

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

# THE CHURCHMAN

February, 1916.

## The Month.

The Old  
Evangel.

It is not surprising that the Bishop of Chelmsford's paper, read at the Islington Clerical Meeting, has excited deep and widespread interest, not only among Evangelicals, but also among those as far removed from the Islington platform as Mr. Athelstan Riley. It said much that has long wanted saying, and it said it well and to good purpose. Yet it was a simple paper; the secret of its power was that it dealt with a real live question which vitally affects every ordained minister of the Church. Its main purpose may be set out in a word or two: it was an indictment of the Evangelical party, that its members are failing to preach the Gospel; and it was a plea that they should return to the proclamation of the old message, the old Evangel, as the only message with power in it to save men's souls. And, after all, the salvation of souls is the chief end of the ministry. We have given the paper the premier place among the articles in this issue because we are profoundly convinced of the importance of the Bishop's message. We have pleaded again and again in the CHURCHMAN for the more definite preaching of the Gospel, but we hardly expected so soon to find the plea so forcibly expounded at the Islington Clerical Meeting, by so powerful a prelate as the Bishop of Chelmsford. We commend the paper to the most earnest attention of all our clerical readers, and laymen will profit by it hardly less. But the real appeal, of course, is to the clergy, that they may realize the grave respon-

sibility resting upon them to know "nothing among men save Jesus Christ and Him Crucified." This it was which in the old Apostolic days brought men in penitence and faith to the Lord Jesus Christ; this it is which to-day will change men's hearts. The old Evangel, ever new! It is the theme which, above all else, is worthy of the Christian minister's best efforts; it is the one theme men and women delight to hear; it is the one message for which they are hungering and thirsting to-day.

It is of the utmost significance that the *Guardian* of January 13 devoted its leader to the subject of the Bishop of Chelmsford's paper, and it is not a little remarkable that it endorsed its allegations and supported its conclusions. Entitling its article "The Preacher and the Crisis," it said:

The Preacher  
and the Crisis.

"His (the Bishop's) appeal for the preaching of the 'old Evangel' was primarily addressed to Evangelicals, but it is impossible not to feel that it comes home to the whole Church, especially at this period of crisis. For the matter of that, indeed, the Church is always faced by a crisis. It passes through times, like the present, of especial poignancy when, however plain its duty, the best and simplest means of performing it is not always obvious, when it treads the path with doubt and diffidence and looks wistfully for a glimmer of light ahead in the darkness. The gravity of the crisis of the moment is plainly realized by the Bishop, and the thanks of Churchmen are due to him for going straight for those fundamentals which, simply because they lie at the root of everything, are peculiarly liable to be lost sight of. If insistence upon the momentousness of the Church's Sacramental system has been the especial 'note' of Tractarian teaching, stress upon the value of the spontaneous spoken word, upon those exhortations to virtue of life with which our Lord led up to the institution of the Church's ordinances, has been the distinguishing characteristic of Evangelical theology. Happily we have of late years made very considerable approach to the blending of these two complementary ideals. They are not mutually exclusive; the blend is essential to the adequate presentation of the whole body of Christ's teaching.

"Sermons directly intended and calculated to save souls are, the Bishop of Chelmsford thinks, 'nowadays looked down upon.' That is a hard saying, and we would fain believe it to be exaggerated. But can we honestly declare that it is conspicuously removed from the facts? Is that the type of sermon which congregations have learned to expect, or which preachers have grown accustomed to preach? Unquestionably we need greater simplicity in the pulpit, and there is nothing so simple as the Gospel. It may be, and is, hard to live, and it is not always easy to preach; yet it is the only thing that matters. But the responsibility for failure to preach it does not rest

clusively with the individual preacher. It must be shared with the hearers who do not demand it, and in an especial degree with the Church, which does not insist upon it from its ministers.

“The old Evangelical Gospel, as it came from the lips of those who laid especial stress upon ‘conversion’ as it was understood in those days, was often hard and narrow; but it achieved great results. It was the Gospel which made Wesley so great a power, which breathed life into the dry bones of the religion of his time. Now that we have to so great an extent got rid of the hardness and narrowness, now that we have learned a wider outlook and have infused a more intense charity and tenderness into the message, its results ought to be more vivifying and more compelling than we have any reason to believe them actually to be.

“The Church, indeed, has long laid far too little stress upon the power of exhortation. Churchgoers look for novelty of treatment, are eager for eloquence, avid of fresh ideas. But there are no fresh ideas in religion. The Gospel is immutable. Its inner meaning may be revealed and illuminated by a penetrating mind, but in essence it remains the same, and that is the first thing which the preacher of salvation has to recognize. Yet within this essential limit there is scope for a multitude of gifts—gifts of intellect, of devotion, of personal holiness, of burning zeal. And it is because these things have been to so great an extent obscured, or even forgotten, that we believe that a most useful purpose will be served by the Bishop of Chelmsford’s outspoken address. If it is, in the first instance, a challenge to the new Evangelicalism, it is, at the same time, a warning to the whole Church to beware lest it lose sight of its primary, its most solemn, and its most pressing duty—the leading of men and women into the path of salvation, not for themselves alone, but, by their example, for those whom they encounter in their passage through the world.”

We have quoted at some length from the *Guardian* article, as we regard it as a most refreshing sign of the times that a newspaper with such traditions should lend its powerful support to a plan for a return to Gospel preaching. There are, indeed, other signs equally welcome (*e.g.*, the Rev. Walter J. Carey’s article in the *Church Times*) as indicating that all sections of the Church are coming to realize that men and women, burdened with cares and sins, are seeking not systems or “isms,” but the living Christ. The Church has failed—miserably failed—to preach Christ, and as a consequence it has lost its power to influence men and women spiritually, and it has become divided against itself. Let the Church recover its primary message and fulfil its primary duty, and the face of England will soon become changed. Moreover, we have a profound conviction that that is

the surest way to the healing of divisions and the promotion of spiritual unity.

The fact that the Government have voluntarily decided to exempt clergy and ministers of religion generally from the operation of the Compulsion Bill ought to set at rest once and for all the questions which have been raised concerning the enlistment of the younger clergy in the armed forces of the Crown. We have never had the least sympathy with the demand that clergy should become combatants ; the idea is absolutely repellent to us, as we believe it must be to all who have a due appreciation of the sacredness of the office to which a clergyman is ordained. It was launched originally by men who by no stretch of imagination can be called friends of the Church, and the less thoughtful of the working classes took it up and, with strange ignorance of the real character of the clergy, attributed the holding aloof to cowardice. It was conveniently forgotten, among other things, that the clergy were practically forbidden by the Bishops to enlist, and that, whatever their own views may have been, their first duty, as Lord Derby admitted, was to obey their ecclesiastical superiors. But after all that was, perhaps, a side issue ; the main contention was challenged even by some who ought to have known better. It was urged indeed by some clergymen—above military age, be it noted, themselves—that if it were right for a Christian man to fight it could not be wrong for a clergyman to join the King's forces, and they disputed that there was anything in the Ordination Service that constituted a bar. But they lost sight of the truth that it is fact of Ordination which is the real deterrent. Without entering into the question of the gifts and graces bestowed at Ordination, it must be admitted that an ordained man is set apart for a particular work. The lay Christian can follow one occupation to-day and another to-morrow, and no one can say him nay. Not so the clergyman. He cannot lawfully engage in business ; he cannot enter Parliament ; his life is consecrated to the ministry. How,

**Exemption of  
the Clergy.**

then, can he possibly lay aside this work, which is pre-eminently one of saving men's souls, to engage in warfare, which admittedly involves destroying men's lives? The argument is so clear, that it is strange it should ever have been questioned. Christian people, therefore, ought to be profoundly thankful to the Government for adopting a course which is wise in itself, and is in agreement with the traditions of Christendom.

**War Work  
for Clergy.**

There is much work for clergy to do for the nation, within their own proper sphere, without their intruding into the fighting line. The Bishop of London, whose sympathy with all lawful aspirations of younger men is well known, has made an effective answer to a deputation which wanted the rule against enlistment relaxed. He pointed out that Army Chaplains are sharing to the full the dangers and risks of the soldiers, and so also are the stretcher-bearers. Two Chaplains were killed in the last battle, and one clerical stretcher-bearer. He promised any curates anxious to serve as Chaplains, that if he considered them suitable, and if on inquiry he found that they could be spared from their parishes, he would endeavour to get them posts as Chaplains, or failing that, always assuming that their departure would not undermine the spiritual work in their parish, and so weaken the nation as well as the Church, he would gladly give leave for them to act as stretcher-bearers. As to the reorganization of the work of the Diocese, he said that already he had asked the Chaplain-General to use the organization of the rural deaneries to ensure that all hospitals in the rural deanery, whether private hospital for officers or Red Cross hospitals or military hospitals, were properly cared for from a spiritual point of view. The Rural Dean had in two deaneries to his knowledge been able to use the clergy from all parishes to help in what is looked upon as the common work of the whole deanery; and as the war goes on such co-operation and re-organization of the work of the diocese will be more and more extended. But he added—and this was the main point of his letter—that when all was done the fact would remain that

the great majority of the clergy will be needed to keep the heart of the Empire true to God at home :

“ We have four millions of people in the diocese, and we must not so act and speak as to lead people to suppose that we have discarded ‘ spiritual ’ weapons and regard physical force as alone effective. If the priests of the Church were to give this impression, it would either shock the consciences or lower the ideals of the laity. As I said at St. Martin’s-in-the-Fields, I want every mourner visited, every recruit commended to the care of the Chaplain of the regiment to which he is posted, touch kept with all women left behind, and help given them to invest their separation allowances in some permanent benefit for their homes and children, or in the War Loan. More than this, we are starting this New Year a chain of unbroken intercession in the diocese throughout the year, and are about to prepare the Church to undertake a National Mission to the whole nation. I think that we shall find the already diminishing number of priests in the diocese no longer reinforced by the large Ordinations of recent years, none too many for so mighty a task, and that in the light of the great spiritual issues involved we may ‘ shorten the days ’ more effectively by renewed fervour and earnestness in the work of our parishes than by any other course which we can adopt.”

The Bishop of London is to be thanked for such a plain, straightforward and convincing answer.

What the Bishop of Oxford describes, with **“ A Remarkable Experiment.”** apparent sympathy, as “ a remarkable experiment ” has lately been tried during a Mission among troops at Fenny Stratford. The Vicar, the Rev. J. H. Firminger, and the Missioner, the Rev. Paul Bull, were anxious that the men should have more opportunities of attending Holy Communion, and as the men were specially liable to calls for Sunday work, it was decided to make the Parade Service a Communion Service, and this was done. The clergy concerned have sent a report of the experiment to the Bishop, who commends it to the consideration of other clergy. There are one or two points about the report which interest us. The first is as to the authority for making the change. The clergy claim that it is within their right. “ It was not necessary,” they write, “ to consult the military authorities, as they are only concerned in arranging the hour and length of the service. The nature of the service lies in the discretion of the Chaplain or officiating

clergyman, and he alone is responsible." We are not sufficiently well acquainted with the King's Regulations to say whether or not this view is correct. It strikes us as a point of such great importance that it ought to be referred to the Chaplain-General, for if the contention can be sustained, it opens the door to irregularities rather more widely than we like to think. Another point in the report is in reference to the "five-minutes' sermon." The men were thus instructed :

"1. We are going to show forth our Lord's Death before the Father, and then those who are properly prepared may come up to receive His Life in Holy Communion.

"2. We plead this Holy Sacrifice for the living and departed, so remember your comrades who will not come home.

"3. You have a special right to be present, for as Christ died for you so you have offered to die for others.

"4. When we show forth the holy Body broken, pray for the wounded and the maimed.

"When we show forth the holy Blood outpoured, pray for those who have laid down their lives for their country.

"5. Remember that the Saints and angels and the faithful departed all take part in this service.

"6. Only those who have been confirmed may come up to receive Holy Communion; those who wish to be confirmed are to give in their names to their Chaplain. During times of war soldiers are allowed to receive Holy Communion even though they have already taken food."

Upon this we need only remark that exact theologians will find many things within these few sentences to which to take exception. One other point remains for notice: "Forty-five out of three hundred received Holy Communion, and on the following Sundays eighteen and twenty-three." The men "left the Church without waiting for the ablutions, as the service had taken the allotted time." We should be sorry to seem to disparage any effort which proved to be spiritually helpful to the men, but we cannot think that the substitution for the usual Parade Service of a service of Holy Communion when the great majority of the congregation do not communicate is an "experiment" which, in the long run, will tend to edification. The clergy conclude their report by saying that "in this camp now lads who are going forth to face sufferings and death can always have free access to our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament."



### "The Ambassador of Christ."<sup>1</sup>

"Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we beseech you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God."—  
2 COR. V. 20.

ST. PAUL was in no doubt as to his commission. "We *are* ambassadors;" we *are* "in Christ's stead." Nor was he uncertain as to his task. The word "beseech" occurs twice: "as though God did beseech you;" "we beseech you in Christ's stead." His task was to speak to men as if God who loved the world was speaking, as Christ who died for all would do if He was there, and to urge, as both would do, everyone to be reconciled to God. At the close of his life, although he declared himself as "the chief of sinners," and as one who had nothing to glory in "save the Cross of Christ," yet he could say: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

Here we have presented to us three thoughts on which it may be well for us to dwell:

1. St. Paul's certainty as to his commission as an ambassador of Christ.
2. The great task entrusted to him "to beseech men in Christ's stead," to be reconciled to God.
3. His retrospect at the close of a long life.

First, St. Paul's certainty as to his commission as an ambassador. Can anyone who studies his life and reads his words doubt for a moment that St. Paul had received a commission—not from men, but from God? It is impossible to conceive such a life without the heavenly vision. He had surely heard a voice saying: "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" and his whole soul responded: "Here am I, send me." *And he was sent* of God and of Christ, *and he went*. So it was with all the Apostles. They knew, not only whom they believed, but *by* whom they were *sent*. It was this which gave them confidence, courage, and power. They always saw the "In-

<sup>1</sup> A paper read at the Islington Clerical Meeting, January 11, 1916.

visible" who had sent them. Brethren, is it so with us? Do we merely in an ecclesiastical sense believe that we are ambassadors, or do we so believe that we are so distinctly and so separately sent of God that it is "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel"? Unless it is the latter our ministry will be a failure. The sense of God "thrusting" us out into His vineyard must be felt at every step. Is it so? Is the response to God's call the overwhelming response of our life? Let me put it wildly, extravagantly, if you will. If to-morrow we became a Carnegie in wealth, should we go on "preaching the old, old story," because we could not help doing so any more than we could help breathing? Is it with us morning, noon, and night? "I am sent of God." I am here "in Christ's stead." An English Ambassador at a foreign Court can never forget that he is not a private person, but must always remember that he is there in his King's stead, to represent his King and country, and not himself. But he is there in times of peace. The moment war is declared he is withdrawn, but we are ambassadors in the enemy's country in the time of war. Our path is never smooth, our task is never easy. We can never be on terms of intimacy with those around. Our citizenship is above, and we are sent to win the allegiance of the whole world to our Sovereign Lord the King, to beseech men to be reconciled to God. That is our one object in life. It is not one among many things. It stands alone. It *is* our life. For me to live *is Christ*. Christ who died for men. Christ in whose stead I beseech men to turn to God. How many of us live in that sense of God's presence, of God's communion? We believe in the Real if not the Local Presence in the Holy Communion, and we also declare that He is present in the Word. But do we feel His presence? Is He in the pulpit with us? Is He in the preparation for the pulpit? St. Paul, as he besought men in Christ's stead, felt the Christ Himself within. "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Are we sure of the Real Presence within? Do we remember that our commission to "Go" is bound up with "Lo, I am with you alway."

Brethren, forgive me if I press once more: "Are you living as ambassadors of Christ?" Let each man answer before His Lord.

Secondly, think of the great task entrusted to St. Paul "to beseech men in Christ's stead to be reconciled to God." In Low Latin we find the word "ambasciator," a waiter. St. Paul glorified in the title "servant," slave of Jesus Christ. In Christ's stead. Our Lord Himself had said: "As Thou hast sent me, even so have I also sent them." God's purpose in sending the Christ was also the purpose of Christ in sending the Apostles. That the world might be won to God through the Cross. That was how all the Apostles understood their commission and their message. We are in the true Apostolic Succession when we proclaim "the glorious Gospel of the Blessed God." It was their one theme. They had no other. "They ceased not to preach Jesus Christ." "The Jesus whom I preach unto you." "But we preach Christ Crucified." "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus our Lord." "That I might preach Him among the heathen." "Preach the Word." "Preach the Gospel." "There is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins." "Preach the Kingdom of God." "That remission of sins might be preached." "Preached through Jesus Christ the forgiveness of sins." "He preached Jesus and the Resurrection." "Jesus who was preached among you by us."

