

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE CHURCHMAN

February, 1917.

The Month.

WE are glad that attention should be called to the religious teaching in Public Schools, but we think it ought to be done in a very different spirit from that which characterized the meeting held in the schoolroom of All Saints', Margaret Street, on Sunday, January 7. There was strong criticism of defective teaching, which where it was *ad rem* at all seemed to relate to experiences long since passed away. No doubt there are still defects—very serious defects—but it is more to the point to say that within the last few years there has been a marked improvement in nearly all Public Schools, and that now religious teaching occupies a much more important place than it did fifty years ago. But if we read the report of the All Saints' meeting aright, the speakers were not so much concerned about religious teaching in the abstract as they were to promote the teaching of a particular kind of religion and that of the most advanced type. Thus the Rev. J. W. Greenstreet, Chaplain of Denstone College, said that "nearly all the boys who were confirmed at the school had been taught the full Catholic Faith, and 90 per cent. of these had made their confession and received absolution." He pleaded for the appointment of School Chaplains and held that "there should be a daily Mass, voluntary of course, and a sung Mass every Sunday. Lastly, there should be ample opportunity for boys to make their confessions. The times should be stated on a board in black and white, so that the boys were not put to the difficulty and bother of making an appointment." Mr. Athelstan Riley spoke much on the same lines. He said that "as to

the Public Schools, as a statement of the definite object to aim at, he did not think there could be anything better on paper than the provision made for religion in the statutes of the Woodard Schools. It was provided that the Holy Eucharist should be the chief service on Sunday and celebrated at such a time as would enable everybody to attend and to remain throughout the service ; every school was to have a chaplain, and opportunity must be given for all connected with the school—masters, boys, and servants—to make their confessions when they wished to a priest not a member of the tutorial staff.” We are glad to have such a clear statement about the aim and objects of the Woodard Schools and hope that it will be carefully noted. Some of the speakers recognized the difficulties such a scheme of “ reform ” would have to face, Canon Arthur Lucas saying that they must first concentrate on the parents, for “ if an agitation was to be started, he thought it would be unwise to base it on a demand for a daily Mass or the teaching of Confession, considering that so many of the parents were strongly Protestant.” Canon Lucas is right ; and we hope it may be long before the strong Protestantism of British parents gives way in this matter. If the Neo-Anglicans are entering upon a campaign for “ reforming the Public Schools ” in the direction they wish, it behoves parents to be more careful than ever to inquire about the nature of the religious teaching given before settling upon any school for their boys. Those who are seeking Public Schools, with a good educational record, where the religious teaching is all that could be desired, may be glad to be reminded of St. Lawrence College, just removed from Ramsgate to Chester ; Dean Close School, Cheltenham ; Trent College, Derbyshire ; Weymouth College, Weymouth ; Monkton Combe School, near Bath ; and Clarence School, Weston-super-Mare. At each of these schools definite Church of England teaching is given, without mediæval errors.

A remarkable article appeared in the *Evening* “The Church and the War,” *Standard* of January 17, which claims that “ few facts were more patent, fewer more sad, than the failure of the Church of England to rise to its position, opportunities and privileges in the great national crisis we have been going through for well on three years now.” The writer pointed specially to the failure of the Church to lead, to inspire, to enthuse, and declared

that it was left to the Y.M.C.A. to provide huts, etc. This, however, is not quite accurate, as the Church of England Men's Society—after the failure of the first few months—rose splendidly to the occasion, and the Church Army has done and is doing a magnificent work at the various fronts and among the men at home. There is much else in the article with which we do not agree; for instance, the sneer at the appointment of "pinchbeck" bishops is unworthy. But in his main contention the writer is undoubtedly right. "In our greatest year of peril—1915—the two great Convocations of the Church," he says, "met and debated—what? The *one*, alterations in the Prayer Book; the *other*, the dress of the clergy at Holy Communion!" and his comment is: "When the nation is in the throes of a life and death struggle, a truly national Church would not wrangle over its Prayer Book or discuss 'Priest millinery.'" We confess we think the writer's argument on this head is unanswerable. It was in the early days of the war that the initial blunder was made, and from it there has been no recovery. If the Archbishops and Bishops had accurately gauged the situation they would have told their Convocations that the discussion of all controversial questions affecting the Church must be laid aside until after the war, and that the whole energies of the Church must be devoted to helping the nation in this terrible crisis. The old excuse "it is easy to be wise after the event" will not hold in this case, for again and again the Convocations were warned in the public press of the grave risk they were running in thus sticking to their old controversies, when even politicians had laid theirs aside. It was this, we believe, more than anything else that bred the suspicion that the Church is out of touch with National life. The ground thus lost has, we repeat, never been recovered. But it would be unfair not to recognize that, in countless ways, the Church has done much to strengthen the religious life of the nation. The National Mission was a great effort wisely conceived and admirably carried through, and we believe its work will tell for many years to come.

The abandonment of the Islington Clerical Conference, and the promised curtailment of some of the anniversary meetings of societies usually held in May has been widely and properly approved. But a word of caution is necessary. It is well to restrict as far as may be possible and neces-

A Necessary
Warning,

sary at this time public gatherings involving considerable expenditure in their arrangement and causing much travelling to and from all parts of the country. But it will not be well if the friends of the excellent objects which the societies were formed to promote and maintain allow their enthusiasm and their pecuniary support to diminish, much less to cease altogether. All Church organizations have wisely reduced to the uttermost all administration and establishment expenses since the war began, but their actual work must be maintained and their organization kept together, otherwise we may be faced at the conclusion of the war with a more materialistic outlook than was the case before the outbreak of the present conflict. Germany has shown us what this means nationally and individually: let us take warning and not diminish but increase our support of and belief in the various spiritual agencies by which the Church is trying to carry out the charge laid upon her by her Divine Master.

A Plea for Reality. The *Scottish Chronicle*, a newspaper for members of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, writes in warm praise of the "Call to Evangelical Churchmen" which the Bishop of Chelmsford, in connexion with the Islington Clerical Meeting, has issued through the *Record*. It says: "His article is thoroughly characteristic. It reflects the mind of a strong personality; it is the work of one who is pre-eminently a leader, with the seer's vision, and the power of the practical man to encompass in some way his visions and his dreams." The *Scottish Chronicle* is right. A more impressive appeal to Evangelical clergy has seldom, if ever before, been made. The Bishop presents the Call which is made to them as a threefold Call, yet really one—a Call to Reality in Belief, Reality in Life, and Reality in Purpose. Such a Call might, of course, with equal propriety, be pressed upon clergy of all Schools of Thought. "Reality" is among the greatest needs of the Church at the present time. For want of it our congregations are diminishing, and the Church is making very little impression upon outsiders. What is the cause of this defect? Religion is concerned with the greatest of all realities, and its ministers should so preach and live that all may know that it has to do with the deepest affairs of life.



The Spiritual and Permanent Value of the Old Testament.*

THE temptation is considerable to preface our subject by a reference to the transmutation of values brought about by the War. The attitude of all of us towards the Old Testament Scriptures has been sub-consciously influenced by recent events. The conflict for righteousness against an unscrupulous foe, who worships the God of Force, has awakened a new interest in the historical record of the trials and victories of God's ancient people. The language of the Psalms, which appeared in some instances strained, comes naturally to our lips as the expression of our deepest feelings, while we pass through the fires of affliction. The voices of the Prophets provide us with just the message which we feel to be needed by a careless and optimistic attitude in the midst of an unexampled crisis. The time is so short, however, for the consideration of so important a topic, that I shall endeavour to be severely practical and as far as possible non-contentious.

The number of subjects illustrated in the Old Testament is almost innumerable. We have the working of Divine Providence (Esther); the Sovereignty of God (Job and Jonah); the Holiness of God, the Majesty of the Law, the Sin of Man, the certainty of Retribution and Reward (David and Daniel); the Triumphs of Faith (Joshua and Judges); Examples of Prayer, Devotion to Duty, Simplicity of Life (Ruth); Gratitude and Ingratitude, the Evils of Jealousy, Revenge (Saul); Ambition, Lust, Covetousness, Pride, Selfishness (Balaam and Lot); the Beauty of Holiness, Humility, Filial Devotion, Diligence, Faithfulness (Jonathan); Honesty, Obedience, Kindness (Joseph). Then there are the great subjects of Prophecy, Typology, Symbolism, Miracles, Parables, Poetry, Proverbs, Devotional exercises and finally Imprecatory expressions—all of which would admit of separate and exhaustive treatment. The difficulty is to know which to select for the purposes of a brief paper. Obviously many of them are too complex for even the most perfunctory discussion. The

* A paper read before the Birmingham Clerical Society.

very enumeration, however, of some of them is sufficient to emphasize the Spiritual and Permanent value of those Sacred Writings.

The question of the character and degree of inspiration lying behind the Old Testament scriptures I shall not touch, save to make the somewhat obvious remark that no truth is uttered apart from the promptings of the Spirit of Truth and that God never employs human agency as a mere tool apart from its own volition and responsibility. Probably all our varying views on the vexed question of Inspiration revolve around our particular standpoint as to the relative importance of these two sides of Truth.

Surely it cannot be a mere accident that the events recorded in the Old Testament so exactly prefigure the truths of the Gospel; that Paradise lost should lead up to and find its antidote in Paradise regained; that the tree of life forfeited by man's sin should reappear in the Apocalypse as the result of the manifestation of the second Adam "who hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel"; that the blood of Abel which cried to God for vengeance against his brother, who ignored his responsibility, should find its antithesis in the precious blood of Christ, which pleads to God for mercy on behalf of his guilty brethren; that the confusion of tongues, brought about by man's effort to scale Heaven by worldly ambition, should have its counterpart at Pentecost, when after waiting upon the Lord in humility and love men of every race learned to speak and understand a common spiritual language; that Abraham's willingness to sacrifice his well-beloved son should shadow forth the eternal love of God, who gave His only begotten Son, and that Isaac in his meek bearing of his own pyre should prefigure Him Who bore His cross on the way to Calvary; that Joseph, hated of his brethren and sold for twenty pieces of silver, should forgive them and minister to them the bread of life, anticipating the Spirit of Him Who cried "Father, forgive them," when He gave His own flesh for the life of the world; that Egypt with its pomp and vanity should be such an eminent picture of the world, which tempts us with "the pleasures of sin for a season," and which must be forsaken if we are to reach the promised land; that the Paschal Lamb should be without blemish and that its blood sprinkled upon the door-post should secure immunity from destruction and should afterwards become the food of the ransomed, in marked exemplification of the immaculate

Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world, and upon whom we feed in our hearts by faith with thanksgiving ; that the passage of the Red Sea and the enemy overwhelmed should prefigure the rite of Holy Baptism and the remission of original sin ; and that the Wilderness wanderings should present us with so many examples for the Christian life, both of warning and encouragement, e.g. the worship of the golden calf, the murmurings and rebellion of the people, the presumption of Nadab and Abihu and of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, the rebukes of Miriam, Aaron and Moses, the failure to go up and possess the land, the presumption and stiffneckedness and hardness of heart ? On the other hand the mighty hand and stretched out arm, the pillar of cloud and fire, the manna, the quails, the brazen serpent, the smitten rock, the triumph over Amalek resulting from the uplifted hands, the Mercy Seat and Shekinah, the Tabernacle with its ritual and worship, the priesthood, the sacrifices, the law, are all emphasized and spiritualized in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which has literally no meaning apart from these references.

Surely it is not accidental that the Holy of Holies was shut off from the common gaze, that the High Priest alone could enter the sacred precincts, once a year, and then not without blood ; that the sin and trespass, the meat and peace and burnt offerings, should emphasize the principles of vicarious sacrifice and atonement, of communion and fellowship, of consecration and self-dedication, and that the incense offerings should symbolize prayer, and that all should be so completely fulfilled in Him " Who bare our sins in His own body upon the tree," Who died " the just for the unjust," " by whose stripes we are healed," " Who is our Peace," " Who made peace by the blood of His cross, having slain the enmity thereby," Who " presented Himself to God an offering and a sacrifice for a sweet smelling savour," Who offers the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar, before the Throne : Who, our merciful and faithful High Priest, " after He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever," " entered in once by His own blood into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us " ? Was it a mere accident that the veil of the temple was rent in twain at the moment when the victorious soul of Christ burst from the tabernacle of His human flesh, delivering us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us ? So that we can sing—

Finished all the types and shadows
 Of the ceremonial law :
 Finished all that God had promised :
 Death and Hell no more shall awe.
 " It is finished " :
 Saints from hence your comfort draw.

If these are mere accidental analogies, it is the most wonderful chapter of accidents that the world has ever seen. The only other alternative to orthodox belief is to assume that we have read into the Gospel Judaistic ideas and elements which are alien to its purpose. It is striking to think out how little Gospel you have left if you eliminate Old Testament ideals. In fact, hardly anything but the Sermon on the Mount and the missionary command.

Again we think of the teaching of the Old Covenant on sin and holiness : the majestic scene at Mount Sinai, the bounds set round the mountain—so terrible the manifestations of Jehovah that even Moses said, " I exceedingly fear and quake " : the ceremonial washings and purifications : the treatment of leprosy as such an eminent type of sin with its loathsome, all-pervading, disabling effects : the detailed and graded provision for the sins respectively of the Priest, congregation, ruler and one of the common people, with its emphasis upon the enhanced guilt of iniquity in holy things, and that privilege and responsibility go hand in hand. It is surely significant that the ordinances of the two birds in the cleansing of the Leper and of the two goats on the Day of Atonement, in each case one sacrificed and the other set free, should set forth the double truths inherent in our blessed Lord's death and resurrection, to be of sin the double cure, cleansing from its guilt and power.

The majesty of the law is one of the great features of the Old Testament. The fact that in later times this principle was interpreted in a hard, dogmatic and superstitious spirit is no argument against the value of the original promulgation. The law of the Ten Commandments with the further moral enactments and precepts has never been abrogated. True, they may appear somewhat negative in form, but this was inevitable in the infancy of religion, and it might fairly be argued that the Christian who keeps the Ten Commandments whole and undefiled is a much more positively righteous person than most of us can claim to be. The ceremonial law was admittedly " our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ," but the old pedagogue had some grand characteristics.

On the hygienic and practical side the old regulations regarding meats, purifications, and sanitation are applicable to-day and are greatly needed. It is notorious that the Jews through their observance of these rules have been conspicuous by comparison with other nations in matters of health and purity. Again, the old laws connected with the Sabbatic and Jubilee years anticipated by centuries our tardy legislation relating to slavery and property. In fact the land laws of the Jews largely effected what Socialism has so far vainly attempted to solve, viz. the problem of accumulated and exclusive possessions.

If the old Jews' conceptions of God depicted Him as somewhat austere and aloof, they at least inculcated that fear of the Lord which is the beginning of wisdom, the reverence without which there can be no true religion, and the obedience which, whatever its motive and character, is the essential of all organized life. It would not be difficult to prove that the conditions which necessitate our National Mission arise almost exclusively from the ignoring of just these principles. If the Jewish ideal erred in the direction of glorifying the arbitrary tyrant, the British caricature is that of the indulgent sensualist, John Bull, whose god is his belly.

