter and expression: he never allowed himself the luxury of slovenly thought or speech. We might take a hint from this in these days of slipshod talking—of "don'tcher knows," and "mean to says," etc. Curiously enough, on one occasion, when enumerating the requisites for conversation: knowledge, command of words, imagination, and lastly, presence of mind and a resolution not to be overcome by failures, he added, "this last is an essential requisite; for want of it many people do not excel in conversation. *Now I want it*: I throw up the game upon losing a trick"! This, I think, shows the modesty of genius; for no one else thought so: in fact many, as they retired beaten from the stricken field, only wished it *had* been so.

Just one more scene. We have seen him in his blunt moods: let us have a look at him when on his best behaviour in an interview with George III. This occurred in 1767, when Johnson was fifty-eight, and it seems to have completed his conversion to the Hanoverian succession, which for a long time he had regarded as a usurpation—though a necessary one. They met at the Queen's House, in the library; of which Johnson had the run by special permission of the King, who one day told the librarian, Dr. Barnard, to let him know when Johnson next came there, as he was desirous of seeing him. The King was shortly informed that Johnson was in the library, and he at once went to see him. As the King entered, Mr. Barnard went up to Johnson, who was immersed in a book, and whispered to him: "Sir, here is the King." Johnson started up, and stood

still. The King at once began to converse at ease with him. I cannot, of course, give you the whole interview, which lasted some time, and which is to be found recorded at length in Boswell. But what particularly won Johnson's heart was this. The King had been urging him to continue his literary labours; to which Johnson replied that he thought he had already done his part as a writer. Then came the King's memorable compliment: "I should have thought so, too, if you had not written so well." Johnson was intensely gratified; and afterwards observed to Boswell: "No man could have paid a handsomer compliment: it was fit for a King to pay. It was decisive." When asked by some one else whether he made any reply to it, he answered: "No, sir, when the King had said it, it was to be so. It was not for me to bandy civilities with my sovereign."

We came to Johnson as a writer. As regards his posthumous, his present fame—still speaking from the intellectual standpoint—the problem again obtrudes itself, whether Johnson is indebted for it mainly to his conversational or to his literary attainments. If we accept the former view (the conversational), then we are committed to the theory that Boswell created Johnson, for what do most people know of Johnson's talk except through Boswell? But this view seems inadequate, to say the least: and I would go as far as to say that, if Johnson had not *written*, his fame would long ago have dwindled, even if there had been half a dozen Boswells to record his conversation. Depreciation of his writing, however, has so long been the fashion that any other theory will probably meet with little favour. There has been what I may term a conspiracy of detraction of Johnson the author. Macaulay, Carlyle with all his admiration of him, Lord Rosebery in his glowing eulogy, all lean to this side. The British Museum is party to the plot; for, as you gaze upon the immortal names emblazoned upon the frieze of the Reading-room, you will be surprised, I hope shocked, to discover that the name of Johnson is not there! Some names are there, greater indeed than his; but there are also others which surely might have given place to that of Samuel Johnson. There is, however, one exception at least to this unanimity of depreciation. Mr. Birrell says, in his brilliant little essay, "Johnson, the author, is not always fairly treated. We are content to repeat phrases. One of these is, that whilst everybody

reads Boswell, nobody reads Johnson. The facts are otherwise. Everybody does not read Boswell, and a great many people do read Johnson. If it be asked what do the general public know of Johnson's nine volumes octavo? I reply, beshrew the general public. What in the name of the Bodleian has the general public got to do with literature? The general public subscribes to Mudie, and has its intellectual, like its lacteal sustenance, sent round to it in carts. It is not a question of the general public, but of the lover of letters. Do Mr. Browning, Mr. Arnold, Mr. Lowell, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Stephen, Mr. Morley, know their Johnson? 'To doubt would be disloyalty.' And what these big men know in their big way, hundreds of little men know in their little way. *We have no writer* with a more genuine literary flavour than the Great Cham of literature. He knew literature in all its branches. He had read books, written books, sold books, bought books, and borrowed books."

Some may possibly be thinking—what *did* Johnson write, except his tiresome dictionary? What did Johnson *not* write? would be a more difficult question to answer. A good many of his works have already been referred to in the course of this lecture.

Let us see: he wrote poems, two at least of which have been pronounced, by no mean judges, two of the noblest poems in the English language: let me quote half a dozen lines from one of them, "The Vanity of Human Wishes." Warning the virtuous scholar that he must not hope to escape the disappointments and calamities of the world, Johnson writes—

> There mark what ills the Scholar's life assail,
> Toil, envy, want, the patron, and the jail.
> See nations, slowly wise and meanly just,
> To buried merit raise the tardy bust.
> If dreams yet flatter, once again attend:
> Hear Lydiat's life, and Galileo's end.

There is an interesting little detail in connexion with that word "patron." In the first instance, Boswell tell us, Johnson had written "garret" here; but, after his painful experience of Lord Chesterfield's patronage, he substituted the word "patron" for it. Lord Chesterfield had certainly proved himself a disappointing patron; but I think Johnson was a trifle hyper-sensitive, and inclined to exaggerate the slights he received. However, the line is no doubt improved by this little touch of bitter humour.

To proceed with our list: Johnson wrote a tragedy, "Irene";

which, excellent from a literary point of view, was a dramatic failure, and was, unfortunately, the cause of some estrangement between him and Garrick, as he fancied that Garrick had not done his best to ensure success for the play. In other respects he took his defeat philosophically; and, indeed, in this case, and generally, he was ready and wise enough to accept the verdict of public opinion. When he was told that a certain Mr. Pott had expressed the view that "Irene" was the best tragedy of modern times: "If Pott says so, Pott lies," was his conclusive answer.