The message of the Apostles was always the same: "We preach Christ and Him Crucified." Is this the one message of the Church to-day? Alas! is it not true that the Church has been largely led aside from her message and her task? She has thought and taught too much about herself, the Bride, and this has frequently obscured her Lord. She must get back to her One Message: "We preach Christ." The less we hear to-day of the Bride, and the more of the Bridegroom, the stronger will the Church become. "Preach the Word" is the exhortation in the Ordinal, and "the Word" is Christ. If Science or Philosophy or Politics invite your attention, tell

them that you have a greater message to give than theirs, and you cannot come down to them. In the lower sphere they may do good, but all of them combined cannot save a soul, purify a heart, or make a single sinner fit for heaven. "It is," said Mr. Gladstone, "the preaching of Christ our Lord which must be the secret and substance, the centre and heart, of all preaching." He was right. To-day we are meeting under the shadow of this mighty War. Day by day our lads are leaving this country to take their place in that fighting-line from which every hour souls pass through the Valley of Death into the hands of God. This is not the time to discuss prayers for the dead, but when I read, as read I do, letter after letter protesting against any such practice, I ask: Does the writer of this letter realize that his disbelief in the efficiency of prayers for the dead throws upon him a great and overwhelming responsibility regarding the living? If there is *no* hope hereafter, if no prayer can avail after once the soul has left the body, how awful is the position of the ambassador of God who strains not every power he possesses to beseech men to be reconciled to God! Upon Evangelicals who hold these views there rests more than upon any other class responsibility to preach a present, full, and free salvation. But, my brethren, are we doing so? This is a time when we must not mince matters or hesitate to use plain language. I think I have had opportunities such as are given to few men to know the position of the Evangelical school of thought throughout the world, and I say, with a due sense of responsibility, standing as I do in this church, which in a sense may be called the Mecca of modern Evangelicals, that the old Evangel is not being preached as our fathers preached it, or as St. Paul preached it. What are the texts chosen to-day? When were the texts I read a short time ago the substance of our sermons? Some time ago I heard a sermon in a C.P.A.S. parish in which the words God, Christ, Jesus, Sin, Salvation, Faith, Heaven, were never once used. This, no doubt, was an extreme case; but do we, as Evangelicals, determine when we ascend the pulpit "not to

know anything save Jesus Christ and Him Crucified?" The pulpit may be the centre of overwhelming power, and it may become the scene of tragic disaster. Now, brethren, if last Sunday night, as we ascended the pulpit stairs, an angel had challenged us, "What is your aim to-night? What do you *expect* to be the result of your sermon?" what *should* we, what *could* we, have replied? Go back to Sunday night. What was your text? What was your sermon? What was the result? Was it a sermon to save souls? The title of one of Newman's addresses was: "The Salvation of the Hearer; the Motive of the Preacher." Was that your definite motive? If some recruit had come into the church for his last Sunday night in England before going to the front, and perhaps to his death, with the thought in his heart, "What must I do to be saved?" what help would your sermon have been to him? Spurgeon, when he preached, always remembered that hearts might be changed for ever as he preached. Did you and I so remember? Henry Ward Beecher, on his deathbed, said: "The greatest object of the preacher is not to teach theology, is not to engage in controversy, but it is to save souls." We believe that; but do we preach that kind of sermon? Moody on one occasion said to Dr. Chapman: "You are making a mistake in your ministry. What you are doing does not count for much. Your preaching, I say it in all kindness, does not save souls." Would anyone be justified in saying the same words to us. Do our sermons save souls? If they do not, what are they worth? Such sermons are nowadays looked down upon. I remember some years ago I was asked to preach at a certain church, and, on hesitating, was told: "You need not really preach; a simple Evangelistic address will do." What would St. Paul have thought of such a statement? Is a sermon one fit to be preached by the ambassador of Christ in the house of God unless it is really and truly Evangelistic? Unless it not only contains, but *is*, the Gospel, and the Gospel is Christ, and the centre of it all is the Cross. Ought we not to be ashamed to preach the sermons we do when we have such a

glorious Gospel to proclaim of a salvation without limit, or extent in power? The Arabians have a proverb, "He is the best orator who can turn men's ears into eyes." The best preacher is he who can make his hearers "see Jesus only." The famous preacher Jowett tells how one Sunday he went out to a prayer meeting at a camp meeting outside New York, at which he was to speak, when one engaging in prayer said: "O Lord, we thank Thee for our brother. Now blot him out. Reveal Thyself." Sirs, we would *see* Jesus—preach Christ. If the Apostles of old would not leave the preaching of the Gospel even to "serve tables" on which provisions were laid for widows, how closely ought we to keep to our one text, "Jesus Christ and Him Crucified!" As Bishop Wilberforce said, "Get unto the Cross of Christ, look at those wounds, see in them what sin is! See in them the greatness of your Master's love! And as a ransomed sinner minister to ransomed sinners! Take your censer and run in and stand between the living and the dead, for verily the plague has begun."

But, lastly, St. Paul had a wonderful retrospect in his old age. Churches planted—souls saved. What is our retrospect? This may appear a strange Islington paper, but I am not going to apologize for it. There is something wrong with the Church, for her ministers are not winning souls, and I pray that from this gathering to-day there may go forth a band of men determined to "win souls." I know some may be called teachers, others evangelists, but, by whatever name he is called, every minister of the Gospel is called upon to "win souls." A clergyman said to me one day: "My temperament is such that I could not preach an Evangelistic sermon." My reply was: "Christ, who could turn a Boanerges into the Apostle of Love, can make you a soul-winner if you wish to be one." Such preaching may disturb your congregations as they are at present. It was to the Greeks foolishness, and to the Jews a stumbling-block, but it saved souls. We clergy have to make our choice. We have to decide whether we will be what are known as "intellectual preachers," "popular preachers," or "soul winners." Which

are we? There is a dearth of conversions. Why? The result of Higher Criticism, says one. The growth of Ritualism, says another. While a third replies, The social conditions of the people. Brethren, do not let us excuse ourselves. The dearth of conversions is owing to none of these things. The Apostles had to meet these things in another form, and worse than these things, but they got conversions. Wesley and Whitefield had a Church and a nation worse to deal with than we have, and yet they got conversions. Why do not we get conversions? Do we? How many in this church had a conversion that he knew about last Sunday? How many conversions did you know about last year? It is all very well to talk about the silent growth, but even a Lydia is known sometimes. What about the drunkards in your parishes? How many were saved last year? If Evangelicals cannot save drunkards, harlots, and prostitutes, then I say there is something wrong with Evangelicals, and the sooner we find out what it is, the better. Some would say it is our surpliced choir and semi-musical services. It is not, for I have known good soul-saving work done under those conditions, and deadness and coldness elsewhere. The cause is deeper down than that. We have ceased to regard sin as our fathers did. We have discarded hell. We have not kept to the Cross. We have not a personal experience of sanctification, and we have lost the power of the Spirit. This is a strong indictment, and I would be the last man to make it unless I believed it true. If it is true of our school of thought, it is true of the Church generally. We have built churches, multiplied services, and largely ceased to win souls. In the dioceses of London and Southwark, with all the Church's activity, the communicants only number about five per cent. of the population. Don't let us blame Ritualism, Rationalism, or anything else, for this result. There are sufficient Evangelical churches in both dioceses themselves to show a very different result, if they were alive. Do not let me be misunderstood. I know full well the lives of devotion and whole-hearted service which many of our brethren are living, and yet I ask you, each one of you,

to look round and tell me how many churches you know where there are clear, definite conversions, as you and I understand conversions. Have we not even ceased to expect conversions? If we had an inquirer, how should we deal with him? Do we know how to point a soul to Christ? Have we a doctrine of assurance to preach? Forgive me, what books do we read? Modern thought must be studied, but side by side with it let us keep our Bunyan, our Finney, and such books as "The Cross in Christian Experience," by W. M. Clow; "The Twofold Life," by A. J. Gordon; and even "Broken Earthenware." These books will help us to let our congregations know and feel that God loves them all, that Christ died for them all, and that the Holy Spirit is present to renew and sanctify them all. But above all we must remember that, although in a sense in the Cross we find all we want, there is a sense in which it will not suffice. Christ was on the earth for forty days after the Cross had been lifted up, but it was only after the Holy Ghost had come that we find men saved through it being lifted up. The great need to-day is the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. The Cross can never be fully seen until the light of the Holy Ghost is thrown upon it. That may be one reason why our Church lays down the rule that, when we draw near to the Holy Table, we must not only have been baptized, but also confirmed, so that, coming as men filled with the Holy Ghost, we may see Him. That surely is the reason why, before we are commissioned to "dispense the Word of God," we pray, "Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire." Our Church recognizes to the full what the New Testament so strongly emphasizes: that we only receive power to see the Cross and to preach the Cross after the Holy Ghost has come. Do we believe that? The ambassador's instructions are clear. He must be guided by the Holy Ghost. Are we so guided? What influence has He upon our lives? Are we men sanctified by the Holy Ghost and moved by Him? The other day I heard of a clergyman who was not a great preacher as the world calls preaching, but whose church was packed to the doors, and to whom God gave many souls, and an



old curate surely gave the secret when he said: "We could always hear him saying softly as he mounted the pulpit, 'I believe in the Holy Ghost—I believe in the Holy Ghost.'"

Some of us, brethren, are nearing the end of our ministry. Is it becoming more spiritual, more powerful, as the physical decays, or do the wells seem to be running dry? No water—no souls refreshed or raised to life. An old man—a castaway—unusable. The saddest picture on earth. Some of us are in the prime of life or just at the commencement of our ministry. What is our ministry like? Is it already a disappointment? Are we already saying, "Why can we not cast them out?" Brothers, old and young, we are here as the ministers of God in a period like unto which there is none else.

"The World's great heart is aching,  
Fiercely aching in the night."

What a responsibility! What a privilege to be the ambassador of Christ, beseeching men, *in Christ's stead*, to be reconciled to God! To have the one, the only message which can put the world right; stop all wars; cure all hearts; purify all lives; and save for all eternity the souls of men. Oh, magnify such an office, but magnify it upon your knees. It is not the office that will save you. That can only be the Gospel which you preach to others. Has it saved you? Oh, forgive me if I ask solemnly this question: Do you, who preach to others, know *your* sins forgiven? Do you *yourself* see the Cross? Have *you* received the Holy Spirit? Do *you* rejoice in victory over sin? If not, here is the secret of failure.

Once more, brethren, let us return to the work to which we were called—"to preach Christ and Him Crucified," to aim only at winning souls, and every moment ourselves to realize:

"This is all *my* hope and all *my* plea,  
For *me* the Saviour died."

J. E. CHELMSFORD.



## The Spiritual Problems of the Great War.

### I.—THE CALL OF THE WAR.

SOME years ago, on the day that King Edward was struck down before his Coronation, I was riding on a bus down Fleet Street. Beside me was a stranger, who turned suddenly, and said: "If there's a God in Heaven, sir, He's speaking to the nation to-day." Such were his words, and they were beyond measure true. And now history is repeating itself, events even more startling are occurring, and God is undoubtedly speaking once more.

The war is in itself a clamant call, and the most urgent consideration of the moment is this: Are we, as a nation, going to heed it? I fear that we missed the call of the delayed Coronation. Are we going to miss this one now? Shall we be just the same when it is all over? In some ways this is impossible, but in the ways that matter most it is quite possible. Frankly I see very few signs that there is any likelihood of a *radical* change at all. Woe betide us if this be so, for if no change for the better come it means that we have had the call sounding and have failed to heed; that we have become harder than ever to the Divine warning.

I am candidly not one of those who think that because we have gone through a war we are necessarily thereby regenerated; no, regeneration means being "born from above" for nation as for individual, and war influences are not (all of them, at any rate) from that source.

Some features, however, are encouraging:

1. *The Call is universal.* Many a time events occur which move large sections of the community, but leave others cold. That is not so now; the war has an influence painfully widespread. By *financial changes* (stringency on one hand, prosperity on the other) the domestic life of the whole nation has been disturbed. By *public necessities* (lighting and drinking restrictions, for instance) the whole social life has been

upheaved. *By family bereavements* (and what family is without at least the danger of them?) the personal sense as to the perspective of temporal and eternal things has been altered. All this is to the good, and it means that whatever response be given (and therein lies the dubious problem), certainly every individual has had something put before him that ought to make him think.

Also it is all to the good that :

2. *The Call has been persistent.* What I mean is : it has not come on one of those waves of national enthusiasm that so soon die down. For instance, it has not (thank God) been engineered by a *press boom*. We know nowadays only too well how the press can stir the nation to take an interest in anything, from the shortage of medical students to Cabinet resignations. But the effect is short-lived ; it is swept away when the next sensation arises. Nor has it come to the nation as the result of a "*prophet in our midst.*" Personally, I am afraid of the modern prophet. He savours of an Egyptian Mahdi or a (late) gentleman from the Salt Lake, U.S.A. But in any case he has not arisen. No, the nearest approach has been an (ex-) Non-conformist minister "run" by the Sunday press, or a (very) secular journalist "run" by himself. In both cases, of course, much that was good has been said ; much that was well worth saying, but still one is thankful that the call has been really independent of such agencies to a large extent.

Again, it has not come as the result of terror following a series of *air-raids*. It is said by those who have lived for months in an atmosphere haunted by Zeppelins, that, after the first time, it is remarkable how little one is affected. Why, in some of our East Coast towns the children's new game is "Zepps," and not a thought of terror about it. So—this is what we are coming to—the call to the nation has not been through any one sensational item, or even one item at all. It has come to an unwilling people through the steady pressure of circumstances, through the gradual opening of our fast-closed eyes to the fact that England cannot always blunder through

successfully ; that one day she will blunder once too often. Yes, the hope for the future lies in this, that Providence is talking in the quiet piling up of unpleasant facts, in the steadily increasing consciousness that God will give no rest (and no victory) until these facts are faced.

This is, of course, God's usual way. In the days of old it was the circumstances (generally the unpleasant circumstances) in Israel's history that brought the nation to its knees, and gave the preacher his chance.

The nation is not yet indeed upon its knees, but it may be at least sufficiently broken to give us our chance. Pray God that we have power and insight to be able to take it !

What, then, is the Call itself ? What is it that God is articulating through the pressure of circumstances ?

It is a call both to nation and to Church, partly separate and partly involved one with another. This interweaving is to be noted, for in one sense all the Church is the nation, but in another sense, alas ! all the nation is *not* the Church. Still, they are bound up with each other for better or for worse, and the Church must, before all things, beware of a Pharisee attitude that would neglect its influence on the nation. That would be the last straw.

First, then, to the nation, it is a call :

(a) *To acknowledge the fact of God.* It is the fact of God, of there being a Deity at all, that we must recover. At the moment we do not speak of the fact that God is revealed in Christ. To begin with, the nation has to relearn the perspective of the Universe, that it has a Centre, that this Centre is a PERSON, and not a mathematical point. Of course, a supposedly Christian nation could not stop there, but there it must, however, begin. England has not been a really Christian nation for years. It is better than France, better than Italy, better than Belgium or Serbia in this respect, but it is not really Christian. Certain principles (that happen to be Christian) are characteristic of England, such as Honesty, Liberty, Integrity, and so on.

But the great nations of Pagan times had at least some of these qualities, and the highly civilized Pagan nations of modern times can beat us on many such points. No, a Christian nation would put the things of Christ first; it would not be content with mere morality "touched" with Christian sentimentality. Much of our otherwise excellent philanthropy and social service fails to rise any higher than that, from the Christian standpoint. And even the war has done little to alter this. Before the war began, we were deploring our empty churches. Are they filled now? Before the war, we were grieving over Sunday desecration. Has it been altered since? Before the war we were apprehensive of the spirit of "lawlessness" breaking out among our young people. They would rush to picture-palaces, they would do just what they liked, and were resentful of any authority. Do you see signs of a radical change now? I wish before God I did, but I do not. And somewhere in the last analysis of things this is due to the lack of a realization of God, lack of true religion. I am not a pessimist, not at all. No student of the Bible who applies the fortunes of Israel to modern life could be pessimistic as to the ultimate end. But I am apprehensive, gravely so, lest England should have to undergo the chastening meted out to Israel, part of which lasts even unto this day. "Return unto God" is the call; "Rend your hearts and not your garments, and turn." "If with all your hearts ye truly seek Him, ye shall ever surely find Him, thus saith your God." Not pessimistic, therefore, but apprehensive, deeply, painfully apprehensive, that the call in this respect will not be answered adequately by the nation.

The second point in the Call is this: It is a call to the nation:

(b) *To standardize its aspirations.* Without any doubt many men and women have been thrilled with aims and aspirations unknown before. Lives lived formerly for self have become radiant with self-sacrifice; minds hitherto engrossed in the narrow circle of the home or the tennis-court have suddenly begun to study high politics, and to think in continents. It is

impossible to be small-minded when you have even to say : "Five millions a day!" It is impossible to be self-engrossed when the soldiers need comforters and sandbags! It is impossible to be self-centred when *your* soldier is far away in Salonica or the Cameroons! Why, the amount of geography you have learned has enlarged your outlook. And what new interest it has given to things! The Bible, for instance. Why, Genesis, after all, *must* be true, because in his last letter he said : "We are now in Mesopotamia, where the actual Garden of Eden was placed." And St. Paul's Epistles have become absorbingly interesting because the Vicar last Sunday said that "when we write to Salonica we are actually writing to the Thessalonica of St. Paul's day." Now, all this is most attractive, and one is not in any way laughing "up one's sleeve." No, so far from that, one commends the acuteness of the Vicar in linking up Scripture with present-day facts. But one asks : What is to become of all this when the war is over? When letters cease to be written to Salonica, will interest in the Epistles cease as well? When those in distant lands cease to require sandbags, will all interest in distant lands cease also? That is the point we have to deal with. We have to find some method of retaining attention on distant lands, diverting it from "Tommys" to much less picturesque "missionaries." We have to retain interest in the Bible, not because Mesopotamia is the Garden of Eden, but because in that Garden God gave the first promise of salvation.

So all this I call standardizing our aspirations. I mean the linking up of feelings that are called forth by temporary needs and fastening them on needs that are perennial.

But this will not happen if the nation—that is, the mass of individuals—drop back to the old worldliness and old pleasure-loving habits of the days that were before. There are those who say people will never go back to frivolity and superficiality after such an experience. Won't they? It is remarkable how quickly we can all do it unless we have some higher objective to occupy our minds.

BACK TO CHRIST, then, is the call for the nation. Yes, it is a Christian nation—nominally, at least—and what should an erring Christian nation get back to but Christ? He can standardize their aspirations; he can satisfy the need for service. If it be true that people will be saying: "I must do something. I never can live an idle life after the joy that I have experienced in work," well, then, there is plenty waiting to be done. Are there not thousands in our slums who have not half a chance of decent existence? Are there not hundreds of thousands of children waiting to be taught the truth as it is in Jesus? Are there not millions of heathens who have never heard of Christ? Here is the call to the V.A.D. workers, to the civic guard, and special constables. Here is the call to those enlisted to enlist in the greater war, a war with no less arduous heroism and an even more glorious prize. But will they? Is it honestly to be counted on that they will thus strike out new lines? I wish I could think so, but—well, we shall hope for the best, especially if a revival of faith in Christ be seen in the immediate future.

But all this only reveals how much the future of the nation depends on the faithfulness of the Church. After all, the nation will not advance higher than the Church advances; at least, it is reasonable to suppose that religious ideals and experiences will always be the primary factor in national ideas and experiences. So the call to the Church is clear. It is:

1. *To re-instate Christ.* Christianity in its last analysis is Christ, and if the Christian Church is not true to Christ she is failing in her primary objective. But it is just here that discussion and divergence has taken place for years; it is about the Person and Office and (above all) the Deity of Christ that the weakening has been setting in. Surely it is time to recover what is, after all, the Catholic Faith. "And the Catholic Faith is this: that we worship One God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity." But also, "furthermore it is necessary to everlasting salvation," that we "also rightly believe the Incarnation of our

Lord Jesus Christ, perfect God and perfect man of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting. . . . Equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, inferior to the Father as touching His manhood." Damnatory clauses, notwithstanding—that is, the Catholic Faith; and, if so, the Church should get back to an experimental knowledge of it, so as to speak of it to the nation with something of the old authoritative conviction. If she did, if she reinstated Christ not merely in her creed, but in her experience and Message, then the nation would have some chance of regeneration; then the upper classes would not be so much enamoured of Christian Science, and the masses would not be so easily entangled in spiritualistic extravagance.

Back to Christ; reinstate Him in our preaching and in our lives. That is, I believe, the first note of the clamant call being made in the Church's ear.