The merciful provision of the cities of refuge for sins of inadvertence must not be overlooked with its interesting typical suggestion. While sins of ignorance were treated as sins and not infirmities, they were on a different plane to sins of presumption against light and knowledge, and with a high hand for which there was rightly neither forgiveness nor mercy.

"Our God is a consuming fire"—"I will be sanctified in all them that come nigh Me"—"Holiness unto the Lord." This principle was inculcated again and again by such incidents as the punishment of Uzzah and the men of Bethshemesh for trifling with the ark: and the sin of Achan with its weakening influence upon the morale of the people before Ai and the subsequent judgment. Objection is sometimes raised against the implication of the family here, and in the case of Korah's rebellion, as being crude and vindictive, but after all it is only making concrete the abstract truth that the children have to suffer for the sins of the parents, as may be observed every day in the infant mortality of the Floodgate Street area in this city. Perhaps in no other way could the baneful nature of sin be more effectively brought home. Again we have the case of

the man who was put to death for gathering sticks on the Sabbath Day, but looking at the matter from a purely utilitarian point of view, assuming that it proved a sufficient deterrent, would not the apparent cruelty of the sentence be altogether outweighed by the cumulative evils of systematic Sunday desecration observable under our own charitable régime? Again, take the case of Samuel hewing Agag to pieces before the Lord, which shocks the susceptibilities of some hypercritical souls. Just assume for a moment that Agag was a German and Samuel a Briton and even the most advanced of our critics would hardly grudge the latter his full aureole. On the other hand Saul, who made a virtue of sparing Agag, went to pieces on that very rock. It is all a question of motive and results, subject to the will of God.

This seems a convenient place to say something about the so-called imprecatory expressions in the Psalms and elsewhere, with their apparent spirit of vindictiveness and identification of the sinner with the sin. One preliminary observation is important. The Jewish nation was a theocracy, and therefore every violation of the law was a sin against God and every enemy of the nation was the enemy of God; in marked contrast with our own depraved democratic system, under which it was possible for a leading article in one of our daily newspapers to say recently that there is no such thing as an absolute standard of right and wrong, which could only be determined by the general sense of a particular community at a given time, than which sentiment it would be difficult to imagine any more grossly immoral, though it contains a germ of truth.

Here again the war has come to our help. The most restrained and cultivated people do not hesitate to employ such terms as the Devil and Hell in speaking of German methods and German personality, and rightly so. It is simply calling a spade a spade. There may be, but there *need not* be, anything vindictive in the feeling any more than in the case of a judge who in assuming the black cap sentences a murderer to the extreme penalty of the law, possibly with tears of compassion on his face. The treatment of Adoni-bezek recorded in the first chapter of Judges appears barbarous, but see his own confession "Three score and ten kings having their thumbs and their great toes cut off, gathered their meat under my table; as I have done, so God hath required me." Surely it was a cheap

price to pay for the stamping out of such a crime? Compare the case of Agag—"As thy sword hath made women childless, so shall thy mother be childless among women." It is merely an anticipation of the New Testament principle—"Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." This explains even such phrases as "Let his children be fatherless and his wife a widow" (Ps. cix. 9). Why? See v. 16, "Because that he remembered not to show mercy, but persecuted the poor and needy man, that he might even slay the broken in heart. As he loved cursing so let it come unto him, as he delighted not in blessing so let it be far from him." Before you reject the sentence, ponder carefully the crime. Or again—"O daughter of Babylon who art to be destroyed; happy shall he be who taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones," Ps. cxxxvii. 8. It is very horrible, but it is only "rewarding thee as thou hast served us," and most criminals understand no other argument. It does not mean, "This is my ideal," but "your inevitable fate." The Gospel teaches forgiveness of our personal enemies, but not of our country's foes. It is just this passion for justice and righteousness which makes the Psalms a very tract for the times. It was the jelly-fish indisposition to look things in the face and call them by their right names that caused the German policy of frightfulness to spring up: in that atmosphere it flourished. Directly we bring down a Zeppelin, they stop coming: when we catch the submarines they repent; when we start using gas, they desist. It is the most merciful policy in the long-run. So if we were to eliminate all the strong, passionate and disdainful language of the Psalms concerning the ungodly they would lose half their value. It goes without saying that what we love are the sweet comforting words of Ps. xxiii. or ciii. or cxxxiii., but you cannot have the sweet without the bitter. It is only the strong man who has faced the stern realities of life and has grown hard by overcoming the assaults of the world, the flesh and the devil who has really earned and can enjoy rest and peace. He alone has a claim to be called a *gentleman* who is prepared to knock down the cad. You have the whole idea beautifully portrayed in the well known picture of Lord Roberts with the little Boer girl seated upon his knee.

What grander sentiments could we have than, "I will set no wicked thing before mine eyes: I hate the sins of unfaithfulness; there shall no such cleave unto me" (Ps. ci. 3). "Ye that love the

Lord see that ye hate the thing that is evil (Ps. xcvi. 10). "Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate Thee, and am not I grieved with those that rise up against Thee; yea I hate them right sore even as though they were mine enemies" (Ps. cxxxix. 21, 22)? It is just this spirit that we need to cultivate in connexion with the National Mission, and we shall never go forth with true compassion and attractiveness to win the world until we have learned to hate evil. Then and not till then will the world take knowledge of the Church, when she "looketh forth clear as the sun, fair as the moon and terrible as an army with banners."

We cannot leave the subject of sin and holiness without a reference to the beautiful picture of Moses coming down from the awful height of communion with God with his face reflecting the glory of the Heavenly Vision, as he mixed with men and things, himself unconscious of the beauty of the Lord which shone forth from his hallowed features.

The Hebrew had a lofty conception of the claims of God upon man's absolute devotion. A special blessing is pronounced upon the head of Joseph, as separate from his brethren. Samuel was lent unto the Lord for life in the Temple service. The Nazarite was to separate himself from all moral and ceremonial defilement, and as seen in the case of Samson his power was lost when he broke his vow: "My strength is as the strength of ten because my heart is pure."

Then there was the solemn dedication to God of that which was of most value to man, e.g. the fruits of the land, enemies and spoil taken in war, or as in Jephthah's vow regarding his daughter. This might involve the destruction of the devoted thing, if so demanded by God. There appears to have been the double motive of the recognition of Jehovah as the source of all blessing and success and the self-discipline involved in giving up what was most valued, as further exemplified in the dedication of the firstborn to the Lord and the firstfruits of the produce of the land.

The clear demarcation between right and wrong is strikingly illustrated by the ceremony carried out after entering the promised land, when the blessings of the Covenant were formally declared from Mount Gerizim and the curses of the law proclaimed from Mount Ebal, forming as they do the groundwork of our splendid Communion service, the infrequent use of which has been corrected

through the beneficent influence of the war. It is important to notice, that in St. Luke's version of the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount, the curses upon the unrighteous are given in the form of woes, as well as the benedictions upon the righteous.

"Life and good; death and evil" is the choice set forth in Deuteronomy xxx. 19. "I call heaven and earth to record against you this day, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life," and in Joshua xxiv. 15, "Choose you this day whom ye will serve, but as for me and my house we will serve the Lord." Moreover, when the people somewhat lightly express their decision for righteousness, Joshua emphasizes the all-important consideration, v. 19, "Ye cannot serve the Lord, for He is an holy God; He is a jealous God; therefore put away the strange gods which are among you."

A word or two seems desirable upon the expression "a jealous God," which has been so much misrepresented. Far from being a crude conception of a mere tribal claimant for rival honour, it anticipates the root principle of the Gospel, viz. God's absolute claim upon His people. "Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price, wherefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit which are God's." "Love so amazing, so divine, *demands* my life, my soul, my all." It is most unfairly over-looked that while the second Commandment speaks of God as visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation (which is a law of nature) it is added "of them that hate Me, and shew mercy unto thousands in them that love Me." So that even here mercy rejoiceth against judgment.

On the other hand is it not just that loss of a proper sense of jealousy which causes parents to leave the care of their children to others, and that lies at the root of the sordid proceedings of the Divorce Court? The dignity of lawful authority and the glory of devoted obedience (apart from the war), are almost lost virtues in England to-day, which we have to deplore, while we admire the hoary splendour of the old Hebrew ideals.

It is time now that we turn to the inspiring subject of Old Testament teaching on the subject of Prayer. It is here perhaps that the innate spirituality of the saints of early days most impresses us. We think of Abraham, the Friend of God, who as prototype of the Beloved Disciple lay so near to the heart of God,

that he had a right to His inmost secrets. "Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do?" Then comes the magnificent and pathetic work of intercession for Sodom with its mingled reverence and importunity, "O let not the Lord be angry and I will speak but this once," with the important lesson that it was after all Abraham's demand and not God's response which fell short of the need, as also in the case of Joash, who smote thrice and stayed and so just missed the succession of victories which would have crushed Syria. How many prayers, good in themselves, have just fallen short of the persistency which ensures success? The other side is powerfully illustrated in the case of Jacob, who as he wrestles with the Angel of the Covenant, declares "I will not let thee go except thou bless me," and with a new name "Israel" comes forth as a prince having power with God and man and prevails.

Moses to whom God spake face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend—"With him will I speak mouth to mouth and not in dark speeches"—beholds the similitude of the Lord and anticipates St. Paul's passionate patriotism, "I would that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren's sake." Compare here Moses' words, "Oh this people have sinned a great sin, yet now if Thou wilt forgive their sin—and if not, blot me I pray Thee out of Thy book." Then comes the assurance, "My presence shall go with thee and I will give thee rest," which evokes the beautiful response, "If Thy presence go not with me, carry us not up hence, for wherein shall it be known here that I and Thy people have found grace in Thy sight? Is it not in that Thou goest with us?"

Again take the prayer of Nehemiah, so touching in its simplicity, directness and efficacy. As he stands in the presence of the great Artaxerxes, with his heart full of anxiety for his people and his city, and in response to the leading question, "for what dost thou make request?" (like Elijah before Ahab, realizing the super-presence of the King of Kings) he tells us, "So I prayed to the God of Heaven," and "I said unto the king," and "the king granted me according to the good hand of my God upon me."

Again, Hezekiah receives a threatening letter through Rabshakeh, with its reminders of the failure of other nations to resist the imperious will of the King of Assyria, with its taunt as to Judah's own unworthiness and claim to have God behind him. Instead of worrying over it or acting upon impulse, or consulting others, he

does what every God-fearing man ought to do, goes up to the House of the Lord and spreads the letter before Him, believing that He really knows, cares, and can help. An immediate response comes back through the Prophet Isaiah, "That which thou hast prayed to Me against Sennacherib King of Assyria I have heard." With the result that "that host on the morrow lay withered and strown, and the might of the Gentile, unsnotted by the sword, hath melted like snow at the glance of the Lord."

Or we think of the prayer of Asa who cried unto the Lord his God and said, "Lord, it is nothing with Thee to help whether with many or with them that have no power. Help us, O Lord our God, for we rest on Thee, and in Thy name we go against this multitude. O Lord, Thou art our God, let not man prevail against Thee." "So the Lord smote the Ethiopians before Asa."

Then take the incomparable Prayer of Jabez, the sorrowful, embedded in a long list of names in 1 Chronicles iv. 9. More honourable than his brethren, he called on the God of Israel, saying, "Oh, that Thou wouldest bless me indeed and enlarge my coast, and that Thine hand might be with me, and that Thou wouldest keep me from evil that it may not grieve me," and the sequel is, "God granted him that which he requested." If you add the prayers of Solomon and Daniel and come to think it out, you find every aspect of New Testament teaching on Prayer anticipated in the Old, and therefore every possible experience and need expressed.

It is often implied that the old Hebrews had but dim visions of a future life and that it was only towards the dawn of Christianity that hope began to irradiate the tomb. Leaving on one side all the well known passages which speak positively, if reservedly, upon the subject, I would ask you to notice how the Psalms, which breathe the inner life and aspirations of the faithful, are full of sure and certain hope beyond the grave. "I have set the Lord always before me." "Therefore my heart is glad." "My flesh also shall rest in hope, for Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hell." "Thou wilt shew me the path of life; in Thy presence is fulness of joy; at Thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore" (Ps. xvi. 8-11). "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil." "Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life, and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever," (Ps. xxiii. 4, 6). "Into Thine hand I commit my spirit, Thou hast redeemed me" (Ps. xxxi. 5).

“ But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave ; for He shall receive me ” (Ps. xlix. 15). “ Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory. Whom have I in Heaven but Thee ? My flesh and my heart faileth, but God is the strength of my heart and my portion for ever ” (Ps. lxxiii. 24, 25). In contrast with men of the world who have their portion in this life, “ As for me, I will behold Thy face in righteousness ; I shall be satisfied when I awake with Thy likeness ” (Ps. xvii. 15).

The prophetic section of the Old Testament is full of deepest interest. The prophet was pre-eminently the seer, who from communion with God had understanding of the times and therefore of necessity foretold, though his essential province was to forthtell. Every wise man can foretell the future more or less. The prophet inspired by the Holy Spirit did so to a peculiar degree. It is not a question of whether the Prophets could foretell future events. They could not help doing so, though often unconsciously. Instead of explaining away obvious prophetic utterances, we ought to be on the look-out for many more. All history is prophecy to the enlightened mind. The Old Testament literally teems with Messianic hope and promise. It matters very little which were pre-exilic and which post-exilic ; whether there was one Isaiah or twenty. The hand of God was upon the Prophets, leading them, often against their own inclination and interests, to utter home truths which did not belong to their times, and which are generally characterized by the frankest criticism of men and things, the unveiling of hypocrisy, the rebuke of formalism, making people see what they were in the sight of God and not what they appeared to be before men.

The miracles of the Old Testament do not seem to me to differ from any other kind of miracle. You either disbelieve altogether in the supernatural, or “ all things are possible to him that believeth.” Nothing is miraculous, when you understand all the laws which govern its manifestations. Everything is miraculous unless you profess to know the last thing which can be said about it. The harvest is as much a miracle as the Resurrection, or the latter as little a miracle as the former according to your view-point. We are of course bound to test the evidence for every alleged miracle, but the main question is, *cui bono?* and the Old Testament

miracles are all practical, beneficent and spiritually instructive.

The Songs of Moses, Deborah, David and Isaiah present a high level of inspired poetic fervour and devotion. The Proverbs and wise sayings are a compendium of well balanced instruction. "Wisdom is the principal thing, therefore get wisdom, and with all thy getting, get understanding" (Prov. iv. 7). "Her ways are ways of pleasantness and all her paths are peace" (Prov. iii. 17). "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: fear God and keep His commandments; for God will bring every work into judgment with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil" (Eccl. xii. 13).

G. N. H. TREDENNICK.



Malachi,

II.

(The second of a series of three addresses given in Westminster Abbey by the Rt. Rev. H. E. RYLE, D.D., C.V.O., Dean of Westminster.)

Malachi ii. 10-iii. 12.

THIS central portion of the book Malachi contains several very obscure passages. But without lingering over them the reader has no difficulty in discerning the three principal subjects with which the prophet is concerned. These are (1) social impurity (ii. 10-16); (2) the coming of Divine Judgment (ii. 17-iii. 6); and (3) the call to Repentance (iii. 7-12).