Johnson wrote a very great number of essays in the *Gentleman's Magazine, The Rambler, The Idler, The Adventurer*, and elsewhere, most of which are full of thought and wisdom, and all of which are models of lucid, logical, scholarly English. He wrote sermons for the clergy who had not sufficient confidence in their own productions: prologues to plays, prefaces for the books of others, and epitaphs; for a prologue or a preface or an epitaph from Johnson was supposed to ensure success to the living, or fame to the dead. All will recognize these few lines from Johnson's prologue written for Garrick on his opening Drury Lane Theatre in 1747. Johnson appeals to the audience to do their utmost to elevate the tone of the Drama: for it rests with them, he maintains, to accomplish this, and not with poor authors and players who have no option but to follow the public taste, which they are powerless to lead:

> Ah! let not censure term our fate our choice,
> The stage but echoes back the public voice;
> The drama's laws, the drama's patrons give,
> For we that live to please, *must please*—to live.

Johnson, in quite another line, wrote many beautiful prayers and meditations, in which it might be truly said that scholarship is sublimed to devotional ecstasy. Let no one for a moment presume that these were mere academical exercises: you have only to read them to see at once that they spring from the heart even more than from the head.

He wrote his "Journey to the Hebrides"; "Rasselas," which he composed in the evenings of one week, and sold for £100, to defray the cost of his mother's funeral. Boswell said he used to read this little story nearly every year.

His edition of Shakespeare must not be omitted from our list. As a commentary it has not found much favour; but the preface

is a masterly piece of original criticism, as brilliantly written as anything Johnson ever wrote—which is saying a good deal. Then, in his old age, came that great classic, the "Lives of the Poets."

And last of all—not chronologically, but to wind up our imperfect catalogue with his greatest labour—there is the tiresome Dictionary. No small output this: all, as Mr. Birrell has told us, of the finest literary quality! A few words concerning this Dictionary. In these days of splendid illustrated dictionaries, brought carefully and minutely up to date, Johnson's work has become no doubt obsolete—a back number. This is the fate of all scientific books. But, for the age in which it was written—a century and a half ago—it was a grand achievement. I think you would realize this more intimately if you would some day turn out of Fleet Street, past the "Cheshire Cheese," one of Johnson's resorts, and thread your way through a network of old courts and alleys to Gough Square, and there have a good look at the house where Johnson wrote his dictionary. In this unpromising spot the needy, ragged scholar, with only one good eye (for of the other Johnson once said, "the dog has never been of much use to me"), toiled on for eight years, with his six amanuenses, of whom five, humorously enough, were Scotchmen. When the last sheet, somewhat belated, was sent off to Millar, the publisher, Johnson asked the messenger who had taken it what Millar said. The messenger answered, "He said, sir, 'Thank God I have done with him.'" "I am glad," replied Johnson, "that he thanks God for anything." So was the work ended. He got £1,575 for it, all of which had been expended long before he had finished his task. So much for the making of the Dictionary. Now for the made article. Leaving Gough Square, find your way to the British Museum, and ask for the first edition of Johnson's Dictionary. When you have seen those two stately folios, and spent, if but an hour in looking over the pathetic preface, the learned introduction, and some few of the definitions, you will, I am very confident, feel nothing but admiration for so great an undertaking so nobly accomplished. The French Academy of forty members took forty years to compile their Dictionary. Johnson, with his one eye and six assistants, completed his in eight. Time has, no doubt, brought to light many little blemishes in his work: but what of that? Nothing short of a miracle could ensure perfection to any dictionary. He made a few downright blunders; when, for instance, he described

" pastern " as " the knee of an horse." A lady once asked him *why* he gave such a definition, fully expecting some learned justification of it ; but his very candid answer was, " Ignorance, madam, pure ignorance." He also gave exactly the same definition for " leeward " and " windward "—" towards the wind." This *was* rather a " howler," we must admit, and dangerous too as an explanation for the amateur boatman ! Sometimes he could not resist betraying his well-known prejudices : as in the case of the definitions of " Pension and Pensioner," which, as we have seen, put him in rather an unpleasant fix at one time ; or " Excise," described as " a hateful tax levied upon commodities and adjudged not by the common judges of property, but by wretches hired by those to whom excise is paid " ; or, again, " Stock-jobber," " a low wretch who gets money by buying and selling shares in the funds." Once at least, he indulged in a little pleasantry at his own expense. He defined " Lexicographer " as " a writer of dictionaries, a *harmless drudge* that busies himself in tracing the origin and detailing the significance of words." But these trifling eccentricities do not impair the merit of the work in the least. I mention them only to give a glimpse of the lighter side of the mighty scholar.

Let Johnson himself say a word here of his own aim in writing, in a passage which gives, at the same time, no bad example of his style : " Whatever shall be the final sentence of mankind, I have at least endeavoured to deserve their kindness. I have laboured to refine our language to grammatical purity ; and to clear it from colloquial barbarisms, licentious idioms, and irregular combinations. Something, perhaps, I have added to the elegance of its construction, and something to the harmony of its cadence." A fine ideal surely ! And who will say it was not realized ?