Again, the Call is certainly for the Church:

2. *To recover the power of the Spirit.* For years the Church has been impotent, so far as the mass of the nation is concerned. Persons so different in view-point as "General" Booth and "Father" Dolling agreed heartily, if sadly, on that, and worked hard in their own way to overcome it. The general impression passing current in reviews, too, is that the Church is impotent as a factor in solving the problems of the race. If so, it is a terrible loss, for the power within the Church is the only power that can ultimately do the work. Of course, one by no means allows the first premise. The Church is not impotent in herself; no, she is more sane and more active than she was sixty years ago. You have only to contemplate the old fox-hunting parson to see the gulf between him and the modern strenuous, even over-strenuous, cleric. Where the Church has failed is in regard to its *impressing the fact on the country at large*. We have failed to "capture the attention" of the masses (as the psychologists put it). But remember that since the masses in question are British, there is not much imagination to capture. In other words, we have to develop, as well as retain, our hold on the imagination. We have in practice to impress



the average hard-headed Britisher that religion counts; that it is one of the things that matter. But in a nation of "shop-keepers" the impression needs demonstration; the power must be expressed in terms of results. Here is where the working of the Spirit comes in. You cannot tell whence it comes or whither it goes, but you can tell effects when you see them. Now the average Englishman is not concerned with metaphysics, but he is strong on what he calls "practical religion." So we need a demonstration of the spirit and of power—and "Ye shall receive the power of the Holy Ghost and shall be witnesses unto Me."

Is the Church praying for the Holy Spirit? Would she really like the results if He came in power? It would mean the uprooting of many doctrines and practices that would not stand the test. It would mean a recovery of the old ideals (if not the old methods) of poverty and chastity, of service and self-sacrifice. And we are not all prepared for that. Some preachers are not prepared to preach Christ as the "only way"; some churchgoers are not prepared to go to church to meet God rather than their fellow-creatures. Some workers are not prepared to become efficient and expert at their work—to put the same thoroughness into Christ's work that they put into their own business.

There is no greater need for the nation than a revived Church, and no greater power available than the power of the Holy Ghost.

Then, in conclusion, all this must crystallize in active service. So the final sounding of the Call is for the Church:

3. *To co-operate with God.* It is a truism that we are fellow-labourers with God. It is a thought unimpressive only by its familiarity that when Christ left this earth, He left the work of evangelizing the nations to us. The Kingdom of Heaven is God's main plan and objective. He is (honestly) more concerned with the Kingdom of Heaven than with the British Empire. Not that he thinks little of that, and if a world-wide Empire can further His purposes, as the Roman roads furthered the activity of St. Paul, well and good. But not otherwise.

God has no interest, as such, in the mere extension of territory ruled by us ; God has no interest, as such, in the fact that on the said Empire the "sun never sets." No, God's main objective is the Kingdom of Heaven and the Kingship of Christ, bringing *every race* under the sway of His Person and work.

Has the nation grasped this ? Has the Church within the nation grasped this ? Largely, it has not.

There are forty millions of people in Britain. How many are interested in the extension of the Kingdom to all nations ? Say half a million, and it leaves thirty-nine and a half million of this Christian land practically indifferent to the full range of the Mission of Christ. I hope it is not harsh to say it, but I verily believe that the mass of Britishers care less about the extension of the Kingdom of Heaven than they do about a halfpenny an hour in wages or a game of Sunday golf.

And the Church herself — the half million, I mean, of whom we spoke ? Some are gloriously keen, and the keeping up of the funds for Missionary work during the strain of war is a splendid testimony to their zeal. But how many of the church-going class really desire to extend the Kingdom ? As far as the slums are concerned, the number is pretty numerous, but as to the dark places of heathenism, it is patent that the majority care very little at all. Why, in some churches the announcement of a missionary sermon to be preached next Sunday is the signal for abstention all round ; in other churches the giving out of the text is the signal for "lights out." Grant that people are burdened with claims, grant that missionary sermons are sometimes dull (though personally I have not found them so), still the awful thought is that the people *do not care*. People who profess and call themselves Christians care little or nothing for the plans and purposes of Christ. Can God bless such a Church or such a nation ? "Them that honour Me I will honour ; they that despise Me shall be lightly esteemed."

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how oft would I—and ye would not !"

But a godly remnant remains in England all the same. Yes, at the worst there are those (not inconsiderable in numbers, though fractional compared with the nation or even with the Church) who have not bowed the knee to Baal. These are holding on with magnificent daring, and the hope of the nation lies with them. To such the Call comes quietly, persistently, after the manner of the "still small voice." Go on with your work for God; go on calmly, prayerfully, imperturbably, in spite of counter claims and distracting duties (themselves imperative to be done as well). To some among such, some who are wavering just a little between the conflicting duties, there comes surely but insistently the Word: "Will ye also go away; will the rush of temporary needs divert your attention from the permanent ones?"

Indeed to all God's children comes the word of Him whose we are and whom we serve; the word of call to fresh consecration: "Lovest thou Me?" Lovest thou Me *more than these?*

And what shall the answer be? Shall each of us, like Peter (full of sorrow for much of past denial of our Lord), cry, "Yea, Lord, Thou knowest all things. Thou knowest that I love Thee." "I" on one hand, "Thee" on the other—and between them LOVE binding them in one.

If that be so for each Christian man and woman, then there is no fear for either Church or nation. Then the Divine Lord will overlook past failures, and will commission us afresh; then the Chief Shepherd will again say to each of us: "Feed My sheep," "Tend my lambs," and will again renew unto us that promise of power by which alone we can regenerate the nation—the "power of the Holy Ghost," which is in itself the dynamic energy of Almighty God.

L. GEORGE BUCHANAN.



## The Reformers and the Communion Service.

ANYONE who compares the public liturgy of 1549 with that of 1552 will observe many important differences. Nobody denies that some of these changes were in the direction of improvement, such as exhortation, general confession, and absolution, which stand at the beginning of Morning and Evening Prayer, and which were taken mainly from the service-books of Calvin and Alasco. But, without doubt, it was in the Communion Office that changes of deepest significance were effected, and we are limited by the title of our paper to an examination of these alterations. We notice that they were of a twofold character—changes in the text, and changes in the arrangement of the prayers.

We shall begin by considering the former. In the title of the Office we observe the first difference. It has been said that the name of the Mass was retained for the Holy Communion in the First Prayer-Book. It was retained, but not as a correct or proper designation. The words of the title in 1549 were, "The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, COMMONLY CALLED the Mass." That is to say, the name of the Mass was treated as a vulgar misnomer, to which we may find a parallel in *vulga dicebatur* of Article XXXI. But this word, associated as it was with rejected medieval beliefs, was not to be countenanced or encouraged, and in 1552 the words, "commonly called the Mass," were struck out. The next thing we notice is that, after the Collect for purity, the Ten Commandments, with responses, were inserted in 1552. Passing on from this, we come to the central act of the Service, known as the Canon. According to the Book of 1549, this included prayer for the Church on earth, commemoration of the Virgin Mary, and prayers for the dead. In 1552 all prayers for the dead were removed. Not to mention other evidence, the reasons for this are given in a very interesting report furnished to Cecil, Secretary of State, by his friend Geste, Vice-Provost of King's College, Cambridge, in the first year of Elizabeth. This report on Prayer-Book revision states: "Praying for the dead is not now used in the Communion, because it doth seem to

make for the sacrifice of the dead. And also because (as it was used in the First Book) it maketh some of the faithful to be in heaven, and to need no mercy; and some of them to be in another place, and to lack help and mercy." He then goes on to say that this usage was not in Christ and His Apostles' time, nor in Justin's time; and he concludes this part by quoting the significant words of Tertullian: "That is true which is first; that is false which is after; that is first which is from beginning; that is from beginning which is from the Apostles." Besides prayers for the dead, the name of the Virgin Mary, the Prophets and Martyrs, and the Invocation of the Holy Spirit for the sanctification of the bread and wine, were also omitted from the Second Prayer-Book.

Following the order of 1549, this brings us to the words of Consecration. Let us notice first the important change from the Sarum Missal made in 1549. According to the Sarum Missal, the prayer is that the oblation "may be MADE unto us the body and blood of Christ;" whereas, in the Book of 1549, the prayer is that the "gifts and creatures of bread and wine may BE UNTO us the body and blood of Christ." What is the meaning of this deliberate alteration, and why was it made? Its import was to do away with the old conception, so prominent in the sacrifice of the Mass, that a great, positive, and mysterious change was wrought in the elements. And it points to the fact that already, before the First Prayer-Book was drawn up, the reformers were possessed by a belief which transferred the seat of the Divine "presence" from the lifeless elements to the recipient. Further testimony will be adduced on this point in another connection. Despite this definite change, however, the language of the Prayer of Consecration in 1549 was not entirely free from ambiguity. Bishop Gardiner, leader of the Roman party, argued from it in favour of Transubstantiation, saying "the creatures of bread and wine cannot be unto us the body and blood of Christ unless God worketh it and maketh them so to be." Cranmer replied, asserting the prominence of the subjective element in the words "unto us:" "We do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made the body and blood of Christ, but that UNTO us in that holy mystery they may be so—that is to say, that we may so

worthily receive the same that we may be partakers of Christ's body and blood. . . ."<sup>1</sup> But, that there might be no further opportunity for such wilful "mistakers," the Prayer of Consecration was altered in 1552 into the form with which we are all familiar.

The doctrinal bearing of these changes can better be appreciated if we turn our attention to the important structural alterations already mentioned. In 1549 the great central prayer, called the Canon, included our present Prayer for the Church Militant, Prayer of Consecration, and Prayer of Oblation. This was now broken up. Some of it, as we have stated, was left out, the remainder was divided into three parts and distributed over the Service. It was a momentous action in a great crisis, an alteration of a tradition which existed for a thousand years. In attempting to appreciate its significance, we must not forget that the reformers had a twofold task to accomplish. They had to purify the Church, and they had to carry the Church with them. We hardly care to think of what might have happened if they had lacked the courage of their convictions. In the words of Bishop Moule: "It was a bold thing to do. But the change was made with watchful care and consummate skill, and multitudes of Churchmen to-day, of varying schools, agree in thinking that the ritual of the most sacred Ordinance of our faith has gained greatly, both in dignity and intelligibility, by what was thus done in 1552."<sup>2</sup>

We have now to consider in detail the changes made in the order and arrangement of the Service. According to the disposition of the Office in 1549, the Prayer of Consecration stood near the beginning; and there intervened between consecration and reception the Prayer of Oblation, the Lord's Prayer, the declaration that occupied the place of the *Agnus Dei* in the Latin Mass, the invitation, the general confession, the absolution, the comfortable words, and "the prayer of humble access." This long interval between consecration and reception, during which the consecrated elements lay on God's board in the eyes of the people, left room for some of the old thoughts of sacrifice and adoration.

<sup>1</sup> Cranmer on the "Lord's Supper," p. 79.

<sup>2</sup> "Story of the Prayer Book," p. 11.

In 1552 the invitation, general confession, absolution, and comfortable words were placed BEFORE consecration, with the result that consecration and reception were made one, being placed in immediate juxtaposition. This was probably due to Lutheran influence, the consistent Lutheran doctrine being, to quote the words of Martensen, that "the words of institution are inseparable from the distribution and the receiving of the bread and wine." Again, the language and position of the Prayer of Oblation suggested the idea that the "reasonable sacrifice" of ourselves was offered concomitantly with a sacrifice of the priest at the "Altar." Every expression which supported such a view was deliberately expunged, and the prayer itself was placed AFTER the reception of the elements. Further, the fact that the "prayer of humble access" stood after the consecration and before the distribution admitted of its being regarded as an act of adoration paid directly to the flesh of Christ, then lying upon the Altar. This was, in fact, claimed by Gardiner. Cranmer regarded such adoration as idolatry. And in 1552 the "prayer of humble access" was placed BEFORE the Prayer of Consecration, so as to be used only while the elements remained UN-consecrated.

It remains, before leaving this discussion, to notice briefly the words of distribution and one of the rubrics. According to Estcourt and Scudamore, there was no form of administration in the Mass. It would appear, however, that the words used were identical with the form provided in 1549, except for the addition of a clause. The words, "which was given for thee," were then inserted. It has been said that the words of distribution in the First Prayer-Book were ancient. But the facts are against this representation. These words, referring as they do to the sacrifice on Calvary sixteen centuries before, are not found in any ancient liturgy; they were taken from a form drawn up by Bucer. Gardiner claimed them to teach his doctrine of the "Real Presence." There was really no ground for the claim; yet the words were changed in 1552. As we all know, our present usage is a combination of both forms. With regard to the sacramental bread, the rubric in 1549 directed that the wafers "be divided in two pieces, at the least, or more, by the discretion of

the minister, and so distributed. And men must not think less to be received in part than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour." This language might easily be interpreted to allow of Christ's body residing in each particle of the consecrated bread, and Gardiner was not slow to apply this interpretation. In the Second Prayer-Book this rubric found no place.

Having investigated the principal changes, both textual and structural, it remains for us to consider the question as to which Prayer-Book was really representative of the reformers' views. Did the First Prayer-Book fully and properly express the mind of the Reformation, and was the Second Prayer-Book merely a concession to the scruples of interfering foreigners? The question is not unimportant, in view of certain present-day tendencies and developments. Indeed, it is of much direct and practical interest, when we remember that the Book of 1552 has, in substance, remained the authorized liturgy of the Church unto this day. Some few alterations were made under Elizabeth, under James I., and under Charles I. Some additions were made in 1662. Still, as Bishop Moule says: "The Book was no more made a new Book by these additions and other changes than a church becomes a new church because a new vestry or even a new aisle is added to it."<sup>1</sup> It is the purpose of this paper to show that there are evidences, abundant and incontrovertible, which must compel any candid judgment to conclude that the First Prayer-Book was but a tentative, transitional effort, a temporary compromise, and that the Second Prayer-Book was the true expression of the "reformed" beliefs, the final settlement of the questions of the time.

In support of this proposition, the "Great Parliamentary Debate on the Lord's Supper" furnishes most weighty and convincing testimony. Mr. J. T. Tomlinson has earned the gratitude of students by placing this valuable document within their reach. The Great Debate was held in the House of Lords, and in the presence of the Commons, during three days in December, 1548. On the following day, December 19, the Bill for Estab-

<sup>1</sup> "Story of the Prayer Book," p. 14.



lishing the English Prayer-Book was introduced, and read a first time; so that this was a public disputation immediately preceding the authorization of the First Prayer-Book. Its importance, which has not yet been generally appreciated, lies in the fact that it presents us with the actual views of the reformers BEFORE the Book of 1549 was drawn up. The reforming prelates who took part in the discussion were Cranmer, Ridley, Holbeach, Goodrich, and Barlow. On the other side, defending the Missal, were Tonsal, Bonner, Heath, Rugg, Aldrich, Skyp, Thirlby, and Day. We now proceed to quote from Cranmer's statements. "They be two things, to eat the Sacrament and to eat the body of Christ. The eating of the body is to dwell in Christ, and this may be though a man never taste the Sacrament. All men eat not the body in the Sacrament. Only good men can eat Christ's body. When the evil eateth the Sacrament, he neither hath Christ's body nor eateth it. I believe that Christ is eaten with heart. The eating with our mouth cannot give us life. *To have Christ present REALLY (i.e., corporeally) here, when I may receive Him in faith, is not available to do me good.* Christ is in the world in His divinity, but not in His humanity. The property of His Godhead is everywhere, but His manhood is in one place only." In like manner Ridley spoke as follows: "The carnal substance sitteth on the right hand of the Father. *After this understanding of the presence He is not in the Sacrament. He is absent,* for He saith He will leave the world. And in another sense He will be with us until the end of the world. The manhood is ever in heaven; His divinity is everywhere present. Christ sits in heaven, and is present in the Sacrament by His working." Not to quote any further, it is manifest from these utterances of the leading reformers that they had at this time thoroughly broken with Transubstantiation, asserting, as they did, in an unmistakable manner, a "*real absence*" in the sense in which the Roman doctrine affirmed a "*real presence*," and that they had already taken up the distinctive positions of the Second Prayer-Book.

How, then, are we to account for the ambiguous statements and mixed character of the Book of 1549? The only satisfactory supposition is that that Book was a compromise, due to the fact

that the Romish prelates had not yet been removed, and that the reformers were thus prevented from giving full effect to their own convictions. Nor is this a mere conjectural explanation. It is the view expressed in letters written by prominent men at this very time. In a letter written in April, 1549, Bucer speaks of having received assurance that the liturgical "concessions made to the infirmity of the present age are *only to be retained for a time*, lest the people should be deterred by too extensive innovations." Richard Hilles wrote to Bullinger in the same year: "Our Bishops and governors seem, *for the present*, to be acting rightly." And Roger Hutchinson, the Provost of Eton, preaching on the administration of the Sacrament, spoke to the same effect: "The King commandeth the same indeed *for a time and season*, and for an uniformity, and to bear with thy infirmity and weakness, until thou shalt have more knowledge."

Further evidence in support of our proposition is to be found in the language of the Second Act of Uniformity. Before examining this in detail, however, there are some facts of much importance which we must bear well in mind. The Second Act of Uniformity passed both Houses in 1552. The first Parliament of Edward VI. lasted from 1547 to 1553. Therefore the **SAME** Parliament enacted the First Prayer-Book, rescinded it, and established the Book of 1552. We may be sure that Parliament would never have taken such a course of action had not strict necessity dictated it. The truth is that the First Book of Edward VI. was a failure. Some, even, of its compilers disliked it. Eight Bishops spoke and voted against it in the Lords, and its lot was the usual result of compromises. It pleased nobody. "Religious" rebellions followed in many places. The people of England evidently would not have it. This is no more than is admitted by some modern ritualists. Mr. Frere recognized "how unstable it was as a basis for a new and lasting régime. The Book was unpopular everywhere, though conservative priests made the best of it for the moment by retaining the old ceremonial." As Mr. Walton says: "The First Prayer-Book, in fact, under the circumstances, and at the time of its actual publication, was an expedient, or temporary compromise, which can have really

satisfied no one." Turning now to the language of the Act of 1552, we find that the third section speaks of "a very godly order set forth by authority of Parliament, to be used in the Mother-tongue within this Church of England, agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church."

