

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

March, 1919.

THE MONTH.

It is with genuine regret that we have been compelled "The Churchman." to increase the price of THE CHURCHMAN from and after the present issue. During the last twelve months the cost of production has been steadily rising owing to the great increase in the price of paper and the steady advance in printing charges, until now the burden has become greater than the magazine can bear. It is possible that there may soon be some slight relief in the matter of paper, but in the present state of unrest in the industrial world, the tendency will be for the cost of printing to increase rather than decrease. We are fully assured that our friends and readers would not like to feel that their copy of THE CHURCHMAN—which, we have reason to know, is coming to be more and more valued—is supplied to them at a loss which has to be made good by others, and we have no doubt we are fully justified in believing that they will loyally and heartily co-operate with us in the endeavour to make both ends meet in a fair, reasonable, and business-like way. It is not proposed to make any alteration this year in cases where the yearly subscription for THE CHURCHMAN is already paid, but in every other case the subscription from and after this date will be 10s. per year; and from January 1, 1920, the subscription will be 10s. a year to *all* subscribers. The price of single copies will be 1s. We greatly regret the change, but the circumstances of the time leave us no alternative. We have been greatly encouraged by the steady rise in the circulation of THE CHURCHMAN during the last few months, and we appeal confidently to all friends of Evangelical truth to lend us their aid in extending its influence. This they can do first by subscribing annually themselves and then by introducing the magazine to other friends and persuading them also to subscribe.

It is a circumstance of wide and remarkable significance that this year the annual conference known as the London Meeting of Lay Churchmen devoted its two sessions to the consideration of the Second Advent; and, what is equally noteworthy, the attendances both in the morning and the afternoon were larger—so, at least, it seemed to the present writer—than on any previous occasion. Such an experience seems fully to justify the belief that now the subject is appealing more deeply to the mind and heart of Christian people than it has done for at least a generation. Not that they have ever wholly lost their hold upon “that Blessed Hope,” but with the pressure of other questions, believed to be of a more “practical” character, it has gradually receded into the background, and the Lord’s distinct command to “Watch” has been neglected by all but a small number of His people. And yet, if we only viewed the question aright, is there, can there ever be anything more “practical” in its bearing upon the Christian’s daily life and walk, than the expectancy of the Lord’s personal return? The revival of interest—if so we may express it—in the doctrine of the Second Advent is due, no doubt, to the extraordinary happenings in the world during the last four and a half years. Even the most casual of persons, men and women of no fixed religious beliefs, have been compelled to recognize that something has been and is taking place that they cannot explain or even understand. It has been literally and entirely true that men’s hearts have been and are still “failing them for fear,” and again and again the question is asked, “How will it all end?” It is in these circumstances that the Christian believer has turned again to the infallible guide—the Holy Scriptures—and there he has rediscovered the almost forgotten truth that the Lord is coming again. “This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven,” and the promise has come to them in a new light, with fresh strength, and with added beauty. The Lord is coming again, and there are many who think they discern in the signs of the times the nearness of His return. But however that may be—it is not a matter for dogmatic statement, as we cannot forget the warnings against fixing times and seasons—it is not of such supreme importance as the revival of faith and hope in the personal return of the Lord Jesus Christ, and we cannot but feel

that the calm, clear and wise discussion of the question by the London Meeting of Lay Churchmen will do much to fix attention upon that central fact. The Chairman, Professor Beresford Pite, struck the right note in his opening address that it was the return of a Person, the Lord Jesus Christ, for which they were watching and waiting, and that no solution of the world's problems could be effective which left that fact out of sight. Upon this lofty theme the Meeting concentrated: it was the burden of every paper read; it found its expression in every prayer offered and every hymn sung; and the result must be a quickening of desire on the part of all who come under the influence of the Meeting to live and work more truly in the light of the certain truth that the Lord is coming again. All the papers reached a very high level of thought and knowledge and power; each showed a wonderfully close acquaintance with the Scriptures bearing upon the question, and a real capacity for applying the prophecies and promises to the world-conditions of to-day.

After a discussion ranging over a period of twelve years there has been reached on Prayer Book Revision what the Archbishop calls "a remarkable measure of agreement," and it would seem at last that we are nearing the end of the matter so far, at least, as the Convocations are concerned, although even there it is possible, judging from the reports of the February session, that one or two points may yet be reopened. But how was this "remarkable measure of agreement" arrived at? Ordinary minds were in a state of confusion concerning what the Convocations had actually done, and what relation, if any, the various decisions of the four different Houses had to one another. In these circumstances the Archbishops of Canterbury and York convened a Conference, of a semi-formal character, consisting of members of all four Houses, "to make a systematic review of the whole of the work already done by the two Convocations in preparation of an Answer to the Royal Letters of Business, to bring out the measure of agreement that exists, and to make recommendations which could be submitted to the Conference by the Presidents." The Conference met early in October last, and the sittings lasted eight days. The Report of the Conference is now available (published by the S.P.C.K., *Royal Letters of Business*, 1919, No. 517),

and it was presented to and practically accepted by the Convocations at their February session. It is this report which presents "a remarkable measure of agreement," although, for ourselves, we cannot see anything "remarkable" about it when we examine the names of the fifty members of the Conference. The definitely Evangelical members numbered about one-sixth of the whole body. It is not pretended that the Conference was unanimous and we feel confident that the votes of Evangelical members were certainly hostile to some at least of the proposals that appear in this "agreed" report.

What has
been Done.

The Report is a very full one and occupies fifty-nine pages. The various changes agreed upon are set out in full detail and need to be very carefully considered. In the main they follow the conclusions of the Convocations, but in some instances the Conference has improved upon what Convocation proposed, e.g., in the Holy Communion this report would allow the use of either the first or the second half of the Words of Administration, or with the consent of the Ordinary the whole form of words may be said "once to each row of Communicants instead of saying them to each Communicant severally." Convocation, it will be remembered, decided in favour of the permissive use of the first half of the Words only. This is a great gain. The proposals for Reservation are retained, and on the question of Vestments the change made by the Conference is distinctly for the worse. The question of the Vestments, as the Dean of Canterbury reminds us, was treated in the proposals of the Canterbury Convocation by a Resolution respecting the Ornaments Rubric which avoided proposing any alteration in the law, but which would have recognized, "under specified conditions and with due safeguards, a diversity of use." In other words, the question of the legality of the Vestments was evaded, but they were to be tolerated with some undefined safeguards. But the proposals of the Conference take no notice of the Ornaments Rubric, but propose a "Note to be prefixed to the Order of Holy Communion," to the following effect: "Notwithstanding anything that is elsewhere enjoined in any Rubric or Canon, the Priest in celebrating the Holy Communion may wear either a surplice with stole, or with scarf and hood, or a white alb plain with a vestment or cope." It

is to be presumed that the word "vestment," as here distinguished from "cope," would include the chasuble. If so, the effect of this Note is to override the existing law, and to give formal legal sanction to the use of Vestments—supposing, of course, that it receive the sanction of Parliament. This, it is evident, would give legal concession to the whole claim of the Ritualistic party, and would formally declare that the use of Vestments is in accordance with the law of this Church and Realm. Thus a very difficult and delicate situation has been created, and this is rendered still more difficult and delicate by the *Nota Bene* added by the Conference, viz. : "This Note is subject to the conditions and safeguards which the Convocations shall hereafter determine, and which shall be here specified. The Conference did not consider these conditions and safeguards, inasmuch as they may be affected by action taken on the Report of the Committee on the Relations between Church and State, and the possible establishment of Parochial Church Councils." When the question was before Convocation, great stress was laid upon the value of "safeguards," but the Conference did not think it worth while to "consider" them, because, forsooth, action taken on the Church and State Report may affect them. The Conference evidently has a firmer faith in the probability of such "action" being taken than is shared by Churchmen generally.

The Report
Adopted.

When the Report of the Conference was presented to the Convocations at the February session the Lower House of the Southern Province adopted it practically in its entirety. In the Upper House, however, some difficulty was raised over the Vestments proposals, and decision on that point was deferred until the May session, but with this exception the Bishops adopted the Report. In the Northern Province the Report of the Conference seems to have been discussed in private, but from a report furnished officially in the press we are glad to learn that the Bishop of Manchester made a strong protest. "He said he grieved more than he could tell over two changes in particular affecting the use of eucharistic vestments and reservation of the sacrament. They seriously affected the doctrinal position of the Church of England, and would lead to great and serious trouble. There would be great danger of a serious

falling away of many of their members. They would part company, for instance, with the Church of Canada, which had refused to make these alterations, and the controversy would be carried into the mission field and into every parish, where it would have to be debated whether the new or the old Prayer Book was to be used." The result of the discussion seems to have been, in the words of the official report, that "the House gave its assent to the recommendations in the report except so far as some of its members retained the objections they had consistently offered to some of the proposals which had commended themselves to the majority." The Lower House "eventually adopted" the Report. But what we are anxious to know is when an opportunity is to be afforded to the Houses of Laymen to discuss this Report in detail? We imagine they will have something to say about Vestments, Reservation, and kindred questions, and what they will say may not be very pleasant hearing for Convocation.

An Unsettled Question. On one point, however, the Conference did not come to any agreement, viz., in regard to the proposed changes in the structure of the Communion Service.

Whether they tried and failed, or whether they purposely left it on one side, does not appear. All we are told is that "the Conference agreed *nem. con.* to the following Resolution: 'That their Graces the Archbishops be respectfully asked to call together a conference of clergy belonging to different schools of thought, in which younger men and liturgical scholars should have full representation, to discuss (after Communion and prayers) the question of permissive alterations in the structure of Holy Communion, in order to forward an agreed settlement of the matter.'" It is to be hoped that before the Archbishops call such a conference they will have received the great Memorial, signed by more than 3,000 clergy and upwards of 102,000 laity, protesting against such changes. This will enable the Archbishops to form some estimate of the strength of the opposition which will not be affected one way or another by any decision such a conference might come to. An "agreed settlement" is out of the question.

THE PUBLIC WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH.¹

BY ALBERT MITCHELL, Member of the House of Laymen,
Canterbury Province.

THE second of the Committees appointed by the two Archbishops to "rehandle" the subjects in regard to which the "failures" of those who make up the Church and Nation had been revealed in the National Mission, or the preparation therefor, was directed to the subject of "The Public Worship of the Church." For some occult reason the adjective has been dropped out in the Report. The insertion of eighteen lines on the subjects of private and family prayer does not appear to afford sufficient explanation.

The Committee as nominated (for it possessed no representative character) consisted of twenty-two persons, of whom four were unable to give much attention to the work. Of the remaining eighteen "effectives," thirteen were ecclesiastics, three laymen, and two women. One, at least, of the absent ecclesiastics has exercised much influence on the Report. Only three, at most four, of the members had definite association with the Evangelical School, and all of those would be regarded as quite "moderate" in their views; but at least seven belonged to the more extreme High Church wing. There was not a single representative of lay Evan-

¹ We are publishing in the CHURCHMAN a series of articles reviewing the Reports of the five Committees of Inquiry, appointed by the Archbishops as an outcome of the National Mission. These will appear month by month not in the order in which the Reports were issued, but in the order in which the Committees were appointed. The Committee on "The Teaching Office of the Church," was the *first*, and their Report was reviewed in the CHURCHMAN for February. The Committee on "The Public Worship of the Church" was the *second* to be appointed, and their Report, reviewed in this article, is published by the S.P.C.K. (price 6d. net). The members of the Committee were as follows:—The Dean of Christ Church (Chairman), the Rev. W. C. Bishop, Dr. Walford Davies, the Head Deaconess St. Andrew's Community, the Rev. H. P. Dempsey, Canon F. Lewis Donaldson, the Rev. W. H. Draper, the Rev. W. H. Frere, Miss M. C. Gollock, Archdeacon Gresford Jones, the Rev. F. A. Iremonger, Mr. H. E. Kemp, Canon F. B. Macnutt, Archdeacon Southwell, Miss L. V. Southwell, the Bishop of Stepney, the Rev. N. S. Talbot, Miss Talbot, the Rev. F. Underhill, the Rev. F. S. Guy Warman, the Dean of Wells, and Viscount Wolmer. Note by the Chairman: The Head Deaconess of St. Andrew's Community and Miss L. V. Southwell were unfortunately obliged to withdraw from the Committee owing to ill-health. The Dean of Wells, for the same reason, attended none of the meetings. Archdeacon Southwell is at the Front, and I have been unable to obtain his final opinion on the report. The rest have approved it, and four members have appended reservations upon one or two points.

gical Churchmanship. Whether by accident or design the impression is given that the Archbishops regard the sphere of public worship as the exclusive preserve of the High Churchman. This is, of course, consonant with the general policy of the Episcopate. Evangelicals are (in moderation) welcome on Church platforms; their Evangelistic fervour must not, by any means, be lost to the Church; work of some kind (preferably spade work the more finished results of which can be utilized by others) must always be found for their energies; their financial assistance must be secured—it does not usually cost very much more than a few kind words, for Evangelicals are an easily placated folk); *BUT*—in all matters of public worship, the ritual and external observances and furniture must be in accordance with High Church ideals; if a corporate (diocesan or otherwise) service is held, the High Church forms are rigidly adhered to; it is assumed that the Evangelicals, for the privilege of admission, will sink their own distinctive practices and interpretations.

“We want,” says the Archbishop of Canterbury in his foreword, “critics as well as advocates.” That is a healthy note to strike.

I.

The Report (which is a good bit overloaded with extraneous matter) leads off with some general considerations. “The instinct for worship has seriously diminished in the people as a whole. In some it exists, but is perverted . . . in others it can hardly be said to exist.” The Committee lean to the view that worship has been a matter of tradition, custom, and legal obligation; and they desire “a better sense of obligation . . . which may rest . . . on devotion and a sense of spiritual need.” But is there not a root-fallacy here? Is there such a thing as an instinct for worship, and can worship be produced either by a sense of obligation or by a sense of need? Is it not rather the fact that the true spirit of worship can be produced only by a realized satisfaction of a foregoing need? Man has an instinct for religion of some kind: something that will satisfy his need, whether it be of protection, of guidance, or (where it is sufficiently developed to include a sense of sin) of forgiveness. Satisfy that need, in however small a degree, and then the desire to worship may be created; but not before.