I. The subject of the first section is one of painful social interest. It had apparently become quite common for a Jew (and the Priests here set an evil example) to divorce his Jewish wife with the object of contracting a marriage with the daughter of an alien race and an idolatrous religion, but socially, officially, or commercially well connected: "he hath profaned the holiness of the Lord which he loveth, and hath married the daughter of a strange god" (ver. 16). Against this mean and heartless conduct towards innocent women the prophet directs a stream of hot indignation. "The LORD," he says, "hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth against whom thou hast dealt treacherously . . . she is thy companion and the wife of thy covenant. Take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth. For I hate putting away, saith the LORD the God of Israel . . . take heed to your spirit that ye deal not treacherously" (vv. 14, 15, 16). This is the last of a series of wrongdoings which the prophet enumerates to account for the fact that the people failed to perceive and realize God's love towards them. They preferred the gratification of their selfish, social aims and undisciplined passions to the fulfilment of his pure Will. Could they look to inherit His coveted blessing while they openly profaned His holy covenant?

The lesson for us is surely this, that *true religion is incompatible with faithlessness to the marriage tie.*

The sanctity of marriage lies at the root of family peace and social order. Where there is no respect for the marriage tie, there

the foundations of morality are broken up : there the honour of womanhood is degraded. Marriages which are made in frivolity and thoughtlessness are wont to be annulled with levity. Unfaithfulness to the marriage tie is the denial of obligations to our fellow-creatures and to God. The religion of an adulterer and a fornicator is hypocrisy. It may impose upon the world ; it is hateful in God's sight.

When Jesus Christ was on earth, the Jews practised the grossest laxity of divorce. The Scribes and Pharisees sanctioned divorce for causes of the most trifling character. Our Lord Himself upheld the strictest line. If severed at all, the tie of marriage could only be severed for adultery : divorce should not be permitted except for that extreme cause (cf. Matt. v. 32).

The violation of chastity, involved in that wanton levity of divorce which has been flagrantly frequent in the United States, and has grown with ominous rapidity among ourselves, and particularly among members of the theatrical profession, is a type of sin which outrages the honour of sex. It does violence to the safeguards of society ; it is the outcome of animal selfishness ; it is the violation of charity ; it is the ignoring of the one Fatherhood of God. " Have we not all one father ? hath not one God created us ? " says the Prophet (ii. 10), as he thinks of our oneness in the family of God, and of the claims of human brotherhood and sisterhood. God has created us soul as well as body. Man is not as the brute beasts. Husband and wife are united by a union that is spiritual more truly than bodily. " Until death us do part " is the solemn pledge given at the altar ; and its observance is the only basis of the happiness and the sanctity of home life. The strict law of Christ may in some cases seem to press with austerity. It is better that there should be hardship in a few exceptional cases than that the opportunity of cruelty, desertion and sensuality should universally be allowed. If marriages were more often contracted in the spirit of prayer and forethought, and less often arranged in giddy excitement or with frivolous and base motives, the records of the Divorce Court would not so continually offend us with scandalous tales of licentiousness, misery, and despair.

2. The second lesson of our passage is that which is furnished by the most distinctive message of the book : *God's Day of Judgement is a people's moral discipline.* The prophet is not predicting a universal

overthrow. He is speaking to his own countrymen, and in particular to the priests. Men were saying scoffingly, "Every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of the Lord," and, "Where is the God of judgement?" if He were just, He would not thus permit the wicked, namely the foes of Israel, to prosper (ii. 17). They would suddenly find that the Lord God has come among them; that His Messenger has heralded His coming; and that the Temple itself has been the scene of His manifestation (iii. 1). How the prophet's words were fulfilled, we cannot say with any degree of certainty. The prophetic vision, as it scans the future, often seems to foreshorten events that were separated by long intervals. The arrival of Ezra may have been "a Messenger" to "prepare the way," in one age; in another, the ministry of John the Baptist, as our Lord expressly testified (Matt. xi. 10). Think of the overthrow and pollution of the Temple by Antiochus Epiphanes! Think of the extirpation of a corrupt High Priesthood by the Maccabee Princes! These were terrific judgements that profoundly affected the life and worship of the Jewish people. They burnt away the corrupt element which had brought their country into misery and their faith to the brink of destruction.

Once more, in connexion with the coming of Jesus Christ, which had been heralded by the Baptist (Matt. xi. 10; Mark i. 2; Luke i. 76, vii. 27), God visited His people. Remember how, ere another generation had passed away, the Roman soldiers had destroyed the City and Temple of Jerusalem. The old worship passed away in the smoke and flame of that day of the LORD. The refiner's fire had consumed the elements of base alloy (iii. 2).

The prophet in our passage sees nothing in sharp outlines. He sees the figure of a Forerunner; he sees a Messenger of warning and reproof. He sees Jehovah coming in a judgement of irresistible power. It is a process which he likens to that of the fuller's wholesale purging and renovation, or to that of the metal-refiner's fire, consuming the dross and purifying the silver. Behind and through the clouds of disaster, he sees expanding a blue sky of restoration and happiness.

The history of nations is an avenue of neglected warnings. Sufferings and catastrophes have a purpose of moral purification which at the time a people fails to discern. "The Day of the Lord may come upon a nation; His Messenger may have heralded the coming, and not been heeded. Men who have not looked for God, will

not have seen Him. They never recognize His Forerunner who never look for His coming. In the education of the world, suffering has served as a bitter discipline. Individuals and nations have alike found it hard to realize that the price of a needed social purification is paid in coin of acute humiliation.

The list of evils, for which the Jewish prophet announces (cf. iii. 5) that judgement must be exacted, has in every age proclaimed the moral decay of a people. There is "the sorcerer," the charlatan who fattens on the timidity of the weak and the credulity of the ignorant : his popularity betrays the bankruptcy of the common faith and the fashionable rejection of the simple and less sensational reliance on the goodness of an Almighty and Heavenly Father. There is the "adulterer," who in an age of unhealthy excitement personifies the defiance of Divine Law and human institution, and the selfish surrender to the impulses of sensual passion. There is the "false swearer," who in unsettled days reaps a plentiful harvest of ill-gotten gain by a system, in which truth is only spoken in business circles when it is convenient or remunerative. There is the "oppressor." In the general hurry to get rich the cause of the poor wage-earner is forgotten. Payment by sweating flourishes, if not openly, yet, at least more flagrantly, in stealth. The destitute are down-trodden by more fortunate rivals. The cause of the defenceless woman and the little children is overlooked by the winners in the race for pleasure and power.

Such are some of the invariable features of corruption when a people leaves out the thought of God. Yet God is infinite in mercy.

"I, the LORD, change not ; therefore ye, O sons of Jacob, are not consumed" (iii. 6). He will visit them ; He will purify them ; He will be to them as a consuming fire against sin and impurity. But He will not destroy His people. There is Divine Love in the discipline of the darkest days.

The passage closes with the call to repentance, which Jehovah addresses to the people. And the lesson it conveys is the familiar one that *Repentance in fact brings a blessing in fact.*

The tithes and offerings which the Jewish people were bound by their religion to bring to the Temple at Jerusalem were the test and pledge of spiritual sincerity. Where there is no conviction of the love and goodness of God, there will be little readiness to make any sacrifice for His cause. Contributions may be trifling in amount ;

but their cessation or reduction affords significant evidence of mental attitude. A man without true religion will take the first occasion for cutting down his payments for spiritual or charitable objects. His charity has been done to be seen of men, not to help forward the cause of the kingdom of God.

What right had the Jews to expect the signs of Divine blessing for which they longed, material prosperity, abundant crops, and the overthrow of their enemies, if on their side they failed to satisfy the simplest test of their real loyalty to God? Let them return to God, not in word and profession only, and they will find He has never failed to be present to them, and is plenteous in goodness and mercy. "Prove me now herewith saith the LORD of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven and pour you out a blessing that there shall not be room enough to receive it" (iii. 10). How easily nations and Churches fall short of their responsibilities in the comfortable days of peace and the easy times of prosperity! Sacred duties are forgotten, the solemn eternal issues of life and death are thrust on one side as an inconvenient subject. In the ordinary estimate of human affairs, the readiness to give furnishes a rough criterion of confidence. Men will nowhere pay, where they no longer trust. Payment is the simplest expression of personal interest and personal sacrifice. The worth of repentance, as the prophet would have his countrymen remember, must be tested by something more than phrases. In the Jewish Church, the man who declined to make his offering, practically renounced his membership. Let him return unto God! let him lay down his offering once more at the altar! let him begin again to make the little yearly surrender, out of his earnings, in thankful acknowledgment of God's fatherly love! It is only the man who tries to make aright his offering to God, that will learn the full extent of God's goodness to himself. Fully to realize God's love you must have begun to take your share in the spirit of self-surrender, of which Church payments are a faint symbol, and the cross of Christ the eternal ideal.

"And all nations shall call you happy: for ye shall be a delightful-land, saith the LORD of hosts" (iii. 12).

(To be concluded.)



The Proposals for the Self-Government of the Church.

THE claim that the Church of England should be granted powers of self-government is no new one. It dates back certainly to the days of King John, and was then so far conceded that Magna Charta declared, "The Church of England shall be free." Whether it can honestly be said that the Church of England has ever been really "free" depends, however, upon the view that is taken of the Papal Supremacy on the one hand, and of the Reformation Settlement on the other. But it is no part of our present purpose to indulge in historical reflections. Those who wish to have an impartial account of the relations of Church and State in England from the year A.D. 200 down to the present day will find it in the second section of the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on the Relations of Church and State, prepared by two members of the Committee, Sir Lewis Dibdin and Mr. A. L. Smith, *al.* it may safely be said that it would be difficult to find in the whole realm of historical literature a statement of those relations more concise, more interesting, or more illuminating. And yet if we deliberately pass it by on this occasion it is because it seems to be more important under present conditions that we should face the too often forgotten fact that we are not living in the thirteenth century, or the sixteenth century, but in the twentieth century. The circumstances of our time, great, as we are so often told, beyond expression, are wholly different from those at any other period of our national history, and if the Church of England is now to fulfil its mission to the nation it must be prepared to adapt its machinery to the altered conditions of these times. It is a mere truism to say that the Church has a great task awaiting it. On the spiritual side, the National Mission has done much to awaken both corporate and individual responsibility, and we may hope to see a considerable growth in spiritual activity; but it must be clear to all who consider the question with any degree of care, that a Church which has no independent legislative powers is hindered, and gravely hindered, in pursuing its own free development. It will be agreed that the Church ought to possess

some such powers, but the question arises, can they be granted without injury to the relations which at present exist between the Church and the State? The Report of the Archbishops' Committee answers the question in the affirmative, and presents for the candid consideration of the Church a scheme which, if it materialize, will effect changes in our present procedure little short of revolutionary. Under its provisions the control of Parliament, as at present exercised, over Church affairs, will be taken away; the Church will have its own legislature.

Whatever opinions may be held regarding the particular proposals put forth by the Archbishops' Committee, there will probably be a large measure of agreement among Churchpeople that it is high time that some alteration was made in the power exercised by the House of Commons in the matter of Church legislation, seeing how on some occasions that power has been shamelessly and scandalously abused. It is impossible to forget what happened (to take a fairly recent case) over the Clergy Discipline Bill of 1892. The sole purpose of that measure was to simplify the machinery for getting rid of immoral and evil-living clergy, yet it was resolutely opposed by the faction in the House of Commons which thought it its duty to oppose all Church legislation, and it was only by the personal intervention of Mr. Gladstone that the Bill was got through. The new Act enabled the Church to get rid speedily of a large number of "black sheep," many of whom, if the anti-Church section in the House of Commons had had its way, would still be snugly ensconced in their benefices and still be exercising the cure of souls! It will be said that this is an extreme case. It may be so—let us hope it is—but at any rate it illustrates some of the evils of the present system. The fact is beyond dispute that during the last thirty years it has become increasingly difficult to get Church Bills through Parliament. The Report of the Archbishops' Committee states that during the years 1880-1913 out of 217 Church Bills introduced into the House of Commons only thirty-three were passed, and yet very many of the remaining 184 dealt with important reforms which could not be carried out because of the hostility or indifference of the House of Commons towards Church legislation. Such a position is frankly intolerable. Moreover, can it be said that the House of Commons, as now constituted, is a fit and proper assembly for the treatment of Church affairs? It is argued

that, with all its disabilities, the House of Commons is still the surest safeguard of Protestant liberties. Are we quite sure of that? No doubt it was so once, but recent developments within the House itself make it extremely doubtful whether it is so to-day. The House of Commons is now—what it will be after the war we cannot say—little more than the tool of the Government of the time. The day of the private member has gone; no strongly contested measure has a chance of passing unless it is backed by the Government; and it might well be that legislation most hostile to Evangelical interests would be adopted by the Government of the day if the Prime Minister had received assurance from the Church's episcopal leaders that the measure had received the imprimatur of the Convocations or the Representative Church Council (as representing the mind of the Church. If, then, there is no sure guarantee under present conditions of Evangelical interests being respected in the House of Commons, it is clear the party would not be worse off, and possibly might be much better off, under such a scheme as that propounded by the Archbishops' Committee, for it would at least ensure that the voice of genuine representatives of the faithful laity would be heard upon any measure that was brought forward under its provisions. But however that may be, let us be quite clear in our minds upon this point: that if the new scheme become effective, Parliamentary control, as we have hitherto understood it, will be gone.

The important question at once arises, will Parliament consent to relinquish its old power over Church legislation? It is impossible to answer the question with any degree of definiteness. If a Radical Government were in office it is at least possible that the proposals of the Archbishops' Committee would be summarily refused. It would be argued—and argued with some degree of force—that so long as the Church of England is Established by law, so long must Parliamentary control continue. But a blank refusal is not the chief or the only danger to be faced. It is possible—some think it is highly probable—that, when these proposals are seriously brought forward, Parliament may say: It is right that the Church should possess powers of self-government, but the only practicable way of acquiring it is through disestablishment; and we may thus find ourselves suddenly confronted with a strong demand for the disestablishment and the disendowment of the whole Church.

The danger is no imaginary one. Whether the condition of the country after the war will make it more formidable or less formidable than it otherwise would be, is difficult to forecast. There are considerations which tell either way. On the one hand the old and bad system of political partisanship will have passed away—at least we hope so. This would tell in favour of preserving the establishment. On the other hand, money will be required for a variety of purposes, and those who have laid violent hands upon the Church in Wales, and have declared that on the day peace is declared the ancient endowments shall be confiscated—presumably as a suitable contribution to peace rejoicings—may cast hurtful eyes towards the vast endowments of the Church of England. There is no mistaking the direction in which that feeling would tell, and it is equally clear that if, at the same time, there existed within the Church of England an agitation for extensive powers of self-government the movement for disestablishment and disendowment would receive from it an extraordinary impetus. This danger was present to the mind of the Archbishops' Committee, some members thinking that disestablishment "would prove to be the only way of securing spiritual independence to the Church" (*Report*, p. 39), but "nearly all the members of the Committee" attached "importance" to the Church remaining established, as "an underlying condition" of their scheme (Sir Lewis Dibdin's *Memorandum*, p. 292).