Canon George Perry describes this as part of "a handsome tribute which the moderate party were able to insert to the merits of the First Book."<sup>1</sup> But this is an error, due to the fact that he omits the very clause which gives the point of the sentence—"to be used in the Mother-tongue within this Church of England." When we compare the language used in the same connection in our Article XXIV., there can be no mistaking the special allusion. Divine Service in the mother-tongue was a practice not encouraged by the Papal party, but it was highly popular, and is therefore reaffirmed in the passage quoted. The Act continues: "And because there hath arisen in the use and exercise of the aforesaid common service divers doubts for the fashion and manner of administration of the same, rather by *the curiosity of the minister and mistakers* than of any other worthy cause; therefore, etc." Before proceeding to quote any further, we must endeavour to determine what is meant by "the curiosity of the minister and mistakers." It is plain that the Act attributes to this cause the necessity for revision, and the theory has been put forward that the persons thus stigmatized were the foreign divines, to whose scruples, it is suggested, the Second Prayer-Book was due. This, however, is an impossible explanation; for Bucer and Martyr were not "ministers" under the Book of 1549, and Alasco never held office of any kind as a "minister" of the Church of England. There is sufficient evidence to leave it beyond question that "the curiosity of the minister" meant, as Mr. Tomlinson puts it, "the crochetty scrupulosity of the ordinary incumbent."<sup>2</sup> Three months after the use of the First Prayer-Book was made compulsory Bonner was indicted before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for non-conformity. One of the articles stated "that the rites of the common service of the Church, now

<sup>1</sup> "The Reformation in England," p. 93.

<sup>2</sup> "The Prayer-Book Articles and Homilies," pp. 21, 22.

set forth, be in some parts of your diocese *diversely performed*; and you, knowing or hearing of the same, have not called any ministers of the service before you for the redress of such diversity, nor corrected the misusers thereof."<sup>1</sup> Early in 1550 Hooper wrote complaining of the reprehensible conduct of the Bishops in neglecting to enforce the authorized practice, as prescribed by the new Book: "It is only the fear for their property that prevents them from reforming their churches."<sup>2</sup> It is rather strange to find this very letter quoted in Canon Perry's work as evidence of Hooper's antagonism towards the First Prayer-Book.<sup>3</sup> Again, Bucer wrote during the same year: "All the Divine offices are recited by many pseudo parish priests or vicars so frigidly, slovenly, and mumblingly, that they are understood by the common people just as well as if they had been read in an African or Indian dialect. In many places the Lord's Supper so takes the place of Mass that the people do not know in what respect it differs from it, except that it is celebrated in the vulgar tongue."<sup>4</sup> So much for the "curiosity" of the crypto-Papal incumbents who were at that time violating uniformity. Who, now, were pointed to as the "mistakers" of the Book of 1549? The persons thus designated were those who "mistook" or wilfully perverted its meaning. Of these, Gardiner was the chief. He avowedly disliked the Book; but since it was set forth by law, he sought to make the best of it by putting a Roman gloss on the Book wherever its language could by any possibility allow of such.<sup>5</sup> In examining the differences between the two liturgies, we noticed how Gardiner "mistook" certain passages. *In every instance* in which this was done the Prayer-Book was altered. There can be no question, then, that the "mistakers," mentioned in the Act were the Roman party, who defended the Missal and opposed the Prayer-Book, or, as Mr. Frere describes them, "the moderate party—and especially Gardiner."

The remainder of the third section of the Act gives us the estimate of the relative merits of the Service-Books formed by

<sup>1</sup> Foxe's "Acts and Monuments," V. 763.

<sup>2</sup> "Original Letters," p. 71.

<sup>3</sup> "The Reformation," p. 88.

<sup>4</sup> Gorham's "Reformation Gleanings," p. 201.

<sup>5</sup> See Tomlinson, pp. 28-32.

the men who compiled both, and is therefore worthy of notice. It declares that the Second Book is the First Book "godly perused and made fully perfect," particularly in the places where it was "necessary to make the same more earnest and fit to stir Christian people to the true honouring of Almighty God." From this marked preference of the Second Book by the very framers of the First we may judge how much truth is contained in the statement which is sometimes made, that the reformers were perfectly satisfied with the Book of 1549, and that the Book of 1552 was due to the fact that they suffered themselves to be overborne by self-assertive foreigners.

Only one other question calls for discussion. The Second Prayer-Book had been enacted April 14, and was to come into use on the first day in November. In the interval, however, something occurred which tended to disturb things. About the end of September Knox, one of the King's Chaplains, preached a fiery sermon before the Court, inveighing against all relics of idolatry, particularly against kneeling at the Lord's Supper. This was unfortunate, for the newly revised Prayer-Book contained a rubric enjoining kneeling reception. The Council ordered the printing of the Book to be suspended till this matter should be reconsidered. Cranmer promised the Council to reconsider the question in concert with Ridley and Martyr, but pointed out that it was *ultra vires* for the Council to alter what had been approved and enacted by Parliament, with the King's consent. In this latter he protested against those "glorious and unquiet spirits which can like nothing but that is after their own fancy," and strongly defended the new rubric, pointing out that to stand or sit at reception, when kneeling is the posture both before and after, "should rather import a contemptuous than a reverent receiving of the Sacrament." For the result, an Order of Council, dated October 27, directed that a "certain Declaration signed by the King's Majesty be joined unto the Book of Common Prayer lately set forth." This Declaration, now known as the "Black Rubric," vindicated Cranmer's position, while it enabled Knox to conform. Before this time Cranmer had been engaged in drawing up an authoritative con-

fession of the Church's faith, known as the Forty-two Articles; and if we compare the twenty-ninth of these Articles with the Black Rubric, we can hardly doubt that the latter came from Cranmer's hand. Indeed, the reason given in Cranmer's letter is the second reason assigned in the rubric—"for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder as might otherwise ensue."<sup>1</sup> The teaching of the rubric is directly opposed to the worship of the Host prescribed by the Council of Trent in October, 1551, and we know that the transactions of that Council did not escape Cranmer's notice. But, it may be asked, if the teaching of the Black Rubric was according to the mind of the Church, how are we to account for the fact that it found no place in Elizabeth's Prayer-Book? This might be thought to indicate that it was an "ill-starred mark" of which the Church was ashamed. The explanation lies in the circumstance that the Black Rubric was not part of the Book of 1552, as authorized by Parliament, but was *appended* to that Book by Order of Council, and rested on no other authority than a "Royal Proclamation." Now, the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI., alone and in its entirety, with the exception of certain specified alterations, was restored by the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity; therefore, to have inserted the Black Rubric under this Act would have been a mistake.<sup>2</sup>

When, however, the rubric became part of the Prayer-Book in 1662, some of its words were altered. Originally, it declared that to kneel at the reception of the elements does not mean "that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood." In 1662 the words "real and essential presence" were changed into "corporal presence." It has been said that through this alteration the rubric became a defence of the doctrine which before it denied. But this is an untenable position, for the doctrinal statements at the foundation of the rubric remain unchanged. "The natural body and blood of our Saviour ARE in heaven, and NOT here, it being against the truth

<sup>1</sup> See Tomlinson, pp. 256-260.

<sup>2</sup> Rev. N. Dimock, "The Black Rubric."

of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one." "The natural body" can only mean the present glorified body of our Lord, as this body alone can be said to be in heaven; therefore, the declaration, as at present framed, precludes the idea of a bodily presence in the elements—a fact emphasized further by the insertion of the word "ANY" before corporal, which excludes any *mode* of corporal presence. No CHANGE of meaning was intended by the verbal alterations of 1662, as Scudamore, Stephens, Perry, and Freeman admit. "Real and essential" gave place to "corporal," because of the change which had taken place in terminology. The realistic philosophy of Aquinas had lost its hold in the seventeenth century—men were no longer familiar with the language of the schools—so that the denial of any "real and essential presence" might be considered a denial of any true presence whatever. But, as we have seen, the reformers firmly upheld what might be called THE "Real Presence"—namely, *spiritual* Presence—and the Black Rubric stands as a witness to that belief.

From the evidences which have been adduced it is contended that we may reasonably and justly conclude that the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI. embodies in its most perfect form the mature convictions of the reformers. The Great Debate shows that as early as before the publication of the First Book they had, in the words of the late Mr. Dimock, "clearly and strongly taken their stand on one side of a doctrinal gulf, on the other side of which stood the teaching of *the* real presence of the body and blood of Christ in or under the form of bread and wine." So that there is every reason to believe that the Twentieth Article, drawn up by Archbishop Parker as the touchstone of Eucharistic doctrine, would have been fully accepted by Cranmer and his colleagues at the beginning of the Reformation movement.

R. MERCER WILSON.



## George Wither, of Bentworth.

THE subject of this sketch was born in the stirring days when the Spanish Armada was on its fateful way to these shores, on June 11, 1588, in the peaceful and typically English village of Bentworth, four miles from Alton, in Hampshire. Born, therefore, in the reign of Elizabeth, living through the reigns of James I. and Charles I., outlasting the Commonwealth, and only dying seven years before Charles II., his lot was cast in exciting times, and from first to last he remained a loyal son of the Church of England, serving her with rare courage, consistency, and devotion. This, however, is not his only title to fame. He was a poet of no mean order, and was the first to attempt the compilation of an English Hymnal. This fact alone justifies us in unearthing such particulars as we can of his eventful career.

His ancestors came from Lancaster, and settled at Manydown Manor, near Wooton St. Lawrence, and, later on, the father of the poet (one of the younger sons of the family) went to live at Bentworth, probably because it was near his wife's family—the Hunts, of Fidding Grange. Judging by some lines in George's "Britain's Remembrancer," they appear to have been in prosperous circumstances:

"When daily I on change of dainties fed,  
Lodged night by night upon an easy bed  
In lordly chambers, and had wherewithal  
Attendants forwarder than I to call,  
Who brought me all things needful; when at hand,  
Hounds, hawks, and horses, were at my command."

In the closing years of his life, which were clouded by poverty and misfortune, he must often have looked back to the easy life pictured for us in these lines.

He was educated at Colemere Grammar School under a famous pedagogue of the period, one John Greaves, and when he was but fifteen we find him in residence at Magdalen College, Oxford, where he had as his tutor John Warner, afterwards Bishop of Rochester. Strangely enough, his name does not appear in the University matriculation registers or in the records of Magdalen,



and therefore we must presume that he was admitted to residence without matriculation, there being a good deal of laxity at the time. Unfortunately, as he himself tells us, he came down without a degree. Some foolish persons disparaged learning to his father, who forthwith removed him, and he returned to his home to devote himself to agricultural pursuits. It has been thought that, as he was summoned home "to hold the plough," there had been a change in the family fortunes; but this seems unlikely, and we need not take the words too literally. The quiet life of an English gentleman of the period seems to have been unattractive to him, and there are indications in his poems that he now spent some time in travel, even finding his way to Ireland, then, as now, little favoured by the tourist. This negatives the theory that they were in straitened circumstances, for travelling was then an expensive form of amusement. Presently he settled in London, first at the Inns of Chancery, and later, as we shall see, at Lincoln's Inn. Here he gathered round him a circle of congenial friends. Among these were William Browne, of Tavistock, the gifted author of "Britannia's Pastorals"; Michael Drayton, of Atherstone, the writer of many historical ballads, and who lies in Westminster Abbey; Christopher Brooke; William Ferrar, and others; and there can be no doubt that George devoted himself more to literature than to the study of law. Not the least important result of the Hampton Court Conference, which was held while he was at Oxford, was the appearance of our Authorized Version in 1611, and it was in the same year that George Wither's first work was published, and it landed him in the first of many difficulties. It was a work entitled "Abuses Stript and Whipt"—a trenchant criticism of men and morals, which speedily brought down upon him the vengeance of the King and other persons in high places. The book was at once withdrawn from circulation, and only the intervention of the Princess Elizabeth, ever his friend and patroness, saved him from imprisonment. It was to her he dedicated his "Epithalmia," and, later on, when she was Queen of Bohemia, his "Psalms of David translated into Lyric Verse." In the year following her marriage he was, unfortunately, induced to re-

publish "Abuses Stript and Whipt," with the result that he soon found himself in the Marshalsea Prison. As might have been expected, this only served to increase the circulation of the book, which actually went through five editions in 1613, while other editions followed in 1614, 1615, 1617, and 1622. Though bounded by the walls of his prison, his mind wandered off to the scenes of his early life, and he wrote at this time his really fine poem, "The Shepherds' Hunting." This was followed by his "Satyre to the King," which, oddly enough, secured his release, probably because James felt he might be a dangerous foe, and that it was therefore wise to propitiate him. Soon after his liberation he was admitted to Lincoln's Inn in 1615, and in the same year his "Fidelia" was printed for private circulation. Only one copy of this issue remains, one of the treasures of the Bodleian Library. The first published edition appeared in 1617, and of this there are only two copies, each defective, but together making a complete copy. Wither was now considerably "in the public eye." Religious controversies were raging. There were the Romanists on the one side, and the Puritans on the other, each seeking to gain the ear and influence of James. Where, it may be asked, does George Wither come in? The answer is, he may fairly be described as a Central Churchman. The late Professor Gardiner said that he was "neither a Laudian nor a Puritan." Another of his biographers says: "He assumed a position intermediate between the Parliamentarians and the Royalists, pleasing neither for long, and eventually offending both." Of his sincerity and simple piety there can be no doubt. One of his contemporaries—John Taylor, the water-poet—declared that he had loved him for thirty-five years, because he thought him "simply honest;" and Richard Baxter called him "Honest George Wither."

His strictly religious works were numerous. He wrote "A Preparation to the Psalter," revealing an accurate scholarship; while his "Exercises upon the First Psalm" was a careful commentary consisting of over a hundred pages.

In 1623 he published his hymnbook, under the title "Hymns and Songs of the Church." It has been said that the failure of

the book was due to the fact that the King regarded it with favour! James granted him by Letters Patent a monopoly in the book for fifty-one years, and no metrical Psalter was to be bound up which did not contain Wither's work. To this there was considerable opposition on the part of the Stationers' Company and the booksellers. Wither declared that the Archbishop of Canterbury approved of the book, only requiring the alteration of one word, and many members of Convocation were in sympathy.

The first part of the book consisted of paraphrases from Holy Scripture, while the second contained hymns for the Festivals and Holy Days, also for Holy Communion, Embertide, Peace, Plenty, etc. It was the first collection of its kind, and it may justly be regarded as the forerunner of the modern Hymnal. The Puritan reaction which had set in helped, no doubt, to bring about its doom, for nonconformity, at the time, was not favourable to hymn-singing.

Wither now followed with a version of the Psalms in lyric verse, to which reference has already been made, and this was printed in the Netherlands. Again Letters Patent were issued ordering that all Bibles should have this version bound up with them. Once more there was opposition. The case was fought out, and the Lords ordered that it should henceforth be sold by **itself**.

In 1641 many of the hymns reappeared, together with others, in a further collection entitled "Hallelujah, Britain's Second Remembrancer." Orlando Gibbons had contributed to the former book some really fine tunes, but there were none for this book. This compilation is in three parts: (1) *Hymns Occasional*, for use at different times, as when waking, dressing, washing, on leaving home and returning, on recovery from illness, etc. As there are over a hundred hymns in this section, it is impossible to enumerate them all. Then come (2) *Hymns Temporary*, hymns or poems for special occasions: for Rogationtide; for the Nativity, the Circumcision, Epiphany, Lent, Palm Sunday; for the Saints' Days; for a birthday; for the anniversary of a marriage, etc — sixty hymns in all. Then come (3) *Hymns Personal*, for special occupations: for a physician, a patient, a courtier, a husband-

man, a merchant, a musician, a schoolmaster, etc.; for special circumstances—for a blind person; for a poor person; for a prisoner, for a cripple, etc.; indeed, there is extraordinary variety. In this section there are sixty-two hymns. The last is entitled "The Author's Hymn for Himself." Its closing verse will serve to show the spirit of the writer, as well as to give an example of his favourite metre:

"And with Israel's royal singer,  
Teach me so faith's hymns to sing  
So Thy ten-stringed law to finger,  
And such music thence to bring,  
That by grace I may aspire  
To Thy blessed angel choir."

Of course, in such a collection, many of the compositions are of unequal value, and the style is often stiff and archaic; but, taken as a whole, these little-known compositions are of a high order, and undoubtedly all his best religious poetry is here gathered together.

The closing years of his life were sad in the extreme. When the Civil War broke out, he sold his estate and raised a troop of horse for the Parliament. He was in 1642 appointed Captain and Commander of Farnham Castle, now the residence of the Bishops of Winchester. After holding the castle for a few days with a small and insubordinate force, he left for London. Though he stoutly maintained that he had acted under orders, he was accused of deserting his post, and his private residence was plundered. He was granted £2,000 in compensation for his loss, and for the next eighteen years of his life he was mainly engaged in the task of trying to get this money. In this he does not seem to have been very successful, and it is questionable if he ever got more than £700 of it. Poverty aroused in him a spirit of rebellion and discontent, and he made free use of his facile pen to air his grievances, until people almost entirely forgot his earlier and better work, and grew tired of him and of the unending stream of pleas and prophecies which he poured forth.

During the closing years of the Commonwealth he resided at Hambledon, in Hampshire, and for a time he seems to have enjoyed the favour of Cromwell, but he forfeited it after having

told the great Oliver "truths he was not willing to hear of." But other troubles awaited him. His sudden appearance in London at the time of the Restoration aroused the suspicion of the authorities. His apartments were searched, and a manuscript poem found among his papers, "Vox Vulgi," gave great offence. Once more he was imprisoned, but in 1663 he regained his liberty, and resumed his voluminous writing. He had already seen one visitation of the Plague in 1625, and graphically described the terrible scenes he witnessed in "Britain's Remembrancer." He was destined to see two other and greater calamities—the Great Plague of 1665 and the Fire of London. Needless to say, he did not lay down his ever-ready pen at such a time, and his last literary work was the production of "Fragmenta Prophetica," consisting of extracts from his prophetic writings. But the candle had begun to flicker, and he passed away, at his house in the Savoy, on May 2, 1667, having lived his long and strenuous life under no less than eleven Governments. Like the best of men, he was not without his faults. He was impetuous and wilful, declining to be guided by others, and this wilfulness brought upon him many troubles from which he might otherwise have escaped. He had an unhappy knack of irritating. In quieter times it might have been less exasperating. Still, his faults were not vices, and he has left an absolutely clean record. His devotion to his wife and his love for all that is pure and beautiful are pleasing to read of in an age in which marital affection was sneered at.

S. R. CAMBIE.



## Kikuyu, and Our Relations with Nonconformists.<sup>1</sup>

THE gravest danger which threatens Evangelicals at the present time is the temptation to settle matters of controversy upon grounds of expediency rather than principle. The tendency to succumb to this temptation is clearly seen in several directions, notably in the matter of Prayer-Book revision. It is sound policy to restore peace in the Church, so runs the argument; therefore, to attain this end, let us compromise, and make concessions upon such matters as vestments, reservation, etc.

