

# 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

September, 1919.

## THE MONTH.

**To our  
Readers.** OUR first word this month must be a very sincere expression of regret at the delay in the publication of the August number of the CHURCHMAN. It was due entirely to circumstances over which we have no control. The number was prepared and printed in good time for copies to reach subscribers not later than the 1st of the month. The delay was in transit from the printing works at Frome to the publishing office in London, but exactly where it occurred or under what circumstances it was held up we are unable to discover. It will not be forgotten, however, that railways are still under the control of the Government and that everything has to give way for urgent Government business. We are taking every possible step open to us to prevent the recurrence of such an unpleasant incident, and we ask our readers to accept our apology for the inconvenience caused to them by the late delivery of their copies of the August number.

**The  
Conference  
Habit.** With the close of the holidays the Conference season will reopen. The Church Pastoral-Aid Society is inviting about one hundred of its friends to a gathering at Wimbledon to discuss the "Findings" of the various Evangelistic Conferences held in different parts of the country during the last ten months and to arrange for a plan of campaign. Early in October a great Evangelical Congress will be held in Manchester, under the auspices of the Northern Federation and Union of Evangelical Churchmen, which is certain to attract a large attendance from the twelve dioceses of the Province of York. Later in the month the Church Congress, which owing to the war has not met since 1913, will assemble at Leicester, and having regard to the central position of the Congress town, it is reasonable to believe that the numbers will be up to and probably beyond the average. How

many more Conferences, and other gatherings of a like nature, are already arranged for, or about to be arranged in the near future, we cannot say, but we believe the number is not inconsiderable. Of the importance of such gatherings we have no doubt. They have a social influence and promote the sense of fellowship; they are also useful in enlarging a man's vision, and in bringing him into touch with the latest and best methods of dealing with some of the more pressing problems of the day. Beyond all question if Conference or Congress is used aright a man should come away stronger spiritually and better equipped for the work he has to do. But there is another side to the story. We note a growing tendency to multiply Conferences, Congresses, Conventions, Public Meetings, etc., out of all proportion to the necessities of the case. The fact that we have just emerged from a four years' period of war when public gatherings of this kind could not conveniently be held, has, perhaps, helped to make their number seem larger than it is, but, without in the least desire to disparage those already arranged, we venture to suggest that in the near future some real effort should be made by those specially concerned to reduce rather than to increase the number of such meetings. If one looks round upon the audiences which assemble, or read, in the papers the lists of those present, it almost invariably happens that one sees the same faces and reads the same names time after time. There are men who have acquired what may be called the Conference habit, and we are doubtful whether it is altogether good. It provokes a degree of restlessness which is not wholesome, and it needs to be watched and—where necessary—checked.

From the nature of things Conferences and similar gatherings are attended, for the most part, by clergy.

**The Claims of the Parish.** The laity have their business to see to during the day—and being good Christians they know they must not be slothful in business—so that *their* attendance must largely be limited to evening meetings. But with clergy it is supposed to be different: they are practically masters of their own time, and have or are supposed to have more time to spare for engagements of that sort. And yet, we venture to ask, is it really so? The parochial clergyman has his hands very full, and in ordinary cases—we are not thinking of exceptional circumstances—the claims of the parish, if they are to be

adequately discharged, leave but little time for outside engagements. If that is so, it raises the question how far those responsible for multiplying the number of such engagements are justified in pressing the clergy to leave their parishes? We are confident that the claims of his parish have the first charge upon the time of the parochial clergyman. It is said that there is an impression abroad that the stay-at-home clergyman is likely to be overlooked, and that preferment is given chiefly to those who are much in the public eye. We cannot say what is the measure of truth there may be in the suggestion, but we are convinced that the man who, remembering the serious terms of his ordination commission, determines to devote his best energies to the care of his own people, is not likely to lose the reward of faithful service. In this connexion there is another matter which requires attention. Is it really necessary that parochial clergy should be expected to give so large proportion of their time to Committee work? A story is current of a Bishop sending for one of his clergy who occupied a leading position and whose Committee experience was considerable. "My brother," said the Bishop, "recommend you to spend from two to three solid hours every day in visiting your people." "But, my lord, what would become of my Committees?" "I have nothing to do with that," came the retort; "you were not instituted to attend Committees." The incident—which is a perfectly true one—exaggerates, no doubt, the actual facts, but it contains a useful moral. The pressure of Committee work is not confined to London, although, perhaps, it is felt more acutely there than elsewhere owing to the fact that all the great Societies have their headquarters in the Metropolis; but it exists and is becoming more and more a difficulty in the country. With the growth of the Diocesan spirit there have arisen Diocesan Committees innumerable, and clergy feel bound to take part in them. It has been held as a reproach to Evangelical clergy that they do not sufficiently take their part in Diocesan work and that consequently Evangelical views are not represented. But if the failure arise from an earnest desire to satisfy first the claims of the parish, the reproach is by no means a dishonourable one. The subject is one of very great difficulty—and we have done no more than touch just the fringe of it—but we do urge most strongly that the claims of the parish should receive the fullest measure of the clergyman's time and thought and energy.

The programme for the next great gathering of the **Lambeth Conference.** Anglican Bishops, known as the Lambeth Conference, to be held in July and August of next year, has now been issued. The Conference meets, as a rule, once in ten years and should have been held in 1918, but the country was then at war and, seeing that the members come from all parts of the world, it was impossible to convene it. Some 250 to 300 Bishops are expected, and the subjects to which their attention will be asked include the following :—

1. Relation to and Reunion with other Churches—(a) Episcopal Churches ; (b) Non-Episcopal Churches, with questions as to—(1) Recognition of Ministers, (2) "Validity" of Sacraments, (3) Suggested Transitional Steps.
2. Missionary Problems—(a) Relation between Missions and Growing Churches ; (b) Missions and Governments ; (c) Liturgical Variations Permissible to a Province or Diocese ; (d) Marriage questions and other practical problems.
3. The Christian Faith in relation to—(a) Spiritualism ; (b) Christian Science ; (c) Theosophy.
4. Problems of Marriage and Sexual Morality.
5. The Position of Women in the Councils and Ministrations of the Church.
6. Christianity and International Relations, especially the League of Nations.
7. The Opportunity and Duty of the Church in regard to Industrial and Social Problems.
8. The Development of Provinces in the Anglican Communion.

The programme is good as far as it goes, but it would be easy to name half-a-dozen subjects upon which the Church would be grateful for guidance, and yet they find no place in the programme. The fact that the Archbishop of Canterbury has felt able to issue the invitation effectually disposes of a very interesting rumour which was current a few months ago and has not even yet wholly died away.

There seems to be a determined attempt to introduce into English churches the Roman service of **Benediction.** There was a case at Cury where, after repeated remonstrances had been as repeatedly disregarded, the former Bishop of Truro proceeded against the Incumbent, and he was deprived of his benefice. There is a case in the diocese of Birmingham where also the Bishop's wishes and commands are alike flouted, but in this case the Diocesan has decided that he will appeal to love rather than to law. What that may mean in practice we do not know, but the Bishop must have taken the measure of the Ritualistic party very imperfectly if he considers that anything short of compulsion will bring the offender to book. In the diocese of Bath and Wells the Bishop is acting with greater discretion. He has visited

the parish where Benediction is held and has formally ordered the abandonment of the practice. What will happen if the Incumbent flouts the order we do not know, but we do know what ought to happen. A more difficult case has arisen in the diocese of Chelmsford. The facts, as disclosed by the Bishop, are as follows:—

The Holy Communion service has been practically superseded by one drawn up and printed by the Incumbent called "How to follow the English Mass." This is a production entirely without authority. An individualistic form of Mass is surely an innovation so far as Catholic practice and doctrine are concerned.

The service of Benediction has been held every Sunday night for months past without any authority from myself.

The Procession of the Host has been commenced inside and outside the church, and services of various kinds have been introduced, parts of which (it is asserted) have been in Latin.

No wonder the Bishop speaks of the situation as "very grave." The Incumbent has failed to regard the authority of the Bishop who is holding his hand until after the holidays. In the meantime he took the very proper course of asking the diocese that special prayer should be offered up in every church for the Vicar of Thaxted and for himself "that the right spirit and the right judgment may be given to both of us, and I trust that by September a right solution of this grievous trouble may be reached." There will be a very genuine desire that the "right solution" may be found without resort to legal proceedings, but of the absolute necessity for practices of the kind described by the Bishop being "promptly made to cease," we imagine that the Bishop of Chelmsford has not the remotest doubt.

**Los von  
Canterbury.**

The possibility of the Convocations sanctioning the admission of Nonconformists to Church of England pulpits, and giving permission to women to pray and preach in our churches, caused something of a sensation in Anglo-Catholic circles. The *Church Times* darkly hinted at secession and disruption, and in this it was but following the threats of some of the more extreme men. A similar cry has often been raised before and nothing has ever come of it, but this time it seemed as if there really were something behind it. A correspondent of the *Church Times*, however, challenges the whole position. He asserts that "some people seem to take a kind of gloomy satisfaction in toying with the idea of a 'Los von Canterbury' movement, when things appear to be going wrong; the possibility of secession

is a kind of skeleton-in-the-cupboard, which is allowed to be half seen through a chink of the door when trouble is impending, but locked away again when the excitement has died down." He thinks that the time has come "for the skeleton to be dragged into the daylight, thoroughly examined, and, if found unlikely to be a creditable or useful ally, frankly consigned to the dustheap." Accordingly he proceeds to examine this "skeleton," with results which, if extremely interesting to onlookers, are not likely to please those who have made the threats. Indeed he has made them look not a little foolish, for, like a set of petulant children, they have not foreseen what the practical results of such a secession would be.

**What Secession would mean.** The correspondent faces the facts, and we are shown, almost for the first time, how the secession movement would work. He writes:—

It is not likely that any of the present English bishops would join the movement, and its episcopate would therefore have to be procured from Colonial sources. It is to be presumed that the disruption of the Mother Church of England would immediately involve that of the Anglican Communion throughout the world; Scotland, South Africa, Nassau, Korea, the U.M.C.A. dioceses, and certain parts of the American, Canadian, and Australian Churches would no doubt declare themselves to be in union with the "Non-juring Church," whilst Ireland, and the greater parts of the Canadian, Australian, and Indian Churches would adhere to the residual "Established Church." The Anglican Communion, as it now exists, would disappear, leaving in its place an "Anglo-Catholic" and an "Anglo-Protestant-Episcopal Church." With the fate of the latter we need not concern ourselves; having lost so many of its most vigorous sons, it would be an organism of low vitality with little power of self-defence; it would probably not retain the delights of "Establishment" very long, and would be soon swallowed up and lost in the amorphous welter of undenominational Anglo-Saxon Protestantism. The cathedrals would be nationalized as temples of a creedless ethic, faintly flavoured with reminiscences of Christian emotion, and lost to Catholic worship for ever.

We can hardly be expected to share the correspondent's view as to the "low vitality" of the "Anglo-Protestant-Episcopal Church." The men whom it would be likely to lose are certainly not "its most vigorous sons," but rather those whose continued presence in the Church is a source of weakness and not of strength; and the thought of their secession seems to conjure up before our minds the vision of a really vigorous Church, active and effective because at unity within itself, with its teaching based upon the sure word of Holy Scripture and absolutely loyal to the Reformation. Such

a Church would quickly become a power in our land and would go from strength to strength.

But what of the other Church? The correspondent leaves us in no doubt what would happen to it:—

Death from  
Inanition.

The "Non-juring" Anglo-Catholic Church, on the other hand, would be a small body; I doubt whether it would include, in England, more than three or four hundred congregations, if as many—governed by, perhaps, five or six bishops. Probably great numbers of those who are now with us would prefer to take refuge in the imposing organization and the tried stability of the Roman Church, rather than embark upon the desperate venture of founding a new denomination. It would start its career without funds or buildings; for years after the secession it would have to worship in hired rooms and public halls. It would have neither the plant nor the organization for training its future priests; it would be too weak in men and money to feed the existing Catholic missions overseas. It would be a shrivelled, artificial sect, without a history or a past. Possibly a really great and Napoleonic leader might be able, in course of time, to make a success of it; but at present no such figure is visible amongst us. Humanly speaking, it seems probable that it would suffer the fate which overtook the Non-juring Church of 1688 and seems likely to overtake the "Old Catholic" Church of 1870, and, after struggling feebly along for a few years, with a scanty band of adherents and a pathetic absence of inspiration and enthusiasm, expire of inanition.

The advocates of secession will not thank this writer for showing up so effectively the weakness of their position. That his estimate is right we do not for a moment question; and it is easy to understand that, with such a fate awaiting the disruptionists, the more sober-minded members of the party will seek to restrain the hot-heads who talk of going out. But, if we may humbly do so, we venture to remind members of the extreme "Catholic" section within the Church of England that, if they are troubled about their position, it is not necessary for them to remain, neither need they seek to form a separate Church such as must ultimately "expire of inanition." There is another course open to them—they can join the Church of Rome with whose principles and practices they seem often to be more in agreement than they are with the Protestant and Reformed Church of England. This is the kind of "Los von Canterbury" movement that would be greatly appreciated. But the counsel of the *Church Times* correspondent is "to stay in and fight."