But now, shutting our eyes as closely as we can to the disestablishment danger, let us examine the scheme itself. Much will depend upon the angle from which we regard it. If Churchmen consider it with their party prejudices strong in their mind it is most probable they will see in it much that will provoke their opposition, and this is true not of one party only but of all the parties into which the Church of England is unhappily split up. We need, however, to realize, strong though our party feelings may be, that the Church of England—Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed, Protestant—is infinitely greater and nobler than any party within it, and that it has the strongest claims upon our love, our loyalty, our devotion, our service. In these circumstances should not our examination of this scheme be directed to seeing whether it will prove, if and when adopted, for the greater welfare of the Church? We shall, naturally and properly, be anxious to safeguard those

interests and positions which we honestly believe give strength and stability to the Church, but should not our primary consideration be the well-being of the Church itself? Evangelical Churchmen can the more readily approach the Report of the Archbishops' Committee in this spirit because, for the first time in history—or at any rate in modern history—the faithful laity—with emphasis on the word “faithful”—will be given, under this scheme, a real voice in the management of Church affairs. Evangelical Churchmen have always held—and rightly held—that the overwhelming majority of lay Churchpeople are in full sympathy with the Evangelical position, and it follows, therefore, that, providing the lay representation is a true reflection of lay feeling, the Evangelical position under the new scheme ought to become stronger and Evangelical influence more potent than they have been for many years past.

The scheme as set forth in the Report of the Archbishops' Committee is so widely known that only a brief outline of it need now be given. The Committee had to propose the formation of a legislative body, and in the constitution of the existing Representative Church Council they found practically everything that would meet the need. Most Churchpeople, at one time or another, have indulged in a certain amount of cheap sarcasm at the expense of what they call that “glorified Debating Society,” but let it not be forgotten that, although quite a voluntary body, it has shown the way by which a Church Council, with statutory powers, can be safely and easily constituted. Archbishop Benson builded better than he knew when first he called into being the Provincial Houses of Laymen. The Church Legislative Assembly, to be called the Church Council, which the Archbishops' Committee propose should be created, will consist of three Houses, viz., (1) The House of Bishops, composed of the members of the Upper Houses of the Convocations of Canterbury and York; (2) the House of Clergy, consisting of the members of the Lower Houses of the two Convocations with slight variations; and (3) the House of Laity, to be elected in much the same way as the present Provincial Houses of Laymen. In regard to the House of Bishops it is not explained in the Report why membership of it is confined to Diocesan Bishops. The Upper Houses of Convocation are thus limited, but seeing that the Church is making a new departure it is passing strange that Suffragan

Bishops should be excluded. Their ecclesiastical position is inferior to, but their episcopal orders are the same as, those of the Primates. They may be elected to the House of Clergy, even as some of them are now to the Lower House of Convocation, but there seems to be reasonableness in the contention that men in episcopal orders should sit in the House of Bishops. In regard to the House of Clergy the variations from the constitution of the Lower Houses of Convocation are chiefly these: that all duly licensed priests and not merely the beneficed clergy will have the right to vote at the election of proctors, and that Deans are no longer to be ex-officio members of the House—a proposal which has already called forth a strong protest from the Dean of Durham, and more will certainly be heard of it. The House of Laity will consist of “actual lay communicants of the Church of England, above twenty-one years of age and of the male sex.” How is membership of the House of Laity to be attained? With very slight and, for our present purpose, immaterial change the existing franchise of the Houses of Laymen is adopted, that is to say every parish will elect its own Parochial Church Council, which in its turn will elect to the Ruridecanal Conference and to the Diocesan Conference. Each Diocesan Conference will elect to the House of Laity in proportion to the population of the diocese. This membership of the House of Laity is reached through the lesser bodies. The alternative plan would be direct election, as to the House of Commons; but it is open to doubt whether this would be more effective than the system adopted by the Committee for the attainment of the purpose in view, viz., the true representation of the laity, while it would certainly be more cumbrous and more costly.

Having noted the qualification for membership of the House of Laity, and indeed for all these Church assemblies, it may now be asked, What will be the qualification of an elector to the Parochial Church Council, which is the body from which all the others spring? It is important that the exact words of the clause should be quoted:—

Qualified electors in a parish must be above twenty-one years of age and may belong to either sex, provided that they either (1) are actual communicants, or (2) have been baptized and confirmed and are admissible to Holy Communion, and do not belong to any religious body which is not in communion with the Church of England. Their names are to be kept on an electoral roll; and any one wishing to be placed on it must sign a declaration that he or she is qualified to be enrolled.

It will probably be around this question of the franchise that one of the chief battles will be fought. It is held in some quarters to be too narrow in its basis, and if the objectors are told that it is the franchise prepared by the existing Representative Church Council, they reply, in effect, that so long as Church Councils are voluntary bodies, possessed of no legislative or other power, it does not much matter what the qualification is; but if the Church is to be entrusted with self-government, the initial franchise must be on a much broader basis, or else, so they argue, the National Church will be reduced to the level of a sect; and they urge that baptism, plus the declaration as to not belonging to any other religious body, ought to be sufficient qualification. The argument is more specious than convincing. If baptism were the only test it would confer the franchise upon large numbers of men and women who are absolutely indifferent if not openly hostile to all religion; and to give such people a voice—and a substantial voice—in the real government of the Church is, from the point of view of religion, as indefensible in theory as it would be intolerable in practice. St. Cyprian is sometimes quoted in support of giving ample powers to the laity. But his promise that he would do nothing without their assent was not made to the laity in general, but to the “faithful laity.” In like manner the great Cambridge Memorial of 1885 on Church Reform, when pleading that the most urgently needed reform was the admission of laymen of all classes to a substantial share in the control of Church affairs, distinctly limited the plea to those who are “*bona fide* Churchmen”; and if the Church of England to-day is to preserve its spiritual character, the greatest care must be taken that this distinction is adequately observed. Eloquent protests against “denationalizing the National Church” may sound very well on a Church Congress platform, but when a new scheme for self-government is in the making, the only true and safe principle to be observed is Church government by Churchmen; otherwise we might as well, perhaps better, remain as we are. There will not be, however, any “denationalizing” of the National Church under the present scheme, for it is expressly stated that “the existing rights of such parishioners as are not qualified electors” will remain intact (*Report*, p. 42).

The absolute necessity for safeguarding the electorate will appear more clearly when we consider the very important duties

which will be entrusted to Parochial Church Councils. It is not only that they will elect to the higher assemblies ; the Archbishops' Committee recommend that they be empowered by statute to perform a number of important duties. These Councils will arrange, with the incumbent, the Parochial Church Budget and the number and allocation of the collections in church ; they will co-operate with him generally in Church work, and will keep the electoral roll. It is proposed, also, that they should be the normal channel of communication between the parishioners and the Bishop, their right to make representation covering a wide area, including alterations in services and ornaments ; that they should have the right to accept and hold gifts of property and to levy a voluntary Church Rate ; and that they should take over and exercise all the powers of the vestry, and also many of the powers, duties and liabilities of churchwardens who, if qualified for membership, are to be members of the Council without election. The members of the Parochial Church Council will be the sidesmen of the parish. The position of the incumbent is left open in the Report, members of the Committee apparently not being able to agree upon it. But whatever may ultimately be decided upon in this regard, it is clear that the existence in a parish of a council with statutory authority, cannot but exert a very strong moral power over the actions of the incumbent. What would be the position of the parties in the case of a deadlock between the Council and the incumbent is not clear. The point will, no doubt, be considered by the central Church Council as soon as it is legally constituted, for it is provided that a clause shall be inserted in the Constitution of that body requiring it to present a measure conferring powers on Parochial Church Councils already set up as part of the parochial machinery (*Report*, p. 47). The scheme of the Archbishops' Committee clearly contemplates giving Parochial Church Councils real power, and this ought greatly to quicken the interest of Churchpeople in every parish.

But important as the work of Parochial Church Councils will be, the greater interest will be centred in the position of the highest body, the Church Council, which is to be entrusted, under the scheme of the Archbishops' Committee, with " full power to legislate on ecclesiastical affairs " and, in course of time, if not at once, with " the power of making canons, now existing in the provincial Conventions," such canons, when they have received the Royal Assent,

to be "regarded as having authority over all Churchmen" (*Report*, p. 49). In regard to questions of doctrine and discipline the constitution of the present Representative Church Council has been followed. In this it is provided that no proceeding of the Council can "interfere with the exercise by the Episcopate of the powers or functions inherent in them or with the several powers and functions" of the Convocations; and that "it does not belong to the functions of the Council to issue any statement purporting to declare the doctrine of the Church on any questions of theology." But, thus limited, "questions touching doctrine and discipline may be discussed, and resolutions relating thereto may be passed by the Council," although "any projected legislative measure" on such questions "shall be initiated in the House of Bishops, and shall be discussed by each House sitting separately, and the Council shall either accept or reject the measure in the terms in which it is finally proposed by the House of Bishops, after that House has received and considered the report of such separate discussions." There are those who would prefer to see a larger liberty in this matter granted to the House of Clergy and the House of Laity, but the provision is not unreasonable; and it should be remembered that before *any* proposal can pass the Council it must receive the assent of each House, such assent being signified by a majority of the members present and voting. It is a well-established *dictum* that "minorities must suffer," but in matters of such vital importance as those which will come before the Church Council it is open to grave question whether the passing of a proposal by a bare majority would really meet the justice of the case. In all matters touching doctrine and discipline a majority of two-thirds of those present and voting in each House should be required before the proposal can be said to be passed by that House.

We proceed now to consider the position of the State in relation to this proposed change. The Report claims to have devised a plan which will preserve to the State "an effective control over the legislation of the Church." It is as novel as it is interesting, and provides that every measure, after it has been passed by the Church Council, shall be submitted to an Ecclesiastical Committee of the Privy Council consisting of about twenty-five Privy Councillors. In view of the nature of the work to be entrusted to them, it is strange that no religious qualification is required of members

of this Committee. The reason, perhaps, is to be found in a footnote to the proposal, stating that "The King in Council, when he speaks through this specially constituted Committee of the Privy Council, will speak in the name of the State and not in the name of the Church" (*Report*, p. 58). Upon such an interpretation of the duties of the Ecclesiastical Committee it is certain that several very important questions will arise. But let us follow the course of the prescribed procedure. The Ecclesiastical Committee, after consultation, if necessary, with the Legislative Committee of the Church Council, will proceed to make their report to the King. If the measure proposed were to be dealt with by a Canon the royal authorization would then be either granted or refused according to the advice of the report. If the measure be deemed to require Parliamentary sanction, both the measure and the report shall then be forthwith laid on the table of both Houses of Parliament. The report of the Ecclesiastical Committee is intended to show the effect of the measure in question, what alterations in existing Acts of Parliament its enactment would entail, and whether there is any objection from the point of view of the State to its passage. If the report is favourable the measure will automatically be presented for the Royal Assent on the expiry of forty days, unless either House of Parliament by resolution direct to the contrary. If the report is unfavourable, the measure shall not be presented for the Royal Assent unless both Houses of Parliament by resolution order that it shall be so presented. Any measure on receiving the Royal Assent shall acquire the force of an Act of Parliaments

It is obvious that much will depend upon the view the Ecclesiastical Committee take of their responsibilities. It has been widely assumed that they will exclude all religious considerations, and examine the measure in the interests of the State on its secular side alone. But is it quite certain that they will so restrict their inquiry? The Church, it must be remembered, will still be the National Church, the Church of England as by law established. Moreover the King, in whose name they are to act, takes oath at his Coronation that he will "maintain and preserve inviolably the settlement of the Church of England and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government thereof as by law established in England." In face of these facts is it not clear that members of the Ecclesiastical Committee would be entirely within their rights if,

in examining Church legislation from the point of view of the State, they considered what would be the bearing of the measure upon the religious life of the nation. To take a concrete example: Suppose the Church Council passed a measure ordering the Mass Vestments to be worn at every celebration of the Holy Communion in every church throughout England. Can it be imagined that the Ecclesiastical Committee would say that such a proposal, so revolutionary in its character, changing the fundamental basis of the National Church, was entirely outside the province of the State? If so, we might quickly find ourselves face to face with a position which seriously menaced the Reformed character of the Church of England. In any case, the provision is one which need further explanation, and if this is not satisfactory, it will be necessary, when the proper time comes, to press for drastic amendment of the powers of the Ecclesiastical Committee.

It only remains to add that the Report recommends that the proposed new constitution shall be framed by the present Representative Church Council and recommended by both Convocations to the Crown. This done, it would have to be embodied in an Enabling Bill, a draft of which appears as an appendix to the Report. When this Bill has passed, the reform will be accomplished, and the Church of England, while remaining established, will be free to manage its own affairs. But that time is not yet. Nothing can even be attempted until after the war. In the meantime it is the bounden duty of Churchpeople to study the scheme in all its bearings, so that when it is brought within the sphere of practical politics they may be ready with an intelligent and practical policy in regard to it.

X.



Parochial Vignettes.

II. PARTY AND PARTY SPIRIT.

WE shall find the atmosphere a little heated, I am afraid, for it is in the neighbourhood of such topics that ferocities glow and glare. Few, it is thought, can be trusted to handle such a bristling subject without thrusting a torch into the gunpowder barrel. All the more need, it seems to me, why it should be taken in hand, if only to get rid of so abundant a confusion which seems to dance attendance upon it. And there is something cooling after all in clear thinking on hot subjects, as I hope we shall find.

We will first try to define a little.

It is quite useless to beg the question by throwing contempt on party, as though it were utterly wrong to take sides of a partisan character. To say of some ardent soul, "Oh, he is a party man," however much intended to throw scorn upon him, misses its mark when we consider that we are all more or less party people, and that we cannot help being so.

What such a despiser of his fellows means to convey is not the fact that he belongs to a certain party in the Church, but that he is an unscrupulous person who takes sides for the mere purpose of controversy, and without knowing much about the question which he decides so absolutely. He may be addle-headed as our friend thinks, he may be hurried along he knows not whither in the crowd, he may be moved by motives not at all nice, and he may be bereft of any real convictions, but then it is possible that he is none of these things, and probably is not. Such a charge is an ungenerous missile which it is far better not to fling. The plain fact is that there always have been and always will be schools of thought in the Church, and what can be more natural than that those who lean in the same direction should coalesce. Your drop of water running down the window pane in a shower will run into another drop of water, and the two will amalgamate into one, but your drop of water will have nothing to do with a stray drop of oil which happens to lie in its way. The two are of a different order, and have no affinity. And, after all, the world is run on the doctrine of affinities. Marriages, friendships, and all society are the fruits of partialities. Those we like or love, those we agree with, those we are comfortable

with. And it is amongst these that unions of more or less rigidity are formed. And as religious bonds are amongst the closest of all, we are not surprised that religious parties should exist and flourish in our Church. It would be unnatural if they were absent.