The remarks that follow as to the weakening of “personal

habits of devotion" and the need of recovery of "common prayer in the family circle" . . . "in some form or another—in new forms if the traditional and decaying ones are thought unsatisfactory," lead up to a long paragraph on the need for training the religious instinct. We are told that even the "atrophied" instinct ("common to all His children") is "capable of recovery . . . when the causes of atrophy are removed, when the will is turned to God and the heart is moved in response to His Love"; but when yet not "entirely atrophied" may be "trained by painstaking effort and quickened by Divine Grace" and "becomes the force that uplifts men to the heights of Communion with God" and "then demands more and more developed stages alike of liturgical worship and institutional religion and of mystical approach to God." A fine piece of confused thinking and unhappy expression. The Committee fail utterly to grasp the fact, so clearly perceived by those who framed our Morning and Evening Prayer, that until there is a revelation of God's law, a sense of sin, and a ministry of forgiveness, all attempts at worship must end in failure. In other words, "devotion" is not a matter of "forms," but of the response of the heart to a realized personal relationship; and worship is not so much a process or means as a result of definite experience. The Committee put the cart before the horse.

II.

The Report runs off here into three successive digressions. The first deals with the lack of religious training in the education of the young, which is stated to be one of the most important causes of the failure of the Services of the Church. Now the fallacy that the school can ever be made an effective substitute for the home in the matter of the impulse to Divine Service is dear to the heart of the priest, but it is wholly mischievous. The Church, as it has gradually, under the evil influence of the Oxford Movement, alienated the first generation of fathers, has been continually engaged in the attempt to evolve a new generation of fathers, more docile to the "great improvements in the order and beauty of the services" which the Report complacently chronicles; but the attempt has been, and will be, futile. You may, perhaps, retain the allegiance of the older generation when you have lost the younger; but you will never retain the allegiance of the younger folk after you have

alienated the older. The boy who is proud to go to church with his father is quick to respond to the disapproval implied in his father's abstention from attendance at public worship. Of course, no general statement can escape qualification; but the problems of church attendance must be grappled with as they affect the grown man in the full vigour of his powers. No virile and successful religious movement has ever started from any other basis. The converted father brings his family to church with him if he feels at home there himself. His family is never likely to feel at home there without him.

The second digression is on "the unnatural and unsatisfactory position of the laity in the Church"; and it contains very much that is good and merits translation from theory into practice. But it rather fails to distinguish between the serious laity, equal to the clergy in spiritual capacity and religious rights, and "the persons who live in the parish" whose undisciplined opinions the Report regards with mingled respect and dread. The initial blunder on the part of the Clergy in the treatment of the laity, lies in the attempt to fit them on to the bed of Procrustes. It cannot be said that in this digression the Committee do anything more than look the difficulty in the face and pass on! Their reference to "the recovery of interest in the services of the Church if the powers and functions of the laity therein could be reorganized" does not carry us very far.

The third essay of the Committee is on the adverse effect of modern industrial conditions on the tradition of public worship. This is a sonorous phrase; and all that the Report says on it is good, so far as it goes; but it is not the subject. The Committee consider that a "radical change" in "our social and industrial system" is necessary to make the way "clear for the return of the people to the public worship of the Church."

But, did the Christians of the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic age, and of the following centuries—the Early Church—allow the conditions of their day to override their actions? Surely it is the duty of the Church to cope with the conditions of the day in the matter of provision of opportunity of public worship, not to be daunted by them! If it be true that those conditions "are greatly inimical to the offering to God on Sundays (particularly on Sunday mornings) of a freewill offering of a holy worship" (and the fact may be readily granted), then it is the duty of the Church to provide oppor-

tunity at other times. Here the Committee do touch on (but are scared away by) a real problem. North, south, east, and west, the same conventionalized hours of service prevail. "Take them or leave them" is the attitude of the powers that be; and the people, not of malice but of necessity, "leave them." If additional services are supplied at other hours, they are so manifestly "extra," of less importance, often dismal and uncongenial (although by an excess of irony often advertised as "bright and hearty," a phrase usually construed to mean as unlike a "proper Church service" as possible), and obviously suggestive of the belief that those who will come to them are of different flesh and blood from the decorous attendants at the "orthodox" hours. That a "proper Church service" at a less accustomed hour meets a real need is witnessed by the vast throngs that crowd into Westminster Abbey for full Evening Prayer at three o'clock, not to speak of other places. If such a service were provided in every residential district (not necessarily or desirably in every church), and no pains spared to make it of the best and most reverent type, the results might be not inconsiderable. But no hard and fast rule can be made: the principle to be asserted is that it is the duty of the Clergy to minister to the *needs* of the people in the matter; and not to expect the people to square their needs with the ministrations provided. The Committee sail wide of the mark in their painful concern for "the regular fulfilment of duties in regard to Church worship" by the people. The shoe is on the other foot!

III.

The longest section of the Report is headed "Suggestions in Regard to the Book of Common Prayer." It is not surprising to read that "The Committee has received a very large number of valuable (!) suggestions for modifications of the Prayer Book." The more perfect a work of art the greater the number of amateurs who think they could better it. We are periodically deluged with solemn proposals for "improving" Westminster Abbey. But there is not so much wrong with our Prayer Book as with the men who use it.

The Committee begin with the Communion Service. The term is their own, but as they speak of it being "offered" in one place, and being "celebrated" in another, there is more than a suspicion

that its use represents a compromise, as neither verb is appropriate. They also fall into error in speaking of "the ancient principle of communicating fasting." Fasting communion is not a principle, but a practice. The Committee think that "it is almost universally felt that the Communion Service has fallen out of its proper place in the scheme of worship." It would be more accurate to say that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper has been pushed out of its proper place in the life of the Church. The Committee use the right title when they refer to the ordinance of our Lord and its claim upon Christians; but they immediately revert to their general phrase and say that "the Communion Service makes less demand for intellectual effort and satisfies more directly the spiritual impulses than such services as Morning and Evening Prayer." But that is a matter of experience; some would not agree; and, in any case, it is affected by the method of administration. Unhappily, the priest can mar the ministration of the sacrament by his idiosyncrasy in a way that he is powerless to spoil the other services. The tragedy of the English Church to-day is that it is practically left to the option of the individual minister either to give to the people the manward ministration of the "comfortable sacrament" ordained by Christ, and prescribed by the Prayer Book; or to summon the people to be (willing or unwilling) "assistants" at a Godward presentment of a totally different action evolved in the visible Church after it had fallen from its first love. This is the rock upon which the Church of England is being deliberately broken in two. It is idle to pretend that it is only the few specially informed laymen who feel deeply on this point. "How do you like your new Rector?" was asked of a taciturn farmer. "He'll *do*," was the curt reply, "He don't turn his back on ye." It is a true instinct that sees the dividing line here. On the one side is the Sacrament; on the other is, in essential, the Mass. Therefore it is that the hesitating suggestions of the Report read differently according to the side of the line on which they are to be experimented. The Committee are so conscious of this that they deprecatingly refer everything "to the wishes and temperaments of different congregations"; but they diffidently suggest an alternative between "a Communion Service somewhat elaborate in its features celebrated each Sunday at which comparatively few persons communicate" and "a special Communion Service held at regular

intervals which is definitely recognized as a corporate parish celebration and at which a large number of parishioners would communicate," when "a large number of the communicants would not be fasting." The Report goes on to assert that "the act of Communion is the true centre of all Christian worship and the bond of union between communicants." Now our Church puts the matter differently: "The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death." There is no authority for the distasteful term "act of Communion." In plain fact, where the gospel of Christ's death is plainly proclaimed, and the sacramental form of the Lord's Supper jealously guarded, there is no great lack of the desire to join in that Holy Fellowship. But it must be admitted that the tendency of late years has been against the experience of the whole community of the Church taking the hallowed signs at the same time. Some "communicate" regularly in the early part of the day, and some at later hours. To those who have used themselves to the early morning service there is often a weird strangeness in the half-service (so to say) tacked on after the sermon; and this is helped where the parson goes out to dismiss the choir and leave the alms-basin in the vestry, and hurriedly returns to take up the service with the abrupt "Ye that do truly." It is difficult to avoid the dulling impression that this is a quite subordinate "postscript" to something more important. When to this is added the fact that this "Second Service," as it is often called, is frequently driven very late by delays in the "Morning Service," it becomes clear that the present habits of service do discourage the proper use of the "most comfortable Sacrament."

Perhaps a practical suggestion may be made. On one fixed regular Sunday in the month, let the early morning Communion be omitted. Have the Morning Prayer, quite in full as far as the third Collect, with organ and at least half choir, at ten o'clock. Then let the eleven o'clock service commence with the Litany, and proceed with the full order of Holy Communion; omitting a sermon but perhaps in place of it having a short ten minutes' devotional word to the communicants, pausing after the Church Militant prayer while the boys of the choir (it is assumed there will be no non-communicant men) and any other non-communicants retire; but the minister remaining standing at the Holy Table, and taking up the thread

with the "Dearly beloved in the Lord, ye that mind," the whole body of the communicants standing according to old custom. At such a service the touching and inspiring experience of whole families taking the hallowed signs together might be renewed; and the whole would close at a reasonable time without haste or tedium; while the careful reading of the noble exposition (so shamefully neglected) of the Church's teaching on the subject of this wonderful sacrament would do more good than many sermons. But any permission of non-communicating presence, or dalliance with the back-to-people position, would be fatal. It would be well for the whole congregation to stand for the Gloria in Excelsis, and sing it to a measured simple setting, to be carefully practised, and maintained unvaried. Nothing would be more calculated to set the ministration of the sacrament "in its proper place" in the minds of the people. In some churches, and on some occasions, a different time of day might be chosen according to local circumstances. Indeed, we want a good bit more of adaptation in our hours of service generally; and it would be common sense to make some considerable difference between winter and summer.

IV.

The Committee next refer to the attack upon Morning and Evening Prayer (which they assert to "make too heavy a demand upon the intelligence and knowledge of the congregation"), the Psalter and the Lessons. It is necessary to protest against the attempt to drive out of our Churches our best people by tinkering with the services that are the best-beloved. It would not be possible to frame services more calculated for edification and reverent worship than the existing Orders of Morning and Evening Prayer. They need no variation, unless it be in some additional rubrics to meet special emergencies. It may be granted that they are not exactly adapted for unconverted people, or worldlings; but it is not seemly that the public worship of the Church (i.e. the faithful laity) should be regulated by that principle. We do very greatly need an authorized form of service of a directly Evangelistic aim, as the Committee recognize, but this should be an addition or supplement. It is a fatal error to attempt a compromise between two totally different conceptions of a religious service on the same occasion. But, please, leave to the true Church Remnant the security of "the Prayer

Book, the whole Prayer Book, and nothing but the Prayer Book "—what old-fashioned folk call "a proper Church service." As a matter of fact this attack upon Morning and Evening Prayer is a purely artificial movement on the part of the more volatile clergy who kick at being bound down to a fixed form; but in this particular the liberty of the clergy is the bondage of the laity. The Liturgy is the layman's only protection; and a question of Church principle is involved. We do not want our services approximated to those of the Nonconformists. Nearly everything that the Report says on the subject of the Psalter and the Lectionary is controversial and betrays an aloofness of position from that of the ordinary devout Churchman. More people have been driven, and will be driven, away from church by failure to adhere closely to the Prayer Book, than have been attracted or will be attracted by these experiments. Give the old book a fair chance, and see if it does not come by its own again. In particular much more use might be made of the Litany. Very much turns on an atmosphere of restful homeliness.

The Committee are on safer ground in their pleas for better elocution and reverence of demeanour on the part of the clergy; in their adverse criticism of the monotone; and their insistence upon training and discipline in these matters. The suggestions that sermons should be preached separately from the regular services, and with greater freedom of place, and with a greater liberty of "bidding prayer" are quite worthy of attention. This, of course, is not strictly worship; but the advice that sermons in the regular services should be shorter is a little more germane to the subject. A very wise suggestion is that graded forms of children's services should be framed. A satisfactory form of service for children has yet to be evolved.

The Committee express a desire to foster the spirit of prayer; but they do not seem to have in mind either the spontaneous conversation of the redeemed child with his Father and Lord or the penitential heart-cry of the convicted sinner to the personal Saviour (indeed they appear to approve of the amazing complaint that there is too much emphasis in Morning and Evening Prayer upon the penitential idea!). They seem rather to be thinking of something formal and soothing, and call attention to the Chaplet of Prayer, a sort of rosary-arrangement—"prayer repeated at intervals."

They also "discussed the extra-liturgical use of the Reserved Sacrament." They advocate "experiments" . . . "to find out, if possible, what are the actual desires which need to be satisfied," which strikes the present writer as a pitiful confession of incompetency and failure. They make some quite old and obvious remarks about free and open Churches, without any indication of knowledge of the other side of the question—the love of people for seats of their own in church; and they hope for the revival of "votive offerings" and approve of a wider use of the churches for conventions and missionary meetings.

V.

A dry summary of points of "Prayer Book Revision" which receive the approval of a majority of the Committee, is not much more than a catalogue, but is enlivened by a solemn warning that a more drastic reform of the Prayer Book than the Convocations contemplate "will be soon necessary." The reason is "that many persons have entirely outgrown the Book of Common Prayer" (this after telling us earlier that Morning and Evening Prayer "make too heavy a demand upon the intelligence and knowledge of the congregation" !); and "the book does not satisfy a number of requirements which have come into existence in recent years." Probably the allusions are to the pseudo-catholic demands. Here the Committee appear to have got tired, but find room for a hasty request for Prayers for the Dead.

A very valuable essay on Church Music is evidently an independent addition, the main authorship of which can easily be guessed; but this merits a separate treatment. It is admirable, but perhaps not wholly uncontroversial.