Some Church  
Questions. The Enabling Bill was amended in the House of Lords in such a way as to meet many of the objections that have been taken to it, and it will be interesting



to see whether the House of Commons will now let it through. The Bishop of Salisbury evidently has his doubts. In a letter to his diocese he says :—

The impression borne upon me by the debate [in the House of Lords] was that Parliament was determined, not only to claim its rights, but to exercise them to the full, and the amendment moved by Lord Finlay and accepted by the Archbishop, which makes it necessary for Parliament to actively support the proposals of the Church Assembly, and not only give a passive acquiescence by allowing them to lie on the table, will afford the fullest opportunity for Parliamentary control. How far this will destroy the purpose of the Bill, and paralysed the efforts of the Church towards spiritual freedom, remains to be seen. Looking to the composition of the House of Commons and the fact that it is no longer to be reckoned on as sympathetic with the highest interests of the Church, it is difficult to be sanguine. Personally, I have for a long time been convinced that any real freedom for the Church of England can only be obtained by "cutting the ropes," and that efforts to untie the knot will only be regarded as attempts "to make the best of both worlds." It is a great satisfaction to all supporters of the Bill, and to all in this diocese who, like myself, desire it to have the best possible chance, that Sir Robert Williams is to pilot it through the probably rough waters of the House of Commons.

The Bishop describes himself as "a supporter, if not a very optimistic supporter," of the Bill. In regard, however, to the proposals of the Joint Committee for the admission of Nonconformists, he is not a "supporter" at all. His letter makes it clear that Reunionists have still many difficulties to overcome. He says :—

I am convinced that such proposals, accompanied by restrictions, limitations, and difficult tests of orthodoxy, would be, and quite naturally, rejected by Nonconformist opinion. They assume, quite mistakenly I believe, that the Nonconformists as a whole are prepared to sacrifice their views or independence in order to unite with the Church of England. That they desire Reunion earnestly and sincerely is beyond all question; but to suppose that they are prepared to pay any price for it means a complete misunderstanding of their position and claims. That they would desire to be admitted as preachers in our churches on the specified conditions I do not for a moment believe. I cannot feel that the plan, if adopted, would be successful in promoting the end aimed at. There would be no reality about it. It would, at a considerable strain on both sides, cover up differences rather than heal them. Giving the semblance of agreement and the impression that no important differences divide us, it would in itself pass the severest condemnation upon the divisions. Without the justification of real and serious divergence of opinion and teaching, those divisions would be a crime against Christianity and a betrayal of its purpose and spirit. I yield to no one in my desire for Union, based on reality, and without betrayal of conviction. I believe, although it is the fashion to despise it, that co-operation on common ground for the good of the people, more social friendliness and abandonment of an attitude that looks like a claim to superiority—and, most of all, conferences such as we have in Salisbury with the ministers of the city for discussion and devotion—are sounder and surer methods than those which are being quite prematurely advocated.

## THE GREAT PRAYER.

### SHORT CHAPTERS ON JOHN XVII.

BY THE BISHOP OF DURHAM.

#### IV.

**I**N the two chapters previous we have considered the Theism of the Great Prayer. With humblest reverence, but drawing very near, we have looked up, as it were, through the eyes of the Intercessor, and so have won some sure sight of Him with whom He intercedes. We have seen Him, in His supreme infinity, personal, holy, righteous. We have heard Him called by the Intercessor, again and again, "Father." We have understood, as we have listened to the wonderful utterance, that He is the Father of the Intercessor not only as to origin, but as to affection. He who speaks recognizes the filial relation not only as between being in its stream and being in its fountain. He speaks, out of an inmost consciousness, about the love which the Fountain pours, eternally into the Stream. "Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world."

This is indeed a Theism not only uplifting, beyond all clouds, to the disciple's mind. It is satisfying to his hungry heart. Upon the throne of existence reigns personal affection. The Supreme loves; nay, "GOD IS LOVE." And that love means not a something so transcendental that it ranges above any intelligible kinship to the tender beatings of a human heart. It is seen here, in words as simple, as homely, in themselves as they are sacred in their matter—as the affection of a Father for a Son.

"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Now, almost without a break of thought, we will go on to a reverently simple view of the CHRISTOLOGY of the Great Prayer. What has it to tell us about the Intercessor Himself?

Its first testimony, beginning with its opening word and carried through to the very close, bears on what we have just been recalling from the other side, His filial being. "FATHER": so the Prayer opens. "O righteous Father, I know Thee, and I have made known Thy name": so the Prayer comes to its end. "Father, glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son may glorify Thee"; "O Father, glorify

Thou Me at Thine own side ” ; “ All things, whatsoever Thou hast given Me, are from Thee ” ; “ I came forth from Thee ” ; “ Thou didst send Me ” ; “ Holy Father, keep them in Thy name ” ; “ Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee ” ; “ Thou lovedst Me before the universe was founded.” Such are the chief explicit utterances in which the Intercessor’s spirit goes out and up with what we can only call, as we worship the utterer, a supreme filial devotion. Whatever is the mighty dignity of His own being, He thus speaks to His FATHER as its eternal origin, as the sublime Giver of the possessions of the Son. And to uplift the glory of the Father, to work out the manifestation of His “ name,” that is to say of what He is as this is revealed to man, to disclose to the disciples and to the world what the Father is, and does, and gives—this is the intense, the dominant, will and work of the Son who intercedes. Once more, whatever is His own greatness, His joy is to see it all as the Stream from that paternal Fountain, and to reveal the Fountain for the wonder and worship of the soul of man.

And our study leads us to see this unutterably filial regard as belonging to the Intercessor not only as He stands amidst us as human, sharing our nature and its natural burthens, acquainted with tears, and now soon to taste death to its depths. It belongs to Him also as He is immeasurably more than human. He is the Beloved of the Father, He is the Lover of the Father, in an existence before, or let us say above, time. “ Thou lovedst Me before the universe was founded ” ; “ I had glory at Thy side (*παρά σοι*) before the universe was.” When the first basal element of material existence as yet was not (we can only speak humanly as to succession and time), when as yet, outside Deity, there was no mental life, no moral life, then, outside and above all successions, in the sphere of the unbeginning, this Son was the Son.

“ When He dwelt on earth abased,” and from our low estate “ lifted up His eyes to heaven,” He was indeed filial, with a sonship which bore a true human aspect ; I mean, a relation to the Supreme in which He could *as man* say, “ My Father and your Father, My God and your God ” ; “ we know what *we* worship.” But that human aspect was only in a deep and holy harmony with the Sonship of the everlasting heaven, the filial love burning eternally upon the throne, “ at Thy side, before the universe was.”

It is well both for mind and heart, often, in deliberate reverence,

to recall this aspect of our Master's glory. The disciple will see in it only new occasion for ever humbler and tenderer adoration of the blessed Son. As he thinks upon it, he will ponder with loving worship the divine moral beauty of what I venture again to call His filial devotion. And all the while the Son's own profound desire will get a growing fulfilment. We shall read in the glory of the Son the glory of the Father. We shall believe with a deep and ultimate rest of faith in that *fontal* holiness, light, and love, from which for ever flows *such a Stream* as Christ the Son, Christ the Lord. "The express Image of the Father's Person" will for ever assure us that that Person is not only infinite and absolute, but Love. The Father is wholly and for ever *as* the Son, in truth, grace, compassion, sympathy, affection. "Blessed, for ever blessed, be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

"My Father is greater than I," just as He is Father. As Chrysostom says on that text (John xiv. 28), "He is greater, not in scale, nor in duration," οὐ μεγέθει, οὐδὲ χρόνῳ, "but because the Son is (eternally) born of Him," διὰ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γέννησιν. So our souls' devotion to the Son shall ever be such as to go, in Him, to the Father, and so to fulfil His own divine filial devotion.

But now, upon the other side of the radiant truths before us, let us think a little of *the glory* of the Son, as His own words unfold it.

"*It sets Him weel to commend Himself*," so said an aged Scottish believer very long ago, to her pastor, Thomas Chalmers. They had been talking, the peasant woman and the illustrious thinker and teacher, about the theme dearest to them both, Christ and His glory. Chalmers, if I remember aright, had spoken of the paradox (not using *that word*, we may be sure!) of the Lord's unwavering testimony to Himself: the mystery presented by the habit of the Meek and Lowly One to set Himself before His disciples, before His enemies, before all, as great, as sinless, as regal, as supremely necessary, as Way, Truth, Life, Master, Lord. The simple colloquist met her minister's words, which no doubt burned with natural and spiritual power, with just that comment: "*It sets Him weel*"; it becomes Him, it is fit, it is *convenient*, when it is He Who does it.

To my own mind it is among the deepest and most intimate testimonies to the proper Deity of the Saviour of man that He, while He loves and welcomes the penitent soul, embracing it with an ineffable sympathy, yet never blames Himself, never for a moment

confesses sin, continually holds Himself up as the perfect answer to man's whole need, the absolute claimant of his whole devotion.

That He should do this and yet never, by the human spirit which has in the least degree got near Him, be felt to strike a moral discord as He does it, points to nothing less than a Person of the absolute order. This is God the Son of God, "over all, blessed for ever"; none the less God because He has stooped in a wonderful love to be also Man.

So indeed and in truth it is in the Great Prayer. "Father, glorify Thy Son"; "This is the life eternal, to know Thee, *and Jesus Christ, Whom Thou hast sent*"; "Glorify Thou Me at Thine own side, with the glory I had at Thy side before the universe was"; "I am glorified in them," in the men whom Thou hast given Me; "All Thy things are Mine"; "We are one," Thou and I; "I will that where I am, there they may be with Me, that they may behold My glory which Thou gavest Me; for Thou lovedst Me before the universe was founded"; "I have made known to them Thy name, that . . . I may be in them."

As we saw when we gathered up the words which speak of the Intercessor's filial relation and devotion, so with these, which speak so directly of His filial glory—the quotations are only a part of the evidence borne to it in the Prayer. As it were around them, beneath them, there lies everywhere implied the infinite significance of the Intercessor, in virtue of His sublime intimacy with the Father, His being manifestly like Him, the Inhabitant of Eternity. The accent of filial devotion, if I may venture again upon that phrase, is never other than that also of filial glory. Even the perpetual assertion of the Father's glory as the Sender of the Son, the Giver to the Son, carries that with it. The words would be worse than pointless, they would be presumptuous, if spoken by one of a lower grade of being; a grade infinitely lower, if lower at all.

So we feel anew, with love and wonder, as we humbly listen at the Apostles' side, the "sober certainty" of the foundation of all our hopes, the supreme fact of salvation, namely, that man's Brother and Friend, man's Fellow and Head, his dying Lamb, his risen Companion, is filial God Incarnate.

That this was the primeval, the original, faith of the Church we are sure, quite apart from the Great Prayer. Half a century before John wrote his record, Paul, to Thessalonica, to Galatia,

takes it as uncontested truth and uses it as the long-proved secret not only of the sinner's hope of heaven, but of his power for a walk of holy virtue upon earth. And facts of that highest order are above all time. This wonderful Intercessor is the same yesterday, and to-day, and to the ages of the endless life.

HANDLEY DUNELM.

*(To be continued.)*

---

## The Nation's Pledge,

ON THE CONCLUSION OF PEACE AFTER VICTORY.

O URS are the Islands that rise from the waters  
 Where the strong winds of the Northern Seas blow,  
 Isles that have nurtured brave sons and fair daughters  
 Who, when the war-cloud burst, feared not the foe :  
 Ours is the Empire whose sons were united,  
 E'en as one man, when her flag was unfurled,  
 Patriots who, when the war-torch was lighted,  
 Bore themselves nobly throughout the whole world.

Many there were who, with selfless devotion,  
 Battled for Britain in deadliest strife,  
 Who, on the land, in the air, on the ocean,  
 Won for us Peace that shall give us new life :  
 Yes, in the radiance of beauty appearing,  
 Breaking through clouds that were dark as a pall,  
 Calming the fury that all hearts was searing,  
 Peace, gentle Peace, lays a spell upon all.

Now that our God hath the Victory given  
 Unto the champions of Right against Might,  
 Pledge we ourselves, who for Freedom have striven,  
 Onward to move in the pathway of Light :  
 Cherishing ever the noble ambition  
 Heralds to be of the Truth, far and wide,  
 Ne'er will we fail in our Heaven-sent Mission,  
 Facing the future with God as our Guide.

ROBEY F. ELDRIDGE.

MELROSE,  
 NEWPORT,  
 ISLE OF WIGHT.

## STUDIES IN TEXTS.

Suggestions for Sermons from Current Literature.

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

### IX. FOUR ELEMENTS IN THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

*Text.*—"Which of those three seems to you to have acted like a fellow man?"—Luke x. 36 (Weymouth).

[Book of the Month: "Jesus and Life"<sup>1</sup> = JL. Other refs., Bruce on St. Luke in Expos. Gr. Test. = EGT; Tristram's "Eastern Customs" = TEC. Plummer's "St. Luke" = PL.]

"The brotherhood of man is implicit in the story of the Good Samaritan. My neighbour is related in exactly the same way as I am to the God Who loves us both. Why help a wounded traveller on the road, without inquiring what we have in common" (JL. 176). Because religion not a matter of talk. Voluble religion has no place here. "The Good Samaritan utters only one sentence, and that is not good advice. The wounded traveller lying on the road utters no syllable; yet as the passers-by approach one after the other, he classifies them as unerringly as the botanist sorts his specimens" (JL .71). "Four attitudes to our fellow-men: the robbers create the problem, the priest and the Levite ignore it, the innkeeper treats it professionally, and the Good Samaritan solves it" (JL. 258).

Four questions:—

1. ROBBERS SAY, "WHAT CAN WE GET OUT OF THIS MAN?"

"A neighbour is a person to be exploited. This spirit makes human beings into economic beasts of prey. The robbers beat the traveller as well. Only his belongings wanted; but to get them, had to disable him. 'Went off and left him.' Here 'social problem' in all its pain and ugliness" (JL. 259). The weakest can go to the wall, unless new force intervenes.

