

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

June, 1917.

The Month.

A Critical Position. By general consent we have reached a critical phase of the war, and the prayers of God's people will continue to ascend day and night that He may grant us a speedy victory. But it is not of that, especially, that we are thinking just now. We have in our mind rather the extremely critical position in which the nation stands to-day concerning its moral and spiritual welfare. "Are we worthy of them?" asked a well-known clergyman after hearing afresh of the tremendous efforts of the men at the Front and of their willing self-sacrifice, and it certainly seems at times that if an honest answer were to be returned to such an inquiry it would have to be in the negative. The unrest in the Labour world; the widespread refusal to accept anything like equality of sacrifice; the continued growth—in spite of all restrictions—of the love of sensuous pleasures; the alarming neglect of the obligations of religion—manifesting itself in many ways and not least in the indifference to the claims of Sunday; and much else—all tending to show that the nation is not even yet alive to the gravity of the times through which we are passing. And, perhaps, one of the saddest features of all is that side by side with the neglect of true religion there is steadily growing up among us a hankering after that which is false. The revival of Spiritism—upon which Mr. Abbey Tindall contributes an able article elsewhere in our pages—is assuming large proportions, and there are other equally hurtful "isms" which are making their influence felt not only in London but in all parts of the country. It may be said that the readiness with which so many people accept false "religions" is, at least, an evidence of a desire on their part to discover some remedy for, or alleviation of, the anxieties and troubles

which so heavily beset them, and that so far it is a sign of greater seriousness of purpose. We cannot, ourselves, altogether accept that view. That there is a spirit of religious unrest, a desire to find some "unknown God," among many who are touched by the sorrows of the war, we readily admit, but remembering we are a Christian country, and that there are Christian churches and chapels within the reach of all, it is most lamentable that so many should be ready to listen to the voice of the first charlatan who happens to come along. Is there any adequate explanation of it? No doubt that old enemy of mankind, the devil, is putting forth all his powers to capture all who will yield to him, but the Son of God was manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil, and we venture humbly to express the opinion that the reason why there is so little "destruction" of Satan's works at the present day is due to the lukewarmness of those who pledged themselves that they would be the Son of God's faithful soldiers and servants until their lives' end. In other words the Church is failing in its warfare.

**Wanted
a Leader.**

When the comparative apathy of the Church in face of the nation's great need is considered, the question sometimes comes almost unbidden to the mind, Has the Church any message at all to offer to the nation? We know, of course, that it has; we know that it is put in trust with the Gospel which is sufficient for every need; we know, too, that it has illimitable reserves of power at its disposal. Why then is the Church so weak? Why is it that the Church has so little religious influence upon the life of the nation? There are many answers to these questions, but the supreme answer, and one that covers all others, is, we believe, that the Church is such a very poor "trustee" of the Gospel—that it does not proclaim it on the housetops and in too many instances has ceased to proclaim it in the churches, and that it does not seek with any degree of real earnestness that endowment of spiritual power which alone can enable it to overcome the powers of evil. The great need of the time is a spiritual leader, some man with a heaven-given message that shall compel attention and stir all hearts. At different stages of the world's history God has raised up such a man, and it may be that He will yet again call out one of His servants to lead His people and to give deliverance to the nation. Such a man has been found for the Government

of the day ; why may we not look for an equally powerful leader in the spiritual sphere ? Is it not permissible to hope and believe that such a leader would be given if the Church were sufficiently earnest in prayer that one might be sent ? Let it not be forgotten that " when the children of Israel cried unto the Lord, the Lord raised up a Deliverer who delivered them " (Judges iii. 9), and when there is the same earnest cry in our own day there will assuredly be the same answer. Meanwhile it is for the Church to see to it that it is at least faithful to its sacred trust and to give itself wholly to the work to which it is called.

It cannot be said that the Church is so comporting itself in the present crisis as to impress the world that
Convocation Again. it has a message to mankind. What the secular side of society thinks of the Church has lately been seen in the comments in the daily press on the recent proceedings of the Convocation of Canterbury. It was pointed out that the nation is engaged in the deadliest war in history, and yet this august body, representative of the clergy of the Church of England, devoted much of its time at the recent session to questions connected with Prayer Book Revision, including the restoration of the name of Charles the First to the Calendar. The criticisms of the press were severe, and no wonder, for the fact that such a body could devote its energies to such objects at such a time as this fills one with despair. The Convocation of York wisely suspended its session ; and the Convocation of Canterbury should have done the same if it had no better contribution to make to the solution of the problems of the time. But this is an old subject and we must not pursue it. Yet it is enough to make angels weep when they look down and see how Convocation misuses its great opportunities. Have its members never heard of the injunction about " redeeming the time " ?

The *Official Year-book of the Church of England*
Church Statistics. for the year ending Easter, 1916, has been published by the S.P.C.K. (2s. 6d. net), and its various summaries of work and finance are instructive. Moreover, it is the first year-book which covers an entire twelve months of war. This fact should be borne in mind when attempting any comparison of the figures with those of previous years. The voluntary offerings

amounted to £7,060,911. Only eight months of the previous year were war months, but it is very noticeable that the voluntary offerings showed immediate contraction. Thus in the year ending Easter, 1915, there was a reduction of £676,084 as compared with Easter, 1914, and in the following year a further reduction of £470,317. In other words, the diminution for the two years ending Easter, 1916, was £1,146,400, as compared with Easter, 1914. This, though regrettable, is of course perfectly explainable. For one thing, Church building and restoration has practically stopped for the present, and this accounts for some of the falling off in voluntary contributions. But, no doubt, the chief cause is the absence of so many Churchmen with the Army abroad, or away from their parishes at home, on military or other duties arising out of the war; coupled with the heavy demands of the State upon the resources of the taxpayer. Then in regard, also, to the statistics of Church work, it was hardly to be expected that they would show advance having regard to the conditions of the time, with many thousands of men out of the country, and men and women at home almost continuously engaged on war work. Moreover, the number of clergy making returns is slightly fewer than last year, which would have an adverse effect upon the general totals. The figures relate to the year 1915-16 and are as follows:—The Easter Communicants were 2,337,612, compared with 2,359,599 in the preceding year; Sunday schools had on the books 2,388,205, against 2,481,999; and Bible classes had 219,014 males and 280,716 females, compared with 277,102 and 304,336 respectively. Confirmation candidates reached a total of 224,756, compared with 225,575 in 1915. The male candidates in 1916 were 95,440, an increase compared with 1915, when they were 93,772; and the female candidates numbered 129,316, a decrease compared with 1915, when they were 131,803. It is not easy to draw any useful inference from these figures for the reason we have stated. It would seem, however, that the Church is holding its own. But when will the advance be made?

“The Peremptory Alternative.” The *English Church Review* accuses us of “unfairness” because, in a paragraph on “The Rebellious Thousand” (CHURCHMAN, p. 195), we said that “if . . . a member of the Church of England desires to have access to the Reserved Sacrament for devotional purposes, he comes at once into

conflict with the Church's rule, and he must either abandon his idea or join the Church of Rome, the only body in all Christendom where such devotions are allowed." We cannot see what there is which is "unfair" in this suggestion. The practice is unlawful in the Church of England, and it does not seem to us to be "unfair," but merely common sense, to suggest that men and women should abide by the laws of the Church to which they belong and that if they cannot do so they should find a spiritual home elsewhere. They may, of course, try to get the law altered, but until it is changed they are bound to obey. But let the *English Church Review* speak for itself—

Is it really accurate to talk in this way of overstepping well-defined bounds, of ceasing to be legitimate, and of coming in conflict with the Church's rule, when writing of a practice on which the Province of Canterbury, not the Church of England, but only a part of it, has come to a decision: a decision which the Bishops of London and Birmingham have refused to share or take any responsibility in? Would anybody, reading the peremptory alternative, "he must either abandon his idea or join the Church of Rome," imagine that the practice in question was being allowed in the greatest diocese of the Church of England: that of the capital of the whole empire?

If this dilemma applies to any one it must apply to the Bishop of London more than to any one else. Does anybody seriously wish to make that application?

We are not in the least disturbed by the challenge presented to us by the case of the Bishop of London. We should be sorry to believe that he himself desires access to the Reserved Sacrament for devotional purposes. His only share in the business is that, with his large-hearted generosity, he is prepared to allow the practice in his diocese. But then there are very few things that the Bishop of London will not allow to a man whom he believes to be in "earnest." We believe him to be wrong: no Church can be successfully worked on the "go-as-you-please" principle.

•• We are glad of the opportunity of announcing that next month Dr. Griffith Thomas will begin a short series of papers in *THE CHURCHMAN* on "The Wondrous Cross."



Neo-Spiritism.

“**A** FATHER afflicted with untimely mourning, when he hath made an image of his child soon taken away, now honoured him as a god, which was then a dead man.”¹ These words of an ancient writer are thoroughly up-to-date. The loss of life in the great war reaches a figure which we do not care to contemplate. The land is full of sorrow and mourning. Sympathy hesitates to rob the bereaved of a single source of consolation; charity gladly passes in silence much that in happier times would excite immediate dissension. But Christian teachers cannot allow without remonstrance ideas to obtain currency which reverse the doctrines revealed to mankind by the Saviour of the world. Spiritism is the earliest form of belief which ethnology presents to us. A lurking spirit was alleged in each individual form of organic life, whether tree, animal, or man. This spirit was removable from the object in which it usually dwelt, and at death became finally separate. The worship of departed relatives was a speedy addition, widespread amongst all peoples. Purified from many evil associations, civilized from many abhorrent crudities, and accommodated to much which scientific discovery has established beyond a doubt, modern teachings of intercourse with the dead possess the essential characteristics of these primitive notions, and may well be described under the name of Neo-Spiritism.

The publication of *Raymond*² is a distinct challenge to Christianity. We cannot refuse the combat to which we are bidden. The book is the most recent of those dealing with this subject from one point of view. Its large circulation³ increases the peril. But our criticisms will, as far as possible, avoid reference to the family affairs of the author, and our attention be confined to the broad principles which give substance to the new creed.

I.

The possibility of communicating with the dead is a question of fact, which must be tested by the laws of evidence. At first

¹ Wisdom of Solomon, xiv. 15.

² *Raymond, or Life and Death*, Sir Oliver Lodge. Methuen & Co.

³ Six editions within two months.

discussion turns upon the opportunities of self-deception. Has every pains been taken to eliminate the element of collusion, which is not necessarily intentional, but may unconsciously arise from lapse of memory, oversight, or leading questions? The circumstances of "sittings" or "table-tiltings" are widely open to suspicion. If A must request B to arrange a sitting for him in the house of C with a medium E under the control of F, in order that he may converse with G, there are several persons whose good faith must be investigated. The living are bound together by common interests. Even if some are strangers to one another, more may be tacitly conveyed by intervening parties than the mind is quite aware of. Before a second or subsequent sitting the medium may indirectly have ascertained much. With so many involved, the evidential force of the revelations is necessarily weakened. Similarly, with four or more persons seated at a tilting table in the presence of a medium and a recorder, the precautions required to give validity to the test are more than can be readily made. When the medium is in a trance or the table tilted by the muscles of those by it, there are no means of deciding how far the will of one or others of the persons participant is acting independently of the alleged control from the spirit-sphere. As a system, the whole method is utterly void of convincing power. Inquiry can only turn upon the issue whether the revelations imparted are of a character to corroborate the claims that are made. Has anything of real worth resulted?

The Delphic nature of the oracle impresses itself upon the student. Stress is laid upon the "Faunus" message. Word was sent from Myers to Sir Oliver Lodge through a Mrs. Piper in New Hampshire—"Myers says you take the part of the poet and he will act as Faunus." The solution of this singularly uncommunicative information depends upon acquaintance with certain lines in the Odes of Horace which in themselves are not free from ambiguity, and which are not unlikely to have been studied by those who deal with the occult. The aid of Faunus saved Horace from death by a falling tree. If a falling tree had figured in the foretold disaster, the burden of disproof would have been shifted on to the impugners of the veracity of this new science. But if the impending trouble is undefined, the terms are uncertain in significance and the prediction sure. "Man is born unto trouble as the sparks fly

upward.”¹ Any petty worry would equally have fulfilled the prophecy with the death in action of Sir Oliver’s son. Myers’ part in mitigating the severity of the blow is unrecognizable and unproven.

This cryptic character conspicuously reappears in an incident which is narrated as “a peculiarly good piece of evidence,” for “this episode of the photograph is a good and evidential one.” Two “sittings” are involved. In the first the medium was palpably in error, declaring “before he went away you had a good portrait of him—two—no, three.” Whether there were two or more is uncertain, but the third alluded to was not at the time in the possession of the family, nor was it seen by them till more than two months after this interview. After a lapse of sixty-seven days Sir Oliver, having received information about a group photograph of which he had now heard, solicited from a different medium a fuller description. A leading question opened the dialogue, “He said something about having a photograph taken with some other men.” Other conversation followed before the medium reported that “he thinks there were several others taken with him, not one or two, but several.” How indefinite! or, how perverse the memory! There were twenty-one of them. Replies were also very evasive. “Were they friends of yours?” “Some of them, he says. He didn’t know them all, not very well. But he knew some; he heard of some; they were not all friends.” “Was he standing up?” “No, he doesn’t seem to think so.” “Were they soldiers?” “He says yes—a mixed lot.” These non-committal answers are indubitably accurate, for they would fit any conceivable circumstances. Another leading question, “Did he have a stick?” “He doesn’t remember that.” The first medium had reported, “He is particular I should tell you of this. In one you see his walking-stick.” So the memory is again defective. The mention of this stick is regarded as evidentially most important. Is it unusual for an officer to carry a walking-stick? Thirteen are visible in the photograph, others may be concealed by the grouping. The photograph was taken ten days before Raymond’s death. Proofs were seen at once, although final prints were not made until a later date when the negatives had reached London. Twenty-two persons at least were present when it was taken. Who can trace all the conversa-

¹ Job v. 7.

tions or letters about it? How can it be quite certain that neither medium was aware of its existence?

The "Honolulu" incident appears to us the most forcible. Simultaneous sittings were being held at Mariemont and in London. At the former it was agreed to ask Raymond to mention at the other the word "Honolulu." This was done. Putting on one side all possibility of contrivance, and declining explanations of telepathy or the association of ideas, the testimony yet fails in demonstrative ability. As accomplished by other than merely human or natural agency the result is miraculous. But a miracle does not prove a theory.

In a familiar paragraph of *Literature and Dogma* Matthew Arnold wrote: "That miracles, when fully believed, are felt by men in general to be a source of authority, it is absurd to deny. One may say, indeed: Suppose I could change the pen with which I write this into a pen-wiper, I should not thus make what I write any the truer or more convincing. That may be so in reality, but the mass of mankind feel differently. In the judgment of the mass of mankind, could I visibly and undeniably change the pen with which I write this into a pen-wiper, not only would this which I write acquire a claim to be held perfectly true and convincing, but I should even be entitled to affirm, and to be believed in affirming, propositions the most palpably at war with common fact and experience."¹ As an argument against the Christian miracles this was very ingenuous. Yet these are not used to prove the revelation, but rather the reverse is the case. The miracles are so inwrought as an integral part with the revelation, that without them the revelation would be incomplete and bereft of much of its self-convincing power. The truth of the doctrine rests on its own inherent qualities of beauty, appropriateness and value, and is confirmed by the exterior effects of its acceptance and application in the heart and life of man. The miracles display the content of the revelation. In this "Honolulu" occurrence the intimate connexion of miracle and revelation is not discernible. The alleged facts would equally serve the purpose of any counter-theory which the mind of man might conceive as the ground of their performance.