The Appendices include a truly wonderful production from three Military Chaplains "come to judgment"! Much of it is incorporated in slightly modified form in the Report; the rest had apparently been a little more than the Committee could assimilate. We are told that "the lay mind is a very elusive thing," and "seldom articulate on any religious topic." So we should imagine—in such company! The "lay mind" finds no difficulty in becoming "articulate" when the clergy are absent. Even when it is not openly reactionary, it is enough to say that the spirit of this memorandum is not that of our English Church.

A careful perusal of the Report, of the worst that it can say against our present Prayer Book, and of the suggestions as to the way to better things as it appears to the Committee, does but confirm the writer in the belief that it is the men who use the Prayer Book and dominate the public worship of the Church who need reforming far more than the old book and the hallowed forms of prayer and praise and teaching that our fathers loved. It is not on the lines of this Report that enlargement and deliverance will arise. If we could once more have an old-fashioned Prayer Book service lovingly ministered in every parish, would it now be too late to repossess the hearts of the people again? Perhaps not, if there were also a fearless proclamation of the gospel of the forgiveness of sins and life in Christ.

ALBERT MITCHELL.



A GUARDIAN OF ORTHODOXY.

“The first thing, then, I want to emphasise is this, that in our Liturgy we have a useful guardian of Orthodoxy. This is no small advantage, as history teaches us. Those who have studied the development of the Church tell us that even Calvin’s scriptural doctrine gradually and silently gave way to a bare Socinianism, not only in Geneva, but in many of the Presbyterian congregations in England, Ireland, and the United States. So long as our Prayer Book remains, it cannot be so with ourselves. We cannot utterly fall away. In our churches, the pulpit here and there may be worse than useless, for dead preachers may speak to dead sinners; it may be infected with the down-grade theology, the ‘modernism,’ of the time—the children may cry for bread and get a stone; it may be semi-popish, and inculcate the Real Presence, and adoration of the elements; but always the error of the pulpit’s teaching will to some extent be corrected by that of the Prayer Book, for our Liturgy, as its preface indicates, has this dominant feature—its adherence to Holy Scripture. Take away the Bible out of the Prayer Book, and how little you have left! I believe that no other Service book in the world is equal to our own in this. Not merely is Scripture publicly read, and congregationally sung, in every part of our public worship, but the responses, collects, ascriptions and special Offices are steeped in Bible thought and Bible language. No man, it is not too much to say, can enter our churches and use intelligently ‘our incomparable Liturgy’ without learning his need as a sinner, the way of salvation, and the outline of Christian life. The very warp and woof of our Prayer Book is God’s word, and herein lies the open secret of its spiritual power.”—CANON BARNES-LAWRENCE in *A Churchman and his Church* (Church Book Room, 82 Victoria Street, S.W.1, price 1s. net).

THE SACRAMENTAL PRINCIPLE.

BY THE VEN. ARCHDEACON DAVIES, M.A., Principal of Moore
Theological College, Sydney.

II.

SUMMING up the New Testament evidence on the Sacraments, three conclusions seem inevitable :—

1. Two Sacraments, namely, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, were instituted by Christ.

2. They were practised at once by the earliest Christians as distinctive Christian rites (Acts ii. 41, 42, 46).

They are linked to the New Covenant as its signs and seals, corresponding with the relation of circumcision and the passover to the Old Covenant.

Baptism is nowhere linked with the actual word "covenant," but it is frequently mentioned in close association with the terms of the New Covenant as in Acts ii. 38. The Holy Communion is definitely linked with the Christian covenant in the account given by all three synoptists, and some alternative readings describe it as the "New" Covenant. It has been suggested (Wright, *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*), that the Eucharist was no new ceremony on the night of the Last Supper. At the miracles of feeding the multitudes our Lord introduced a custom of breaking the loaves before distribution, whereas the ordinary practice was for the breaking to be performed by the partaker as the loaf went round. It may have been this personal trait that opened the eyes of the disciples at Emmaus (Luke xxiv. 30, 31). The Last Supper was the occasion when a deeper meaning was attached to the ceremony by our Lord Himself, and it became a permanent institution of organized Christianity.

These three positive points, then, emerge in the New Testament :—

1. The two Sacraments of the Gospel were instituted by Christ Himself.

2. They were practised at once by Christians as soon as the Church began at Pentecost.

3. The two Sacraments thus instituted and practised were signs and seals of the New Covenant.

To these may be added as negative points :—

4. No theory of the Sacraments is formulated in the New Testament, they are simply instituted and practised.

5. Their administration is not definitely limited to any class, or group, or set of officials in the Church, though the apostles naturally take the lead.

6. They are not in any sense magical rites. The gift of the Holy Spirit is closely associated with baptism. Yet the baptism of Cornelius (Acts x.) followed the bestowal of the spiritual gift, while Simon Magus was duly baptized but did not receive the gift. The New Testament gives no ground for any *ex opere operato* theory of the Sacraments.

7. There is no evidence in the New Testament that the Sacraments owe anything to the heathen "mysteries" as the source of their suggestion, though the "mysteries" may have affected, and probably did affect, the later developments of Sacramental theory and ritual.

8. The Sacraments are never placed before the preaching of the Word, they always follow it. It is those who receive the Word who are admitted to the Sacraments.

9. The Sacraments are never made the basis of salvation. Salvation comes to man as the free gift of God, through the finished work of Christ, to be personally appropriated by faith, by taking God at His Word. Repentance and faith are the conditions of salvation laid down in the New Testament. The Sacraments follow as signs and seals of the covenanted blessings. They are means of grace because they are means of assurance. They are personal transactions, not mechanical contrivances. Theoretically they are not necessary, but practically they are inevitable and yield a test of loyalty in members of the Church.

The limits of this paper and the wide scope of the subject have compelled the writer to be somewhat dogmatic, but the statements have been put into that form for the sake of clearness as well as brevity. What has been stated has been strictly confined to plain and legitimate inferences from the New Testament as the one standard of what is necessary to salvation. If the sacraments are what a persistent propaganda in our Church claim to make them, then the New Testament is no longer the final authority, for it gives them no such position as is claimed. The development of sacramentalism can be clearly traced in Church history. What is adver-

tised as "Catholic teaching" on the sacraments is the product, not of New Testament study, but of the neglect of the New Testament in those dark ages of medieval barbarism over which a false romantic glamour has been cast, but whose real grim history is largely unprintable. When and where the open Bible was placed freely before the people, medieval sacramentalism mostly disappeared in the new won light of recovered revelation. To this day, and always, the plain teaching of the New Testament is the best answer to pseudo-Catholic assertions. The New Testament is sufficiently clear upon the origin and value of the Sacraments of the Gospel, setting them forth as organic expressions of personal religion, individual and corporate, rather than as exclusive functions of a mechanical system.

V.—THE TRUE BASIS OF THE SACRAMENTS—PRECEPT OR PRINCIPLE ?

The two conclusions reached so far are :—

1. The Sacraments of the Gospel are derived from the personal institution of them by Jesus Christ. Their sufficient basis is the Lord's example and precept as recorded in the New Testament.
2. The Sacramental Principle states a great truth, but is of itself an insufficient basis for determining the number and value of Sacramental ordinances.

The first point has already been explained, but the second point calls for further explanation as it raises the deepest issue of religion, namely, what is the final authority in belief and conduct ?

The truth of the Sacramental Principle has already been recognized in the earlier part of this paper, together with the need of applying, in practice, the principle of limitation. The question now arises, who or what is to set the limit, and where is the line of limitation to be drawn ? If religion is to be entirely based on a *priori* intuitions or abstract principles, who or what is to decide on the validity of the intuitions and principles ? Which intuitions are to be accepted, and which rejected ? How are conflicting principles to be reconciled in practical application ? Is the Christian religion to be reduced to the evolution of intuitions or the elucidation of principles ? Or is it to be a life of personal loyalty to the Personal God made accessible through the Personal Saviour, and maintained and expanded through the Personal Spirit of God ? Is Christianity

to become merely the conforming to a code of casuistry coupled with assent to a system of dogma? The Pauline battle between law and grace is not yet over, but revives again and again as personal religion freezes into formalism.

Now the Sacramental Principle, while it states a universal truth, and thus has immense philosophical and religious value, does not of itself explain the unique power of the two Sacraments of the Christian Gospel, for it degrades them to merely particular instances of universal fact. Of course this aspect of the two Sacraments is vastly important as sanctifying common life and vindicating the universal presence of God in power to bless men. But to dwell exclusively on the Sacramental Principle as the basis of the Sacraments of the Gospel is to reduce them to the level of other religious ordinances of the Church, and to make them the Sacraments of the Church rather than of the Gospel. For if everything may be sacramental, then, in practice, unless the principle of limitation is applied, nothing is distinctively sacramental unless it is definitely recognized as such. This recognition is the function of an authority which itself can claim recognition. The Church has this authority, and accordingly sacraments came to be regarded as institutions of the Church, so that the only limit to their number was the limit set by the Church. This is what has actually happened in history. The two Sacraments of the Gospel were added to until they became the seven Sacraments of the Church—a long process, as marriage became a sacrament only in the thirteenth century. The only reason why the number was limited to seven is that the Church said so. Thus it came to pass that the professed sacramentalists, for all their talk, degraded the sacraments into mechanical operations ordered by the Church rather than spiritual ordinances given by God to man. The *ex opere operato* view follows closely in the wake of the unduly asserted Sacramental Principle.

Hence the Church, in order to indicate the supreme importance of the Sacraments, has to distinguish them by an elaborate and significant ritual, has to rely on all possible external aids of pomp and circumstance which made the "Mass" a painful contrast with the severe simplicity of the Original Last Supper.

An elaborate ritual and impressive organization of external adjuncts are necessary if the Sacraments are chiefly institutions of the Church. But such spectacular displays are not at all necessary

if we regard as Sacraments only those ordinances which have as their authority the direct personal command of Jesus Christ. This is one reason why our present Holy Communion office is so much superior to the "Mass," and to the proposed alterations which would bring it back nearer to the "Mass." The Holy Communion office in the Book of Common Prayer is a much better representative of the Sacrament as our Lord instituted it and as the primitive Church of the Apostolic age practised it.

The undue assertion of the Sacramental Principle, as already shown, magnifies the authority of the Church at the expense of the personal authority of the personal Saviour of men, Jesus Christ. For the final authority of the Gospel is the authority of the Lord Who gave that Gospel, and when we go back to the only written records we have of His life we find that He instituted two Sacraments. He did *not* state the Sacramental Principle and then select two particular instances. The Sacraments of the Gospel derive their authority, not from an abstract principle, interpreted and applied by an external organization, but from the command of a Divine Person. He told His disciples to baptize and to celebrate the Lord's Supper. They were to baptize in His Name, and to eat and drink the bread and wine in personal remembrance of Him. The Sacraments of the Gospel are essentially personal in their institution, and in their fulfilment. Our Lord did not commission His Church to institute Sacraments. He instituted them Himself. The two Sacraments He instituted were directly personal to Himself, and were His gifts to His Church. Accordingly they are part of the trust of the Church. No other alleged Sacraments can claim this position.

Furthermore, the Sacraments of the Gospel are sacraments of the New Covenant. Our Lord definitely linked them with it. Baptism was linked with the proclamation of the New Covenant, the Holy Communion was instituted as its perpetual sign and seal and pledge to those who had accepted and obeyed the proclamation. No other alleged sacraments are thus definitely attached to the New Covenant, at any rate not in the New Testament, which is the documentary basis of the Christian Faith.

Most sacramentalists draw a distinction between the two greater and the five lesser Sacraments, but it is surely more scientific, because more in line with the facts, to draw an absolutely clear and sharp distinction between the ordinances instituted by Christ

Himself as part of the New Covenant, and those practices and customs, however useful and even sacred and necessary, which have grown up in another way, possess other sanctions, and which do not serve the same purpose nor show the same direct connexion with the Church's Commission from her Lord to preach the gospel. Christ is the personal centre of the Gospel, and surely we ought to reserve the term "Sacrament" specifically and solely for the two institutions which have come to us direct from that Personal Centre. We ought to find another term for institutions and ordinances which have other sanctions, and come to us with a much less direct authority.

It will be found as a matter of history that where the value of the Sacraments has been deduced mainly from the Sacramental Principle, the human side of religion has been over-emphasized, the needs of man have been set above the claims and the glory of God, and religion has become man-centred, and therefore a man-organized thing, until the Church has taken the place of God as the object of devotion and even of worship, and a church system has usurped the direct personal communication between man and God.

The Sacramental Principle is a great truth, but it is not the only truth. The worst heresies have been evolved from isolated and overworked general principles. The Sacramental Principle, when over-stressed, creates the danger its enunciation was meant to avoid, by materializing the spiritual to such an extent that the visible becomes more real than the invisible, and the spiritual is finally identified with the material. Thus the road is made open to sheer idolatry, and the less instructed multitude readily take it. Sacramentalists are notoriously materialistic in their views of the sacraments, as seen in their ritual and cult developments, their liturgical experiments, and their popular teaching. The emphasis on the Sacramental Principle, by concentrating attention on the outward thing, is really an invasion of religion by naturalism which tries to justify itself by a weak infusion of idealism. In order to assert itself the Sacramental Principle has to advertise itself by an elaborate and gorgeous ritual with all the resources of symbolism, that marvellous art by which anything may mean anything. The Two Sacraments of the New Covenant do not need such advertisement, as they derive their appeal from the Lord's command. It is by regarding the sacraments as rites of the New Covenant in Christ

that we get a more truly objective value set upon them, while avoiding the *ex opere operato* cultus which is so closely akin to the mechanical view of nature. The use of the Sacraments as mechanical operations encourages a passive attitude towards religion, whereas the personal valuation of them, as spiritual ordinances given us by Christ, ascribes to God His due, and yet brings home to man his personal responsibility towards God and his neighbour.