2. THE SUPERFICIALLY RELIGIOUS MAN ASKS, "WHAT BUSINESS IS IT OF MINE?"

"The prescription of the priest and the Levite is the simplest; turn their eyes away. We lose the point if we think of them as

<sup>1</sup> By Professor J. F. McFadyen. Pub. by James Clarke & Co. One of the suggestive "Humanism of the Bible" series.

bad men ; still more if we regard them as cruel men. They were conventional men. A half-naked unconscious man, covered with blood, was outside of their routine " (JL. 260). This was the common Jewish doctrine towards outsiders. Tristram quotes Talmud :—" If a Jew sees a Gentile fallen into the sea, let him by no means lift him out thence. It is written, ' Thou shalt not rise up against the blood of thy neighbour,' but this man is not thy neighbour " (TEC. 182). " ' Came and saw ' : and thus the Levite is made to be more heartless than the priest, whom he seems to have been following. The priest saw and passed on ; but the Levite came up to him quite close, saw, and passed on. He was half-unconscious, and they wished to get past without being asked to help " (PL. 287).

" Is it in the very nature of all materializing of worship to concentrate attention on sacrifice rather than on mercy ? " (JL. 261).

" When we have passed him by, the wounded traveller remains. The scene on a lonely road ; no spectators but God. Each showed as he was, without public opinion " (JL. 262).

### 3. THE INNKEEPER ASKS, " WHAT SHALL I GET IF I HELP HIM ? "

" Even this is an advance on the stage which says : Here is an enemy ; let us kill him " (JL. 181). " The Samaritan is a busy man ; he cannot give up the whole of his time, but calls in the innkeeper. A combination of the amateur and the professional philanthropist. Samaritan renders first aid, supplies the funds, makes arrangements, is the inspiration of the whole story, superintends the professional ; promises to come back again " (JL. 262).

" That the innkeeper is a professional is not intended as a point against him. Like any other workman he is worthy of his wages. Yet, the hero of the story is not the innkeeper. Every one who has any acquaintance with the working of public institutions knows that when the administration of kindness is left to paid agents, there is no certainty that the work is being carried out in the spirit of the Good Samaritan " (JL. 263).

### 4. THE SAMARITAN ASKS, " WHAT MORE CAN I DO ? "

" To the robbers the traveller was a victim to be exploited ; to the priest and the Levite a nuisance to be evaded ; to the innkeeper he was a business proposition ; to the Samaritan he was a neighbour to be helped " (JL. 263). " We must help them as men, not



as 'cases.' Wounded traveller quite unknown. Samaritan was not out looking for adventures ; bearing his cross and ready for the call " (JL. 265). " The story brings even the lowly beast of burden within the circle of love and service " (JL. 181). The Samaritan helps, pays, promises future oversight.

" Not enough to strike a bargain with the innkeeper. There is need to see that generous purpose is not being frustrated " (JL. 263). " The speech of a man who in turn trusts the host, and has no fear of being overcharged in the bill for the wounded man. *I*, with a slight emphasis which means—you know me " (EGT. 544).

So we see the four and we draw our lessons :—

" All good Samaritans, whatever influences may try to thwart them, have the whole trend of things on their side " (JL. 181). They tend to enlist others in their service. " In the early days, we measure progress by the number of our Good Samaritans " (JL. 209). In the end they will abolish the robbers or convert them to Good Samaritanism, which is Christianity. " As the Kingdom triumphs, the test of its progress is the extent to which we no more need our Good Samaritans " (JL. 209). The story illustrates " the Kingdom's law of gravitation : God in the centre ; all men attracted to God, attracted to each other, by the very law of their being " (JL. 177). This always the law, needed discovering. " Just as the law of gravity had operated for millenia before Newton discovered it, so it was as true under Satan's reign as under God's reign, that every structure based on envy, greed, ambition, malice, hatred, is evanescent " (JL. 181). " The Good Samaritan had some command of money. How he acquired that money is irrelevant to the story. But it is not irrelevant to ask whether in earning or gaining the money he exhibited the same spirit as he exhibited in spending it. Generally speaking, the theory that underlies our present system is that in our business lives we are bound by considerations of honesty, justice, and fair-play ; and only after our income is actually in our pocket can we afford to listen to the claims, supposed to be of a loftier and more or less optional morality, of generosity and kindness. Does the story leave it possible for us to imagine that the Samaritan's goodness deserted him when he donned his office coat ? " (JL. 266-7). " The Christian Church has already worked miracles in creating Good Samaritans ; its next task is to induce men to earn their incomes in the spirit of Christian service " (JL. 268).

## REUNION FROM TWO ASPECTS.

BY THE REV. H. A. WILSON, M.A., Rector and Rural Dean of  
Cheltenham.

**S**IMULTANEOUSLY there have come to hand two books on the subject of Reunion: Canon Ollard's *Reunion*<sup>1</sup> and a volume of essays by Churchmen and Free Churchmen, entitled *Towards Reunion*.<sup>2</sup> They present a most interesting contrast in almost every respect. The former looks back, the latter looks forward: Canon Ollard yearns hopelessly, the essayists are buoyant in expectation: Canon Ollard can only propound a "wait and see" policy, but *Towards Reunion* has a definite programme outlined. Such are a few of the points of contrast.

A good deal of attention has already been given in *The Record* to the essays referred to, but it is impossible to exaggerate their importance. I am not now attempting a review of a book which is of the highest importance, but simply trying to express some of the thoughts which it awakens, thoughts which are thrown up on the background of Canon Ollard's four lectures. But a few comments on this High Anglican contribution to the Reunion problem must first be indulged in for the sake of clarity. It is not quite fair to take popular lectures too seriously, because there are certain limitations imposed upon the lecturer. He must be brief, he must compress his matter, he must try to be definite and lucid. But when all allowances are made it is hard to be patient with this lecturer. Questions upon which authorities are greatly divided are dismissed in a dogmatic sentence or two, and when for party reasons a certain conclusion is desirable all contrary evidence is ignored and an *ipse dixit* is called in to settle the matter. For instance, to quote Jeremy Collier's absurd remark about the Synod of Dort as conclusive against the authority of the English delegates there, is as futile as the adoption of Heylin's attempt to wriggle out of the difficulty of the 1610 consecration of the Scottish bishops. Canon Ollard makes no reference to Bishop Andrewes' (who was one of

<sup>1</sup> *Reunion*. By the Rev. Canon S. L. Ollard. London: Robert Scott, 3s. 6d. net.

<sup>2</sup> *Towards Reunion*: Being Contributions to Mutual Understanding by Church of England and Free Church Writers. London: Macmillan & Co., 7s. 6d. net.

the consecrating bishops) attitude, but boldly says that the Presbyterian ministers were consecrated bishops *per saltum*, whereas there is practically no doubt whatever that the reason they were not first ordained priests was that their Presbyterian ordination was officially recognized. Nor again is there any evidence that the persecuting legislation of the Restoration was the work of the State and not of the Church. Every Churchman would like to think this was so, but no serious historian would maintain such a theory. Archbishop Sheldon admitted that he was out to eject all Nonconformist divines from the Church, and had he known that even the few who actually conformed would have done so, he declared he would have made the terms harder still. The sermons and pamphlets published at the time show that the bigoted Archbishop had a wide following among the clergy. It is sadly true that the legislation of those dark days was inspired by the Church.

It would be an easy task to add to these illustrations of partisan garbling of history, but that is not the matter we have in hand. The lectures are on the subject of Reunion, and so deep and urgent is this matter that every Christian should welcome any honest attempt to help the ideal to become the real. But unhappily Canon Ollard has no help to give. Rome is hopeless, and the East is nearly as bad. The foreign Reformed Churches make but a slight appeal. The only path which is really open runs towards the English-speaking Free Churches, and this path the High Anglican will not take. He is obsessed with an exploded view of the ministry and hampered by mediæval theories of the sacraments, and this impedimenta renders him helpless and unable to make any contribution whatever to a subject which is increasingly engrossing the attention of Churchpeople.

One of the most depressing aspects of the Reunion movement is the inability of High Anglicans to make any practical contribution to the problem as it affects our English religious life. For instance, of what value is the following suggestion: "We shall do our share best by being true to the English Church, loyal to its positive principles." The writers in the volume of essays would repudiate hotly any charge of disloyalty to the English Church, and rightly so. But "loyalty," as Canon Ollard seems to use the term, appears to mean a jealous and unyielding maintenance not only of "the Prayer Book standard," but of the Tractarian exegesis

of that standard. But even this is less helpful advice than it appears to be. High Anglican writers are repeatedly urging us to think out our principles, to understand clearly what the "Ecclesia Anglicana" really stands for. So that to maintain a standard which we have not yet discovered is not exactly helpful in what is nothing less than a religious crisis.

Now the essayists, on the other hand, have already thought out their principles: they know where they are; their minds are clear and fluid, and in consequence they have a message. They believe that the Holy Spirit of God is the urgent cause of the movement towards Home Reunion. The matter is not with them a question of tactics or ecclesiastical politics—God Himself is in the thing. These convictions are shared by multitudes, and many of us would go so far as to say that the Church of England is on its trial, and if this "day of the Lord" is missed it may never return and our candle may be put out.

It is because of these firm feelings that we view with dismayed alarm the procrastinating tactics of the Upper House of Convocation and the negative and ferocious *non possumus* of the Lower House. It seems as if Bishops count for little to-day. They appear to have lost all power for initiative and leadership. Because the Lower House, by obstructionist tactics, rejected a somewhat lukewarm report in favour of co-operation with Free Churchmen, the Upper House suspended their consideration of the subject. Bolshevik generals are in the habit of "leading" their armies by following on well behind. There is much to commend in this policy. If the troops are successful, the general hurries to the front and claims the success as his own; if they fail, he has secured a good start on the way home. But England wants real leaders in every sphere to-day, and the policy of waiting to see how the cat will jump is simply worse than useless.

In practice this episcopal inactivity and anxious looking for something to turn up will result in simply damming up the stream, which is already dangerously high. The dam is near bursting point, and what then? Some of us who have worked and prayed for Reunion when the subject was not popular, and we were simply voices crying in the wilderness, are genuinely alarmed at the possibilities. We want Reunion by constitutional methods and not by "direct action." Courageous direction by our leaders is the supreme need

of to-day, and all we can find is caution carried to the point of timidity, and an exasperating procrastination which irritates almost beyond endurance.

The writers in the volume of essays referred to would probably be all correctly classified as Evangelicals, and the book is arresting as a witness to the fact that Evangelicals have at last found a positive policy. No longer are they in the intolerable and undignified position of trying to hold back a refractory horse. They have seen a vision of an England reunited in faith and worship: it is a vision which inspires the soul and creates the daring spirit. And it is the daring spirit which alone is in harmony with the trend of thought to-day. Caution is not popular, and those who would lead in the England that now is must be willing to "live dangerously." The old fearful timidity which has destroyed the hope of Evangelicals to be leaders in the Church is dying rapidly and will soon be buried deep.

But Evangelicals are not alone in their Reunion programme. The successors of the Moderate Churchmen or the Latitude men of the seventeenth century are the Broad Churchmen of our own time. And these, like their predecessors, have taken some very decided steps in seeking to bring about Reunion with Free Churchmen. Perhaps one of the most significant acts was the passing of a resolution unanimously in favour, of pulpit exchange at the annual meeting of the Churchmen's Union on the eve of the meeting of Convocation last month.

Alas, there remain outside the High Anglicans! They have nothing positive to say: they have only threats to utter. If the forward policy is sanctioned, those threats may materialize; but in any case if, as is firmly believed by Evangelicals, God has given the vision and God bids them go forward, it is not for them to hold back. The Finger of God points straight ahead and the consequences of their obedience may well be left to Him.

H. A. WILSON.



## WHAT IS REVERENCE ?

BY THE REV. W. S. HOOTON, B.D.

PREBENDARY FOX, not long ago, summed up in a telling phrase one marked tendency of modern thought and writing concerning which there appears to be much confusion of mind. "The opposition," he wrote, "takes many forms. There is the open refusal of those who have said, 'We will not have this Man to reign over us.' But long before this is reached, there are subtle developments of thought where *respect comes short of reverence*, where obedience is subject to conditions, loyalty to reservations, and where men, often pious and learned, try to effect a compromise between the real and the unreal."

Several of these phrases are suggestive enough ; but it is the one which is italicized in our quotation that bears upon the idea of this paper. What is reverence ? Many current expressions, glibly used, indicate a great need for clearing of thought. In connexion with the study of the Bible, we are constantly hearing of "reverent criticism." Distinctions are drawn between "rash" or "extreme" and "moderate" or "reverent" critics ; and even conservative scholars are heard to insist on the debt which we owe to the latter. It is held to be one of the marks of enlightenment to applaud these utterances, and the surest sign of bigotry to suggest even the shadow of a doubt. Well, it is good to "prove all things." No harm is done by inquiry ; and if there is a reverent criticism, let us by no means make the mistake of including its adherents in indiscriminating condemnation. The unfortunate ambiguity of language makes it necessary here to explain that the word "critic" is used in the generally accepted sense, and not according to that strict application by which it can be taken to describe even the most conservative student of the origins and the text of Scripture. Our purpose is to inquire into the reverence of moderate adherents of the current hypotheses of criticism, and to judge them out of their own mouths.

It is unnecessary even to mention the names of any critics of the more extreme order. But several names of the former class will readily come to mind. Perhaps the most typical is that of the late Professor Driver. He is constantly quoted as an example of a

class of devout students sincerely believing in a divine revelation through Scripture, and convinced that the main hypotheses of criticism in no way interfere with that revelation. It is with men like this that we have to do—men whose sincerity and single-mindedness are beyond doubt, and whose devoutness no one has dared to question.

