

# 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

August, 1917.

## The Month.

**Convocation  
and the  
Nation.** THE Convocation of Canterbury has not improved its position by its proceedings at the July Session. Indeed when we recall the doings of this body during the last three years we feel that it would have been no loss—it might even have been an advantage—to the Church if its sittings had been suspended for the period of the war. We find it difficult to understand its attitude towards the War and National Questions. Members of Convocation, in their individual capacity, no doubt, feel as strongly and as deeply as the rest of us the gravity of the crisis through which the nation is passing, but, collectively, and in their corporate capacity, they seem to be altogether remote from the actualities of life. Will it be believed that although the agenda paper of the Lower House contained several motions relating to matters of national importance, no time could be found for the discussion of any of them? Yet the House sat for four days. The Revision of the Prayer Book, the Expurgation of the Psalms, the whittling away of the Divine authority of Holy Scripture—these were the things which the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury seemed to consider of the greater importance in this the third year of the great war. Is it any wonder that the nation is out of touch with the Church? The gulf between the Church and the nation, or, as some would prefer to put it, between the nation and the Church, is becoming wider and wider, and our great fear is that unless something is done soon to bring Church and nation more closely together the gulf may become unbridgeable. That there are faults on both sides we are well aware, but the clergy

of the Church—and in particular those in Convocation who have a special responsibility resting upon them—ought to be eager above all others to serve the nation and to lead the people along lines that will make for the nation's highest welfare.

But the Lower House is not alone to blame. The "The Man in the Street." Upper House has laid itself open to very severe criticism, from which it has been impossible to escape. To take one subject only, it is evident from some of the secular newspapers that the way Convocation has treated parts of Holy Scripture has shocked even "the man in the street." Thus the *Evening Standard* of July 9, *à propos* the controversy on the omission of Psalm lviii., asked the President of the Convocation these three questions, but we eliminate the direct personal reference as being alike unworthy and unfair, and apply the questions to the general body of Convocation: "1. Did they not, when ordained deacons of the Church of England, profess unfeigned belief in 'all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament,' and also undertake to 'diligently read the same unto the people assembled in the church'? 2. Do they not, on the Second Sunday in Advent, recite the Collect beginning 'Blessed Lord, who hast caused all Holy Scriptures to be written for our learning'? 3. Whence do they derive authority to repudiate their ordination vow and go back on the Collect'?" These questions are sufficiently direct, and that they should appear where they did is a fact of the utmost significance. The manner in which the Question to Deacons was treated was simply deplorable.

This question came down from the Upper House in the following form: "Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament *as conveying to us in many parts and in divers manners the Revelation of God, which is consummated in Jesus Christ?*" The words in italics are an addition to the Question as it stands in the Prayer Book. The Dean of Christ Church moved and the Archdeacon of Gloucester seconded a motion that the Lower House concur in the recommendation of the Upper House. The Dean of Canterbury moved as an amendment that the Question be as follows: "Do you acknowledge that the Holy Scriptures of

the Old and New Testament were given by Divine inspiration ? ” but he found only four supporters, the amendment being rejected by sixty-three to five. Then Canon Wood moved to insert the words “ by Divine authority ” after the words “ as conveying to us. ” He received a larger measure of support, but on a vote being taken the amendment was rejected by fifty-two to thirty-one. The House, however, accepted an amendment to substitute the word “ fulfilled ” for “ consummated ” ; but it rejected by fifty-two to twenty-one, an amendment by Canon Wood that the last words should read “ in our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God ” ; and it also rejected by forty-five to nineteen a proposal that the final words should be “ fulfilled in the Incarnate Word, our Lord Jesus Christ. ” Finally it agreed by seventy votes to five that the concluding words should be “ in our Lord Jesus Christ. ” We make no comment upon this haggling over a form of words to express the Divinity of our Lord : we simply state the facts. Next a proposal was made to omit the words “ in many parts, ” but the amendment was rejected, and finally the question as sent down by the Bishops was concurred in by seventy-four votes to four. The suggested object of the change is to relieve tender consciences in the case of men hereafter to be ordained ; it does not seem to have any weight with Convocation that the new form of words will deeply wound the consciences of thousands of loyal Churchpeople of the present generation.

Having thus finished the consideration of the latest Psalm lviii. Report of the Joint Committee on the Royal Letters of Business, the Lower House entered upon the Report of the Joint Committee on the use of the Psalter, and expressed its approval of the omission of Psalm lviii., and of portions of other Psalms as follows : Psalms xiv. 5-7 ; lv. 16, 24, 25 ; lxxviii. 21-23 ; lxxix. 23-29 ; cix. 5-19 ; cxxxvii. 7-9 ; cxxxix. 19-22 ; cxl. 9, 10 ; cxliii. 12 (adding the final words “ for I am Thy servant ” to verse 11) ; the reason alleged for these omissions being unsuitability for use in public worship in these days. The Dean of Canterbury and some others protested, but in vain. The action of Convocation has excited widespread opposition in *The Times*, the controversy raging round the omission of Psalm lviii. Archdeacon Hobhouse rushed to the defence of the majority of the Lower House, claiming that the “ true cause of objection to such Psalms is that, when the

Psalmist wrote, men did not as yet discriminate between moral indignation against sin and personal vindictiveness against the sinner." In support of his plea he quoted what the late Dr. Driver said in a "striking sermon" on Psalm cix. : "The foes of the Psalmist may have been hostile to a *cause*, but they have also attacked and persecuted a *person*: and the personal feeling thus aroused is what finds expression in the imprecations which have been quoted. And it is just this feeling of personal hate and personal animosity which, judged by the standpoint of Christian ethics, stands condemned." The Archdeacon continued: "Can 'H. C.' [the correspondent whom he was answering] really defend the use of such expressions in Christian worship? Does he really wish to see the teeth of the ungodly broken in their mouths, or their children dashed against the stones? If we are to repeat such expressions without meaning them, it makes our public worship unreal; and if we are to repeat them *ex animo* it will make it vindictive and un-Christian." To this letter the Dean of Canterbury promptly replied by pointing out that the statement which is quoted from the late Dr. Driver "gives the lie direct to the Psalmists, and is an inexcusable libel on them." "He alleges" (the Dean continued) "that the personal feeling, aroused by personal attacks on them, is what finds expression in the imprecations which have been quoted. On the contrary, the uniform language of the Psalmist is that of verse 21 of Psalm cxxxix. : 'Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate Thee, and am I not grieved with those that rise up against Thee?' So in Psalm lviii., it is not the Psalmist personally, but 'the righteous,' who shall rejoice when he seeth the vengeance. If people like the Germans make themselves in body and soul the champions of evil we are bound to hate them in that capacity." The Dean, however, saw some compensating advantages in the action of Convocation. "They have given a prominence to Psalm lviii. which it would not otherwise have enjoyed, and have thus put into the mouths and hearts of thousands of Englishmen and Churchmen one of the grandest expressions of the righteous indignation by which we ought to be animated." It is this aspect of the question which has impressed the imagination of the people, and it is difficult to say they are not right. The constant recollection and repetition of Psalm lviii. will assuredly help us all to place the barbarities of the Germans in their right perspective.

The laity have no power of government in the Church of England, and it is one of the strongest advantages of the scheme put forward by the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on the Relations of Church and State (which has our cordial approval), that under it the laity are to be given a statutory place. It is to be hoped that whatever may happen to other portions of the scheme, there will be no whittling away, but rather a strengthening of the status and powers of the laity. A tremendous change will be effected if ever the scheme become a reality, and it may be hoped the laity will use their powers wisely and well. It will take them some time to accommodate themselves to the altered circumstances, for, as things are at present, they are practically ignored in many matters affecting the welfare of the Church, although there are voluntary Houses of Laymen already in existence. Take, for example, the question of the Revision of the Prayer Book, in regard to which the laity are most deeply concerned. It has been said that before the work is finally disposed of the proposed alterations will be submitted to the Houses of Laymen. No doubt this will be done, but in what form, and what length of time will these Houses be allowed for considering the many intricate and difficult questions involved? The question is not unimportant. Convocation has been at work on Revision for ten years: will the Houses of Laymen be given even one year in which to go through these changes seriatim and see whether or not they approve of them? If Convocation really desired to give the laity a substantial voice—such as, even under our present system, they are morally entitled to have—in the work of revision, they should have called the laity into consultation long ago, and submitted the proposed changes to them one by one. If that had been done it would quickly have been seen how completely out of touch Convocation is with general Church opinion on many points of vital importance to the Church of England. As it is, if the proposed changes are to be submitted *en bloc* and the Houses of Laymen are asked to take them or leave them, it is to be feared they will take them rather than that the labours of Convocation should be thrown away. But that will be no fair index of genuine lay opinion. Revision of the Prayer Book on wise and reasonable lines is greatly needed. But much of the work of Convocation has been neither wise nor reasonable; it has simply pandered to the reactionaries.

Not the least interesting feature in the Forms of **The Nation's Cause.** Prayer issued by authority (through the S.P.C.K.) for use on August 4 and 5 in connexion with the Third Anniversary of the War, is the Address to the People provided for delivery by the Minister in Church or at any service in the open air. It is short, but very much to the point, and may be commended to careful attention. After re-stating the motives with which three years ago we entered upon the War, and declaring that our record is clear before God and man, the Address proceeds:—

The events of the past three years have more than justified our entrance upon the war. The action of our enemy has been such as to make the issues at stake increasingly plain. We are fighting for truth, for justice, for decency in warfare, for the world's freedom from oppression, for the very possibility of its progress in the future. And the conviction that this is so has now brought to our side the great Republic of the West, to share in the same struggle and thereby to confirm our faith in the righteousness of our cause.

As we look back we thank God to-day for the spirit of unity which He gave us at home, for the loyal co-operation of our brothers from beyond the seas, for the harmony which has existed between ourselves and our Allies, and for the measure of success which He has already granted to our arms.

As our thoughts go out to those who are facing the perils of war, and to those who bear the burden of work at home, we are bound to ask ourselves plainly whether we are doing all that in us lies, by self-restraint in the matter of food, by the limitation of our expenditure, by contributions of money, and by acts of personal service, to show our gratitude to those who are defending our national honour and protecting our very lives. Is our conscience clear as we kneel to pray for God's blessing on their efforts? We are here before God this day to dedicate ourselves afresh to the task which we have undertaken, to reaffirm our unalterable determination, to renew our strength as we wait upon Him.

Lastly, with bowed heads we reverently salute the dead who have given their lives in this sacred cause, humbly thanking God for their courage and devotion, and solemnly resolving in His Name that we will not leave their work unfinished, nor suffer their great sacrifice to have been made in vain.

There is the true ring about these words, and it is of the highest importance in view of the activities of so-called "pacifists" and other cranks that we should ever keep to the front the fact that we are fighting for truth, justice and freedom.

At a great meeting at Queen's Hall, held on Monday, **Life and Liberty.** July 16, under the presidency of the Rev. William Temple, the following resolution was adopted with only one dissentient: "That whereas the present conditions under which the Church lives and works constitute an intolerable hindrance to its spiritual activity, this meeting instructs the Council, as a first

step, to approach the Archbishops, in order to urge upon them that they should ascertain without delay, and make known to the Church at large, whether and on what terms Parliament is prepared to give freedom to the Church in the sense of full power to manage its own life, that so it may the better fulfil its duty to God and to the nation and its mission to the world." It seems to be clear that this new Movement will speedily become a force to be reckoned with. The speeches at the meeting did not afford very much light upon the methods by which the promoters hope to gain their objective, but those who want to learn more about the Movement should read *Life and Liberty*, a pamphlet by the Rev. William Temple, published by Macmillan & Co., Ltd., price 3*d.* The Movement is designed to secure Self-Government for the Church, and Mr. Temple sets forth some of the causes for which it is necessary. These relate to finance and administration—parochial, capitular, diocesan, and provincial and ecumenical. How ambitious is the programme of reform let the following extract suffice:—

My proposal is that there should be a great subdivision of the Province of Canterbury, and also of York if that be thought necessary. The division might work out as follows [the asterisk denotes new dioceses], though no importance whatever is attached to these details:—

*Province.*—Canterbury. *Dioceses.*—Canterbury, Rochester, Chelmsford, St. Albans (4).

*Province.*—London. *Dioceses.*—London (the City), Stepney, Islington, Willesden, Kensington, Southwark, Croydon (6).

*Province.*—Winchester. *Dioceses.*—Winchester, Chichester, Salisbury, Oxford, Guildford,\* Southampton \* (or Portsmouth) (6).

*Province.*—Exeter. *Dioceses.*—Exeter, Truro, Bath and Wells, Bristol, Gloucester, Hereford, Plymouth,\* Barnstaple \* (8).

*Province.*—St. David's. *Dioceses.*—St. David's, Llandaff, Bangor, St. Asaph (4).

*Province.*—Lichfield. *Dioceses.*—Lichfield, Southwell, Peterborough, Worcester, Birmingham, Stafford,\* Derby,\* Coventry,\* Leicester,\* Shrewsbury \* (10).

*Province.*—Ely. *Dioceses.*—Ely, Lincoln, Norwich, St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich (5).

The Province of York (11 dioceses) might remain for a time as at present, or a new province might be created for Lancashire, Westmorland, and Cumberland. Thus there would be eight or nine provinces. Each would have its Council or Synod to determine questions of special concern to itself. . . . There would also be a Council or Synod for the Church as a whole, and the Archbishop of Canterbury would preside over it, having the functions of a Patriarch.



## Why not "A Church of the British Nation" ?

**T**HERE is a great body of doctrine, in accepting which, whatever their differences in other respects may be, all Christian men are absolutely at one. We have "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." On the other hand, there is nothing which hinders the progress of Christianity in the world at large more than the disunion which to-day exists among the different members of the Christian Commonwealth. These two facts seem contradictory to one another, but they are both true. It is evident therefore that the disunion can continue only through the fact of their essential union being forgotten or denied. Disunion being as prejudicial as union is beneficial, it should be the object of every true Christian to endeavour to discover and remove the causes of disunion as far as possible. The fact that there is this agreement upon the great mass of the leading fundamental doctrines of Christianity shows us that we must seek the causes of disagreement in the acceptance, on the part of certain sections of the Christian Church, of doctrines which are of less real importance. On examination we find that some of these distinctive doctrines are diametrically opposed to the teaching of Christ and His Apostles, while in other cases too much importance is ascribed to unimportant matters, or at least to things of merely secondary value. It is historically easy to trace some of them to non-Christian sources, as Bishop Lightfoot<sup>1</sup> has done in the case of the dogma of a Christian Sacrificial Priesthood distinct from the spiritual Priesthood of all believers. In the same way it has been shown by Dean Stanley and others that some of the ceremonies and the dress of the officiating ministers in certain Churches are of heathen, or at least of non-Christian, origin. This being so, it is hardly a matter for surprise that the introduction of such things should have had a disintegrating effect upon the Church of Christ.

The last great prayer of our Lord and Saviour before His crucifixion for us all was that we all might be one in Him.<sup>2</sup> We find also the distinct intimation that, if we are not, the world will not believe in His Divine Mission. We see therefore the absolute necessity, not only of agreeing in secret upon all the essential doctrines of

<sup>1</sup> *Dissertation on the Christian Ministry.*

<sup>2</sup> John xvii. 21.

Christianity, but also of *realizing* that agreement as fully as possible. Macaulay has well pointed out that to disunion and dissension between the various Reformed Churches was in large measure due the cessation of the progress of the Reformation in the rest of Europe, nay more, the loss of many countries where it had already achieved a very considerable degree of success. The Protestant Churches were in reality one in rejecting everything unscriptural in doctrine as well as in accepting all the fundamental truths of Christianity, as taught in the Creeds. But their differences on comparatively speaking trivial points prevented them from recognizing their unity. They therefore quarrelled with one another, and thereby gave their common foe an opportunity of which he was not slow to avail himself. In spite of this, Protestant Christians up to the present day have failed in this matter to learn wisdom from experience. We have not yet closed up our ranks, and hence there is always room for our opponents to step in and part us still further from one another.