It should be added that the records of communications received

¹ P. 128. Cf. A. B. Bruce, *Chief End of Revelation*, p. 171.

are not seldom fragmentary, discursive and erroneous. The conversations are frequently abrupt owing either to rapidity of utterance preventing note-taking or to confused sounds which became unintelligible. On the whole to a logical mind the evidence is worthless. The matter might at once be dismissed as an idle fantasy, were it not for the extreme danger to the soul's life with which it is fraught.

II.

“The Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils.”¹ The emphatic teaching of the Holy Spirit demands careful attention. The phrase “in the latter times” (ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς) must not be severely pressed, for elsewhere² the Apostle speaks of “the last days” (ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις). The words “doctrines of devils” (διδασκαλίας δαιμονίων) must be examined. Alford comments: “Doctrines taught by, suggested by evil spirits: gen. subjective.” As a grammatical interpretation this is undoubtedly correct, but perhaps the association of “evil” is not necessarily implied. And who are the spirits?

Josephus, a younger contemporary of St. Paul, indicates that the word “demons” was employed in his time to denote the spirits of deceased men. “What man of virtue is there who does not know, that those souls which are severed from their fleshly bodies in battles by the sword are received by the ether, and . . . become good demons and propitious heroes, and show themselves to their posterity afterwards.”³ And again: “Those called demons, which are no other than the spirits of the wicked, that enter into men that are alive and kill them, unless they can obtain some help against them.”⁴ Thus demons may be either good or bad; but they are the spirits of dead men.

In the second century this meaning was accepted by philosophers. Augustine quotes the opinion of Appuleius: “He says that the souls of men are demons, and that men become *Lares* if they are good, *Lemures* or *Larvæ* if they are bad, and *Manes* if it is uncertain whether they deserve well or ill . . . the *Larvæ* are hurtful demons made out of wicked men . . . the blessed are called in Greek ἐν-

¹ 1 Tim. iv. 1.

² 2 Tim. iii. 1.

³ *Wars of the Jews*, vi. 1, 5 (Whiston's translation).

⁴ *Wars*, vii. vi. 3.

δαίμονες, because they are good souls, that is to say good demons, confirming his opinion that the souls of men are demons." ¹

The worship of the genii of the Emperors gave throughout the Roman world an impetus to the cultus of the dead. The word "demon" appears to have lost its connexion with the deities or semi-deities of Greece, and to have received a definitely human reference of morally neutral character. Allusions in this sense are not infrequent in the early fathers of the Church. In the spurious epistle of Ignatius to the Smyznæans we read: "For I know that after his resurrection also He was still possessed of flesh, and I believe that He is so now. When, for instance, He came to those who were with Peter, He said to them, 'Lay hold, handle Me, and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit' (f.n., literally 'demon')." ² Tertullian remarks that "offerings to propitiate the dead . . . are idolatry: idolatry in fact is a sort of homage to the departed; the one as well as the other is a service to dead men. Moreover, demons have abode in the images of the dead"; ³ and "we decline to swear by the genii of the Caesars . . . are you ignorant that these genii are called 'Demonēs,' and thence the diminutive 'Daimonia' is applied to them." ⁴ In later times, as the custom of worship increased, the demons held an intermediate position between the gods and men. The word reverted to its older sense as the beings became invested with quasi-divine or satanic honours and the human origin was forgotten.

This interpretation adds force to the LXX translation of Psalm xcvi. 5, "All the gods of the nations are idols (*δαίμόνια*), but the Lord made the heavens," and gives cogency to the parallelism of Psalm cvi. 28, "They joined themselves also unto Baal-Peor, and ate the sacrifices of the dead," especially when read together with verse 37, "They sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils (*δαίμονιους*)." In Deuteronomy xxxii. 17, the Greek word in this sense seems very suitable, "They sacrificed unto devils (*δαίμονιους*), not to God; to gods whom they knew (*ἤδεισαν*) not, to new gods that came newly up, whom your fathers feared (*ἤδεισαν*) not."

In the New Testament St. Luke, the intimate friend and fellow-traveller with St. Paul, supplies unmistakable evidence to this

¹ *Civitas Dei*, ix. 11 (Clark's translation).

² *Apostolic Fathers* (Clark's translation), p. 242.

³ Tertullian, vol. i (Clark's translation), p. 21.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 111.

use of the word. The Athenians were, according to St. Paul, if reported verbatim, "too superstitious" (*δεισι-δαιμον-εστέρους*),¹ even as the Corinthians, whom the Apostle visited immediately after leaving Athens, also "sacrificed to devils" (*δαιμονίους*).² The word was taken from the philosophers, to whom St. Paul "seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods (*ξένων δαιμονίων*), because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection."³ Festus in like manner said, "Of their own superstition (*δεισι-δαιμονίας*), and of one Jesus which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive."⁴

The interest of St. Paul's declaration to Timothy is not only that of a precise prophecy clearly fulfilled, but it provides the searching test whereby we may decide the relation of Neo-Spiritism to Christian doctrine. Do the revelations and teachings of the dead lead towards, or repel from, Christ, Who is our only hope of immortality?

III.

Neo-Spiritism is grossly materialistic in tone. The departed spirits live in brick houses, wear clothes, smoke cigars, drink whisky and soda. In their laboratories all sorts of things are manufactured. They suffer pain and soon get tired. The occupations of the former life occupy their minds. The old pets—horses, dogs, cats, or birds—rejoin them after death. Flowers reappear on the scene. The reconstruction of the body is hindered by cremation or the loss of a limb. Such conceptions are of purely earthly origin. No truth is revealed, previously unimaginable. The prejudices of the adherents are manifest in the scheme. The details are repugnant to most educated people. In contrast with the Christian doctrines there is miserable failure to grapple with human need.

Neo-Spiritism ignores sin. The perpetuation of our weaknesses, with a faint-hearted endeavour to outgrow them, is its contribution to this subject. The ill effects of Babel linger where each spirit continues to use his former language. The life beyond the grave is still disfigured by its petty tiffs and quarrels. Raymond has "heard of drunkards who want it [strong drink] for months and

¹ Acts xvii. 22.

² I Cor. x. 20, 21. The only passage other than I Tim. iv. 1 in which St. Paul uses the word.

³ Acts xvii. 18.

⁴ Acts xxv. 19.

years over here." The Christian hope of a better life is only provided after an endless series of evolutionary processes. The instincts of the heart repudiate such pessimism.

Neo-Spiritism denies the atonement of Christ. The only remedy for iniquity is in its slow decay. What should then prevent a further outburst does not appear. "Spirit-doctors" have their daily rounds to minister to the prevalent sufferings, which, as represented, are more physical than spiritual in nature. The Saviour is not so much as mentioned in His redeeming power. The Cross of Christ is a stumbling-block. The ordinary desires of unregenerate man to avoid the narrow ways of God are discernible.

Neo-Spiritism offers no consolation to those who mourn the lost. They live on in a continued existence of toil, trouble and difficulty. Annihilation would be preferable. Is such a life all that Christ offered to the penitent thief? Is this what St. Paul craved in his intense desire to depart and be with Christ? In truth, Christ seems to have removed farther away. For three months Raymond had not seen Him. There was no need. "All the sad ones see Him, if no one else can help them." "I am not expecting to see Him yet." Thus are we deprived of our consolation that our friends "sleep in Jesus" and that in the last day they shall rise first to meet Him.¹

Neo-Spiritism has no room for prayer or the worship of God. The question may fairly be raised whether it attains to the level of Deism. Remorseless and inexorable law, governed by no personal will, controls all events and all developments. The vague allusions to the power of prayer are meaningless. "Prayer helps when things are not relevant." "There is a lot in prayer. Prayer keeps out evil things, and keeps nice clean conditions." But such assertions ill fit the general system, and nothing can be made of them. Bias against ecclesiasticism yields support both to prayers for the dead and prayers to the dead. These incidental allusions are worthless for lack of guidance. As a concession to popular opinion prayer is permitted: in reality its value is nil.

Neo-Spiritism repudiates the Scriptural doctrines of resurrection and judgment. "All the decay that goes on on the earth plane is not lost. It doesn't just form manure or dust. Certain vegetable and decayed tissue does form manure for a time, but it

¹ 1 Thess. iv. 14-16.

gives off an essence or a gas, which ascends, and which becomes what you call a 'smell.' Everything dead has a smell, if you notice; and I know now that the smell is of actual use, because it is from that smell that we are able to produce duplicates of whatever form it had before it became a smell . . . rotting wool appears to be used for making things like tweeds on our side. . . . My suit I expect was made from decayed worsted on your side." The solemn and the ridiculous intermingle. How different it all is to the triumphant utterance of St. Paul, "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him," "We shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump,"¹ "Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father."² Of judgment hereafter there is no trace in this modern anti-Christian creed.

Neo-Spiritism is void of inspiration to assist in the battles of the present life. Certain members of the Corinthian Church had "hope in Christ" for "this life only." Their condition is described as "most pitiable."³ But Neo-Spiritism is more deplorable, for it destroys our "hope in Christ" here. When the grave is emptied of all significance, when life just goes on without any vital interruption, insistence upon the new birth or regeneration becomes a mockery.

The claims of those who profess to have had intercourse with the dead are without charm or potency to all such as have "learned Christ; if so be that ye have heard Him, and have been taught by Him, as the truth is in Jesus."⁴

E. ABBEY TINDALL.

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 38-51. ² Rom. vi. 4. ³ 1 Cor. xv. 19, R.V. ⁴ Eph. iv. 20, 21.



St. Matthew and the First Gospel.

II.

[We much regret to state that since these papers on St. Matthew and the First Gospel were written, the writer, the Rev. Arthur Carr, has passed away. His death is a great loss to Biblical Scholarship.]

WE now come to a very important and much disputed point in the history of the transmission of the Gospels, namely, the earliest actual evidence of a written gospel. That evidence is found in the well-known passage of Eusebius, *H.E.*, iii. 39. Eusebius then quotes the words of Papias. As Papias is known to have conversed with those who had seen the Lord, or at least with those who had known Apostles, his testimony is very important. He says: "So then Matthew composed the discourses or oracles or sayings (*δὰ λόγια*) in Hebrew, and every one interpreted them as he could." Much and often as these words have been discussed, their meaning is still uncertain. Papias, whose date may be stated approximately as A.D. 120, is writing in Greek to Christians, whose language was Greek, and who had presumably a Greek Gospel or Gospels in their hands. As there is evidence of quotation from St. Matthew's Gospel by Clement of Rome (c. A.D. 95) it is allowable to say that they were acquainted with that Gospel in Greek, and that they knew nothing of the Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew. Papias then informs his readers that originally Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew: the definite article before *λόγια* confirms this view. He says in effect, the well-known Gospel which you have in Greek was originally written in Hebrew (i.e. in Aramaic). He then adds words which have been variously explained. "Every one interpreted them as he could." Why does Papias say that? He says it to explain the various Greek versions all purporting to be derived from St. Matthew's Hebrew or Aramaic Gospel, some of which would be faithful interpretations, others indifferent and faulty owing to the interpreter's ignorance of Hebrew or Aramaic. Still, it must be remembered that these versions would exist in large numbers, and would supply sources for other Gospels in addition to the notes and reminiscences of the Apostolic teaching (*διδασχί*) referred to in Acts ii. 42. Further evidence as to the existence of a "Hebrew" Gospel of St. Matthew is given by Irenaeus

(III, i. 1) in the second century,¹ who says: "Matthew published his Gospel writing among the Hebrews in their own language, while Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel at Rome, and founding the Church. After their departure (*ἔξοδον*) Mark, the disciple and interpreter of St. Peter, having committed to writing the things proclaimed by Peter, transmitted them to us."²

It is of course possible that what Papias means by "the Oracles" is a collection of Our Lord's discourses with only so much narrative introduced as was necessary to explain the occasion of delivery. On the other hand, Papias applies the same word to the Gospel of St. Mark, and he uses the expression "oracles of the Lord" (*τὰ λόγια του κυρίου*) in the title of his own work, which we know to have contained facts as well as discourses.

Possibly the imperfection of the Greek versions may have been among the causes which induced St. Matthew to put forth his own version of the Gospel in Greek.

Apart from this, however, it is quite certain that a demand would arise among Greek-speaking converts to Christianity for a gospel in their own language, carrying with it the authority of an Apostle and witness of Jesus Christ. And here it is necessary to observe that such a gospel need not have been a translation.³ St. Matthew, as noted above, like many of his fellow-countrymen at that epoch, may well have been able to converse and write with equal facility in Greek and Aramaic.

Partly owing to the complete alienation of Church and Synagogue which seems to have taken effect after A.D. 135, the Greek language came to be at that time a special instrument for the transmission of Christian truth and ministry.⁴

At a very early age the four Canonical Gospels in Greek held the distinctive position which they have occupied ever since, and from the first the authenticity and canonical order of each has been practically undisputed until modern times.

Irenaeus gives the order as we have it: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John. Clement of Alexandria, c. 200 A.D., says: "The two Gospels

¹ See also Eusebius, *H.E.*, vi. 25; III, xxiv. 6; V, x. 3.

² This is inconsistent with the very early date assigned to Mark by Archdeacon Allen, viz., A.D. 45.

³ One of the arguments against the authenticity of St. Matthew's Gospel being that it bears no mark of being translated.

⁴ *Expositor*, July, 1916, p. 13.

which contain the genealogies were written before the others." The origin of the second Gospel is described as follows: "Peter having preached the word at Rome . . . his hearers prayed Mark, who remembered the things spoken by him to put them in writing, and after he had composed the gospel to deliver it to those who had asked it of him."

In the *Didachè* (c. 100 A.D.) St. Matthew and St. Luke alone are quoted, and not St. Mark. In the Ignatian letters again St. Matthew, St. Luke and St. John are quoted, not St. Mark.

Origen also (Eus., *H.E.* vi. 25) gives the priority to the Gospel according to St. Matthew with great definiteness. St. Mark he ranks second in order of time, composed under the guidance of St. Peter. This testimony is the more striking, as it would be natural to ascribe the priority to a gospel which carried with it the authority of the Chief of the Apostles. It may also be noted here that scholars like Clement of Alexandria and Origen had before them the same facts of likeness and difference in the first and second Gospels, but no doubt appears to have risen in regard to the priority of St. Matthew.

It is not to be supposed that during that long period the Canonical books as we now have them were unchallenged; the authorship, for instance, of the Hebrews, of the Revelation, of 2 Peter and of the Pastoral Epistles was in turn subjected to keen criticism and their claim to canonicals disputed. No such doubts were raised in regard to the authenticity of St. Matthew. It is cited or referred to by Clement of Rome, c. 95 A.D.; in the *Didachè*, probably c. 100 A.D.; by Ignatius, c. 107-115 A.D.; by Polycarp, c. 110 A.D.; by Papias, c. 120 A.D.; by Basilides, c. 125 A.D., the first to apply the term *εὐαγγέλιον* to the Gospels; by Justin Martyr, c. 140 A.D., and Tatian, his pupil, who composed a harmony of the four Canonical Gospels, the *Diatessaron*, c. 170 A.D.

It is a striking literary fact that this position remains uncontested until the eighteenth century. Towards the end of that century Lessing, Eichhorn and Griesbach asserted the interdependence of the Synoptic Gospels. About the same date Storr and Herder maintained the priority of St. Mark. In the nineteenth century Wilke, Bauer and Volkmar followed on the same lines, while Gieseler contended for an original Oral Gospel.

The following quotations from recent editors of St. Matthew's Gospel and writers on the synoptic problem will show the position

now generally held. ¹ Dr. Stanton writes ; “ Our first and third Evangelists each had both the Marcan outline and the additional matter, or a considerable portion of it, lying before him in a written form, when he set about combining them so that he could frame a plan how best to introduce the latter into the former and could systematically carry out his plan.” And again : “ The Evangelist has skilfully combined the matter taken by him from the two documents which have just been mentioned.” Dr. Armitage Robinson adopts nearly the same view. “ It may be taken for certain,” he writes,² “ that the writer of the first Gospel used St. Mark.” The concession is made, however, that the non-Marcan portion of the first Gospel may possibly be assigned to St. Matthew.