Let us examine some of the utterances of these men in relation to two branches of the subject—their attitude towards the Bible, and their attitude towards our Lord Himself.

I. With reference to the former, it must be remembered that their contention is that the Bible is not itself in its completeness the Word of God, but that it contains that Word. Many of us, of course, repudiate that position altogether; but we must be fair in discussion, and must realize it may be argued that such a distinction affects at any rate the matter of *reverence*, which is our sole subject of present discussion. Even this is not to be granted without demur; for our Lord's treatment of Scripture, and that of the Apostles, indicates that they regarded it as the Word of God in its entirety—and the reverence, moreover, of their allusions to it is something so very different from the "respect" (shall we say?) shown in the references of modern critics of any class, that it might reasonably be maintained that this itself is a strong point against their claim to handle reverently the Scriptures of truth. But we desire to-day to take no ground on which the discussion can be side-tracked. It is better to take our stand to this extent on the critics' own ground, and see whether they are reverent from their own point of view—however inconceivable it may appear to us that God should have determined to give man a revelation of truth and then arranged it so that he should be left to flounder in a morass of uncertainty where he might find solid ground, or (to change the metaphor) should be abandoned to the mercy of every fresh guide in the wilderness. Indeed, the position seems all the more incredible in view of the fact, which we shall find illustrated later on, that according to some of the critics (even "reverent" ones) part of the material amid which the revelation is enshrined is not only not the Word of God, but is positively misleading, and must be ruthlessly discarded before that revelation can be found.

Another difficulty arises from the fact that some of those who will be mentioned have already passed from our midst. The rule

“de mortuis” is by some perhaps considered binding; but in a matter of this moment it should not be difficult to meet the difficulty by avoiding personal bitterness towards either the living or the dead: and this is what it is desired to do.

First, then, a brief reference to Dr. Driver. It would be difficult in any case to leave out so typical a representative of the School we have in view. But we want to pass on to more detailed references from the works of other scholars, and will only be brief here. Many of us have read his Commentary on Genesis. Is it too much to say that the broad effect of what he writes—especially on the opening sections of the book—must be to delight the heart of the infidel? And can everything be quite right, from the point of view of reverence, when that is the result? Such an one is not likely to be charmed by the common critical assurances of spiritual beauty underlying the narratives, or even to be disarmed by comparisons with the less enlightened records of other nations. What he wants is to prove the Bible wrong: and he undoubtedly finds in Dr. Driver, for example, an ally he would not have found, e.g. in St. Paul. This should be enough at any rate to induce a feeling of uncomfortable doubt. No allowance is made (if personal recollection rightly serves) for the fallibility and changing character of scientific opinions. This sweeping assertion of inaccuracy can scarcely be viewed as strictly reverent. Again, it is notorious that Professor Driver treated many distinct declarations that “the Lord spake unto Moses” as of no account. Concerning large sections of the narrative at any rate, the Lord did not speak to Moses at all in his opinion, but Jews of many centuries later invented the whole thing—Mosaic authority and all. It is really difficult for most people who would like to be thought reverent to understand how such a narrative can be held even to “contain” the Word of God, or to understand how reverence can be attributed either to the alleged authors of this kind of composition or to the interpreters who can adopt without a moral shock such a view of the form in which it has pleased God to convey to us His revelation.

But let us pass to a more detailed illustration, from another writer of the first rank, who would certainly be reckoned in this class—Sir George Adam Smith: and let us take it from his best-known work, his exposition of the Book of Isaiah. In that work he is obsessed by a peculiar idea with regard to Isaiah ii. 1-5, which



cropped up from time to time in his opening chapters. In our day the beauty and restful charm of that wonderful prophecy are more than ever apparent. We are beginning to see how, after perhaps no long interval, the King of kings, the Prince of peace, will Himself introduce and establish that glorious predicted reign of peace. But to the learned author it is, at least as applied here, an example of unenlightened expectations at a period of unchastened and self-confident enthusiasm. It seemed to Isaiah at first as if he could lift up the people by his own word (ver. 5) to that ideal state, and he has to learn the truth by the painful experience of disappointment. Now, on the broadest grounds (we will come to the extraordinary details presently), can this be held to be a reverent attitude towards any part of prophecy, or indeed could any such utterance be considered to "contain" the Word of God in any sense at all? Perhaps it might be argued that as this prophecy appears elsewhere, and therefore Isaiah may only have accepted it for himself (as Sir G. A. Smith considers he anyhow did), the passage is even so not deprived of its glorious uplift for our weary times. It seems so much simpler—and really it seems more reverent—to believe that God was truly inspiring His servant to reveal, in the power of the Holy Spirit, what should veritably come to pass!

But now for the promised quotation in detail. The culmination of this obsession appears on p. 61 (vol. i.). This is the passage—“And, as we have seen, there is every reason to believe that Isaiah did at first share the too easy public religion of his youth. That early vision of his (ii. 2-5), the establishment of Israel at the head of the nations, to be immediately attained at his own word (v. 5), and without preliminary purification, was it not simply a less gross form of the king's own religious presumption? Uzziah's fatal act was the expression of the besetting sin of his people, and in that sin Isaiah himself had been a partaker. 'I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips.' In the person of their monarch the temper of the whole Jewish nation had come to judgment. . . . The prophet's eyes were opened.”

Now unless this means that the confession of Isaiah vi. 5 (just quoted) has definite reference to the prophecy of ii. 2-5, and that in uttering that prophecy, or at any rate in his application of it, Isaiah *sinned* in the same way as the presumptuous King Uzziah, though

it may be in less degree, it would seem that words lose their meaning. Is "reverent" the right epithet for that ?

And it is all so pitifully unnecessary. Whatever is there in Isaiah ii. 5 to give ground for all this monstrous edifice of irreverent imaginings ?

Let us now take an example or two from New Testament criticism. And let the first be from Dr. M'Neile's learned Commentary on St. Matthew. The author is known as a devotional writer as well as a theologian, and would no doubt come within our definition in most people's eyes. What is his view of the reliability of that Gospel as we have it ? He shows up, indeed, the extreme follies of some critics. Nevertheless, in at least thirty instances in the last eight chapters alone, he betrays in one way or another his own doubts of the record. And he is sure that some "additions" are "certainly apocryphal," and that the writer used "very little critical sifting." Any passage, in fact, may be overthrown, without the least manuscript evidence, if he decides so. Even the "literary evidence" for the Virgin Birth, though it does not appear that it is rejected by him personally, is treated as if it might reasonably be considered inferior to that provided by the "congruity" of that doctrine with "the whole body of Christian belief." (As if the Creeds would survive if the records on which they rest were destroyed !) Dr. M'Neile speaks of "the unmistakable stamp of genuineness." But what two critics will agree in all cases where this elusive quality is claimed ? God has not left us in such chaos : and is there not a spiritual instinct which revolts against the claim that this kind of treatment is "reverent" in the case of records in which it has pleased Him to embody all that we know of the way of salvation ? How could they even certainly "contain" it ?

Our last example under this division of our subject is from a recent book by Dr. Garvie—*The Purpose of God in Christ*. On pp. 77-8 he writes : "The revelation of God in Jesus Christ is organic, it is a living whole, and just as a living body can assimilate only what is akin and not foreign to its substance, so there are statements in the Holy Scriptures which do not accord with the revelation of God in Christ, and Christian theology should not attempt to include them in the creed it offers to the Church." Just afterwards two examples are given of what is meant by this astonishing assertion. "The doctrine of election, for which texts of Scripture can be

quoted, has gone except in a few theological survivals of a happily dead past ; the doctrine of eternal punishment is going to the same scrap-heap, even although still more texts in its support can be quoted." I venture to say that not only the attitude towards Scripture, but the very phraseology, is *irreverent*, and betrays a mind fatally distorted in its view of Scripture by familiarity with irreverent handling of it. Observe—Dr. Garvie does not, as some might, deny that these doctrines are Scriptural. He confesses, apparently, that they are ; and then contemptuously consigns them to the "scrap-heap," because "the Christian reason and conscience and spirit" (forsooth) "judge these doctrines as incongruous with the love of God through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ in the community of the Spirit." What are the plain implications of this, when stripped of verbal subterfuge and rhetorical disguise ? Simply that the modern conscience is beyond comparison more enlightened than the apostolic, and even that the Master's own spirit moved on a lower level than that of the modern theologian. This kind of verbal respect for "the revelation of God in Christ" is thus seen to **over** the worst kind of implied irreverence.

In another place (p. 91) Dr. Garvie refers to 1 Corinthians xv. 28 as something which "Paul conjectures." In this instance the "conjecture" appears to be approved of : but we have already seen it is not so in all cases, and the phrase throws a flood of light on the author's view of Scripture, and on the ease with which anything can be repudiated if it does not suit the author's point of view. It is a marvel that so sincere and acute a thinker as Dr. Garvie undoubtedly is, can fail to see that the upshot of his book is to represent his own "conjectures," in any case in which he acts as censor on St. Paul, as greatly superior to those of that Apostle.

2. The other matter is even more serious. What is the attitude of modern writers towards our Lord and His teaching ? In our last example we have already discovered an implied illustration of it. And in this matter we continually trace the inevitable advance of criticism in the course of years. It may confidently be affirmed that statements now frequently made about our Lord could not have been written without the long sapping process which has undermined real reverence, first for the Old Testament, and then for the New. In the attacks now openly made upon the accuracy of our Lord's own expectations and teaching with regard to eschatology

we see the real tendency of modern criticism unmasked. The central citadel of the Faith is under siege.

And even in matters where criticism has touched the authority of our Lord it is possible to trace a development of a similar character. The earlier doubts thrown by critics on the position adopted so strongly by Bishop Ellicott in his *Christus Comprobator*, and by other similar writers, were of a much milder character. When they were confronted with our Lord's authority for the authorship of the Pentateuch or the 110th Psalm, or for the historicity of Jonah, or of the Bible narrative of the Flood (a subject lately once more the sport of every unbeliever in the land through the deplorable utterance of one of our Deans in Convocation), it was possible for them to give a reply which did not openly outrage Christian feeling. True, it was a very involved and wonderful reply; and many of us have never ceased to marvel how it could really satisfy anybody. But at any rate they saved their reverence—to some extent at least—even if it was at the expense of their logic. But we have now got long past that.

What shall be said of these words from Dr. M'Neile's Commentary on St. Matthew? "It is impossible to escape the conclusion that Jesus, as Man, expected the End within the lifetime of His contemporaries." And this with reference to a statement introduced by our Lord's specially solemn formula *ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν* (Matt. xxiv. 34).

The same commentary is unsatisfactory in its treatment of the Temptation. It leaves doubt whether the personality of the Tempter is recognized at all, and certain phrases lead to a very serious question in one respect. In each of the three cases it is said that our Lord addressed the quotation ("It is written") to "His own heart," or to "Himself." Now it is impossible to say—it is in fact well-nigh impossible to believe—that the author really means these words to convey the meaning which one would think they must most naturally suggest. But is it not at least amazing that a writer of his ability should be able to pen such words (and to pen them thrice, with apparent emphasis) without any consciousness that they *might* suggest such an idea, and that he should not have guarded with the most scrupulous care against any such a possibility? And an equally serious question in any case arises with regard to other writers. Whether Dr. M'Neile believes there is a personal devil or

not, very many modern writers do not believe it—and probably some of them would be classed as “reverent.” Where, then, do they think these temptations came from? Such questions are most painful. But the issue is too serious to permit of countenance being given to the specious concealment under which such essential irreverence of thought is too often cloaked.

This terrible tendency of advance is illustrated by our final quotation. We should expect the late Dr. Bruce to be ranked among reverent students. All the more startling are these words (Matt, xvi. 28, *Expos. G.T.*)—“Christ’s speech was controlled not merely by His own thoughts but by the hopes of the future entertained by His disciples. He had to promise the advent of the Son of Man in His Kingdom or of the Kingdom of God in power (Mk.) within a generation, whatever His own forecast as to the future might be.”

One might be excused for scarcely believing one’s eyes. Is there any possible interpretation which could avoid the awful implication that these words seem necessarily to bear? It is true that the context speaks of the two alternatives suggested by His eschatological teaching. But nothing can take away the sinister force of that sentence. And it seems so surprising even from an expositor’s point of view. Nothing was farther from our Lord’s practice than to encourage the mistaken impressions of His disciples, especially as to the coming of the Kingdom. Acts i. 7 is an example of this.

Now it is impossible to believe that a man like Dr. Bruce could have brought himself to write such a sentence if he had not become accustomed first to ways of regarding the Bible, and even the Saviour Himself, in which “respect comes short of reverence.” If I say such an utterance is almost incredibly atrocious, I suppose I shall be accused of uncharitable judgment. But really, if the formularies of our Church can characterize errors of a different order as “blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,” what is the appropriate language to use to-day about this kind of thing?

W. S. HOOTON.



## CHRISTIANS AND RECREATION.

BY J. T. BUDD.

WHILST of course taking the Scriptures as our guide and standpoint on this important subject, we will not forget that the Bible is not a book of rules, but of principles, and that whilst we are not the keeper of our brother's conscience, we *are* responsible for our daily influence on others. "None of us liveth unto himself." Influence has been described as the silent preaching of a life; the powerful attraction of an invisible magnet; the malaria of sinners; the perfume of saints.

Christians are the salt of the earth, the light of the world. St. John draws a clear distinction between the love of the world and the love of the Father; St. Paul emphasizes separation in God's people, and in his letters calls for loyalty to Christ, and disentanglement not only from what is sinful, but from all that is doubtful—"not of faith"—and implores his converts to lay aside "weights," as an athlete does who has one object in view, as well as "easily besetting sins."