The first essential in the way of effecting a cure for this state of things is to *realize* our unity and to take steps for some outward expression of it. Between ourselves on the one hand and the Greek and Roman Churches on the other there exists a barrier which at present seems insuperable. They have adopted and added to the teachings of Christ certain dogmas which are in direct opposition to the Gospel. These they insist on our accepting; and this we cannot do, because we are entrusted with the preservation of "the faith once for all delivered to the saints." We dare not mingle with it doctrines which are distinctly of heathen origin. We have seen in the past how these doctrines have corrupted the Faith, how they have led to the shedding of oceans of human blood, how they have driven men away from Christ. Hence, though we gladly and thankfully acknowledge that not a few members of these Churches, in spite of professing such doctrines, are one with us in love for our Lord and Master, yet at the same time we recognize that the attitude of these Churches towards ourselves, no less than our love for the Truth and our obligation to live and die for it (as many of our fathers did), still prevents any outward union with them. We can only hope and pray that they may return to the Gospel and cast away the accretions which have gradually rendered such Churches in large measure hostile to the truth.

But is there anything in the world which necessitates or even justifies the division of Protestant Christendom into so many different Churches? We know from history how these divisions originated, and we are also aware that it is both impossible and undesirable to endeavour to persuade all men to adopt the same forms, ceremonies, and method of Church Government. Such an arrangement, if it could possibly be adopted, would do incalculable harm by checking progress and crushing individuality. It would be contrary to Nature. All the branches of a tree are not exactly alike in form. An army may be one in allegiance to the sovereign, in obedience to its commander, in its patriotism; but all its regiments are not clad in exactly the same uniform, nor have they in every respect the same traditions or the same duties. It would be quite possible to imagine the different divisions of an army to be distinguished from one another far more than they generally are, without ceasing to co-operate with each other for the accomplishment of a common purpose. What would, however, be most prejudicial to the army, and would in all probability prevent it from succeeding in its object, would be for the various regiments composing it to forget that they were parts of one and the same army. If our battalions fighting in the present great War permitted *esprit de corps*—itself a very desirable thing—to lead them each to deny that the other regiments had any right to be considered portions of the army, if they refused to work in harmony with one another, then, no matter how great their loyalty might be, they would be unable to meet and defeat a strong and united foe. This, we fear, is too much the case at present with the Army of Christ Jesus. Whether or not they realize it, the various Reformed Churches *are* regiments in one and the same army. Dissensions between them are therefore not only injurious to the common cause but treasonable towards the Captain of our Salvation. Instead of accentuating and exaggerating our trivial differences, we should and could, without the least sacrifice of principle, co-operate with each other for the benefit of humanity, the evangelization of the world, and the glory of our Divine Master. We well know that such a course of conduct would be in complete accord with our Lord's desire, and that it is necessary for the accomplishment of His purpose of Redemption. It should therefore be the great object which we should seek to attain. We should let nothing—not even our dearest prejudices,

which generally spring largely from our ignorance of the beliefs of our fellow-Christians of other denominations—hinder its attainment.

It is unnecessary to inquire whether this unity is or is not a possible thing to reach. Christ never gives a command which cannot be obeyed. Difficulties may and do exist: but difficulties are well defined as "things to be overcome." Experience has already shown us that in this particular case they have even now begun to vanish. The existence of the British and Foreign Bible Society, of the Religious Tract Society, of the China Inland Mission, and of various other great philanthropic schemes, has proved that the different Protestant Churches—as far at least as many of their most zealous individual members are concerned—can work together, and that union is strength. Another proof of the same thing is afforded by what is called the "Comity of Missions." This has prevented any disagreement between the representatives of different Protestant Churches in the Mission-field. It is only where the unchristian sacerdotal spirit has manifested itself (as in the Bishop of Zanzibar's attitude towards the Kikuyu proposals recently) that, as we might expect, difficulties have arisen: and the sacerdotal spirit has no rightful place in any true Protestant Church. It certainly can claim no rightful place in the Church of England, as our Articles and Prayer Book and the writings of the leaders of our Church in the early days after the Reformation, such as Bishop Jewel and the "judicious" Hooker, clearly prove. From its surreptitious entrance into the Church in our own time may ultimately result the disruption of the Church of England. Whenever this spirit showed itself in the past, as for example in the days of Archbishop Laud, it led to religious persecution, the blame for which should rest, not on the Church of England, but on those who abused her name to propagate doctrines which she had repudiated. In obeying their Master's command to go and make all nations disciples, Protestant Christian Churches in drawing nearer to Christ have drawn nearer to one another. It would indeed be absurd, in the midst of Heathenism and Muhammadanism, if Christians were to quarrel with each other about the Episcopal or the Presbyterian form of Church government, about the use of extempore prayer or fixed forms of worship. In the presence of the Master, in the face of the foe, in view of the ignorance, misery, and degradation of men.

who know not God, all such petty differences sink into their proper insignificance.

The publication of a joint Catechism by so many of the Free Churches is another evidence, visible to all men, of the reality of the unity which underlies our diversity of names and forms. Probably there is hardly a single article in that Catechism which the Evangelical Members of the Church of England could not accept. Again, the fact that very many of the best hymns in the English language are common to all Protestant Churches proves that we are one in part at least of our actual worship even now—to say nothing of our use of the same version of the Bible in both public and private devotions. Such books as "Pilgrim's Progress," though written in prison by one suffering persecution for conscience' sake at the hands of his "Christian" fellow-countrymen, are; and for several generations have been, the common heritage of all Protestants throughout the world. The labours of John Wesley, Moody, and other men of like spirit, have been a blessing to all Protestant Churches alike. The unity so desirable between us *does* then already in some measure really exist, and should be openly recognized to the glory of God. It is, in fact, authoritatively recognized in the Communion Service of the Church of England, where the Church of Christ is defined as "the blessed company of all faithful" (i.e. believing) "people."

One of the most hopeful signs of the times is that people are beginning to feel how desirable it is that there should be some outward manifestation of the inward unity which already exists between Protestants. The question is, what steps should be taken to accomplish this? By demanding the recognition of "the historic Episcopate," the Lambeth Conference of 1888 virtually declared their intention of demanding terms of surrender on the part of the other Protestant Churches, and thus for a time hindered the accomplishment of a union so fully in accordance with the mind of Christ. Our knowledge of Church History enables us to see that the time for asserting (and expecting educated and reasonable men to believe) that Episcopacy is *necessary* either to the *esse* or to the *bene esse* of the Church of Christ has passed by for ever. On the one hand we have learnt beyond the possibility of dispute that the Episcopal "Order" (if we are strictly justified in using such an expression) arose in very early times in certain portions of the

Christian Church. On the other we perceive that it was a *development*—one no doubt very useful and calculated to play a very important part in the history of the Church, but not therefore to be deemed necessary for all time. Episcopacy in early days was so very unlike what is called by that name in England to-day that it might perhaps be questioned whether in the Church of England it can any longer be said to exist. We have something very much more like the Episcopacy of the first and second centuries in Episcopacy as it is now found in the Churches of Australia and New Zealand, and still more in the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Moravian Church. In the Mission-field to-day we see exactly how, almost necessarily, Episcopacy arose in the early Church. A foreign Missionary has committed to him the superintendence (*ἐπισκοπή*) of a large district, and all the native Pastors and catechists there are under his supervision. This is exactly what a Bishop had to do in the early Church, besides helping to ordain in conjunction with the other Presbyters, for he was reckoned as one of the Presbytery. What still further supports this view as to the development of the Episcopate from the Order of Presbyters is the fact that, as every student of the Acts of the Apostles knows, the words *ἐπίσκοπος* (bishop) and *πρεσβύτερος* (elder, presbyter)<sup>1</sup> were originally interchangeable terms, though the former was more commonly used among Gentile, the latter among Jewish (and Syrian) Christians. We also know that the Christian elder was in Greek cities styled *ἐπίσκοπος*, because his distinguishing functions were considered similar to those discharged by the civil functionaries who bore that title. Although it was natural, and doubtless in accordance with God's will, that Episcopacy should soon be established in most parts of the Christian world, it for a time failed to commend itself to the Churches in Rome, Corinth, and Alexandria. But the doctrine of the "Historic Episcopate" had not then emerged or evolved itself, and hence the other parts of the Christian Church never appear to have thought for one moment of denying the "Orders" of those who had, *e.g.*, in Alexandria, been ordained "by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery." In the same way, for a long time after the Reformation, it is a matter of history that Episcopal Ordination was not considered by the Church

<sup>1</sup> The men who are styled *presbyters* (*elders*) in Acts xx. 17, are called *bishops* in v. 28.

authorities in England necessary before a man was admitted to hold a living in this country. Presbyterian ordination was recognized without the least scruple, just as by the early Church.

When therefore we find men discussing the question whether the Church of England can or cannot recognize the Orders and Sacraments of the other Protestant Churches, the thought occurs to one's mind, By what authority do we refuse to recognize them, since our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the Head of the whole Universal Church, has unmistakably acknowledged and confirmed them? No one can be aware what grand work has been done in England, in America, and most of all in the Mission-field, by these Non-Episcopal Churches, without confessing that God is with them of a truth. If then the Captain of our Salvation has recognized in these men the gifts which He Himself must have conferred upon them, have they, after all, any real need of our recognition? Again, if the subordinate officers of an army do not recognize the appointments made by their Commander-in-Chief, do they not thereby render themselves liable to be dismissed for insubordination, if not mutiny? Judas Iscariot was undoubtedly an Apostle, whose claim to that title none could deny, while many could and did deny that of St. Paul. To which of the two should we prefer to trace our Orders? Is it possible for a reasonable man, a spiritually-minded Christian, to prefer Orders derived from a Leo X. to those which may have been conferred by a Wesley? Are the Orders which may be traced back to Archbishop Laud, of persecuting memory, preferable to those which may presumably have been conferred by men of the stamp of Moody or Spurgeon? "By their fruits ye shall know them."

At one time most people in England fancied that monarchy was the only system of political government which was pleasing to God. How they reconciled this view with the history of the Israelites as recorded in the Old Testament it is hard to understand, but so it was. We have broader ideas on the subject now. Acknowledging that a very strictly limited form of monarchical government suits us, we are able to see that another system of rule may suit other nations better. We now perceive that, although monarchical government is undoubtedly a quite legitimate form of rule, it is not the *only* system of government which God approves. It is time for us, therefore, in the same way to understand that, though Episco-

pacy is certainly an allowable method of polity for the Church, and has in the past proved very useful at times, yet it is not the only system that can lay claim to Divine approval. Nor must we confound names with things. The "bishops" mentioned by Ignatius did not hold quite the same position as those in the Middle Ages, or the latter that of our modern English territorial Bishops. History shews us that, whereas Episcopacy has been of great service to the Church at certain epochs, at others it has been the source of much injury. In this respect it resembles monarchy. God's grace is not limited to names and titles, any more than to the use of Latin or any other particular language in Divine worship. It is a matter of notoriety that all existing Churches differ very materially in forms, ceremonies, and manner of worship from those observed in the early Church, though the latter was not distinguished for a strict and rigid uniformity everywhere. The altered circumstances of modern times have doubtless not only justified but necessitated such changes. Why not recognize the legality of changes in the forms of Church government also, where necessary? The German Lutherans, for example, wished to retain Episcopacy at the Reformation, but well-known circumstances made it impossible to do so. Why blame them? Why indeed should any Church condemn another on such grounds as the form of Church government, when a monarchy would not be justified in refusing to recognize another state because its government was republican? No one particular form, ceremony, method of government, can justly be deemed essential to the existence of a true branch of the Vine. The one rule laid down for us in such matters is: "Let all things be done decently and in order."

Every Protestant Church that holds the essential doctrines of Christianity is a part of Christ's Church Universal. This is proved by Christ's continued presence and blessing. "Ubi Christus, ibi Ecclesia." Our own Nineteenth Article says: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." This definition fits the case of all the other great Protestant Churches at least as well as it does the Church of England under existing circumstances.

"God is not the God of confusion but of peace." Therefore the days of our divisions should be ended. Then we should become in



some way one, outwardly as well as inwardly. Recognizing our inward and spiritual unity in Christ, we should endeavour so to act as to make that unity visible to the world at large.

It remains to inquire what way can be suggested of accomplishing this.

Is there any reason why, in this age of federations, there should not be a great Federation of Protestant Churches, independent of one another in government, in forms of worship, and in their particular shades of opinion upon less important questions, but all accepting as their minimum of doctrine the so-called "Apostles' Creed," or, better still, the "Nicene" ? In addition to this it would be very desirable to adopt one, and only one, other Article of Agreement, affirming the all-sufficiency of the Eternal Priesthood of Christ and of His one sacrifice once offered for the sins of the whole world, and rejecting the Sacerdotal heresy, the Anti-Christian claim of the Pope to be Head of the Church and Vicar of Christ, and the doctrine of Transubstantiation. In relation to the latter point it would be hardly necessary to use stronger terms than those employed in our Thirty-First Article : "The sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

In ancient times it was deemed desirable, in opposition to the Arian and other heresies, to add Article after Article to the Creed, explaining what was and always had been the true teaching of Christ's Church. In the same way every Protestant Church has drawn up its own Articles. We might now simplify these for the use of the Federation by summing up what is fundamental. The ancient Creed and one such Article as we have suggested, rendered necessary by the introduction of serious errors into the teaching of large sections of the professing Church, would really embody everything vital in the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England and in the Confessions and Catechisms of the other Protestant Churches. Each Church would retain her own Formularies as long as might be desired, but by their uniting in the Federation outlined above their essential unity would be declared and manifest to all men. The advantages which such a confederation would offer are obvious. Prejudice (and, in an ever increasing degree, ignorance) would vanish, and co-operation in all good work would follow as a

matter of course. We should present a united front to infidelity and every form of error, and we could labour together for the suppression of intemperance and all other vices, tyranny and oppression, for the relief of suffering, and for the spread of the Gospel both at home and abroad.

Consider what the condition of North America would be at the present time, were all the States of the Union entirely separate from one another. What a vast amount of power would have been lost, had they not united. Imagine the immense possibilities of discord which would exist. Instead of a great and mighty nation, we should have a large number of petty States, independent of one another, of no weight in the councils of the world, unable to express a united opinion, to carry out a common policy, to protect themselves from their enemies, parted from each other by endless jealousies and antagonisms, like those we see to-day in South America. This is practically the case with the Protestant Churches of the world. The motto "Divide et impera" was doubtless a wise, if hellish, one for the ancient Roman conquerors to adopt, but it was ruinous for the nations and tribes that permitted themselves to become its victims. So it is now with our Churches. It is impossible to imagine, much less to exaggerate, the access of strength, spiritual and material, which would accrue to us in every department of Christian work were we all united together as we should be. It is the clear duty of every Christian who loves his Master to do all in his power to realize our Lord's desire in this matter. The man who, instead of doing this, strives to accentuate the trivial differences between those who are in reality members of the one Body of Christ is guilty of great and criminal folly.

A beginning of this work of Federation might be made in the British Isles. We should then have a "Church of the British Nation" indeed. The Federation would soon spread throughout the whole English-speaking world, and would finally be joined by all the Reformed Churches everywhere. This would not in any sense involve the erection of a new Church; it would merely be the outward assertion and realization of the inward unity which already exists, and has always existed, between all true believers in Jesus Christ who have kept their faith undefiled and uncorrupted with error.

## The Wondrous Cross.

### STUDIES IN THE ATONEMENT.

#### II.

**L**EAVING, however, the historical development of this doctrine, it seems essential to consider it [in the light of modern thought, which follows two main lines, subjective and objective. These are the two classes into which all theories of the Atonement can be divided.