Dr. Plummer, in his edition of the Gospel, writes : “ The answer to the question—Who was the author of the first Gospel ? is a negative one. It was not St. Matthew ” ; (p. x) again : “ Assuming that the first Gospel was written in Hebrew by St. Matthew, the Greek Gospel must be a translation from the Hebrew original ” ; and (p. xi) : “ The writer of our first Gospel used St. Mark in nearly the same form as that in which it has come down to us.”

Archdeacon Allen, with even greater confidence, speaks of the proved priority of the second Gospel to the other two synoptic Gospels as “ the one solid result of literary criticism.” (Introduction, p. vii.)

And Dr. Macneile, speaking of the date, writes : “ a *terminus a quo* is afforded by the fact that our Evangelist (i.e. St. Matthew) used the second Gospel practically in its present form, the latter must probably be placed before [the fall of Jerusalem, A.D. 70.” The author was certainly not St. Matthew the Apostle—and why ? “ An eye-witness would not have been content to base his work on that of a secondary authority.”

Here it may be noted that the priority of St. Mark is taken for proved without need of further argument, and on that very disputable conclusion, the authenticity of the first Gospel is denied.

On the other hand, the priority and authenticity of St. Matthew's Gospel are maintained in recent times by theologians of no less repute, such as ³ Westcott, ⁴ Hort, Lightfoot and Zahn. And

¹ Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Part II, 24 and 323.

² *The Study of the Gospels*, p. 17.

³ *Canon of the New Testament*, 69 foll.

⁴ *Ecclesia*.

⁵ *On Supernatural Religion*.

in favour of the conservative position is the ancient and continuous tradition, as cited above. It should be remembered that the assertion of the priority of the second Gospel and its use in a written form by the authors of the first and third Gospels involves, or is thought to involve, a denial of the authenticity of the Gospel according to St. Matthew: in other words, the first Gospel can no longer be regarded as direct Apostolic evidence of the words and acts of Jesus Christ.

The synoptic problem is not, therefore, one of literary or academic importance only, it is one of supreme spiritual interest. It makes an enormous difference in regard to the foundations of our faith whether we are to believe that the Gospels—the “word” or *λόγος* spoken of by Jesus in His high priestly prayer—were written by those whom He was then addressing or not. It is indeed *prima facie* most improbable that no one of the Apostles should have been the author of a Gospel. Still more improbable is it that during St. Matthew’s lifetime any one should have put forth a Gospel under his name, or that doing so a “compiler” should “edit” the Apostolic tradition even to the extent of changing Our Lord’s words to suit the circumstances of Church life in the second century. In any case it is no unreasonable claim that the problem should be restated and re-examined.

The modern critical position which now generally holds the field as indicated above is that the first Gospel is the work of an anonymous “compiler” possibly as early as 50 A.D., possibly living in the second century, who composed his work partly from material supplied by St. Mark, partly from an unknown source known for the sake of convenience as “Q” or “Quellen.”

The arguments in support of this hypothesis are mainly:—
 (1) The fact that the whole or nearly the whole of St. Mark’s Gospel is incorporated in St. Matthew’s Gospel. (2) That the same sequence of events is followed in these two Gospels. (3) That references are made which imply a comparatively late phase of Church life and organization.

This is only partially true.¹ “Nothing,” says Mr. James in his recent *Harmony of the Gospels*, “can be more mistaken than the common notion that St. Mark’s Gospel is a mere epitome of St. Matthew’s. On the contrary, in several of the parallelisms St.

Mark's Gospel far exceeds (in length) that of the other Synoptics." Professor J. H. White quotes eleven instances where this is the case,¹ in five of which St. Mark's record contains twice as many words as St. Matthew's. Commentators naturally find it difficult to account for this condensation. Archdeacon Allen writes²: "The writer of the first Gospel represents the tradition of the Church at a later stage of development than does the second. And it is quite clear that as the years passed there was a tendency to modify the tradition with regard to the Lord's sayings and actions. The later writer omits clauses, which seems to attribute failure or lack of power to Christ." A statement of that kind leaves the reader of the Gospel in a condition of absolute ignorance as to what Our Lord said or did not say. And after all it is a pure conjecture thrown out to avoid a supposed difficulty.

In pursuance of his theory Archdeacon Allen accounts for alterations and compression in St. Matthew's Gospel by "an increasing feeling of reverence for the person of Christ" resulting in the omission of words and phrases which attribute human emotion to Christ or describe Him as asking questions. Among other instances cited are, "looked round about on them with anger" (Mark iii. 3), "moved with compassion" (i. 41), "marvelled" (vi. 6), "looking upon him, loved him" (x. 21). These and similar causes for omission hardly need refutation. Of the last Dr. J. H. White writes: "It is really hard to take this instance seriously. St. Matthew is said to have excised these words from dogmatic motives, because he thought it unworthy of Our Lord to love the young man!"³

It must also be remembered that whatever date is assigned to St. Mark's Gospel it was written at a time when the Christology of St. Peter, St. John and St. Paul was recognized in the Church, and that if St. Mark's narrative had been felt to be inconsistent with that Christology, it would not have been received in the Church or sanctioned by St. Peter. There could, therefore, have been no need for St. Matthew to modify the language of St. Mark if, as assumed, he had that Gospel before him.

ARTHUR CARR.

(To be concluded.)

¹ In an article in *The Church Quarterly*, July, 1916, p. 307.

² Commenting on St. Matthew in a more recent book Archdeacon Allen gives a much earlier date to the Gospel.

³ *Church Quarterly Review*, July, 1915, p. 312.

The Lord's Supper as Presented in Scripture.

A LAYMAN'S VIEW.

I. THE LORD'S SUPPER AS INSTITUTED.

THE whole presentation of the Lord's Supper in Scripture is contained in twenty-six verses, and is made on three occasions.¹ The story of its institution is told in each of the synoptic Gospels in two or at most three verses; and its communion and purport are spoken of by St. Paul in his first Epistle to the Corinthians.

This is a remarkable testimony to the unique character of the Word of God, if we consider that when these records were written it was not only customary to give the most minute directions with regard to every ordinance, but under the Pharisaic rule was absolutely obligatory. We perceive by what a gulf the inspired records are separated from the writings of the time; and to my mind no theory except that of verbal inspiration² can possibly account for the unique literary character of the Gospels, quite apart from their subject matter.

The immediate purpose of the Lord's Supper is remembrance of the absent Lord in His atoning sacrifice; from this flows the communion of saints with the Lord and with one another; and, lastly, the Supper is also most undoubtedly a spiritual meal. To these three points St. Paul adds the fact that it constitutes a public witness of the Lord's death until His return. In this Supper we remember and we feed upon our crucified Saviour in the presence of, and in communion with, our living glorified Lord: Christ Himself fills the scene at the Supper as at no other time. At other church services, meetings, lectures, etc., man is seen and heard; but at the Supper, the heart is brought into contact with Him who wholly possesses it. We realize at this time as at none other our dependence for ALL on Christ in His atoning death, and the whole soul spiritually feeds on the Lamb of God in the expression of His love at Calvary. Christ is known in the Lord's Supper as the real Centre wherever a Christian church is found.

¹ Matt. xxvi. 26-28; Mark xiv. 22-24; Luke xxii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. x. 16, 17, 21; xi. 20-34.

² By this is meant not a quasi-mechanical action; but inspired thought clothed in inspired words.

Moreover it is the death of the *Lord*. What a title to our devotion! He is our Lord and Master, in virtue of His purchase of us by His blood. Thus He becomes the Master of a veritable slave, and that slave, myself—wholly His. This is a dominant thought throughout this Feast.

Curiously enough the words—the Lord's Supper—are not, strictly speaking, found in Scripture, the word used being, not the noun "Kurios" or "Lord," but the adjective "kuriakos" or "lordly." This word occurs only twice in the New Testament; once in reference to the Lord's Day (Rev. i. 10) and once to the Lord's Supper, thus closely connecting the two in a remarkable though quite incidental way. The Lordly Supper is partaken of on the Lordly Day; that is to say the Supper, distinguished from all other meals by being connected with the Lord in *death*, is received on the Day distinguished from all other days, by being connected with the Lord in *resurrection*.

It is worthy of careful note that the Lord's table is not, however, called the "Lordly" table; but is the table where the Lord presides. It is not so with the Supper; this in itself is Lordly. A special term is thus used for the day and the Supper, but not for the table.

We now turn to the history of the Feast. First, the upper room of the institution of the Lord's Supper. We note in Mark xiv. 51, 52, that at the betrayal a certain (nameless) young man dressed in a linen cloth was seized, but fled away naked.¹ This mysterious episode is entirely explained if the last Supper were taken in the house of St. Mark's father, a supposition which is confirmed in Acts xii. 12,² where we find this very house the centre of the infant Church in Jerusalem. The incident of the young man being recorded solely by St. Mark himself is naturally explained, if we remember that Judas left the upper room to betray Jesus, and when he received the band of soldiers from the priests, would undoubtedly lead them back there first. When they arrived, on rousing the house, they found that Christ had left; and Judas knowing, as it is said that "He oft resorted" to Gethsemane, followed Him there with the soldiers. The young man Mark doubtless hurried after them, hastily covering

¹ He would be so called when only dressed in the scanty undergarment.

² "He came to the house of Mary, the mother of John whose surname was Mark; when many were gathered together and were praying."

his scanty inner garment with a linen cloth, to warn the Saviour, and thus was caught. It is therefore probable that the Supper was held in St. Mark's house ; and that there the disciples constantly assembled until Pentecost " was fully come," and that subsequently the house remained as the chief centre of the Church at Jerusalem.

Peter and John were charged with the provision of this Passover, and their first duty would be to procure the sacrifice. For this they would enter the Temple courts and purchase their lamb, which would only cost them about three shillings of our money (Christ, we remember, being sold to the priests for £3). At about four o'clock they would take the lamb up to the brazen altar and there kill it, the blood being poured out by the priest at the base of the altar. They then sang the " hallel "—" Blessed be he that cometh in the Name of the Lord." The lamb was then flayed and dressed and would be carried on a board with staves by Peter and John to the house of Mark, where it had to be roasted whole. Later in the evening our Lord and the other ten disciples entered for the Feast.

The upper room was always the best room in the house ; the table would be very low, and the seats would be large cushions placed on the floor on which the guests reclined. For several reasons which one need not now enumerate, Judas appears to have been on our Lord's left, which was the place of honour, and to secure which was possibly the cause of the unseemly strife which occurred on the entrance of the disciples into the room. St. John reclining on our Lord's right could naturally lean his head " in Jesus' bosom," while St. Peter apparently occupied the lowest place at the other end of the table.¹ The lamb, and four cups of wine, bitter herbs, and a thick paste made of fruits to resemble the clay of Egypt, with three cakes of unleavened bread, would be placed later upon the table. In Egypt the Passover, as we know, was taken standing, for they were still slaves and not yet delivered ; but in the land where they were free men, having passed out of bondage, they were accustomed to recline at their utmost ease.

We must notice that this Passover was the only sacrifice offered by Christ ; when He attended the Feast at other times, He was only one of a company, but here He was the " head of the household," which must consist of at least ten persons.

¹ This order is supported by Edersheim and others.

After the first cup of thanksgiving, it was usual to wash the hands, but in this case our Lord rose from the supper table and, girding Himself, proceeded to take the lowest place, and to their great surprise, to wash the disciples' feet—a strong but tacit rebuke to their unseemly dispute as to which of them should be the greatest. The scene is wonderful, for not only had there been an angry contention amongst the chosen twelve, but the heart of one of them was already a raging devil of hate against his Lord, at the very moment when the heart of Christ was consumed with self-sacrificing love for His own. The same word is used for the action of Satan as for Christ's action, when it is written Satan "*poured*" hate into the heart of Judas, and Christ "*poured*" water into a basin.

After the washing, on which I do not here dwell, the Passover dishes were all placed on the table, and our Lord breaking an unleavened cake would say, "This is the bread of misery which our fathers ate in the land of Egypt." He then took the sop which was the portion given to each, and which consisted of some of the flesh of the lamb on a piece of the unleavened bread, together with some bitter herbs, and gave it to Judas. This was at the very beginning of the Passover Feast, and as Judas went immediately out, he neither fully "ate the Passover," nor partook of the Lord's Supper which followed it.

The cup of blessing was probably the third cup of wine, and practically concluded the Passover Feast.

The Passover Feast was the more remarkable, for the Passover was the only sacrifice not offered by an Aaronic priest, and also was not of the Law, but was instituted before it was given. In like manner Christ in heaven became a priest not after the order of Aaron, and His death as the Lamb of God was primarily a sacrifice, not after the order of Leviticus.

The Passover being now practically ended, our Lord took another cake¹ of unleavened bread; in the words of Scripture, "He took bread, He brake it and said, this is . . . for you." In these three actions we see, as has been beautifully pointed out by others, first

¹ We must note here that in St. Luke *xxii.* 14-23, we get another illustration that the order (Luke i. 3) the evangelist follows in his Gospel is not historical. Not only are the events narrated in a different order in this passage, the contention, as well as the departure of Judas being here placed after the Supper, but part of verses 19 and 20 are not found at all in many manuscripts.

in the taking of the bread, our Lord's voluntary incarnation ; then in the breaking of it, our Lord's violent death ; and in the words " for you," His vicarious sacrifice.

It is only fair to mention here, that there is a difficulty as to this being a real Passover Feast. It would be quite out of place to enter into the argument as to whether the Passover that year was held on the Thursday or the Friday. It has been ably urged that our Lord did not eat the Passover at all on this occasion save in the mystical form of the Lord's Supper, the Passover being kept when Jesus died on the next day. Edersheim, however, and many others clearly show that at that time there were two observances of the Passover : the Pharisees and the Jews keeping it on one day, the Sadducees and Galileans on the next, thus making it possible for our Lord to take the Feast on the Thursday, and yet Himself to be the Passover Lamb on the following day.

The words " This is my body " signify that the material bread was at the time the body of the Lord ¹ to the spiritual understanding.

" This cup is the new covenant in my blood " clearly marks the close of the old covenant of law (2 Cor. iii. 14), and the foundation of the new covenant of grace (2 Cor. iii. 6) with Israel (Jer. xxxi. 31), to be fully ratified on their national repentance hereafter.

The words " I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God " doubtless refer primarily to this future time.

It is interesting to note that our Lord Himself instituted both the Lord's Supper and Christian Baptism, and that both of them have reference to His death and resurrection. In baptism we are buried into His death, out of it we rise ; in the Lord's Supper we remember Him in His death, on the day He rose, until He comes.

The Lord's Supper is essentially a sacrament and not a sacrifice ; and a sacrament is " the material and visible symbol of an invisible and spiritual reality." Observe, a symbol is much more than a description, inasmuch as sight is much more than hearing ; the Queen of Sheba indeed says it is twice as much. The sacrifices of Israel were all true sacraments, and in this lay all their value.

This being clearly understood, we may point out that " This is my body " cannot mean, " This has become my body." The words

¹ There is nothing in Scripture to show it was so regarded before or after ; or even that it was all consumed at the time.

imply no change in the elements, but clearly point out, that that which in physical reality is still *bread* in the sacrament (after the "blessing" or giving thanks, see 1 Cor. xi. 27), in spiritual reality is the *body* of Christ to those who rightly partake. "This do" also cannot be rendered "this offer"; "doing" never means offering.

In the early Church, the Supper was inseparable from the *agapee* or love-feast, the occasion of happy Christian fellowship, and which was also one of almsgiving to the poor, when all that was eaten were gifts of food brought for the occasion. The connexion of the two was doubtless felt to be warranted by the association of the Lord's Supper with the Passover. The *agapee* or love-feast is mentioned in Jude 12. The eucharist, as the Lord's Supper was called, was the concluding part of the *agapee*, or a second supper. The *agapee* was really the elevation of an ordinary meal to a fellowship of love and almsgiving, and long formed a part of the Lord's Supper; but eventually, on account of many abuses, the latter was separated from it.