People do not really want "magic," but rather the personal touch of Almighty God. The Sacramental Principle, if taken as the basis of sacramental valuation, imports into the sacraments the idea of natural law, which tends to destroy the personal touch. Yet the Sacramental Principle, when kept in its place, does convey a truth that is directly relevant to the general practical value of the sacraments, though not directly relevant to their unique value in the Christian religion. This unique value is best realized by their vital connexion with the New Covenant. A sacrament based on a law of nature is a discovery of man rather than a gift of God. In no sense is the New Covenant a discovery of man. It is entirely and freely the gift of God to man. The two Sacraments of the New Testament are means of grace by the fact and method of their institution, for they are gifts bestowed as pledges of grace, that is, of the personal free favour of God towards us. *For grace is no impersonal influence, but the actual personal presence in power of God Himself.* The Sacraments are means of grace also because they are gifts of God, and gifts confirm friendship and increase it. They are the unique means for putting us in touch with the fact of God, not by magic, but by faith, that is, by personal response to, and appropriation of, the gift of God offered freely to us. The Sacraments follow the Word, as in the Pentecostal history. They are the visible signs and seals of the grace proclaimed and given in and through the Word, and they themselves are means of grace when faithfully received.

DAVID J. DAVIES.



THE SECOND ADVENT IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY¹

BY SIR WILLIAM F. A. ARCHIBALD, M.A., Lately Master of
the Supreme Court.

THE prediction of enmity between the Woman and the Serpent, connected as it was with the multiplication of the Race, shadowed forth the Coming of a "Son of Man" who, though wounded in the encounter, was to win a terrible conflict with Satan. Looking back at that great prophecy we can see in it now, what was hidden from our first parents, Calvary, and also Olivet crowned with triumph and glory.

How far God's great purpose was disclosed to the generations which followed before the Flood we know not; yet St. Jude tells us in his Epistle that Enoch, the seventh from Adam, had had a prophetic vision of the Lord's return to judgment with ten thousands of His saints (Jude 14, 15). Job also knew that his redeemer (or vindicator) would stand at the latter day upon the earth, and that in a resurrection body he would see God, another prediction of the Second Advent (Job xix. 25, 26, 27). The Psalmists knew the same great truth, as can be seen from several Psalms, e.g., xlv. and lxxii. Whilst Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Ezekiel and Zechariah had a clear perception of the coming of the Messiah; not only His first coming in humble guise as "a Man of Sorrows and acquainted with grief," "by whose stripes we are healed" (Isa. liii.); but also of the glorious day when "His feet shall stand upon the Mount of Olives," and "the Lord shall be King over all the earth and there shall be one Lord and His name one" (Zech. xiv. 4, 9).

The splendour of these latter predictions had sunk into the Jewish mind, and in their pride and anxiety for the realization of the earthly kingdom, in which their race was to figure so gloriously, they overlooked the clear prophecies of Our Lord's first coming and put Him to an ignominious death. When He came into the world it was so different from what the Jews had expected, that His very disciples hesitated to believe in Him, and it was not until the last

¹ A paper read at the London Meeting of Lay Churchmen on February 15.

few days of His earthly life that He fully disclosed to them the great truth of the Second Advent.

From the time when, in the supreme moment of His trial, He was solemnly challenged by the High Priest in the words, "I adjure Thee by the living God that Thou tell us whether Thou be the Christ the Son of God"; and, repeating some of the words of Daniel vii. 13, answered publicly, "Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven." The Second Advent, which He had already announced privately to His immediate disciples, became the great hope of the Church Universal. This hope was confirmed to His disciples by the two angels who appeared at His Ascension and said, "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven." It seems strange that any one can read such declarations as intimating a spiritual coming into the hearts of believers; for, certainly, the High Priest and the audience gathered around him were no believers, and yet they were to see the returning Lord coming in the clouds, and when St. John in his great revelation (Rev. i. 7) says, "He cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him, and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of Him." It is difficult to conceive any words which could more effectually describe an actual physical return. In that sense the early Christian believers understood them, and, for example, the inscriptions in the Roman catacombs show that the persecuted saints who took refuge there had their attention riveted upon the Coming Christ rather than looking back at the great scenes of His life and death upon earth. So fully were their minds fixed upon the Second Advent that they fell into the error which St. Paul corrected in his Second Epistle to the Christians at Thessalonica, and evidently expected the great event to happen in their time; not understanding that a long historical interval was to elapse and that great events and signs were to precede His Coming.

When we read our Lord's conversation with His disciples in Matthew xxiv, He gives two great signs of the approaching day. 1. The preaching of the Gospel in all the world for a witness to all nations, which was to immediately precede the end. 2. The fig tree, which He had used before as an emblem of the Jewish nation, was to show signs of returning life by putting on leaves.

The first sign, which is closely mixed up with history, seems to have been the one to which the great Enemy of Salvation determined to oppose his fullest powers. No sooner had the "Faith" begun to spread than he attacked it with fire and sword. Persecution, torture, martyrdom fell upon the humble soldiers of the Cross; but special grace and fortitude were granted to them and, in spite of every effort to destroy them, the blood of the martyrs proved to be the seed of the Church, and the Gospel seemed likely within a short time to spread throughout the whole known earth and so to hasten the end and the doom of the Prince of this world.

It was under these circumstances that he appears to have developed the greatest of all his plans for the ruin of mankind. When the Christian religion was fast spreading towards the countries of the East, Mohammed appeared on the scene. Once, as Dr. Koelle, the well-known missionary at Constantinople, said, a member of what was equivalent to a Christian Bible Class, some members of which afterwards were men of mark on the Christian side, whilst others followed Mohammed, he became the greatest opponent that Christianity ever had to contend with. In a marvellously short time, with diabolical energy and enthusiasm, he overwhelmed the forces of the Cross and carried all before him. Within 100 years after his death his followers had cut the trade routes between East and West, and had not only swallowed up Egypt and Palestine, but had extended their conquests northwards as far as Turkestan and Bokhara and westwards along the coast of Africa to the Pillars of Hercules, thus effectually drawing a curtain from North to South and from East to West which shut Europe up in a corner by itself. From that moment communication with Asia and Africa was cut off, and so for centuries the day was postponed when the spread of the Gospel was to bring in the end of the Dispensation and the return of the Saviour.

How successful this part of the Devil's plan was and how impenetrable was the curtain which cut off Europe from the rest of the world may be judged from the fact that, even as late as the reign of Edward VI, when the English Prayer Book was being prepared, it did not enter into the minds of our Reformers to insert a prayer for the heathen; the only prayer approaching it being the Collect for Good Friday for Jews, Turks, Infidels and Heretics, these marking the extreme horizon of those days. They could not see beyond the

curtain, and the heathen were completely out of sight and out of mind.

One thing remained to be done to complete the ruin of Christianity. A drop of sacerdotal poison at Rome, the fountain-head of the Christianity of that day, soon turned Europe into a charnel house. The narrow enthusiasm which enabled the early Christians to conquer Greek and Roman heathenism now turned into the religious bigotry of the Middle Ages, bringing in ultimately the terrible Inquisition with all its horrors; and the Prince of Darkness must have felt secure of his triumph.

But God, "Who hath chosen the weak things of this world to confound the things that are mighty," kept the true light shining in the mountain fastnesses of the Cottian Alps and Bohemia and other places too insignificant for the Holy Office to investigate, and by Huss and Wickliffe and Tyndale and Luther and Gustavus Adolphus and Henri Arnaud and others of the heroic band He brought the Gospel through this awful trial.

The Devil's weapons were also turned against himself.

The heathen had been forgotten, but not so the wealth of India and China; and the cupidity, which had ruined all spirituality in the Roman Church and had been such a terrible motive in many of the persecutors, had probably been fed by the stories in the *Arabian Nights*. Thus it was that Columbus and Vasco da Gama, and afterwards Cortez and Pizarro and the Spanish Conquistadores, were sent forth to discover a new world or to rediscover one that had been known and lost, the great hope being that they would bring to Europe once again the wealth of the Indies by a new route. The success of Columbus and Cabot and others who followed him into the Western World led to the discovery of New England and the Atlantic coast of America. Fishermen and settlers went out and the world was astonished to find that heathen existed. To the credit of England a Society was at once formed upon the initiative of Sir Walter Raleigh to carry the Gospel to them; and this "New England Company," which was launched by Raleigh with a liberal donation of £100, is, we believe, still in existence.

Why then did not Protestant Missions at once go forth into all the world and hasten the great day? History shows the reason plainly. The Enemy of Souls had not exhausted all his armoury. War after war drained the resources of Europe and occupied men's

minds with fear and apprehension for their lives and for the very existence of their nationalities. England herself was continually fighting for her life with Spaniards, French and Dutch and others, and under this hecatomb of war the Gospel for the heathen lay buried.

But the end was at hand. When the American War of Independence had come to a conclusion, and the conflict between England and France had for a time been suspended, the great and terrible Revolution in France broke out. The effect of the horrors of that tragedy upon the minds of all good men must have been immense, particularly in England where Wesley and Whitfield had aroused the consciences of multitudes of people. Christians, no doubt, were shocked beyond expression, and there came an awakening in Great Britain to the fact that the Nation had sadly neglected its duty to the world at large, which resulted in the formation within a period of ten years of the principal Protestant Missionary Societies. The Baptist, Wesleyan, London and Church Missionary Societies came into existence, and the Religious Tract Society to supplement their efforts with literature, followed by the great British and Foreign Bible Society, which arose out of the latter society early in the nineteenth century. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel had been established much earlier, but originally to minister to the religious needs of Colonists. From that time dates the rapid progress of the Gospel in the world.

Another historical event, we believe, greatly contributed to the movement. The voyages of Captain Cook to the Pacific Islands had disclosed a large population living in heathen darkness, many of them cannibals and all of them subject to most cruel superstition and devil worship. Himself a good humane Christian man, he pleaded the cause of these poor people, and the pathetic circumstances of his death helped to arouse the conscience of Christian people in all European countries.

But two things were wanting: 1. Access to the heathen; 2. Rapidity of communication.

In the boyhood of some of us Africa was still a mere coastline, with very small exceptions. No one since Marco Polo had penetrated China and Central Asia. A great part of North America was trackless forest and prairie—whilst most of South America and Central Asia were entirely inaccessible. Persons going to India took

many months to reach their posts. The Australian Colonies were considered suitable principally for penal settlements because of the sparse populations of Europeans ; and the distances seemed so great that when emigrants went off, even to America, we all sang " Cheer, boys, Cheer," and bid them farewell as though we could hardly expect to meet again in this world.

What a marvellous change has taken place since then ! Was it mere chance that made Watt watch the lid of his mother's kettle and apply the force of steam to commercial purposes ? Was it not under the inspiration of God that George Stephenson showed the practicability of using steam for land haulage ? We believe it was. In the result the whole earth has become accessible in the most wonderful way, whilst steamers, railways, telegraphs, telephones and posts have drawn the world together and have enabled the good leaven to spread with marvellous rapidity. The discovery of cylindrical printing early in the nineteenth century, and the application of steam to the production of literature, has enabled millions of Bibles in hundreds of languages and dialects to be distributed in all the world ; and now it may be truly said that the Gospel is being preached by lip or printed page through all the continents and islands of the earth as a witness. The world has opened within the last hundred years, as a bud opens into full bloom, with a rapidity which our forefathers could never have contemplated.

Does anything stand between us and " the end " so far as this sign is concerned ? ¹

Let us take to ourselves Our Lord's solemn words : " When ye shall see all these things know that it is near even at the doors." " Therefore be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh."

WILLIAM F. A. ARCHIBALD.

¹ The second sign, viz. that in relation to the Jewish nation, was dealt with in a subsequent paper.



THE HEALING OF THE TWO BLIND MEN AT CAPERNAUM.

BY THE REV. WALTER R. WHATELY, M.A.

II.

THE story is more than a link in a chain. It has a distinctive character of its own, which comes most clearly into view when we contrast it with the story of Bartimaeus. This distinctive character appears mainly in the attitude which Jesus adopted toward the petitioners. Both at Jericho and at Capernaum Jesus is appealed to as "Son of David," a cry which otherwise we hear only twice in the Gospels, from the Syro-phoenician woman, and from the crowd that escorted Jesus into Jerusalem. There is nothing in the least remarkable in this appeal; "Son of David" was a recognized Messianic title, and may, for aught we know, have been frequently applied to Jesus. The essential difference between the two narratives comes into view when we note how in each case He received the appeal.¹ In Capernaum, *so long as He is in the open street*, He takes no notice, but walks on and goes into His house. When the blind men have followed Him into the house, and the interview is now private, He grants their request, but immediately adds the injunction, "See that no man know it." In Jericho, on the other hand, He responds at once, in public; He stops in His walk, and, in the presence of a large crowd, commands the men to be called, asks them what their desire is—not the same question, be it noted, that He asked at Capernaum—and grants their request at once.²

This surely constitutes a real difference between the two narratives. But the full significance of this change of attitude on Our

¹ Dr. Plummer has noticed this in his commentary.

² Matthew alone records that at Jericho He touched the men's eyes. But I think there can be little doubt that this is correct. One gathers from the Gospel narrative that Jesus usually, but not always, laid His hands on the sufferers—though not on demoniacs—and probably always where there was a sense defective. Such defect, in the case of the blind and deaf, closed up one of the avenues by which our Lord's personality made its appeal to the mind and heart of the sick person, and it was only natural that in such cases He should open another by laying His hand upon the defective organ. Where there was impotence of the limbs, He seems sometimes to have tested the sufferer's faith by simply commanding him to act like a normal man. The case recorded in Luke xiii. appears to have been somewhat peculiar.

Lord's part cannot be grasped without first raising the important question why, in His work of healing, He sometimes avoided publicity and sometimes actually courted it, and why, in particular, He occasionally forbade people to proclaim a miracle which He had just performed. To this latter point we must, in the main, confine our present investigation.