We must not fail, however, to recognize that there is a ministry of definite helpfulness in wholesome humour and in pure bright recreation. Such refresh the wearied and physically depressed, like exhilarating ozone, or a high Swiss mountain breeze, or a blast from the restless sea. We need home pleasures, not boisterous frivolity, but joyful mirth. Busy men, tired home workers, factory and office souls, lively youths, sprightly girls, as well as children, need pleasant hours. But to-day we need to remember more than ever, and will specially during coming months, that man is not sent into this world *merely to be amused*, that he is a soul and possesses a body!

Young folk *will* seek pleasure away from home if not provided there, and then they go without the restraining influences so much needed. The companionship and fellowship of gatherings sanely and safely conducted—such as Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, and a host of similar Church weekly meetings *are able to provide*—should supplement, not supplant, home ties and associations. To leave home three or four times a week, even for

religious exercises, seems to indicate an immoderate use of what is good. To-day boys and girls are out of hand! The fatherless will need a firmly kind guide! This will need to be remembered especially in villages. In lonely hamlets and small towns the huts and hostels, used during the war, may be erected with prodigious advantage, if placed under the supervision of bright, godly men and women. Christian women of leisure, and disabled officers willing for further self-sacrifice, will have here untold opportunities for service.

#### CHRIST'S JOY.

It has often been said that Christ never smiled. We do not know of any scripture to warrant this assumption. We do know He was "anointed with the oil of gladness," and we know, too, that little children were not afraid of Him. We do not forget either that He was invited to the joyous wedding feast of a young couple, and that He accepted the invitation, and there manifested forth His glory. Where gloomy thoughts, habits, or dress prevail amongst Christians, such give a corresponding tinge to spiritual life, in which pure mirth is separated as irreverent, and inconsistent with a life of practical holiness or health of soul.

Christ loved children. Children naturally love fun and games. It is said of the restored Jerusalem, "The streets of the city shall be full of boys and girls playing in the streets thereof." Grandmothers can sit all day long with their Bibles and hymn-books on their knees and enjoy both to their hearts' content: like sheep they feed in green pastures, but the lambs skip and gambol with frolicsome delight. We must not expect the lambs of the fold to act as grandmothers before they are well into their teens! Young students and lads, loving God's Word and prayer, derive excellent strength and vigour of mind from cricket or football. Young girls love exercise in the open air, and find its after-effects most stimulating, not enervating or tending to dissipate spiritual energy, like the excitement that results from mixed dancing in heated atmospheres late at night, or that produced by unhealthy, pernicious novels.

#### WALKING IN WISDOM.

In talking on this matter of recreation, we must exercise great forbearance, discrimination and patience, because the recreations of Christians will be as diversified as their tastes. What is enjoyable

to one would be wearisome to another, and perhaps objectionable to a third. If a man of the world, an intense lover of music, gifted with a splendid voice, becomes a Christian, he won't henceforth dislike music, but his gift will be sanctified. A man passionately fond of literature or public speaking, and another devoted to horticultural pursuits, will preserve their tastes, but their powers and knowledge will be consecrated. Some people will read what they would not sing, personally we would sing whatever we would read—if we had a voice!

Our natural tastes are so different, even when under the control of God's grace, we need to exercise great wisdom and thoughtfulness when we speak of things we consider dangerous; we are all so inclined to contend for victory rather than for righteousness, for self rather than for the truth. We had a friend, a Quaker, a peace-at-any-price man, who would fight and argue so hotly about temperance, and denounce drinking so excitedly, he almost got tipsy with zeal in behalf of the noble cause!

#### RECREATION A NECESSITY.

All work and no play makes older people than Jack dull. It will readily be conceded that young people need relaxation. Probably some Christian workers who have passed away would be alive to-day if they had cared more for the redeemed body and sought to "prosper and be in health even as the soul prospered" (3 John 2). The question is, as to the nature of the recreation permissible, the amount required, and when it should be enjoyed so as to promote health, spirits and energy.

It is as natural for the young to play as to eat and drink. If the mind or body is kept continually in one groove, always at the same tension, without adequate rest or change in thought or labour, the subject or work will become irksome or "get on one's nerves," one side of the nature will get warped or over-exercised, so that loss of vitality and energy will result. Sleep at night may prove sufficient for the body; our animal nature is satisfied with mere cessation from active physical toil. The mind and heart need very different restoratives. The mind is refreshed and invigorated, not by ceasing to think, but by a complete change of thought.

#### REMEMBER!

If recreation be a necessity, it must be enjoyed at the right



time. We observe then, first, that the Sabbath day is not the day for amusement. This subject of vital importance—Sabbath observance—would need an entire paper to itself. The *war has not increased* our love for Sabbath rest, though agriculturists and munition workers found it *did not pay* to work seven days a week! The Lord says, “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.” The commands “Do no murder” and “Do not steal” appeal to us by natural instinct; but the command to keep the Sabbath holy, and refrain from unnecessary labour does not appeal *directly* to conscience. Its excellence is not at first so clear. Some one has said that the first tenant farmer had this clause in his lease, “God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it.” Prebendary F. S. Webster recently wrote a fresh and illuminating article on the Sabbath which we would commend to those who seek to lead others to keep it holy.

Many say that the only time they have for recreation is on the Sabbath day, and that they can't preserve their health without amusement. No man, in the long run, preserves the health he owes to God's goodness by breaking one of His commandments. God tested many during this war to see whether they would obey His voice or not. The heads of Government departments found and had to admit, that women did more and better work in six days than in seven. The promise in Isaiah lviii. 13, 14 still holds good.

The night, we are told, is the “physical Sabbath of the day, restoring strength and repairing the waste and the weakness of twelve hours' toil. The Sabbath is the moral as well as the physical rest of the week, rectifying, adjusting, making up incidental omissions or inequalities in the previous six days, *and in addition* refreshing and restoring the whole moral and spiritual economy of man. Sleep is the way of spending the night, and of recovering from the fatigue of the day; but as the day is not meant by nature for sleep (some self-sacrificing hospital nurses have to sleep in the day-time in rotation), so, sleep cannot be a legitimate way of spending the Sabbath day. The restoration or refreshment of the Sabbath must arise from *withdrawing* the mind and thoughts from its week-day subjects, and so securing a total change of association of ideas, currents of fears and hopes, and anxieties and thought.”

Either the Sabbath day is holy, spiritual, sacred, for holy spiritual ends, or it is a holiday for pleasure and recreation.

If it is a sacred day, what right have we to promote concerts or open public galleries or picture palaces which attract the young, to work musicians, caretakers, porters, railway clerks, engine-drivers and guards, hotel servants and officials, in order that, forsooth, we may enjoy ourselves at other people's expense? *It is pure selfishness.* Sabbath-breaking is one of our national sins for which England will inevitably suffer, if we do not "amend our ways and our doings" (Jer. vii. 2; Hosea iv. 9). The excitement of a Sunday excursion train, and the worse excitement at hotels and house-party entertainments, is not the rest the spirit and mind and body imperatively need.

To-day we have far more holidays, half-days and shorter working hours than we had fifty years ago—and rightly so—but the inroads and encroachments on the Lord's day are insidiously and enormously increasing amongst all classes. One trembles for this land, after the enduring mercy of the Lord during these four years of war! The Church as a body and individual Christians must awake and "sound an alarm."

#### THE NATURE OF RECREATIONS.

Are we to avoid everything which depraved appetites abuse, and shun everything that extreme followers of fashion pervert? Certainly not! If we despised everything wicked minds abuse, we should give up using dinner knives and a great many useful things. But, and this is our point, if there be any habit or usage or pleasure that gives rise to much that is evil, and frequently leads to serious moral or social or bodily injury, if not to crime itself, such habit or amusement should be abandoned! Must not a Christian, however, go a step farther? However permissible it might possibly be for a Christian to adopt a certain course—*perhaps* safe for himself—if his *example leads others astray*, will not Christ's claim upon him and his love for Christ bind him to stop and not allow his liberty to become a stumbling-block to a weak brother? (Rom. xiv. 15, 16; 1 Cor. x. 23, 24).

The love of excitement is so engraven on our souls it may be regarded as an appetite. "Like other appetites it is not sinful unless indulged in unlawfully or to excess." We may not do evil that good may come. We must not disobey God's commandments, even to keep [people out of the public-houses on Sunday, to give

them fresher air, or cultivate their tastes for the fine arts. Better, far better for them to "rob their bodies of some strength, their minds of some energy, their souls of some pleasures, their families of some enjoyment, than to rob God of that which He claims as His own." So many people forget that man is a soul, and possesses a body and mind.

#### THE COLORADO BEETLE.

Most of the popular amusements of the present day are so perverted, Christian men and women, for the sake of their own and others' moral purity, cannot countenance them! We have heard a good deal lately about the Food Controller and potatoes, etc. If there were no potatoes in this country, and if we were forbidden to import them, we should consider it a hardship. This occurred some years ago in Italy. Potatoes were forbidden to be imported on account of the Colorado beetle. Foreign potatoes in themselves were unobjectionable, but this insect made such ravages there was nothing for it but to exclude the potato altogether!

Serious evils have become connected with many forms of amusement, so that the only course left to us is to make them *contraband*! You cannot sift out the beetles from the potatoes, so the potatoes must be excluded! Recreation in these times does not require a stimulus, but it certainly does need guidance and control.

#### SKATING ON THIN ICE.

Skating on solid ice is an exhilarating exercise, but skating on thin ice is dangerous. Whilst recreation is a necessity, many popular amusements need careful guarding or avoidance. In these papers we express only our own judgment. But we wish to make this statement frankly, that speaking broadly, we include in dangerous amusements those which the world, as such, *loves*, and which it is quite natural for the people of the world to admire and enjoy. St. John's words are true: "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." The reproach of the Cross has not ceased. "If any man *will* come after Me" he will have a cross of obliquity to bear, and must not expect to escape ridicule or scorn.

In our concluding paper we shall examine in detail some facts about theatres, balls, whist drives, races and concerts.

J. T. BUDD.

(To be concluded.)

## THE C.M.S. AND THE C.E.Z.M.S.

By CHANCELLOR P. V. SMITH, LL.D.

IT is probably known to many of our readers that of late years suggestions have been made and conferences have been held with a view to bringing about a closer union or possibly an amalgamation of the Church of England Zenana Missionary Society with the Church Missionary Society. The reasons for proposing such a step are not far to seek. Before the year 1887 the C.M.S., with a few isolated exceptions, employed no women missionaries, unless the wives of missionaries could be regarded in that light. Accordingly, to reach the women of India, who were inaccessible to individuals of the other sex, the Indian Female Normal School and Instruction Society was founded in 1861, to send out women missionaries for giving Christian teaching, with the aid of Indian helpers, in girls' schools and in zenanas, on an undenominational or interdenominational basis. In course of time many of the Church of England supporters of the Society felt this basis to be unsatisfactory, and in 1880 an amicable division was arranged; those who adopted this view forming themselves into a new Society with the title "The Church of England Zenana Missionary Society" and taking over a portion of the work and part of the staff of missionaries; while the rest remained attached to the old Society, which some time afterwards assumed the name of the Zenana Bible and Medical Mission in place of the rather ponderous title which it had previously borne. With reference to its new name it should be mentioned that before the split its operations had included the establishment of hospitals and dispensaries for women and girls; and the employment of medical missionaries; and both Societies afterwards developed this branch of missionary enterprise on a considerable scale. The original Society had always worked more or less in conjunction with the C.M.S.; and this association of effort was continued by both the old and the new Society after the severance; the C.E.Z.M.S. expressly declaring in its constitution that it should work in co-operation with the C.M.S. Thus the two bodies supplied in India the element of missions by women to women which had been practically left untouched by the C.M.S.; and the C.E.Z.M.S. soon extended its operations to South China.

So matters stood until towards the close of the last century. As Dr. Eugene Stock tells us in his *History of the Church Missionary Society*, vol. ii. pp. 397-399, the Committee of the C.M.S. had more than once affirmed the policy of separate organizations for the two sexes. In 1863 they resolved that as there were already two Societies, the Society for Promoting Female Education in the East (since extinct) and the Indian Female Normal School and Instruction Society, whose professed object it was to send out ladies for schools and zenanas in India, they were not prepared to take up that branch of missionary operations, except under very special circumstances or for the supply of their training establishments for Indian schoolmistresses. And a year later they again resolved that they could not send out ladies for zenana work. In 1867 they received a memorial urging them to take over the existing Zenana Societies altogether. To this they replied that while the C.M.S. already imparted a large amount of instruction to the women and girls of India in Zenanas, Bible classes and schools by the wives, sisters and daughters of its missionaries, they believed that there were openings for the employment of additional female missionaries, especially for zenana teaching. But they conceived that the C.M.S. could not undertake to organize such an agency on any considerable scale consistently with the claims of other branches of its work; whereas a Society, professedly established for educational purposes and conducted by a ladies' committee, might advantageously undertake and carry on the work in co-operation with various missionary societies.

In 1887, however, the C.M.S. completely changed its policy as regards women missionaries and began to employ them systematically as part of its regular staff. No fewer than 214 were sent out during that and the following seven years; and the number has gone on increasing until it has actually exceeded that of the ordained missionaries of the Society. On June 1, 1918, the Society had on its staff in the mission field 325 ordained men, 75 laymen, 264 missionaries' wives and 338 other women, sent out from home. At the same time the employment of women in the organization of local associations and the collection of funds to assist the Society's work was largely developed; so that the C.M.S. is not only now engaged in the same missionary operations as the C.E.Z.M.S., but is also appealing for the support of those operations to practically

the same constituency and by the same methods as the smaller Society.