In the early Church, confession of sin was habitual before partaking of the Supper, in accordance with the injunction of 1 Corinthians xi. 28, "Let a man examine himself," and to avoid the judgment that there falls on those who carelessly partake. The fasting communion, that began to be practised when the Supper became a breakfast, and was separated from the *agapee*, was really at first simply a recoil from the excesses of 1 Corinthians xi, and not at all from the idea that the Lord's Supper should be the first food to pass the lips. This is very evident when we remember that this Supper for over a century was taken in the middle or at the end of a meal. The eating of gifts before or after the Holy Communion, a survival of this primitive practice, may still be seen in the Greek Church, in the old Coptic, and in some Latin Churches.

For the first century at least, the Supper was after six o'clock on the Sabbath, that is at the commencement of the Lord's Day, which thus began with God. When the time was changed from Jewish to Roman, the day ending at midnight instead of 6 p.m., the Supper was taken after midnight on the Sabbath, and always either in the middle or at the end of the love-feast. The change to such a late hour unfortunately brought in many serious abuses, which were at length stopped by Trajan's Rescript, which was an edict issued A.D. 112 against associations; the younger Pliny wrote about it.

The Lord's Supper then became a breakfast, the use of candles, however, being still sometimes continued, as an indication that originally it was a supper. It began to be corrupted by Ignatius, only sixty years after St. Paul, by the adoption of heathen mysteries, faith then representing the flesh of the Lord, and love—His blood. The real doctrinal corruption, and the sacramental teaching that involved a change in [the elements, and transubstantiation, began later on, at the close of the second century, in the days of Justin Martyr. The Supper required then the presence of a bishop and a special priesthood, and ceased to be a congregational meal. In the Lord's Supper after its first institution there was, as in the Jewish Passover, nothing official—no priest, president or officer, no rules nor ritual, nor official formula, nor even any exactly prescribed order.

At first, for a long period, the cup preceded the bread, as in 1 Corinthians x ; while later, and down to the present day, the bread is given before the cup. In the Didache, or teaching of the twelve Apostles (a very early document), the order is the cup and the bread.

This Supper, together with almsgiving, was undoubtedly the centre of Christian worship, and chief occasion of the gathering together of the early Church. This dominant position was almost entirely lost for a time in the Protestant Churches, but the Supper is now being restored to a more prominent place. It is remarkable that while one large body of Christians—the Quakers—dispensed with it altogether, another body of Christians—known as Brethren—have always, in all parts of the world, assembled on the Lord's Day for no other purpose ; and although perhaps only few in number locally, have therefore sometimes formed the largest body of communicants in the town.

Many illustrative allusions to the Lord's Supper, more or less direct, occur in Scripture. The first of course that we notice is the Passover Feast in Egypt, of which indeed it was the antitype and fulfilment. Another is in Exodus xxiv. 11, in that mysterious sacred meal, when on Sinai the nobles beheld God, and did eat and drink ; surely a beautiful description of what the Supper should be to us. It is also probable that the discourse in St. John vi. though not primarily referring to the Supper at all, but to saving faith in our Lord's death, is indirectly connected with it. 1 Corinthians v. 6, 7, "Let us keep the feast," may also contain some reference to it. 1 Corinthians x commences with baptism, and continues with eating

spiritual meat and drinking spiritual drink, a distinct reference again to the Lord's Supper, as was also the wonderful Supper on the Lord's Day at Emmaus.

The Christian's three sacrifices—his praise, his alms, and himself—are all connected with the Supper. As holy priests we offer the sacrifice of praise according to Hebrews xiii., and in the collection,¹ "to do good and to communicate" we "forget not," "for with such sacrifices" God "is well pleased"; and with regard to our bodies, while the Supper recalls that God gave His only begotten Son (St. John iii. 16) it cannot also fail to remind us that therefore "we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren" (1 John iii. 16). It is thus the three sacrifices are connected with the Lord's table. The altar on which these are placed is Christ, for it is "through Him" they are offered (Heb. xiii. 15).

Breaking bread was in the East a common expression referring at first to eating at any meal, inasmuch as the bread is not of a soft spongy character which can be cut, but crisp and hard as our biscuits, and requiring to be broken; then later on amongst Christians the expression was reserved for the love feast and the Lord's Supper, and lastly it became restricted to the latter only.

The Lord's Supper has three aspects—past, present, and future. It refers to the past in 1 Corinthians xi. 24, 25, in "remembrance"; to the present in 1 Corinthians x. 16, 17, in "communion"; to the future in 1 Corinthians xi. 26, in "showing or proclaiming." It is connected first with Christ, secondly with His Church, and thirdly with the world. It has three objects—for remembrance, for communion and food, for witness. It is linked with the Passover in the Gospels, with idolatry in 1 Corinthians x, and with great disorder in the Church in 1 Corinthians xi.

Speaking of disorders, I might briefly refer to two evils of modern times. We have seen that the remembrance is that of the Lord Jesus in His death, symbolized by the cup (representing the blood) being apart from the bread (representing the body), for while blood in the body is a sign of life, poured out it is a sign of death; and it is our Lord's *shed blood* in death that is the ground for the remission of our sins: not His blessed life when He went about doing good, and

¹ Here as elsewhere more familiar words such as "offertory" might be used, but throughout, as far as possible, Scriptural as distinguished from merely ecclesiastical expressions are adhered to.

when the blood was in the body. In like manner at the Passover in Egypt, it was not the spotless lamb, but its sprinkled blood, that saved the people. In the Church of Rome, where the cup is withheld from the laity and the wafer eaten by them as containing both the flesh and blood of our Lord, it is evident that the symbol represents life rather than death, and to this extent the spiritual force of the Supper is annulled. Moreover, we must never forget that to eat blood throughout the Scripture is death, and was strictly forbidden. There is no doubt that, if we follow the Lord's Supper as instituted, that the blood must be drunk and not eaten; and it is equally apparent that if the wafer only be taken as the Supper, the blood is eaten and not drunk, or is altogether omitted.

I will only pause here a moment to remind a few ultra-spiritual people who dispense with the Supper altogether as being too material, that the command is not to "remember the Lord," but to "eat the bread and drink the cup," before passing on to an evil that often accompanies too frequent communion. There is of course the greatest blessing in a weekly communion, which appears to have been the New Testament custom, but there is also a considerable danger attached to it, which, alas, is far too little understood—one from which only the Spirit of God can save us. Nothing indeed but this can prevent that which so constantly recurs, from becoming a mechanical or a common act, of which little is thought once it is past. The reverence, the solemnity, the worship which must attend this Supper if the Spirit of God be present, is frequently, painfully, and conspicuously absent. One cannot but value, though carried to great extremes, those preparations still surviving in parts of Scotland of perhaps a week's fasting, prayer and confession to God before the table is approached. While therefore to take the Lord's Supper on the Lord's day is the right practice, one does feel the danger of the sin of carelessness and irreverence when communicating every week.

One word may be said, in closing, on the "future" aspect of the Supper as connected with Christ's return. The Epistle to the Corinthians was, as we know, written six years before the close of the Acts of the Apostles. These Acts of the Apostles (with the exception of St. Paul) were concerned specially with those Jews who became believers in Christ; added to whom, chiefly through the ministration of St. Paul, were an increasing number of Gentiles. The Jews,

however, were still in "the patient forbearance of God" under trial, and if they repented, "the times of refreshing would come to them from the presence of the Lord" (Acts iii. 19). This return of Christ, had there been a national repentance, would have been very speedy, and in those Epistles written before the close of the Acts (when the door already closed on Judea, was also closed to the dispersion at Rome) is so presented; whereas in those letters of St. Paul that were written after the final doom of Israel was pronounced in Acts xxviii. 26-28, it is not so prominent. These words "until He come" would in the Corinthian Epistle, and before the last shutting of the door of grace (until the future restoration of Israel) in the close of the Acts, have a very special and immediate force: similar indeed to that which, in these closing days in which we live, it has now.

It is important to note that these words: "ye do show (or proclaim) the Lord's death until He come," are not in the imperative mood as a command; but are the statement of a fact that the repetition of this memorial feast constitutes in itself a proclamation of the return of Christ, possibly then very imminent.

Many results doubtless flowed from this Supper; but only the one is placed on record in the Scripture which we should be most likely to overlook, and that is its public proclamation of the Lord's death to the world which crucified Him. We are told on high legal authority, that the regular public remembrance of any act or deed from its first occurrence establishes it as an historical fact to future generations. For instance, if there were no history of it, the annual Waterloo banquet would suffice to establish the fact of there having been such a battle; and there can be no doubt that the world has yet to answer for the legalized murder of the Son of God. This is indeed the reverse side of the picture presented by the Lord's Supper: to those within, salvation; to those without, judgment. In the proclamation itself, however, we may still see the grace of God, which until the door be closed brings salvation and a seat at the table to all who believe.

We have completed our brief survey of the institution of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and considered generally its purpose, its history and its results. In the articles that follow, we will look at it more closely as a remembrance, a communion, and as spiritual food.

A. T. SCHOFIELD, M.D.

[Next article: "The Lord's Supper as a Remembrance."]

"Our Unhappy Divisions."

[This paper is based on an address given by the writer at a conference held in connexion with the National Mission of Repentance and Hope. It was cordially received and backed by several speakers. The address was suggested by a note by the Editor of THE CHURCHMAN in a recent issue: "Our unhappy divisions seem to paralyse all our efforts, yet there does not seem to be the slightest sign of any attempt to bridge the gulf between the Church and Nonconformity."]

THE antipathies and animosities of the various Christian churches and bodies are an undeniable scandal, and do infinite harm to the cause of Christianity, specially perhaps in the mission field. That remarkable, large-hearted, broad-minded man, Donald Hankey (the "Student at Arms"), wrote: "In this, as in other ages, outsiders would be puzzled to recognize the disciples of Christ by the love they bear one another." And again: "In the long run the most disastrous failure of the Church is the failure to love. It is this that does more than anything else to alienate men of good will."

I venture to offer my opinion that the antipathies and animosities arise mainly from an imperfect conception of what the Holy Catholic Church, the Church Universal, "the Holy Church throughout all the world" which acknowledges God in the *Te Deum*, is, and is not. Evidently it cannot be the Roman Church alone, or the Greek Church alone, or the Church of England alone, or the non-Episcopal Churches, whom we call "Nonconformists," alone. The Holy Church Universal is the blessed company of faithful people, in all these Churches, who are seeking God and His Christ, and are striving to serve Him. I believe that the doctrine of our own Church is the purest, and its system of Church government the best, and that there is much that is wrong in the doctrine of the Church of Rome and its system; nevertheless I do not doubt for a moment that in that Church, and in other Christian communities, there is as great a proportion of true servants of God who are accepted by Him, as in our own. It would take pages to give the names of the saintly men who have adorned the Church of Rome, but as prominent ones St. Francis Xavier and Lacordaire, of whom there was recently a memoir in THE CHURCHMAN, may be mentioned; and among Nonconformists, Bunyan, the Wesleys and Whitefield, who, with many others, are esteemed to be holy and saintly men by the great body of Christians.

In England we are principally concerned with the Nonconformists. It is to be remembered that in Scotland the very great majority of the people are Presbyterians, whose doctrine varies little from that of some of our Nonconformist bodies; also that it is estimated that among English-speaking Christians the number of non-Episcopalians exceeds that of our own Church.

The Nonconformists have been estranged from us largely by our own fault. We, clergy and laity, have too often treated them with aloofness and cold toleration, and even arrogance and condescension. This must be most galling, and is sufficient to account for the hostility which many of them feel towards us. It is a consequence of this that they are unwilling to give our Church an opportunity of improving our services and discipline, and it is common knowledge that there may be, in consequence, difficulty in passing the Archbishops' scheme for the purpose through Parliament. We have to thank ourselves for much of this.

I would give an instance of what I mean. I recently heard it propounded that we might come to the Sovereign of this kingdom being crowned by the head of the Baptist Church instead of by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and this was considered a joke. (I think I have heard it before.) Some years back there was much discussion, in which Lord Rosebery took a leading

part, as to the advisability of making the House of Lords more representative, and it was suggested that the Nonconformists should be represented, as our Church is by the Bishops, which to my mind would be right. There are many things more improbable than that this should not eventually come to pass, and then it might fall to the head of the Baptist Church to place the Crown on the Sovereign's head. Why should there be anything ludicrous about this? He would no doubt be a holy, devout man, revered by multitudes of our fellow-Christians. The idea that it should be so, seems to come from the supercilious attitude of some Church people, and surely the spirit which suggests it is not the spirit of Christ. Church people should remember the scathing reproof of St. Paul to the Jew despisers at Antioch in Pisidia. If this attitude of arrogance and superciliousness comes from the Church being the State Church, the sooner it ceases to be so the better, for it does infinite harm.

The Times of January 24 published a peace declaration by eminent members of the "Christian Churches" in the United States. Such a joint declaration is not possible in this country even on so great an occasion as the National Mission, owing to the want of harmony and cordiality between the different Churches. Again, in *The Times* of January 27, there is an article headed "The Holy Communion in War Time," in which the following occurs: "There are many ways of celebrating the Holy Communion: serious as such differences may be, on the eve of battle the soldier knows that the Romans, the Anglicans, and the Nonconformists are remembering the same Great Act and are communing, however dimly, with the same Lord; and, after all, to-morrow they may be, all of them, where they will know the truth and pass out of shadows. . . . They have all the same vision. If it were in the power of any Recorder to compare spiritual experience it might be discovered that those who are keeping the solemn Feast according to all customs are nearer together than they think." If this spirit and frame of mind could only be got into our hearts at home, surely the antipathies and animosities would subside. Much the same thought was expressed by Hooker in Queen Elizabeth's days, but it fell on deaf or unwilling ears.

Now I think it is the business of every one of us to do our utmost to bridge the gulf mentioned by the Editor of *THE CHURCHMAN*. I have already said that I believe the doctrine of our own Church to be the purest, and its system of government the best, but we do not claim an exclusive monopoly of truth as the Roman Church unfortunately does. I would not press our doctrine and system on others, but I would hold out to all Christians, Church of Rome, Greek, and Nonconformists, the right hand of fellowship, recognizing that they, with us, are fellow-soldiers in the Church militant, fighting on the side of God and His Christ against sin, and seeking to save that which was lost. In our daily prayers we should remember, first, God's servants the clergy who immediately care for us, and ask His blessing also on the clergy throughout the world, of all Churches and Communion: that He would be their refuge and strength, and that He would give them a right judgment in all things, and they may ever rejoice in His Holy Comfort.

The antagonism between ourselves and the Nonconformists has gone on for generations and will not be allayed in a day. I am thankful that in my lifetime (and I am old), I see great improvement, specially of late years, and more specially since the war. I believe that the war is drawing all Christians together, and I fervently hope that we may come out of it purified as by fire. My plea is that we all, not pressing our individual opinions, should do our utmost to forward the cordial fellowship in Christ of all Christian Churches.

GEO. CHRYSIIE, *Colonel.*

Parochial Vignettes.

VI. THE PARSON'S WIFE.

(Concluding Article.)

GREATLY daring, I am attempting to consider the place, power, and excellencies of the Parson's wife. If in the course of my thoughts her deficiencies creep in, it will be pardoned for the sake of truth. There are lights and shades in every class of human kind, and they will not be found lacking here. That she is an important personality in the parish in which her lot is cast, all must acknowledge. For weal or woe she is second to none, not even to the Squire's wife. It is true she is only an accessory and is imported, not by ecclesiastical ordinance, but by the will, and under the shadow of, the Vicar, yet, once there, her unofficial presence is conspicuous to a degree. From the first day to the last of her sojourn in the parish she stands out in the limelight, and moves under the scrutinising and critical eye of a sometimes kindly, sometimes unkindly, public. In fact, she is a power to be reckoned with, and summed up.