Let us take one more look, the last, at Johnson, the man. The scene is the sick-room ; the bed, his death-bed. His illness was painful, distressing—and mortal. How then did Johnson comport himself in this dreadful hour ? He had once written, " Philosophy may infuse stubborness, Religion only can give patience." He was going to prove this : he did prove it, and something more—that *his* religion gave him not only patience, but courage, hope, and peace. Once only during those last days, after great pain, did something of his old despondency come upon him, and he broke out into those pathetic words, which even he could not have composed :

> Canst thou not minister to a mind diseased ;
> Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow ;
> Raze out the written troubles of the brain ;
> And, with some sweet oblivious antidote,
> Cleanse the stuffed bosom of that perilous stuff
> Which weighs upon the heart ?

To which Dr. Brocklesby replied with readiness—

> Therein the patient
> Must minister to himself.

" Well applied," murmured Johnson, "that is more than poetically true." Sociable to the last, he loved to have his friends around his bed. One day Bennet Langton found Burke and four or five other friends sitting with him. Burke said, " I am afraid, sir, such a number of us may be oppressive to you." " No, sir," replied Johnson, " it is not so ; and I must be in a wretched state indeed when your company would not be a delight to me." Could anyone have made a more courteous, more touching response ?

As the end he had dreaded all his life drew nearer, his fears grew fainter, his faith firmer ; and in complete resignation this great and pious spirit passed from this earth.

B. BRAITHWAITE.

The Missionary World.

THE Wesleyan Missionary Society has put forward its aim for this year's work—"Half the year's income by the first half of the year." This is a practical measure which would cause no hardship to individual donors, little trouble to local officials, and a really substantial saving in central expenditure. It is stated in the *Foreign Field* that if the present income from the circuits came in regularly it would amount to about £33,000 each quarter. Instead of that, the central treasurer received, in round figures, in the first quarter, £1,600; in the second, £13,000; in the third, £14,900; in the fourth, £52,600; and after December 31, £50,500. As a result, inasmuch as expenditure was continuous throughout the year, no less than £2,000—enough to support six missionaries on the field—was wasted in paying bank charges for money which had to be borrowed in anticipation of income not yet received. All other societies will watch with interest the result of this appeal, in the hope that if the Wesleyans attain their aim the reform may become general.

* * * * *

The National Laymen's Missionary Movement, at a time when its counterpart in North America has been organizing a great campaign throughout the country, has been heavily crippled in its activities through the war. The secretary of the Scottish Movement has been under arms for more than a year and is now in command of a battalion; the secretary of the British Movement, Mr. T. R. W. Lunt, having completed his training as an officer of the Royal Field Artillery, has gone to the front; Ireland has in the same way lost some leading workers. But the work goes on quietly and deeply, for men already weighted with heavy tasks are keeping it alive until its leaders can resume their posts. A specially interesting piece of work, a club at Barton-on-Sea in connexion with the convalescent home for wounded Indian soldiers, has been carried to completion by the British Movement, and has won appreciation from the authorities and gratitude from the men.

* * * * *

The problem of making Christianity indigenous is not solved when the Church in the mission field undertakes its own support

and is released from foreign control. The heart of the matter lies deeper than that. We need to go back again and again to a realization of the sacredness of personality—whether individual or national—and the immediacy of the Divine indwelling in the hearts of men. A Church is only indigenous when it brings the glory and honour of a nation into the Kingdom of God ; when Indian, Chinese, African, as well as American or European are filled with the one Spirit and manifest the life within them each according to his kind. This can only be attained where the growth comes organically from within not mechanically from without. The S.P.G. *Mission Field*, quoting from the *Church Times*, gives an encouraging instance of a development of church life in India in the C.M.S. mission at Batemanabad in the Punjab. Bishop Durrant of Lahore writes—

> We are always hoping that India will think out and interpret Christianity for herself, not rejecting the mighty heritage of the past, but seeing the message both of the Bible and the Church through Indian eyes. . . . I see real signs of this being done in Batemanabad. There is a little company that have banded themselves together to seek to prove the fullness of what Christ means. One of their leaders, a mystic through and through, has made for himself a cross of many coloured woods, which he carries with him wherever he goes, to remind himself and others of the One Whose he is, and Whom he serves. Quite spontaneously they have started what seems equivalent to the agapè or love feast. Sometimes when they meet together they begin by taking a cake of unleavened bread and solemnly breaking it, and giving to each one present a portion as a sign of fellowship. They meet daily and sit sometimes half through the night singing and praying and exhorting. . . . The part played by music in their religious life is, as far as my small experience goes, unique. I have never been to a place where one felt so transported back into what one imagines must have been, from this point of view, the atmosphere of the Early Church. . . . There are not wanting signs that in their attempt to grasp Christianity for themselves they will not neglect our heritage in the Church. . . quite of themselves some ninety candidates for Confirmation had come forward, having realized from the Bible the blessing promised in the laying on of hands. Of these many were labourers working for hire, and could not get leave from their non-Christian Zamindar masters, but even so fifty-eight were presented. At the celebration of the Holy Communion on the morning following the Confirmation we had 102 communicants, and I have never been at a more solemn and impressive service. The little mud church was full to the doors, and the earnestness and reality of the worshippers warmed one's heart. I do not want to paint too rosy-hued a picture. . . . But . . . I feel that there is a life here ; and that Christ is working out His purpose.