#### A. SUBJECTIVE.

This is concerned with the Atonement as directed towards man, and the work of Christ is to be understood as a revelation of Divine Love to elicit our repentance. In Ritschl the Atonement is a test of fidelity to God ; with Bushnell it is expressive of God's sympathy ; in Maurice and Robertson it is indicative of the surrender of Christ ; in McLeod Campbell and Moberly the Atonement is regarded as vicarious penitence. Thus, in one way or another the Atonement is a revelation of truth and of the Divine character as Love, which is intended to overcome the fears of the sinner, to assure him of God's friendship, and thereby to incite him to rise to a true life.

All this is, of course, accurate and helpful, but in itself it is inadequate, and therefore unsatisfactory as a full explanation of the Atonement. The illustration has been given of a man throwing himself into the water from a pier to prove his love, but the mere effect of throwing himself into the water without accomplishing a rescue does not seem to be sufficient. The man who rescues another who is drowning at once proves his love and saves the lost. It is also pointed out that this theory fails to deal with the reality of sin and to justify forgiveness, since evil is passed over and not brought to an end. When a man has gone headlong into sin for years and then sees the horror of it and changes his life, there is still the stain of sin, its effects upon his character, and its results on others. Then, too, the general weakness of this theory is that there is nothing in it to show how those are affected who are unconscious and cannot correspond. There are many on whom such a revelation of Divine Love cannot possibly make any impression or elicit any response, such as infants, the insane, and the heathen. Are these to be unsaved because they remain uninfluenced ?

Of these various interpretations of the moral theory, that of McLeod Campbell and Moberly is at present most prevalent, and it has received additional confirmation through the Essay in *Foundations* by Mr. W. H. Moberly, who therein presented afresh his father's view. It would seem, however, as though the criticism of this interpretation is convincing. Thus, the Bishop of Down (Dr. D'Arcy) has asked how penitence can be vicarious any more than punishment, especially since penitence cannot atone for past sin.<sup>1</sup> Nor does it explain why the quality of penitence should culminate in the act of death. Then, too, it gives no account of the New Testament imagery of Ransom, Propitiation, Redemption, nor does it explain how the soul is enabled to break the power of sin. Dr. Armitage Robinson is of opinion that the use made by this theory of the word "penitence" is at once unreal and unfamiliar.

"Does not *penitence*, we are bound to ask, involve as an indispensable element *self-blame*, and not merely the sense of shame? Must not its language be, 'We have sinned . . . of our own fault'? Love's self-identification with the sinner may go as far as the sense of shame on the ground of physical relationship (as of mother and child) or of deeply affectionate friendship. It may go as far as self-blame without losing touch with reality, if it is conscious that further effort on its part might have prevented the shameful issue. But can self-blame be genuine where *ex hypothesi* there has been no responsibility for the sin?" (*Journal of Theological Studies*, January, 1913).

To the same effect are the criticisms of Dr. Denney, who holds that to express the Atonement as penitence is really, unthinkable.

"No rhapsodies about love and no dialectical juggling will ever make this anything but a contradiction in terms. It is a thoroughly false way of describing a familiar fact, which has, no doubt, its significance for the Atonement, though it does not exhaust it. . . . Resolved the Atonement into 'a perfect lesson in humanity to the judgment of God in the sin of man'; a response to God which has in it 'all the elements of a perfect repentance—a perfect sorrow—a perfect contrition—all excepting the personal consciousness of sin.' The exception, it may be said, destroys the theory" (*British Weekly*).

Indeed, it may be said without much question that such a theory changes the entire meaning of the word "penitence" and involves an utter contradiction.

"The theory—unless the whole meaning of the word 'penitence' is altered—is a contradiction in terms. An infinite repentance is performed to avert an infinite penitence. The repentance is for human sin. The repentance is by Him Who knew no sin. The guilt is incurred by the

<sup>1</sup> D'Arcy, *Christianity and the Supernatural*, p. 80.

human race, and availing repentance takes place in the guiltless Jesus. How can this be? What element of penitence can enter into the mind of One Who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth? One of the most extraordinary passages in the theology is that of McLeod Campbell, when he says that our Lord's mind had 'all the elements of a perfect repentance in humanity, for all the sin of man—a perfect sorrow—a perfect contrition—all the elements of such a repentance, and that in absolute perfection—all excepting the personal consciousness of sin.' Need we point out that the exception is the very essence of the whole? Where there is no personal consciousness of sin, penitence is impossible. Contrition is the sign of an inner change from evil to good. How can such a change take place in the Eternal Son?" (*Church Family Newspaper*).

When Dr. Moberly's book first appeared, a similar criticism was made.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Clow has made a brief, but acute criticism of Moberly :

"Moberly calls the Incarnation the crucial doctrine. Mark how he gives his case away even in his adjective" (*The Cross in Christian Experience*, p. 319).

It is not by any means the least important of all criticisms of this view that it cannot find any real foundation in the passages of the New Testament dealing with the Atonement. This is the general line taken in a recent searching criticism which, at the same time, preserves all the truly valuable features in Moberly's view. Dr. H. R. Mackintosh in an article, "The Vicarious Penitence of Christ" (*Expositor*, February, 1916), while speaking in the warmest terms of the moral and spiritual value of this position in several respects, nevertheless points out that there is nothing like it in the New Testament, that it gives no explanation why all the features of our Lord's experiences should culminate in death and that it is not true to ordinary life. Dr. Mackintosh concludes that the Atonement is fundamentally something that God does, and on this account, whatever is the heart of the Atonement must be predicable of God. Dr. Stalker ("The Atonement"), while apparently approving of McLeod Campbell's view in one place, subjects it to severe criticism in another as that which is not found in connection with New Testament teaching on the Atonement.

#### B. OBJECTIVE.

This is concerned with the Atonement as directed towards God, and the work of Christ is to be understood as a revelation of Divine righteousness and grace to convict and convert. On this view the Atonement includes three great truths.

<sup>1</sup> H. G. Grey, Introduction to Dimock, *The Death of Christ* (2nd edition).

1. The Manifestation of the Divine Character. The Death of Christ is a demonstration of God's righteousness, God's holiness, God's love. Very few modern books give any true consideration to a crucial passage like Rom. iii. 21-26, where the Cross is shown to be the revelation and vindication of righteousness. Pardon, according to the New Testament, is based on justice as well as mercy.<sup>1</sup>

2. The Vindication of the Divine Law. Is not Christ's Death in some way "penal"? Retribution is in the very constitution of the universe, and on this view God in Christ bears the "penalty." And yet it has been pointed out that the transference is not of guilt, or of moral turpitude, but simply of legal liability.<sup>2</sup> It is surely in this sense that the Death of Jesus Christ is "vicarious"; otherwise, what meaning can be attached to that term? If we are not to be allowed to speak of vicarious punishment, why may we speak of vicarious suffering? What is the precise meaning and value of "vicarious"?

3. The Foundation of the Divine Pardon. It is sometimes argued that as human forgiveness does not need an atonement, God's pardon should be regarded as equally independent of any such sacrifice as is now being considered. But this is to overlook the essential features of all forgiveness, which means that the one who pardons really accepts the results of the wrong done to him in order that he may exempt the other from any punishment. Thus, as it has been well illustrated, when a man cancels a debt, he, of necessity, loses the amount, and if he pardons an insult or a blow, he accepts in his own person the injury done in either case, so that human pardon may be said to cancel at its own expense any wrong done, and this principle of the innocent suffering for the guilty is the fundamental truth of the Atonement. It is, therefore, urged with great force that every act of forgiveness is really an act of Atonement, and thus human forgiveness, so far from obviating the necessity of Divine Atonement, really illuminates, vindicates, and necessitates the Divine pardon, for "forgiveness is mercy which has first satisfied the principle of justice." And so we hold that on this view Christ's Death made it possible for God to forgive sin. What His justice

<sup>1</sup> One of the most useful books discussing the legal aspects of the Atonement is *Law and the Cross*, by Dr. C. F. Creighton. The value of the book is largely due to the fact that it consists of Addresses to Lawyers, Students, and Professors at College and Law Schools (Eaton & Mains, New York).

<sup>2</sup> Bruce, *The Humiliation of Christ*, p. 316.

demanded His love provided. This fact of the Death of Jesus Christ as the foundation of pardon is unchallengeable in the New Testament. Repentance cannot undo the past ; it can only affect the future, and any religion which does not begin with deliverance can never be a success as a discipline. Christ spoke of and dealt with the fact of deformity as well as of growth. " That we being delivered . . . might serve." <sup>1</sup>

The value of this view is that it keeps close to the New Testament and gives a satisfying explanation of such words as Redemption, Propitiation, Reconciliation, Substitution, Representation, Identification, Satisfaction. It appeals not only to the heart, but also to the conscience, and is based at once on absolute righteousness and on the power of Divine grace to undo sin. This is also in harmony with the deepest needs of human nature.

Thus, the Atonement means that God in the Person of His Eternal Son took upon Himself in vicarious death the sin of the whole world. The offer of mercy is made to every one, since there is no sinner for whom Christ did not die, and every sin, past, present and future, is regarded as laid on and borne by Him.

" This, then, is the New Testament doctrine of Atonement, that He whose office it had ever been to reveal the mind of the Father, and who had assumed human form, having passed through this mortal life without sin, and being, therefore, non-amenable to any penalty decreed upon transgression, had voluntarily submitted to that cause of death, with all its mystery of meaning, which He had Himself announced and thereby rendered the forgiveness of sins possible to man " (Cave, *ut supra*, p. 324).

" To describe the central fact of the Gospel in ethical terms as a revelation of love, and exhibition of obedience, or a manifestation of the Divine character, expresses a side of truth, apart from which a doctrine of substitution may become, if not immoral, at least superstitious. But such descriptions cease to be true, if they are taken for definitions. The Cross is no longer a revelation, if it be not a redemption. If it be large enough to deal with a situation of which the factors are God, man, and sin ; if it be a fact of religion through which men approach that Personality in whom they have their being, its significance cannot be understood unless it be recognized as a mystery, illuminating and illuminated by life and experience, but itself not reducible to simpler terms. . . . It is essentially an eternal fact, embracing, but not embraced by experience ; and its theory, though to the spiritual man increasingly rational, must ever be less than that which it seeks to explain " (*Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, Article Atonement, by Canon J. G. Simpson, p. 138).

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

(To be continued.)

<sup>1</sup> In various forms this is the essential view of Dale, Denney, Forsyth and Simpson.

## Attila, King of the Huns.

**J**UST nineteen hundred years ago Europe—that is civilized Europe—a large tract of North Africa, most of Syria and Asia Minor, together with the islands of the Mediterranean, were beginning to enjoy the luxury of profound peace. For the first time in history, perhaps, the entire western world as well as the near East had, after centuries of warfare, learned what it was to be at rest. Poets and prophets imagined that the Golden Age was come again, when Order and Justice were to take up their abode among men, who were not to learn war any more. Such was the result of the long struggle between rival parties in the old Roman Republic, on the ruins of which was to be erected the imposing fabric of Empire, itself destined to become the birthplace of the “Pax Romana.”

It was during the reign of the first Emperor, Augustus, that an event took place which, insignificant as it must have seemed at the time, even to the most shrewd observer, was to exercise an unparalleled influence on all succeeding history. It was the birth, in an obscure Syrian village, of a Jewish child, known later as a prophet and teacher among his co-religionists, who was to seal his testimony by dying a criminal's death before he was forty—Jesus of Nazareth.

For some 250 years after Augustus's death, the strong and impartial hand of Rome kept its grip upon all the states, dependencies and provinces which composed the Roman world. During this time, now under the rule of bad, now of good, Emperors, the western world flourished exceedingly. Rome imposed her culture upon all the countries that owned her sway; her arts, her laws, her language, her institutions became a pattern for mankind. From the town of Berwick-upon-Tweed away to the frontiers of Persia; from the Danube in the north to Egypt and the Great Sahara, the influence of Rome was felt. The trade of the Empire was of vast dimensions. Roman roads and military outposts were everywhere; and so wisely were the various provinces policed, and so admirably was the system of local government practised, that a traveller from York to Alexandria in the year 100 A.D. could have performed that journey as rapidly and as safely as the traveller of only 100 years ago.



But about the middle of the 3rd century a cloud arose on the horizon. It was a cloud coming out of the still barbaric north. In the early days of Empire, the Romans were supreme in military power and prestige ; but two long centuries of peace had produced their inevitable results. The old Roman spirit had become weakened through wealth and luxury. The old " National Service " system had gradually disappeared, and had given place to a new system whereby the army was recruited from classes of men who had no personal interest in the Mother-City. The citizen army had become, in large degree, a mercenary army inspired by hireling hopes. And while the military spirit had undergone this change, a change had come over the dreams of the fierce northern tribes, no longer content to remain within their immemorial fastnesses, but eager to share with the master of the world the rich prize of empire towards which they began to turn hungry eyes. In course of time these tribes crossed the frontier, and a great battle was fought which ended in a victory for the barbarians. Worse than this even, Rome was obliged to purchase peace—or rather a cessation of hostilities—by paying a huge indemnity to the victors.

The Goths, thus enriched, moved back behind the frontiers ; but the rumour of their success had spread far and wide, and other tribes became seized with a longing to try conclusions with Rome. The Franks, zealous for plunder, fell upon the rich provinces of Gaul and Spain ; while, in the East, the Persians plundered Armenia and overran Syria.

It seemed, for the moment, as if Rome had developed such grave internal weakness that the very existence of the Empire was threatened. At home, no fewer than nineteen Emperors arose within the space of about thirty years, held authority for a brief period, then fell by assassination. At last there succeeded to the purple, not a Roman noble, but an Illyrian peasant, Diocletian, who by sheer force of character and military merit stemmed the tide of invasion.<sup>1</sup> After a reign of twenty years Diocletian voluntarily abdicated, but not before he had succeeded in making a division of the Empire, East and West.

Following immediately on his resignation came a fierce struggle for Empire, a struggle which terminated finally in Constantine's

<sup>1</sup> It was under Diocletian that the last great persecution of the Christians took place ; but it was one of the most terrible in the history of the Church.

uniting the Empire again under a single sceptre. Pagan Rome became Christian; the era of persecution was at an end for the Church, which now embarked on a course of worldly triumph that remained unbroken for more than a thousand years.

It was not till nearly a century after Constantine had transferred the seat of Empire from the banks of the Tiber to the shores of the Bosphorus that Rome fell into the hands of the barbarians. Yet during the whole of that time the Empire itself was continually distracted, and divided in its aims. The Emperor Theodosius, by re-uniting East and West in fact and not in name, was indeed able for a time to stem the tide of invasion from the populous north; but at his death the Empire was again split up between his two sons Arcadius and Honorius, of whom the former ruled at Constantinople and the latter in Rome. It was during Honorius' troubled and inglorious reign that the Goths, under the warlike Alaric, forced a passage into northern Italy. The one man, Stilicho, who might have saved the situation, was basely betrayed and murdered; and then the end came. Famine and pestilence had done their deadly work; and though a half-hearted effort was ultimately made to keep Alaric at bay, on August 24, 410, Rome—the Queen city of the world, which had for hundreds of years dictated the policy of nations—was forced to submit to all the horrors of a sack. It was Antwerp and Louvain over again, though Alaric, more merciful than the German Kaiser, ordered the lives of the unresisting inhabitants to be spared, and the churches to remain inviolate.

After the capture and the sack of the Capital, Alaric pursued his victorious course through the rich lands of Italy, only to find his triumph cut short by death. His successor married the sister of Honorius, who himself died in the year 423, after an eighteen years' inglorious and tragic reign.

Of the successors of Honorius history says little; they flash before us, like patterns in a kaleidoscope. True, they bore imperial names; but the fabric of the once inviolable Empire was fast falling to ruin. The proud and wealthy province of northern Africa was incapable of maintaining its independence against the Vandals, under the fierce Genseric, who wrought havoc everywhere along the Mediterranean littoral, and did not spare even the sacred shores of Italy.