I am glad to say that it is not my concern to discuss these questions to-day, and I am sure that if you are half as weary of them as I am, you will be equally glad. But the point I wish to emphasize is that, whatever practical decision we arrive at, must be decided upon grounds of principle, and not by an opportunist policy, however attractive it may appear upon the surface. The man who has got his principles clear is the only really safe guide—at any rate, in matters of religion. The basis of his position is truth, and not good policy. Statesmanship is subordinated to unflinching adherence to Scriptural truth, and, however pleasing a vista is opened before him by the statesman, however he may be reproached for his unbending determination, he persists in saying: "We are not careful to answer thee in this matter."

I have dwelt upon this point, because I am convinced that the only sound way in which we can approach the Kikuyu problem is by subordinating policy to principle. I can imagine no subject which involves so many Evangelical principles at one time as this. Policy dictates compromise. "Agree with thine adversary *quickly*," says the opportunist. The Church is near to a grave split; its external unity is menaced far more by this question than by any other. Already secessions have occurred. Even the Bishops, who usually veil their opinions in obscure and non-committal language which can mean several things at the same time, are ranging themselves definitely upon different sides.

<sup>1</sup> A paper read at St. Albans Clerical and Lay Union on November 9, 1915.

A serious controversy is upon us, and we must discover, not what is the wisest course to adopt, but primarily what is the right attitude to take.

Now, no time need be spent upon describing in detail the Kikuyu incident, nor the behaviour of the Bishop of Zanzibar. The suggestions made at that conference, together with Dr. Weston's amiable opinions, were submitted by the Archbishop to the Consultative Committee of the Lambeth Conference. This committee issued their report, and the Archbishop some months later published his opinion, which was in line with the advice given by the committee mentioned, though, perhaps, rather more sympathetic in tone. Four questions were submitted to the advisory body: Whether non-Episcopalians should be admitted to the Communion in the Church of England; whether non-Episcopalian ministers might be admitted to preach in the pulpits of our missionary churches; whether members of our Communion should be permitted to attend the Communion in non-Episcopalian Churches; and the general question of the united Communion Service at the Kikuyu Conference.

The advice tendered answered the two former questions in the affirmative, and the latter in the negative. The matter is now officially pigeon-holed till the next meeting of the Lambeth Conference in 1918. But to say that the subject is left at that point would be wrong. Pronouncements are being made by all sorts of people, chiefly those who dissent from the Archbishop. The party in the Church who speak in the loftiest way of the Divine character of the Episcopate have united upon a policy of intimidation of the "successors of the Apostles." They have presented an ultimatum to each missionary Bishop, asking whether he is prepared to support the policy outlined by the Archbishop, and, if so, declaring their intention to withhold their support of the work in his diocese. Several of their protagonists have attacked the Archbishop, and three or four diocesan Bishops have reassured their anxious clergy by declaring that the Archbishop's opinion has no binding authority upon them, and hinting that, if it is confirmed by the Lambeth Conference, there will arise a situation of the greatest anxiety. Upon this point there

can be no difference of opinion: The next Lambeth Conference will have to decide a most serious matter, and no man who loves his Church can face the possibilities of their decision without many a troubled thought.

Between now and then it is our clear duty to study the question at issue, and on grounds of principle decide what attitude Evangelical Churchmen should adopt. My paper is designed towards this end.

In the first place, let me offer a few considerations upon the significance of the advice tendered by the Consultative Committee to the Archbishop, and upon His Grace's opinion. The expressions of a body of this character and those of the Archbishop should carry the greatest weight with all Churchmen. It is manifest that these pronouncements were in no sense party opinions. They have given complete satisfaction to no section of Churchmen. The Archbishop's advisers have gone upon the principle of estimating justly the needs of the situation in the mission-field, and they appear to have been as little concerned to pacify the Bishop of Zanzibar as to concede everything that the Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda recommend. Whatever we personally may feel as to the details of the advice and opinion, we are bound to admit that the whole question has received most careful and thorough consideration by a body of Bishops representing the soundest scholarship and most far-sighted statesmanship in the Church.

It is for such reasons that we resent the way in which the Archbishop's opinion has been received in certain quarters. By some of our leading Bishops he is described as if he were a kind of ecclesiastical Pooh-Bah, who speaks with one voice as Metropolitan of the Anglican Communion, and with another voice as the Archbishop to whom these extra-provincial missionary dioceses are related. And by some of the more reckless spirits he is lectured in a way which rouses the indignation of those who are old-fashioned enough to give "honour to whom honour is due."

To disparage the Archbishop's opinion as merely an individual expression is clearly wrong in fact. It is, in essence, the unanimous judgment of the Consultative Committee of the Lambeth



Conference, which consists, among others, of the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Winchester, who are justly credited with being statesmen of no ordinary calibre, and who have given no evidence of being biassed in favour of Evangelical opinions. Indeed, this last remark applies to the whole committee. The advice to His Grace was tendered by a body of Bishops in which High Churchmen were strongly represented, and Evangelicals only very slenderly. Yet the decision is resented by High Churchmen, and Evangelicals are prepared to make the very best of it. Here is food for thought.

The only right way in which to examine this difficult question is to examine the principle underlying the advice and opinion, and to see to what extent it is reconcilable with our own principles. To avoid the possibility of misunderstanding, let me say at once that I think that we shall find that the expressions of the Archbishop and of those who advised him are in complete harmony with Anglican principles, and in line with those charitable judgments which, since the Reformation, have, with few exceptions, been characteristic of all our great divines. The logic of the position may lead some of us to feel that His Grace should have gone further; that he should have approved members of our Communion attending the Communion in non-Episcopal Churches when out of reach of their own; that he should have given his benediction to the united Communion at Kikuyu. But cold logic is not always a sound guide. Provided principle is not involved, sound policy deserves all consideration, and we may well believe that the wise hand of statesmanship has, for good reasons, drawn the line beyond which naked logic must not be pressed.

Now let us examine the principle behind Kikuyu.

We Evangelical Churchmen believe that our Lord founded a Church. The nucleus of this world-wide society, which looked to Him as Founder and Source of its life, was the Apostles. Within this society corporate dwells the Redeemer; pulsing through it is the Divine Spirit of God. This society is, moreover, a visible Church, known and read of all men. It is a holy society, separated unto God from the world, and though in the world,

conspicuous as a "city set on an hill," and keeping its environment free from corruption as the salt which retains its savour, it is yet not of the world, in the sense that its final ideals and its ultimate standard of conduct is heavenly. Membership of this society is obtained by repentance of sin and belief in Christ, confessed in Baptism. By Baptism the individual is admitted into the visible Church—by that, and by that alone. Once admitted, he becomes qualified, *ipso facto*, to eat the one Bread and to drink the one Cup.

The more we read the New Testament, the more we become convinced of two things: one is the absolute clarity of these essential facts, and the other is the wide gulf between these and every other test or mark which is advanced as distinctive of the Church. If we approach the New Testament with bias, we can make out a pretty good case for several other criteria of the Church; but I am bound to say that a person with a bias in the opposite direction can make out an equally good case for something exactly opposite. On the level of undisputed fact stand these statements: the Church is one holy and visible society, indwelt by the Spirit of God; it worships one Lord and Redeemer, whom each member confesses at the one Baptism which marks the beginning of his life as a Christian; it commemorates its Lord and enjoys Communion with Him in the one Holy Feast appointed by His own command.

But what about Church government? you ask.

So far as the advice of the Consultative Committee and the opinion of the Archbishop are concerned, we may at any rate at this point walk round the whole of this question. It does not yet arise. The question before His Grace's advisers was, stripped of all decoration, simply this: Is every baptized Christian to be regarded as a member of the Church of Christ? If the answer is given in the affirmative, the inevitable deduction follows: every baptized person is eligible for admission to the highest privilege of the Christian—that is, admission to the Holy Communion. If the answer is in the negative, then it amounts to this, that Baptism does not admit into Church membership, or else that some other additional qualification is required—a position which is devoid of all Scriptural foundation.

There is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, and one Church which worships the one Lord, enshrines the one Faith, and acknowledges the one Baptism. The Archbishop's opinion is in complete harmony with the pronouncements of Scripture, and those who assail him, let it be plainly said, are assailing Scripture. In throwing open our Communion in the foreign field to native converts separated from their own Churches, His Grace is not doing merely the charitable thing, but that which Scripture in principle enjoins. These native converts are baptized, that is beyond dispute; for even assuming that the ministry which led them to Christ is "invalid," their Baptism is not impaired, for antiquity pronounces that even a layman can baptize. Nor can the exclusionists resort to the argument that schism has separated them from Communion, for no one will seriously maintain that a heathen African converted to Christianity by a Presbyterian is a schismatic from the Church of England.

The answer seems to be inevitable: the Archbishop is right.

But there are not wanting some who attempt to evade this line of argument. Mr. Leighton Pullan has taken it upon him to rebuke the Archbishop sharply. Let us glance at his view.

"How are we to regard baptized persons who are not in Communion with the Church, but living in good faith?" he asks. "If they are baptized, they are beyond question members of Christ, and nothing can exaggerate the importance of that fact. . . . No baptized person who is penitent and loves God can be lost" ("Missionary Principles," p. 21).

This is clear enough, but bewilderment begins when Mr. Pullan begins to limit the implications of his own sound statement. He continues thus: "Any portion of the body which organizes itself into a polity which has not evolved from Christ's own appointment necessarily ceases to be part of that body. It places itself as a system or body outside the Church" (*ibid.*, p. 36).

Mr. Pullan cannot mean that when a body of Christians revolt from Episcopacy, for that is the polity described by him as "evolved from Christ's own appointment," that they *individually* become outside the Church, because in the previous passage

quoted he has already declared that in consequence of their Baptism "they are beyond question members of Christ." He can only mean that, though in a corporate sense such a body of persons is not the Church, yet individually they are members of the Church.

I do not wish to enlarge unduly upon this, because I may not have caught Mr. Pullan's opinion correctly; but if it is really his view, it is a very odd argument. A body of members of the Church, by amalgamating into a secondary society, at once loses corporately that status which each one enjoys as an individual! It is a grave illustration of the maxim, "Save me from my friends."

But even supposing that this really were so, it does not affect the question of the admission of non-Episcopalians to our Communion; for if the individual Christian claims his privilege in virtue of his Baptism, the subtle question of the status of his own society in its corporate capacity does not arise.

A similar view is held by Dr. Swete.

"Baptism," says this writer, "admits not into a particular Church, but into union with Christ, and therefore into union with His Body, the universal Ecclesia" ("The Holy Catholic Church," p. 12). And again: "Baptized members of such societies" (*i.e.*, "non-Episcopal societies") "are, by virtue of their Baptism, members of the Body of Christ" (*ibid.*, p. 16). But, like Mr. Pullan, Dr. Swete will not allow that an aggregate of members of Christ's Body of this description is a Church "in the New Testament sense." What privileges they enjoy individually they sacrifice collectively, because they "have thrown over the threefold ministry, and cut themselves off from the historical Body of Christ" (*ibid.*, p. 40). Now what, we ask respectfully of such a ripe scholar as Dr. Swete, does this mean? How can an association of people collectively be "cut off from the historical Body of Christ," and at the same time all the members of that association individually be, "by virtue of their Baptism, members of the Body of Christ"?

Either by their "act of explicit rebellion," as Bishop Gore called it, against Episcopacy they have nullified their Baptism, which no one appears to hold, or else their Baptism, despite all

their errors, stands firm, and they are members of Christ. In which case they are eligible to participate in Communion with the Church Catholic. I can see no other possible alternative.

So we feel that the Archbishop is not merely charitable in sympathy, but also sound in principle when he states: "I have no hesitation in saying that, in my opinion, a diocesan Bishop acts rightly in sanctioning, when circumstances seem to call for it, the admission to Holy Communion of a devout Christian man to whom the ministrations of his own Church are for the time inaccessible, and who, as a baptized person, desires to avail himself of the opportunity of communicating at our Altars" ("Kikuyu," pp. 27, 28).

Now, it is not difficult to see how this affects our relations with Nonconformists here at home. The Archbishop's opinion amounts to this: The baptized Nonconformist's status as a Christian is as sound as our own. So far from unchurching them, or looking doubtfully upon them, he reaches out the hand of brotherly acknowledgment, and invites them cordially to the Feast of Love in our Church when precluded from attending their own. The great barrier between us and them is broken down. The patronizing air, which gives more pain than a direct insult, is, as it were, authoritatively forbidden. This, rightly interpreted, should mean the clearing of the air in every parish in the land.

At the same time, it must be noted that His Grace's opinion gives no sanction for the issue of general invitations to all the Nonconformists in our parishes to attend Communion in their parish churches.

In passing, I may say that there is ample sanction for this in the literature of the seventeenth century, where Episcopal pronouncements and sermons abound pleading with Nonconformists to attend the Sacrament in their parish churches. Indeed, in the same century, as no doubt you remember, Acts of Parliament were passed imposing severe penalties upon those Nonconformists who refused to communicate. But though we may feel convinced that we have full legal right to invite our baptized Nonconformist parishioners to claim their privileges, though we dare

not refuse them if they come, yet it is worth while weighing well the advisability of broad-cast invitations. The Archbishop's words apply only to Nonconformists who are shut off from the ministrations of their own Churches. He has considered carefully each word he has spoken, and, we may be sure, has good reasons for going no further.

We do not want to encourage religious vagrancy, for that is what roaming from church to church means. A plant does not grow well if it is plucked up and planted in a different place each week, and neither does the spiritual life flourish under such circumstances. There is a good deal to be said in favour of not attempting to disturb our Nonconformist fellow-Christians, but rather to urge them to stand loyally by their own Church and ministry.

But, personally, I feel very strongly that, at any rate, so long as our Church claims the proud title of "Church of England," at least occasionally general invitations should be given, as a witness that the Mother-Church has not forgotten her obligation to the half of her children. For instance, when peace is proclaimed, would it not be a truly happy inspiration if our Bishops were to bid us to arrange a united Communion Service in every parish in the land? I believe, laying aside all higher considerations, that such a thing would do more to check Welsh Disestablishment than all the fulminations of prelates and politicians combined.

But even a casual student of the Kikuyu literature must discover that the seat of the difficulty lies deeper than the question of admitting Nonconformists to our Communion. We have got to face boldly the question whether we acknowledge their societies as Churches and their ministries as valid. I have said enough upon the principles which must guide us in deciding the status of their societies; by no logic can a gathering of baptized Christians be denied the title of Church. A few words must now be said about non-Episcopal ministries.

It is really helpful to find the Archbishop digging a little deeper the grave for that hateful and poisonous word "valid." "I purposely avoid the words 'valid' and 'invalid,'" he says, "as

I have always found myself unable, without a feeling of intolerable presumption, to give to that phrase the meaning which in popular parlance it would seem to carry " ("Kikuyu," p. 30). His Grace will have every loyal Churchman with him when he urges the danger of regarding the threefold ministry as " trifling or negligible."

We need not dwell even for a moment upon a defence of our own ministry. We are satisfied with Episcopacy, thankful for it, and firmly determined to abide by it. But, as Bishop Andrewes said, because we " prefer a better thing," we do not therefore " damn " every other system.

A study of Church government discloses an interesting fact. Originally the two ideas which, for want of better words, we may describe as democratic and aristocratic were blended. The Church chose its ministers—this was the democratic side of ministerial appointment; the highest officials in the Church ordained the chosen men—this we may call the aristocratic side. The stress laid upon the former seems to have been as great as that laid upon the latter. You see this in the New Testament and in Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians. Cyprian described the election by the Church as of " Divine tradition and Apostolic observance "; Julius of Rome stigmatized a high-handed act where no such election had occurred as " lawless and contrary to ecclesiastical canon." Leo said: " No reason can tolerate that persons should be deemed to be Bishops who were neither chosen by the clergy, nor called for by the laity, nor ordained by the Bishops of the province with the approval of the Metropolitan."

In medieval times popular election lapsed entirely, and the stress was laid upon ordination by the highest officials of the Church. At the Reformation it was revived, but by the non-Episcopal Churches. They have retained to the present day the democratic ideal, and among them the essence of a true ministry is the call of the Church. We, in common with all other Episcopal Churches, failed to revive this Scriptural and ancient practice. Our Bishops became lackeys of the Court, and were often sycophants who earned their high positions by supporting the Crown. We may console ourselves that this has

practically entirely ceased; we may be persuaded (as I personally am) that appointment of Bishops by the Prime Minister works well, and that a better scheme has yet to be devised. But the fact remains that we have lost one of the primitive criteria of a properly ordered ministry. This was one of the gravest objections that the early Puritans lodged against our Church.

The nice question then remains: Which ministry is in the safer position to cast stones at the other—the one which has retained the ancient form of ordination and rejected the election by the Church, or that which has retained election by the Church and rejected the ancient method of ordination? Perhaps we should decide that, as both are in a glass-house, it would be well to suspend stone-throwing altogether.

The test of a ministry is the fact of its approval by God, witnessed by the fruits of the Spirit. Let us, therefore, in our dealings with our Nonconformist neighbours, suspend academic dispute, which ministers to ungodliness, and enter into a holy competition with them to outrival them in making our flocks patterns to the Church of Christ.

H. A. WILSON.





## The Atonement in the Writings of St. John.

### II.

HAVING thus rounded off his conception of the results of the Atonement, St. John now proceeds to emphasize that the Cross is not something towards which our Lord was ruthlessly and inexorably hurried, in spite of Himself, but that it was submitted to by Him as a purely voluntary act.

#### 4. *The Voluntariness of the Atonement.*

The way is prepared in quite a natural manner for the statement of this particular aspect of the matter. At the close of our Lord's discourse to the Jews in the Temple, as described in viii. 12-30, Christ declares that the man who abides in His word (viii. 31), or enters into the knowledge of Himself of which He has been speaking, will know the meaning of freedom in its fullest sense (viii. 32), and will enter upon eternal life (viii. 51). The questionings and cavillings of the Jews in answer to our Lord's statements resulted ultimately in active opposition, with the result that Christ had to hide Himself from their attempts to injure Him (viii. 59). The sign, therefore, which is described in the next chapter seems to be a commentary upon the hostile attitude which the Jews had taken up. One notices a great contrast in the elaborateness of the preparations here—*cf.* the spittle, the clay, the anointing, the journey to the Pool of Siloam—with the spontaneity of the previous signs, and the difference seems to mark the difficulties encountered by Christ towards His life and message. The difficulties, however, were now crystallizing into active opposition on the part of the Jews (ix. 22, 34), and the ostracization of those who believed in Christ was on a par with the attempt at stoning mentioned in ix. 59. It is now, therefore, that our Lord begins to make a certain difference in His teaching and in His method of teaching. Prior to this stage Christ had taught all who would listen, now He teaches only His disciples and those who had a certain degree of faith in Him (*cf.* x. 41, 42). But the point which concerns us with reference to

the Atonement is that our Lord quite clearly emphasizes the voluntariness of His own position. The rising tide of opposition was producing an atmosphere which presaged disaster for Himself, and, therefore, when the note of separation from the general body of Jews comes in chap. x., it is also clearly marked by the voluntariness of Christ's own position. He sees quite clearly that Calvary is already in sight, and hence He declares His freedom in going to it. This is brought out in such verses as x. 10, 11, and 15, and they are all summed up in the words of x. 17, 18: ". . . I lay down My life. . . . No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." When blasphemous abuse (x. 20, 21) had developed into attempts at personal violence (x. 31, 39), and the inevitableness of death was now being revealed, it was necessary that our Lord should make it plain that He was moving onward with His eyes quite open to the consequences, and that He was going quite voluntarily into the shadow of death.