The cases in which such a prohibition is recorded are five in number¹—those of the leper, the blind men of Capernaum, the daughter of Jairus, the deaf man of Decapolis, and the blind man of Bethsaida. The motive of the prohibition is partly suggested to us in Mark i. 45, where we are told that the leper's disobedience to the command compelled the retirement of Jesus to desert places, as the only way of avoiding the crowds. But this is only a partial explanation. Why did He, at this particular juncture, wish to avoid them? Apparently because there was a danger of their coming to regard Him as a mere wonder-worker, and allowing the deeper aspects of His mission to pass unheeded. All through the Lord's Galilean ministry there are signs that He perpetually strove to preserve in the minds of His hearers an accurate balance and proportion between the various aspects of His teaching and work. So far as His immediate followers were concerned, these efforts were eventually successful; with the multitude they failed. Among the latter, indeed, the misapprehension went still deeper. To them Jesus was never really much more than a great earthly and political Messiah, come to restore in more than its ancient splendour the throne of His father David; and when it became finally clear that His aims were irreconcilable with their own, they crucified Him.

Now of all the Messianic titles none was more calculated to foster this erroneous view than the title, "Son of David." It is not difficult, therefore, to understand why the Lord did not choose, at Capernaum, to respond in public to such an address. But why did He act differently at Jericho? This question is not very easily answered. I venture to suggest that the explanation lies, partly at least, in the difference of locality. It seems to me that Our Lord

¹ It is a mistake, I think, to include Matthew xii. 16 and Mark iii. 12 in the list. The prohibition in Mark may either have been addressed to the demons, to prevent them from proclaiming our Lord's Messiahship, or to the crowds, to prevent them from divulging the place of His retreat. The prohibition in Matthew had almost certainly the latter significance. (V. Zahn, *in loc.*, *Comm. s. Matth.*)

was more reticent about His Messiahship in Galilee and in the North generally than He was in Judaea. It is worthy of note that neither of these two incidents stands alone in the Synoptic narrative. When the Syro-phoenician woman appealed to Jesus as "Son of David," He treated her as He had treated the blind men at Capernaum; He walked on without taking any notice. It is not, I think, an adequate explanation to say that the woman, being a Gentile, was not entitled to appeal to Him as "Son of David"; this would account for His subsequent refusal, or reluctance to grant her request, but surely not for His silence and apparent inattention. What does account for it is the fact—which is quite evident in Matthew's narrative—that the interview took place in the open air.¹

The incident at Jericho has an equally instructive parallel. Almost immediately after it Jesus rode in triumph into Jerusalem amid cries of "Hosanna to the Son of David"; and when the chief priests and scribes, in sore displeasure, called His attention to these words, and asked Him to rebuke His followers, He replied, "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise."

Some will doubtless reply that this difference of attitude on Our Lord's part was a matter not of place but of time. They will urge that the second pair of incidents took place at the very end of Our Lord's ministry, and, in particular, that the Triumphal Entry was the culmination of that ministry, the occasion when He at last threw off all reticence, and made a public and unmistakable claim to be the promised Messiah. That there is some truth in this view can hardly be denied; nor am I concerned to deny it; all that I am attempting to prove is that Our Lord consciously and deliberately adopted on the first two occasions an attitude which He as deliberately abandoned in the last two. By what motives this change was dictated is a separate question.

But there is something to be said for the geographical explanation. Considerations of time will not wholly explain the contrast. Whatever may be said of the Judæan ministry, the ministry in the North was marked, after its first stage, by a gradually increasing reticence and privacy. Very early in that ministry Jesus began to resort to parables, instead of more explicit teaching. More and more He withdrew Himself from the public gaze and sought retirement, either with His disciples or alone. And after the feeding of

¹ "She crieth after us"—"then came she."

the 5,000, this change of method becomes more marked. He forbids His disciples to speak of His transfiguration, or to tell men that He is the Christ. He performs, so far as we are told, only three more miracles, and in two of these He endeavours to avoid publicity, by leading the sufferer aside, and by forbidding him to spread the news of his cures. These prohibitions, moreover, are marked, if I mistake not, by an increasing stringency ; in Mark vii. 26 Jesus apparently gives the command over and over again, while at Bethsaida He goes a step further, and forbids the restored man even to enter the town.

So ended the Galileean ministry. But the ministry in Perea, which immediately follows, shows none of these marks of secrecy and reticence. Three miracles of healing are recorded in its course, but none of them are followed by an injunction to keep silence ; the two first indeed (Luke xiii. 11 foll., xiv. 1 foll.), seems to have been specially designed to attract attention ; they were performed in public on the Sabbath Day, and on the initiative of Jesus Himself.

I do not think that the explanation of these facts is far to seek. It seems fairly clear that the danger against which Our Lord had to take precautions in Galilee was not, in the main, that of open and defiant rejection, but that of a blind and carnal enthusiasm ; which, if He had not taken resolute steps to baffle it, would have literally forced Him (*v.* John vi. 15) into the position of an earthly and political Messiah, with the ultimate result of bringing Him into collision with the jurisdiction of Herod and the Romans, and causing Him to be put to death on a false issue. This, of course, would have been fatal to the true spiritual success of His mission. The issue raised before Caiaphas at Jerusalem was the true issue, and though at Pilate's judgment-seat the false one was, for obvious reasons, put forward by the Jews, neither Pilate nor any one else had any doubt about the facts. In Jerusalem and Judaea it would seem that there was from the first no danger of a misunderstanding. This is borne out by what we know from other sources of the two provinces. The Messianic hope burned brightly and often fiercely in Galilee. Professor G. A. Smith remarks that the nature of the people, like that of the district itself, was volcanic. " Josephus describes them as ' ever fond of innovations, and by nature disposed to changes, and delighting in sedition.' . . . From among them came the chief

zealots and wildest fanatics of the Roman wars." ¹ "That the Messianic tempers were stronger in Galilaean than in any other Jewish hearts is most certain." ² The vitality of this hope, its generally carnal nature, and the inability of the Galilaean to understand the spiritual nature of Our Lord's teaching, combined to produce the danger to which I have alluded.

In Jerusalem and Judaea the situation was very different. There, in the heart and centre of official Judaism, the real import of Our Lord's teaching was discerned, in part at least, from the very first, with that clear-sightedness which fear and hatred often breed, and which, in spite of the cross-currents which the Fourth Gospel reveals to us, could not ultimately lead to any result but murder. "It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem."

The caution and reticence, then, which were necessary in Northern Palestine were not called for in Jerusalem. More than that, they were impossible. It was absolutely necessary that Jesus should make some public and unmistakable declaration of His Messiahship, and that He should make it in the religious capital of Israel. If He could not allow it to be supposed that He was an earthly and political Messiah, neither could He allow His countrymen, and [particularly their religious leaders, any excuse for saying that He had not claimed to be Messiah at all. "Son of David" was, indeed, an inadequate title for "the Lord from Heaven," but He could not, at the climax of His Judaeian ministry, leave any loophole for the suggestion that it was not His by right.

I submit, then, that there is a real difference between the two narratives which Sir John Hawkins and others regard as one, ³ a difference characteristic of the respective spheres, and possibly also of the respective periods of Our Lord's ministry in which they are recorded to have taken place.

Bishop Westcott suggests another point of difference, a point which I do not feel inclined to press, yet cannot entirely pass over. In the first of these two narratives, Jesus says to the blind men, "According to your faith be it unto you"; the blessing is confined

¹ *Hist. Geogr. of the Holy Land*, p. 421.

² G. A. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 424.

³ Sir John frankly admits that the prohibition to publish the miracle at Capernaum, and the use of the word *ἐκείθεν*, suggest an earlier date than the Jericho incident; he also notes the entry into the house as a distinctive point.

to the limits of their spiritual capacity ; it is no smaller, but also no greater. We miss here the phrase which Mark attributes to Jesus in the later story, " Thy faith hath saved thee." Westcott sees a real distinction between the two phrases ; he thinks that the Lord is only represented as using the word " saved " in cases where some blessing additional to and higher than mere physical healing was received. A careful analysis of the cases where the word is used seems to me to bear out this view ; in the case of the Samaritan leper, in particular, the word appears almost pointless without this special significance. And in this connection it is perhaps worth noting that Bartimaeus immediately followed Jesus in the way, while the only subsequently recorded act of the blind men at Capernaum was one of disobedience to His express command.

But there is yet another mark of the historicity of the Capernaum incident, a mark, moreover, which finds a parallel in the three other stories of the healing of the blind—the circumstances under which the sufferers came into touch with the Divine Healer. The variations of circumstance give to each of the four narratives, but particularly to that of Matthew ix., an air of verisimilitude.

1. The blind man at Bethsaïda was brought to Jesus by friends. Jesus was then only paying a visit, probably a brief visit, to the town ; the blind man, who himself was apparently not a resident,¹ would not be likely to find Him by his own efforts, and may not even have known that He was there ; but the Lord was well-known in Bethsaïda as a miracle-worker,² and there would naturally be those in the town who could bring the two together.

2. Bartimaeus, on the other hand, who was a beggar, and seems to have been regarded by the passers-by as beneath the notice of Jesus, would probably never have known that the Great Physician was in the town, if it had not been for the noise of the crowd. He got his opportunity, so to speak, by accident.

3. In the case of the blind man at Jerusalem, the Lord Himself took the initiative. The man was not, indeed, without friends. His parents were living, and might have brought him to be healed. But the remark in verse 32 : " Since the world began was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind,"

¹ I gather this from the words, " Do not even go into the village." Jesus would hardly have forbidden him to go back to his own home.

² V. Matt. xi. 21.

the doubts of the neighbours (verse 9), and the incredulity of "the Jews" (verse 18), suggest that even Jesus was not expected to cure so desperate a case.¹ It is interesting to note that such evidence as we have appears to bear out what the Evangelist implies, that the cure was unprecedented. In fact, there is no other miracle recorded where the defect remedied is said, either by statement or implication, to have been congenital.²

And there is another and more subtle mark of historicity in the narrative. Just as the act of healing was more startling, so was the spiritual result more far-reaching than in any previous recorded instance. The restored man was ready at once to receive religious teaching from the lips of his Healer, ready even, without hesitation, on His bare word, to acknowledge and worship Him as the Son of God. Is not this, though at first sight startling, yet really most profoundly natural? The man had received from Jesus a new sense; he had been ushered into a new world; he was enjoying a fresh and utterly unimagined experience. At such a crisis in his personal history he would be in exactly the right condition to receive a new revelation, especially if it came from the Healer Himself; nay, he would even be prepared to believe that the Healer was Himself the new revelation, not merely the restorer of physical or even of spiritual eyesight, but Himself the Light of the world.

4. Different from all these were the circumstances of the blind men of Capernaum. To them it was a simple matter to find access to the Great Physician. Jesus had walked to the house of Jairus accompanied by a crowd of people; He had gone there with the manifest intention of healing the sick child, and the multitude must have been waiting expectantly without, swelled perhaps by the band of mourners whom He had ejected from the death-chamber, and whose scorn and resentment were no doubt vociferously expressed. Moreover, He had just performed a miracle on the way thither in the presence of that very crowd. Must not the narrow Oriental

¹ That no one should, *on that particular day*, have brought the blind man to Jesus, requires no special explanation. It was the Sabbath.

With reference to the question of his parents being able to bring him to Jesus, one gets the impression from verse 21 that they knew nothing of the Great Healer. But it is possible that their profession of ignorance may have been a pretence.

² In some cases it clearly was not, e.g. the case of the blind man at Bethsaïda. A slight exception may perhaps be alleged in the case of dumbness (though obviously *not* the deafness) in Mark viii. 32.

street have been alive with loud and excited discussions about Him ? And would not the multitude be waiting with tense expectation for the moment of His re-appearance ?

It was then perfectly natural that the blind men should be aware that Jesus had now left the house of Jairus, and was again in the street. Nor could they have had any difficulty in following Him to His own home. He was then residing in Capernaum ; it is quite possible that the blind men already knew the house ; and if they did not, they could easily find some one in the crowd to direct them. The whole incident is natural and lifelike, and has, I think, every appearance of historical reality.

WALTER R. WHATELY.



THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE

“ St. Chrysostom, fifteen centuries ago, speaks in burning words, in one of his expository sermons, on the neglect of the Bible. He affirms that in that neglect lies the most fruitful of all sources of misbelief, misbehaviour, confusion and strife in the Church. His words are as true to-day in England as they were in Constantinople in the fifth century. . . .

“ I am quite sure that the Christian life, for its fullness, stability, strength and health, its adult efficiency as a life for God, normally needs, and vitally needs, all the intercourse it can get with the Bible. On the one hand, as we have just recollected, the Christ Himself turned to the Bible for divine aid and light, as to His Father’s oracle. With its words He met the Tempter in the desert. With its words He stayed His most holy soul in the Garden and on the Cross. He died with the words of a Psalm on His lips. When He rose, coming back from Eternity to converse with men in the body, He set out before His wondering followers, ‘ in all the Scriptures, the things concerning Himself.’ So it is our sure wisdom, if indeed we call Him Lord, to use the Book as He used it. To us as to Him it is to be the oracle of eternal verities, for to-day, and for the life to come.

“ Then also, such is the Bible, the Christian who practises ‘ intercourse with the Book ’ will certainly find that a something great and gracious, large and deep, loving and strong, comes out of it into his inner life, and grows there, a something such as no other reading can bring. Make that Book your friend, and you shall surely catch the contagion of its character, its way of thinking about God, about man, about sin, judgment, mercy, holiness, about virtue here and its glorification hereafter.”

[THE BISHOP OF DURHAM in *The Call of Lent* (S.P.C.K.).]

QUEEN MARY TUDOR AND THE MARTYRS OF THE REFORMATION.

BY THE REV. S. HARVEY GEM, M.A.

II.

THE second Parliament of Mary met on April 2, 1554. It was, however, of short duration. Acts for sanctioning the persecution of heretics were carried in the Commons, but thrown out in the Lords, and so postponed for the present. The Queen dissolved Parliament on May 5. That being done, she permitted or required Convocation to summon before it Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer, who were now in the Tower. A mixed Commission of Oxford and Cambridge men were to sit at Oxford for this purpose, and thither the Archbishop and the two Bishops were brought.