* * * * *

The Mass Movement in India is so vast that our minds almost fail to grasp its significance. For instance, the American Methodist Episcopal Missions in India report nearly 30,000 baptisms in one year, but had to refuse 40,000 people because they had no provision

for teaching them. The number of inquirers in the missions of this one society is said to amount to 150,000. An article in the *C.M. Review* helps us by bringing the situation more within our grasp. It describes the Mass Movement in the district of one mission—the C.M.S., in one area—the United Provinces. Even there the figures are great enough. Five thousand Christians have been gathered in from 100 villages, and there is work yet to be done among over 1,000,000 outcaste people in 7,000 villages. For this task there are five C.M.S. missionaries, with twenty catechists and seventy workers of a lower grade, all engaged in preaching to non-Christians and teaching newly-baptized Christians and children. It is calculated that the immediate needs of the mission are 100 trained Indian teachers for elementary schools; fifty catechists to prepare inquirers and instruct them after baptism, and twenty Indian pastors to administer the sacraments, conduct worship, and supervise the work, besides the necessary buildings and funds. The article is written jointly by the Indian Principal of the Allahabad Divinity School and a young English graduate who is a member of his staff.

* * * * *

The Bible in the World is always worth reading. Its good stories are, unlike many other missionary incidents, well and concisely told. The May number is of unusual interest. The account of the Ewe Bible, the printing of which was completed in Germany after the war began, sent out by special permission of the British Government to Togoland in West Africa in the beginning of this year, and eagerly welcomed by the converts of the German (Bremen) mission there, who sent a thank-offering of £5 to the B. & F.B.S. in acknowledgment of their work, is a romance in two short notes. Still more stirring is Mr. William Canton's paper on "The Little Ocean Child"—the island of Niué, which "stood up to help the kingdom of King George the Fifth" at the outset of the war. The marvellous missionary story which lay behind the "quaintly loyal letter" of the twelve chiefs of Niué is beautifully told and might well be incorporated in sermon or address. Out of a total population of 4,000 the "Little Ocean Child" has sent 150 young men, each with his Testament in his breast, to serve with the New Zealand contingent on behalf of the country whose missionaries won their fathers from wildest savagery to light and peace.

The first part of an article on "The Bible in Chinese Life" in the same magazine is not only valuable as containing a powerful testimony to the living power of the Word but as bringing a remarkable man before those who know comparatively little of the oriental leaders of the Church in the Mission Field. The Rev. Cheng Chingi-yi, a native of Peking, was brought to Christ in early life and baptized in the L.M.S. Mission Church. He subsequently worked, partly in England, on the translation of the New Testament into Mandarin with Professor Owen of King's College. He then became pastor of the "Independent Church" in Peking and a leader among his own people. He was one of the two Chinese representatives at the World Missionary Conference (Edinburgh, 1910) and is a member of the China Continuation Committee. He writes English fluently and contributed an able article to an early number of the *International Review of Missions.*

* * * * *

The present writer was privileged during the memorable Edinburgh Conference to be a fellow guest with Mr. Cheng and with two other remarkable men of Asia for ten days. One was Professor Takusu Harada, head of the Doshisha College in Tokyo, the other was Bishop Azariah of Dornakal, then in priest's orders. The scanty time available for social intercourse between the meetings was as charged with missionary inspiration as the great conference itself; not only was the contact of East with West stimulating to a high degree, but also the interplay of Tamil, Chinese and Japanese, one upon the other. Such an experience was worth a library of volumes on the Church in the Mission Field.

* * * * *

A writer in the current number of the *Laymen's Bulletin* introduces a discussion of "Race Problems on the Pacific Coast" by the suggestive sentence: "Formerly the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific mingled in the Straits of Magellan; now they meet in the Panama Canal." It is worth while to set a map open before us and think awhile, for the problems of the Pacific—racial, industrial, and missionary—are those of the coming days. On the one hand is the great American coast line; on the other, the Asiatic sweep of Mongolia, Japan and Korea, China, Siam and the Malay Peninsula; between them the myriad islands of the Southern Seas, New Guinea, and the East Indies; still southward, Australia and New Zealand.

The existing problems—and they have been many and acute, whether caused by immigration (as in the case of Japan and America) or by indentured labour (as in the case of Indians in Fiji) or by dual control (as in the Anglo-French Condominium in the New Hebrides) —are bound to multiply when trade flows in increasing volume, as it will do after the war, through the Panama Canal. In consequence of the war, fresh international questions are likely also to arise. On the mainland of Asia, most of the great missionary agencies of America and Europe are at work. In the Islands there are—moving from Asia eastward—large Dutch and some German missions in the East Indies, German and British Missions in New Guinea, and in the further Pacific Islands French, German and British Missions have been at work. The Christian Churches of Australia have been developing their island missions, and have recently taken over the work in the Torres Straits at the request of the London Missionary Society. The missionary story of the Pacific has a thrilling past; the watchful prayer and strenuous effort of the Christian Church will be needed if the dangers of the future are to be averted and the promise which it holds fulfilled.

* * * * *

It is earnestly to be hoped that the recent great Congress at Panama may call attention in efficient measure to the needs of South America. The primary responsibility lies upon the northern half of the American continent, yet we, who have such close commercial links with South America, are by no means free from guilt. There are said to be in Bolivia a million Indians who have never been touched with the Gospel, and in Mexico there are three million unreached by any Christian organization. In the great city of Buenos Aires there are not more than 100 places of worship, including even those of Jews and Moslems; not one out of every thousand of the population would be found in a Protestant or Roman Catholic place of worship on Sunday morning. Of the 5,000 students in the university scarcely five would confess Christ as their Saviour. About 98 per cent. of the students in the universities of Latin America profess themselves to be agnostics. It was interesting to learn from a worker of wide experience who had never visited Latin America before that of all the work under consideration at the Panama Conference the most convincing was that of the South American Missionary Society. G.

Notices of Books.

WALKER OF TINNEVELLY. By Amy Wilson-Carmichael. London: *Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* Price 6*s.* net.