There is nobody in the world so thrown upon her own native resources as the Parson's wife. Like the poet, if a success, she is born, not made. Untrained, as a rule, passing through no special discipline for her arduous post, she is plunged into the whirl of semi-public life whether she can swim or not. It is a case of swimming or sinking. It is therefore to her credit that she rarely sinks, and swims with more or less facility. In truth, she is often found swimming, when her poor husband is struggling in the parochial seas, and nigh to sinking.

Instances many will occur to most minds, I think.

And here let me say boldly that in the face of a great celibate church, and despite the anathemas to which a married clergy are exposed by a Church which is wiser apparently than nature or Scripture, our Parsons' wives have more than justified their existence. And the Romanists would say so too if they were not more keen on having a fighting body at their sole disposal untrammelled from a tie which would keep them ever so little from subjection to themselves. They will have no divided affections, and prefer to crush

the wife rather than endanger their mastery. It is in their case the Church against the home, the Church against nature, the Church against womanhood.

It would be too large a question to consider how far the Roman Church has suffered for the lack of the humanising influence of the wife, whether a gentler voice would have made itself heard, whether the harshness and the almost savagery of the priest in history would not have been modified by the womanly element at the man's elbow. Shorn of all that was soft and kind and feminine, left to their inhumanity, what wonder that the Inquisitors should have racked and burned? With no gentle, detaining hand possible, we need not marvel that mercy was left out and that the brute became paramount.

But we must not be drawn aside by speculations, however interesting, from the main object of our inquiry, which is the Parson's wife as she lives, and moves, and talks, and works under our very eyes.

Let us first of all *define her place*.

There is, of course, the woman's sphere and the man's, and smooth working depends naturally on each keeping to their own line of metals, like the trams in our streets. It prevents collisions. Naturally, her place is not the first. However great her ability or powers of management, she can never be the Vicar of the parish. She is just a helper. She may, and no doubt will, pull strings behind the throne, and manage her husband to her heart's content if he does not mind, but before the world and the parish he is the superior always. A wise woman will recognize it. And even when she uses her lawful power in the home she will, if she be wise, do so silently and secretly. Her place is inside the coach, and his on the box, and it is better if she stays inside and abstains from even getting on the box beside him. There is a little pneumatic tube which may be used to communicate with the driver, and of this no doubt she will avail herself at times with advantage to the safety and direction of the coach. But even this should not be used too ostentatiously. Not, however, that a wise husband will wish to keep her in subjection. This would be sheer slavery. She will have her definite sphere, in which she will be the mistress, and which she will adorn far better than he ever can. A man in a **Mothers' Meeting**, for instance, is like a fish out of water. A class

of girls, too, is beyond him. But she knows her sex, and understands their ways and artifices and peculiarities. And now that so much is being done for women the sphere of the Parson's wife is by no means restricted. There let her be queen, subject, of course, to proper restrictions in the very nature of things parochial. Neither will she be able quite to share her husband's whole life, for many of the secrets he is told in confidence he must not share even with her. The golden rule of a married life is to have no secrets from each other, and personal secrets even the Parson will not have, but other people's secrets are not his to share, and on them his lips should be hermetically sealed.

But her chief sphere is not a public one at all. Her real parish is her husband, and over him she can and will exercise the best of care. And where there are children too, she knows as a mother which should come first of all. It is not merely a question of minding the house and mending the stockings and keeping everything domestic in good order. She can make it easy for him to do his work; she can make him fitter to do it mentally and physically; she shares his mental interests; she can save him from the endless worry of a parson's life; she can be a kindly spur to help him along when apathetic, or a spirit of optimism to cheer him when oppressed, or a mentor to hew a way through his many difficulties, for a woman's wit can wind through devious ways which a mere man will find it hard to strike. In fact, a good wife doubles the Parson's powers and contributes just the elements which he is almost sure to lack. Of how many Parsons must it be said that it was his wife who made a man of him. She has softened his harshnesses, warmed his heart, and kept the spiritual to the fore when the mind was in danger of drowning the heart. And if sometimes she has been useful to him as a spur, not infrequently she has hung on to him as a drag, preventing some precipitate action which he would be sorry for later. Her delicate tact is worth a fortune to the blundering man, and the bloom and edge of his ministry have often been of her providing. Over his sermons, too, if she be a woman of courage and discernment, she will prove her worth, for she can say what no one else can dare to say, and no man worth his salt will resent it. She can brisk him up in his sermons, as she has probably had to do in his appearance, and send him forth spick and span before his people. His "white horses"

she will detect and declare. His tricks of manner and faults of inflection she will detect. If he is too long she can in her inimitable way shorten him, and if he is too short lengthen him out. If turbid in his sermonic flow she can clear him, and if he has unwittingly said something foolish she can lay her finger upon it and show it up. Love is not afraid to do all this, for she lives not to please but to make more pleasing. And love can say anything. Of course, she must have managed more or less to be abreast of him in knowledge of things, but that is not difficult for the clever wife, and as a matter of fact the clergy in the mass are not very advanced in their intellectual standards. She may never be a philosopher, but she will always have a ready wit and nimbleness of mind which can see clearly by intuition and instinct. She may not know how she arrives at a thing, but that she gets there is evident to all.

Then her sphere is to run a model home in the face of the parish. And rich are the fruits of a Vicarage where everything is as it should be. Its regular hours, its pieties, its peaceableness, its serenity, its utilities will stand out as a beacon to the homes which are broken and sad. And its lessons will not be lost, for every eye turns towards the Parson's house, and the busy little birds flit about the parish telling all of its excellencies. Every Vicarage home is set upon the hill-top, and it cannot possibly be hidden. Her hospitalities, too, will be famous, for up to the limits of her means she will be generous and kindly, treating all alike with a liberal and loving hand. Not that she will be hospitable to the mere beggar, for she will have the wit to see through the whine, and detect the reality beneath. Because she is tender she is not a fool. To rich and poor, to young and old, her hand will be extended in welcome, and, free from all exclusiveness, she will feel that she lives for all.

Such is a part of the sphere of the Parson's wife. There is much that one might have dwelt on had space permitted, such as her sympathy with the sick and suffering, her care for the lonely ones, her love for the little ones, and her special care for the neglected ones. For, being the mother of the parish, she, like the good mother, looks after the feeblest and neediest first.

Let us now ponder a little over her *trials and difficulties*. For certain it is that her lot will not prove a bed of roses. There will be disillusionments many, and she may wish before very long that she had been some one and somewhere else. For the Parson's wife,

like the Parson, is the parish target at which many a bolt will be shot. There will be trials from the critics, trials from the gossips, trials from the jealous, and trials from the superior ones. Human nature in parishes, I fancy, finds it come more natural to blame than to praise; at least most natures work out so.

Certainly, the Parson's wife must not expect to give complete satisfaction, nor to please everybody. Either she does too much and is meddling and interfering, or she does too little and is lazy. She will have imputed to her things she never said, and she will have put to her credit actions she never did or thought of doing. She will day by day pass through all extremes of climate; now she will be gushed over, and later she will catch sight of an averted shoulder. She will be misrepresented continually. If she says too little she is reserved. If she says too much she is "such a talker." Little innocent reflections are often so twisted that, after going the round of the parish, she will fail to recognize them as her own, if she should chance to hear them.

She will get abundant credit for everything after she is gone, and her successor will be told of her good deeds to repletion, but so long as she is on the spot she must live in hope. And the trouble is that it is usually because she does so much that she lays herself open to such reflections. Had she been lazy, only showing herself once a week to the parish, she would probably escape any unpleasantnesses. The mistake the parish makes is that they misunderstand her position, and do not realize that she is not at their disposal at all except by way of benevolence. She is a voluntary worker, and not a paid curate. And woe betide her if she is sick for too long. For then there is a standing grievance against her, and they feel that she is a fraud and ought to make way for some stronger successor. The parish is not getting their money's worth, it seems, and it resents it. As if the poor Parson's wife enjoyed being ill, or were ill on purpose.

Neither is this all the tale of her woes, for in addition to her own peculiar ones she has to bear her husband's as well. So she is between a double fire. If he becomes unpopular, somehow she is covered with the same pall. And when you add to all this a supposed criminality of the poor wife in any unwelcome changes on the part of the Vicar, her cup is pretty well full. *Cherchez la femme*, was the old cry when some evil emerged. And so when

the husband becomes "high" in an ecclesiastical sense it is the wife who is held responsible for the change. To the popular view she is undoubtedly at the bottom of all changes supposed to be for the worse. His ups and downs are manipulated by her. And so she becomes the parish scapegoat.

A wonderful view has the Parson's wife of human nature unadorned; a little world of it. And she is shut up with it, unable to escape even if she would. And, having to come to close quarters with it, she gets an enlarged view of people's innermost crotchets. And they, being close to her, can make their very whispers heard and make manifest their very facial contortions. It is not that there is so much of it but that the few bulk so largely in the little parish ring-fence. Most people are excellent, honest and kind, but just as a bee in a bottle raises the echoes and resounds far, so a few ill-conditioned natures can poison the air with their buzzings.

No Parson's wife sets herself up as perfect, and probably all of them would confess that they might have done things better and that they have much to learn, the young wives especially, who are only in their apprenticeship and can only learn by their mistakes. But what pains and hurts them is that no allowances are made for their mistakes, that no credit is given them for their good intentions, and but little praise for what they really have succeeded in achieving. Ah! well, if it is any comfort that all fare alike, and that no Parson's wife quite escapes the critic's lash, they may have that measure of consolation to the full. And if it be a consolation that they will be praised to the skies when they are gone, they may enjoy that too. All the same, the better comfort would be to have a little in the hand in the thick of work when the balm would be most grateful.

It is high time now that we dealt with some of the *consolations of the Parson's wife* lest any should think that her bed is made only of thorns. For, undoubtedly, no life in this world is more calculated to bring brightness than hers. She treads the highway of blessing, if any woman on earth does.

For she is a woman with a mission, and that of the best. She knows her work, and she lives in the midst of it. No need that she should be in doubt when she wakes in the morning as to what she is intended to do that day. The path of duty stretches out before her white and shining. There is misery to be grappled

with, perplexed feet to guide along the way of life, burdens to be lifted and lots made easier by loving ministries. And the recipients of her kindly sympathies live beside her very door, and look to her for the smile which refreshes like rain in a dry and sultry world. And if a well-filled life be a happy one she has that satisfaction to the full. No reverberation of emptiness in her life; if anything, it is likely to be too full. The trouble in many a woman's life is that she is self-centred and idle, and no woman on God's earth can expect peace in such a life. But the Parson's wife has something to do, something to think solidly about, something to make for. And the results of her work will ever tend to brighten her spirit, because she goes where darkness may be found thick and terrible and it will be her privilege and joy to see that darkness pass and the true light shine. Is there not the best of joy in driving dull care away, in smoothing out the deep dint in the knitted brow, in bringing hope into the eye and hearts of the despairing? Even where she does not succeed perfectly she cannot fail utterly, and to have done something to lighten and brighten is to have something of that sunshine reflected back.

There is a great deal of comfort, too, in feeling that she is laying out her life to the best advantage. There is no need for her to worry as to whether she is in the place God intended her to be. Your frivolous lady, who from morning to night is planning her pleasures, may well doubt whether her life is well lived. In fact, she may be sure that it is not. But the Parson's wife, amidst all the hardness and disappointments of her life, need be tormented within by no discords but may have the happy consciousness that God's choice blessing rests upon the woman who is trying to live for God and humanity. God's "Well done" is after all the best music in life. The clouds which she drives away from others cannot gather around her own head, and the springs of fresh and sweet waters which she taps for the thirsty will be found to quench her own thirst too. And she will discover constantly that with the lifting of others' weights her own take wings and fly away. As for the ingratitude of men which the Parson's wife will taste to the full, the less she expects gratitude the less she will be hurt at the want of it. If she works for gratitude, and does not get it, her cup will be full of bitterness, but if she works entirely for her Master's glory, and only for His approval, the shrill voices of the querulous

and complaining will pass unheeded. Human popularity she may or may not get, but if she is swayed by higher desires she will not mind if it does not come. She will be sorry for the ungrateful, but for herself not at all. Unspeakable indeed will be the consolations of the Parson's wife who lives in the upper spheres of the spiritual and divine, and only comes down to bring a bit of Heaven into darkened hearts and homes and lives.

I should like now to dwell a little on the *perils of the Parson's wife*, perils to which she is peculiarly exposed by her position. They will occur to herself, no doubt, but it will be well to deal with them honestly.

There are *personal perils* which she needs to guard against. The peril, for instance, of thinking that fitness comes from position, and that finding herself a Parson's wife she must needs therefore have the needful capacity to be one. Whereas fitness can only come along the common road of thought and prayer and self-discipline and experience. She has to learn her business like her husband, and often learn, alas! by many sad failures. There is also the danger of the official drowning the woman, official fussiness, official peremptoriness, or official pride pushing out the deeper womanly instincts. There is the peril of over importance, and of claiming a deference which only capacity has a right to. There is the peril of underestimating the spiritual in her work and life, as if machinery would go on healthfully without the inner driving power. For the Parson's wife will find her influence rise with the rise of thinner temperature and fall as that falls. In truth, personal piety must be her chief asset, and she, like her husband and all Christian workers, must be dependent upon the Holy Spirit's enabling for every step. Energy is good, business-like methods are good, but the best of all is a spiritual character, and a heart resting on the perfect sufficiency of the Master and Lord. Her special peril is in forgetting this.

Then there are *social perils* which will assail her as the Parson's wife. She may forget in the claims of society that she is not the Parson's wife for one class only, and so be unjust to the neglected. Or she may display the spirit of condescension when ministering to the poor, as if she had to descend many painful steps in order to reach them, and would be glad when her work was over that she might mount again to the upper regions of her social life. Then

the claims of society may eject the duties of the home and the parish, the paramount being laid aside because society bids her, and her inclination coinciding therewith. Society undoubtedly has its place, but its place is not a first one by any means, and to put it first is to spoil the life. Influence once lost is not easily regained, and the Parson's wife who reverses the right order will step down from her high place and dishonour it. Then there are wifely perils of no mean danger which must be met.

She may glorify her husband beyond his merits. She may praise his powers and make him ridiculous by overestimating them. She may scheme for his advancement and degrade him by her interference. Perhaps he may be worthy of the fattest of livings, be fit as to his calves for the canonical leggings, and even be worthy to grace a bishop's throne, but it would be better if other people made all this known and gave him the leg up. For her to sound his praises as a preacher, and to undervalue others on his behalf, is not a wise pursuit. And this is dangerous ground, and she had better keep off it religiously.

Then there are *parochial perils*, which like rocks just below the surface, jagged and threatening, await the Parson's wife. She may overstep the line between the wife and the husband, and attempt to wear his authority. She may do it with the best of intentions, yet nothing but harm can come of it, because if she forgets her position the parish does not, and nothing is more resented. And then when he champions the wife in his chivalry the battle is joined and parochial blood is shed. Choirs, curates, parish workers could write volumes on the mischief which comes from interference from the Parson's wife. It certainly is not easy to play well the part of a Parson's wife, for all her defects are magnified in the parish lens, and her words are spoken as in a whispering gallery. Without the gift of reserve and silence she may set the parish by the ears. And unless she walks warily she will tread continually on the parish toes. It is well therefore that she should be awake to her many perils.