The close of the section of the Gospel dealing with the voluntariness of Christ's part in the Atonement is followed by the sign in chap. xi., which has a distinct bearing upon what has preceded as well as upon what follows. The sign itself is a clear proof of Christ's power over death, and therefore witnesses implicitly to the point which has already been examined, whilst the statements of our Lord with reference to Lazarus's death (xi. 4, 15), and His words in xi. 25, 26, show also quite clearly that our Lord's submission to death was purely voluntary. The same facts also prepare the way for the next aspect of the subject dwelt upon by St. John, and that is the necessity of the Atonement.

##### 5. *The Necessity of the Atonement.*

We have already seen that the great sign recorded in chap. xi. shows that our Lord went quite voluntarily to the Cross, but St. John now proceeds to show that there was an actual necessity that Christ should die. This aspect of the subject arises out of the preceding narrative, and it says that Christ's death is necessary first of all for the world.

(a) *For the World.*—The sign of raising Lazarus had, like all the other signs, its positive and negative effect—*i.e.*, in sifting believers in Christ from unbelievers, and in drawing the former closer to Christ and causing further reaction in the case of the latter. This dual effect is seen in xi. 45, 46, where many of the Jews gave in their adhesion to Christ, but where others went to the Pharisees to recount what they had seen and heard. The upshot is seen in the calling of the Jewish Council, and in the dictum laid down by Caiaphas “. . . that it is expedient . . . that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.” The application of this well-known Jewish adage to our Lord by the high priest only carries with it the sinister aspect of necessity, but St. John gives the truer interpretation in his gloss: “ This he said not of himself: but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation; and not for the nation only, but that He might also gather into one the children of God that are scattered abroad ” (xi. 51, 52). The death of Christ was a necessity, called for by the needs of men, who would be ultimately gathered into one body of believers by the sacrifice on the Cross.

The Cross is also declared to be necessary for Christ's work.

(b) *For Christ's Work.*—This particular aspect is in contrast with certain incidents which superficially seemed to indicate that Christ's work did not need a *via dolorosa* like Calvary. The first of these was the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem (xii. 12-17), with the caustic commentary of the Pharisees that the world is gone after Him (xii. 19). The interview also with the inquiring Greeks seems at first to suggest the same fact. If the Hellenized Jews were being attracted to Christ, surely, then, there was no need for a personal sacrifice on our Lord's part—the mystical truth involved in the fact of the Logos must surely suffice. But the seeming triumph was only used by Christ to emphasize the fact that His death was necessary for His work. “ Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it beareth much fruit ” (xii. 24). In the death of Christ the Son of man would be glorified (xii. 23), and reap the fruit of His life's work. The same truth is brought out in the

address following, in which Christ reveals the questionings of His own soul about the future. If His soul was troubled, and if the natural shrinking from death should prompt Him to claim deliverance from it, yet His Divine consciousness told Him that His presence in the world pointed Him on inexorably to this hour of Calvary (xii. 37). If, therefore, a superficial view should consider that the Cross was a triumph for "the prince of this world," Christ forestalls the view by declaring that the Cross is the overthrowing of the world-prince, and not simply that, but also is the means by which His own work would be completed (xii. 31).

St. John has now brought his narrative down to the period just anterior to the Betrayal itself, and on the eve, as it were, of the great catastrophe he proceeds to enumerate certain ultimate results which would occur from the seeming failure of Christ in the Cross.

#### *Ultimate Issues of the Cross.*

The first of these seeming paradoxes is that the Cross would result in glory for Christ Himself.

(a) *For Christ's Glory.*—This aspect of the Cross is presaged in the remarks of St. John after the interview with the inquiring Greeks. The refusal of the Jews to believe in Christ moves St. John to recall the words of Isaiah, who predicted the blindness of the Jews to a suffering Messiah (xii. 37, 40). This, however, did not prevent St. John remembering that Isaiah had seen a glory even for the suffering Messiah (xii. 41), and on the eve of the Cross St. John himself can now see it. Such an insight was no doubt hardly possible except to the eye of faith, nor do the incidents which follow make it easier to realize that the ultimate outcome was to be glory for Christ. For the narrative goes on to depict the Master as a servant doing menial acts (xiii. 1-20).<sup>1</sup> It then

<sup>1</sup> It is well worth noting here the striking association of the Divine consciousness of our Lord along with His voluntary humility. In xiii. 1, St. John emphasizes Christ's knowledge of His approaching departure to the Father; and in xiii. 3 there is the comprehensive statement of the oneness of Christ with God, coupled with the fact that the Father had delegated all things into Christ's hands. But along with this there was the seeming paradox of the menial act of washing the disciples' feet. The whole scene is parabolic in the sense that it sums up the principle underlying the Incarnation and the Cross—*i.e.*, the principle of self-sacrifice.

goes on to relate the Last Supper and the statement of the coming Betrayal (xiii. 21-30), but the incidents are not crowned by any note of personal sadness. Rather, at the end, there is the note of triumph, a pæan of gladness, because in the darkening shadow of the Cross now appearing the Son of man is to find glory (xiii. 31).

Nor is the glory to be confined to Christ, but the Cross is going to issue in glory for the disciples themselves.

(b) *Glory for Christ's Disciples.*—The Upper Room discourse, which commences in chap. xiv., made it quite clear that the death of Christ was at hand, and the statements about "going to prepare a place for them" (xiv. 2) and "going to the Father" (xiv. 28) carried with them the fact that the "going" was by way of the Cross. The point which emerges, however, from our Lord's discourse is that this going by way of the Cross to the Father is to bring joy and glory to the disciples. In the first place, by Christ's own going away the disciples are to do greater works than those accomplished by Christ Himself (xiv. 12). Then, again, Christ emphasizes the same fact in the simile of the vine and branches. The "greater works" are to be paralleled by the "much fruit," and as Christ's own works brought hatred and the result of hatred to Himself (xv. 25), so their works will do the same for them (xv. 20). And if Christ's own works brought the Cross to Himself, and in the Cross He found His own glory, this seems to be implied for the disciples also. There is a joy in store for the disciples, but it is for them, as for Christ, a joy through the path of suffering and sorrow (xvi. 20-24). For the disciples, as for Christ, there is a joy and glory through the way of the Cross.

The third of these ultimate issues of the Cross is the fact that it will turn out for the glory of God Himself.

(c) *For God's Glory.*—The glory referred to is of a twofold nature—it is the glory of God in Christ Himself, and also in the disciples. The first aspect is mentioned in the beginning of the high-priestly prayer. Our Lord, in addressing the Father, refers to the fact that "the hour" of the Cross and Passion had now come, but the prayer of Christ asks that the glory of the Father may be realized through the Son in this dread hour (xvii. 1).

Christ had already glorified the Father in the revelation of Him which had been given by Christ's own life on earth (xvii. 4), yet Christ asks specially now, on the eve of Calvary, that the glory of the Father may be realized in the Son, and that the pre-existent glory which Christ had had from all time in the presence of the Father should now be made manifest in this hour of the Cross (xvii. 4).

Furthermore, there is a prayer that the same glory of God may be realized in the disciples. Christ first of all declares that He Himself is glorified in His disciples, and that the glory which He had received from the Father He had given to the disciples (xvii. 10, 22). But if the glory of the Father had already been made manifest to the disciples through Christ, He also prays that the disciples may one day see the glory of God in Christ when the latter has passed into the unveiled presence of God through the Cross (xvii. 24). The whole of the prayer, therefore, seems to ring with the note of glory for Christ, for the Father, and for the disciples through the Cross.

St. John now proceeds with the incidents of the Betrayal and the Crucifixion, but one notices again the emphasis laid by Christ upon His own voluntariness in this dark hour. To the disciples, who propose to put the issue to the test of brute strength, He proclaims His willingness to drink the cup of suffering (xviii. 11); to the representative of the Roman power He defines His own position as a King, but not of this world (xviii. 36), and that the Roman power to put Him to the death of the Cross was only a power delegated from His kingdom above (xix. 11). Christ moves on to the Cross, whatever of dark mystery there was in it for Him, with the perfect assurance of His own freedom in it, and with the knowledge that it was to be for the glory of God and of men.

Had the narrative of St. John stopped at this point, there would have been a certain completeness in his historical record of the Cross. The manner in which he shows its foreshadowings from the very outset of Christ's ministry, and the comprehensive way in which the various aspects of the Cross are considered, would make his narrative complete when the story of the Cross

had been told. But there was a further incident to relate, for the post-Resurrection appearances of Christ in the Upper Room sum up in themselves the whole teaching of the Atonement. On the occasion of the first appearance in the Upper Room, St. John tells us that ". . . Jesus came and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. And when He had said this, He shewed unto them His hands and His side" (xx. 19, 20). It will not be called a strained exegesis to remark that these words and the action of Christ summarize the message of the Atonement. It was "Peace" for the disciples, and through them for all men; but it was "Peace" through the Cross, the marks of which were on the hands and side He showed to them. There was peace for men with God by the Cross.

The second appearance of our Lord in the Upper Room conveys an equally important truth (xx. 26-28). The incident seems to be concerned mainly with the change of mind wrought in the disciple Thomas, but there is a deeper meaning still. Christ's invitation to the doubting follower to examine the marks of the Cross on His person are followed by the full profession—for the first time in the Gospel—of belief in Christ as the Divine Lord and God. It is the Cross, with the resultant Resurrection, which marks the Divinity of Christ (*cf.* Rom. i. 4), and brings home to men the truth that He is Lord and God. In this great fact, therefore, lies the guarantee that whatever had been presaged of the Cross of Christ carried with it the conviction of truth.

The Gospel of St. John, therefore, has a certain completeness in this record of the fact of the Cross of Christ. It begins with the proclamation that the Cross explains the purpose of Christ's coming into the world; it goes on consistently to show that in every aspect of our Lord's teaching the Cross plays a central part; it finishes with the scenes in the Upper Room, where the two appearances proclaim that in the Cross there is peace with God by Him whose Godhead the Cross itself attests.

T. W. GILBERT.

*(To be concluded.)*



## The Missionary World.

IN the month when the three quarterly magazines come before us, we generally confine ourselves almost entirely to notes on the current magazines. The first place must be given to the L.M.S. *Chronicle*, not only because of its burning presentation of the outcome of the important committee referred to last month, but also because it contains a singularly interesting statement as to "War and Wealth," by Sir George Paish, editor of *The Statist*, a financial expert who was called to the help of the Government at the beginning of the war. His financial forecast, unexpectedly favourable as it is, is not so striking as the following paragraph from his paper:

"My view as to religious activity specifically is that much greater effort ought to be put into religious work during this war than has ever been put into it before. Religious activities ought to be increased, and not diminished. I would not increase activities abroad at this stage, except where our soldiers are assembled; but would hold on to existing work. If we take advantage of this time of suffering and of endurance to make people realize what religion really means, instead of the war leading to restriction in your activities, it should lead to great expansion.

"If people here become much more in earnest about their religion during the war, there will be a great expansion in their religious activities as regards the rest of the world after the war. I would suggest, therefore, that the L.M.S. should help to strengthen the religious life of the nation at this time by every means in its power."

A more impressive testimony to the power of spiritual revival even in the region of finance could not be found.

\* \* \* \* \*

But the L.M.S. find themselves, owing in large part to the war, faced by a possible deficiency of about £20,000, which, in addition to an accumulated deficit of like amount, creates a serious situation. Very gravely and reluctantly the committee have decided to close down or transfer work in India or elsewhere equivalent to an annual expenditure of £10,000, unless by the end of January there is such a definite response in the Churches as will amount to a guarantee of largely increased permanent income. The situation is being faced on the highest spiritual grounds, and we believe that the issue, whatever it be, will result in deep blessing for the society and its work. Further comment



would be out of place until the result is known, which will not be until after this number of the *CHURCHMAN* is published.

\* \* \* \* \*

The three quarterly reviews, which the writer has read almost from cover to cover, certainly make a strong presentation of missions and their related topics. *The East and The West* is unwontedly Anglican, but the number is a good one. The only Nonconformist, the Rev. J. C. K. Anstey, contributes what is perhaps the best paper on "Vernacular Training in India." Canon Robinson's historical sketch of the "Conversion of France" is specially welcome; we know too little of the early European missions. Canon Bullock-Webster is always worth reading on Church finance. The two papers on colonial education in South Africa, and the position of women there, are full of valuable information; and the sketch of the late Dr. Marks, "a pioneer missionary in Burma," is fresh and stimulating. In the Editorial Notes, an important statement from the Bishop of Nagpur is quoted, in which he characterizes as "wholly untrue" the allegations that the German missionaries in his diocese had used their position in India "to undermine the authority of the Government, or to promote German as opposed to British interests in the country."

\* \* \* \* \*

The *Moslem World* gives large space to Islam in India—a subject of primary importance, which is well discussed by the Rev. A. J. P. French of the S.P.G. Mr. H. A. Walter, one of the Literary Secretaries of the Y.M.C.A., writes on "The Ahmadiya Movement To-day." Besides papers on "The Turk in History," "The Future of Persia," and a most interesting account of the Oriental Public Library at Bankipore, there are two articles of the type which the *Moslem World* alone provides, and for which a small number of students peculiarly value it: one is a masterly discussion by Professor Duncan B. Macdonald of the clause "Begotten not Made," the other a learned and luminous paper by Canon Gairdner of Cairo on "The Doctrine of the Unity in Trinity." Increasing attention is being given in the *Moslem World* to a record of current news and literature on Islam.

\* \* \* \* \*

The *International Review of Missions*, in addition to the usual "Survey of the Year," has a fine study of "Hope," by Professor Cairns, and several articles on somewhat unusual subjects. Dr. Robert E. Speer discusses at length the "Political Environment of Missions in Siam"; Mr. Chengting T. Wang, a former member of Yuan Shih-kai's Government, contributes an incisive paper on "How to make Christianity Indigenous"; Archdeacon Kitching, of Uganda, writes on "Capturing a Language"; and there is a short suggestive paper on "Physical Education and Missionary Work."

\* \* \* \* \*

The "Missionary Survey of the Year 1915," in the January number of the *International Review*, from which we quoted last month, is an amazing evidence of the vitality of missionary work. In the teeth of all the problems raised by the war, there has been open progress, as well as a quiet undercurrent of steady advance, which energizes our hope for the future. Whilst the survey is interesting to all who care for missions, and is indispensable to students of missionary problems, it has a peculiar value for men who frequently preach or speak on missions. It provides matter for a number of striking addresses or sermons. A study of any one mission-field would be an obvious and, to most audiences, a very welcome choice, but the survey also provides a large amount of material for addresses on such subjects as "Activities of the Church in the Mission-Field"; "Missionary Education—its Promise and its Advance"; "The Harvest of a Year (record of baptisms)"; "How Missionaries Plan and Think (a study of the work of committees and conferences in the mission-fields)"; "Governments and Missions"; "The Effect of the War on German Missions"; "Social Reform in the East"; "Christian Literature and Bible Distribution," and so on. The last three pages of the survey suggest a striking line for a sermon, and references are given in the footnotes to illustrative material in the preceding pages.

\* \* \* \* \*

One of the sorrows of the war has been the suspension in part of the international fellowship in missionary work which was so remarkably fostered by the Edinburgh Conference. It is

impossible to forecast the time and the way in which fruitful intercourse with former German fellow-workers will ultimately be restored, but meantime there remains a very real internationalism in missions, though for the present it cannot be complete. An interesting illustration of this is given in a list of contributors for 1916 and after, which is inserted in the current number of the *International Review of Missions*. The announced contributors are members of nine nations: from the East—Japan, China, and India; from the Continent of Europe—Denmark, Finland, Holland, Norway, Sweden, and Russia, besides Great Britain and America. If much has been lost, much still remains.

\* \* \* \* \*

The *C.M.S. Gazette* quotes a letter from the Rev. D. Marshall Lang, of Hakodate, which bears good news of the National Evangelistic Campaign in Japan. He writes:

“ At the end of June we had our long-looked-for meetings of the Special Evangelistic Campaign. . . . One special meeting was for educationists, and, being called by the Education Society of Hakodate had a larger and more refined audience than would have otherwise come; yet another was for merchants, and, being called by the Chamber of Commerce reached all the best of that class who came to hear the testimony of one of Japan's greatest merchants of to-day, an earnest Christian of close upon eighty years of age, who goes up and down the country advocating the religion of Jesus as the best for the country and individuals alike, and you could have heard a pin fall during the delivery of his simple but forcible address. But the addresses that were universally allowed to be the most telling, because the most direct and heart-searching, yet the most simple, were those of the one Japanese lady speaker, who is a member of a well-known banking family. She was only in Hakodate for a day and a night, but spoke four times—to women, schoolgirls, schoolboys, and at a mass meeting. Audiences were good even in the theatres, and gave a quiet attention, which spoke of a real desire to hear; and at the end we had about 180 names given in of those who were ready to hear more. We thank God for His goodness all through the effort—a really ‘ united ’ effort for the salvation of the townspeople.”

\* \* \* \* \*

*The Missionary Review of the World*, which is rapidly improving in the weight and interest of its contents, has recently published an impressive study by the Rev. S. B. Rohold, of Toronto, of the place of the Jews in the various nations. Few have realized the enormous number of Jews who are fighting in the conflicting armies, many having acquitted themselves with

conspicuous bravery, or the leading place taken by Jewish financiers in the great war loans. At a time when Jewish citizens are so notably serving the nations, masses of Jews in Eastern Europe have suffered the horrors of an enforced exodus, and are homeless and penniless. By one decree of the Russian Government, 200,000 Jews were deported at a few hours' notice under conditions of appalling severity. In Palestine, the colonizing work, into which so much money had been poured, has been completely swept away by Turkish act. Jewish refugees to the number of 15,000 have taken refuge in Egypt. In this time of shattered hopes, Jewish hearts are more open to the Gospel message than ever before, and whilst British missionaries have to withdraw from Jewish work in the war zone, the work itself goes bravely on. The time has surely come when the Jews should be ranked as a mission-field with the other great national and religious divisions of the human race; when care for Jewish missions should not be the interest of a few, but of all; and when all the manifold problems of Judaism—from the attitude of the modernized and often rationalistic intellectual Jew down to that of the poor and downtrodden immigrant—should be studied with wide-minded and prayerful sympathy.