But until quite recently there remained one distinguishing feature which differentiated the two. The missions of the C.M.S. were directed by a committee of men; those of the C.E.Z.M.S. were under the management of a committee consisting, with a few exceptions, of women; who not only were able from the more limited size of the Society to maintain a closer personal touch with its missionaries than was possible in the case of the C.M.S., but also from being of the same sex were naturally in more complete sympathy with them. During the last few years, however, this aspect of the case has undergone a change. Owing partly, no doubt, if not wholly, to the general advance in the position of women since the outbreak of the Great War, the C.M.S. has admitted women to its committees, so that the work of its women missionaries is now directed in part by individuals of their own sex. This last assimilation of its machinery to that of the C.E.Z.M.S. has naturally led many of the supporters of the smaller Society to reconsider the question of the desirability of its union with the larger organization, and to adopt the affirmative view in place of the negative which they had opposed to it when it had been discussed on one or two previous occasions. There can be no doubt that if the policy and practice of the C.M.S. had been in 1880 what it is at present, the C.E.Z.M.S. would never have been founded; and, that being so, it is natural to surmise that its continuance as a separate organization may not be any longer expedient in the general interests of missionary enterprise in India and China.

A further feature of the present situation has pointed in the same direction. While the income of both societies has happily increased, the cost of missionary operations has increased in far greater proportion, owing to the enhanced prices abroad as well as at home, and the rise in the Indian and Chinese exchanges, which means that more English money is required for conversion into rupees and dollars than before the war. In short, work which before the war could be done for £100 now costs something like £170. The C.M.S. is making a great effort to meet the crisis by means of a gigantic Peace-thanksgiving Offering as well as an increase in its annual income. But the C.E.Z.M.S., with its smaller organization, finds it difficult to make a corresponding effort with any adequate

success: and it is accordingly faced with the prospect of being obliged seriously to curtail its work. In these circumstances the general interests of the mission work would seem to require that any necessary reductions should only be made with the concurrence of the C.M.S. and with liberty to the C.M.S. to step in and supply the gaps wherever it considered that these general interests would be seriously injured by them. But this would be most easily and effectively accomplished if the two Societies were united together in a common organization.

These considerations led, in the early part of the present year, to a renewal by the committee of the C.E.Z.M.S., with a far greater approach to unanimity than before, of overtures to the C.M.S. for union with that Society, which had been made some years previously but without any result. And on May 27 a joint Sub-committee of members of the C.M.S. and C.E.Z.M.S. committees agreed to the following points as a basis on which the union of the two Societies might be effected:

1. That the C.M.S. should take over and accept responsibility for the whole work, excluding Singapore, of the C.E.Z.M.S., as from an agreed date, it being understood that the work at Singapore be transferred to another body before the agreement comes into force.

2. That the C.M.S. shall take over the missionaries of the C.E.Z.M.S. on to the active list of the C.M.S. as shall be arranged between the two Societies.

3. That, in the roll of missionaries of the future united Societies, a mark indicating those who have been C.E.Z. missionaries appear against their names.

4. That the C.M.S. should accept responsibility for salaries and allowances not less than C.E.Z. now has for the C.E.Z. missionaries taken over.

5. That the C.M.S. shall establish a C.E.Z. Auxiliary Fund, and all contributions to it, including legacies to the C.E.Z.M.S., be strictly appropriated for such work as has been previously carried on by the C.E.Z.M.S.

6. That the C.M.S. Committee should feel free to shape its future policy as regards C.E.Z. institutions as may appear to be best for the future work of the united Societies.

7. That there should be freedom in the location of all C.E.Z. workers.

8. That, for a time, as far as possible, the words "with which is incorporated the C.E.Z.M.S." be inserted in brackets under "Church Missionary Society."

9. That the C.M.S. shall ask some present members of the C.E.Z.M.S. Committees to accept membership of C.M.S. Committees.

10. That, for a time, the C.M.S. shall appoint a consultative Sub-committee on C.E.Z. work, which shall include some who have been members of C.E.Z.M.S. Committees.

11. That, in the future Home work, as in the future Foreign work of the whole Society, the C.M.S. Committee shall be free to adopt such methods as may seem to be desirable.

12. That all arrangements with regard to the future of the Home Staff of the C.E.Z. will have to be governed by the necessity of securing all possible

economy in administration, the C.E.Z. being informed by the C.M.S. before the agreement comes into force as to the persons who shall be taken over by the C.M.S.

The C.M.S. Committee agreed to the amalgamation of the C.E.Z.M.S. with the C.M.S. upon the above basis with the addition of the following point :

13. That all the landed properties and other assets of the C.E.Z.M.S. be transferred to the C.M.S.

The C.E.Z.M.S. Committee on their part, generally approved the thirteen points of the proposed basis of union, but very properly resolved that the opinion of their whole constituency on the subject ought to be ascertained ; and a Special General Meeting of the Society was accordingly held for that purpose on July 9. It was summoned to consider whether the Society should be incorporated with the C.M.S. on the basis accepted by the Committee of the C.M.S. and generally approved by the Committee of the C.E.Z.M.S. But before it was held, there were signs that the proposal would meet with a considerable amount of opposition ; and Bishop Stileman, a former Secretary of the Society, gave notice that, although personally in favour of the union of the two societies, he should move that in view of the absence of any approach to unanimity on the question, negotiations for the union should for the present be dropped. The President of the Society, who was in the Chair at the meeting, decided that this motion should have precedence over the resolutions which had been prepared in favour of accepting the proposed terms of incorporation ; and the result was that these terms were never actually discussed nor was the opinion of the meeting expressed upon them. The personality of the mover of the shelving resolution, and the persuasive speech in which he introduced it, contributed no doubt to its general acceptance. It was carried with only a very few dissentients in the following form :—

“ That with reference to the suggested amalgamation of the C.E.Z.M.S. with the C.M.S. this meeting, recognizing that a sufficient measure of unanimity amongst the members of the C.E.Z.M.S. does not exist such as to justify a definite proposal to the C.M.S., resolves that negotiations with a view to union of the two Societies be not further proceeded with at the present time ; and that the constituency of the Society throughout the country be urged to continue their whole-hearted support of the work.”

So the matter at present rests. But the resolution evidently contemplates that the last word has not been spoken in reference to



it; and a consideration of the *pros* and *cons* of the question may assist towards arriving at a right decision upon it, when it next comes up for serious discussion. The issues involved are evidently twofold: (1) Is any sort of union of the two societies desirable? and (2), if so, upon what terms should it be arranged?

(1). The main reason for a union of the societies is the importance of unity of command and of organization in the mission field. On this point we have received a never-to-be-forgotten object-lesson from the Great War. The Allied forces in France and Flanders had all the same object in view, and they were eventually thoroughly equipped to achieve it. But as long as they acted independently, they could make no decisive impression on the enemy. When, however, they were placed under one supreme command, they moved forward in concert to ultimate victory. The forces of heathenism and Mohammedanism in the spiritual sphere are no less formidable than were the German armies in the material world, and in attacking them we cannot afford to waste our resources and our energies by independent action without concert or co-ordination. It is true that there is already a certain amount of co-operation between the two Societies and their missionaries in the mission field. There are local conferences of women missionaries on which the missionaries of both societies sit and vote on equal terms. And the corresponding clerical secretary of the C.M.S. in each mission district acts also as the corresponding secretary of the C.E.Z.M.S. But he must keep the accounts of the missionary work of each Society separate, and must remit them with any questions which may arise as to the conduct of that work to the Committee of the Society concerned. And the aggregate force of the women missionaries cannot be manipulated as a single unit without the concurrence of two independent Committees which may not always see eye to eye in a particular matter. Obviously here there is a real loss of power and concentration, entailing injury upon the whole work; and the fact that this would be cured if the Societies were united is the strongest and most obvious reason for their union. But the probable achievement of economy and retrenchment in the home staff and administration may be advanced as another reason; and in support of it there can, no doubt, be adduced the widespread tendency, which we observe in the commercial world, for smaller undertakings to combine with larger undertakings of a similar character.

But the cases are not exactly on all fours. Each of the combining commercial undertakings has had its own constituency or body of customers, and the combined venture may confidently expect to retain both of these and to add more to them. The constituencies of the C.M.S. and C.E.Z.M.S. are, however, largely, though, of course, not wholly, identical; and it is gravely problematical to what extent individuals who now contribute to each, or parishes which now collect for each, would continue to give the same aggregate amount to the work if the two Societies were united into one. It must also be remembered that although the union might enable us to dispense with some of the home staff of the C.E.Z.M.S., yet the collection and manipulation of some £52,000 a year and the provision for some 220 missionaries cannot be carried on without the expenditure of a substantial sum in administration; so that if, as is, of course, contemplated, the present C.E.Z. funds and operations are maintained at their present level, a considerable part of the present home outlay of that Society would still be required to be expended by the united Societies.

(2). Assuming, however, that union is desirable, mistakes may easily be made in the terms on which it is effected. What are we to say about the basis of union which the meeting of July 9 was to have been asked to approve? It will be noticed that, of its thirteen articles, seven may be regarded as laying down principles, while the remaining six indicate the machinery by which those principles are to be carried out. The first set consists of articles 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11 and 12. They prescribe that the C.M.S. shall take over and accept responsibility for the missionaries and the whole work (except Singapore) of the C.E.Z.M.S.; that the C.M.S. Committee shall be free to deal with the C.E.Z. institutions and the location of all C.E.Z. workers in such manner as may appear best for the future united work; and that the C.M.S. Committee shall decide which of the Home Staff of the C.E.Z.M.S. shall, with regard to all possible economy in administration, be taken over by the C.M.S., and shall in the future be free to adopt, in the Home work no less than in the Foreign work of the whole Society, such methods as may appear to them to be desirable. If there is to be union, all these points seem to be essential elements in it, since they are all concerned with that unity of command and organization which it would be the primary object of the union to secure. But as to the machinery

for carrying out these points there is room for difference of opinion. The proposed basis contemplates the extinction of the C.E.Z.M.S. as a separate entity. It is not to remain as a subordinate part of C.M.S. organization; it is to be replaced by a C.E.Z. Auxiliary Fund; all contributions to which, together with legacies given to the C.E.Z.M.S. by name, are to be strictly appropriated for such work as has been hitherto carried on by the C.E.Z.M.S. But all the landed properties and other assets of the C.E.Z.M.S. are to be transferred to the C.M.S. with no proviso that they, or the money's worth of such of them as may at any time be devoted to other purposes, shall be used exclusively for C.E.Z. work. For a time, however, a consultative Sub-committee on C.E.Z. work is to be appointed, which is to include in the first instance members of existing C.E.Z.M.S. Committees.

It is not surprising that these proposals should have met with strong opposition from many warm friends and supporters of the smaller Society. They are open to objection both on sentimental and on material grounds. To abolish the fourth largest Missionary Society of the Church of England after a successful career of nearly forty years would wound the feelings and affections and tend to alienate the sympathies of a large number of individuals who are at present keenly interested in both Societies and are associated with both by tender ties. But this is not all. The bulk of pecuniary support to the C.E.Z.M.S. comes from parishes and persons who also contribute to the C.M.S. Some of these would, no doubt, for a time continue to give both to the general funds of the C.M.S. and to its new C.E.Z. Auxiliary Fund. But many would undoubtedly decline to do so from the very first, and as time went on it would be increasingly difficult to maintain the double contributions. It may be said that these sentimental and material objections to the scheme ought not to exist. But we must take human nature as we find it, and make allowance for its limitations and imperfections. There are, however, other substantial objections to the contemplated extinction of the existing C.E.Z.M.S. It is proposed that legacies bequeathed to it shall be paid into the new C.E.Z. Auxiliary Fund of the C.M.S. to be used for C.E.Z. work. But will that Fund be entitled in law to receive them, or, owing to the Society to which they were given having become defunct, will they lapse and fail and so be altogether lost to the missionary cause? It might be

possible, by proper provisions in the instrument by which the absorption of the C.E.Z.M.S. into the C.M.S. is accomplished, to render it probable that the Courts would order legacies bequeathed to the extinct Society to be paid to the new C.E.Z. Auxiliary Fund ; but it would be scarcely possible to frame provisions which should place executors under an obligation to pay to that Fund without obtaining the sanction of the Court a legacy given to the C.E.Z.M.S.t particularly if bequeathed with the usual direction that the receipt, of the Treasurer of the Society should be obtained for its payment. Thus these legacies, if secured at all, would be secured less the expenses of obtaining a decision of the Court upon them. Again, the funded and landed properties of the C.E.Z.M.S. are at present held by " The Trustees of the Church of England Zenana Missionary Society Registered," a body of four trustees incorporated by the Charity Commissioners under the Charitable Trustees Incorporation Act, 1872, with a common seal which is to be affixed to documents with the signatures of two of the Trustees and the Financial Secretary of the Society and a provision that the Committee of the Society may from time to time appoint members of the Society as new Trustees to fill vacancies in the number. What is to become of these properties if the Society is extinguished ? The proposed basis of union contemplates that they shall be transferred to the C.M.S., that is, to the Church Missionary Trust Association Limited, which is the trust body of that Society ; and it has been suggested that the sanction of the Charity Commissioners might be obtained for the transfer. But the Charity Commissioners have no jurisdiction over the C.E.Z. landed properties in India, and for the transfer of these a similar sanction from the Courts in each Presidency would appear to be required. And is it not the case that properties vested in the C.M. Trust Association Limited are subject to a floating charge to secure the repayment of certain debentures issued some years ago to increase the capital of the C.M.S. ? Is it clear that the Charity Commissioners or any Court would sanction the transfer of unencumbered charitable trust property to a body in whose hands it would become subject to a charge ; or a transfer from trustees whose liability is unlimited to a body with limited liability ?