And, as though this were not enough to fill the cup of human

misery to the brim, there was shortly destined to arise an even greater and more terrific figure on the horizon—one before whom the Romans alike in the East and West were to stand dismayed, the figure of the dreadful Hun monarch, Attila, “the scourge of God.”

We hear first of the Huns somewhere about the year 425 A.D. Their encampments lay, roughly, within the limits of modern Hungary; and when we meet them on the stage of history it is in connexion with the Eastern capital which they had begun to threaten. They were bought off, for the time, by promise of an annual subsidy,—to such a depth of degradation had the rulers of Constantinople sunk, thanks to weakness, political imbecility and miserable intrigue. Had the Eastern Emperor, Theodosius, possessed manhood enough to fling down his gage and challenge these barbaric hosts as a brave man should, the whole history of Europe might have been different. But unhappily he did not.

One of the first acts of Attila, on succeeding to the Hunnish throne, was to humiliate the Eastern Empire by levying on it a fresh and heavy indemnity. His next move was to enlarge his dominions in the northern and western portions of Europe; and henceforward Attila could count on a crowd of vassal princes to serve, when summoned, under his standard. His warriors numbered over half a million—an immense army in those days. If his expedition against Persia was unsuccessful, it did not constitute more than a temporary set-back, as the future was shortly to demonstrate. In the year 441 Attila formed an alliance with the Vandal king, Genseric, thus securing that astute and ruthless monarch in the possession of N. Africa, and depriving the Western Empire of any chance of recovering this rich and prosperous province. At the instigation of his new ally, Attila presently attacked the Eastern Empire. An ambitious and crafty prince, when bent on war, can generally trump up some excuse for his action, as we know to our cost. Attila was not slow in making a trivial incident a justification for embarking on this fresh enterprise; and it was a Christian bishop who assisted him by an act of treachery. The king of the Huns descended upon the Balkans almost exactly where, in 1914, the Austrians made their first infamous attack on Serbia. City after city fell before the furious onslaught of the barbarians, and hundreds of miles of Europe, in its most fertile and civilized parts, were laid

desolate. What Falkenhayn has recently accomplished in Rumania, was done by Attila in his devastating march. Nothing could stand against his fierce and fanatical soldiery. Yet the Emperor Theodosius stood irresolute—or unconvinced; the policy which “waits and sees” is as old as the hills, and never yet mastered a resolute and unremitting foe. The armies of the East, hastily called together at last, were unable to withstand the tidal wave of invasion; and in a brief while Attila appeared before the gates of the imperial city. Multitudes of captives were dragged from their homes, to be dispersed among the wild tribes that owed obedience to Attila.

The Eastern Emperor was obliged to come to some sort of understanding with the savage conqueror. An embassy was dispatched from Constantinople to his camp. “What city in the Empire,” cried the boastful king to the trembling envoys, “could exist if it were our royal pleasure to wipe it off the face of the earth?” Yet Attila, unlike his modern imitator, did display some signs of relenting, and consented to terms which, though harsh and onerous, were not quite impossible. A reconstruction of the map of Eastern Europe followed upon the Conference, and a huge indemnity was imposed.

Two years later, the payment of the tribute (which, according to agreement, was to be paid annually) was refused; and Attila, mightily incensed, resolved to attack the Empire both East and West. The king frankly despised the Eastern Empire; perhaps the treacherous attempt on his life by secret emissaries from Constantinople had convinced him that he had little to fear from a Government which had sunk so low that, when unable or afraid to attack him openly, had recourse to the knife of a hired assassin. It says something for Attila that he actually forgave the Emperor for this treacherous design.

The Emperor himself did not long survive the inglorious pact which he had made, or his effort to undo the hard terms of that pact by the method named. He died from a fall from his horse in the year 450, and was followed by Marcian, a good man and a vigorous soldier, who, had he been able to succeed to the throne at an earlier period, might conceivably have done something to invigorate a vacillating and weak policy. It was Marcian’s act, in refusing further tribute, that provoked Attila to undertake

his campaign against the Empire as a whole. The new Emperor felt—rightly—that to allow the majesty of Empire to be insulted by a barbarian, without some decisive protest, was intolerable. The refusal at once brought Attila into the field. To the unspeakable terror of the inhabitants the Huns invaded Gaul in the next year (451). They perhaps reckoned on as easy a victory as had fallen to their lot when they had swept through the Balkans to the walls of Byzantium. But in this they were mistaken. The commander-in-chief of the Western armies was no time-serving minion of Eastern origin, but a man who combined in his person the wisdom and strength of the Romans of a former age. Aetius was as brave as he was able, and was clearly marked out as the one soldier equal to face so tremendous an emergency. More than that, he had long since won the confidence of all those whose opinions mattered. By a bold and rapid stroke of policy, he was successful in linking up the Roman armies with those of the Visigoths (at that time ruled by the son of the great Alaric). Indeed the Visigoths had everything to gain, and nothing to lose, by standing shoulder to shoulder with the imperial troops. Italy and France were (then as now) united in a determination to resist the common foe. Tribes hitherto neutral passed over to the side of Aetius. They were urged to remember that it was the duty of every Christian man to save from violence and sacrilege the Churches of God from the hands of bloody barbarians, who spared neither priest nor nun, woman nor child, in their devastating course through Europe. The spirit of the Allied nations of to-day was incarnate in the peoples of the West, who saw, with alarm and agony, what a victory by the Huns would certainly involve. Those that had hitherto wavered now followed the lead of Aetius; and the combined army moved by rapid marches to relieve Orleans—which was already being besieged—and to give battle to Attila's innumerable hosts.

On the approach of the Allies, Attila raised the siege and gave the signal for retreat. Foreseeing the fatal consequences of a defeat in the very heart of France, he recrossed the Seine and took up a position on the field of Châlons-sur-Marne—a part of France rendered now doubly illustrious, because it was not far from that historic field that, nearly 1,500 years later, the invading hordes of Germany were repulsed on one memorable September day.

Both armies strove to reach a hill of moderate elevation com-

manding the vast battle-ground. Attila, confident (as ever) of victory, resolved, before putting matters to the proof, to deliver an harangue to his troops. "I myself," cried the monarch, "will throw the first spear; and the wretch that refuses to imitate my example is devoted to instant death." These words kindled the martial enthusiasm of his followers, and the order of battle was forthwith formed. On the Roman side, Aetius commanded the left wing, Theodoric the right. The fight began early on the morning of a July day in the year 451. Prodigies of valour were performed on both sides. Quarter was neither asked nor given. During the struggle the Visigothic King, while riding along his ranks to encourage the troops, was slain. The news quickly reached Attila, who now exulted in the thought of coming victory. But it was not to be. Suddenly and unexpectedly a large body of men, whose presence had been carefully screened till then, bore right down from the hills upon the centre of the maddened Huns. Their flanks were left unguarded, and the Allied Armies were quick to press their advantage. Only the approach of night saved Attila from disaster. As it was, he was forced to retire, and entrench himself within the ramparts of his fortified camp.

Silence fell on the battle-field, where, according to trustworthy accounts, a quarter of a million men lay in their last sleep. Attila, dreading some hostile stratagem, remained self-beleaguered in his camp. Then slowly began the great withdrawal. It was indeed the last victory achieved in the name of the Western Empire, but its results are manifest. The Huns retreated sullenly to their inaccessible German fastnesses, the enemy still hanging upon their rear. It was not till the Rhine was once more reached that Attila could feel secure. And, meanwhile, France was saved.

And yet it was only a respite that had been secured. The power and reputation of the Huns were not seriously diminished by the failure of their French campaign. In the following spring Attila repeated the demand he had already made for the hand of the Roman princess, Honoria, in marriage. This demand was decisively, even scornfully, rejected, notwithstanding the all-but incredible fact that Honoria herself (mesmerized perhaps by the glamour of victory that seemed to surround Attila) had written to the Hun to offer herself to him. The indignant king now resolved to avenge himself for the slight by invading Italy. The barbarians were

unskilled in making regular sieges ; but Attila was bent on utilizing the forced labour of prisoners and captives,<sup>1</sup> and counted—not wholly without reason—on treachery among the Romans themselves.

The campaign opened by an attack on Aquileia, a town not much more than twenty miles from the modern Trieste, and standing at the head of the Adriatic. To-day the town is quite small and unimportant, but in those days it was a large and flourishing seaport. Against this town, therefore, Attila brought his siege-train, consisting of battering-rams, and artillery capable of hurling immense stones, and blazing darts. Three months were spent in a fruitless effort to batter down the walls ; and Attila was on the point of abandoning the siege when, one evening, as he was riding round the town, he noticed a stork getting ready to leave her nest in one of the rampart-towers, and to escape with her young into the open country. Attila, who was as superstitious as he was brave, at once regarded this as an omen of victory. The siege was renewed with greater fury than before, and at length a breach was made in the stout walls. Through this breach the barbarians poured into the devoted town, and so thorough was its destruction that, a few years later, the very ruins of Aquileia could hardly be found.

Henceforth Attila's task was easy ; and, as he moved southward, city after city was reduced to heaps of blackened ruin. When he captured Milan, he was annoyed to find in the royal palace a large picture representing the Caesars on their throne, with the barbaric chieftains prostrate before them. Attila bade the painter reverse the figures and the attitudes ; and now the Emperors were depicted, on the same canvas, approaching the king of the Huns in humble attitude, pouring out at his feet sacks of gold—a tribute to the conqueror. It was worthy of the Kaiser himself, in his most inflated moment. But pride is apt to go before a fall. And so it was destined to be in the case of Attila. Meanwhile the task of the gallant Aetius seemed well-nigh hopeless. Unable any longer to count on the support of his former allies, the Visigoths, he stood alone to check the march of the invader, and to delay, if he could not prevent, the destruction of Rome itself. Indeed, Rome, once confident in its own strength, but now grown to be the prey of internal factions, and weakened by luxury and idleness, was wholly incom-

<sup>1</sup> Exactly what the Germans are doing to-day in Belgium and N. France.

petent to withstand the furious onslaught of the Huns. A solemn embassy was, accordingly, despatched by the helpless Emperor to see whether some sort of peace could be patched up ; and the Pope himself consented to head the embassy, and risk his life for the safety of his countrymen. It was a noble and a patriotic act, in somewhat striking contrast to the calculating conduct of his latter-day successor on the throne of St. Peter, who has thereby let slip the most splendid opportunity of justifying his claims before the world.

The Roman ambassador, with Pope Leo at their head, met the ferocious Attila by the shores of lake Garda. Overawed—so the story goes—by the presence of the venerable Pontiff, Attila actually consented to leave Italy, his retreat being expedited by the payment of a huge sum of money. Possibly he believed that it was prudent to retire, before his army, weakened by disease and losses, and already enervated by the climate and luxury of Italy, proved unequal to the task of overwhelming the capital and overrunning the south of Italy. Moreover, the sudden and miraculous appearance of the two Apostles, Peter and Paul, who (we are told) threatened the king with instant death if he molested Rome, may have influenced him, then as always liable to superstitious fears. Such is the legend, according to old writers. Whatever the reason, Attila withdrew his forces, and the Empire was, for the moment, saved. Nevertheless, Attila threatened a fresh incursion if the princess Honoria were not yielded up to him ; and this threat might have been carried out, had not a stronger than Attila appeared to cut short all his ambitious schemes.

In the very next year, the Hun consoled himself for the loss of Honoria by adding a beautiful girl, Ildico, to the tale of his many wives. The marriage was celebrated with much barbaric pomp ; and Attila, after drinking heavily at the wedding banquet, retired for the night. He did not arise next morning ; but his attendants, fearful of disturbing their master, let him alone until late in the day, when, alarmed at the ominous silence in the royal apartment, they broke into his room. There they found him dead, and bathed in blood ; but whether this was due (as some thought) to Ildico, or whether he had broken a blood-vessel, was never known. The whole Hunnish nation celebrated his obsequies with savage ritual and wild lamentations, and buried him along with the bodies of innumerable captives, massacred in his memory. So perished Attila, the last king of the Huns.



As it was his military genius alone that had kept together his loosely knit and barbaric empire, so his death was the signal for its rapid dissolution. Founded on force and fraud, and cemented with blood, this Empire possessed no power in itself apart from the guiding hand of its terrible and ruthless creator. After his death the civilized world once more breathed freely, for the Huns were no longer an object of dread. Yet the respite granted was but for a brief interval. The Roman empire was corrupt and ready to fall. As an example of the weakness and cruelty of its rulers—and the two things often go together—mark the fate that was in store for Aetius, whose services to the state had been so precious. The base and feckless emperor, Valentinian, grown jealous of the great commander who had saved Italy, and freed at length from the terror of the Huns, murdered Aetius with his own hand.

Justice, not slow to punish such treachery, swiftly overtook the guilty emperor. In the year 455, two years after Attila's death, Genseric accomplished what the Hun had purposed to do, but had never succeeded in doing—he took and sacked Rome. During one awful fortnight the city, with all its wealth and magnificence, suffered the cumulative horrors of a systematic pillage. And if, in one sense, Rome managed to survive even this, she survived the loss of all that men hold dearest—her freedom, her virtue, her honour.

Such is the tragic story of the fall of Rome.

“O doom of overlordships! to decay  
 First at the heart, the eye scarce dimmed at all;  
 Or perish of much cumber and array,  
 The burdening robe of Empire—and its pall.  
 Far off from Her that bore us be such Fate,  
 And vain against Her gate  
 Its knocking.  
 Nor must She, like the others, yield up yet  
 The generous dreams, but rather live to be  
 Saluted in the hearts of men as She  
 Of high and singular election, set  
 Benignant on the mitigated sea;  
 That, greatly loving freedom, loved to free,  
 And was Herself the bridal and embrace  
 Of strength and conquering grace.”<sup>1</sup>

E. H. BLAKENEY.

<sup>1</sup> William Watson, *Ode on the Coronation of King Edward VII.*

## The Lord's Supper as Presented in Scripture.

### A LAYMAN'S VIEW.

#### III. THE LORD'S SUPPER AS A COMMUNION. (I Cor. x.)

"Grace be unto you and peace, from him which *is*, and which *was*, and which *is to come*; and from the seven Spirits which are before his throne; And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful Witness, and the first-begotten of the dead, and the Prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that *loveth* us, and *washed* us from our sins in his own blood. . . . Behold *he cometh* with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." *Revelation* i. 4, 5, 7.

**I**N these verses we see that the Eternal God, the Son of the Father, our Lord Jesus Christ, no longer, since He has become a man, speaks of Himself as the unconditioned "I am," but in terms of time, as He "which is, and which was and which is to come." He uses human language here to express the Godhead, for we never can say "I am," but we can speak of past, present, and future. "He is," for we read He "loveth us"; this is the present aspect of Christ as connected with His love; "He was," for He "washed us"; this is the past of Christ as connected with His sacrifice; "He is to come," for "He cometh"; this is the future of Christ as connected with His return.

In like manner, the Lord's Supper has these three aspects of time: past, present and future. The past and the future are found in I Corinthians xi. He washed us from our sins, therefore we recall His death in the past; He is coming with clouds in the future, and therefore we "do this" until He come. But here we have to do with I Corinthians x., which is not primarily concerning the past—what Christ has done, nor the future—His return; but is the ineffable present of the love of Christ which passes knowledge. So that in this chapter we have before us those three words, "He loveth us"; for the love of a present and living Lord is the subject of I Corinthians x.

In the first few verses of I Corinthians x. we find (as I have already said) a distinct allusion to the two sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper. Baptism is clearly prefigured in the crossing of the Red Sea—"Our fathers . . . were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." As to eating the bread and drinking the wine, we read: "And did all eat the same spiritual

meat and did all drink the same spiritual drink ; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them ; and that Rock was Christ."

In the sacrament of the Lord's Supper we eat a spiritual meat ; in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper we drink a spiritual drink. It is true that then the literal drink was water, and now the spiritual drink is blood, because for us " He came not by water only, but by water and by blood " ; and this is symbolized in the bread and in the wine upon the table.