\* \* \* \* \*

No missionary literature is more inspiring than good biography, and we have been enriched by several volumes of late. Lives of two well-known C.M.S. missionaries—Miss Mary Bird of Persia, and the Rev. T. Walker of Tinnevely—are sure to come to the notice of readers of the *CHURCHMAN*; the biography of a Scottish missionary, Mary Slessor of Calabar, is less likely to become familiar. Yet it is one of the most striking missionary books of the decade, recording the extraordinary work of a woman who ranks among the finest of the great missionaries Scotland has given to the Church. The stories of the little frail woman, once a mill girl in Dundee, at work alone among the raw West African heathen are full of adventure and romance.

\* \* \* \* \*

A book of prayers, which, at a price of 5s., has been reprinted three times by Messrs. John Murray since January, 1913, and is now reissued with many improvements in a second edition at

es. 6d., must have in it qualities which meet some widespread need. "A Chain of Prayer Across the Ages: Forty Centuries of Prayer," arranged by Dr. Selina Fox, now Deputy-Governor of H.M. prison at Aylesbury and formerly a missionary in India, is designed either for use at family worship or for private devotion. Besides groups of collects, arranged for daily use and covering twenty-three weeks, there are prayers for use by children, for the medical profession, for prisons and institutions, for special seasons of the Christian year; national prayers—an excellent collection—prayers for events in the home, and a large number of varied and beautiful missionary prayers, old and new. The index of subjects shows how large a mass of material is available on any special topic, and the index of authors and sources shows the extreme interest—historical, liturgical, and devotional—of the book. It will be welcome not only in the homes of our own land, where it will aid in missionary and general intercession, but also in the mission-field, where such a book would enrich with treasures from all the ages the prayer-life of a mission-station or the devotional meetings of a missionary conference.

\* \* \* \* \*

To revert to the January magazines, they are for the most part above the average in interest. Persia claims a prominent place. The *C.M. Review* has an article by Dr. Catherine Ironside describing recent events; the *Jewish Missionary Intelligencer* has a long record of Mr. Garland's journey with the missionaries from Ispahan to Ahwaz; the *Moslem World* also devotes several pages to news from Persia and Armenia, besides Mr. Malcolm's paper. *Mercy and Truth* has several good articles, particularly one by Dr. Arthur Lankester, who has been revisiting his old work at Peshawar; the Baptist *Herald* has an account of the hospital at Tsinanfu; and in *China's Millions* there is a striking story of the founding of the Union Hospital in Changsha, in Hunan Province, in conjunction with the China Medical Board of the Rockefeller Foundation. The following articles or stories are specially fresh, and worth noting as likely to interest some who do not ordinarily read missionary publications: "Gifts of Great Price," in the *Bible in the World*; "A Village Tragedy in India," in the *S.P.G. Mission-Field*; "A Widow aged Eight,"

in *The Zenana*; "General Botha lays the Foundation-Stone of a Mission Church in the Transvaal," in the Wesleyan *Foreign Field*; a "Study of Zenana Work and its Fruits," in the B.M.S. *Herald*; and "An English Officer's Testimony," in the *C.M. Gleaner*. We note with interest that *Our Missions*, the quarterly organ of the Friends' Foreign Missions Association, is to be issued monthly henceforth; and that the C.M.S. halfpenny paper, *Awake*, is to be edited especially for men "of the industrial classes."

\* \* \* \* \*

The Central Board of Missions is doing the missionary cause a service by issuing, under the editorship of the Rev. J. O. F. Murray, a series of well-printed, attractive booklets with the general title of "Missionary Tracts for the Times." The object of the series is to aid the Church in interpreting the missionary aspects of the war. The really living character of the booklets, added to the extraordinarily low price (one penny for a sixteen-page booklet in coloured cover), should insure a wide circulation; clergy and missionary leaders will do well to see that local booksellers lay in a proper stock from the S.P.C.K., who are the publishers, and may also with advantage recommend the series to all whom they desire to influence in the direction of broader and deeper thought on Missions. The first four tracts already issued are: "The Time of our Visitation," by the Rev. J. O. F. Murray; "The Holy War," by the Rev. William Temple; "The World of To-Day and the Gospel," by Miss Ruth Rouse; and "The Building Power of Christ's Kingdom," by Archdeacon Gresford Jones.

G.



## Notices of Books.

THE MIRACLES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Professor Arthur C. Headlam, D.D. London: *John Murray*. Price 6s. net.

In this volume Dr. Headlam gives us the Moorhouse Lectures which he delivered at Melbourne in 1914, besides two other lectures delivered at Ballarat and Melbourne. Dr. Headlam remarks that the standpoint of science is changing; that it no longer binds us to a hard mechanical view of Nature; and that the deductions of comparative religion are untenable. The field is therefore open for untrammelled investigation. "Every able man who studies theological questions studies them in a spirit of research, as well as of belief," says Dr. Headlam (p. 56). He does so himself, as he is competent to do. It is therefore the more noteworthy that, approaching the question in this spirit, Dr. Headlam pronounces in favour of all the Gospel miracles, with the possible exception of the Gadarene swine. The evidence for the Resurrection he takes to be very strong, and that for the Virgin Birth quite good. It is noteworthy that Paulus, who rejected so many of the miracles, accepted that of the Virgin Birth. In view of the strength of the position criticism now shifts its ground, and says that the evidence is good, but that the events were not miracles.

The definition of a miracle is important, but we are kept waiting for Dr. Headlam's definition till near the end of the book. "A miracle really means the supremacy of the spiritual forces of the world to an extraordinarily marked degree over the mere material" (p. 335).

The Old Testament miracles, though outside the scope of the book, come in for some notice. Dr. Headlam does not champion them so bravely, though he feels that there is much to be said for them, as they belong mostly to two great periods in Israel's history—the deliverance from Egypt and the days of Elijah and Elisha. In view of the extraordinary events associated with those periods, miracles were quite possible. The settlement of Israel in the world with a special religion and revelation opened the door to them.

Dr. Headlam states three positions which may be taken with reference to New Testament miracles: (1) that Christianity is untrue; (2) that Christianity is true apart from the miraculous; (3) that Christianity is true. He reviews the treatment of miracles in the New Testament, concluding that the New Testament represents miracles as part, but part only, of the evidence for the truth of the Christian message.

In the early days of the Church miracles presented no difficulty, for men could not conceive a world without miracles. Celsus asked how Christians could appeal to miracles, when magicians performed them. Origen's reply, which Dr. Headlam emphasizes, was that our Lord's works possessed a moral character which was absent in other miracles. St. Augustine's treatment of miracles receives special commendation, as he was the first to discuss the subject in the light of a philosophy of Nature. He argued that miracles were not contrary to Nature, but to Nature as known. St. Thomas Aquinas developed St. Augustine's argument, urging

that what comes from God cannot be contrary to Nature, for God is the author of Nature. Neither would allow that a violation of the order of Nature was possible, or that miracles constituted such a violation.

Dr. Headlam proceeds to review the chief critics of miracles. He shows clearly that the ground which they took is no longer tenable, and that, after all the years of criticism, miracles still hold the field. Spinoza; Woolston, Middleton, and Hume; Paulus, Schleiermacher, Strauss; the writer of "Supernatural Religion"; Matthew Arnold and Huxley, come under notice. The apologists who met them quite held their own—Origen, as against Celsus; Butler, as against Collins or Tindal; and even Paley, as against Woolston. Hume receives fuller treatment. His position that miracles are a violation of the laws of Nature has been met by Huxley, who showed that the laws of Nature are not agents, but "a mere record of experience upon which we base our interpretations of that which does happen, and our anticipation of that which will happen" (p. 79). There are generalizations of science which we call laws, but from them must be distinguished "certain metaphysical reconstructions, in accordance with which people were in the habit of explaining Nature" (p. 85).

It is not possible, again, to contend that miracles violate the uniformity of Nature, for it is only "where the antecedents are the same, or approximately the same," that the consequences will be the same. There is no proof of inevitableness in Nature. Further, if the conception of the universe being developed according to a certain plan be entertained, there is nothing in this theory inconsistent with theism or with a belief in miracles. At the same time, "for a mechanistic explanation of the plan and development of the universe we have no evidence at all" (p. 104).

In the next lecture Dr. Headlam deals with various explanations of miracles—Sensationalism, Materialism, Pantheism, the Philosophy of the Absolute. Theism alone offers an adequate explanation of miracles. "It starts from a recognition of human personality; it explains the moral facts of life; it helps us to understand the purpose and aim of the universe" (p. 131). Belief in God implies a purpose in the world, and the existence of a purpose makes a revelation of God to man likely. We see, too, the world developing up to the revelation of God in Christ. Now, a sign of that revelation is not unreasonable. The progress of the world and religion make miracles probable.

In following up this argument, Dr. Headlam seems to indulge in what he condemns—an *a priori* argument—for he urges that we cannot believe that God would allow the belief in Christianity to grow up based on illusions (p. 145).

Dr. Headlam proceeds to review the evidence for miracles. He traces the course of New Testament criticism. The Tübingen theory is discredited, and negative criticism of the New Testament has failed. On the other hand, while making full allowance for the results of criticism, we can claim to take the three Synoptic Gospels, the Acts, and St. Paul's four chief Epistles as offering evidence for miracles. These are reviewed in turn with great care. Dr. Headlam concludes that all evidence "tells us that our Lord's life and activity were characterized by events such as are described as



miraculous." The evidence is complex, but the miraculous element cannot be separated from the rest. It is remarkable that while Q, so far as we know, was a collection of discourses, it contained much evidence on the subject of miracles.

The Resurrection and the Virgin Birth receive a lecture each. Dr. Headlam says that belief in the latter "did not play any part in the preaching of Christianity," but he thinks its value as a witness has been greater as time went on. "The Church has, therefore, wisely retained it in her creed" (p. 299).

In the eighth lecture Dr. Headlam reviews certain explanations of miracles. He says well that "it is assumed that the miracles are untrue and therefore it is necessary to discover a story which will explain how the stories grew up" (p. 327). He claims that the confession "now made that the evidence for these miracles is good, is good and decisive evidence of the reality of the miraculous" (p. 315). In the closing lecture Dr. Headlam sums up the situation. No one explanation of miracles except the Christian can be given. Critics have to give a variety of different explanations. In his closing pages Dr. Headlam appears to contradict himself. He suggests on p. 336 that it is not enough to say that God can do all things, therefore He can work miracles. On p. 338 Dr. Headlam says that, if asked whether any particular miracle were credible, he would refuse to "set any limits to the power of God's Spirit." However this may be, the lectures are a most lucid and effective presentation of the case for miracles.

The evidential value of miracles Dr. Headlam believes to have been very great in the early days of Christianity. In our own day they stand for less, yet "ultimately we come to the fact of a revelation, and in relation to that miracles seem to take a natural place" (p. 349). Something has happened which has had an immense influence on the history of mankind. Christian history tells us that that something was "the Manifestation of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and the new power that He brought into the world" (p. 351).

J. T. INSKIP.

CHURCH AND NATION. By William Temple, Rector of St. James's, Piccadilly, W. London: *Macmillan and Co.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

This volume embraces the Bishop Paddock Lectures for 1914-15, delivered at the General Theological Seminary, New York. Mr. Temple in his preface admits that he was one of those "who had allowed concern for social reform, and internal problems generally, to occupy his mind almost to the exclusion of foreign questions." Moreover, he candidly confesses that he was prepared to stake a good deal on what seemed to him the improbability of any outbreak of European war. In view of the altered situation, he determined, he tells us, to deliver himself of such views as he had formed concerning the rights and wrongs of the war itself, or the questions at stake in it. Nor does this sufficiently, in our opinion, indicate the scope of this work. Delivered to men with the work of the ministry in view, there is in these lectures a frank discussion of many problems, and Mr. Temple gives his opinion with characteristic candour.

Should the clergy take part in politics? "It seems to me, one who is called to be a priest of the Church inevitably forfeits the right to take part in the hurly-burly of party politics." Should the clergy act as combatants? Mr. Temple thinks not, and carefully states his reasons.

Even the subject of reunion is considered, and it is suggested that "in any scheme for practical reunion no man must be required to repudiate his own spiritual ancestry." It is refreshing to read that "different bodies have developed different types of religious life," and that "there is such a wealth of spiritual activity in the world now, such as it is difficult to imagine under a rigidly united Church." In order that these types may be preserved, Mr. Temple suggests that they might be retained as different Orders in a United Catholic Church—an Order of St. George Fox and an Order of St. John Wesley, for an example. The principles involved in the Kikuyu controversy are further dealt with in one of the appendices, which are not the least interesting parts of the book.

Perhaps it is only too sadly true that probably, as Mr. Temple says, not one of his suggestions will win universal assent even in our own communion. "But," he observes, "amid all our amiable sentiments, it is time for somebody to say something definite, or as definite as the complexity of the problem allows."

Anything offered in this spirit is certain to be well received, and we warmly commend this volume as a contribution towards some of the problems of our time.

LESSONS ON CELEBRITIES OF HEBREW STORY. By H. F. B. Compston and H. A. Lester. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 1s. 6d. net.

A volume of lessons for elder scholars and Bible classes in a series of graded lessons. Nearly every study is arranged on a threefold plan—preparation, presentation, and application. It is a little startling to be told, in the Introduction, that the Old Testament writers "were not scientific historians who weighed their authorities and tested their information." Surely the compiler of the early narratives of Genesis must have possessed considerable critical faculty, or, as we should prefer to call it, the inspiration of selection, which enabled him, out of a mass of material, to select what was true? Again, we are told that "the annalists, and recorders, and chroniclers, and antiquarians, of Old Testament times were preachers, not historians." It appears to be very questionable if the books of the Judges, the Kings, and Chronicles, were intended "rather for edification than information." One can hardly help wondering whether the authors lay emphasis on the "edification" because they are not certain that the "information" is always trustworthy. Many of the spiritual lessons and reflections of the Old Testament are based upon the history. It is difficult to see how they could be deemed edifying if the personages and incidents were not really historical. We do not wish to do the authors any injustice, but this seems to be their view, for they tell us that "the patriarchal narratives in Genesis are to be understood as national traditions rather than history," and on p. 61 that "the Book of Joshua includes legendary elements."

However, the lessons themselves leave nothing to be desired, and we go so far as to say that preachers as well as teachers will find much suggestive

matter in them. One point we notice, and that is that each lesson starts with a distinct "aim," which is usually stated in a single sentence. A good many sermons and lessons have this defect—they attempt too much. Others have the more glaring defect of aiming at nothing in particular, and the consequence is they leave us nowhere in particular! If preacher or teacher can enforce *one* lesson, he or she may be well content.

It is refreshing in these days, when so many endeavour to depreciate or discredit the Thirty-nine Articles, to find them referred to, and to be reminded that no Prayer-Book is complete without them.

**SOUND DOCTRINE.** By the Rev. Alfred Hewlett, D.D., sometime Incumbent of Astley, near Manchester. London: *Chas. J. Thynne*. Price 1s. net.

This is a small volume containing some thirteen sermons of the late Dr. Hewlett. He was known in his day as a very strong or what is called a hyper-Calvinist. We would be among the first to acknowledge the debt which the Reformation owed to John Calvin, and there is much in the book before us which appeals to us, and which, we think, may well be labelled "sound doctrine." When, however, Election meets us at every turn, we cannot help feeling there is a want of proportion. The writer seems indeed, if we may use the expression, to be more Calvinistic than the great reformer himself. Thus, in his note on p. 17, he objects to "setting forth the Atonement of Christ as *sufficient* for the whole of the human race, but *efficient* for the elect," though, if we are not very much mistaken, Calvin himself was the one who invented this very expression. Speaking of our Thirty-first Article, Dr. Hewlett says: "If that Article, or 1 John ii. 2, mean every individual of the human race, no soul can be lost." Whether he be right or wrong in drawing this conclusion, we utterly fail to see how the expression "the whole world," used both in the Article and in the passage referred to, can by any straining be made to mean only a section of the human race. Both Scripture and our own formularies surely teach most emphatically that our Saviour's death was a propitiation *for* the sins of the whole world, taking this in its widest sense. Whether all avail themselves of it is another matter. God's election of His people is a glorious truth, but if there is any analogy between the election of Christians and that of the Jewish nation, this would imply, not that the elect have a monopoly of salvation, but rather that God chose them, as He did Abraham, that blessing through them may be passed on to a far wider circle.

**SAVING FAITH; OR, THE GREAT QUESTION ANSWERED.** By the Rev. A. Metcalfe, with Commendatory Preface by the Bishop of Durham. Fourth and Enlarged Edition. London: *Chas. J. Thynne*. Price 1s. net.

The Great Question is, of course, that of the Philippian jailer: "What must I do to be saved?" There are six chapters, dealing respectively with the Difficulties, Object, Promise, Effects, Illustration, and Influence of Saving Faith, and these are followed by the outline of "A Solemn Dedication" of oneself to God. Referring to the book, in his Preface the Bishop of Durham writes: "I value highly its exposition of the Scriptural account both of our unspeakable need and of the 'unspeakable gift' of the Antidote.

Taking these chapters in their plain central message, I read in them that 'old story' which is yet for ever new to the conscience touched by the Spirit of God. I read it set forth with beautiful clearness, fidelity, and sympathy; and, above all, I find it so presented as always to remind the reader, as he ponders the thoughtful pages and their luminous statements 'of the way,' that we are actually saved, not by doctrine, however true, but by the Saviour—Personal, Living, Loving; the place of peace and purity and power is only found in Him." Recommendation so strong from such an authority should be an excellent advertisement for the book. The author is evidently a keen, and we should think a successful, soul-winner, and seems thoroughly to understand personal dealing with those who are anxious about their soul's welfare. It would be an excellent volume to place in the hands of those who, like the jailer of Philippi, want to be saved. The following sentence is a suggestive one: "Look away from yourself, then, look away even from your own looking, and see nothing but Jesus, and the Son of God revealed in Him as your Saviour."

THE SHADOW ON THE UNIVERSE; OR, THE PHYSICAL RESULTS OF WAR.

By I. M. Clayton. London: *Simpkin, Marshall and Co., Ltd.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

"The object of this book," we are told, "is to prove that warfare engenders a process of physical degeneration which must eventually bring about the extermination of the human race." We quite agree with the author that war is a very dreadful thing, and believe it should only be resorted to as a very last resource, and should at the proper time be prepared to welcome any counsels which make for international peace. At the present time, however, seeing we have been forced into what is for us a just and righteous war for the defence of the weak and the oppressed, and possibly for the very existence of our nation and Empire, and that against an enemy who refuses to be bound by the most solemn contracts, a work like the one before us seems ill-timed, and likely to weaken the hands of those who are striving at all costs, and, as we believe, rightly, to bring the present conflict to a successful issue. We are glad to note a sentence like the following: "The varied peoples that comprise the British Empire, their diverse characteristics, temperaments, and individualities, and yet their complete unity in a crucial hour, proves the efficacy of the rule of liberty and freedom, which leaves each independent to develop its own individuality, and yet in their heart of hearts binds them by an invisible bond of fellowship into one imperial whole." Would all this, however, have been brought into such prominence as it has if it had not been for the position into which the present war has placed us? Our fear is that the tenets of the volume before us, by discouraging recruiting, may prolong the war, and so have an effect very opposite to that which the writer seeks.