There is one thought I should like to discharge finally in the course of my consideration of the Parson's wife, and I wish it were unnecessary to touch upon it at all. I refer to what I may call *the tragical wives*. There are some, alas! and they are not difficult to classify. Naturally, there will be some bad eggs in the clerical

and parochial basket both of Vicars and Vicaresses. I am thinking of the wives of parsons whose thoughts and sympathies are outside the parish boundaries, and who are square women in round holes. Their tastes run on lower planes than altruistic ones, and they are happier when the mundane things of life are in the ascendant. Had they not been parsons' wives they would have been seen rarely in church, and never at religious meetings. They have no calling for any approach to saintship, and frankly declare their preference for sinners rather than saints. They are worldly women who by some unhappy turn of the wheel find themselves where they hate to be. And so parish work becomes a bitter drudgery, and religious aims something unintelligible. Pagan in sympathies, they wear the Christian vesture as a penance and as a disagreeable duty. Of course, anybody can see how this tragical state of things is bound to work out. Such a Parson's wife necessarily lives a separate life from her husband, and they will travel along in double harness which will gall and chafe both. Pulling in different ways, there is a danger that the parochial carriage overturn. Certainly, there will be disaster sooner or later, the poor parish will suffer, and the scandal of the Vicarage friction is not likely to be unknown, while the wicked will rejoice, and the serious be outraged. For, however skilfully the lack of unity be covered over, sharp eyes and ears will soon detect the chasm, and sharp tongues tell the news abroad. Such a Parson's wife can only be a millstone around his neck to cast him and his usefulness into gulfs unsoundable and bottomless.

For the connexion between lack of sympathy and sheer antagonism is soon bridged, and she who is so religiously cool will before long become an open foe in his household.

Not, however, that the case is quite hopeless, for who knows but that soon the light of Heaven will visit this dark soul and show her her lack of that life which alone can transform chill into warmth, and hostility into liking and love. And, surely, the grace of God can never do a grander work than when it has reached down to pick up from the cold ground the world-bound spirit of the tragical Parson's wife.

CHARLES COURTENAY.



“Christian Imperialism.”¹

IMPERIUM ET LIBERTAS.

“I will run the way of Thy commandments when Thou hast set my heart at liberty.”
—PSALM CXIX. 32.

I
THE Lord triumphant reigns!
Glad voice from yonder shore!
The Mighty God, who all sustains,
Now all adore!
His will resistless founds
The noblest Liberty;
And lo! to all creation's bounds
The bond are free.

2
Thrones and dominions fall
Before the Eternal's seat;
Rule ends, for Thou, Lord, rulest all;
Thy piercèd feet
Kiss'd by the kings that go
With songs in Thy blest ways,
Have humbled each rebellious foe,
To God's great praise!

3
I hear death's dying wail!
Sorrow and sighing cease;
Hush'd by the kingdom's freshening
gale
Of Life and Peace:
On sin has fallen defeat
From God's all holy hand;
And righteousness and mercy meet
Through all His land.

4
Wake song of birds, and sing
Unsilenced evermore!
No danger lurks for living thing
On hill or shore:

Unfading, undefiled,
The Kingdom blest has come;
Ancient of days and little child
Are safe at home.

5
Now calm, aloof from change,
Now stirr'd by eager life,
Free but controlled all creatures
range;
No jarring strife!
The distant stellar rays,
The full-disk'd planets' beam,
In free harmonious, choral maze,
For ever gleam.

6
Ah! vision of the King,
Ah! Freedom's glorious reign,
Art thou a day-dream vanishing
In night again?
See Christendom in arms!
Mark Islam's faithless scorn!
By doubts' and heresies' alarms,
The Church is torn.

7
Faint not, sad Church, but know
Through all thy earth and skies,
The throne and kingdom here below
Shall surely rise:
Yield all thine offerings,
Free, but compell'd by love,
Silver and gold, and nobler things
To God above.

¹ This Missionary Poem was written sixteen years ago, when the menace of “Christendom in arms,” and of Islam, and of home strife in Church and State, formed an aliens' menace; a kind of forecast of the present cataclysm of almost universal war. The Hymn has been sung in the Albert Hall, and Queen's Hall, and at district and village meetings occasionally. But it has never been printed in Missionary Hymn Collections, or on hymn sheets, and it is probably unknown to most of our readers. It is therefore reprinted here, with the hope that it may be helpful, in part or in whole, in these days when from the thick of the conflict with the powers of darkness, material and spiritual, the Church, ever praying “Thy Kingdom come,” looks back to the ancient and sure prophecies and promises of the Kingdom, and onwards to the fast approaching fulfilment, and desires in the power of the Holy Ghost to do her part in hastening through all nations the splendour of the great hope of the coming of the Lord.

8

Smite with the iron rod,
 The hammer of the word,
 The mighty instrument of God—
 The Spirit's sword :
 Smite with the wound that heals
 Man's proud and sinful race,
 For lo! the Holy Ghost reveals
 Redeeming grace.

9

Comes now the conflict's end,
 The powers of darkness fall!
 Now Life and Death no more con-
 tend ;
 Life lights us all :
 " We do now what we would "
 The Law of Liberty,
 The glad necessity of good,
 Binds fast the free.

10

Awhile! and then with joy
 The Son, by love constrained
 Yields for His Father's high employ,
 The kingdom gained ;
 And every bended knee,
 And tongue confessing praise ;
 Up to the Father's throne will He
 In freedom raise.

11

Then flashes forth again
 As of the central sun,
 The glory of the Lamb once slain ;
 Then Three in One :—
 One rule, the heavenly host,
 One, the new earth shall own ;
 The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost
 Fill the High Throne.

A. E. MOULE.

A Late Spring.

HOW long for softer winds we vainly sighed,
 And wonder'd when rough winter's tedious reign
 Would end, and eager life spring forth again
 From earth unfetter'd. So our Easter-tide
 Broke on a sleeping world, and April died
 In winter-garb ;—when lo! there burst amain
 The flush of quick'ning warmth o'er hill and plain,
 And deck'd our waiting mother like a bride.
 So have we yearn'd o'er souls that slumber late,
 Heedless of Time's unhalting, hurrying tread :
 While faith, far-seeing, boldly bade us wait
 Till the warm breath of God should gently move
 Upon the wintry waste,—till Voice of love,
 Stronger than death, should wake and raise the dead.

G. S. S.



Preachers' Pages.

HOMILETICAL HINTS AND OUTLINES.

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

Trinity Sunday,

Text : " Three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost : and these three are one."—I *John* v. 7.

The circle of teaching concerning (a) The creature and his Creator, (b) The sinner and his Saviour, (c) The saint and his Sanctifier,—the great body of revealed truth,—is now complete. It remains to deal with that revelation which sets forth the Three Persons and their relationship in the ever-blessed and glorious Trinity.

The preacher will have to judge for himself how far it may be well for him to explain the sense in which the word " person " is used, for want of a better one. He will be guided by the capacity of his hearers. So far as illustrations are concerned—they are bound to fail adequately to exemplify or elucidate so great a mystery. We may, however, take one. We are familiar with the wonderful tri-colour process which has revolutionized modern colour printing, and by which a variety of tones and tints are obtained by superimposition. They are all produced by the association and blending of three colours—they co-operate to produce these results. So the persons of the Trinity have been associated in great enterprises from the creation of the world to the redemption, and they still co-operate with one another in the application of the benefits of redemption to the soul of the sinner. [Examples of this are given by Harold Browne in his work on the Thirty-nine Articles.]

Or the preacher may elect to show how the doctrine of the Trinity has, like other mysteries, been gradually unfolded—that there has been progress in revelation according to the capacity of man (cf. *John* xvi. 12).

1. God above us—the omnipotent, omniscient and majestic Jehovah.
2. God with us—Emmanuel, partaker of flesh and blood, essentially Divine but yet intensely human.

3. God in us—the Holy Spirit possessing, renewing and empowering the life and revealing the purposes of God. Jesus enabling us to look into the heart of God and the Holy Spirit “taking of the things of Jesus and showing them to us.”

So far as the text is concerned it is undoubtedly true that the words that follow “bear record,” up to the word “spirit” in verse 8, are an interpolation, most likely inserted in the first instance as a marginal note or explanation at a time when the Trinitarian controversy was raging. Early Christian writers understood the passage, as it originally stood, to refer to the Trinity.

First Sunday After Trinity.

Text: “The love was manifested.”—I *John* iv. 9 (Epistle).

In this letter St. John, who being on terms of privileged intimacy with his Lord and perceiving the Divine character as it was set forth by the Eternal Son, discourses upon the subject of love, showing how it has been manifested in The Life of lives and how it may be displayed by man. Let us gather together a few obvious thoughts about the love of God.

I. THE FACT OF IT. (a) *This is a matter of common experience.* The unthankful and evil as well as the Godly are the recipients of the Divine bounty (Matt. v. 45). Day by day His creatures look up to Him and are fed. (b) *This is the subject of Divine Revelation.* The inspired volume has really but one object—to reveal the heart of God, and His purposes for man.

II. THE MARVEL OF IT. This appears when we consider the might and majesty of God and the rebellion of which man has been guilty from the very first. The Divine love has *persisted* even when deliberately slighted.

III. THE EVIDENCES OF IT. These are on every side. They include—(a) *The bounties of His providence.* “He filleth all things living with plenteousness.” (b) *His wonderful forbearance.* “His mercy endureth for ever.” Why are apparently useless lives spared? Is it not to give them another chance? He will not cut down the fruitless tree but leaves it awhile. In this we see the optimism of the love that “hopeth all things” and despairs of none. (c) *The redemption of the Cross.* This is the supreme manifestation of the love of God which finds expression in so many forms and spheres.

IV. THE OUTCOME OF IT. (a) "*That we might live through Him*" (chap. iv. 9). Deliverance from the power as well as the penalty of sin. (b) "*That we should love one another*. The redeemed life is to be lived in the power of the "new commandment."

Second Sunday After Trinity.

Text : "A certain man made a great supper and bade many."—*Luke* xiv. 16.

On more than one occasion our Lord was hospitably entertained by prosperous persons. This reminds us that except at times, for purposes of meditation and prayer, He did not leave the ordinary path of human life and neglect social duty. The preceding paragraphs show that He was a keen observer and He gives some practical council on behaviour under such circumstances. Now in this parable He proceeds to set forth the Gospel—its origin, its nature, its scope, and the treatment it receives even to-day. Let us take—

I. THE INVITATION ; OR, HOW GOD HAS DEALT WITH MAN. "A certain man made a great supper." This implies—(a) *That the Gospel is the result of the Divine thought and preparation*. The idea originated in the mind of God. Revelation and the events of human history have together been making preparation under His guidance. (b) *That religion has a social side*. There is partnership in worship and effort. This fellowship finds its highest expression in our Eucharistic worship. (c) *That the spiritual hunger of man can be satisfied by the provisions of the Gospel*. "All things are now ready." The table of Grace is laden with satisfying viands. "Bade many." Probably the primary reference is to the Jew and his advantages. Those first invited would be the more favoured among the friends of the kindly host.

II. THE REJECTION ; OR, HOW MAN HAS TREATED GOD. (a) *With disrespect*. The excuses are the product of a self-satisfaction which has no sense of need. The claims of (1) property, (2) business, and (3) home are insistent and have their proper place, but they must not be allowed to usurp that which God claims for Himself. (b) *This disregard is too general*. There seems to be a terrible conspiracy among men to decline the Gospel invitation. "They all *with one consent*," etc. These are they to whom the things of this life appear to matter most. "What shall it profit a man if

he . . . lose his soul?" Men by their own volition determine their destiny and then God fixes the decree—"None of those men . . . shall taste of My supper."

III. A LARGER SCHEME : AMPLE ACCOMMODATION. From the highways and hedges of the country-side as well as from the streets and lanes of the city they pass in, having but one qualification—*need*. When the Jew refused to recognize Christ, the larger scheme unfolded itself and the Gospel was seen in its fine Catholicity, there was "room" for Gentiles. This scheme affords—(a) *A task Angels would be glad to undertake*. Nevertheless it is one assigned to men and not to angels—"Go out." It entails activity and self-sacrifice. (b) *A task by no means free from difficulty*. This is implied in the words—"compel them to come in." (c) *A task not without its reward*. "They that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars for ever" (Dan. xii. 3).

Third Sunday After Trinity.

Text: "All of you be subject one to another."—I *Peter* v. 5 (Epistle).

Much controversy has raged round the question of the position assigned by our Lord to St. Peter. However as to the precise nature of his task there can be no doubt—he was to "strengthen the brethren." In this letter we see him fulfilling this ministry. The message of this section may be summed up thus: (1) Subjection, (2) Sobriety, (3) Steadfastness.

I. BE SUBJECT. St. Peter would have them "all" learn to esteem others better than themselves. He bids them "Gird on humility." The *ἐγκομβωμα* was a kind of apron, usually worn by slaves to keep the *ἐξωμὴς*, or vest, clean. Our cincture is thus a token of servitude and an acknowledgment of our obligation. But this sweet grace is none too common in our day. The saying, "Jack is as good as his master," is expressive of the spirit that is very prevalent. The man who is boisterously self-assertive and pushing is the man who is credited with gumption. Yes, but this is not the grace of a modesty which looks *out* rather than *in*. And after all, when we remember what tiny atoms we are in all the vast creation, it ought not to be difficult for us to cultivate the fine art of walking humbly before our God, Who recognizes and rewards

such a spirit (Mic. vi. 8). Do we crave to be in the limelight? The true Christian always is in the light of God.

Violet, violet—blue and sweet,
Nestling down at the old oak's feet—
Can it be you are glad to grow,
Nobody near your grace to know?
Whispered the violet, soft as air,
"GOD can look at me anywhere."

The Christian can afford to wait with patience for the "due time" (v. 6) in which God will "exalt" him.

II. BE SOBER. Though we need not interpret this in an exclusively literal sense, it should be noted that in classical Greek the word is frequently used to denote what we call total abstinence. Over-indulgence of any kind blunts our moral sensibility. We may take the word in a figurative sense as expressive of a general steadiness and self-control which fits us for carrying out the order—"Be on the alert." We need "to have our wits about us," self-indulgence may throw us off our guard. As an incentive we are reminded of the "alertness" of the Devil—alias our "adversary"—"who goeth about," etc. (Job i. 7; ii. 2). Refer to 1 Peter iv. 7 and Luke xxi. 34-6.

III. BE STEADFAST. There is to be firm attachment to the great body of revealed truth—"the faith." Possibly it had already begun to be crystallized in a "form of sound words" (see 2 Tim. i. 13 and iii. 14). Already the adversary was attacking not only the individual but the truths embodied in the creed. Men steadfast in the faith are needed to-day as much as ever. If a man cannot define his faith he is hardly likely to be able to defend it very effectively.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

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

During the advance of the Russian Army in the
Forward. summer of 1916 in the Buchatch-Dniester section of
 the front, this watchword was given to the attacking
 infantry, "Ever forward, not a step backward." In the strength
 of these words they went out against the lines of the enemy and
 drove them from their entrenched positions. Would it not be a
 fine thing if we all acted in the spirit of this watchword? So long
 as life lasts we shall all have spiritual foes to encounter—doubts,

unbelief, selfish ease, sins of the flesh or temper, temptations too numerous to be recounted. How are we dealing with them? Weak natures yield and are overcome. Others seem satisfied if they can just hold their ground, neither advancing nor retreating. This is virtual defeat. All hearts that are true to themselves and loyal to "the Captain of their salvation" will be content with nothing short of victory. They long to overcome the enemies of their own and the world's salvation. They know that without such victories they cannot win the world for Christ. And in each encounter with the foe, open or insidious, their hearts are fired by the ambition to gain ground and never betray their Lord by yielding in a moment of weakness. "Ever forward, not a step backward" will be their watchword.