Now turn to chapter x. 15, "I speak as to wise men ; judge ye what I say." We are thus commanded here to use the wisdom that God has given us to discriminate the truth of what is said ; we are to judge what is written in this Scripture because it is very deep ; it is so deep indeed that no man by his own wisdom alone can fathom the depth of the next two verses. It is an unique and profound view of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The whole passage is a testimony to verbal inspiration ; for if the very words of the next two verses were not given by the Holy Spirit, St. Paul would hardly have used words entirely different from those in the next chapter, and it is probable we should have had many more of them. The alteration or addition of a single word may make all the difference between truth and error in these profound mysteries. I know no other inspiration but verbal inspiration (combined with, and not opposed to, plenary inspiration). I cannot conceive of God supplying thoughts, and then leaving to men the words in which those thoughts are to be expressed ; and in many ways we get good evidence that the words of Scripture are the words of God. If, for example, our four Evangelists had written the four Gospels in their own words, though they might have been generally inspired to do so, they would certainly have written four narratives very different from those we have. If there be one thing more than another that the Eastern delights in, it is descriptions ; full of epithets and adjectives expressing his delight and wonder in the subject of his narrative. It therefore strikes us dumb with amazement to find that from beginning to end of the four Gospels no adjectives express the delight with which they wrote of Christ ; no epithets are attached to His Holy Name. With cold pens and yet with burning hearts, they simply wrote down the bare narrative, and expressed neither surprise nor delight nor admiration nor love in what they were

writing ; no Eastern could do that, unless his pen was held by another Hand than his own.

In the last chapter we considered the Lord's Supper as a remembrance—a looking back to the past. Here we have the present communion with the risen Lord Christ. There is no " Jesus " in this chapter. " Jesus " has to do with the past when He was on earth ; this is communion now with the Lord Christ—the present aspect of the Lord's Supper.

The cup in this 10th chapter is definitely placed before the bread ; and this was probably the practice in the first century of the Christian Church ; but the practice now—as in the institution—is for the bread to be taken first and then the cup. Why then is the order given in 1 Corinthians x. the reverse of that in the 11th chapter ? Because our blessing is first of all individual ; we come as individual sinners to Christ ; afterwards the blessing is corporate, and connected with the whole Church. Though this is not the order in the Holy Communion, it is the way we approach the Divine sacrifice, the way it reaches us from our standpoint ; for the cup comes historically in our experience before the bread.

Moreover the cup refers to Christ alone ; the bread refers to Christ, and also to His Church.

Notice again, the word is " the cup " ; not " the wine." I have mentioned already that the Bible never speaks of bread and wine but of the bread and the cup. I have said I do not know the reason. I will however make two suggestions that may be probably true, and partly answer the question. First of all it is what we see ; we see the bread but do not see the wine if the wine be in a cup. The other suggestion is this. As the Lord may have foreseen, down the ages many difficulties arising in some countries of procuring wine, the question of what is in the cup is not insisted on ; it is never called wine, although there is no doubt it was wine and should be wine. At the same time if there is something else than wine in the cup, it is still the cup ; for the emphasis is not on the wine but on the cup, and therefore whatever is in the cup is spiritually the blood of Christ, and we so drink of it. I know of some parts in China where wine cannot be got, they use some other fluid, nevertheless it is the Lord's Supper ; and I daresay if we could see with an omniscient eye the practice over the world, we should be surprised to find in the cup how many substitutes for wine the circumstances required.

As I have said, the cup is mentioned first here, for "Without shedding of blood there is no remission," and our first connexion is with the blood of Christ.

Then I learn my corporate blessing—Himself and His Church. What I learn first in the cup is what He *has done* for me; then secondly I learn in the bread what He *is* to me, a living Christ "Who loveth me."

We see therefore the reversed order here is most significant, and wise men who judge what Paul says will understand the reason of the change.

But let us look further at these two profound verses.

"The cup of blessing which we bless" (verse 16). *We* bless.

May I be allowed here to refer to the wonderful words of a great teacher (I refer to the late Dean Alford) on this word "we" and the force of it:—

"It is not the act of the minister as by any authority taken to himself, but only as representative of the many."

"We being many are one body"; "We" here means the many or their representatives; the one who gives thanks at the Lord's table, does not give thanks, according to Scripture, and according to the Dean, by any authority in himself, but on the part of the many.

Dean Alford goes on to say: "The figment of sacerdotal consecration of the elements by transmuted power is as alien from the apostolic writings as it is from the spirit of the Gospel."

There with one blow, which is the more remarkable as coming from a dignitary of the National Church, is laid low all professions of priestly position at the table of the Lord.

Having referred to this Church authority, I may call attention also to the Bishop of Oxford who, I believe, denies that there is any transubstantiation or change of the elements, any repetition of the sacrifice or any reservation taught in Scripture.

"We." What do we do? "The cup of blessing which we (all of us together) bless." We must once more point out it is God Whom we bless; so we might read "the cup for which we give thanks" (see Matt. xxvi. 27), for the One to Whom we give thanks the One Whom we bless.

The "cup of blessing" is full of blessing for us, and we should not be at the Lord's Supper at all but for the blood of Christ. We

bless Him because He blesses us. Every one who blesses God for the cup placed in his hands, does so because that cup has proved a cup of blessing to his soul in the blood of Christ. All comes first of all from God; and then having received Divine life, our thanks flow out in a stream of praise back to the God Who gave it; and "we love Him because He first loved us." This is the double stream of blessing—the Divine circulation of eternal life.

God is the One blessed; the cup is not itself blessed, adored or elevated.

"Is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" The communion. What is communion? Communion is an intelligent participation with Christ, first of all in the spiritual blessing we receive by drinking, and then by the spiritual sacrifice of praises we offer to Him. We drink and thus we have materially partaken of the cup; but spiritually with discernment, we have communion, not primarily with one another as all drinking out of one cup, but with Christ as sharing the virtues of His shed blood, and therefore we bless and praise. Drinking is material; blessing is spiritual; the one is partaking of the cup; the other the communion of the blood of Christ, and the two, alas! do not always go together.

Now we turn to the bread. "The bread which we break." Observe again, it is not Christ Who breaks; it is we who do everything, since it is the present action that is here referred to. The word is "break." I think we must insist on the breaking. In the East, as I have shown, it is not a question of a loaf of bread; they had only a biscuit which could not be cut; it had to be broken violently—fractured. Do not shrink from the idea that the body of Christ was broken, because it says "a bone of Him shall not be broken." Though His bones were not broken (the bones of the thieves were broken), His body was broken; it was violently rent by the thrust of the spear and the driving of the nails. His body was broken for us; and this broken bread is His body to those who discern it in the eating of it spiritually. Do not refuse: this particular word "broken," which is found a great many times in Scripture, is specially used for the violent breaking of bread. The literal body was broken, pierced and rent, but the mystic body of Christ can never be broken or rent.

"For we being many are one bread and one body." Why

are we one bread? Because we all partake of the one bread. We, the many, the communicants, who partake of the Lord's Supper, are literally one bread. We were not one bread before communion, though always one body as baptized by the Spirit, but we become one bread when we have all eaten a part of the one bread that is on the Lord's table. This is a material fact; it is no question here of spirituality; it is a fact that the bread which was on the table makes those amongst whom it is divided symbolically one bread. We are one bread because we all have eaten a part of the same loaf. That is the simple word of the Apostle; but it is most beautifully guarded as we shall see. We are one bread thus, by literally partaking, by materially eating; but we are all shown to be one spiritually, because the bread spiritually to us is the body of Christ, not only personally but corporately. "Now ye are Christ's body (the 'the' is omitted) and members in particular" (1 Cor. xii. 27). This then is the deep mystery of the double meaning of the word "body," referring here, as it does, both to Christ and His people.

Observe it does not say only that we are one bread, or that we are one body; but it says: "we . . . are one bread, one body," thereby distinguishing the material act from its spiritual meaning, while connecting the two. In the material act we are one bread at the time because we have all eaten of it; and this recalls the fact that we are all permanently one body and are all partaking spiritually of the one body of Christ. "For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body being many are one body; so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body" (1 Cor. xii. 12, 13).<sup>1</sup>

One may here point out a fact which is I grant of secondary importance, but is still of great interest—that on this table there is only one loaf. If you had looked at the table in the wilderness, you would have found twelve loaves there because they represented the twelve tribes of Israel; you find two or three in the Jewish Feast in the land; why not have two now on the table as representing Jew and Gentile? Because both are one in the Christ, and this bread represents the one body, the one Christ. Its meaning, as we have seen, is extended in this 10th chapter to represent not only "Christ" but "the Christ," for we being many are one bread and one body,

<sup>1</sup> I do not go here into the deeper development of the thought, in the revelation of the mystery in Ephesians.

all spiritually united in figure in this bread. We must fully understand and enjoy the spiritual reality in the material figure. If we fail in this, there can be very little communion, and there may be none ; we can partake of the Lord's Supper without communion ; without being communicants strictly speaking. There are two words here used—the one is to partake, and the other is to commune ; the former means an outward and material participation, the other an inward and spiritual union. Any one can break the bread, but it is not to them the communion of the body of Christ unless it be partaken of with spiritual discernment ; that is why we read about “ not discerning the Lord's body.” Therefore many people may partake who are not communicants, because *a communicant is one who spiritually realizes the meaning of the material act.*

Therefore also the cup which we bless, “ is it not the communion ? ” Yes, if we receive it spiritually we have communion with Christ in the taking of it ; but not otherwise.

We have noticed there is no “ Jesus ” before us here. It is the blood of Christ, Who is present with us in resurrection life. “ Where two or three are gathered together there am I.” Who is the “ I ” ? Christ, the risen Christ present with those who intelligently commune with Him at the Lord's Supper. There is no word here of eating or drinking ; we bless the cup but it does not ever say we drink of it ; it is “ the bread that we break,” but it does not say we eat of it ; not because this is doubted, but because it is taken for granted, and is done by all. But the communion is not taken for granted, nor as a matter of course ; some may eat and drink without having communion in either the body or the blood of Christ ; so it is the communion, not the eating, that is expressed. Communion is the whole point ; there is not remembrance here, there is no “ showing,” the Scripture is absolutely absorbed by the present individual and corporate blessing, realized to the full in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Let us in closing just look at the order in the argument in verses 14-21.

We are told in the 14th verse to flee from idolatry, because in the verses 15, 16, and 17, the Christian at the Lord's table is in communion with Christ. In the 18th verse Israel was the same in their sacrifices. So are the heathen in verse 21 in sacrificing ; for though



(v. 19) the idols mean nothing, yet behind the idols (v. 20), are the devils with whom we are in communion if we eat at their table. In other words, those who eat at the table are in communion with what is represented on that table—at the table of the heathen, communion with devils, at the Lord's Supper, communion with Christ.

May He in His love grant that we may all personally realize in taking the Lord's Supper the full joy of that communion of which we have spoken.

A. T. SCHOFIELD.

*(Next and final article: "The Lord's Supper as Spiritual Food.")*



## State Ownership and Direct Control of the Liquor Traffic.

### THE THIRD REPORT OF THE CENTRAL BOARD OF CONTROL, 1917.

I N one of *Punch's* clever vignettes two schoolboys agree to stay on at a scientific lecture, in the hope that the professor will burn his fingers soon in his experiments. But a successful experiment means a firm footing for the grip of the next upward rung of the ladder. What has been done, well done on a small scale, is likely to succeed on a larger. Nothing succeeds like success. When Bacon's *Novum Organum* had once for all routed the guessings of a priori arguments, the inductive method, the learning by experience, leads the way.

The Third Report of the Central Control Board of the Liquor Traffic in this island is the record of a successful experiment. It tells, how "direct control" has been developed, not only by being tightened within areas already subject to it, but by taking in fresh areas. It shows not merely how drunkenness has decreased in these districts—that by itself might be fallacious, for other causes have to be counted in—but how new vigour, new life is infused into the industries of our nation, a healthier tone into the moral fibre, grievously handicapped, as we all knew only too well, in the earlier phases of the war. This "immense improvement" (p. 7) rings through the Report from end to end, and is amply justified by tabular statistics.

And, what is really a very important item, this marvellous transformation seems to have been accomplished as if by the waving of an enchanter's wand, with a remarkable "absence of friction."

A good deal of this may fairly be ascribed to the tactfulness of those who administered the policy of the Board. They moved gradually, like the London doctor who allowed his patients to go on with their laudanum on *condition, that they would always replenish the bottle after a dose with fresh water*, seem to have made sure of their ground before advancing, and to have enlisted the cooperation of those, who knew the locality. Suave pertinacity does wonders. Anyhow, this absence of deterrent friction is encouraging to those, who are afraid of interfering with vested interests.

Of course there have been "modifications" from time to time of the Board's original plans of operation. A wise man changes his mind sometimes; a fool never. The Board seems never to have swerved from the two guiding principles of their policy: first to check, not only downright drunkenness, but "soaking," "boozing" and the wastefulness which, like gangrene, eats away our national resources; and next, to provide substantial refreshment all round. Just as individuals differ one from another and require in detail a different treatment, so it is with localities and districts. Each has a character, each a different environment of circumstance. But in every case, by limiting the hours during which alcohol can be had, by timing these hours so as to coincide with meal-times, by curtailing the redundance of public-houses, above all by getting rid of any pecuniary profit to owner or tenant in pushing the sale of intoxicants, the steady pressure of State Control has done what nothing else could have done so effectually.

It is the emancipation of Britain from a bondage which has been a reproach to her among the great nations of the world.

Much remains still to be done. The habit of "treating," the "wetting" habit of finishing a bargain with whisky, such things, like our Teutonic adversaries, die hard. But this deeply interesting Report proves, how the snake in the grass may be scotched and killed.

But restriction by itself would be less than half the battle. The only real remedy for evil is to substitute something better in place of it. No trainer of colts for the Derby or of candidates for the Civil Service would be content to eradicate faults only. A farmer knows that weeds will soon cover his field again unless the ground is preoccupied by something better. Canteens, sometimes attached to a factory, have been provided generally, and have proved invaluable for the supply of good wholesome nutriment and for recreation. The influence radiating from the canteen makes, the Report assures us—and one can well believe it—a "profound change" in our industrial outlook and conditions, just as a bad sort of public-house is a focus for the bad characters in the neighbourhood.

But, it is objected, State ownership is a step towards Socialism, or, to use a more significant term, Collectivism. This is true not of our National Drink Bill only, but in many other ways. A war unprecedented alike in extent and intensity has done it. There

seems no end to the multiplication of Governmental Departments ; they almost defy counting : no end to the absorption of private resources into one huge, central reservoir. In other respects, when the storm shall have rolled away, we shall probably revert to our British habit of encouraging the unshackled enterprise of individuals, unless there is something wrong to be set right by the interference of the community. But the Drink Traffic is a thing distinctly by itself, as experience has proved again and again ; it is a running sore. Under a wisely regulated State ownership, as experience has proved now, the Drink Traffic may be, has been, controlled for good.

Again, it is objected that restrictions on places of public entertainment lead to excessive drinking at home. But this, as experience shows, is only, when the restrictions are not backed up by public opinion. The war has awakened our nation to appreciate the absolute necessity of restrictions.

“ Allegations of increased home-drinking have frequently been made since the outbreak of the war, both before and after the operation of the Board’s restrictive Orders. Such allegations seldom admit of positive proof or disproof. The Board has carefully investigated the most specific of these allegations, and they are satisfied that in the great majority of cases they are unsupported by substantial evidence. The bulk of the best attainable evidence, derived from the majority of Medical Officers of Health, from trained health visitors, and from detailed inquiries made on behalf of the Board as well as from the police is in the opposite direction.”