This is a remarkable book. Seldom does one meet with anything so engrossing in its interest, and at the same time so spiritually and intellectually instructive. Walker's was a rare life, and the story of it is told with rare discrimination and power. The picture is so many-sided that a satisfactory review of it seems a hopeless task; the book itself should certainly not be missed by any one who desires an uplift. Even many who knew the man will be surprised by some of the revelations of his character and influence. "Walker of Tinnevelly" he is fitly called; but the power that flowed through him was felt almost all over India—in Travancore and Masulipatam, in Madras and the Nilgiri Hills, in Central and Western India, and in the United Provinces—as well as in Ceylon. His natural abilities were great, but the secret of that power was that everything was subordinated to the spiritual. We see in him absolute singleness of aim, inflexible determination, conscientious and wholehearted attention to the matter in hand (and nothing was too small to take in hand), extraordinary self-effacement and humility—and, above all, devotion to prayer at all times and at all costs. One of the underlined passages in his books (he was fond of marking his books) is "all conscience and all courage." But with it all Miss Wilson-Carmichael makes it clear how exceedingly human he was; lets us see his weaknesses and how they became subordinated to the main purpose of life; and shows us a man who entered wholeheartedly into a wide variety of legitimate human interests, and, let it be added, enjoyed a good joke. There are some good portraits, but a face whose chief charm consists in expression can seldom be quite satisfactorily reproduced by the photographer: and he had no liking for being photographed.

The book is more than a biography: it is, by virtue of its quotations and explanations, an education in missionary policy and practice and life. A few examples may be of interest here. One chapter reprints the bulk of an illuminating paper on the condition of the Indian Church, its weaknesses and their remedies. Later on comes a memorandum on the knotty question of Prayer Book translation, and its bearing on the development of an indigenous Church. Or again, a burning question of our day is anticipated by events of well over ten years ago in India, which caused much discussion on intercommunion with non-episcopal Churches. One of the C.M.S. men who contributed to the discussion is quoted as saying that this would be "the key of any serious attempt to avoid perpetuating indefinitely our divisions in India." Another section deals with Walker's own views on the modern attitude towards non-Christian religions, and especially, of course, Hinduism. And he knew what he was talking about. His conclusions were based on "a long and exhaustive study in the vernacular as well as in English of Hinduism as a religious system." He also read what modern writers have to say about it. His knowledge of idiomatic Tamil was so remarkable that a pundit engaged to read with him once left his chair and sat at his feet, "for you are my pundit," he said. He was intimate with the great Tamil classics, and acquired a working knowledge of Sanskrit besides. But, to him, Hinduism was ever "a high thing which has exalted itself against the knowledge of God," as the authoress puts it. Once he said, "Read one of these modern-view magazine articles and then read a page or two from the Acts of the Apostles, and you seem to be breathing another atmo-

sphere." And he thought too much emphasis was being laid on very intimate knowledge of non-Christian religious thought as part of a missionary's equipment. Moreover, in approaching Hindus he proved it was possible to speak the truth in love without offence. Uncompromising as he was, he impressed them: for one thing, they divined his earnest convictions. After his death, some of them "were heard talking of him as a man Heaven-sent." They understood him, anyhow.

The amount of work he did was amazing, especially considering his lack of great physical strength. The journals reveal a continual story of itinerating, special Missions and conventions, ordination classes; voluminous correspondence on matters great and little, public and private; literary work, including commentaries and translations, and the conscientious examination of Tamil MSS. submitted for his criticism; wide reading on very varied subjects of public interest; long and exacting interviews; and fights for the liberty of converts. Somehow time was found for all, and never at the expense of the prayer-life. Early retirement and early rising were the chief, but not the only, guarantees of this. And the definitely spiritual is ever to the fore. The tours in Tinnevelly and the wonderful series of Missions among the Reformed Syrian Christians form the backbone of the book. "Our Iyer, Walker Iyer—can we ever forget him?" said a Syrian leader. "It was Walker Iyer who saved our Church from schism."

Miss Carmichael has earned the thanks of the Christian public by undertaking, in the midst of all her labours in India, the exacting task of selecting material for such a book, and by putting it together with such conspicuous ability. It must be a dull heart that is not both inspired and humbled by the result.

W. S. HOOTON.

THE GREAT WAR: ITS LESSONS AND ITS WARNINGS. By the Right Hon. Jesse Collings, J.P., M.P. *The Rural World Publishing Company.* Price 2s. net.

The author is well known as an advocate, and a very able and efficient one too, of agricultural and land reform. This little volume is evidently the work of one who has for long years studied his subject, and knows thoroughly well what he is writing about. His object, he tells us, is "to awaken the minds of the people to the importance of Agriculture, and to show that that great industry is the only safe basis on which the economy of the nation can rest." What is to become of our soldiers when they return from the front? How is employment to be found for them? "There will be no other outlet," Mr. Collings tells us, than the land. He has had conversations with many returned wounded soldiers, and has in no case found them "willing to return to their former work," while all of them are taken with the idea of working on the land with the hope of possessing a part of it. The author is a great advocate for small holdings. Men will put more energy and work into land which is their own. There are also many waste spots, and land by the roadside which might be turned to account and become an asset to the nation. During his thirty-five years' experience of the House of Commons, the writer has been struck with the small consideration given to agriculture. This is because agricultural associations are non-political, and Governments are created on the lines of party politics. If the farmers would take political action, regardless of Party, a more satisfactory state of things would, he considers, be brought about. He wishes that more land were devoted to corn. A very great deal more might be made of the land of England, and so food-stuffs provided which now are imported. Had not the German fleet been bottled up at the beginning of the war we might have been in a very bad way.