CHRIST OUR EXAMPLE. By Caroline Fry. With Prefaces by the Rev. Canon Christopher, M.A., and Introductory Biography by the Rev. Thomas S. Dickson, M.A., and a new Foreword by the Rev. E. L. Langston, M.A. London: *Charles J. Thynne.* Price 1s. net.

A reissue of a well-known and most valuable book. The Prefaces by the late Canon Christopher should be carefully read. He was a great admirer

of Miss Fry's little work. It was at his suggestion, and, indeed, at his risk, that the book was reduced in price, first to 1s. 6d., and afterwards to 1s. He himself purchased large quantities of the treatise, and constantly gave away copies to his Oxford and other friends. The present issue completes the thirty-first thousand, a testimony in itself to the value and popularity of the work. In his Foreword, after referring to those who have to confess "My life is one constant struggle to overcome my natural tendencies, and proneness to self-indulgence, luxury, prayerlessness, and indifference," Mr. Langston writes: "My dear friend, I am glad to be able to tell you that there is a glorious Gospel for Christians. . . . There is absolutely no need whatever for the soul to be constantly defeated in the battle of life. There is a glorious life of liberty, power, rest and peace for every believer." It is on this very account that he recommends the prayerful study of Miss Caroline Fry's book. The short account of her life, entitled "Caroline Fry: a Story of Grace," by the Rev. Thomas Dickson, will be found a valuable and interesting addition to the volume. It is reprinted from "The Life of Faith," December, 1908. We are glad that so valuable a work is being kept before the public, and that, although first published in 1832, it is not being allowed to fall in any sense out of date, as it certainly ought not to do.

STUDIES IN REVIVAL. Edited by Cyril C. B. Bardsley, M.A., and T. Guy Rogers, B.D. With a Foreword by the Archbishop of Canterbury. London: *Longmans, Green and Co.* Price 6d.

We are not surprised to see that Mr. Bardsley's former manual, "The Way of Renewal," is already in its eighth thousand—indeed, we prophesied its success a few months ago. We now heartily welcome and warmly commend this new little book, "Studies in Revival." Its appearance is most opportune—at a time when a National Mission is being talked about, and when efforts are being made to stir up faith and fervour. It should be read not only by the clergy in town and country, but it should be freely circulated among Church-workers and among the many communicants who do little or nothing for the cause of Christ. The Bishop of Stepney strikes the first note in a stirring chapter, "The Hour is Come," while Mr. Guy Rogers follows appropriately and suggestively with "Lessons from the Past." Six sectional studies deal with various spheres of labour, and contain valuable hints to workers. The Bishop of Durham and Mr. Bardsley contribute the closing chapters on "The Breaking Forth of His Glory" and "Revival a Practical Possibility." Let no one be tempted to ignore this book because of its price—"the nimble sixpence"—for it is worth more than many times this sum. An edition in cloth binding may be had for a shilling.

FAMILY PRAYERS. By the Very Rev. J. C. Vaughan, D.D., sometime Dean of Llandaff. New edition. London: *Elliot Stock.* Price 2s. 6d. net.

The fact that recently several well-known books for family worship have made their reappearance seems to indicate that the late Lord Roberts' example and commendation have happily led to a revival of this practice. Since the days of Richard Hooker few divines have merited the title "Learned and Judicious" more than Dean Vaughan, and these devotions are just what we should expect them to be—deeply reverent, comprehensive, sober, and

couched in dignified yet simple language. In the original preface, which is reproduced—dated September 8, 1871—Dr. Vaughan tells us what he feels such a book ought to be, and it is not too much to say—the passage was quoted in last month's *CHURCHMAN*—that he has quite come up to his own ideal. Some may think, perhaps, it is a pity that some special prayers have not been added, particularly as the new edition makes its appearance in war time, but, then, Dean Vaughan's style is inimitable, and prayers from a new pen might have broken the sense of unity and continuity.

**THE CHILDREN'S BREAD.** Thoughts on the Church's Year: Advent to Trinity. For Sunday-School Scholars. By M. L. McClure. With numerous Illustrations. London: S.P.C.K. Price 2s. net.

Mrs. McClure tells us in her preface: "These teachings were first published in *Our Empire*, a weekly magazine for children which circulates throughout the Mother-country and Colonies—to a large extent in the remote districts of Canada. . . . Many of the instructions are taken almost verbatim from the catechizings given by the present Dean of Rochester to the children at St. Peter's, Eaton Square." Some, she tells us, "have been revised by his own hand." The book is written in a forceful and interesting style, and, besides the pictorial illustrations, there are not a few illustrative but brief, anecdotes. It is got up in an attractive form. The teaching, including as it does much that is very good, is cast in a distinctly High Church and strong Sacramentarian mould, which, while it will appeal to those of its own school, will be disappointing to Evangelical Churchmen.

**WHEN GOD CAME.** London: C. M. S. House. Price 6d. net.

Here are three delightful pen-pictures—Italy in the thirteenth century, Germany in the fourteenth century, and England in the eighteenth. In other words, the anonymous writer tells in these pages the stories of the Franciscan movement, the times and call of Francis of Assisi; of the Friends of God and the life and work of John Tauler, the Dominican; and the Evangelical Revival, with special reference to John Wesley, George Whitefield, Fletcher of Madeley, William Romaine, John Newton, Charles Simeon, and others. The closing chapter, headed "To-day, if ye will hear His Voice," is a forcible and fervent appeal—in which the lessons of the past are summed up—for sacrifice and service. It is suggested that the book may be used after the Study Circle method, and with a view to this outlines for study have been prepared. These may be obtained from the publishing manager, C.M.S. House, price 2d. Those who convene such circles may be sure of interest and profit.

**THE CHURCH CATECHISM EXPLAINED TO CHILDREN.** For Scholars without a Teacher. By M. L. McClure. With numerous Illustrations. London: S.P.C.K. Price 2s. net.

Uniform with "The Children's Bread," and, like most of the instructions in that volume, the great majority of these catechizings were given by Dean Storrs, of Rochester, at St. Peter's, Eaton Square, as he himself tells us in his preface. The theological flavour is the same as "The Children's

Bread." There are some fifty-one illustrations—more than in the companion volume—and many excellent and suggestive anecdotes. There is a beautiful one on p. 55 illustrating atonement and vicarious suffering which ought to appeal to children.



## Publications of the Month.

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

### BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

- UNLIKELY MINISTRIES OF GOD.** By the Rev. J. Stuart Holden. (*Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* is. net.) Those who heard Mr. Holden's remarkable address at Keswick last July on "The Unlikely Ministries of God" will be glad to possess this volume, and those who did not will like to make its acquaintance. They will find it rich and fruitful to a rare degree. In a series of chapters on the ministries respectively of Darkness, Withdrawal, Delay, and Contradiction Mr. Holden deals with some of the most urgent spiritual problems of the time. He is always buoyant, always encouraging, always uplifting.
- THE GREATER MEN AND WOMEN OF THE BIBLE.** Edited by the Rev. James Hastings, D.D. (*T. and T. Clark.* 8s. net; subscription price 6s. net.) Volume V. of this most interesting and valuable series. Among the men are Andrew, the two Herods, James, John the Baptist, Matthew, Thomas, and others; while among the women are the Virgin Mary, Martha and Mary, and Mary Magdalene. Each of these volumes represents wonderfully wide research, and will be found of the utmost service to clergy and religious teachers generally.
- THE HISTORY OF THE TEN "LOST" TRIBES.** By David Baron. (*Morgan and Scott, Ltd.* is. net.) The Anglo-Israel theory has a charm for many people, but before making up one's mind it is just as well that consideration should be given to what is said on the other side. Mr. Baron's volume will well repay perusal. It examines the theory in the light of Scripture and history, and—refutes it.
- INTERCOMMUNION WITH THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH.** By the Rev. R. W. Burnie. (*S.P.C.K.* is. net.) A series of addresses on "The Schism between East and West and the Possible Healing" which have a special interest at this time. But Mr. Burnie's view-point is different from ours.
- THE VOYAGE OF LIFE.** By the Rev. Canon Ball. (*S.P.C.K.* is. 6d. net.) An exposition of the narrative of St. Paul's voyage towards Rome, as related in the Acts, with a direct application to the voyage of human life.
- LYRA CHRISIL.** By Alfred Ernest Knight. (*Morgan and Scott, Ltd.*) A volume of metrical musings on the life of our Lord, reverential in tone, spiritual in teaching, and restful in purpose.
- CHRIST AND THE CHURCH.** By the Rev. A. W. Robinson, D.D. (*S.P.C.K.* is. net.) A Sequel to "God and the World," and a welcome addition to that most useful series of evidential books drawn up at the instance of the Christian Evidence Society.
- THE ETHIOPIC LITURGY: ITS SOURCES, DEVELOPMENT, AND PRESENT FORM.** By the Rev. Samuel A. B. Mercer, Ph.D. (*A. R. Mowbray and Co., Ltd.*) The Hale Lectures for 1914-1915. An exhaustive treatise of great interest and value to all liturgical students.
- FATHER STANTON'S LAST SERMONS IN ST. ALBAN'S, HOLBORN.** Edited, with a Preface, by the Rev. E. F. Russell. (*Hodder and Stoughton.* 5s. net.) A collection of sermons specially reported on the initiative of Sir W. Robertson Nicoll. These sermons will repay the most careful perusal; they are a striking exposition of the mind—and the heart—of a great preacher who, with intense devotion to what are known as "Catholic principles," combined a strong love for the simplicity of the Gospel.

- A BOOK OF THE CHILDHOOD OF CHRIST. (*Philip Lee Warner.*) Pictures of Old Masters, interspersed with text.
- AND MARY SINGS MAGNIFICAT. By the Ven. E. E. Holmes. (*A. R. Mowbray and Co., Ltd.* 1s. 6d. net.) With six illustrations in colour, by Lilian J. Pocock.
- TWELVE GIFTS. Quotations from English writers on the Fruits of the Spirit, arranged for daily use. By A. Harvey Jones. (*Robert Scott.* 1s. net.) A very precious little book.
- THE DAWN OF RELIGION IN THE MIND OF THE CHILD. By Edith E. Read Mumford, M.A. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 1s. 6d. net.) This study of child life is most interesting, and is likely to be useful. It recognizes that in the heart of a child's being God has laid the foundation: the nature of the superstructure reared upon it depends upon the materials teachers bring, and the conditions secured for building thereon.
- THIS TIME AND ITS INTERPRETATION. By the Bishop of Edinburgh. (*Robert Scott.* 2s. 6d. net.) Bishop Walpole has given us an eminently reasonable and an altogether inspiring volume. It consists of a series of most helpful expositions on our Lord's last discourse, and will claim the attention not only of that large company of readers whom the Bishop always commands, but also of many more who are anxious to know all they can about "this time and its interpretation."
- THE RETURN OF THE KING. By the Rev. F. J. Horsefield. (*Marshall Bros., Ltd.* 2s. 6d.) A treatise—interesting, careful and illuminating—on the certainty, meaning, and nearness of the Second Advent.
- THE CREED OF A YOUNG CHURCHMAN. By the Rev. H. A. Wilson. (*Robert Scott.* 2s. net.) We offer, as we believe Churchmen generally will offer, a hearty welcome to this volume. It is the book for which many clergy have long been waiting, and it meets most admirably a great need. Whenever a young person drifts away after Confirmation it is often due to want of an intelligent appreciation of the position of Church membership. Mr. Wilson, in a series of chapters—most attractively written—offers help, guidance, and instruction well fitted to strengthen the attachment of young people to the Church.

### WAR LITERATURE.

- RAEMAEKERS' CARTOONS. (*Hodder and Stoughton.* 2d.) A collection of forty cartoons by the eminent Dutch artist, Louis Raemaekers, depicting with a vividness and pathos it would be hard to equal, and impossible to excel, the many outrages committed against Belgium and the Belgian people. These cartoons will do much to bring home to people the brutality and infamy of Germany.
- THE BRITISH DOMINIONS YEAR-BOOK for 1916 (*British Dominions General Insurance Co., Ltd.*) contains contributions of special importance in connection with the war by E. Charles Vivian, Fred. T. Jane, Edgar Crammond, Edward Salmon, Sir Leo Chiozza Money, Sir Laurence Gomme, J. Ellis Barker, H. Massac Buist; and C. G. Grey, Lady St. Helier, and other authorities, on the various phases of our Imperial and National life.
- THE BISHOP OF LONDON'S VISIT TO THE FRONT. By his Chaplain. (*Longmans, Green and Co.* Presentation edition, 2s. 6d. net.)
- THE WAR AND THE PROPHETS. By F. D. (*Morgan, Son and Co., Ltd.* 2s. net.) A remarkable book, which all students of the religious aspects of the war should read. The author's view is that the Kaiser is "Anti-Christ."
- THE EAGLES AND THE CARCASE. By "Theta." (*Morgan, Son and Co., Ltd.* 2s. 6d. net.) A most interesting book, designed to show "the sacred origin of the war, its gigantic issues, and the glorious destiny of the English-speaking race."
- EUROPE IN ARMS: A CONCISE HISTORY OF THE GREAT EUROPEAN WAR. Vol. I. By Everard Wyrall. (*Bertram Wright and Co., Ltd.*) The first volume of what promises to be a work of inestimable value. Mr. Wyrall has adopted the chronological order, and the present volume deals only with the events from the presentation of the Austrian Note to Serbia to Von Kluck's retreat from Paris. He has relied wholly upon official records, and these he has woven into a narrative which is not only thrilling, but is also most illuminating in its estimate of events. It is sumptuously illustrated, and we look forward with great pleasure to succeeding volumes.
- "WHO DIES IF ENGLAND LIVE?" From "The One who Looked On." (*Elliot Stock.* 1s. net.) A pathetic little volume, which will move many hearts.



**MISSIONARY.**

**MAY BIRD IN PERSIA.** By Clara C. Rice. With Foreword by Bishop Stileman. (C.M.S. 3s. 6d.) A wonderfully interesting biography of a most remarkable woman-traveller, whose heart beat strong and true in its sympathy with missionary enterprise. It should be widely read.

**GENERAL.**

- SECOND STRING.** By Anthony Hope. (*T. Nelson and Sons.*) A further and most welcome addition to Nelson's famous "Sevenpenny Series."
- THE CABIN.** By Stewart E. White. (*T. Nelson and Sons.*) A Californian story of great interest, and a notable addition to Nelson's Shilling Library.
- CAPTAIN LOBE.** By John Law. (*Hodder and Stoughton.* 1s. net.) A Salvationist story, full of life, vigour, and movement, first published twenty-five years ago, but its encouragements for the Social Reformer are as strong to-day as they were then.
- NOTES ON THE CATHEDRALS: Southwark and St. Edmundsbury.** By W. H. Fairbairns. (*S.P.C.K.* 1d. each.)
- THE THREE BEARS.** Edited by F. J. Harvey Darton. (*Wells Gardner and Co., Ltd.* 1s. 6d.) Tales from a wonder book of beasts.
- THE LITTLE GIRLS' KNITTING AND CROCHET BOOK.** Edited by Flora Klickmann. (*R.T.S.* 1s. net.)

**ANNUAL VOLUMES.**

**THE DAWN OF DAY** (*S.P.C.K.*, 1s.); **GOLDEN SUNBEAMS** (*S.P.C.K.*, 1s. 6d.); **THE HERALD OF MERCY ANNUAL** (*Morgan and Scott*, 1s.); **CHATTERBOX NEWSBOX** (*Wells Gardner, Darton and Co.*, 1s. net); **THE BRITISH MESSENGER** (*Drummond's Tract Depot*, 1s.); **THE GOSPEL TRUMPET** (*Drummond's Tract Depot*, 6d.); **GOOD NEWS** (*Drummond's Tract Depot*, 5d.).

**PERIODICALS.**

- THE HIBBERT JOURNAL.** (*Williams and Norgate.* Annual subscription, 10s.) The January issue of this well-known "quarterly" has the following articles: On Some Moral Aspects and Issues of the Present War (Count Goblet d'Alviella). The "Fight for Right" Movement (Sir Frederick Pollock, Bart.). Against Departmental Religion (Right Rev. J. W. Diggle, D.D.). Mr. Balfour's "Theism and Humanism" (Professor A. S. Pringle-Pattison). Vitalism (Charles A. Mercier, M.D.). The Human Mind *versus* the German Mind (Professor George T. Ladd). The Definite Failure of Christianity, and How it might be Retrieved (Miss M. E. Robinson). Is Christianity Practicable? (Professor William Adams Brown). The Incompetence of the Mere Scholar to interpret Christianity (Professor E. Armitage). The Warlike Context of the Gospels (Rev. Charles Hargrove, D.Litt.). Quality *versus* Quantity as the Standard of Industry and Life (C. R. Ashbee). Religion in Russia To-Day (Professor J. Y. Simpson). Nationalism and Cosmopolitanism (Rev. R. H. Law). There are also Discussions, Surveys and Reviews in abundance.
- THE ENGLISH CHURCH REVIEW.** (*Longmans, Green and Co.* 6d. net.) The January issue has a goodly budget of Notes and Criticisms and the following articles: The Archbishop of Melbourne on Reunion. The Episcopate at the Reformation—II. (Rev. Professor Whitney). The Sacrament of Penance—II. (Rev. H. U. Whelpton). Christian Doctrine and Prayer for the Departed. Montalembert (the Editor). The Protestant Conception of the Church (Stahl). 1865 (the Editor). The Olympian Attitude (Rev. Fr. Neville Figgis). The Parting of the Ways (Geraldine E. Hodgson, Litt.D.).
- THE CHURCH MISSIONARY REVIEW** (*C.M.S.*, 6d.) has an illuminating survey of "Islam in Africa," by the Rev. G. T. Manley, and the following articles: Primary and Secondary Education in India (C. A. C. Streatfeild). Recent Events in Persia (Dr. Catherine M. Ironside). A Missionary Pioneer of the Western Prairies. Studies in Revival, Difficulties—Opportunities—God (Rev. Canon J. Gurney Hoare, M.A.). In Memoriam: I. John R. Wolfe (Rev. J. Martin). II. Elizabeth Armstrong (Rev. J. R. Longley Hall). III. John E. Robinson (Rev. H. Sykes).