“ The same general conclusion holds good with regard to the allegations made respecting the increase of drinking among women.”<sup>1</sup>

If any of [those who have given] close and unbiased attention to this [vital] question still hesitate whether or not to support a fairly balanced scheme of State Ownership and State Direct Control of our Liquor Traffic, pages 13, 14 of this Third Report ought to be conclusive as showing what has been successfully done at Carlisle, especially [in the] organization of [the] Gretna Tavern.

The annual reports of the *People’s Refreshment Houses Association* tell [the] same story of good done by the manager’s profits coming only and entirely from the sale of non-alcoholic drinks.

I. GREGORY SMITH.

<sup>1</sup> See Table II, etc., etc. in Appendix.



## Preachers' Pages.

### HOMILETICAL HINTS AND OUTLINES.

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

#### Ninth Sunday after Trinity.

Text: "Neither tempt Christ," etc.—1 Cor. x. 9 (Epistle).

St. Paul's object is to demonstrate the fact that the Church is the true Israel and that all the past is its inheritance, even though it be in part Gentile. Even the past had sacraments and the ministry of the second person of the Trinity—e.g., Christ (v. 9) cf. "the reproach of Christ" Heb. xi. 26. His opening words—"I would not that ye should be ignorant"—is a favourite expression. See Rom. i. 13, xi. 25, 1 Cor. xii. 1, 2 Cor. i. 8, 1 Thess. iv. 13. He proceeds to speak of temptation under different aspects.

I. THE SON OF GOD TEMPTED, UNDER THE OLD COVENANT, BY THE SONS OF GOD. Think of the way in which God's children try His patience and take Israel in the wilderness as an illustration. There is something startling in the suggestion that Christ was tempted by the Israelites in the wilderness. But in the face of our Lord's own statement, "Before Abraham was, I AM," and again, "Abraham rejoiced to see my day," it is not so surprising. He who is *the* word in which God has expressed His thoughts and feelings towards mankind, has made Himself felt through all the ages. (a) *He has revealed the essential character of God—love.* "The only begotten Son . . . hath revealed Him." (b) *He has demanded of mankind, homage, trust and obedience.* St. Paul's argument is that the sin of tempting and rejecting Him is the same in every age.

II. THE SONS OF GOD TEMPTED. This reminds us of the different senses in which the word temptation is used. We notice—(a) *That there are temptations "common to man."* This being so, not even the faithful can hope to escape. Even the Lord must endure the attack of Satan. But while we are not compelled to be good, we are not obliged to be bad. Satan has no power but to tempt, he cannot force us to yield. (b) *That the Sons of God are so equipped as to be able to conquer.* "Not . . . above that ye are able." We need not be among the vanquished but among the

victors. For the needful strength we may count on the faithfulness of God. We can say with St. Paul that His grace is "sufficient."

---

**Tenth Sunday after Trinity.**

Text: "Ye were Gentiles, carried away unto these dumb idols," etc. *I Cor.* xii. 1 (Epistle).

In this section of his letters St. Paul is answering questions which have been addressed to him on points of faith and morals. He has already dealt with (1) marriage, (2) meats offered to idols, (3) Christian worship—the position of women and the observance of the Sacrament. He now proceeds to deal with the questions which have been asked concerning spiritual gifts. Later on he deals with the doctrine of the Resurrection and the subject of Almsgiving. We have here plenty of subject matter. The following points are suggested as affording scope for homiletic treatment.

I. AN INGLORIOUS PAST. "Ye were Gentiles," etc. St. Paul not infrequently reminds his converts of the terrible depths of depravity out of which they have been lifted; *e.g.*, "Such were some of you," *I Cor.* vi. 11. The man who has made his way in the world often finds it convenient to forget what he once was, and sometimes slights his former acquaintances. St. Paul's object is not to taunt these Christians with their past, but rather—(1) To break down all false pride and self-complacency. (2) To incite them to deeper penitence. (3) To stimulate their gratitude.

II. AN INSPIRED CONFESSION. "No man can say . . . except by the Holy Ghost." Here is one of several proofs that a man is under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. For another proof of this, see *I John* ii. 1-3. There is need to-day for clear witness of faith in the Divinity of our Blessed Lord. This confession not only involves the recognition of His Godhead but of His Sovereignty. He is our Lord. As such His precepts are not to be regarded as wishes but as commands. None of them are "grievous" (*I John* v. 3). [On "calling Jesus Anathema"—consult any good commentary.]

III. THE CONCEPTION OF THE CORPORATE LIFE. St. Paul is fond of metaphors which illustrate this. We have, for instance, the following:—(a) *Civic life*. The duties and responsibilities of the Christian citizen (*Eph.* ii. 19). (b) *Family life*. The household of faith (*Eph.* ii. 19, iii. 15). (c) *The material structure*. The

building fitly framed together . . . builded together (Eph. ii. 22). (d) *Military life*. The army, the equipment, training and duty of the Christian soldier (Eph. vi. 11-16). (e) *Here, as in Eph. iv. 16, 17, we have the human body*. The different functions of its various members and their inter-relation illustrate Church life.

---

Eleventh Sunday after Trinity.

Text: "I declare unto you the Gospel which I preached unto you." 1 Cor. xv. 1 (Epistle).

St. Paul continues to deal with questions which have been raised by the Corinthians. The passage introduces the elaborate argument into which he enters to prove the Resurrection. He sets forth (1) the nature and (2) the effects of the Glad Tidings. We are sometimes told that the Cross of Christ was merely a human accident and had nothing to do with the redemption of mankind, and this even by Christian teachers. But, if it be so, then the Apostle must have been mistaken. He very distinctly teaches otherwise and, further, sets forth the Cross as the fulfilment of prophecy—"according to the Scriptures."

I. HE RECALLS MEMORABLE EXPERIENCES. (a) *The vision of the Risen Christ*. "Last of all He was seen of me also." He gives an important list of persons who were chosen as witnesses, but his own experience is to him the most valuable—"seeing is believing." He has a sense of personal unworthiness: "Not meet . . . because I persecuted the Church." (b) *The Commission to him of the Gospel as a sacred trust*. "That which I also received." He was entrusted with a task and he has been mindful of the obligation. With the Psalmist he can say, "I have not kept back Thy mercy and Truth." Cf. 2 Cor. v. 11, 17, 19.

II. HE REVIEWS AN ARDUOUS BUT HAPPY MINISTRY. He is not conscious of unfaithfulness, but can say that what he received he delivered, and that he laboured strenuously (v. 10). He has also the joy of being able to add, "Ye received." Every preacher who reads these words must surely be driven to ask himself whether or not he possesses the necessary qualifications,—not a place in an ordered succession, be that succession unbroken or not, but personal experience which alone qualifies for witness. In a court of law no one is heard whose evidence is not based on experience. But there is also a message here for the man in the pew! The preacher may be

able to say "I delivered." He can do no more. Have you "received"? ["Believed in vain." For various interpretations consult a commentary.]

Twelfth Sunday after Trinity.

Text: "Jehoshaphat . . . came down to the king of Israel."  
—I *Kings* xxii. 2. (First lesson, mg.)

A strange "affinity" (see 2 Chron. xviii. 2). Politically nothing can be urged against it, but religiously it was a grave error, fraught with unforeseen and disastrous results. It nearly cost poor Jehoshaphat his life (I *Kings* xxi. 32, 33), but there were other consequences which did not immediately appear, and which did not enter into his calculations. But it is a great art to be able to discern the ultimate and perceive the tendency of things. The episode related in this chapter constitutes the first act in a life-tragedy. Let us look at the three acts.

I. ACT ONE. A ROYAL FEAST. Scene, the banqueting hall of the royal palace in Samaria. A great feast is spread in honour of Jehoshaphat's visit. Wine and wit are flowing freely. But what undesirable surroundings for a godly man! After the feast Ahab "showed his hand." He cared nothing for the society of such as Jehoshaphat: his only object was to make use of him, and unfortunately Jehoshaphat lent himself too easily to his host and pledged himself and his people with surprising readiness to the enterprise. See 2 Chron. xviii. 3. One can only put it down to deplorable weakness.

II. ACT TWO. A ROYAL WEDDING. The bridegroom, Jehoshaphat's son Jehoram, who succeeded him, and the bride, daughter of Ahab and Jezebel. A desirable "match" people called it,—the union of two royal houses! If Jehoshaphat had seen this when he associated himself with Ahab how would he have felt? Would he have gone? Can one doubt that it was through the friendship that sprung up between these royal houses that this marriage came about?

III. ACT THREE. A ROYAL FUNERAL. The last act in this terrible tragedy. See 2 Chron. xxi. 19, 20. No tears are shed over the grave of this man who passed away in the prime of life (2 Chron. xxi. 5). Unhonoured and unsung they laid him to rest in the city of his fathers, but "not in the sepulchre of the kings." His down-



fall is distinctly attributed to the evil influence of his wife. See 2 Chron. xxi. 6.

How many lessons come crowding in upon us as we read this dramatic story! Evil communications corrupt good manners. Those who are coming behind us will very likely tread in our foot-prints. Marriage makes or mars a man. Many men are what women make them. How great, then, is woman's influence for good or ill.

---

**Notes for a Harvest Sermon on Psalm lxxv.**

Introductory notes. In this psalm all nature, animate and inanimate, lifts up her voice in song. The valleys, thick with corn, join in chorus with man (v. 2) to offer a hymn of praise. Consider—

I. THE VASTNESS OF THE DIVINE RESOURCES. What demands are made upon the Creator! He would be a sorry creator who proved himself unequal to such demands. But to God belong the silver and the gold and the cattle upon a thousand hills. The river of God is "full." The valleys are "thick" with corn. The very "clouds drop fatness."

II. THE VARIETY OF THE DIVINE GIFTS. He giveth food to all flesh: and just the meat appropriate to the needs of each.

III. THE CONTINUITY OF SUPPLY. The ancient promise, "seed time and harvest shall not fail," is remembered by Him Who is ever faithful to the covenant that He made with a thousand generations.

IV. THE VOW THAT IS TO BE PERFORMED. See Psalms, lxi. 8, and lxvi. 13-14. Every grateful heart utters a vow and every faithful heart rests not content with vowing but "daily performs."

---

**ILLUSTRATIONS.**

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

In a speech he made in the City Hall of Cardiff Little Nations  
—and People. (Oct. 27, 1916), Mr. Lloyd George said: "Little nations were never more alive, never more important than they are to-day in this conflict of gigantic Empires. If I were to pass a criticism upon the Allies, I should say that, whilst fighting for little nations, they have never fully recognized and realized their value and their potential strength. They have never quite realized the value of Belgium, or Serbia, or Montenegro, or

Bulgaria, or Greece, or Roumania. When the time comes to write the story of this conflict, it will be found that the cardinal blunder of the Allies was not to understand the power—the potential power of the little nations. Britain is now at the full strength of an Imperial tide ; and yet, whilst the tide is high and will get still higher, it will never submerge the joy of the little nation in its past, in its present, in the future which it can see plain to its gaze. The small nation is like the spring ; it does not cease to have a separate existence even when its waters are merged in the great river, it still runs along the same valley, under the same name, draining the same watershed. And if it ceased to flow and to gather the waters of its own glen, the great river would shrink, would lose part of its impetus and part of the purity of its waters."

What is true of nations is true also of men. This War has brought into greater prominence the gifts and qualities of some few great men ; but it has in a far higher degree shown the value of little men—yes, and of little women too—people whose position in life was hitherto obscure, even despised by the haughty. Yet the touchstone of war has revealed their nobility of character. The splendid patriotism, the spirit of self-sacrifice, the cheerful devotion to duty, however irksome and distasteful, shown in the trenches, in the air-service, on board battleships and mine-sweepers, and in the munition factories, have been among the greatest wonders of the age. How much England—aye and the whole civilized world—owes to these little people—these brave humble lads and patient women—we have begun to learn.

May the teaching and the lessons of their faithful lives never be forgotten. And may the least esteemed among us all take fresh courage, believing with a new joy in the potential power for good and useful service possessed by every soul that draws its individual strength and purity of motive from Him Who "is no respecter of persons."

Zeppelins had crossed the North Sea during the night, and, probably not knowing where they were, had dropped scores of bombs on a country district along the east coast. Happily there were no casualties, as nearly all these deadly missiles had fallen on the open fields. But the noise of their explosions had naturally alarmed the people living in adjacent villages. For these poor country-folk it was indeed a night of

God stronger  
than the Devil.

terror. The next morning I went to see an old man lying on his bed of sickness, from which he was never to recover. His wife was dead, and he lived with his daughter, a widow. The cottage was spotlessly clean and tidy. The daughter seemed shaken after her experience of the night; she owned to having been badly frightened, but she added, "Father wasn't worried the least bit; his faith is so wonderful." I went into the bedroom where the old man was; and when I asked him how he felt and what he thought about it all, he replied, "I haven't felt disturbed in mind the whole night. Sir, what I think is this: the devil is very strong on earth to-day; but (with energy in his failing voice) the Lord God Almighty is stronger than the devil, and He'll make everything right in the end." The sublime philosophy of these words from the lips of an old farm-labourer have often come back to my mind since I heard them spoken, and I pass them on to those whose faith is being tried by any trouble or perplexing doubt. The evil that is wrought in the world to-day is the devil's work. Where he came from or why he is allowed to exist and work mischief I know not. But you may have this sure confidence, that the devil is only being let loose for a season.<sup>1</sup> And, however strong he is, the Lord on high is a great deal stronger. Sin and suffering shall all come to nothing in their appointed time; and the Lord will make everything right in the end.

---

### THE STUDY TABLE.

The study of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament is unduly neglected by a large number of the clergy; yet some of these books are very important, if not for anything else, at least for their presentation of the social life, popular beliefs and religious aspirations of the Jews during the centuries which immediately preceded the advent of our Lord. This lack of interest has probably been due to the lack of a cheap and handy translation of these books. Prof. Charles' excellent and monumental edition is too costly for the general reader. Dr. Oesterley and Canon Box are, therefore, rendering a real service to Biblical students by their edition of a faithful and scholarly translation of these books in a handy form and at a reasonable cost.<sup>2</sup> Each volume is furnished with a short but adequate introduction discussing the date, authorship, etc.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rev. xx. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Translations of Early Documents*, edited by the Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D., and the Rev. Canon G. H. Box. *The Book of Enoch*, by R. H. Charles, D.Litt., D.D. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, by R. H. Charles, D.Litt. *The Wisdom of Ben-Sira* (Ecclesiasticus), by W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. *The Apocalypse of Ezra* (4 Esdras), by the Rev. Canon Box—all published by S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d. net each.

Of the four volumes before us the *Book of Enoch* and the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* are translated by Dr. Charles with introductions by Dr. Oosterley. The book of Enoch, considerable parts of which, according to Charles, are pre-Maccabæan, was written by a Jew who lived in Northern Palestine. "The influence of 1 Enoch on the New Testament has been greater than that of all the other apocryphal and pseudepigraphal books put together" (Charles). Enoch is of special interest on account of its discussion of the problem of evil; the Messiah and the Messianic kingdom; the title of the Son of Man; and the Resurrection.

The *Testaments* in its original form belongs to the reign of John Hyrcanus (B.C. 135-104), but has been added to during the middle of the last century B.C. It has been further augmented by Christian interpolators. "It reaches an astonishingly high ethical standard" and must have been known to the writers of the New Testament.

The translation of the *Wisdom of Ben-Sira* (or Ecclesiasticus) is from the pen of Dr. Oosterley. The book was originally written in Hebrew, and was later translated into Greek by the author's grandson. Fragments of the lost Hebrew MS. were discovered by different scholars during the years 1896-1900. These cover nearly two-thirds of the whole book. Dr. Oosterley's translation is based on Smend's Hebrew text, wherever the Hebrew is extant, otherwise Sweet's Greek text is followed. This is one of the most valuable of apocryphal books, and seems to have been so much used in the early Church as to become an ecclesiastical or Church book. Hence the title "Ecclesiasticus" given to it by Jerome. No other book gives us such a clear glimpse of the social life and religious teaching of the Jews of the time. Dr. Oosterley, in agreement with most recent scholars, assigns B.C. 190-180 as the approximate date of the composition of the original Hebrew. Other scholars, including Westcott, place the original Hebrew about a century earlier. We must confess that the later date has not convinced us.