They were examined separately so that each might stand alone against the many opposed to them, and they were condemned. How such an uncatholic course of action could have been allowed to themselves by Convocation, or permitted by the Queen, passes the comprehension of orthodox historians, for the members of Convocation who took part were only priests, and it was quite uncatholic for priests to pass condemnation on Bishops, who should have been tried before Bishops. The Pope regarded this trial as nugatory and required another, in which men of episcopal rank acted on his behalf.

The three main articles should be noticed.

It was maintained by the Romans and denied by Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer—

- (1) That the natural body and blood of Christ are present on the Altar ;
- (2) That no other substance remains after consecration ;
- (3) That in the Mass there is a lively sacrifice for the dead and the living.

But though condemned, the three Bishops were remanded to prison for a long while, and we shall come by and by to their second trial at the instance of the Pope.

Hearing of what had taken place at Oxford, those of the Reform-

ers who were imprisoned in London, of whom the principal were Hooper, Bradford and Philpot, put out a declaration, stating what they believed and what they rejected (A. p. 218) and they addressed it to Parliament. It contained the following words :—

“ To your tribunal we appeal against the infamy of the reproach of heresy, which our adversaries unjustly fix upon us. This they do, because we retain the true substance of bread and wine in the Holy Supper, on the plain testimony of the Word of God, and of all the old Fathers ; because we take away the corporal presence of Christ from the signs of the Supper, acknowledging only a spiritual and sacramental presence in them who use the signs with true and proper rites, a presence received by faith only in them who use the signs rightly ; because we follow the Scriptures in assigning the corporal presence to heaven alone ; because we allow of no propitiatory sacrifice for sin other than the death of Christ.”

But the third Parliament had met (November 12), the House of Commons had been packed by the Queen, and they now passed Acts for the punishment of heretics, which came into operation in January in the next year (1555). At the same time the Acts of Henry VIII against the See of Rome were repealed. Yet with a singular irony it was not considered a heresy to hold to the estates of which the monasteries and the Church had been robbed, and every landowner was confirmed in the ownership of the property to which he had no moral right. An attempt to recover these, as Mary with proper consistency desired, would have cost her her throne, and perhaps her life.

Therefore the position of affairs was this :—On the one hand an exact definition of the mode of our Lord's presence in the Eucharist, a most abstruse and mysterious subject, and one never defined at all by the early Church, was now required of all men on pain of being burnt to death, while if you happened to be an owner of stolen goods, that is, of the monastic and Church property, you were given a formal right to retain them. As long as you accepted the Roman formula of transubstantiation you might keep your stolen goods.

It was in this Parliament, May 3, that the Reconciliation with the Holy See of Rome was effected. This ought to have preceded the Queen's imprisonment of heretics, in which she had acted with autocratic disregard of proper order ; but the reconciliation had long been her great object, and now it was to be carried out by the arrival in England of Cardinal Pole, the Papal Legate. The Houses of Parliament had been reduced to the attitude of penitence, and a great ceremonial took place : Philip, the Queen and the Cardinal

rejoicing over the prostrate multitude of Lords and Commons, who humbly knelt to receive absolution from the Legate. The formal reunion of schismatic England with the Holy See was declared, and the Queen shed tears of happiness.

Two members of the House of Commons, to their honour be it said, had the courage to vote against the reunion. One gave a silent vote; the other, Sir Ralph Bagnall, protested that he had sworn to obey King Henry's laws, who had laboured like a worthy king for twenty years to expel the Pope from England, and he would keep his oath.

All had now been got into order for the suppression of the Reformers. Nearly 300 burnt offerings were about to expiate the years of schism, besides the numerous victims who died of want and misery in loathsome prisons. Was this reign of cruelty due to the Spaniard Philip and his companions? Some historians have thought so, as the Spaniards were far more cruel than English people, and the Inquisition had developed in Spain its most fiendish tortures. On the other hand, the Emperor Charles V had constantly been warning Mary of the danger of proceeding to extremities with a people newly recovered for Catholicism. Philip was an excellent son; he had married to please his father, and to advance his policy; he knew the English hated the marriage; he had done all he could by money and manner to please the nobles; and to win the populace he had been seen to drink flagons of strong ale without flinching. It was his true policy to do all he could to win and not to offend. He conciliated Elizabeth, who was supposed to lean to the side of the Reformers and was supported by prominent nobles. But the Protestants, except Cranmer, were not politically influential; they were chiefly studious Bishops, parochial clergymen, now deprived of their posts, or humble artisans. They would have been content had they been let alone. There was no adequate object in rousing the execrations of the nation on their behalf. Philip was a man of the world; to him religion was a matter of externals, what course would answer best for politics was the great question with him, as it was with his father. Would he be likely then to adopt a needlessly unpleasant policy? Moreover, he had allowed a Spanish friar, de Castro, to preach in London against severity to heretics. All these considerations make against the supposition that Philip stimulated the persecution. There is only one symptom, as far as I am aware, that tells on the other

side. Philip joined the Queen in addressing a letter to the Bishops, admonishing them to make search for heretics in their dioceses. Such are the considerations for and against Philip ; we must leave them as they stand. Probably the question will never be settled with entire certainty.

But—to pass on—the mention of the Bishops leads to another point. Gardiner of Winchester and Bonner of London have usually been represented as monsters of iniquity. It must be admitted that recent researches do not bear out the accusation. They were not personally anxious for the Reformers to be severely treated, but when called upon to act they behaved roughly to them. The English Bishops as a rule were glad to shut their eyes to troublesome opinions ; they, most of them, wished to have a comfortable life in the enjoyment of their wealth and dignity ; to be called upon to burn heretics was a troublesome interruption to a pleasant existence.

The English nobility did not desire the persecution of their inferiors. They were rather afraid of too much zeal, lest those among them who had abbey lands should become objects of attack. Their attitude might be expressed by the motto "*surtout point de zèle.*"

Taking all these aspects of the matter, I am inclined to regard the Queen as the prime mover, from first to last, in the suppression of the Reformers. Her inconvenient conscientiousness made it a point of duty to burn everyone alive who was opposed to the Holy See. Duty, she thought, could never be carried too far ; she had no fear of being "righteous overmuch." What she held to be right must not be shrunk from, be the consequences what they might.

Hence, from mistaken motives, she set going the most widespread cruelties that ever disgraced the soil of England.

Moreover, while intending to bring England back to Rome, she took the best means for spreading the influence of the Protestant martyrs. She sent every victim back to his own neighbourhood to be burned, making them the heroes of their friends and neighbours. Crowds gathered round the local hero, their own martyr, and ringing cheers went up when he fought through his agony with unshrinking courage. She desired to suppress the Protestants ; in effect she lighted the beacon-fires of the Reformation, and as the souls of the martyrs went up to heaven through the flames, a deadly hatred of the religion of the Pope settled in men's hearts, and a conviction

that a Gospel for which so many were content to die must indeed be the truth of God. The burnings of the Protestants were the missionary beacons of each neighbourhood.

A few words may be said here as to the general character of the persecution. Its most remarkable feature was the enormous number of persons of the humbler classes on whom vengeance fell. The country was mapped out into districts and a complete organization arranged for enforcing conformity. Justices of the peace were to look up doubtful persons, and were bidden to employ secret informers, a most un-English proceeding, reminding one that Mary was half a Spaniard herself. The sheriffs were ordered to institute search, and to be present at the burnings. The Bishops also were urged on, not showing much alacrity for the horrible task. A few gentlemen were among the victims, but we read chiefly of artisans, of callings still familiar to us, as, for instance, such humble persons as weavers, barbers, butchers, bricklayers, blacksmiths, tailors, shoemakers and labourers ; harmless persons such as a cripple and a blind man. Women were not spared ; wives and widows and quite young girls, and even a blind girl, were sent to feed the flames. The blind girl went to the fire holding her little brother in her hand to guide her.

Sixty-nine persons were burnt in the latter part of the year 1556 alone—altogether the numbers were not far short of 300. The Court was much incensed by the report that reached the Queen of the uproarious cheering that welcomed every martyr who bore his sufferings with courage. As a rule, the crowd was in favour of the sufferer and against the authorities, and well they might be. In some places loud exclamations of prayer were heard from bystanders, that God would strengthen the victims in their agony. So much was the Government annoyed by these results that stringent orders were sent round, forbidding such demonstrations. But the sturdy English crowd, and moreover in a good cause, proved beyond control. The burnings, as I have said above, had exactly the opposite effect to what was intended ; they rendered numbers of persons who, if let alone, would have been of no account, conspicuous by the honours of a glorious endurance, witnessed by many who otherwise might have made small account of religion at all, or of doctrinal differences.

Moreover, and this made the matter worse for the persecutors,

most of these persons simply died for the faith in which they had been brought up. Ever since the days of Henry VIII and through the reign of Edward VI younger persons were brought up regardless of the Pope's supremacy; they looked upon themselves usually as Catholics of the ancient Church of England, as King Henry VIII did, or as Protestants taught from early years to deny transubstantiation and to say the services in the English tongue. They were not deserving the name of heretics at all. The views they now maintained were those which learned divines had taught them in their youth. This reason of the faith that was in them was not infrequently brought forward by the accused ones in their own defence. And a most reasonable defence it was. They indeed were the very best of the nation; unlike many others, they would not be of one religion under one ruler and of another under the next. Of what value could a conversion be, if they yielded to it on a sudden because the fire was in sight? Many recanted, but they could not prove worthier citizens than those who were too conscientious to do so. But thus has a persecuting spirit always defeated its own best interests. The French nation lost its best men by driving out the Huguenot families, and England under Mary had cause to be proud, not of the characters of those who conformed, but of the heroes who were faithful unto death. And it was they who made the Reformation.

The principal objections made by the adherents of the Reformation when brought to trial were, first, that they rejected the Papal supremacy, considering that the Bishop of Rome had no rightful authority over this realm of England; such authority not having been recognized in the primitive Church of Christ. Secondly, they desired to retain the Book of Common Prayer in English, as being intelligible for public worship, and therefore objected to the restoration of the Latin service book. Thirdly, they disapproved of the Mass, and the doctrine of transubstantiation which went with it, denying, what the Romans affirmed, that a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead was offered in the Sacrament.

S. HARVEY GEM.

(To be concluded.)

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS.

BY THE REV. HERBERT MARSTON, M.A., Rector of Lydford-on-Fosse, Somerset.

III.

FOUR topics, perennial as elements of Christianity, jut like salients from this epistle into the thought of modern men. They are these: The personality of Jesus, the doctrine of grace, the Atonement, the possibility of communication between the world of sense and the beings and forces of the world unseen, and even of the world beyond the grave.

I will collect and combine in one view St. Paul's messages to us on these topics. Their significance is obvious. No one can peruse current fiction, poetry and speculation, without becoming aware of the largeness of the space which they fill. They figure largely in Browning. Mrs. Humphrey Ward rose to celebrity by her handling of the first of the four. A tribe of inferior writers constantly make them the themes of loose and illiterate lucubration. One deals with the eclipse of faith. Another describes the making of a Christian. A third lets imagination run wild in the grotesque fable of the reativity of Christ. A fourth fills a serial story with the progress of a saint. If these performances are for the most part worthless so far as religion is concerned, they evidence conclusively that the popular mind is full of a sort of interest in religion. I hope, therefore, that St. Paul may get a hearing on the subject so much in the vogue.

I. The personality of Jesus is the most interesting of these topics. I do not here refer to the theological doctrine of the "Person of Christ." I am thinking neither of Athanasius nor of Dorner. I am thinking of the identity between the Jesus of this epistle and the Jesus of the four Evangelists. Eight times does St. Paul in this epistle mention our Lord by His human name. This is an unique phenomenon in his writings. Some psychological reason for this phenomenon must have existed. The Jesuits adopted the sacred name Jesus as peculiar to their order, because they wished to exalt the virgin mother by depressing her divine Son. The early Evange-

licals brought back into the living usage of the Church the name of Jesus because it expressed and enshrined the offices of redemption, which they insisted upon. The Apostle also had his reason for dwelling on the name of Jesus. "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest" had been the words of the voice which arrested and converted him long years before. He was himself now in the midst of persecution for Jesus' sake. He recalled the voice and the Name above every name; for they calmed and fortified his soul. When he mentions the triumphal progress of the Gospel, he speaks of his Lord as Christ. He describes the subject of his preaching at Corinth as "the Son of God Christ Jesus." The atoning work he couples with the title Christ. The appeal to be set free from the thorn in the flesh was addressed to "the Lord." But when he is delineating his tribulations and the power that sustained him, he speaks of Jesus—the life and the dying of Jesus; he is their bond-slave for Jesus' sake. The Incarnation in his view is "The well known grace of the Lord Jesus." Any tampering with his original gospel he repudiates as being the inventing of another Jesus—a Jesus not his nor belonging to the twelve.

The evidence of this series of uses of the sacred name is strongly adverse to the crudely improbable assertion that St. Paul knew and cared little about the earthly life of the Redeemer. The name Jesus could have meant nothing to the Corinthians but a historical person, Who but He who is depicted in the four Gospels could be that historical person? We know that on his first visit to Jerusalem after his baptism St. Paul passed a fortnight in the company of Peter and of James, the Lord's brother. From them he learned the story of the divine life. With them he conversed about those additions to it which he could make. Together they wove into a true unity the narrative of Jesus. There is no schism in the New Testament. There is no ingenious effort to patch up or to conceal that schism. There is not one Jesus for the Jews, and another for the Gentiles. There was not one Jesus preached by Cephas and another preached by Paul. The Jesus of the Evangelists is the Jesus of St. Paul. He loved Jesus; he preached Jesus; he was the slave of men for Jesus' sake.