* * * * *

In the reply of the Allies (December 30, 1916)

False Peace. to the German Peace Note, their reasons for rejecting the overtures of the enemy were clearly stated. The Allied Governments said that "the putting forward by the Imperial Government (i.e. Germany) of a sham proposal . . . appeared to be less an offer of peace than a war manœuvre." There is a striking parallel between this sentence and some words spoken about a hundred years ago by Henry Grattan, one of Ireland's greatest orators. Napoleon was then seeking to cajole Great Britain into accepting his proposals for peace. He claimed to be acting in the interests of humane principles; he was really masking his designs for a continuance of tyrannical power under professions of the love of liberty. Grattan tore the flimsy device to shreds, and in a burst of eloquence exclaimed, "Such offers of peace are nothing more than one of the arts of war"; and he warned our fathers that "if they listened they would be deceived—and not only deceived, but beaten." The Great Enemy of our salvation is always endeavouring to make a compact of peace between the world and the Church. "Why should not the Church meet the world on more friendly terms? Why uphold the dogmas of faith and practice which condemn the easy-going, pleasure-loving, sensual man of the world? Why contend for a creed which excludes so many other excellent religious systems? Let there be an end to this Pharisaic spirit. If the Church will enter into a closer alliance with the world, her influence for good will be far greater and Chris-

tian people will begin to enjoy themselves." By this kind of argument the Arch-enemy is continually trying to entangle believers. It is but a "sham proposal," "one of the arts of war," intended to deceive. Had the Allied nations accepted the German Peace Note they would (in the words of the Prime Minister) have "put their heads into a noose, of which Germany held the rope-end." They would have risked losing all for which they had been contending. They would have exchanged freedom for slavery.

In the spiritual conflict in which we are engaged, hard though it may seem at times to say it, yet the words of the Bible remain true—"the friendship of the world is enmity with God" (St. Jas. iv. 4). To yield weakly to the spirit of the times is not really to find peace. Too often it means losing the true peace of mind and conscience which can only be enjoyed by those whose loyalty and love for Christ constrain them to say "No" to the world.

* * * * *

Sitting one afternoon in the lounge-hall of the Strand Palace Hotel, my eyes were drawn to a notice hung up on the wall, printed large so as to be easily seen. It was this: "No Austrian, German, Turk, or Bulgarian, whether naturalized or not, is employed in this place." This meant that all who belonged to any nationality at war with Great Britain had been turned out. There was no room in that place for the enemy who had disturbed the peace of Europe and done such hideous wrong to the cause of humanity. How does it stand with you? What have you done to those enemies to the peace of your soul? those deadly foes to righteousness and heart-purity and holiness of character which work such havoc in the lives of men and women? I mean the temptations and allurements to sin which come in many a form and are known by different names. There are great and grievous sins, monstrous crimes, glaring vices, corresponding to the super-man among the nations. And there are "little sins" as they are called, of lesser magnitude, like Turks or Bulgarians. Do any of them find employment in your life? Some perhaps may be called "naturalized." In early life they became part of your very nature. Whatever be their name and character, let there be no place in your heart and life for the deadly habits of any form of wrong-doing. Cast them all out in the name of Jesus Christ and by the power of the Holy Spirit. Shut the

Sin—To be
Cast Out.

door of your heart against them, and guard with jealousy every avenue of thought along which they might come back and steal an entrance into your soul's citadel.

* * * * *

In his first speech in Parliament as Prime Minister, Peace—What is it? Mr. Lloyd George gave a clear forecast of the reply which the Allies would make to the German Peace Note, just received. "There must be no mistake," he said, "about our position in a matter of such vital importance to millions. Complete Restitution, Full Reparation, Effectual Guarantees—these are the only terms on which peace is possible." "Complete Restitution." The people who have been driven out by the enemy must be restored to their homes. "Full Reparation." As far as possible, recompense must be made for past wrongs, and justice must be satisfied. "Effectual Guarantees." The mere words that lured Belgium to her destruction would not satisfy the Allies any more than a written bond which could be torn up as a "scrap of paper" when "the law of necessity" is invoked by Teutonic aims and ambitions. Something better than Germany's word must be given as security for the future. The Prime Minister's words are very suggestive of something else—far greater and grander and more far-reaching than any peace which may be established by nations among themselves. I mean our "peace with God." By our sins we are estranged from Him. But through the Atonement of our Lord we are reconciled; and the peace He made for us through the Blood of the Cross carries with it a full security of these three conditions—"Complete Restitution, Full Reparation, Effectual Guarantees." "Complete Restitution"—to all the privileges and blessings which God intended for us when He created man in His own image, but which were forfeited by the sin of our first parents. "Full Reparation"—for the outrages done by the sins of countless generations to the Eternal Law of Righteousness. This has been accomplished for us by the sinless Life and perfect sacrifice of that Life offered by our Redeemer on the Cross. "Effectual Guarantees." These are set forth in parabolic language in the Epistle to the Hebrews (vi. 16-20). There are the two immutable things. First the promise, the simple word of the living God; and then that promise confirmed by an oath—the word of honour and the bond of a sacred compact on the part of God Himself "with

Whom it is (unlike man) impossible to lie." The German Peace Note (so called) illustrates the nature of the offers and promises which the world holds out—all is vague and illusory. Like the apples of Sodom, said to be found on the shores of the Dead Sea, they would prove to be full of ashes within. Those who accept God's Guarantee of peace in Jesus Christ His Son are never disappointed. It is a peace which passeth human understanding, because it is so divinely perfect in its assured security.

* * * * *

Boastful
Claims
Refuted.

The battle of Jutland, of which the first anniversary has just taken place, was at once acclaimed by Germany as a great victory for her High Sea Fleet. German newspapers issued extravagant statements about the comparative losses of ships on both sides, greatly in favour of Germany; subsequently adding that the British Grand Fleet had been utterly routed and put to flight. In the course of a few days the real truth became known. The much-vaunted victory of the German Navy had consisted in sinking a certain number of British ships and losing more of their own. The battle ended in the German ships being put to flight and taking shelter behind their mine-fields and in their protected harbours. The victors had fled, leaving the "vanquished" in possession of the field! Since then England's naval supremacy has probably been stronger than it was before. Sometimes in the conflict between Christianity and unbelief a battle is fought—in the realm of science perhaps—and the anti-religious press of the day boastfully asserts that the claims of Christ have been overthrown in argument. The world is given to understand that the books of the Bible have been annihilated as the vehicles of Divine inspiration and authority, that the downfall of Christianity as a Divine Revelation is now assured. Christian Apologists (like the British Admiralty) are at first afraid to claim all that has been won, and simple-minded believers are apt to give way to panic and to become faint-hearted, until the real truth is made clear. Then it is known that the forces of infidelity have been utterly discredited. Their attacks have only left the truth stronger than before, and "the impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture" stands above the waves and billows, supreme as ever.



The Missionary World.

THE missionary societies have now held their annual meetings and presented their annual reports to a Church that was expectant but rather anxious. The results are hopeful and stimulating—for difficulty stimulates as much as success. The note in the great meetings was that of chastened confidence, and the thanksgiving of those societies which had an especially favourable balance sheet was tempered by the necessity of an unrelaxed loyalty to responsibilities undertaken. Each year of the war it has been the custom to say that *next year will be the test*. It was said last year, and the year has been good. It is being said now again and the omen of rising prices supports the statement. But the missionary year of 1917-18 has dawned well, and the word is passing round that chastening is a proof of sonship and when it is not regarded lightly it is sure afterward to prove to be for our profit. The burden of missionary administration is a heavy one and those who bear it need to be encouraged by a cheerful and willing Church which announces its intention to see them through. The National Budget appeared about the same time as that of the missionary societies. Perhaps missionary supporters may here be reminded that the income tax is not to be raised and that the three newly increased taxes are not those which are ordinarily supposed to effect the regular contributors to missions! Let us set out bravely once more to give and to gain for the societies all that we can.

* * * * *

The C.M.S. made a notable advance on May 1, in appointing twenty-four women to membership of the General Committee. Events have been moving in this direction for several years; the step has not been taken without much careful thought and when it was taken it was done generously. A very important principle has been recognized in fixing the number of elected women at twenty-four—the same number as that of elected laymen previously appointed annually. The Society has recognized that the laity includes women as well as men and that the lay members of the Church need to be called into council. It would be a foolish interpretation to give of the occurrence that the Society wished to mark its thankfulness for the vast help which women have rendered to it. Rather

is it true that the Society has recognized that full-orbed work is that which alone can give the fullest results in the Kingdom of our Lord and having so resolved has fearlessly acted. In so doing the C.M.S. has given a lead to the Church of England, opening to the lay woman the same sphere of usefulness as to the lay man, and probably the effect will be widespread in other societies. However much we may personally welcome this step it remains to be affirmed that no advance, no reform, no new departure, however needful, will in itself effect great results; the Spirit of the Lord alone can vitalize, renew and bless. If He should pour out His Spirit freshly now upon the C.M.S. His sovereign power will have a new channel to use, and the glory will be given to Him and not to an expansion of the method of administration.

* * * * *

Few more striking instances of change in the "unchanging East" could be given than the account in the current number of the *Moslem World* of a modern newspaper called the *Kibla* which is published in Mecca. The latest telegrams and Marconigrams follow the course of the war and local news shows how the organization and discipline of the country are proceeding under the control of the Sherif. The aim of the paper is to support the movement for Arab independence and for return to old religious tradition, in opposition to the attitude of the (so-called) Committee of Union and Progress at Constantinople. In addition to news, which is said to be accurate though perhaps selected because it is favourable to the end in view, there are articles on the position of Islam in various lands and on current events touching Arab interests, or showing how other nations—*i.e.*, Italy—attained to independence; and extracts from Egyptian and Indian newspapers, and even from such London organs as the *Near East* and the *Morning Post*. Not only East and West but the Middle Ages and modern thought meet in this most interesting newspaper which appeals alike to the Bedouin in the desert and the cultured university student in the town. Mecca must ere long become an open city when it issues a paper with a world outlook such as this.

* * * * *

Mr. Wigram's article in the *C.M. Review* on "Past Efforts and Future Adaptations in the C.M.S. in India" is very welcome as giving a broad setting to the many questions which arise as to missionary policy and advance. The need of the hour is for wide-eyed

specialists, who know one subject supremely well, and yet because they can relate it to general issues are in no danger of taking action in view of that one subject alone. It is profoundly true that general evangelization, medical work among Moslems, educational work, work through indigenous Christians (whether by voluntary witness or by the ordained ministry) and church organization are all interlaced and act and re-act upon each other. There has never been a time when Christian missions were so full of possibility and hope or when problems lay so thickly along every line of advance.

* * * * *

We welcome with special pleasure the minute of the C.M.S. Committee on "The Progress of Christianity in India" called out by requests for reinforcements from the various Indian missions of the Society. Though addressed to the "governing bodies in the Indian field" it has a powerful message for those who serve the cause at home. It demonstrates the inadequacy of what is as yet being done in view of the needs of the work; it shows how thought in the home committee as well as in mission councils abroad is turning towards a transference of much more responsible office to qualified Indian workers; it throws open for "thoughtful consideration" the whole educational work of the society, and raises the question whether its educational policy might not in the future concentrate more closely on giving more efficient education to Christians, even at the cost of lessening other schools; finally this stirring memorandum deals with the need for fostering the sense of responsibility for the progress of vital Christianity which is "already happily manifest in some parts of the Indian field." We can conceive no better programme for a meeting of laymen or clergy, for a missionary night in a C.E.M.S. branch, or for a study circle, than a careful debate upon this statement by the committee. It leads to the heart of some of the most living problems of the day.

* * * * *

The question of missionary reinforcement after the war begins to claim attention from those whose eyes are turned to the needs abroad. The Conference of British Missionary Societies—which is meeting this month at Norwood instead of at Swanwick—has appointed a strong committee to consider the whole question of recruiting for foreign work, and communication has been opened with chaplains at the front and others who are in touch with men. It is

evident that when war claims press no longer the new spirit of sacrifice and service will lead many to offer for work overseas. Educational and training centres are considering how to complete the equipment of men who were called to the army in the midst of a college career, and missionary societies are taking pains to discover how such candidates as have true vocation may be used to the best effect. On the women's side a committee has been formed including representatives of agencies connected with home or parochial work, social service and foreign missions, so that the widest possible presentation of avenues for after-war service may be brought before the girls and women who have so strenuously served their country. Nothing but good can result from such a facing of the common needs of the world; the cause of foreign missions will assuredly not lose by being regarded as part of a great whole rather than as a separate interest in the Church's life.

* * * * *

In theory every reader of the *Churchman* has an interest in Jewish missions, and some at least take a practical part in their work. The London Jews' Society, in particular, claims support from many of the parishes which support the C.M.S. But Jewish missions will never come to their own until the extraordinary interest of the Jewish mission field is presented with a force and freshness greater than in the past. It needs to be shown that this scattered ancient people, comparatively few in number, make an appeal as varied as the other non-Christian races, and that in solving, or even intelligently studying, the problems presented to Christianity by Judaism—whether orthodox or reformed—light will be thrown on the very heart of missions to Moslems. There are among us not a few who have made a scholarly study of Judaism and the Jewish mission field, and of them some have produced literature of great apologetic value for use among the Jews. Will some of these writers turn their pens to produce pamphlets or articles which will win from the Christian public for the Jewish people and Jewish missions that warmth of well-instructed sympathy which they sadly need? We believe a large response would follow such an approach.

* * * * *

China's Millions for May contains an editorial note, which owing to its peculiar value we take the liberty of reprinting almost in full. The subject dealt with is the China Inland Mission and the war.

this mission, as is well known, contains missionaries of numerous nationalities and accordingly it has had to deal with exceptional complications. The entry of America into the war and the breach of diplomatic relations between China and Germany, bringing a possible five hundred million more human beings into relation with the conflict, have increased the complications. China was one of the few remaining parts of the world where German missions could continue their work; this presumably will now be suspended. There were also German missionaries on the staff of the C.I.M. The situation is delicate for the C.I.M. and the statement which follows will be widely welcomed.

“Quite apart from the many political and economic questions involved, with which we are not here concerned, the problems which this strife forces upon the Church of Christ are complicated and painful beyond measure, and the Mission’s difficulties are only a part of this greater whole. Believing, as we do, that the Church of Christ is composed of those who, out of every nation, have been born from above through faith in Christ’s atoning work, we are naturally more concerned about the attitude in spirit of Christians one toward another than about any other question. And in this war it seems as though Satan was making his supreme effort to separate those who are called to be one in Christ Jesus.

“Though we do not write as avowed pacifists or conscientious objectors, we can and do adopt the following words of an article published in the *Friend* for February 16 last: ‘In our judgment the present condition of the world constitutes a call to emphasize more than ever before the super-nationality of the missionary movement and of the Church of Christ generally. In its very essence the missionary message is opposed to everything that savours of racial antipathy or prejudice. The work to which we are divinely called is not to extend the civilization and interests of any particular nation, but to make Jesus Christ known to the world.’

“In a way that was quite unsought and manifestly of God the China Inland Mission has developed not only into an interdenominational but also into an international organization. . . . Is this bond in Christ to be sacrificed to war? If it is, will it be for God’s glory? Only a supreme love to Christ and a supreme devotion to His Kingdom can overcome the disruptive forces of this war as they bear upon the members and associates of the Mission. . . . In view of inquiries which have been made by some friends of the Mission it seems desirable to state that in the matter of finance all the Continental Associate Missions are entirely supported by funds supplied by their own countries. These and other similar matters connected with the practical administration of the work are known to the British Minister in China and to the authorities at home.

“But some may ask, as some have asked, if fellowship is possible or desirable in the light of all that has happened. The answer to this must depend upon the loyalty of all to the sole object for which they are united, namely, to quote the [words used above, ‘not to extend the civilization and interests of any particular nation, but to make Jesus Christ known to the world.’ Failure in this respect must imperil the fellowship. This is not to denationalize any men or make him unpatriotic, but solely to put the things of Christ first. As to whether a man should repudiate the actions of his country, as British

Christians have repudiated the opium traffic, that assumes that the man has full, unbiased, and accurate information upon which his judgment can be based. Until such time as all have this there is at least a call for patience, forbearance, and charity. Only God can really judge the heart of any man.