Canon Box's *Apocalypse of Ezra* is excellent. Besides critical notes, he gives brief and valuable explanatory notes. It is to be hoped that other translators will follow Canon Box's example in this respect. This "Apocalypse" consists of 2 Esdras iii.-xiv. of the English Apocrypha. It is extant only in Latin. Both the Hebrew original and the Greek from which the Latin version was made are completely lost. It seems to have been composed about 100 A.D. The theological value of this book is great, as it lays much stress on the doctrine of the original sin; the future life; the Heavenly Messiah, the Son of Man; the impotency of the Law to save. From the Latin MS., from which our authorized version was made, a long passage of some seventy verses had been cut out, evidently for dogmatic reasons, but is extant in all Oriental versions. In 1875, Prof. R. L. Bensly discovered this famous Missing Fragment, which is now included in the R.V. between verses 35 and 36 of chap. vii. Canon Box also gives us these valuable verses, from which we gather that "the soul enters at once into a state of blessedness or the reverse, according as it is righteous or wicked" (Box). As man's future destiny is fixed in this life, and cannot be changed after death, no prayer for the dead is of any avail (ch. vii. 104-5).

May we suggest to the Editors that an index will greatly enhance the value of these volumes? These books are thoroughly scholarly, handy in form, and reasonable in price. We wish them wide circulation.

KHODADAD E. KEITH.

"Mrs. Nankivell," we are told in *A Scheme of Teaching for the Church's Year*, and *A Year's Course of Lessons for Sunday School Classes* (by Constance Nankivell. R. H. Allenson, Ltd. 2s. 6d. net) "has been preparing

this book for several years. Its plan has been put to the practical test in Bournemouth with real success and appreciation. As now completed it affords very useful material for a year's course of sermons, and also, in the last portion of the book, provides a fine scheme of Sunday school teaching for a whole year." The authoress is much impressed with the "chain of ordered thought and teaching" contained in the Prayer Book, a sequence often lost, because broken into. Thus from Advent to Trinity we have laid before us what God has done for us, while from Trinity to Advent our thoughts are rather led to what we may do for God. The two portions of the work indicated by the double title are practically two distinct volumes bound together, each with a Preface or Introductory Note of its own. In the one prefixed to the latter portion of the book it is pointed out that the experience of army chaplains and hospital visitors goes to shew that many "who know so well how to serve, and how to suffer for their country, do not know their way to the Presence of their King, Who remaineth a King for ever." Hence the intense importance of Sunday school work of the best kind. "We are," says the writer, "verily guilty concerning these lads, if we let them go forth to the Great Adventure without making sure that they know where to get what God alone can give." Preachers and teachers will find many useful hints in this work.

\* \* \* \* \*

A collection of remarkable answers to prayer will be found in *The Answer Came* (edited by J. Kennedy Maclean. Marshall Brothers. 3s. 6d. net). These were originally contributed by readers of *The Life of Faith* under the heading "To His Praise." In this collected form they constitute a remarkable witness to the Divine faithfulness, and preachers will find here not only encouragement in their work but illustrative material for use in the pulpit or prayer meeting.

\* \* \* \* \*

*My Ideals of Religion*, by the Rev. Walter J. Carey, R.N. (Longmans, Green & Co., 1s. net), is an admirably planned little volume, designed to appeal to "the class of men and women who deny neither God nor their conscience," whose "intention is to do right, but they are so confused." Such magnificent material he has seen in the Navy, and he would gladly die with a *nunc dimittis* "if they were one and all the friends and servants of Jesus Christ." It is to help these Mr. Carey has written. His ideals, if not very new, are presented with freshness and a certain degree of unconventionality, and the book will be appreciated by many. He belongs, as every one knows, to the "Catholic" school, but he is out to win souls rather than proselytes.

\* \* \* \* \*

A book such as *The People's Missal* (compiled by the Rev. E. A. L. Clarke, sometime Curate of the Church of the Ascension, Lavender Hill; H. R. Allenson, Ltd., 5s. net) has no practical interest for us, whatever may be its historical value. We are old-fashioned enough to believe that clergy who have solemnly pledged themselves to use at all times of their ministrations the Book of Common Prayer and no other, are bound by that pledge, and we cannot see how it helps the loyalty of the people to put into their hands a "Missal" which enables them to follow the so-called secret devotions of the celebrant, even when, as in this case, the compilation is based on the Sarum rather than the Roman use. The volume contains sixteen illustrations, reproductions of the beautiful paintings of the late Frederic Shields to be seen in the Chapel of the Ascension, Bayswater.

## The Missionary World.

THE regret with which we learn of the resignation by Sir John Kennaway of the presidency of the C.M.S. is equalled by the pleasure with which we welcome Sir Robert Williams as his successor. Those who were privileged to know Sir John Kennaway in private as well as in public life can best realize how faithfully he gave himself to the work and how much he contributed to its well-being. For some time past he has been wont to transfer some of the more onerous public duties to his successor, and we are sure that the sense of loss involved in his official severance from the work will be assuaged by the knowledge that the new president will maintain all the best traditions of the Society and yet face with fearless insight the problems of the new day which lies so close ahead. One of the signal tokens of God's goodness to the C.M.S. is the succession of true and able men raised up to fill the offices of president, treasurer, and honorary secretary.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Conference of British Missionary Societies held in June, at Norwood instead of at Swanwick this year, has already been reported in the weekly religious Press. But one or two of its main features call for notice here. It was, as always, an occasion for fellowship and intercourse of a specially genial kind, but in addition this year there was a new spirit of agreement in definite united intercession, and a fresh zest and energy in discussing the co-operative side of missionary work. The advance was not shown by ready acquiescence in suggestions sent up by the various committees, but by the healthy vigour with which proposals were challenged and debated, and the open mind with which solutions, when found, were recognized and accepted. The Conference is developing a common mind and will, and though it has no executive functions, the representatives sent up by the various societies not only contribute to the conclusions arrived at, but are able to commend them, in the light of the mind of the Conference, to their committees. This year the Conference reconstituted the Board of Study for the Preparation of Missionaries on new lines—as proposed by the Board itself—with a view to giving it a closer relation to the Conference and making it more fully representative of the societies.

The C.M.S. is facing with resource and energy the somewhat serious situation created by the lessening of income and the increasing claims of the work abroad. Readers of the *CHURCHMAN* will already have received the letter issued by the secretaries and the valuable pamphlet of *Suggestions*; both have been issued separately and also printed in the July issue of the *C.M.S. Gazette*. We trust that the clergy everywhere will respond to the appeal specially made to them for co-operation and will apply for and make full use of the *BULLETIN* which is being prepared exclusively for their use. The first issue is now ready, and can be had, by clergy only, on application to the Home Secretary at the C.M. House.

\* \* \* \* \*

*China's Millions* for July contains an address by the treasurer of the C.I.M. in Shanghai which should be read by local missionary treasurers and collectors and by the members of all committees which deal with missionary finance. It is an amazing record of "the splendour of God in providence." It is abundantly clear that the Mission has not lacked experience of financial strain, yet the growth of the income has kept pace with the growth of the work, and Mr. Hayward was able to bear witness that not one farthing of the total expenditure in China—£1,100,000—was spent before it was received, that there is no entry of any bank interest for overdraft, and there has been a balance in hand on every day of the twenty-eight years that he has been in the Shanghai office as on every day that preceded them since the Mission was founded. This is a unique record. We quote it because its secret does not seem to us to lie so much in the distinctive methods of the Mission as in the life of prayer and faith which underlies its work.

\* \* \* \* \*

Once more the floods are loose in China and the new Government which it was hoped was getting settled has been overwhelmed. It is possible that by the time these notes are published the nominal monarchy may again be a thing of the past. The great mass of the Chinese people do not know one form of government from another, and are at the mercy of the few who are striving to work out good or bad ideals. Fluctuations are inevitable when a people so vast and so immature are awakening and when the educated few are removed so far from the ignorant many. The form of government matters little, but China needs true patriots as leaders, who will

care for the interests of their country, not for their own. Among the Christians such are not lacking. The situation is a call to prayer. It would be a grievous set-back to the cause of Christ's Kingdom if China reverted to militarist rather than to constitutional rule. For one thing, Confucianism would probably be made the religion of the State. The whole body of Christians will need both courage and wisdom in this fresh crisis which confronts them.

\* \* \* \* \*

Those who realize the great work of American missions are watching with interest the gradual evolution of the *Missionary Review of the World*, a magazine long edited by Dr. Pierson and now the property of a body representing the main American mission boards. The magazine has a great opportunity at a time when America is freshly involved in war and has much to think of outside her past experience. In addition to the large funds needed for Armenian and Syrian relief, a great "Christian War Programme" is being undertaken by the International Committee of the Y.M.C.A. For work amongst American soldiers in France and elsewhere 1,000 Y.M.C.A. secretaries are needed, and 200 buildings are to be erected at mobilization camps. Three million dollars is being raised to initiate this work, and all the while America needs money and men and women for her great missions in non-Christian lands. It is good that the *Missionary Review of the World* is in existence to reinforce the appeal of the denominational magazines.

\* \* \* \* \*

A striking article on "Recent Movements in Japanese Thought," by Professor Masumi Hino of Doshisha University appears in the *International Review of Missions* for July. It is a penetrating study, sympathetic but highly critical of the transformations in thought which have taken place since 1868. The period of imitation and admiration of foreign civilizations which prevailed until 1890 was followed by a period of self-assertion in which the cry of "Japan for the Japanese" rang through the country and the young Japanese churches grasped at independence. From 1901 to the present day what Professor Hino terms "the Romantic period" has set in. It began with the luxuries which were the result of the victory of Japan over China. Students and preachers turned from subjects which taxed reason to those which excited sensation. Pictures were introduced in newspapers and magazines; food assumed a



new interest. The happiness of individual citizens was thought of before the welfare of the State. Freedom tended towards libertinism. The sense of duty has been weakened among young people and ethical foundations have been shaken. The situation, which is too complex to reproduce in a brief note, is one which all missionaries to Japan should study, and it contains elements which have strong admonition for ourselves. Professor Hino holds that the Japanese now recognize the need for religion far more than they did at the close of the nineteenth century, and urges that the whole country is open to Christian instruction and will yield a rich harvest in response to steady work.

\* \* \* \* \*

We note with pleasure that the Candidates' Fund associated with the monthly intercession paper issued by the C.M.S. is increasing, though it is still very far from equalling that raised in a similar way by Canon Bullock Webster for the S.P.G. Every indication that the Church is concerned with the equipment of missionaries gives hope of a better day. An article in the July number of the *International Review of Missions*, while touching sympathetically on the work done in training institutions and by the Board of Study for the Preparation of Missionaries, urges that the more responsible task lies upon the Church as a whole, which should not only insist upon adequate specialized preparation being provided and be willing to meet the inevitable expense, but should also use its own agencies of home, school and parochial life as a means of preparing men and women qualified to be missionaries. Clergy will find it worth while to make this paper the basis of a parochial conference in which they may gain light as to the real value—or otherwise—of existing local agencies in building up Christian character and true life ideals.

\* \* \* \* \*

In days when anything either on education or on India commands attention, Miss McDougall's article in the same *Review* on "The Higher Education of Indian Women" is sure to have many readers. The broad outlook taken by the best missionary educators is a model which many need to copy at home. Miss McDougall not only works successfully at the problems which centre round the Christian College for Women at Madras, of which she is principal, but she finds time to watch the whole trend of educational matters

in India, discerning tendencies as yet only half-defined and foreseeing dangers which lie in the near future. Missionaries are increasingly learning to make this wider contribution to the life of the country in which they work. A paper on "A Conscience Clause in Indian Schools" in *The East and The West* by the Rev. W. E. S. Holland is another illustration of this. Missionary work is claiming from its home supporters not only the traditional guinea multiplied many times, but intelligent study and wide outlook. The true "experts" are not those who are trained to make detailed decisions in accordance with precedent in committee rooms, but those who are steadily seeing the growth of the life of the nation as the background for each separate piece of work, and who are prepared to re-estimate the value of every part in relation to the whole.

\* \* \* \* \*

Opponents of Prayer Book Revision at home will gain by a perusal of the paper by the Rev. Copland King on "Prayer Book Revision in the Mission Field" in the current issue of *The East and The West*. The writer shows that whatever may be said for maintaining the English Prayer Book as it is, there is no reasonable ground for applying the same arguments—even if they were conclusive ones—to the churches in Greater Britain. He quotes statements showing that at the Pan-Anglican Congress missionary leaders from Africa, India, China and Japan urged that the Prayer Book, as it stands, is, when translated into the various vernaculars, unsuitable and incomprehensible to the people. It seems to be generally agreed that it would not be impossible to arrange for a book which should be freely adapted to special needs and yet remain in all languages a bond of union between the mother and daughter Churches. But at present there seems to be no authority which can sanction or direct such revision, and here, as elsewhere, we find ourselves thrust back on the urgent need for legislation which shall liberate our Church to arrange its spiritual affairs at home and throughout the world.

G.



## Reviews of Books.

### TWO BOOKS ON THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN.

#### I.

THE PLACE OF WOMEN IN THE CHURCH. By H. L. Goudge, Darwell Stone, W. J. Sparrow Simpson, Lady Henry Somerset, Geraldine E. Hodgson, Dr. Mary Scharlieb, Mrs. Romanes, Miss E. K. Sanders. London: *Robert Scott*, Roxburgh House, Paternoster Row, E.C. Price 2s. 6d. net.

Women are entering so many fields of labour in these days of war and are so ably demonstrating their ability to hold their own, that it is certain we have not heard the last of proposals to secure for them not merely a recognized position in the councils of the Church, but even the right to enter the ministry. The suggestion is startling, but at the same time it demands consideration, and this volume is a most valuable contribution to the discussion. It puts forth strongly and ably the reasons against the proposal, but it must not be left out of count that in the near future the place of women in the Church will be very different from what it has been.

The Introduction puts us in possession of certain leading facts. We are reminded, for instance, of Mr. H. W. Hill's unheeded warning at the meeting of the Representative Church Council in 1914 and of the way in which the matter was reopened at the time of the National Mission. The contention of those who favour the ministry of women is clearly stated by one of themselves:—"Our feeling is that priesthood is a human office, not at all a sexual one, and that since women are human beings it is unreasonable to refuse them an opportunity of holding it because they are women."

We also find here pithy extracts from articles in the *Nineteenth Century* and *Contemporary Review*, and perhaps Mr. Athelstan Riley's forceful reply to Miss Picton-Turbervill, entitled "Male and Female created He them," may be taken as a terse statement of the case as against those who favour the progressive movement:—"As between the sexes I say boldly that there is inequality in privilege, inequality in calling, inequality in opportunity of service. There is one set of physical functions peculiar to the man and another set peculiar to the woman, and no 'movement' will ever succeed in making them interchangeable." His argument is that if this, and much more with which he deals, be true in the natural sphere, it is not unreasonable to suppose that it holds good in the supernatural sphere, and that in it there should be inequalities and differences in callings and functions. A pronouncement made by Miss Maude Royden and an address by Mr. John Lee both come in for consideration, while the account of a public meeting held so recently as January 8, in the present year, reminds us that the subject is still being hotly debated in certain quarters.

The articles which follow vary in length and deal with differing aspects of the subject; and while we fear that those who are favourable to the movement will find little in these pages that affords them satisfaction, they will find it of immense service to study the arguments and evidence so carefully collected together. The volume is one to be reckoned with.