From these considerations flows clearly a conclusion of devotional value. There is abundant justification in Apostolic usage for the familiar way of speaking of our Lord specially dear to a certain

type of modern Christians. There is among them a felt need for a human Saviour. A frigid and distant mannerism is repellant to them. They must speak of their Lord as they find Him, very human indeed. The instinct of these hearts is amply justified by the usage in this epistle. "How sweet the name of Jesus sounds" is Pauline, as well as an Olney hymn.

2. The doctrine of grace has lost in our generation much of that commanding preoccupation which it used to exert. This misfortune is partly due to the dreary formalism with which the Divines of the Protestant Churches invested the living reality. It is due also to the crude and bitter controversies which, in England at least, divided good men, who all meant the same thing, yet who each angrily contended that his brethren meant something else. It is also due, in part, to the scientific temper, which has overspread all religious thought, and which suspects a term which more than any other represents a thing claiming to be above nature. The habit of contrasting grace with nature, though it has the support of our Catechism, cannot be justified from Scripture. In itself it seems unreasonable; for the Bible maintains that God is the Author of nature and of grace. The New Testament opposes to grace either Law or Sin. It never opposes to grace nature either human or cosmic. This fact ought to conciliate the truly scientific mind. Grace is an influence or force which runs parallel to nature. It comes in to supersede moral law where moral law cannot effect the supreme object. It is in conflict with sin, because sin is that in the world which defies all law and thus requires the introduction of power more effectual than law.

We need only recall the names in Christian history, connected with the doctrine of grace, to see what a venerable and wholesome prescription sustains it. Augustine, Bernard, Calvin, Pascal, Romaine, are but a few of them. Each of these great and good men impressed on the human mind the sovereign importance of the doctrine of grace. Each of them felt it as a personal possession. Its hold over them was not ecclesiastical and dogmatic, but vital and interior. The mind of our age turns strongly another way. We are above all things humane. We call for the social virtues, and for a social spirituality. We want people to be good, to be happy, to be sound. We have left in majestic isolation the deeper things of God. Yet after all Christianity is the religion of grace. Here is

its origin, its principle. It is indeed true that the word never appears on the lips of Jesus. Yet His first recorded utterance is described by St. Luke as exciting wonder, because of the grace that characterized it. And when St. John sums up the effect of the religion of the Incarnate Word he does so in the sentence " Grace and Truth came into being through JESUS CHRIST." A time must surely come when the spiritual life will consciously return to its fountain head in the doctrine of grace.

3. This epistle contains, as I venture to think, the most powerful of all St. Paul's references to the Atonement. The close of the fifth chapter is the passage to which I allude. We are all familiar with the formula " The Atonement in the light of modern thought." May I without impertinence invert the formula and consider modern thought in the light of the Atonement? As I compare this passage with the views that are current among us, a noteworthy difference is apparent between our contemporaries and the Apostle.

Without attenuating divine justice, without compromising upon human sinfulness, without importing the harsh idea of a commercial arrangement, without reducing the reconciliation to a weak and good-natured concession, St. Paul states the event, and the process, with simplicity and dignity; his touch is firm, and his vision clear. St. Paul says that atonement is reconciliation. This reconciliation affects the whole world. This reconciliation was brought to pass by God. It was an act done by Christ the sinless one, when He was made sin for us. It is intended to produce righteousness in those who receive it. It is pressed on men by the ministers of the gospel; it is the very word of the gospel itself. Though volumes have been written on the Atonement, and though volumes more will be written upon it, the passage before us suffices for the preacher, for the believer, for the seeker after truth and peace. Doubtless various human souls appropriate the doctrine in various ways. But as the reconciliation is one, so the appeal to all men is " Be reconciled to God." Any reconstruction of the gospel that omits this appeal from its central place, will ere long succumb before the moral misery and impotence of the world.

4. With no subject is the mind of our age more strangely fascinated than with that of the unseen world. Intercourse with the East has revived among us interests in the cults of Eastern peoples, and in those cults the world unseen figures large.

A reaction from the hidebound materialism that prevailed after

the publication of "The Origin of Species," has gone after a spiritual background to the universe. Independent thinkers, like Sir Oliver Lodge, have tried to apply scientific method to the phenomena of spiritualism. In another quarter the inquiry has taken a more healthy and useful direction. There are many who desire to see revived those charismatic gifts of the Spirit, which certainly existed among Christians for a long time after the Apostolic age. This desire has set us on inquiring what is the relation of body to spirit in this life present. We ask boldly, "Have these extraordinary gifts totally ceased?" We ask further, "If they have ceased, is not the cessation our own fault?" and "Ought not that fault to be corrected?" Such are the causes that have again brought into prominence the question of the two worlds.

Three passages in our epistle throw welcome light on the subject. I would remark upon them that they are all serious and candid; they have nothing of superstition or of ecstasy about them; they justify us in inquiring fearlessly and without shame into these problems. Everything is strictly verified in experience. St. Paul knows; he tells us when he does not know.

The first passage in order of time is that in chapter xii. He describes a wonderful experience which happened to him fourteen years before he wrote. He was caught into Paradise; there he heard and saw. Of the precise nature of the experience he could not speak positively. It may have been bodily; it may have been out of the body. Of the event he had no doubt; of its moral value he was willing to boast. He was kept sober in the retrospect of this experience by the assurance that God knew all about it.

The second passage is the immediate sequel. The rapture into Paradise was counterpoised by another experience of a mysterious order. St. Paul became the victim of a Satanic visitation. It beat upon his frame; it was managed by an angel. This creature pierced his bodily frame with acute suffering. The trouble became chronic. He appealed to the Lord for relief. The reply is significant, "My grace is sufficient for thee." Grace has a bodily function. It can correct not merely the vices of the soul, but also the plagues and vexations of the fleshly frame. From this conviction we derive the belief that by Christ's grace we may prevail over the more subtle forms of evil.

The third passage is in the fifth chapter. St. Paul depicts the house not made with hands. This appears to be a vesture which

clothes the spirit of the believer at death. It is not the spiritual body, nor is it the body of Christ's glory ; yet it may well be akin to both. In this vesture we are to appear before the *bema* of Christ. In it we shall receive the things done in the material body. In it we shall be at home with the Lord—to adopt the dubious but tender language of our Bible.

If we now combine these passages and contemplate the general cast of the teaching, we shall find that it amounts to this. The Christian as such has dealing with both worlds. He has nothing to fear about either, for God knows all about each of them. That grace, by which spiritual life is nourished, has a close and powerful relation with the body, with Satanic powers, with being as a whole. His mortal part is destined to undergo a change, but a change similar to the order of things, in which he now moves.

There is an underlying unity between the operations of grace and of nature. Sin, as the negation of nature, is the only alien thing ; and its disturbing eccentricities must at last be removed from the universe. Till that high consummation, Christ reigns over His people totally, not partially, always, and by moral order. No sublimities, no profundities, are beyond the grace of Christ. Purity, humility, and charity are everywhere at home and everywhere supreme.

HERBERT MARSTON.



STUDIES IN TEXTS.

SUGGESTIONS FOR SERMONS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.

BY THE REV. HARRINGTON C. LEES, M.A.

III. A SENTRY IN STONE.

Texts.—"The Lord be the Watchman between me and thee."
 "Jacob swear by the Fear of his father" (Gen. xxxi. 48, 53).
 "Swear not at all, but let your speech be 'Yes,' 'Yes,' 'No,' 'No'"
 (St. Matt. v. 34, 37).

(Book of the month : "FOLKLORE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT" ¹ = FL. Ref. to *Expositor*, May, 1918 = E. article by T. H. Darlow.)

"Mizpah" in popular devotion is a misused reference. It was here a watchword of suspicion between two crafty men who could not trust one another's word. Laban and Jacob were "diamond cut diamond." But their appeal to religious safeguards is instructive. They erected a pillar; they built a cairn; they made a covenant by sacrifice; they ate part of the sacrifice (xxx. 45, 46, 51, 52, 54). Peoples who habitually used such ritual had a long way to go before arriving at the simple sincerity of the Sermon on the Mount.

I. THE RITUAL (vv. 45, 46).

A. *The Stones*. "A large stone as a pillar, with a cairn of smaller stones about it, to mark the boundary neither should pass; a monument of mutual suspicion; a deed in stone to which each of contracting parties set his hand; a watchful eye to hold them" (FL. 2, 401). Canon Tristram says such monuments are still used by Arab herdsmen as watching-stations over their flocks (FL. 2, 402): illustration of God's watching. Cf. oath made on black stones by St. Columba's tomb in Iona was decisive (FL. 2, 405). Jacob swears by the Fear (God in His awesome aspect) of Isaac; Laban by Abraham and Nahor (as an old marginal note says, "their respective ancestors," xxx. 53).

B. v. 54. Cf. Genesis xv. 10-18. *The Covenant by sacrifice*. The victim was cut in two. Hebrew, Latin and Greek all say, "to cut a covenant." i. Symbolic of retribution to overtake man who breaks covenant (FL. 1, 399). ii. Symbolic of union. The contracting parties passed between the pieces (Cf. Jer. xxxiv. 18); thought to be thereby united with each other by bond of common blood (FL. 1, 392, 393, 412, 425. Greeks did this before Trojan war). See also Herodotus iii. 8, an illustration from Arabs (quoted in E. 353). iii. They made a feast of the sacrifice, sitting on the stones (xxx. 46, A.V., 54). "Intended to ratify the covenant, by common meal, strengthened by absorbing the solidity of the stones" (FL. 2, 408).

¹ By Sir J. G. Frazer (Macmillan & Co., 3 vols.). *Studies in Comparative Religion*. Its facts should often be judged apart from its inferences. Many points illuminate the Bible; it needs discrimination in study for the Christian preacher. Immense industry, as always with this author.

To break all this was to break the law embodied in third commandment, directed not against profanity popularly understood, but against breaking treaties and promises ratified by swearing (E. 353). Over all this the cairn was God's silent sentry.

II. THE MESSAGE FOR US.

A. God spoke of old in curious ways to the infant consciences of men (Heb. i. 1). By pictures and signs He came to men who groped in the dark (Acts xvii. 27), if they acted honestly (Acts x. 35). Even stones and dismembered carcasses had their message.

B. These symbolisms are true in spiritual fact. There is a divine sentry between covenant-makers, there is in Calvary a blood link which makes men one, and does bring retribution to those who carelessly trample it under feet. There is a heavenly feeding by which members of the body are strengthened in fellowship. See Psalm xv. 4, RVM. and PBV. Ephesians ii. 13, 14. Hebrews x. 29. I Corinthians x. 16-17, RVM.

C. But the Gospel of Christ has elevated our conceptions. "In the morning of the world men ratified their covenants by invoking the awful name of God. To "take that name in vain" (as the third commandment calls it), meant to tear up the covenant which the name had consecrated (E. 354). But, after all, this is the device of untrustworthiness. Even God's accommodation to men's distrust of Him (Heb. vi. 13-18), must be a temporary expression outgrown when "Littlefaith" attains spiritual manhood (Heb. v. 12; vi. 1). In Christ, God's word is known to be faithful without any oath (2 Cor. i. 20-22), and men who are fellow-members of Christ have only to say a thing to have it believed without any cairns or covenant sacrifices (St. Matt. v. 33-37). The superfluity of these other things arises out of the intrusion of evil (cf. St. Matt. v. 37). In the Mother-City (Gal. iv. 26) of Christ's New Kingdom no lie can live (Rev. xxi. 27), and truth is unembarrassed by sentinels: the river flows clear as crystal down the street of its daily life (xxii. 1, 2, RVM).



REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

A MUCH DISCUSSED BOOK.

THE LORD'S COMING AND THE WORLD'S END. By the Rev. W. J. L. Sheppard, M.A. London: S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d. net.

This is a remarkable book. Its author sets out to demolish the views of prophecy commonly held among Evangelicals who are usually regarded as very deep Bible students, and undoubtedly few of his arguments can be dismissed with a wave of the hand. He frankly "spiritualizes" nearly everything. And his treatment demands respect because he is not one of those who discredit inspiration or disbelieve in a personal Advent. If an event is unquestionably foretold in Scripture—e.g. 1 Thessalonians iv.—he unquestioningly accepts it. And he bases all he says on the words of Scripture.

Most of us who are not definitely committed to any school of prophetic interpretation will probably feel, after reading this book, that it is well not to be too sure how the details of prophecy will be worked out. We shall feel this, not only because of Mr. Sheppard's arguments, but because, as we venture to think, he is sometimes too sure himself. It is impossible to give many instances either way; but we should like to select one or two examples of his strength, and also of what we think may be his weak points.

On the subject of the pre-tribulation Rapture, and especially the *secret* Rapture, he has hit on a point which must have struck many of us. Where is the Scripture proof? Writers and speakers follow each other with dogmatic assertions, but they either take the fact for granted or quote passages capable of different interpretations. If anybody has an answer to Mr. Sheppard here, we should like to see it. We have looked for it in many quarters, and are anxious to find it. At the same time, has he dealt with every passage which may be taken to bear upon it? We have found no direct reference to Luke xxi. 36.

Another point which seems quite unanswerable is that if Matthew xxv. deals with a judgment of living nations at the Coming of Christ, and if all Christians, living and dead, are then already with Him, the earth would be uninhabited during the Millennium, if a Millennium be accepted (note ver. 46 here).

But in one pivotal passage Mr. Sheppard is not so happy. First of all, we are not quite sure of his point on 1 Thessalonians iv. It is quite true that nothing can be built on the word "first," which cannot be assumed to refer to anything but the succeeding "then." But is there no hint of a separate resurrection in the emphasis on the words "in Christ"? He gives a perfectly clear reason for his belief that there is not: but it does not quite convince us. We are still more doubtful about Revelation xx., which is really pivotal to his whole position. If he fails here, the spiritualizing theory is done for. The comparison with John v^c 25, 28 is very striking, but the parallel is not exact. In that passage, the distinction between spiritual and literal is made clear by designed variation of phraseology. In Revelation xx. there is no such variation. *ἐξήσαν* is used in both cases, and moreover in consecutive lines. To seek a different meaning in such circumstances is very forced. Nor is this all. *πεπελεκισμένων* is another stumbling-block. Mr. Sheppard knows the value of correct translation of tenses. He insists on the right rendering of *ἐρχόμενοι* in Revelation vii.