These grave objections to the proposed basis of union appear to be capable of being removed without prejudicing its main features. At the joint Conference on May 27 it was expressly stated on behalf

of the C.M.S. that it was intended to make the proposed C.E.Z. Auxiliary Fund a definite part of C.M.S. organization ; to be supported not only by separate sermons and meetings and contributions, but also by separate literature and having a staff of its own to work it and its own Annual Meeting in the May week. Well then, instead of establishing this fund in lieu of the C.E.Z.M.S., let the C.E.Z.M.S. itself be retained to act the part which this Fund is intended to take, and nothing more. Its constitution would, of course, require to be altered and greatly simplified, but this could easily be done, if there was a general agreement on the subject. Instead of being an independent Society having as its object to make known the Gospel of Christ to the women of India and, if so determined, in other heathen or Mohammedan countries, and working in co-operation with the C.M.S., it would become an integral and subordinate part of the C.M.S., and its object would be to form an Auxiliary Zenana Fund to assist the C.M.S. in making known the Gospel of Christ to the women of the above-mentioned countries under the direction of the Committee of the C.M.S. Membership of the Society would be acquired by contributing to this Auxiliary Zenana Fund. The Society would have a Committee acting in all respects as a Sub-committee under the direction of the C.M.S. Committee and such officers and staff as the C.M.S. chose to appoint ; but the Lay Secretary and the Treasurer of the C.M.S. would also be the Financial Secretary and the Treasurer of the C.E.Z.M.S. There would be, as heretofore, an Annual Meeting of the C.E.Z.M.S. on the Friday afternoon in the May week, and the C.M.S. Committee would nominate to this meeting the persons to be elected on the C.E.Z. Committee for the ensuing year. It should also have the power of filling up vacancies on this Committee, so that if for any reason the Annual Meeting declined to elect its nominees, these could still be placed upon the Committee to supply the places which would thus be left vacant. The incorporated C.E.Z. trustees would continue in existence and would hold as part of the assets of the Zenana Auxiliary Fund not only the existing C.E.Z. properties, but also any capital funds and properties hereafter given for the purposes of that Fund. All these funds and properties would, however, be at the disposal of the C.M.S. for the objects of the Fund, and if the C.M.S. Committee at any time considered that any of the landed property in India or elsewhere, not subject to any specific trust, was no longer required

for those objects, they would have the power to alienate it on providing the Fund with its proper equivalent in money or property.

It may be objected that this scheme is only a half-measure. If it were, this would not necessarily condemn it. There is an old saw that half a loaf is better than no bread ; but there is a still older and equally true saying that the half is oftentimes more than the whole. A process may be achieved by two steps with intervals between them which cannot be effected by a single stride. It is, however, claimed for this scheme that it would really accomplish the whole of the essential objects of the proposed basis of union. And, except as regards the merely technical point of the legal tenure of the C.E.Z. properties, it would do so by practically the same machinery, though under a different nomenclature. But, it may perhaps be said, the idea of one Society as a subordinate part of another Society is preposterous. That, it is submitted, depends altogether on the relations established between the two bodies and not on the designations by which each is known. The C.M.S. has already many associations within its organization ; and " Association " is only another name for " Society." It would, no doubt, from a literary point of view be preferable to style the C.E.Z.M.S. when incorporated into the C.M.S. a Fund, or an Auxiliary, or an Association. But there are cases, and this, it is contended, is one of them, in which substantial reasons to the contrary ought to outweigh considerations of mere literary taste or accuracy. As Pascal said, " Je ne dispute jamais du nom pourvu qu'on m'avertisse du sens qu'on lui donne."

One further observation in conclusion. In taking counsel as to the relations between the C.M.S. and C.E.Z.M.S. we ought not to ignore the uncertainty which hangs over the future of ecclesiastical organization in India and in China. It may be profoundly affected not only by changes in the civil government, but also by the development of the Christian Church in those countries. As long ago as 1894 that great ecclesiastical statesman, Archbishop Benson, expressed the opinion that the era of societies, as directors of missionary enterprise, was drawing to a close. It seems likely that, as time goes on, mission work will become more and more locally managed and controlled either by diocesan authorities or by a larger indigenous Church. If, as may not impossibly be the case, the closing months of this year witness a union of the non-episcopal South

India United Church with the Anglican Church in the Madras Presidency, the unified body can scarcely fail to claim a dominant voice in the conduct of missions to the surrounding heathen. The C.M.S. has always bidden us to look forward to the time when all missionary operations and all mission property will be handed over to a duly constituted and flourishing local Church. The possibly near advent of this consummation of our evangelistic efforts supplies an additional reason against desiring to incur the expense and trouble of disturbing the existing tenure of C.E.Z. property in the mission field by transferring it from one trust body to another unless such transfer is absolutely necessary for the good of the work.

P. V. SMITH.

## THE CHAPELS ROYAL OF BRITAIN.

BY J. CRESSWELL ROSCAMP, M.E.

### III. KING HENRY VII'S CHAPEL, WESTMINSTER.

THE very name of Westminster conjures up in the mind a picture of old-world dignity and grandeur and associations with the Royalty of England from time immemorial. The old Abbey, standing here still as it has done since before the Norman soldiers ever trod the shores of Great Britain, is one of the most cherished possessions of the Nation. It is a "Royal Peculiar," that is to say, it is an ecclesiastical possession of the Sovereign alone and no Archbishop or Bishop has any authority within its doors, for the Sovereign is its Ordinary. History breathes from every chapel and every part of the magnificent edifice, but if one portion more than another calls to the imagination as "a temple not made with hands" it is Henry VII's Chapel.

When those beautiful gates are opened and a glimpse of the Chapel is obtained, it seems indeed as if it were not of this world's making but had been designed and erected by the dainty hands of angels, and one feels impelled to walk softly lest by chance the sleep of the illustrious dead that lie within should be broken. Henry

had been reconstructing the chapel at St. George's, Windsor, wherein to place the body of Henry VI, but a struggle ensued between the authorities at Chertsey Abbey where he had lain, Windsor and Westminster, and the matter was referred to a council held at Greenwich, who decided that the body must be placed in the Abbey at Westminster. Accordingly, the Chapel at Windsor was abandoned and the present beautiful addition made to Westminster, Pope Julius II sanctioning the removal of the body from Chertsey Abbey, but the price he asked to canonize him in accordance with Henry's wish was so exorbitant that his body was left at Windsor, where it had been brought, and rests there to this day.

The Chapel is 104 feet 6 inches long, 69 feet 10 inches wide, and 61 feet 5 inches high. The roof is extraordinarily beautiful, composed of very light panelled pendentives and fan-tracery, with cinquefoiled arches and supports like a fretwork of countless butterfly wings. The row of clerestory windows with their exquisite stained glass cast a solemn tint throughout the building, which is surely a masterpiece of that great architect of the close of the fifteenth century, Sir Reginald Bray. The East end terminates in a fine apse, and on each side of the Chapel hang the banners of the Knights of the Bath, tattered and worn with age and drooping motionless over the monuments of the great dead below. The lofty stalls of quiet dignity are beautifully carved and their stone panelling adds to their magnificence and beauty, while the carved wooden figures of the Kings, Bishops and Saints encircling the whole Chapel under the canopies finish the picture of sacred loveliness.

Mr. F. Bond in his work estimates that the Chapel must have cost at least £250,000 altogether, the initial cost being about £140,000, while the endowment "to the land of God and the honour royal" would reach another £100,000. He points out, too, that the whole of this endowment was confiscated by Henry VIII and his successors, leaving only the Chapel to remain.

Henry VII and his Queen, Elizabeth of York, lie buried together in the bronze chantry behind the "altar," whilst standing round according to the Monarch's last will and testament are figures of the Saints Michael, John the Baptist, John the Evangelist, George, Anthony, Edward, Vincent, Anne, Mary Magdalene, and Barbara. Queen Elizabeth died in 1503 in childbirth in her twenty-seventh year, while Henry only lived six years later, dying at his Richmond



Palace in his fifty-fifth year and being brought hither to be lain by her side. The life-like effigy above the tomb was the work of the Florentine sculptor, Torrigiano, the rival of Michael Angelo, and it was completed in 1529. The bronze grille around the tomb, though much mutilated, is still the finest piece of metal work in the country. Formerly there were thirty-two statuettes of gilt bronze on the grate, but all have been stolen or destroyed except six.

The vault below and side by side with this one is that of King James I.

Only a matter of a few weeks afterwards died Margaret Beaufort, the wife of Edmund Tudor, Earl of Richmond. She was truly a most devout person and sincerely beloved for her good works. Amongst them may be mentioned her founding the St. John's and Christ's Colleges at Cambridge, and, on the advice of Bishop Fisher, establishing the first divinity professorships at both Oxford and Cambridge. Her beautiful tomb is in the South aisle near to that of her great-great-grand-daughter, Mary, Queen of Scots.

Edward VI died on July 6, 1553, and his successor, Mary, was the cause of his funeral being postponed, desiring it to be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Roman Catholic Church. A compromise was, however, effected whereby a Requiem Mass was held at the Tower, after which the coffin was brought to Westminster and the service conducted from the English Book of Common Prayer. The plate on the coffin described the King as "On earth under Christ, of the Church of England and Ireland the supreme head."

On December 13, 1558, died Mary I, the daughter of Henry VIII, and Katherine of Aragon—a tyrannical bigot, unscrupulous and despotic, and in her death mourned by none. Indeed, the chroniclers have it that well-nigh before the service was over people were pulling down the black drapings of the Abbey. At the funeral Bishop White is said to have used for his text the words: "A living dog is better than a dead lion!"

Then came Queen Elizabeth, who passed away at the Palace at Richmond on March 24, 1603, and was brought down the river to Whitehall, and thence to the Abbey. The people flocked from all parts to witness her burial, and their enthusiasm so stirred King James I that he erected the exquisite memorial to be seen to her. The front is not so fine as that erected afterwards to Mary, Queen of Scots, but is nevertheless a most handsome memorial

to the Virgin Queen. The recumbent effigy is of white marble, and portrays the features full of strength and dignity, while she is represented clothed in royal robes and carrying the orb and sceptre in her hand. These, however, are now broken and her crown is gone. Her stately coffin rests on the top of that of her sister Mary, and it is situated in the North aisle.

Later, in 1612, the remains of Mary, Queen of Scots, were by the King's command brought from Peterborough, where she had been buried, and lain in this Chapel, and James erected yet another tomb of most exquisite beauty to the memory of his mother. This memorial is situated in the South aisle, occupying a position similar to that in memory of Queen Elizabeth. The effigy is also executed in white marble, and depicts the features as small but exceptionally sweet and beautiful. At her feet lies a Scottish lion with a crown of Sovereignty. Formerly, devout Scots used to make pilgrimages to her tomb, and it is chronicled that miracles were performed there and sufferers were healed of their ailments.

In the same year his eldest son Henry, the Prince of Wales, died, and it is said that over two thousand attended his funeral, so extremely popular was he for his accomplishments and his lovable nature, but for some reason or another no monument was put up in his honour.

At the East end are the two pathetic tombs of the two little daughters of King James I, Princess Sophia dying three days after birth, having a tomb of alabaster in the form of a cradle, while an effigy of her little sister, the Princess Maria, lies on a marble table-tomb resting upon her left arm.

James I was buried on March 27, 1625, and after this the next interment took place during the time of the Commonwealth, the Lord Protector, Oliver Cromwell, having his mother buried there in 1654, and his sister, Jane Cromwell, in 1656.

Oliver Cromwell himself was buried in 1658, the funeral costing the nation £60,000, but at the Restoration on January 30, 1661, the Royalists, by the consent of Charles II, had the body dragged from its resting-place and drawn on a hurdle to Tyburn Hill, where it was hanged upon the gallows until sunset, thereafter taking it down and beheading it, throwing the body into a pit at the foot of the hill and putting up his head along with those of Ireton and Bradshaw on the top of Westminster Hall.

Parliament voted the sum of £70,000 for the removal of the body of King Charles I to this Chapel, but the money was appropriated by Charles II, and the body lies still at St. George's, Windsor.

Charles II was buried "very quietly at night and without any manner of pomp," and here too lie the bodies of William III and Mary II, the good Queen Anne and Prince George of Denmark, at the East end of the South aisle.

Queen Caroline, the consort of George II, was buried in 1738, and twenty-two years later her husband lain by her side. He had directed that "his ashes should be mingled with those of his wife," and so the two coffins were placed together in one large sarcophagus and one side of each removed.

William, Duke of Cumberland, the victor of Fontenoy and Culloden and the founder of the Ascot Race Meeting, was interred here in 1765, and here too are buried the first Duke of Buckingham, the favourite of James I and Charles I.

The great Duke of Marlborough, who was given a most magnificent public funeral, was first buried here in 1722, but removed to Blenheim by the Duchess in 1766.

And so here are congregated the mighty dead, whose deeds have thrown a grandeur and a gloom over the pages of England's history, and we pass from the scene where the very pavement seems strewn, as it were, with crowns, helmets, swords and all the bent and bruised relics of the monarchs and nobles whose history is ours, and leave them to their rest of peace, wherein some day we too shall lay us down.

J. CRESSWELL ROSCAMP.



## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

## THE NEGLECTED PROPHET.

THE BOOK OF THE PROPHET JEREMIAH. Edited by L. E. Binns, M.A.  
Westminster Commentaries. London: Methuen & Co. 16s. net.