Canon Goudge's article, "The Teaching of St. Paul as to the Position of Women," is well entitled to the premier position, not merely because it is

the longest, but because it deals exhaustively with St. Paul's teaching, which we see in the Introduction has been impugned, and even described as "uninspired"! It deserves the most careful study by all who are anxious to arrive, so far as is possible, at the exact meaning of the Apostle's references to the place of women in the Church. At the outset the writer disposes once and for all of the theory that St. Paul held Oriental views of women, but that on the contrary he was a Hebrew of the Hebrews and that the notion that in his day the Hebrews held degraded views of women is entirely erroneous, and instances are given to show how he regarded women, recognized their utility and desired that they should be treated. He further disposes of the argument that the Apostle's teaching that "in Christ Jesus there is . . . neither male nor female," is a denial of the subordination of women, and he proceeds to show that subordination does not imply either subjection or inferiority. The limitation placed upon the activity of women in the Church and the reasons therefor, as given by St. Paul, are fully and frankly discussed. They are shown to be based upon the true relation of man and woman, and upon a necessity for women to be "in quietness" because public speaking and teaching involves too great a strain upon their nervous system. But the whole treatment of the subject is scholarly, lucid and sane, and the article gives the book a very distinct value.

Dr. Darwell Stone's brief contribution is a reply to Dr. Percy Dearmer, whose interpretation of St. Paul he describes as being "as perverse as his article is clever," and he makes mincemeat of the suggestion that the prejudice against women taking services is "an Anglican peculiarity."

Dr. Sparrow Simpson gives us an invaluable history of the ministry of women and more particularly of the office of deaconess, and he closes with a warning against the disparagement of tradition.

The remaining contributions are hardly less valuable. Dr. Geraldine Hodgson deals with the Ordination of women, and Dr. Mary Scharlieb with *The Medical Ministry of Women*, while Mrs. Romanes and Miss Sanders deal respectively with *The Religious Life* and *Younger Women and the Church*. There is in these latter articles more and clearer evidence than is found elsewhere in the book of a theological view-point, somewhat different from our own, but this not withstanding, the book, as a whole, forms a valuable compendium, well fulfilling the promise of its title,—to give an account of the place of women in the Church of God.

## II.

WOMEN IN THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH. By the Rev. T. B. Allworthy, M.A., B.D. Cambridge: *W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd.* Price 3s. net.

The sub-title of this volume describes it as "A critical study of the evidence in the New Testament for the prominence of women in early Christianity," and though there is nothing to indicate that its appearance has any immediate connection with the matters which we suppose led to the preparation of the former book, yet inasmuch as it deals with various points raised in the discussion as to the ministry of women in Church, it is of course a further contribution to that discussion. But it is much more than this,—it is the work of a student who has with infinite pains considered practically every passage in the New Testament which would throw light upon the subject.

Mr. Allworthy opens the subject by drawing attention to the "revolutionary attitude towards women adopted by our Lord," and he points out that while Jewish women enjoyed, in our Lord's day, considerable freedom, yet there was little recognition of their mental and spiritual capacities. The Jewish teachers did not consider it necessary or desirable that women should

be educationally on an equal footing with men. Consequently our Lord's treatment of them must, he says, "have been unintelligible to the men of His time,"—for He certainly showed that He had "a sincere belief in the intellectual and spiritual possibilities of women, and that He recognized no distinction in spiritual things between the sexes." He passes on to consider, as we have observed, all the women mentioned in the New Testament as members of the Church, as well as every passage dealing with their work and witness.

As the space at our disposal is limited, we turn to those passages in which Mr. Allworthy deals with the points considered by Canon Goudge. As to the veiling of women Mr. Allworthy mentions the fact that a bare head was ordinarily the badge of a woman of bad character: this may have been one of the reasons why St. Paul considered it was not "seemly" that a woman should take part in the meetings for worship with her head uncovered. Both writers agree in regarding the passage, "For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels," as presenting serious difficulty. Canon Goudge notices the Revisers' rendering,—the insertion of the words "a sign of,"—but regards the addition as "speculative," and he very rightly says that if this gives us St. Paul's meaning correctly, it still leaves us in ignorance "as to what angels he refers to and what they have to do with the matter." In a footnote he refers to Tertullian's explanation, namely, that St. Paul may have had in mind the sin of "the sons of God" (LXX. angels) with "the daughters of men" (Gen. vi. 1-4),—this he considers "the best explanation." Mr. Allworthy, too, notices this, but he quotes the Robertson-Plummer International Critical Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (to which he frequently refers) describing this view as "somewhat childish" and as taking the meaning to be that "if a woman thinks lightly of shocking men, she must remember that she will also be shocking the angels, who, of course, are present at public worship." He, however, is compelled to add, "No satisfactory explanation of the 'authority' is offered." He emphasizes the fact which Canon Goudge ignores, namely, that "the Apostle takes the prophetic ministry of women for granted and assumes that it will continue." Canon Goudge takes "the child-bearing" through which women are to be saved as referring to the Incarnation. This Mr. Allworthy regards as "an attractive but highly improbable view." He prefers the simpler interpretation—"She shall be brought safely through child-birth, if they (perhaps husband and wife) continue in faith and love and sanctification with sobriety."

On the prohibition, "Let the women keep silence in the Churches," Mr. Allworthy has a good deal to say. He thinks it "quite possible" that the passage is an interpolation made in an age when (and he quotes Sir Wm. Ramsay) the dislike of the prominence and the public ministration of women "was intensified to abhorrence." His reason for this conjecture is that in Codex Bezae and other manuscripts it is placed at the end of the chapter. He gives other reasons and at the same time candidly admits that the hypothesis has not found favour with many English scholars. There seems to be no escape from his final conclusion that "the prohibition itself, whether made by St. Paul or a little later, would seem to prove that in the early days of Christianity women *did* teach; otherwise it would not have been necessary." We suspect that Mr. Allworthy would be among the number of those who sympathize with the movement to allow women to minister publicly in church. But there is nothing controversial in the book, which contains a vast amount of information and suggestion that is stimulating and illuminating. Its value is out of all proportion to its size and price, and it deserves to be set in the library among the works of reference.

THE NATURE AND FUNCTION OF THE SACRAMENTS. By the Rev. A. J. Tait, D.D. London: *Longmans Green & Co.* Price 3s. 6d. net.

Dr. Tait has done a very valuable piece of service by the publication of this book. The general position which he holds is learnedly explained and defended by innumerable quotations from Ancient and Reformed Divines in such books as those of the late Mr. Dimock. What was badly needed was a simple and constructive account of this position without the wealth of quotation, and having regard to certain phrases which have come to the front in recent years, such as the Sacramental Principle and the Extension of the Incarnation. Two of the nine chapters are devoted to an examination of these phrases, showing their precise applicability and their limitations. In regard to the first, the author does well to state concisely on his second page an important point which, if it had been borne in mind, would have saved the Church from many errors. "The Sacraments are signs and means of grace: and grace is not an impersonal force, or a kind of detached commodity which has an existence of its own apart from personality. Grace, in the sense in which we are now using the word, is the operation of the Holy Spirit upon the hearts and minds of men: it is essentially a personal influence."

One of the most valuable chapters is that on "Sacramental Language." Dr. Tait points out that the whole language of the Prayer Book rests on two principles, that a sign can be spoken of in terms which strictly are applicable only to the thing signified, and that people are supposed to be sincere in what they say. These principles are justified by the language of the New Testament, and Dr. Tait shows how the Pauline passages on Sacraments imply their operation. The application of this fact to the disputed phrase, "This child is regenerate," is expressed as follows: "From the point of view of the Divine giver, Whose gift of grace was given before the world was, the words are the language of Divine donation, declaring that the gift has been given, but leaving entirely undetermined the question as to the fact, time or manner of its actual reception and experience. From the point of view of the recipient, the words are the language of charitable presumption, it being presumed that the child or person has entered into the enjoyment of the gift, in so far as his capacity makes such enjoyment possible."

Throughout the book are scattered a few quotations from Jewel, which serve as a reminder of the identity of the thesis of the book with the views of the classical Anglican theologians. We most heartily commend the work.

C. H. K. BOUGHTON.

THOUGHTS ON RELIGION AT THE FRONT. By the Rev. Neville S. Talbot, Assistant Chaplain-General. London: *Macmillan & Co., Ltd.* Price 2s. net.

This is a valuable little book, written from a delightfully human point of view, upon a subject of great importance. The author, who has had personal and intimate dealings with men at the Front, addresses himself to the question: "How is it with the Christian religion at the Front?" Some of the ideas current at home concerning religion across the water are a good distance removed from reality. The status of the chaplains is wrong: they belong to the "super-world" of officers, which is separate from the men. The author defines this as an "unchristian position." Christ, he thinks, would have served as a stretcher-bearer. On the whole, his opinion is, there is not a great articulate revival of the Christian religion at the Front. Deep in the hearts of the men lie spiritual springs, which issue forth in cheerfulness, stubbornness, patience, generosity, humility and willingness to suffer and die. The race has not decayed: and the revival is of natural religion. Religion

as taught by the Church of England has been proved to have a feeble grip on the masses. The war overtook us in a condition of great poverty towards God. The writer pleads for a reordering of our presentation of religion to the men. Christianity, stressed as it appears to be at present, will never catch the souls of men. A hopeful note is sounded in the last chapter. "There is everywhere about, over here, a diffused Christianity in men who are better than they know. It seems like so much material that needs but a spark to set it ablaze."

---

COMPARATIVE RELIGION. A. S. Geyden, D.D. London: S.P.C.K.  
Price 2s. cloth, net.

A little book, but an exceedingly conscientious guide to the student of the great religions of the world, and the significance of truths held by them in common. The author will not jump to conclusions, and in dealing with the early records of religion he persistently holds back his reader from yielding to that temptation. It is so easy to generalize, and to construct, apparently from stage to stage, a consistent history of the growth of religious ideas, when "it is only to a very limited extent that the conclusions appear to be justified." "There is a manifest advantage in the comparative inquiry into the beliefs of living tribes as compared with the records of the past." Dr. Geyden's earnestness is throughout a probable cause of some repetition of statement. The reader, at any rate, is not allowed to "scamp" his subject. The book is not a "short and easy" conspectus of the various non-Christian faiths of the world. It is a serious guide to the "science of comparative religion," a science still young, but holding the promise of great value in the future. The book is one in a most useful series of small evidential works projected by the Christian Evidence Society, and presented to the Christian public in the excellent form for which the S.P.C.K. is famous. A helpful bibliography and index add to the value of this little volume. E. H.

---

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH CHURCH ENDOWMENTS. By T. Kestell Floyer, M.A., F.S.A., sometime Librarian of Worcester Cathedral. London: *Macmillan & Co., Ltd.* Price 3s. net.

The writer has presented a most readable little volume upon a most interesting subject. His intention is to "account for those conditions and features in the organization of our Church which still survive": and he does this remarkably well. The book is written with a charm of style and a wealth of illustration that combine to enthral the reader. "The Rise of the Parish Church," and "The development of 'The Parson'" are perhaps the most fascinating of the chapters. The perusal of the volume reveals the existence of a great many anomalies in the administration of the Church. These are, in the main, due to her long history. The author presents various schemes that would go far to remedy obvious defects.

---

TWIXT THE OLD AND THE NEW. A Study in the Life and Times of John Henry Cardinal Newman. By the Rev. W. E. Bloss. London: S.P.C.K. 5s. net.

The substance of this volume represents a series of lectures originally delivered with no intention of the wider publicity of the printed page. There is no claim here to a complete biography; the essay is designed to be a study in human nature. Newman's fascinating personality is presented as manifested in his relations to the ecclesiastical life and thought of his age, with

a view to the fuller appreciation of the value of his life and work. The writer modestly disclaims all pretensions to originality, and expresses his desire to be the gathering together in concise and readable form of information which is only available to those who have access to larger and more expensive books. The volume is divided into the following sections: i. Religious Movements in the early years of the Nineteenth Century. ii. John Henry Newman—Early Life and Formation of his Religious Opinions. iii. The Oxford Movement. iv. Newman's Career as a Roman Catholic. To this interesting volume are added four valuable appendices—The Papal Aggression: Newman and Manning; Newman and Modernism; The Association of Ideas—and several plates.

---

THE SECRETS OF A HOLY LIFE. By the Rev. R. Wood-Samuel. London: H. R. Allenson, Ltd.

The Bishop of Durham warmly commends this helpful little book in a characteristic Foreword. Mr. Wood-Samuel has packed into ninety-four pages a great deal of sound, sensible and withal Scriptural teaching upon the subject of holiness of life. The titles of the chapters will give a good idea of the scope of the book. In five pages headed Introductory, "the marks of a Holy Life are given in the language of Scripture." Then follow five chapters. I. The Secret of Self-knowledge: Searched by God. II. The Secret of Purity: Cleansed by God. III. The Secret of Continuance: Kept by God. IV. The Secret of Sustenance: Fed by God. V. The Secret of Power: Filled by God. Attractively got up and published at a shilling it is just the book to give to a young Christian.

---

A TRUE MOTHER. By C. S. Maynard. London: Marshall Brothers. 5s.

We have fallen upon days when even the validity of the Christian experience is attacked, and this will prove a far more ruthless and more insidious enemy to encounter than those which attack the records of our most holy faith. These, which have been busy for the past forty years, we have perhaps lamented unduly, for their work tended to make belief less mechanical and more spiritual, and at any moment we were free to fly away to where the arrows of the critic cannot reach; to the living work of the Holy Spirit on the individual heart, to the corroboration endlessly afforded to the words of the Bible by the practical experience of the Church of Christ. Here was a stronghold into which one might always flee and be safe. But now, as in modern warfare projectiles become longer in range and more highly explosive, so does hostile analytical force attempt a wider scope, and endeavour to pull down the central tower of all our fortress, the position we believed unassailable, embodied in the triumphant words, "*I know whom I have believed.*"

The outside of a book may be misleading, and this one with its lovely illustrations and its children's songs, would give little idea of the real problems it deals with. The sage, "Experience," whose voice is heard in every other chapter, is great on Mental Evolution, and explains that the individual child and the whole race run parallel to one another in their development. But there are glimpses beyond this, and the author throws the whole burden of the proof of the reality of the Kingdom of Heaven on the personal experience of each of the five sons and daughters, as they reach "the Age of Silence." The mother's position is a little pathetic, especially in dealing with the two children who grow up cleverer than herself. She starts with ecstatic hopes that faith in Christ will, as it were, "come natural" to her children, and she is baffled on this side and on that, and has to wait eighteen years; then, and



only then, she finds all her prayers are heard and her hopes abundantly realized. We leave her too happy to speak, listening to the chimes singing their praises to "the Lamb on the throne above."

SEVEN HUNDRED STORIES AND ILLUSTRATIONS OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.  
By the Rev. Walker Gwynne, D.D. London: S.P.C.K. 5s. net.

This is a considerably enlarged edition of a work, compiled by an American Clergyman and first published in 1897. It is not surprising to read in the preface that this collection represents over thirty years' "patient gathering from every quarter." The unique feature of the book is that it follows the course of the Church's Year, each Sunday having a number of quotations. This strikes us as being more likely to be helpful than a collection arranged under alphabetical headings. In turning over these pages, crowded with pleasing stories, we have been struck with the fact that a very large percentage of them are connected with great sailors and soldiers or naval and military exploits. For example, among those for the Second Sunday in Christmas-tide—general subject—Infant Baptism—we have the following—The true Soldier. Good Soldiers. He is a Soldier. No Surrender. Perseverance in the Christian Soldier. Faithful unto death. Soldiers of Christ. No Retreat. The Benefit of Early Training. Waterloo won on the playfields of Eton. Pledged to Eternal Warfare. Hannibal, etc. We draw attention to this because no doubt many of those who in these stirring days have, as Chaplains, to address men in both services, will be glad to know of a book containing many stories likely to help them in the preparation of their addresses. How carefully the compiler has done his work may be gathered from the fact he mentions—that having consulted two similar works, from one of 3,000 illustrations he only extracted *two* and from another of 6,000, only *one*! This is not a collection of unconsidered trifles but a really valuable work of reference.