MISSIONARY TRACTS FOR THE TIMES. Published for The Central Board of Missions by the *S.P.C.K.* Price 1*d.* each, net.

No. 1. "The Time of Our Visitation." By the Rev. J. O. F. Murray, D.D.

No. 2. "The Holy War." By the Rev. W. Temple, M.A.

No. 3. "The World of To-day and the Gospel." By Ruth Rouse.

No. 4. "The Building Power of Christ's Kingdom." By Herbert Gresford Jones, M.A., Archdeacon of Sheffield.

These tracts are the first four numbers of a series which is the fruit of a request by some members of a Missionary Convention held by invitation of the Central Board of Missions at Swanwick last year. Others are in preparation. The object is "to consider the missionary aspect of the situation created by the War." Dr. Murray contributes an "Editor's Preface," in which he enlarges a little on this aim, and explains that each author is solely responsible for his own contribution to the series.

His own tract, which is the opening number, examines the "signs of the times" and the difficulties which they present to faith in singularly bold and sympathetic language under arresting headings. It not only serves as a general introduction for the more detailed consideration of missionary matters in succeeding numbers, but it is especially timely in view of the National Mission. The situation, Dr. Murray tells us, is "before all things a call to corporate repentance, at once to Churches and to Nations." Mr. Temple works out in a striking manner several detailed comparisons by which he shows that the "Holy War" for the kingdom of Christ should appeal to the Christian for personal services with louder and more insistent voice than the call of King and country which has found so ready a response. 'If we have fought in the righteous war of Britain, shall we be shirkers in this holy war of God?" But is it really tenable that the apocalyptic figure in Revelation vi. 2 symbolizes Militarism? Miss Rouse is Travelling Secretary of the World's Student Christian Federation. She examines the bearing of the great world-movements of our day, and closes on a note similar to Mr. Temple's. Speaking of the world's need and of Christ's power to supply it, she asks: "The Church believes in such a Christ? Yes, in her creeds. But is she ready for the sacrifice that such a Lord demands?" Archdeacon Gresford Jones takes as alternative title to his tract "The Conditions of Prevailing Prayer," and he deals searchingly with its honesty, its temper, and its concentration. He has much to say on sincerity and on that forgiving spirit which desires not vengeance, but, coming from a "missionary heart," "seeks to bring back the erring brother, purged and humbled, into the great Family once more." The ideals to which he directs us are "world-wide conversion" and "a united Christian Church," and he believes the road to the former is through the latter.

It is much to be hoped that this series, issued by an authoritative body, may reach many who might otherwise be unreached by the missionary call now intensified tenfold. Their brevity leaves no excuse for neglect; and they are attractive in form.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE. A philosophical essay. John Theodore Mery. Edinburgh and London: *William Blackwood and Sons.* Price 5*s.* net.

Mr. Mery addresses a lucid and critical essay to those who, unable to deny the fundamental postulates either of religion or of science, are yet seeking some method of reconciliation between them. The first section provides a brief epistemology in which the two great conceptions are (1) that the usual distinction of the Outer and Inner Worlds—object and subject—has no solid

basis in fact, but that the Outer consists of a selection of the most vivid or prominent impressions within that "continuous stream of thought" or "firmament of the soul" which is the Inner life, and (2) that a sound psychology will proceed along the lines of development of the individual mind from the period of infancy to full-grown vigour. Substantiating this position by close and well-balanced argument, there appears first a complete synthesis of rival philosophies, for realism and idealism become blended in one; and secondly, a place is found for the evident, though at times elusive, presence of personality in the teacher as well as the pupil. The child only learns through another person, and acquaintance with an external world is secondary in order of time. This explains the medical evidence recently given to the astonishment of a coroner and his jury that an infant of two months had died from the result of shock due to a Zeppelin raid. An impersonal cosmogony is impossible. It is fact, not myth, that "out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast . . . and brought them to Adam to see what he would call them," for the human mind requires a personal teacher. It is history, not legend, that "they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day," for without such a voice the ethical thoughts of right and wrong would never have occurred to man. Mr. Mery does not advocate here the tenets of any particular religion, but Christian readers cannot fail to notice how completely his philosophy justifies the doctrine of God maintained amongst us. Science, dealing with definite abstractions which can be located in time and space, speaks with the greater precision and certainty, but she regards as an unwarrantable intrusion upon her domain the feelings, desires, and volitions of organic life. Her utterances are apt at any one time to be generally accepted by all except the most ignorant, but her voice varies widely from generation to generation. Religion has to struggle with a language too concrete for her purpose and with ideas which are not very sharply defined, yet in essentials her teachings are more permanent from age to age. The subtleties of philosophic thought will continue to perplex the mind, but, with this book handy for reference, relief will often be obtained, and the retention of a calm faith in God be placed beyond the reach of cavil and dispute.

THROUGH THE JEWS TO GOD. By S. C. Kirkpatrick, S.Th. London: *S.P.C.K.* Price 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

The aim of the book, as the preface tells us, is to stimulate the Christians to study the faith of the Jews, and the Jews to study the faith of Catholic Christianity. The author calls upon "staunch Jews" to join "staunch Christians" and "work for a Kingdom of God which shall conquer the world." The title, however, does not convey an adequate impression of the contents of the book, which is really a brief sketch of Hebrew history and of the social and religious life of the Jews as they appear to a High Church Anglican.