It is not that they agree on every point of doctrine, but that they agree on the main points, on the things which in their opinion matter. Their colours may not match perfectly, but they match sufficiently well for working purposes, and certainly are near enough in tinge to look alike in the distance. It is enough that they are not discordant. Rough approximations serve for unities, and rallying flags and centres of action. And all sensible parties are content with this amount of juxtaposition.

And that this party connexion is understood is evident when some vote is called for, and it is essential that like should close in with like. Then out of the general movement in the mass emerge the parties clear and definite. And even your non-party man stands disclosed as being as much a sinner as the rest. Of course, everybody knew which way he would go, but it pleased and flattered him to stand aloof and aside, and only the exigencies of the situation had crystallized him and made him cling to his special sugar-candy string.

It is curious how the most secretive of men will reveal themselves almost in spite of themselves. At some unexpected moment the flash and gleam will reveal the scarlet, or the Puritan black will suffuse itself, or the neutral tint will gather emphasis to the attentive eye. You can no more permanently hide it than the tailor can conceal his profession. It works through all disguises, and will be out. In times of stress and storm we all run under some umbrella, and the umbrella we choose will be our own particular and special shape. At the bottom, as a matter of fact, there is abundant common ground where at ordinary times we meet and commune. There is indeed more common ground than particular ground. We agree far more than we differ. But, while we agree in the great facts of our faith, we part company in our application of them.

Thus, we all believe in Redemption by the Lord Jesus Christ, and its universality and freeness, but as to how the sinner is to obtain the benefits of that Redemption we differ. One believes that the way is open straight to Christ, and that by faith the benefits are personally received. Another wants badly to find room for the priest and human absolutions and sacraments. We all accept the

Word of God as really His ; but when we ask in what sense, and how far, and to what extent, we scatter. The Holy Communion is indeed a feast of fat things for the worthy and believing participant, but there is a whole world of difference between the man who makes it a show, and tells us that the Lord of Life lies upon the Table and is a real Sacrifice, and the old-world Christian who feeds upon Christ in his heart by faith and looks for Him nowhere else.

And so it is of no good to try to assure one another that party questions are just tweedledum and tweedledee matters, and that we all mean the same thing, for we do not. Our differences are often deep and vital, and if we agreed to sit down together, and nestle beside one another as if we were in thorough agreement, we should only succeed in playing the fool and making our rents wider. Glacier pinnacles are often wide asunder from each other, and to treat them as if they were close is only to fall into the crevasses between. My vested brother who burns his incense, throws himself into such strange postures, and adores what to another is still a piece of plain bread, lives in a world which to some of us is another world theologically than that in which we dwell.

The next subject before us is the gain of party.

We have been so accustomed to bemoan the differences which our parties make visible that the statement that any good could ever come from such divisions will come as a shock to some. And yet nothing is so certain in this world than that the religious world is a better world for the varying points of view represented by our religious parties. Think of the oft desired substitute for parties : the deadly monotony of agreements with never a ruffle upon their surface, every one echoing his neighbour, and all quite certain that everybody else is right. It would be like some still mere in a dark, dank wood, where the surface is only rippled by frogs and flies, where dead leaves float, and fogs are ever rising. No sunshine ever reaches it, and no breath of real life ever stirs its dull surface. We fly from it, and call it a hateful spot, a place of gloom and desolation. Better to me the storms of the great ocean where we can breathe, although it may be hard to keep our footing.

But let us see where the good features of party views are to be found.

For one thing they keep us from becoming one-sided.

Truth is not one-sided, however much we may try to think so,

and however much we may shut our eyes to the other sides. A diamond has more than one facet, and all the cutter's care is exercised to provide as many facets as possible. There is an obverse to every coin of the realm. There is another side to the hill. And if men try to express some unaccustomed side of truth, who are we that we should quarrel with them for it? We should rather quarrel with ourselves for letting that side sink out of recognition and remembrance, and regret the necessity for another to brush by us in his efforts to rescue what we have left in the lurch and out in the cold. What can be more foolish and false than to insist that our side is the only side, and that if there should be another side it is quite unimportant. Offer a defaced sovereign to the bank, expect the cashier to take your money, although only one side is clear, and see what will happen. We are too ready to deal in half truths, and to challenge the man who would fain replace the missing half.

For another thing party provided a home for neglected truth. There was a time when Athanasius stood against the world, and when one man stands so much alone it is difficult to cherish a truth as it should be. It needs a party to keep it warm and to protect it against the rough world, and the truth is only safe when men have responded to the call for help, and have gathered together to protect and shelter. What is hard for one is easy to many. And just as many hands protect, many lips proclaim it, and so the party grows just to keep a home together for it.

When Athanasius and the few orthodox Christians stood together as one for the great truth of our Lord's divinity, it began to be safe, and when the party grew in numbers and influence the tide of Arianism rolled back defeated. When Wesley rose above the religious horizon, legality and dryness were masters of the field, and it was necessary that he and his should in one great bold party go forth to make known the simple Gospel of Christ. But for party efforts, how much would be left to us to-day of our great spiritual inheritance of truth? It is party which has saved us again and again. They have held aloft the truths which were being trodden down so thoughtlessly, and saved them from destruction. What a small party began the call for Reformation in England, and how necessary was it in the interests of truth that they should hold together and die together to keep alight the torch of truth! And that they did it we ourselves owe what to many of us is a priceless heritage.

Moreover, party provides a barrier against the return of the old evil tides of error. What party, by the grace of God, has wrested from the raging seas, party must be raising her dykes to keep, lest she should have to fight the same battles over again. The watch-dogs must be there ready to give alarm, for old errors have enough vitality in them to trouble again if not kept low. Are we not witnessing the revival of old heresies and abominations to-day? And good it is to have those at hand who have fought through that campaign and are ready to fight again. This is the answer to give to those who say that, inasmuch as the party's work has been done, they should drop their banners and ancient battle cries and cease to be. Let them rather stay and watch, and be ready, for their work will have still to be done again some day.

Now that we have tried to show what can be said for party, let us see some of the dangers which all parties are exposed to. For there are perils, many which wait diligently on all parties in Church matters, and indeed in every other sphere of life.

There is the danger of putting a part for the whole, which perhaps may be the origin of the name. Running one truth for all that it is worth, we are apt to run down other and, quite as important, truths. You give the bread, and deny the cup. And nothing is more sure than that parties are in terrible danger of holding a disproportioned creed and a lop-sided faith. The faith party decries works; the works party forgets the faith-spring without which good works cannot be done. And having this onesidedness inscribed upon their banner as a party, the fear is that all avenues for the return of the banished side may be finally closed up. It is the tragedy of many partisan minds that this closure has become an accomplished fact; they have no room for any more truth.

There is the danger of denying to opponents any interest in the true faith of a Christian. Because they do not believe his truth they do not believe any. They must be quite unconverted and lost men and women. You see, his truth is so vital and central that to miss it is to go quite astray. And so we often find that almost the first thing a controversial antagonist does in the supposed interest of his truth is to deny his brother the possession of any saving faith at all. He is practically to him a heathen man and a publican. And until he is converted to that special truth he is a rank outsider. To the Plymouth Brother his Church is the only Church, and to the

Romanist and the High Anglican not to be in alliance with their Church is to be in a parlous condition. Men with such a party spirit can see nothing worthy outside their own party walls.

Then the partisan is disposed to stand severely aside from any approach to unity with his differing brethren. He glories in his isolation. He will not kneel at the same Holy Table with you. And you must not draw near to commune with him. You are a religious pariah, and must be treated as such in the interests of his sacred and sure party, or, as he would call it, his Church. Individually, he might be inclined to make exceptions, but, in a party, rigidity pure and simple is the order of the day. He is sorry for you, but then it is a call to mend your ways and your faulty creed, and to ally yourself with the only true Church in Christendom. Accept his view of baptism, surrender your view of Church order and Church government, see eye to eye with him in the supremacy of sacraments, shake off the dust of your feet from the old and false with which you are at present allied, and then all will be well with you. So great a sum does party demand for its priceless alliance. A party is certainly pretty swollen and big in its own eyes. And then it happens as a natural corollary that, with a party, conversion to its tenets displaces in importance all others. The party is apt to be the goal to which all sinners must come and find shelter. They occupy the salvation-ground, and in their arms the dead shall find life. Believe truth and be happy. And so, without intending it, other truths far more important are dropped out of view and disappear. It is not that they do not hold such doctrines in their creeds, but that with so long pondering their differences they lay pretty nearly all the emphasis on the disputed point, and cannot bring themselves easily to lift the others out of their shell. Thus, to a Roman Catholic, membership with his Church is enough; she will see to the salvation of the soul entrusted to her. The Church's faith will make up for his deficiencies. This is salvation by party with a vengeance.

Of course, party spirit cuts off much healthy growth. How can I expand if I am bound round with so many wrappings of party that I cannot move? My party blinkers prevent me from looking around, the cramps upon my mind prevent my understanding fresh views of truth. I am tethered like a donkey to one bit of pasture, and can only feed in the same contracted bit. Party fences shut me

in, and however much I may wish to wander over the great expanses around, I cannot overpass by my limitations. How all this is bound to check growth is evident. It may keep me faithful to my party, but it is at the expense of all that is expansive. I do not say that because we are of party we need necessarily be partisans in all its bad sense. We love our party best indeed when we hold ourselves free to break loose here and there if more light comes. The danger of the closed mind must be so evident to us that we take good care not to close it to future glimpses of truth, from whatever quarter they may come. A wise man will never let any system, however choice, imprison him and limit his liberty. But we all know how prone we are to run ourselves into moulds, and set there. No man thinks clearly who thinks to order, or thinks in grooves which others have made for him.

Then it is wise to remember how apt strong party spirit is to make us formal, and to chain us to our shibboleths. There are party cries and watchwords which to many stand in the place of vitality and real conviction. The world's wicked wit makes sport at this tendency of the religious world. They wonder whether the good soul who writes D.V. so punctiliously slipped it in from habit and without thinking. They marvel too at the easy way in which the Sacred Name is introduced, and the strangely assured way in which it is assumed that by speaking much on religious matters a good profession is made, instead of too often degrading the good coin by over-much handling when there are no thoughts of buying or selling anything divine with it. Each party has its own peculiar shibboleths, so that it is easy to tell whether the speaker is a Churchman or a Nonconformist, an Evangelical or a High Anglican. Of course, they may mean all that they seem to express, but the fear is that they may mean less and sometimes may mean nothing at all. Naturally, it makes for unreality to use meaningless phrases, and we shall do well to watch our use of them. They are apt to make party spirit stronger, and to brand us deeply for the worse. The beginning of all parties is the best time, for then they are in the midst of their realities; then they mean facts which the heart has grasped dearly; then the sacred fires pass from heart to heart, and truth is glorious. But when age comes, the early days of glory have been forgotten, and a new generation has come in who learn their party truths at second-hand, then phrases take the place of

the old fires, and men utter formulas which are as dry as sticks and as cold. It would be good for the extinct party to die out of hand, for its day is past and over.

My last question is an inevitable one—What shall be done to improve matters in the face of all our parties?

Some would say, Eliminate the parties. But we dare not say that. It would be an evil day for Christendom if we ran all the little pools into one great ocean lake. There was a time when the Roman Church dominated the world, and we know the stagnation and death which ensued. You might as well try to eliminate all nationalities and to hurry all families into one. It is by our differences that we exist healthily as much as by our agreements. Even husband and wife agree better when their unlikenesses are as real as their likenesses. Eliminate parties? It cannot be done.

Moreover, we have our non-party men, have we not? At least they say that they belong to no known party. But how can they eliminate all party views who have no leaning to either? Some, let us boldly say, hold with no party because they are indifferent in spirit to all definite truth. Many have a backboneless creed which is neither fish, flesh, nor good red herring. They smile contemptuously on men's fierce quarrels because they often have no deep religious feelings on any religious topic, and do not care enough for truth to fight for it. While those who declare themselves to be of no party are as really and truly party men in their votes and sympathies as if they bore the name.

But if we cannot eliminate parties we had better try to get rid of the worst features of the partisan spirit. And how to achieve this we must attempt to show.

We must get to know one another better. This is one of the best of remedies, and the most essential. We shall probably then discover that half our quarrels are about names which we translate differently, or totally misapprehend. We father opinions upon people which they have never held, and never thought of holding.

Then we had better circumnavigate our creeds, and see what is on the other side. Not infrequently we shall be surprised to discover that the obverse of our own creed is our maligned brother's creed. He is actually holding the other end of our own line.

If we can then proceed to lop off extravagances, excrescences

and novelties and meet in the middle, it is likely that we shall find our hands actually touching those of our opponents. For it is the new developments which land us in so many troubles in church matters. Let but these novelties disappear, and the residual essentials will satisfy all sensible and fair-minded men.

Then we can exercise a little more charity, and consider that no man is half so bad as he looks, and that the best of men even of our own party could not bear too much light thrown upon them. Yea, it would be well that we should also remember that we ourselves should look queer to one another under a perfect searchlight. To father our opponent with all the consequences which we think flow naturally from his premisses, but which he knows do not, to give the rein to suspicions which are products of a too lively imagination, to caricature for controversial purposes the other man, is positively unfair. Charity forbids.

And let us beware lest we find ourselves fighting for party rather than for truth. We can easily delude ourselves on this point, and lash ourselves into a bitter mood which is far more for our own side than for God's. We fight best when we fight for the highest causes ; not for the lowest and most personal. And nothing short of truth, God's truth, ought to satisfy an honest man. And if we and they make for truth apart from the claims of our parties, we shall be very likely to land in close proximity to each other before very long, and in friendship, not antagonism.

We shall do well sometimes to take off our party spectacles, and look through a bit of good glass, pure, white, and flawless, and gaze at truth's fair face as God reveals it to us in His Word. It will not be easy. We shall want to have our favourite commentaries by our side, and most favourite doctor to do our interpretations ; but this will be to fall back upon our coloured party spectacles again which we have suggested should be laid aside for a while. Let us then allow for a time a bit of independent thinking, try to see with our own eyes, and, unhampered by rulings from this man or that, this school or that, weigh the thing for ourselves. We shall, probably, come back to our old views, and believe just the same as before, but then we shall be better convinced than before, and have a better foundation by far. We shall then believe, not because we have fallen into line with our party, but because we have fallen into line with God's own revelation. In some such ways as these

we may help to eliminate the evils of party spirit. We shall not be less of our party, but we shall be more free from the limitations and vices of a partisan spirit.

There are not a few signs visible in the theological world that a better spirit is gathering, and we thank God for it. No longer do men refuse to meet or pass each other by with averted eyes. The Evangelical Churchman is seeing the benefits of order and reverence in outward things. The High Churchman is finding that the Gospel of the grace of God must be put more to the front, and is preaching the necessity for a real conversion of spirit. The Sacraments are Christ's even if the interpretations are human and fallible, and the use is not to be arrested because their abuse has been so disastrous.

Forms of prayer can be made as spiritual and devotional as the free and extemporaneous ones. The Church is a real, visible body, and membership in it is not to be despised or made light of. The only, but vital, difference is the breadth of its extension and the nature of its life. Those who make light of its visibility, and those who make light of its invisibility, will have to meet at some common point, inasmuch as both are true. Those who press the outward, and those who insist on the inward, must see the necessity of both. But formal connexions are but a poor substitute for the inner realities, and to adjudge them to be coincident is to misread facts in the light of mere theory.