"What the future holds in store we do not know. Our one concern, come what may, must be to maintain the spirit of Jesus Christ, to love our enemies, to pray for those who spitefully use us, to ask that our love may increase and abound one toward another and toward all men. Only thus can evil be overcome and the spirit of war cast out."

* * * * *

The *Foreign Field* (Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society) contains a brief and striking article by Mr. Marshall Broomhall on the end of opium in China. In 1906 the Emperor of China issued a decree saying that "within a limit of ten years, this harmful foreign muck must be fully and entirely cleansed away." The task is now completed. So engrossed with war demands have we all been that this really great event has received comparatively little notice. Vigorous agitation was made in this country, and in certain circles it is true to say that there was prayer "without ceasing," but the impressive part in the anti-opium movement was taken by China itself. Immense financial sacrifice was made to suppress the trade, and those who know China well think that nothing but moral greatness could induce the rulers to persevere in their determination. *The Times* stated that "the strongest of governments might have flinched from such a task." Not so China. We echo Mr. Broomhall's closing question: "With such striking qualities as these, to what heights of national greatness may not China rise if possessed by the quickening power of the Spirit of Jesus Christ?" F.C.G.'s Cartoon in the *Westminster Gazette* is reproduced in the *Foreign Field*, representing a Chinaman in conversation with John Bull and in pidgin English explaining that when opium was stopped in ten years' time then he would send a missionary to stop drink in England.

G.



Reviews of Books.

WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST? By the Rev. C. E. Raven, M.A. London :
Macmillan and Co. Price 4s. 6d. net.

It is the first duty of a reviewer of this book to thank Mr. Raven very warmly for having published the five lectures of which it consists, and to bespeak for them a wide and careful reading. They are written in a very lucid style, and although they make no parade of learning, and footnotes and references are conspicuous by their absence, there is no difficulty in discerning that very wide and thorough study of the necessary literature lies behind them. We say unhesitatingly that younger clergy and lay people with some measure of education will have their knowledge extended and their thinking stimulated by Mr. Raven's work. He has done the Church real service.

Not the least interesting part of the book is the Introduction, which takes the form of an autobiographical apology for its appearance. Cambridge men and others will have recollections of the storm at Emmanuel College which was caused a few years ago by the anti-Christian crusade of the late Master. In those days Mr. Raven, then newly-appointed Dean, had to bear the brunt of the fighting on the Christian side. He was forced to search for the foundations of the faith that was in him, and in the conflict he gradually felt his way towards the theology which he has here made an attempt to state. But before he published his conclusions, he wisely left the academic atmosphere and tested them in the very different atmosphere of parochial life. A theory stands or falls, as he recognizes, by its salvation value.

Before we leave the Introduction, one paragraph must be quoted. It is a statement as to those persons who will disapprove of the main principle on which the book rests. They are "all those who on one ground or another maintain that in religion restatement is neither necessary nor possible, since all matters in dispute can be settled by submission to an authority of an infallible or absolute character, that is, to an authority whose verdict is to be accepted without question as final and decisive." The present writer agrees with Mr. Raven on his main principle, and we need be the less alarmed about it because he tells us that real reform must "be begun by way of a readjustment of emphasis, not of a restatement of belief."

It will be well, perhaps, now to try to sum up in a few sentences the gist of the book. Lecture I, on "Man's Knowledge of God," distinguishes between God as Absolute, of Whom probably only the mystics can know anything, and they not much, and God as relative Whom we do know. There follows a discussion of transcendence, immanence, revelation and inspiration; and the chapter closes with an excellent account of the modern attitude to the miracles. Let us quote one sentence. "Modern psychology compels us to allow that the miracles of Jesus, and to a lesser degree those of His followers, are the reasonable, the natural, the inevitable accompaniment of lives of unique exaltation, purity and power."

Lecture II, on "The Oneness of Jesus," is a sketch of the development of Christology in the early Church, and a criticism of its predominantly metaphysical character and consequent obscuration of the humanity of Christ.

Lecture III, bearing the title, "The Many-sidedness of Jesus," turns out to be an account of the sources for the life of Christ. The Synoptic and Johannine problems take up most of the space. This lecture is exceedingly good. There is a saneness and balance about it which are very refreshing

after the unconvincing hair-splittings of some arm-chair writers. We do not remember any other untechnical account of St. John's Gospel which is so fresh and convincing. We had better add that Mr. Raven defends the Johannine authorship.

Lecture IV is the climax of the argument. It is difficult to sum it up. But it may suffice to say that after an examination of what are called the sincerity, the sympathy and the claim of Jesus, and an account of human experiences of ecstasy and communion with God, the author states and defends the following position: "Christ transcends us as the perfect does the partial, as the image of God does those who are spoiled copies of that image. His oneness with the Divine comes along the same lines and affects the same side of His nature as do our ecstasy and communion. We must reckon it a difference rather of degree than of kind." Lecture V attempts to examine the practical results of this Christology. A number of points are touched on, the most striking being a theory of Atonement by the transforming effect of the love of Christ upon our personality.

Now for a word of appreciation of the main contention of the book. We can go a long way with Mr. Raven. We quite sympathize with his dissatisfaction with Patristic Christology. We heartily support his plea for a Christology based on experience, thoroughly ethical in tone and consonant with modern psychology. Where we differ from him is this. Having excellently laid a foundation, he needlessly refuses to build a house. We hope he will understand if we say that his position is over much Ritschlian. The revolt against metaphysics is carried too far. What is wrong with the Patristic Christology is not that it is metaphysics, but that it is bad metaphysics, divorced from experience. Our ethical conception of Christ should lead us on to a metaphysical conception of Him. Let us quote from H. R. Mackintosh's "The Person of Jesus Christ" (p. 303): "Let us recollect that the Christ thus ethically known pertains ultimately to the sphere of reality with which the metaphysician is concerned, and that there exists no legitimate point of view in which He appears as a merely relative phenomenon. . . . Between the ethical and the metaphysical view of Christ there is no final antagonism." We would add that Mr. Raven's account of the Atonement in Lecture V seems to us defective precisely because he lacks a metaphysic of Christ. The Godward aspect of the Atonement is entirely ignored in favour of a moral-influence theory.

There are two minor criticisms. Mr. Raven professes to be "brutally frank." Occasionally his "brutality" is excessive. The book would be improved by the modification of some passages. Moreover it would greatly assist the reader if a good analysis of the argument were provided.

We would repeat, in closing, our gratitude for the book. We are very sorry to have to give it only a somewhat qualified approval.

C. H. K. BOUGHTON.

TRADE, POLITICS, AND CHRISTIANITY IN AFRICA AND THE EAST. By A. J. Macdonald, M.A., with an Introduction by Sir Harry Johnston, G.C.M.G., K.C.B., Sc.D. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Price 6s. net.

The author has made a very complete study of the great problems of Imperial administration which are connected with the subject of his book, and his discussion of them is most illuminating and informing. It is worthy of the careful attention of all who are in any degree responsible for influencing the government of our possessions in Asia and in Africa, and also of missionary workers and of the great public which is now concerned with the interests of missionary work. In several chapters he deals fully with labour

problems in Africa (both African and East Indian), the liquor traffic in Africa, India and Ceylon, and the opium and morphia trade in China. Lack of space prevents any full review of these chapters, which probably form the most valuable portion of the book. It must suffice to say that they reveal many facts which should make any British subject blush, and that the sore points are very faithfully dealt with in the light of our Christian obligations, while practical remedies are everywhere suggested. The nemesis following the un-Christian behaviour of Christian nations appears clearly from time to time in the discussion. Before leaving the subject, we must just note that Bishop Tugwell and the West African missionaries are completely vindicated in their action with reference to the liquor controversy some years ago; while it is very serious to read that, in connection with the same traffic in India and Ceylon, restrictive measures which the people themselves desire are not granted, so that positively "the Churches find themselves supported by the adherents of the native religions against a Government which is nominally Christian." The opium curse, again, seems only to be making way for the worse havoc of morphia, great quantities of which are imported into China by British firms through Japanese agents. The author pleads forcefully for a sincere exposition of Christian principles by traders and politicians abroad. We hope his earnest words may be heeded.

Other chapters discuss the relation of Christianity to education and to non-Christian religions: and we should like to notice in some degree matters which so closely concern us here. One very interesting theory is propounded on the difficult subject of the organization of Native Churches in India. The argument is this. India must be treated as an empire of federated races, not as a federation of separate states in a single nation. Consequently it is impossible to look for a National Church of India. There must be a number of national Churches for the different races. Some of us may think the suggestion raises as many difficulties as it tries to settle: but the author might reply that the difficulties of secular government are anyhow as great. With his attitude to other religions it is not easy to deal—partly because a fair presentation of it would require lengthy treatment, as his qualifications are numerous and many of his statements are limited by them to an extent difficult to determine. Yet we cannot accept his standpoint, which does not sufficiently recognize the essential uniqueness of Christianity. What, for instance, does this mean?—"Christianity, distinct from missionary enterprise, cannot afford to maintain the old exclusive attitude." How can Christianity be distinguished from missionary enterprise? Are not the terms identical, in the Founder's purpose and commands? In this section particularly, but also indeed elsewhere in the book, we are impressed by the truth of a dictum lately heard, that modern writers say much about Christianity, little about Christ. The main defect of Mr. Macdonald's outlook on other religions is that he writes of a powerfully influencing and permeating, and indeed an absorbing Christianity, but seems to forget the all-conquering Christ.

The book is greatly marred by some passages in the Introduction, contributed by Sir H. Johnston, a distinguished Imperial administrator of wide-spread fame. He emphasizes the aspect of Christianity as "the Gospel of Pity," established for the first time by Christ, and transforming life. This, of course, is well enough; but he also speaks in what can only be described as contemptuous terms of the doctrines on which that Gospel is based. Some may feel that his testimony to the results of missionary work is the more valuable because it must therefore be entirely unprejudiced. He regards those results as purely ethical: but ethical results depend for their solidity

and endurance upon changed hearts—and hearts cannot be changed even by the sublime ethics of Christianity in themselves. For the past two and a half years the world has had the plainest lesson on the consequences to ethical behaviour of the repudiation of Christian doctrine. One would have thought such a lesson would have come home to observers much less trained and skillful than the writer of this Introduction. Yet it seems entirely lost on Sir H. Johnston.

W. S. HOOTON.

THE STUDENTS OF ASIA. By G. Sherwood Eddy, M.A., with Foreword by the Hon. Sir Arthur Lawley, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., K.C.M.G. British Edition edited by Basil Yeaxlee, B.A. London: R.T.S. Price 3s. 6d. net.

Asia is trying to crowd into a decade or two a renaissance which occupied centuries in Europe. At any rate the leading nations of Asia are doing so; and the renaissance is in many respects an even greater one. This is quite in harmony with the spirit of an age in which everything is done at lightning speed. But is the Church of Christ keeping pace with such rapid movement? In the war we have been forced to "speed up" our preparations and to subordinate everything to efficiency. In the greater warfare we are still far too content to "wait and see."

These are some of the reflections which arise from such a book as this. And everybody who wishes to understand the renaissance of Asia should read it. Mr. Eddy, whose expert knowledge of the facts is everywhere understood, sums up conditions in India, China, and Japan. We do not always realize that these include something between one-third and one-half of the world's population—possibly nearer one-half than one-third, though we are not sure whether the author's assumption that China represents one-fourth by itself can be confidently maintained in view of some statistics of recent years. His special attention is given, of course, to student life, which he describes in a manner that enables us to enter into its conditions more fully than anything we are likely to meet with elsewhere. And his special appeal is to Western students; but this is a book that ought by no means to be confined to student readers. Among other notable features we should like to call attention to the extraordinary accounts of the vast meetings of Oriental students which Mr. Eddy has addressed, and of the great growth of Christian influence among prominent men in China, as well as to the vividly told life-stories of leaders like Chang Po-ling, Bishop Azariah, Dr. Neesima, and several others, which are of heart-stirring interest. Sir Arthur Lawley contributes an ideal Foreword, which is no mere friendly recognition of the ethical results of missionary work, but indicates true spiritual sympathy with its vital aims, and bears the remarkable testimony that among all the influences stirring social and political life in India, "that of the missionaries is *wholly* for good."

We are glad to see that Mr. Eddy, with all his American vigour and experience of the value of educational work, is old-fashioned enough to declare in uncompromising terms the pre-eminence in urgency and fruitfulness of regular evangelistic effort. Such workers are "the infantry who must finally win or lose the day in missions." It is good also in these days to read the plain statement that "Hinduism must be held responsible for the separation of religion and morality found in Southern Asia." Yet he understands fully the value of a tactful presentation of the truth. It is amazing to read that only fifty people in India avowed themselves agnostics at the last census, the majority even of these being in Burma. This shows the religious nature of the Indian peoples, but it does not diminish the peril of the disintegrating

forces of secular and materialistic education. There is a virtual agnosticism, or a perfectly futile attempt to bolster up the Hindu system, which are as dangerous as even avowed atheism. We are also struck by the remark that India has more Christians, and yearly adds more converts, than any other field, though others may attract more notice. But we can linger no further over details, and can only conclude by suggesting that the book itself shall be procured and read.

W. S. H.

THE CROSS IN MODERN ART. Descriptive Studies of some Pre-Raphaelite Paintings. The Rev. John Linton, M.A. London: *Duckworth and Co.* 5s. net.

This volume contains studies of twelve well-known paintings, by Madox Brown, Rossetti, Millais, Holman Hunt, and Watts: artists who are all more or less closely connected with the "Pre-Raphaelite" movement. The aim of the writer is to show how the essential truths of Christianity have been re-interpreted in English art for the modern world. "The Art of the Pre-Raphaelites was in the profoundest sense religious, because they were religious men." The writer of this work claims that they have brought back the Cross into modern Art—but not the crucifix that dominated pre-Reformation Christianity, and the dark and repellent enigma of Calvinistic theology. The Cross, to these "Pre-Raphaelites," is at once more divine and human than either of these, and finds its most complete and direct expression in Burne-Jones' mystic "Tree of Life," which forms the frontispiece of the volume. The writer is at great pains to conceal the idea of "Death, or the ugliness of death," in the portrayal of the Cross in modern Art; but surely it was "The death of the Cross" that was the Apostle's "Glory," and that must for ever be the sinner's only hope. A great deal of thoughtful inquiry has been made into the motives and aims of the artists, in painting the various pictures, with the result that much unsuspected beauty is revealed.

THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS. A Study in the Apostles' Creed. Henry Barclay Swete, D.D. London: *Macmillan and Co.* 2s. 6d. net.

No one will expect in a brochure of small compass a full treatment of a theme so vast and important as the Forgiveness of Sins. Rather we expect to find the outlines of the subject arranged in a manner meant to be suggestive of further study. For such an endeavour Dr. Swete (whose death we regret to record occurred on May 10) had no equal, and this scholarly work is full of reliable assistance to the preacher of the Gospel of Reconciliation. The first section, upon the Biblical doctrine, elucidates its essential features, and refers the reader back to his Bible for further meditation. The second part summarizes the history of the Church in its application of the fact through its ministry, and develops both the requirement of confession and the evolution of a system so as to cast much light upon certain modern controversies. The concluding chapters discuss the Forgiveness of Sins in experience, and will be useful to the missionary who seeks to arouse souls to the acceptance of Christ, or to the pastor who desires wisely to handle the perplexities which are not infrequently laid before him. This inexpensive book is within the reach of the clergy, and they will find it stimulating and helpful beyond many of more ample proportions.

The Directors of The London City and Midland Bank, Limited, announce that they have elected the Right Hon. Reginald M'Kenna to a seat at their Board.