Miss Kirkpatrick evidently knows the Jewry of the East of London and is well acquainted with the literature about the Jews. In the first three chapters she briefly describes the Promised Land, the Origin and Dispersion of the Hebrews and the Sources of Judaism. In the following four chapters she deals with Jewish Parties, their doctrines, customs, ritual, and Messianic expectations. She speaks with great sympathy with the Jews and praises their national virtues, and rightly puts to them the question, "What more could another Messiah do than has already been done by Jesus Christ in winning so many millions to a belief in the one God?" (p. vii). There is a great deal of interesting information about the Jews in this book, and with many of the author's sentiments we are in complete agreement. Her attack,

however, on educational and medical missions for the Jews in England (p. 147) is both uncalled for and unjust. We can speak from knowledge that a medical mission, conducted on Christian lines, is Christ-like, and one of the best means of removing Jewish prejudice and of exhibiting to the Jews practical kindness which they appreciate. Writing as a "Catholic," Miss Kirkpatrick is too anxious to find similarity between the teaching of the Synagogue and that of Anglican Catholics. This fact makes her overstate her case and read ritualistic notions into Jewish practices. For instance, she speaks of the Jews "bowing towards the recess in the *East end* of the Synagogue" (p. 101). This is misleading. As a matter of fact, the Jew does not turn to the East when he prays, but to Jerusalem, at whatever point of the compass that may lie. In the days of our Lord, Jews in Jerusalem prayed toward the Holy of Holies, which was in the *West*. Again, speaking of praying for the dead, Miss Kirkpatrick says "the custom, of course, is pre-Christian" (p. 94). It is true that Jewish *mourners* pray for their dead and that a son says "Kaddish" for his deceased parents for about a year. Yet the practice cannot be proved to have existed before the sixth century of the Christian era, and the "Kaddish" is *not* a prayer for the dead. It is a beautiful doxology and prayer that the Messianic kingdom may soon come. It was originally used as a closing collect in the schools, and has no special reference to the dead. The writer's reference to the Jewish belief in Purgatory is also one-sided. Although from time to time divergent speculations have been suggested by different Rabbis, the Synagogue has not formulated any doctrine of Purgatory. The unseen world is divided into *two* parts, the Garden of Eden and Gehenna.

Miss Kirkpatrick is a strong advocate for a Hebrew Christian Church. The question is a moot one, and many Jewish converts are in favour of such a Church, but until the Jews have a country of their own, the realization of such a plan seems to many others not to be feasible.

Apart from the points to which we had to take exception, the book is excellently written and supplies a long-felt need.

Publications of the Month.

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

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

CONSCIENCE AND CHRIST. By Hastings Rashdall, D.Litt. (*Duckworth and Co.* 5s. net.) A volume of lectures given at the Theological Seminary of Oberlin College, Ohio, U.S.A., in 1913, the publication of which has been delayed by the war. Canon Rashdall says in his Preface that he has been struck by the different tone in which moral questions are dealt with by philosophers on the one hand and by theologians and preachers on the other. The Moral Philosopher, if he is not one of those who explain away Morality altogether, usually holds that Morality means the following of conscience. In theological books and sermons it is as commonly assumed that the supreme rule for a Christian is to follow Christ. Canon Rashdall believes that there is truth in both principles, but it is obvious that this position involves a problem as to the relation between the two authorities, and a problem not very often explicitly dealt with. That is the problem with which these lectures are mainly occupied.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY: THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES. By James Hardy Ropes. (*T. and T. Clark.* 9s. net.) A welcome addition to this well-known Commentary. It is both critical and exegetical, and in both respects it is marked by ripe scholarship, reverent tone and illuminating

application. The difficult phrase in James i. 17, "shadow of turning" is given an interpretation which is new, but it must remain for discussion whether even yet we have the right solution.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF JESUS. By G. H. Box, M.A. With Foreword by the Bishop of London. (*Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd.* 5*s.* net.) This is a work of the first importance. It presents a critical examination of the Gospel-narratives of the Nativity and other New Testament and early Christian evidence, and the alleged influence of heathen ideas. The author's own "firm conviction is that the essential truthfulness of the Gospel-narratives only shines forth with added lustre as they emerge from the fiery ordeal to which they have been subjected." The Bishop of London commends the book as "very clear and scholarly" and one which will "carry conviction to the unprejudiced mind."

WHY MEN PRAY. By Charles Lewis Slattery, D.D. (*Macmillan and Co., Ltd.* 3*s.* 6*d.* net.) A deeply sympathetic treatise, beautifully written and leading men's thoughts heavenward. In a series of six chapters Dr. Slattery shows that prayer is inherent in human nature, discovers God, and unites men; that God depends on men's prayer, and that prayer submits to the test and receives God.

HAVE YOU UNDERSTOOD CHRISTIANITY? By W. J. Carey, M.A., R.N. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 2*s.* net.) A well-intentioned book, written entirely from the Sacramental point of view. The chapter on conversion strikes us as painfully inadequate.

THE RAINBOW CROWN. By C. E. Stone. (*Robert Scott.* 2*s.* net.) Those who know Mr. Stone's *Flowers of Gold* will be ready with a specially warm welcome for this further volume of "talks to boys and girls." Bright, terse, clear and direct, these "Talks" cannot fail to interest young people. The book will be invaluable to teachers and preachers and it will also give much enjoyment to boys and girls who use it as a reading-book.