It is not that men are blind to their differences to-day or that they make light of them, but that they are trying to coalesce at the edges, and to agree where agreement is possible. The unity which comes through surrender of convictions would be fatal. We have no right to merge our individualism in any Church, however venerable or pure. The Church is made up of individuals, and to deny their individual standing as units in the great society is to commit suicide. It is the tyranny of society ecclesiastical and political which is the standing menace of to-day.

Probably, the time will never come when the great Church of Christ upon earth will lose all its differences and defects, at least here, but in the Glory-land all will be different. For then we shall know even as also we are known.

CHARLES COURTENAY.

[The next article in this series, "Strain," will appear in March.]

The Missionary World.

THE fact that peace proposals have been made—whatever their value and however remote their fruition—naturally gives rise to the thought of the Church under the test of peace. Shall we meet that test as well or as ill as we met the test of war? For that it will be a test is certain, and nowhere will it be more acutely applicable than in the missionary world at home. The test of peace after the intense strain of war, when every faculty was bent to endurance and every personal sorrow was mitigated by the common calamity, will prove our capacity to relapse or our resolve to continue. We sometimes easily assume that peace, when declared, will bring at once in its train all those flowers and fruits of peace which are normally the product of its long prevalence. This is not so. After carnage and bitterness and death such as the last thirty months have brought us, peace will at first be negative; it will mean the ceasing of war not the harvest of calm. Indeed the harvest of war will long continue to be reaped in days of peace. As surely as the soil and the sub-soil have been ruined from the agricultural point of view in the war-trodden areas of France and Belgium for years to come, so surely has the moral and spiritual ground of Christian endeavour been affected by the influences of war. What can we do that no loss shall befall our Master's cause and Kingdom when we exchange the stress of watching by land and air and sea for the stress of possessing without material hindrance a new world in His Holy name? There is a great danger of expecting automatic expansion, or of taking a period of repose, or of believing that because great shells have ceased to shake this earth, all is well. Surely the message for the missionary worker is "Gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end. . . ." If the first shock of war was a call to prayer and to action, so also will be the first shock of peace. And now we have been clearly warned that out of the darkness of the past and the threats of the present such a day is coming to us. Let us in all the confusion of the hour and its multiplying embarrassments give ourselves afresh in loyalty and discipline to the Christ of the whole world, so that we may not waver nor relapse, hesitate or unbend, when we can once again prosecute our task.

The cornfields of France and Flanders can only be remedied with patience, but a miracle can renew the devastation of Christian endeavour, and we have a right as chastened believers to expect that our merciful Lord will grant us His grace in miraculous measure. It will be in this confidence that we shall seek to reconstruct our life and service ; surely a new humility as learners will be upon us, a new generosity as givers, a new simplicity as citizens ; and as we have preached everywhere during the war that spiritual force must displace material force, then we shall set ourselves to live as we have proclaimed, establishing on earth a society out of which a harvest of witness to Christ will be raised up. With so great a prospect before us let us gird up the loins of our minds and bind ourselves afresh to the cause of all causes—the spread of the Kingdom of God—in peace as in war.

* * * * *

The announcement that the Missionary Week following the National Mission has been postponed will be a greater disappointment than surprise. It is well known how far-reaching are the restrictions placed on travel for all save actually essential purposes. We believe the Committee were quite right in their decision, following as it does on the decision of the Islington Conference and anticipating, as we believe it also does, many similar decisions with regard to the larger religious gatherings in London. But the situation throws a fresh responsibility on the Church to which we doubt not it will manfully arise. In the early stages of the National Mission it was announced that “ this is a soldier’s battle.” So it is now in the missionary ranks. The individual and the locality acting for the whole body of the Church can maintain and expand the missionary cause. Every prayer meeting, every study circle, every collection, every sermon, every bit of self-preparation for future service abroad has an added value. Rural deaneries and urban areas can have their own small conferences and can cultivate among themselves the larger spirit of corporate determination to bring in the day of Christ throughout the world. Not for one moment can the missionary countenance of the Church blanch nor the missionary heart of the Church cease beating because some of the great fixtures temporarily cease to be held. The infantry of the Church, the rank and file, will stand shoulder to shoulder with

renewed dedication and confidence, each determined in his own locality and according to the character of his special responsibility, not only to maintain but to advance his share of the work. And may it not well be, in the end, that the trust of individual responsibility freshly thrust upon us will prepare us now, as nothing else would have done, for the greater days which are coming to us?

* * * * *

The publications which were specially prepared for the Missionary Week and the whole missionary movement following the National Mission, are now issued by the S.P.C.K. They should be widely used, and will prove invaluable in furthering the cause through the country. They are as follows: *Adventure for the Kingdom*, Rev. W. E. S. Holland; *What are Foreign Missions Doing?* Eugene Stock; *Islam and the Gospel*, Rev. H. U. Weitbrecht, D.D.; *The National Mission and Mohammedanism*, Canon W. H. T. Gairdner; *Young West and Young East*, Ruth Rouse; *Things as They Are, A Survey of Recent Missionary Facts*, G. A. Gollock; *Some Objections to Foreign Missions*, Edwyn Bevan; *The Church in Earnest*, Rev. C. C. B. Bardsley. All these are either 2d. or 1d. Bishop Copleston has also written a leaflet on *The Missionary Sequel of the National Mission*.

* * * * *

The East and The West opens the year in its January issue with a number of articles of real worth. Whether we read Bishop Baynes on "Missions and Labour," or the two articles on "Social Reform in its Relation to Missionary Work," and "Indian Social Problems," written respectively by Mr. John Lee and Mr. N. K. Bose, or study "The Chinese Church, its Financial Problems," by the Rev. H. B. Rattenbury and "Self-Support and Self-Control in Polynesia," by the Rev. H. Hough, we find breadth of spirit and freshness of outlook. The paper on "Sir Rabindranath Tagore in Japan" has a curious interest, and the editor contributes another chapter on the Conversion of Europe, dealing this time with North Germany. Bishop Montgomery's article on "The American Church," though fragmentary, is illuminating. All who desire to follow the wide current of missionary thought owe a debt to Canon Robinson for the quarterly which he edits and for which he provides material of value from such varied sources and on so many themes.

The January number of the *International Review of Missions* contains again one of those missionary surveys of the past year which missionary students and speakers have found so indispensable. Into some sixty pages are compressed the outstanding missionary facts of the year, classified under countries and topics so that reference is easy, and yet so arranged as to give a broad conception of world movements. The record of the year 1916 is a striking piece of Christian evidence which men who watch for the coming of the Kingdom should not miss. The general deduction made at the close of the survey is as follows :

“ There is one fact of supreme significance which the preceding pages must have brought to the consciousness of every reader. Among non-Christian tribes and peoples there is an eager readiness to hear the Gospel and a spirit receptive of its message, and the Church in the mission field is realizing in a new and dominating sense that ‘ the real, the fundamental, the permanent object for which it exists on earth ’ is to interpret to others the revelation of God in Christ, proclaiming its meaning in wide-spread evangelism, and manifesting its application in every department of human life.”

* * * * *

Education continues to receive—and rightly so—a large place in the pages of the Review. Problems are arising in the mission field which will claim the best attention of the Christian Church. The article on “ Japanese Nationalism and Mission Schools in Chosen ” has a significance far wider than the two countries of which it treats, and Mr. Oldham’s study of “ The Question of a Conscience Clause in India ” is an invaluable contribution to clearness of thought on a problem which may at any moment press acutely for solution. Among other articles we notice with pleasure the first of a series of four papers by Professor A. G. Hogg of Madras on “ The God that Must Needs be Christ Jesus.” It is a fresh and striking statement, born of the author’s experience in the presentation of central Christian truth to a college audience—partly Hindu, partly Christian—in India.

* * * * *

The monthly missionary magazines bear evidence of careful forethought. Especially is this the case with the *Church Missionary Review*. The number is strong, fresh, and varied ; we welcome the range of subjects touched and the varied writers secured. Special attention should of course be directed to Mr. J. H. Oldham’s article

on "Principles and Practice of Co-operation." This is one of the subjects of the hour, and it demands the closest study. *The Mission Field* (S.P.G.) fittingly welcomes Bishop Montgomery home from his recent visit to the United States. Though the financial statement for the year is not complete, the treasurers have much to report that is encouraging, the total sum received to date being nearly £2,000 in excess of that received to a similar date last year. Behind the gifts lies the increase of the spirit of self-sacrifice—best of all assets of a missionary society. *The Bible in the World* (B. & F.B.S.), in a brave leading article, says, "In the dawn of a new year such as none of us ever faced before, we do well to lay to heart the saying of an eloquent American bishop: 'The power of any life lies in its expectancy.' What are we hoping for?" We ought to take this question in conjunction with a later statement on the financial position of the British and Foreign Bible Society which may be imperfectly understood. We quote a paragraph in full to show what the war means to the enterprise of a society which so far has maintained its service to Christian missions abroad without any reduction, and which hitherto has not refused any missionary organization the editions for which it has made request.

"Christian people, however, must grasp the serious problem which confronts the Society in which they are all partners. To-day the cost of producing books has enormously increased. Our English editions alone are costing at the rate of £8,000 a year more than they cost before the war; while the cost of foreign editions is enhanced in similar proportion. Our binding bill in London alone has increased by £6,000 a year; even during the last twelvemonth our expenses for freight have gone up by between £2,000 and £3,000. In war time the loss on foreign exchange forms a very grave item; at the present rates, as compared with those of 1915, we are incurring a net loss of over £7,000 a year. The above figures involve the Bible Society in an increased expenditure of £24,000 *per annum*, and they by no means exhaust the adverse effects of the war."

* * * * *

The New Year's message of *China's Millions* on the words "Fear Not" is just what we would expect—strong, satisfying, human and absolutely uplifting. "Let the worst come that man or devil can achieve, our times are in the hands of Him Who has conquered and holds, with hands once wounded for us, the insignia of His supreme and final authority." These are the things we need to be told—and need to believe. A touching interest attaches to the following statement on "Sons of Missionaries and the War."

Missionaries give much, but not exclusively to lands other than their own.

“ In the present great war there is a wide fellowship of sorrow and suffering. All classes of the country are affected alike, the rich and poor, those at home and those abroad. In the case of our missionaries, though engaged in work for God in a land far distant from the fields of conflict, their homes have not been exempted from the general call upon the manhood of the nation. In all more than 110 ‘ Old Boys ’ of the Chefoo schools have joined the colours, and of these sixteen have given their lives for King and country, while four more are among the missing of whom so seldom further news is heard. Besides these one was drowned through the torpedoing of the *Lusitania*, one engaged in the Royal Army Medical Corps is a prisoner of war, while several others have been wounded, some, we regret to say, seriously. Of these 110, eighty-eight are sons of C.I.M. Missionaries, either now or in former years.”

G.



Preachers' Pages.

HOMILETICAL HINTS AND OUTLINES

[Contributed by the Rev. S. R. CAMBIE, B.D., Rector of Otley, Ipswich.]

Septuagesima.

Text: "So run, that ye may obtain."—1 Cor. ix. 24 (Ep.).

Graphic imagery derived from the Olympic and Isthmian games is frequently used with effect by St. Paul (Phil. iii. 12, 14; 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8; Gal. ii. 2, v. 7; Acts xx. 24). This suggests the following considerations:—

I. AN APPOINTED COURSE. For the runner bounds are fixed and rules prescribed. These have to be observed. "Yet is he not crowned except he strive *lawfully*" (2 Tim. ii. 5).

II. AN APPLAUDING CROWD. The runner has the encouragement that comes from the cheers of interested spectators. "We also are compassed about with so great a crowd of witnesses" (Heb. xii. 1).

III. AN APPETITE UNDER CONTROL. "Temperate in all things" (verse 25). For ten months those who were to take part in the Isthmian games subjected themselves to rigid discipline, diet and training. St. Paul could say—"I keep under my body" (verse 27).

IV. APPROPRIATE CLOTHING. Lightly clad. Nothing to impede progress. "Let us lay aside every weight" (Heb. xii. 1).

V. AN APPRECIATED CROWN. "They do it to obtain a corruptible crown" (of Grecian pine leaves). Notice St. Paul's different "crowns" and their significance. Not even the Minister's crown is for him alone.

Still forget the things behind,
Follow Christ in heart and mind,
Toward the mark unwearied press,
Seize the crown of righteousness.

Sexagesima.

Text: "Whereinsoever any is bold . . . I am bold also."—2 Cor. ix. 21 (Ep.).

The Apostle recounts his privileges and reviews his experiences. What a record the latter form! There is enough material here,

if worked up, to fill volumes! "It represents a life hitherto without precedent in the history of the world. Self-devotion at particular moments, if for some special national cause, had been often seen before; but a self-devotion, involving sacrifices like those here described, and extending through a period of at least fourteen years, and in behalf of no local or family interest, but for the interest of mankind in general, was up to this time a thing unknown."—*Stanley*.

I. HE IS CONSCIOUS OF PRIVILEGES OF WHICH HE MIGHT BE JUSTLY PROUD. "Are they Hebrews: so am I, etc." (verse 22). But these are not the things in which he now glories (verse 30) as he used to do (see Phil. iii. 4-8). The only advantage he sees in them is such assistance as they may be to him in proclaiming the Gospel.

II. HE IS CONSCIOUS OF EXPERIENCES OF WHICH HE HAS NO CAUSE TO BE ASHAMED. "In labours: in stripes: in prisons: in deaths, etc." (verse 23). He wears on his breast no decorations, but he bears honourable scars. He calls them "the marks of the Lord Jesus" (Gal. vi. 17). This is the Christian's only cause for glorying. Even *then* "let him glorify GOD on this behalf" (1 Pet. iv. 16).

III. HE IS CONSCIOUS OF A WATCHFUL SOLICITUDE FOR THE WELFARE OF THE CHURCHES OF GOD. "The care of all the Churches" (verse 28). This anxiety—(a) Exercised him constantly. "Cometh upon me *daily*." (b) Exhibited itself in (1) Intercessions (Col. i. 9, etc.). (2) Instructions, e.g. Pastoral letters.

IV. HE IS CONSCIOUS OF FEELINGS OF RIGHTEOUS INDIGNATION AT THE WAY TRAPS ARE SET FOR THE SAINTS. "Who is led astray (*lit. tripped up*), and I am not aflame with indignation?" (verse 29 Weymouth). Woe be to him who puts "an occasion to fall in his brother's way" (Rom. xiv. 13). "It is the duty of the Godly to remove every stumbling-block" (Isa. lvii. 14).

Ash-Wednesday.

Text: "Shew My people their transgression."—*Isa. lviii. 1.*

These opening words, together with the message that follows, remind us of him who modestly spoke of himself as a mere "voice crying." The Baptist's mission was to call men to repentance and to show its real nature as contrasted with the formality which

largely characterized it (see Isa. xxix. 13 and Matt. xv. 8, 9). Such appeals are by no means out of date.