14. (But, by the way, is he necessarily right there? If that vision was future, the present tense would be proleptic, and would refer to what was happening, not in St. John's day, but at the time represented in the vision.) It is surely clear that *πεπελεκισμένων* refers to those who, at the time referred to, had been already beheaded. It passes our comprehension how such a tense can refer to a *present* experience of potential martyrdom, even if this latter interpretation could be accepted without grave doubt. They had been beheaded, and lived. We are not, indeed, sure that the omission of the word "again" in ver. 5. makes so much difference as is represented. But even if it does, what is the precise value Mr. Sheppard assigns to the words "the rest of the dead"? Why "the rest," if those already mentioned in ver. 4 had not been literally dead and literally raised? We think we know what he would reply, but the only reply again seems terribly forced.

Is it correct, too, to say that the New Testament is "absolutely silent" on such a reign of blessedness, except for this disputed passage? How can we be quite sure there is no reference in Matthew xix. 28, Acts iii. 21, Revelation xi. 15, Matthew v. 5, Acts i. 6, 7, or perhaps other passages? In the last case, for instance, it seems very significant that our Lord did not deny the main assumption. His silence, when denial would have been so easy, and especially when a direct allusion to times and seasons might be understood as an admission of the ultimate fact, may well be argued as assent.

We do not quite like the way in which Bishop Moule is quoted. Many of us know how scrupulously balanced are the assertions of that careful theologian; but the quotations might convey an impression that he gave an adherence to the spiritualizing view to which he certainly did not commit himself. In one place, moreover, there is apparently a grave misquotation, unless Mr. Sheppard's edition of *Outlines of Christian Doctrine* is different. Correctly, the passage runs (p. 109): "And if so, the question arises whether the same principle does not rule other Old Testament predictions of the future of Israel." Mr. Sheppard writes "the other." There is a difference, and it may mean much.

We are not impressed by the chapter on the Creed of the Church. Let it be granted that the Reformers and others held certain views: nevertheless they used Scripture language, and therefore the interpretation of it must be Scriptural, whatever that is. With the doubtful exception of the Athanasian Creed, none of the passages quoted demands adherence to the view advocated as a matter of loyalty to the Church.

The book is remarkable, as we have said, for its arguments. But it is also remarkable for its omissions. It would be unreasonable to expect everything in a small volume; but it is extraordinary to find no reference to the remarkable chronological correspondences worked out by the leading students of the Historical School (we except less responsible people who have brought discredit on the study of the subject by rash conjectures). We do not recall more than the most casual reference to Daniel in the whole book! On the very day these words are written, there appears in *The Life of Faith* (February 5) an address by Bishop Moule, in which he remarks on Dr. Guinness's forecast for the year 1917 forty years ago. That year witnessed the fall of Jerusalem and Bagdad—portentous events for Turkey: and moreover, this is only the latest of a whole series of correspondences which simply cannot be fortuitous.

Mr. Sheppard would probably point us to his remarks on the principles of the Apocalypse as his answer to the Historicists. But it is simply begging the question to say that "any line of interpretation which violates" the

principles he lays down " may be dismissed as erroneous." He is up against the facts of history there; and the Historicists have evidence to produce which he has not. In the address just named, Bishop Moule regards the Apocalypse as strictly predictive (the same conclusion may be drawn from the section of his " Outlines " quoted in this book). Referring to the parallel of Daniel's chronological prediction already fulfilled at the First Advent, the Bishop, with gentlest irony, suggests that some liberalising Hebrews " may have smiled at Simeon's and Anna's hope, and advised them to read Daniel's visions in a more philosophic spirit; to forbear to load them with chronological responsibilities; to regard them rather as pictorial embodiments of principles." " But," he adds, " such sages would have been wrong. The seventy weeks meant history and an event, the supreme event for Israel and the world." Mr. Sheppard does not really " liberalise," in the usual sense of that word at any rate; but he does some at least of these things with reference to the Apocalypse. Among these predictions, by the way, the Bishop shows he includes Revelation xx., probably reckoned by " year-days."

Perhaps the weakest part of the volume is the Foreword. 2 John 9 is not clear enough for the writer's purpose, at any rate unless more closely limited, and moreover lays him open to a retort from Revelation xxii. which we notice has already been made. And it is inconsistent to allow that such points are non-essential on p. 8 after this apparently inclusive fulmination on p. 5. Mr. Sheppard cannot have it both ways. If 2 John 9 is applicable he must have no dealings with the Bishop of Durham, Mr. Hubert Brooke, and quite a host of other people whom we are quite certain (as indeed he himself clearly shows) he is by no means anxious to excommunicate!

But there is nothing unseemly about the tone adopted in the book towards opponents. Most of the way we have been rather critical; but that is because we do want the author and others to weigh well these points, and such-like with them. The book is really impressive, and deserves the attention which it is receiving—it is already in a second edition. It *compels* thought, and we hope it will lead to wider and deeper study and discussion, without recrimination, of its great and immediately vital topic.

CANON LILLINGSTON'S "EVANGELISM."

THOUGHTS ON EVANGELISM. By Canon A. B. G. Lillingston, with a foreword by the Bishop of Durham. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1s. 6d. net.

This little book of eighty-four pages, which has already gone into a second edition, comes as a suitable sequel to the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on the Evangelistic Part of the Church—and enforces the findings of that Committee. From a rich and varied experience the writer lays emphasis upon Evangelization as the primary (and too often the neglected) duty of the Church and its members. He modestly disclaims novelty or profundity in treatment; but no one can read this volume and fail to be impressed with its deep, searching tenderness and high pastoral value. There are four chapters—The Need, The Clergy to Lead, Helps, " Jesus spake the Word unto them." The book is simply written, in a style that arrests, with many an incident related to bring out the point. The tone is spiritually high; the manner gentle; the aim to lead the readers to an appreciation of the real purpose of the Church and the first work of its true members. For all the failure—the remedy is obvious. " The Church, the whole Church, Clergy and Laity alike and together, must walk nearer to God, must walk continually in the Light, for in the Light we see Light—and can then go forward in the steps,

and after the example of, the Master Himself, and manifest God more fully and better to a world that is sitting and labouring in darkness or in gloom." This is a little book which every "parson" would be the better for reading: the younger men would find that it would shape their course, and the older men would be gently rebuked and led back again to the first paths.

OTHER VOLUMES.

THE PATHWAY TO FULNESS OF BLESSING, by the Rev. E. L. Langston, M.A. (*London Jews' Society*, 16 Lincoln's Inn Fields.) 2s. 6d. net. The writer declares that the greatest need of the servants of God to-day is to be filled with the Holy Spirit: and declares that in the prophecies of Balaam and in the history of Israel there are wonderful object-lessons of the way to live such a life of overflowing blessing. How to enter this life, the difficulties we must encounter, and the obstacles to be overcome, are all given in Balaam's remarkable prophecies. Those three prophecies are dealt with as setting forth the calls to Separation, Sanctification and Satisfaction.

* * * * *

INTERCESSION AND THE SHARING OF THE CROSS, by Charles Gardner, Muriel G. E. Harris, Eleanor McDougall, Michael Wood, Annie K. Small. (*Macmillan & Co.* 2s. net.) This is a small volume of five essays on Intercession, in which with others the following subjects are dealt with:—"The Background of Intercession," "Contemplative Intercession," "Vicarious Offering." The reader will put down this little volume with sense of the greatness of the power of intercession: a mighty power of which he has learnt but first principles.

* * * * *

THE SPIRIT OF JESUS. A Study of St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Missionary and Social Gospel for To-day. (*S.P.C.K.* 2s. net.) By the Rev. Canon A. E. Humphreys, M.A. This book of studies is prepared as the basis of "ten minutes daily with the Bible," and has a modern English version of the Epistle, showing the connected argument. The studies cover a period of six weeks.

* * * * *

THE MEANING AND REALITY OF PRAYER, by the Rev. A. R. Whately, D.D. (*S.P.C.K.* 4d. net.) This is a scholarly, and yet a simple, treatise on a great subject by a writer of distinguished ability. It is among the freshest and most helpful little booklets on this important topic.

* * * * *

DREAMS: WHAT THEY ARE AND WHAT THEY MEAN, by J. W. Wickwar. (*Jarrollds*, 2s. 6d. net.) Most of us dream, and some of us have theories of the meaning of dreams. Mr. Wickwar, who has given the subject much study, claims to have treated the old topic in a new way, in the light of "common-sense reasoning." His conclusions may not be ours, but he has certainly produced a very interesting little book, which has reached a third edition.

* * * * *

A LITTLE BOOK FOR MOTHERS AND SONS, by Nora Brodie Thornhill (*Longmans, Green & Co.*, 2s. 6d. net), is a series of readings by mothers to their boys during the seven weeks of the holidays. The writer disclaims any literary merit, but one cannot but admire the ingenuity shown in the capture at the outset of the youth's attention by an interesting story or topical allusion, an indispensable preliminary to the enforcement of the subsequent religious lesson.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

Books suitable for Lenten reading are many, and the various publishing houses who issue books of this kind are not behindhand this year in giving churchpeople a varied selection. Of the new books which have come before us, the one which seems to have the greatest "special message" is Canon de Candole's *Christian Assurance* (3s. 6d. net cloth and 2s. net paper cover). The book is designed as a series of short readings for each week-day in Lent, and in the words of the author has a very simple and direct purpose. It is written with the desire of offering a word of good cheer to any who in a cloudy and dark day have begun to question, or be less sure of, the Christian hope. But it is not only to the perplexed that the book will appeal. It will strengthen and encourage many an earnest Christian.

The Rector of Cheltenham, the Rev. H. A. Wilson, issued last year a book for Lenten meditation entitled *The Time of Refreshing* (2s. net). Lent is a time of spiritual refreshment, and the author's aim is to give some practical help in the strengthening of the soul. The little book concerns itself only with the old truths, and if it succeeds in calling its readers to those truths it will have met one of the greatest needs of to-day. Clergy who are contemplating a course of addresses on Holy Week will find the four concluding addresses both useful and suggestive. They are brief considerations of four incidents in the spiritual experience of St. John the Evangelist under the titles "The Oath Made," "The Great Incentive," "The Broken Oath," "The Recovery." The other addresses are very practical and inspiring.

A re-issue of *Christus Redemptor*, by Dr. Tait, of Ridley, at 1s. net, and 9d. net, will be welcome. It is distinctly a book with a message, and a message which is definite. The theme is Jesus Christ, as the title signifies. Dr. Tait brings up the fact that when the Evangelical revivalists stood up to preach, what arrested the attention of the people was the certainty, the assurance, with which they spoke. Previously men had preached moral essays, now they preached Jesus Christ. The five addresses the book contains were originally delivered at St. Paul's Cathedral and are meditations on 1 Corinthians i. 30. In a succession of chapters—"The Divine Model," "Wisdom from God," "Righteousness," "Sanctification," "Redemption"—Dr. Tait enunciates several fundamental truths concisely and forcefully. The paragraphs in the book are neither long nor difficult. The use of Holy Scripture is constant. It is a book for meditation, and at the end of each chapter are passages for further consideration and suitable collects for those who desire to use them.

Christ and the World is the title of a little book of Lenten addresses by Canon R. B. Girdlestone (9d. net). They will be found helpful to readers who will also be able to enjoy the simple and colloquial style in which they are given. Canon Girdlestone has not adapted the addresses to "book form" but has printed from the shorthand writer's copy. The titles of the six chapters—"The World and its Prince," "The World and the Church," "Coming out of the World," "The Pleasures

of the World," "Tests of Worldliness," and "Helps to Attain an Unworldly Spirit"—give an indication of the scope covered by the book, which is full of thoughtful suggestion.

Many will be glad of the wholesome doctrine contained in Canon W. E. R. Morrow's little volume, *Christ Magnified* (1s. 3d. net). The title itself is a happy inspiration and well describes the purpose of the contents of a really useful little book. The six sermons which the book contains deal with important aspects of the person and work of Christ. The sermons will bring help to the many who are striving to "magnify Christ" and are a message to those who are still seekers after truth.

Manuals containing simple and clear instruction on the Service of Holy Communion are always in demand, particularly one specially suited to candidates from higher elementary or secondary schools. *My First Communion*. *First Communion*, by the Rev. A. R. Runnels Moss (1s. and 1s. 3d. net), will be found such a book. The Bishop of Manchester contributes a preface, in which he describes the book as helpful to true devotion and containing instruction true to the principles of the Communion Office in our Church without being controversial in tone; it is quite definite in its teaching, and it has a special value at the present time, when Romanising manuals are scattered broadcast.

Another little book of a different type is *The Holy Communion: its Institution, Purpose and Privilege*, by the Rev. Canon Barnes-Lawrence, Vicar of St. John's, Boscombe, 1s. net, and 6d. net. The aim of this little book is to provide a manual giving positive teaching rather than controversial, treatment and as it is impossible in any book on the Holy Communion devotional, or otherwise, to leave out entirely the controversies of the day, Canon Barnes-Lawrence has relegated those controversial parts to a series of very valuable notes which he prints at the end. The book is intended specially to help young Christians of the more thoughtful and educated classes.

The Bishop of Sodor and Man's Manual *Holy Communion: Historical, Doctrinal and Devotional*, 1s. 3d. net, is a book of yet another kind. The chief idea in writing this manual is to provide a handbook which will be both historical and doctrinal, and yet at the same time devotional and practical, without being overloaded with detailed instructions which tend to divert the communicant from the main principles of the service. With this end in view, the Bishop lays the foundation in a series of introductory chapters dealing with the preparatory and yet all important aspects of the subject. He then builds on them a historic, devotional and practical explanation of the service itself. The book is written for the average intelligent and earnest communicant, who desires to know something of the history, more of the doctrine, and most of the true spirit of the Communion Office, and is designed to help to a reverent and intelligent observance of the service.