PEACE-MAKERS. By Violet and Armel O'Connor. (*Methuen and Co., Ltd.* 1*s.* net.) A collection of papers and verses which have already appeared in *The Westminster Gazette, The Universe, The Rosary* and other publications. John Oxenham contributes a "Foreword" in the shape of a poem on "Peace and Good-will" which is quite the gem of the collection. Let this extract suffice :—

> Remember!—this the promise is,—
> "*To men of good-will—Peace!*"
> If we would compass lasting peace,
> We must cast out from our full treasuries
> All that now stands between,
> And makes the promise vain.
> We must return once more to Him,
> Whose grace
> This full world tends to dim.
> We must, if needs be, tread His ways
> Of poverty and pain,—
> With single soul we must become
> His men again.

STUDIES IN LOVE AND DARING. By A. S. L. (Mrs. Hugh Jones). (*William Rider and Son, Ltd.* 3*s.* 6*d.* net.) A series of beautifully written sketches—tender, eloquent and true—founded on minor characters in the Gospels and the Acts, designed to show that the essentials of Christian discipleship have always been "love and daring."

GENERAL.

THE PLACE-NAMES OF DURHAM. By the Rev. Charles E. Jackson, M.A. (*George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.* 5*s.* net.) This is a volume of much wider literary interest than its simple title would imply. The inquiry has been conducted with thoroughness and the list of authorities consulted contains the names of rolls, documents and volumes not easily accessible. The writer acknowledges the difficulty of his task, for he tells us that Anglo-Saxon is practically a new and difficult language even to an educated Englishman who approaches

it for the first time. The inquiry has yielded most satisfactory results, even though "the real derivation of many place-names puts to confusion a host of the popular and beloved etymologies."

CRISES IN THE HISTORY OF THE PAPACY. By Joseph McCabe. (*G. P. Putnam's Sons.* 10*s.* 6*d.* net.) A history of the Papacy in one volume is something of an achievement, yet it has been in a certain degree accomplished by Mr. McCabe, who has written a study of a score of the outstanding Popes, giving an adequate account of the work and personality of each. Each of these Popes represents a significant or critical stage in the development of the Papacy, and the periods which lie between the various Pontificates have been compressed into a brief account of their essential characters and more prominent representations so that the work forms a continuous study of the Papacy. In the list of the Popes, the name of Peter A.D. 67 is put first, but in a footnote Mr. McCabe explains that no writer calls him "bishop" of Rome until the third century, and it cannot be regarded as *proved* that he ever visited Rome. "The date of his death, and the succeeding dates until the third century, and many later, are conjectural and disputed."

MADCAP JANE OR YOUTH. By C. A. Dawson Scott; and THE GENTLEMAN: A ROMANCE OF THE SEA. By Alfred Ollivant—two new volumes in Nelson's Sevenpenny series; THE STORY OF THE MALAKAND FIELD FORCE, 1897. By Winston L. Spencer Churchill—a volume of Nelson's Shilling Library. (*T. Nelson and Sons, Ltd.*)

PAMPHLETS.

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE ATHANASIAN CREED. By Professor F. C. Burkitt, D.D. (*S.P.C.K.* 2*d.* net.) An abridgment of an address given at Cambridge in 1910. Professor Burkitt insists upon the importance of right doctrine and looks with some misgiving upon the movement for getting rid of the Athanasian Creed, "a movement which has for its object the banishment of the most reflective and scientific exposition of the Christian idea of God in relation to man, at the bidding mainly of modern humanitarian sentiment and squeamishness."

PERIODICALS.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (*T. and T. Clark.* 6*d.*) for May has a variety of "Notes of Recent Exposition," several pages of most interesting reviews, a goodly budget of Contributions and Comments, and the following articles: "The Mysticism of Greece" (Adela Marion Adam, M.A.). "The Revelation of God in Christ" (Rev. H. R. Mackintosh, D.D.). "The Denials of Peter" (Sir W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L.). "The Mystery of the Kingdom" (Rev. J. Warschauer), and "The Bookshelf by the Fire" (Rev. George Jackson).

THE IRISH CHURCH QUARTERLY. (*Hodges, Figgis and Co., Ltd.* 1*s.* 6*d.*) The current number is an excellent one with articles on "Alfred George Elliott, Bishop of Kilmore, Elphin and Ardagh" (Ven. Robert Wallace Boyd). "Idealism and Realism" (R. A. P. Rogers). "Ireland and the War" (Rev. W. S. Kerr, B.D.). "The Stowe Missal" (E. J. Gwynn). "Koheleth and Khayyam" (Rev. F. W. O'Connell, B.D.). "The Evolution of Body and Mind in Man" (Very Rev. C. T. Ovenden, D.D.).

THE ENGLISH CHURCH REVIEW (*Longmans Green and Co.* 6*d.* net.) for May has a budget of Notes and Criticisms, and the following articles: "The State of the Departed" (Archbishop of Melbourne). "Dissatisfaction with the English Communion Office." "Report on Religious Unity." "The Contribution of the Church of England to Foreign Missions" (Rev. M. R. Newbolt). "The Stewardship of Faith" (Rev. Fr. Neville Figgis). "Principles of Agreement between Roman and Anglican."

THE CHURCH MISSIONARY REVIEW (*C.M.S. House.* 6*d.*) for May has articles as follows: "Travancore and Cochin: A Centenary Survey" (Rev. W. S. Hunt). "Problems of the Mass Movement in the C.M.S. Districts of the United Provinces" (Revs. S. J. Edwin, and R. T. Howard). "The Panama Congress" (Rt. Rev. H. R. Hulse, D.D.). "The Chekiang Diocesan Synod" (Rev. H. Barton). "In Memoriam: I. Rowland Bateman (R. Maconachie and Rev. H. U. Weitbrecht, D.D.); II. Elizabeth Anne Bishop."