I. A DISAGREEABLE TASK. "Show My people their transgression." One of the special functions of the Ministry. But not confined thereto (2 Cor. v. 18-20; Jas. v. 20; Eph. v. 11; 2 Tim. iv. 2). No one will pretend that this is a pleasant task. Nor do transgressors welcome correction. Often men (*a*) resent it (Isa. xxx. 12), or (*b*) reject it (Jer. v. 3). But note that the Hebrew word rendered "trumpet" is that used in Leviticus xxv. 9 (cf. Josh. vi. 4) and is connected with the proclamation of Glad Tidings (see Luke iv. 18). It is "an instrument, which, with whatever variety of music its upper notes may indulge our ears, never suffers its main tone of authority to drop, never slacks its imperative appeal to the wills of the hearers."—*G. Adam Smith*.

II. A DISTRESSING PICTURE. "Behold, ye fast for strife and debate, and to smite with the fist of wickedness," etc. (verses 4, 5). We are invited to contemplate an unseemly union—"formal religion and unlovely life."—*G. Adam Smith*. "There may be much outward show of religion in daily approaches to God in His house, while there is no vital piety."—*Wordsworth*. "Ye find pleasure," etc. "They had, in fact, a great greed for ordinances and functions." They were punctilious in their observance of the ritual of their religion but there was an absence of spirituality. It was defective (*a*) on its Godward side—it was an empty formality: and (*b*) on its manward side, there was an absence of that charity which is so plainly set forth (verses 6, 7) as an obligation. "Character grows rich and life joyful, not by the performance of ordinances with the cold conscience of duty, but by acts of service with the warm heart of love."—*G. Adam Smith*.

[Various kinds of formalists (2 Tim. iii. 5):—

1. *The Aboriginal formalist*. Isaiah describes his superstitious idolatry in chapter xlv. 16 *et seq.*

2. *The Philosophic formalist*. St. Paul came in contact with him at Athens.

3. *The Jewish formalist*. The palmiest days of Jewish ceremonialism were the ungodliest. Then came the Pharisees.

4. *Christian formalists*. Described and warned in the letter to Laodicea.

5. *Non-Christian formalists*. Multitudes who comply with all

the requirements of the civic law and are blameless in their outward life.—*D. J. Burrell, D.D.* (adapted).]

Quinquagesima.

Text : " Up to Jerusalem."—*Luke* xviii. 31 (Gospel).

Considerations preliminary to Lent. Up from Jericho—the city of the curse (see *Josh.* vi. 26 and *1 Kings* xvi. 34) up to Jerusalem, the city of blessing (see *Neh.* i. 9, etc.). Compare parable of Good Samaritan " down from Jerusalem to Jericho : the facility and perils of descent. The Lord's call is ' Excelsior ! ' " UP to Jerusalem. This involves time, trust, toil, tenacity. It was on this road the Samaritan came across the wounded man and displayed the true Charity. Behind all Lenten sacrifices and ministries should be, as their motive, holy heavenly Love. It is a supernatural grace. See Collect " Pour into our hearts." In the Epistle (*1 Cor.* xiii.) St. Paul gives us its constituent parts. In the Gospel we have an example of it in the restoration of sight to the blind. In the case of Bartimaeus we see—

I. POVERTY. In addition to the dire calamity of blindness, so common in the East (one in every thousand) are added distressing circumstances. He was driven to live by begging. The sinner is in a condition of moral bankruptcy, though he frequently considers himself solvent.

II. PRAYER. " He cried saying, Jesus, etc." One of our airmen lay dying after a terrible fall. He was too severely injured to be moved and his comrades knelt by him as his life slowly ebbed. His lips were seen to move and they asked him if there was anything he wished to say. His reply was, " The angel asked for my pass-word and I answered JESUS." The officer who told the story added, " I have no doubt he got through with his pass-word."

III. PERSEVERANCE. " He cried so much the more." How many things " put us off " the prayer-life. They would silence Bartimaeus. But his earnestness issued in perseverance.

IV. PITY. " Jesus stood." The people looked at one another inquiringly. Why? Because one word had fallen upon His ear and reached His heart of compassion—Mercy! " Who asked for mercy? " " He commanded him to be brought unto Him." Penitence, a sense of need, brings an instant response.

V. POWER. " Immediately he received his sight." Mere pity,

where more is possible, is not enough. But if we can give nothing but compassion let us not withhold it. Jesus displayed His sympathy and extended His succour. God "immediately" recognizes and rewards faith.

VI. PIETY. "He followed Jesus in the way." Jericho was forsaken, for the cry was "up to Jerusalem." Presently he was found among those who thronged the Temple-courts. The way of piety is uphill (see Ps. xxiv. 3). Presently all the redeemed will reach the House on High.

First Sunday in Lent.

Text: "Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil."—*Matt. iv. 1* (Gospel).

We may consider our Lord's temptation as—

I. INDICATING THE DIVINE APPOINTMENT OF TEMPTATION.

"We sometimes speak of temptation as if it were an accident of life: we forget the words 'led up.' Temptation is part of a plan, it is a step in the succession to a better life."—*Joseph Parker*.

II. INDICATING THE EXISTENCE OF A MALEVOLENT BEING—THE AUTHOR AND AGENT OF EVIL. Observe Jesus holds him responsible. "An enemy hath done this. The enemy . . . is the Devil" (*Matt. xiii. 28, 29*). Consider

(1) His PERSONALITY. No abstraction or influence. Scripture throughout implies a conscious, intelligent personality. He incited Judas (*John xiii. 2*), prompted Ananias (*Acts v. 3*), obstructed St. Paul (*1 Thess. ii. 18*), instigated persecutions (*Rev. ii. 10*). etc., etc.

(2) His POTENTIALITY. His power is manifest and is exercised (a) Over the world in general (*John xii. 31; xiv. 30*). (b) Over man in particular (*Luke xi. 31; 2 Cor. xii. 1*).

(3) His PAST HISTORY and future PUNISHMENT. His past is veiled in obscurity. Many of our ideas concerning it are drawn from Milton. We need to be cautious. *1 Timothy iii. 6* throws light upon it. His punishment (*Rev. xx. 10; Matt. xxv. 41*).

III. INDICATING THE METHODS OF THE ADVERSARY. "We are not ignorant of his devices" (*2 Cor. ii. 11*). His plans are worn threadbare but this is to our advantage. They run on three lines: "lust of the flesh, lust of the eyes and the pride of life." To be forewarned is to be forearmed. "He frequently disguises himself" (*2 Cor. xi. 14*). Often there is nothing seemingly devilish about

him. Here he poses as a friend full of solicitude for our Lord's welfare. This is a trick as old as the days of Adam and Eve!

IV. INDICATING THE POSSIBLE PLACE AND PROBABLE TIME OF HIS ATTACK. *Where?* "In the wilderness" (verse 1). Solitude affords no immunity. *When?* "Then" (verse 1), i.e., after a special revelation from Heaven. After some signal deliverance we may find ourselves, like Israel, "right against Jericho" (Josh. iii. 16). First teaching, the testing: first instruction, then examination.

V. INDICATING THE WEAPON WITH WHICH WE MAY SLAY THE FOE. "The sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God" (Eph. vi. 17). Jesus knew how to handle it. His Bible was the Old Testament, but even this is enough. It is written *again*. Truth is nowhere embodied completely in one verse.

[The matter in this Outline might provide matter for two sermons.]

ILLUSTRATIONS.

[Contributed by the Rev. J. W. W. Moeran.]

Mr. Ben Tillett, the Labour leader, was describing
Equality. at a meeting in London a visit he paid to the trenches.

He had witnessed out there some things that were very touching. He had seen men and officers absolutely worn out, sleeping side by side. "No matter whether men come from Eton and Oxford, or whether they are Bethnal-Greeners, when they come to face hell they are just one man." He meant, of course, the hell of shrapnel-fire and machine guns and all the horrors of suffering, death and destruction, in the presence of which class-prejudices and social differences find their level. It is also true that when men see with clear vision the great realities of sin and judgment and of the Life beyond, with its two alternatives of happiness or woe, then the barriers that human customs have raised crumble into dust, and the equality of souls before God is made clear, for "He is no respecter of persons."

* * * * *

In the *Scotsman* (June 5, 1916) appeared a narrative
Helpless. by one who had been in the naval battle of Jutland, in which he said, "One of the many sad sights seen that day was that of a destroyer half-a-mile away. She had been

badly hit, and she gave a message which a sailor does not like to see: 'I am in a sinking condition.' It was pitiful; but there was none to help. It is war; and the sailors on a doomed ship, bred in the school of chance, are the last to complain." It is indeed one of the sad things about human suffering, that, with all the will and sympathy in the world, there are times when we are powerless to do anything in the way of real help for those who greatly need it. And we can only believe that such experiences are allowed to befall us so that we may learn to look to Him Who is able to help because He is "mighty to save." None ever called on Him in vain. Unfurl the flag of your distress in the name of Jesus. Keep it flying and you shall not sink. Before the cold waters of despair and death close over your head, some lifeboat will come alongside, and the hands of Divine Love will be stretched out and will carry you safely from danger into security.

* * * * *

"I spoke to a wounded man just back from the firing trench. He had lost his right hand, and I con-
Loss and
Gain. doled with him on his bad luck. 'That is nothing,' he replied cheerfully; 'I offered my life to France, and she has only taken my hand; so there I gain'" (H. Warner Allen, special correspondent of the British Press with the French Armies). Yes, he had gained more than he had lost. He had lost his hand certainly; but he had gained the satisfaction of serving his beloved country, and of suffering for her sake; he had gained the joy of knowing that he had done his duty; he had gained immeasurably what he would have lost irremediably were it possible for him to have held back while others pressed forward—he had gained self-respect. The loss of his hand was but material; the gain of all these things was far more. The man who becomes a true Christian gives his life to Jesus Christ as his Lord and Saviour. Outsiders, irreligious people who do not understand, see him renouncing the world with its alluring pleasures and unspiritual influences; and they say, "See what a lot he has had to give up! how much he has lost!" "No, indeed," he learns to answer, "you are greatly mistaken, and so was I at one time. In surrendering my life to Him Who gave His life for me, I have lost very little; something, it is true, because self-denial is a condition of Heavenly citizenship. But I have gained far more than I have lost. These losses have

been few and slight ; the things gained have been many and great. Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord : for whom I have suffered the loss of all things and do count them but dung that I may win Christ."

* * * * *

During the night of May 31 to June 1, 1916, the **Help Near.** Danish steamer *Vidar*, on her way to England, was passing part of the scene of the battle of Jutland. She was commanded by Captain O. C. Christiansen, a brave and humane man, who dared the risk of floating mines (several being observed) to cruise along in search of any who might have outlived the battle. Through the darkness a large black object came into view. It was a buoy, to which were clinging five men, the only survivors of the Destroyer *Shark*. From one of these could be heard a faint and plaintive cry. As the *Vidar* drew nearer, its words were gradually distinguished by those on board. It was "We are alive! We are alive! We are alive!" They were alive in that sea of dead! The plaintive cry caused a thrill of emotion in the breasts of those on board. A small boat was lowered, and these poor wrecked sailors, with limbs frozen, and eyes staring, and teeth chattering, were taken in to her, and carried up the gangway and laid on the saloon floor, then with kind hands and restoratives brought back to life. In the struggle for existence, on the sea of human experience, are many waifs, drifting on its cold waste of waters ; others beside them have sunk beneath the waves. They are just clinging, helpless, but not hopeless, to some promise of God's care and love. They can only just cry pitifully for help as they become conscious of the nearness of some Divine Presence. To such poor wretched souls we say, "Hold on. Cease not to pray and trust. You shall not cry in vain. God has His own ways and means of bringing help. The time will come when you shall be able to say, 'He drew me out of many waters. He delivered me from my strong enemy.'"

* * * * *

In the Cathedral Church of St. Sofia, Constantinople, on the inner side of its vast dome, traced in golden mosaic, is the Figure of our Lord on the Cross. When the Turks took Constantinople, they plastered this over

with a thick layer of whitewash, so as to leave only its shadowy outline discernible in the dim light of the building. The Christians of the Orthodox Church in the East have a tradition that when this picture of the Crucifixion becomes plainly visible, it will be a sign that the reign of the Sultans of Turkey is coming to an end. Since the war began it is stated that the picture is, week by week, becoming more and more distinct to the eye of the observer. The face and figure of Christ and the lines of the Cross may now be traced with ease. So the hearts of the faithful beat high with expectation. Whatever be the value of the tradition and the claim that is now being made for its fulfilment, we may certainly use it in the spirit of hope, as an allegory of that which our hearts long for and believe. "The old, old story" of man's redemption through the offering of the Son of God upon the Cross has been too much obscured in recent years by human philosophy and "science falsely so called." The war is making men realize how little these two have done, or ever can do, to save us from sin and sorrow. And the eyes of many are being opened to see that the only hope of the world from man's own cruelty and folly is to be found in the Saviour Who died on Calvary's Cross. So the picture in the Church of St. Sofia, for centuries desecrated by Moslem fanaticism, bids us look for the Coming of the Lord in the hearts of men and in the Glory of His promised return.

THE STUDY TABLE.

A very useful Manual has just been issued with the title *The Creed of a Churchman* (Longmans, Green & Co., 1s. net). It is a composite production, being the work of the Bishops of Peterborough and Barrow-in-Furness, and the Revs. Cyril C. B. Bardsley, E. A. Burroughs and Edward S. Woods, who "regard themselves as unitedly responsible for the whole book." We are not in the secrets of the authors, but we presume that their object has been to produce for use by Evangelical and Moderate Churchmen a Manual similar to those published in the interests of another School of Thought by the Bishop of Oxford and the Rev. W. J. Carey respectively. How far, however, it will be acceptable to the older school of Evangelicals we cannot say. It sets out views on the Divine Society, the Ministry, the Bible and the Sacramental Life which

carry us much farther than many of the older men would care to go, and we should not be surprised if a counterblast from that quarter were shortly to be issued. Although only a small pamphlet it covers a wide range. The earlier chapters deal with "God, Nature and Man" and "The Christian Revelation of God," and the treatment is admirable. The chapter on Sin and Forgiveness lacks the definiteness we should like to see, but the truth that "the Cross was the vent of pent-up love; the love that hates sin, yet hungers to forgive the sinner," is strongly insisted upon. The chapter on "Membership" of the Church calls attention to many points, e.g. Baptism, Confirmation, the Forgiveness of Sins, etc., and sets out clearly and well what is the modern Evangelical rule in regard to them. Perhaps the two finest chapters are those on "The Kingdom of God" and Missionary Service. The Manual contains much that is helpful, but the treatment in general strikes us as being too philosophical. A more practical treatise and one with more "grip" about it would have met the need better. In a work of this kind "grip" is essential. The Bishop of Oxford and Mr. Carey know where they are, and their readers know where they are. Nevertheless, we are glad *The Creed of a Churchman* has been written; it will help many, and if it had been stronger it would have helped many more.

* * * * *

No preacher's study shelves are complete without a volume or two of addresses for Children's Services. Many such are issued, and among the very best must be classed those of the Rev. Will Reason, M.A. In his new volume of talks to boys and girls, *The Wonderful Sword* (Robert Scott, 2s. net), preachers to children will find everything they require. These "talks" are founded on stories such as children love to hear, and there is a quiet dignity about them which lifts them out of the rut of such productions. The writer adapts himself pleasantly and easily to the level of the children's intelligence, and preachers who take him and his book as their companion and guide will find the power of arresting and retaining the interest and attention of their young hearers.



Reviews of Books.

A SPIRITUAL PILGRIMAGE. By the Rev. R. J. Campbell, M.A. London : *Williams and Norgate. 7s. 6d. net.*

No more notable person than the late minister of the City Temple has in recent years passed out of dissent into Holy Orders. For some twenty years he was one of the most prominent figures in English Nonconformity, and his secession from its ranks caused something of a sensation. Even before his advocacy of the New Theology, his reputation as a preacher was well established, and it is no secret that Dr. Joseph Parker, orthodox of the orthodox, hoped that the young minister of the Union Church, Brighton, would succeed him at the City Temple, and with this hope in view gave him his death-bed blessing. Dr. Parker had little, if any, admiration for the Anglican Church, and what he would think of Mr. Campbell's subsequent career and of this book we cannot think.

The title of the book seems inadequate, inasmuch as it is the record not of one pilgrimage only but of several, and as we lay down the book—which has not a dull page from first to last—we do so with the uncomfortable feeling that the writer may not even now have found a permanent religious home, notwithstanding his observations about the Church over which the Bishop of Rome presides, for he is travelling along a road which has led many a shrewder man, many a better balanced mind, to acknowledge the supremacy of the Papal See. But there is another reason why the title seems to us inadequate. It fails to indicate the scope of the book. It is much more than an account of his conversion (or as he would most likely prefer us to call it, his re-conversion), to Anglo-Catholicism, it is in a very real sense his autobiography, for in it he tells the whole story of his life from childhood and gives us an insight into the working of his mind, needless to say, in an eminently readable, pleasant style.

Mr. Campbell comes of a nonconformist stock. His grandfather was a Congregational minister and his father, who is still living, is a minister of the United Methodist Free Church—a man, we are told, “of liberal tendencies in his thinking,” with a rooted distaste for Calvinism. Even the grandfather selected the Congregational ministry because he would subscribe to no confession of faith, so that the three men seem to have been cut out of the same piece.

Mr. Campbell's early years were spent with his grandparents in Ulster. This was necessitated by delicacy from which he has suffered more or less all his life. It prevented him from going in for athletics and seriously handicapped him in Oxford days. In Ulster he was brought into contact with its virile Presbyterianism and he gives us in his opening pages many vivid recollections and impressions. Educated at a local Grammar School, he eventually became a “student teacher” there, and then obtained a post in a small high school in Cheshire under a Clerical headmaster. This was in more ways than one “a pilgrimage.” He not only passed from Ireland to England but he came into touch for the first time with the English Church. “The whole tone of the school was Anglican,” and he was confirmed by Bishop Moorhouse. He gives us a comparison between the Ulster Presbyterianism and the English Nonconformity with which, of course, he came into contact too, when, as he says, his father brought him home. It is in many ways one of the most significant passages in the book. Nothing else that he has written so plainly shows his present position and his attitude

towards Evangelical religion. We will transcribe the whole passage and ask our readers to consider it carefully.

The first (difference) was that the "Church" disappeared, and the "Gospel" took its place. I hope no Nonconformist will feel aggrieved by this statement. In my early days many would have been quite satisfied with it and considered it a credit to Nonconformity rather than a reproach; they would have said that the Gospel came first and the Church a long way second; perhaps most of them would say so still. But while I did not know what this change of emphasis meant I was very conscious of it. I could not but realize that the pulpit was tuned to a different note unless when my father was preaching. Evangelization was the thing chiefly aimed at, and that of a particular and well-marked type. Personal relationship to Christ constituted the subject-matter of the sermons, being born again and progressing individually in the spiritual life till the soul attained to complete sanctification. We were constantly exhorted to come to Jesus, to make our peace with God, to forsake the world and so on—all very good and right in its way but not what I had been accustomed to hearing. It is no exaggeration to say that the very idea of the Church seemed to be almost superfluous. Any suggestion of the necessity of being grafted into Christ's mystical body by baptism or otherwise was wholly absent. To be converted, to be saved, was held up before us as almost the sole objective of the penitent sinner, that is, when penitence could be induced in the sinner at all. *It repelled me, though I did not quite know why and I never got over my repugnance thereto.* [The italics are ours.] It was repugnance to that individualistic gospel of salvation more than anything else which led to the utterances on my part which produced the controversy of ten years ago. In that controversy I definitely broke with Evangelical Nonconformity. What has happened since, so far as I am concerned, *is not a return to that*, but to the idea of the Church as the Church, the sphere of sacramental grace, the home of the growing soul, our Lord's visible witness and representative on earth, the society in which He dwells and which His Holy Spirit guides and inspires.

That is the passage and its full significance is readily discerned. Mr. Campbell seems to lack the happy knack of perceiving that the truth generally lies between the extremes. Is he quite sure that he has done full justice to the stalwart Protestantism of the Ulster Presbyterians? Does he seriously ask us to believe that the Gospel of salvation, which he is pleased to term "individualistic" is not faithfully proclaimed by Ulster Nonconformists, and that the Church is more prominent in their teaching than the Gospel. Moreover is it possible that, while he was yet in his teens, he was so discriminating a theologian as to perceive this "difference"? However, we know now where we are, or rather where he is—he has not returned "*to that*" and his words justify the inference that he still entertains his "repugnance" to it. Then we may be more than ordinarily dense, but we wonder what he means by "the Church as the Church": does he mean "the Church as THE Church," or what? It is probably a question of emphasis. Where would he have us place it? Is there not a Central Churchmanship which embodies in its teaching all that is true in these two conceptions of which Mr. Campbell speaks? They are not mutually exclusive, as he appears to think. It isn't one side or the other, it is something of both sides. Surely he feels, despite what he has written, that God deals with human souls not in the bulk, so to speak, but as individuals, and that personal relationship to Christ is of the deepest importance? It seems terrible to think of this being "repugnant" to him. Surely, too, "the growing soul" depends upon the personal relationship to Christ and not merely upon membership

in the Church. What saith the Scriptures of the New Testament? But then we are well aware that on the question of sacramental grace that the school with which Mr. Campbell has allied himself goes far beyond the teaching of Central Churchmen. There again it is the question of the *via media*! Certain views are, we say, "poles asunder": Mr. Campbell seems to be so constituted mentally that he easily reaches the remote ends. He travels at lightning speed and does notice all he passes!

It is indeed the story of a strange career. Of Mr. Campbell's genuine piety and remarkable gifts there can be no doubt whatever, but it remains all the same a tale of alternations from one set of opinions to another—from Ulster Presbyterianism and English Nonconformity to Anglican Churchmanship. Then we find him—after the spiritual awakening of his early student days, identifying himself with Oxford Nonconformity and preaching in its Chapels until requested to desist by the authorities of "The House." After that we find him selecting a Father Confessor and in close association with the most extreme Churchmanship! Then in the end he once more turned back into dissent—he could not see his way to subscribe to the Prayer Book or, indeed, to any formulary—and the twenty years of his Brighton and London ministry began. As we know they have ended and at the age of forty-nine he is ordained! To be quite frank—we do not think that Mr. Campbell himself sees how strangely mixed his career has been and in how many fields he has ploughed! What does he expect persons, who have not moved about from one communion to another, to think of such an incident as his preaching on October 14, 1915, for Dr. J. D. Jones at Bourne-mouth (even though it was a long standing engagement) and motoring the next day to stay with Bishop Gore and to be "received once more as a Communicant of the Anglican Church?"

Mr. Campbell, as we might expect, tells very fully the whole story of the New Theology controversy and of his still earlier battle with the representatives of Labour. So far as the former is concerned, the exigencies of space prevent our going into the matter, but it is noticeable that he regrets the publication of his *New Theology*. He goes even further where he says, "I am perfectly willing to be judged by the wholeness of my pulpit utterances during the many years that I have been a preacher, *with the sole exception of this period of disputation and cross purposes.*" Perhaps never before has a writer so completely condemned his own work as Mr. Campbell has done. He says—"It was too hastily written, was crude and uncompromising in statement, polemical in spirit and gave a totally wrong impression of the quality of the sermons delivered week by week from the City Temple pulpit." He devotes twelve pages to Bishop Gore's reply to his book and it is certainly remarkable, as he observes, that it consists of lectures delivered from the very pulpit Mr. Campbell now occupies. They dealt with the opinions of Sir Oliver Lodge as well as with those of the minister of the City Temple, upon whom it evidently made a great impression, and he admits that it led him to face certain difficulties, with which the Bishop dealt, "with new earnestness."

Needless to say, those who still have any doubts as to Mr. Campbell's faith in the Divinity of our Lord can now bury them. He tells the story, too, of the Christ-Myth controversy and of how he eventually dissociated himself from those "who denied the historicity of Jesus," and he affirms his conviction that this school "need no longer be taken seriously."

A keen observer, he has given us his reflections upon an almost endless variety of subjects.

A prolific reader—he tells us, at considerable length, about the books that have powerfully influenced him, and they represent a bewildering

variety of subjects. Newman he read "with mingled delight and repulsion." Dean Inge's *Christian Mysticism* he fitly describes as "a truly delightful book." Fairbairn's *Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, "a remarkable compendium of profound learning without much that was illuminating in its whole bulk," though he speaks more kindly of other works by the same author. From Dale on *The Atonement* and from his *Living Christ and the Four Gospels* he confesses he "did not get much in the way of enlightenment." Dr. Marcus Dods and Professor A. B. Bruce were "a great inspiration" to him. J. R. Illingworth helped him "up to a point." He tells us with equal freedom and candour what he thought of Clement, Origen, Tertullian and Cyprian. From the day he commenced his ministry at Brighton he began, he acknowledges, "to submit to the influence" of German theologians. Now he marvels at his "docility under their bold assertions" and frankly acknowledges that he "believed them too readily." For this he holds Professor Cheyne mainly responsible, and he is probably right. He does not hesitate to say that German liberal Protestantism, Harnack's not excluded, "rationalizes everything." But does not all this reveal a certain "instability," a weakness which by the way he seems to regard as the peculiar inheritance of the Celt?

A careful student—he lets us into the secret of his method of study—a method which made Sir W. Robertson Nicholl "shudder"—an elaborate system of manuscript books in which he has been wont to make notes of everything he has read and record his impressions.

A man with a wide circle of friends—he has given us here and there in these pages graphic portraits of many of them, and in some cases he makes them appear very different from what we have often imagined. For instance, he describes Dr. John Clifford as "the most magnanimous little giant in the world" with nothing "small" in his make-up. Then again of Keir Hardie he says he "was greater as a prophet than he would ever have been as a statesman. But he was a great man all the same and I shall ever be glad to have known him." In another passage he speaks of him as "one of the most unselfish and high-minded men I ever met." For Dean (afterwards Bishop) Paget he had the greatest admiration and affection and he tells us that for years after he entered the Nonconformist ministry he continued to consult him when in perplexity. This friendship began in his student days at Christ Church.

Scattered through the book are many outline sketches of notable persons with whom Mr. Campbell has been in touch. To one of these we must refer at greater length. He made the acquaintance of Tyrrell who, he says, "did not attract him much." He expresses wonder "if he was ever truly a Roman Catholic at all," though elsewhere he has recorded Tyrrell's saying that if the Church of Rome were to die the other Churches might order their coffins, and it is strange to find that it was Tyrrell's *Christianity at the Cross Roads* that made it plain to him that the Christ he was preaching "was the Christ whom the sacramental system of the Catholic Church presented to mankind as liberal Protestantism neither did nor could." This was a determining factor in his secession. He came to the conclusion that "Either Jesus was what the Catholic Church said He was or He did not exist; either He was the man from heaven, a complete break with the natural order of things . . . or He was nothing."

So far so good. We feel it will be at least satisfactory to many people to know that to Mr. Campbell our Blessed Lord is "neither a mistaken visionary nor a pious fancy of later times." But is it not a little daring to assert that "Protestantism is afraid of the Supernatural" just because it is less credulous than certain types of Catholicism, Anglican and Roman?

Is it fair to even suggest that the great bulk of Protestants, Episcopalian and non-Episcopalian, hold those views which Mr. Campbell describes as "liberal." But in the passage we have quoted in which he says that Jesus was either "supernatural, super-rational, super-everything or He was nothing" he goes on to say that "this is scarcely the Christ of Protestantism at all, whether liberal or conservative." There, then, is the suggestion. But all the great leaders of English Nonconformity hold those views as to the Person of our Lord which the Catholic Church has ever held, as expressed in the Creeds of primitive and undivided Christendom. There is not enough in this discovery of Mr. Campbell's to drive him out of the ranks of Nonconformity and send him right across English Churchmanship to its farther side. But this is his present location (shall we say—for the present?)—he stands committed to the extreme Anglican position and for no good reason that we can discover, unless it be the fact that he has a perfect genius for going to extremes. It can hardly be pleasing to the majority of his "advanced" Anglican friends to find that he does not recognize the invalidity of his past ministry, and he is careful to explain that his reordination was "no slight upon Nonconformity in general" nor upon his own ministry in particular.

We shall watch his career with more than ordinary interest. A man whose published sermons reached an average circulation of sixty thousand weekly would be sure to make his influence felt in any community, and the English Church pulpit is not so strong that such a forceful person is likely to be lost sight of. In this connexion it is worth observing that Mr. Campbell admits that his weekly published output was too considerable and he has no intention of ever again attempting such an exacting task.

NO CHURCH: NO EMPIRE. By the Rev. J. J. R. Armitage. London: Robert Scott. 3s. 6d. net.

This is an interesting collection of addresses delivered to men in various churches in the Archdeaconry of Rochdale. They are arranged in three parts. The first six are headed—"Has Christianity Failed?" and they are manly, straight talks. The second set, entitled "The Case against Germany," will be read with interest, especially the addresses in which Mr. Armitage so forcibly sets forth the analogy between Prussianism and Socialism. He is able to point out in his preface that the views he expresses obtained confirmation (after the addresses were written) from the published reports of the interview, in May last, between the Kaiser and the leaders of the German Socialistic party. The closing section is entitled "Victory and After," and among other subjects the problems of drink, poverty and gambling are dealt with courageously.

In these days when it is fashionable to discredit the Reformation and decry the Reformers it is refreshing to come across a preacher bold enough to speak of that movement as a factor in the building up of our Empire. "England's supremacy," he says, "dates from and is essentially due to this. All movements which would undermine the work of the Reformation are dangerous to the liberty of the individual." In certain quarters capital is being made at the present time of the fact that Germany was the home of Luther and of Protestant thought. The desire is to make Protestantism appear responsible for all that we deplore in German character and conduct to-day. But Mr. Armitage reminds us on his very first page that Germany has been "for generations the centre of Jesuit intrigue and of materialistic Socialism." We welcome this volume, without qualification, and wish for it the wide circulation it deserves.