From the days of his preaching down to this present time the prophet Jeremiah has been the victim of strange neglect and misunderstanding. And yet, as Mr. Binns in his new commentary is careful to point out, some of the sublimest utterances of Scripture were very probably inspired by his work and teaching. Among his contemporaries his patriotism was too idealistic to awaken sympathy. Posterity equally has for the most part found his conception of religion too austere to win universal acceptance. But the choicest spirits of all time have recognized the true greatness of this man. It was he in all likelihood whom the author of the "Servant" passages in Isaiah had in mind as model. Philo held Jeremiah in great reverence. Our Blessed Lord's teaching of the New Covenant is based on Jeremiah's, and, as Mr. Binns says, there is justification for assuming that the prophet was one of the great moulding influences on St. Paul. It seems strange, therefore, that even in our day Jeremiah is so little studied. His book presents fewer critical problems than many others in the Old Testament: the ordinary reader can safely assume its integrity, speaking broadly; it is for the most part free from the bewildering obscurity of parts of the minor prophets. Whence then the neglect? There are at least three causes. First, the book, though sublime and picturesque, lacks that miraculous eloquence which makes so many a chapter in Isaiah irresistibly attractive; second, Jeremiah's message is so intimately bound up with the downfall of Jerusalem, and his own tragic conflict with his short-sighted contemporaries, that any study of his writings demands a patient interest in the rather sordid story of the last days of the Judean kingdom; and third, the present arrangement of the chapters is so capricious to all appearance that a coherent and consecutive view of the prophet's work is impossible without taking considerable pains. Here then is the opportunity for the commentator. A scholar can scarcely do a more useful work than so to present this book to English readers as to win them to that one satisfactory method of biblical study—the method of discovering the prophet's message to our own age and circumstances by studying his message in the light of his own. But with all respect to academic scholarship, the attempt will fail if it be merely academic. We congratulate Mr. Binns on escaping the pitfalls of mere pedantry. His work shows real self-restraint. He is obviously interested in Canon Kennett's theory that Deuteronomy is later than Jeremiah. One could imagine him eagerly arguing in support of this view. Yet he contents himself in this volume with a mere mention of the theory and references to works where it is fully discussed.

On the other hand, in his notes on the text Mr. Binns happily avoids to a great extent the annoying practice of some commentators of arousing the reader's interest in some point only to leave him dissatisfied with the mere crumbs of reference to some inaccessible work. Both in the introduction and the notes Mr. Binns is carefully suggestive, illuminating his comment with frequent applications to present circumstances, or quotations from quite modern writers, being ever at pains to interest and help the reader, whose main interest lies in life to-day rather than in Jeremiah's time. Mr.

Binns meets the three difficulties of which we have already spoken fairly. An introduction to each section, and a citation of Cornill's rearrangement on page lxxvi, help the reader to discover the date of each chapter. If one has any criticism on this point it is only a wish that a little more emphasis had been laid on the value of studying the book in an order impossible in a commentary following the text of EVV. Again, Mr. Binns discusses the history fully and interestingly, conveying always, as has been said, the impression that Jeremiah has a message for us as truly as for his contemporaries. Indeed, it was the striking similarity between the events of Jeremiah's age and ours that seems to have impelled our commentator to his task. The publisher's announcement that the author of this work seeks to deduce lessons "of value for all time, and not least for the age of transition and unrest—in many ways so like the prophet's own—in which we are now living," is fully justified. On the very first pages of the introduction, for instance, the importance of the prophet is illuminated by quotations from Dr. Temple's *The Faith and Modern Thought* and Mr. Oliver C. Quick's *Essay in Orthodoxy*.

Mr. Binns presents a very convincing and able defence of the literary qualities of the book. His observations on Jeremiah and nature, both in the introduction and a detached note, are valuable and interesting. Yet one could have wished for still ampler treatment. The impress of nature upon all the writers of the Old Testament is a subject of deep interest, and we cannot but feel that Mr. Binns has not allowed himself quite enough scope. He refers to Ruskin on the pathetic fallacy. Ruskin is undeniably confusing, if not confused, on this point. We doubt whether scriptural writers ever fall into the fallacy in the way which Ruskin condemns. The biblical writers seem never to read into nature a fanciful reflection of their own moods, though they boldly use language in which nature is personified as reflecting the mind of God. Probably Mr. Binns saw that his commentary was already swelling to proportions which began to alarm him, for other of the detached notes besides this on nature seem to show that the author felt the necessity of restraining himself. The notes on the text are ample and satisfying. They aim at something more than merely explaining difficulties for the English reader. They notice awkwardnesses and difficulties which the student of Hebrew, alive to critical questions in detail, will alone appreciate. Mr. Binns' soundness of judgment is well shown in two notes on "Sacrifice in the wilderness" and the authorship of xxxi. 31-34: the former also reveals to us what difficulties beset the exact scholarship of men to-day whose sense of accuracy tends to blind them to the fact that the prophets were not always careful to say neither more nor less than they precisely meant. Surely when Jeremiah asserts, "I commanded not your fathers concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices, but this thing I commanded them, saying, Hearken unto my voice," he is not making a precise historical statement to be taken with painful literalness. We do not believe that Mr. Binns' suggestion to replace the translation "concerning" by "for the sake of" is really necessary. The prophet made an unqualified statement which would not perplex his hearers, and the critic who seeks to support on such a text any argument as to the date of the Deuteronomic code is, in our opinion, trusting to a very poor foundation.

It remains but to say that this volume is in every way worthy of the tradition of its series, and to hope that Mr. Binns' work will do much to bring to an end the undeserved neglect under which the great and nobly patriotic Jeremiah, true prophet of the Eternal God, still labours.

J. R. DARBYSHIRE.

## WHAT CHAPLAINS SAY.

THE GREATEST RELATIONSHIP. By Rev. A. C. Bouquet, B.D. WHAT IT MEANS TO BE A CHURCHMAN. By Rev. W. J. Carey. London: S.P.C.K. 2s. net each; or 1s. in paper boards.

These two small volumes belong to a series written by past or present Chaplains to the Forces, edited by Rev. F. B. Macnutt, formerly S.C.F. and editor of *The Church in the Furnace*.

In the first Mr. Bouquet states "the case for religion" with force and insight and discusses the "God-sense" in a very practical, common-sense way. Here is an example—"Life to the man in whom God's Presence has become central assumes a wholeness and completeness. . . . The individual then plays hockey or oils his engine to the glory of God, to the glory of God he types correspondence or makes bricks, to the glory of God he pursues the search for truth with joyful but unrelenting accuracy in the labyrinths of scientific research, to the glory of God he cheerfully wastes his medical skill (as some would think) in a town practice where the bad debts are nearly as numerous as the small patients, or renounces promotion in exchange for exile to some fever-stricken station on the far seas." Again, anent the alleged dishonesty of native Christians, he says—"Would there be any justification for such logic as this?—I once knew an officer in the British Army who was decorated with the M.C. He had not earned it and was a 'washout.' I have also known several other officers who were no good at all. Therefore none of the officers in the British Army are any good, and none of those who have been decorated have earned their decorations": or "officers are decorated for bravery. Therefore no officer who is not decorated can be brave." This, he says, represents "the kind of logic which is often applied to Christian people." He next considers the character of God and lays down the proposition that He is Almighty in the sense that the Universe is ultimately under His control. "It is a strange wild place but it is not out of hand." There is a suggestive chapter on "The Commonwealth or Kingdom of God" and some useful "notes."

Mr. Carey is, as usual, vigorous and plain. He writes briefly on a variety of subjects, e.g.—on Christ "the centre of our religion,"—on the Atonement "so often wrongly explained that it is a stumbling-block to many," on the Holy Ghost "the 'liaison' between us and Christ." He has something straight to say about "Personal Conviction" and much that is useful about the "Brotherhood of the Church": but we observe that apparently his only quarrel with the Roman Church is over the pretensions of the Pope! His remarks on the Sacraments are somewhat "scrappy." We read—"By Christ's own words and Christ's own institution those who partake of the consecrated Elements partake of Him." He might have added—"only after an heavenly or spiritual manner." Moreover, he designates "those five commonly called Sacraments" as "sacramental ordinances." Can we suppose that he has not noticed the significance, in the Prayer Book, of the phrase "commonly called"? Perhaps the best chapter is the last—"The Church's Call to Service": it makes us feel that if we do not agree with the writer on all points, we are one with him in believing that "the only solution of all problems lies in the teaching of Jesus."

We are not told what other volumes are to be included in this series, but if when they appear they are up to the standard of these first, they will serve a useful purpose.

## THROUGH CATHOLIC EYES.

THE AMERICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH INTERPRETED FOR ENGLISH CHURCHMEN.

By Arthur Whipple Jenks, D.D. *S.P.C.K.* 3s. 6d. net.

Recent events have done a good deal to arouse interest in the American Church, and we have quite lately had two books dealing with the subject. It is well that English Churchmen should know something of the history and work of the daughter Church in the United States. They will learn from Dr. Jenks' book in brief outline how that Church originated and developed, and what are its present conditions and organization. It is unfortunate, however, that the author has so great an animus against Protestantism and the word Protestant. This feeling pervades the greater part of the book and finds expression again and again. He tells us (p. 33) that "From the end of the eighteenth century the Church in the United States has been under challenge to uphold her claims to be Catholic and not Protestant." For a body endeavouring to uphold such a claim it must be rather an embarrassment to be entitled the "Protestant Episcopal Church," and Dr. Jenks glides lightly round this somewhat delicate position, suggesting that "The title by which the Church became legally known seems to have come into use accidentally rather than by deliberate design" (p. 27). But he does not tell us of the opposition which was aroused by and frustrated the attempt to alter the title. It is not only to the word, however, but to all it connotes that Dr. Jenks objects. He stands for the necessity of Bishops as a guarantee of the spiritual life, and upholds such ceremonies as Benediction, Reservation, the use of incense, vestments, "altar" lights, etc. While claiming that these and the theological system they represent are to be found in the Protestant Episcopal Church, he has nevertheless to admit that they are not general, and that they make way with difficulty.

Dr. Jenks gives an account of the difficulties which attended the efforts to secure an episcopate for the American Church and how, finally, recourse was had to the Scotch Bishops who consecrated Dr. Seabury, making, however, as far as it was possible to do so, a condition that he should introduce the Scottish form of the Communion Office. We learn also some of the historical causes which operated against the spread and popularity of the newly formed Church. These historical causes account in a measure for the numerically insignificant position of the Church in the United States, but only in a small measure. There are forty-two million members of various professing Christian Churches in America, and of these the Protestant Episcopal Church claims only a little over one million. The Lutherans more than double that number; so do the Presbyterians. The Baptists and the Methodists each claim seven millions of members. The fact is that a free and educated laity has little use for a sacerdotal Church. They have no objection to Episcopacy. Probably, other things being equal, the overwhelming majority would prefer it. But the lesson which America has to teach us is that a Protestant laity, if they must make a choice, will even endure the loss of Episcopacy rather than surrender that spiritual liberty and simplicity of worship of which Protestantism is the charter and safeguard. W. G. J.

---

MR. "QUICK'S CHURCH PRINCIPLES."

THE TESTING OF CHURCH PRINCIPLES. By Oliver Chase Quick. London: *John Murray.* 5s. net.

The author has written in haste. Paradoxical as it may seem, herein lies the chief value of the book. Upon questions of urgent and current controversy many with little leisure or learning form rapid judgments, express their

opinions, and record their votes. Mr. Quick, with a little leisure for writing and a learning which is much more than a guarantee against stupidity, but without following to the finish every line of argument, helps us to understand what is running in men's minds. Avoiding the peril of including all such persons in one category, we perceive that many ardent advocates of Church reform and adherents of the "Life and Liberty" movement are urged by dissatisfaction with the Prayer Book, the status of the clergy, the position of the National Church, and the exercise of authority in reference to Modernism.

Excellent reforms are frequently maintained by inadequate or erroneous reasoning. The Enabling Bill must be valued by its own intrinsic worth. The hopes of some supporters may not be fulfilled. Here we offer no opinion of our own. But if constitutional changes are desired in the Church as the only means of reverting to the Prayer Book of 1549, with a consequent alteration in the Church's doctrine of Holy Communion, of securing the isolation of the clergy from the laity as teachers of the Faith, of making the Holy Communion the chief service of the Church, and refusing to the indifferent the privileges of Christian Baptism, marriage, and burial, then some of us will certainly inquire whether we are drifting. If the baptismal basis of the franchise is to be rejected in favour of the communicant as a further means of reaching these aims, we shall be well advised in holding to the former.

Space does not permit an analysis of Mr. Quick's arguments. He should not have permitted himself to attribute the general self-satisfaction in regard to sin to the Protestant teaching of three and a half centuries, and he needs to be careful lest in the toleration of Modernism he opens the door to Socinianism, Spiritualism, or Christian Science. When he declines the authority of Holy Scripture as the dead voice of the past, he should remember that these writings contain the original deposit of our faith, and that the water is never purer than as it comes from the spring. But, though we criticize his work, he must be reckoned with. An easy charm of style fascinates many. Evangelicals must read and weigh this book, for it will carry great influence and provide a storehouse of argument for those whose type of Churchmanship is not ours.

---

#### A ROMAN PERVERT.

MEMOIR OF KENELM HENRY DIGBY. By Bernard Holland, C.B. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 12s. 6d. net.

It is rather late in the day to resurrect Kenelm Digby, since he has been dead nearly forty years. Coming of a distinguished family and the son of an Irish clergyman, and this brought up in an Evangelical atmosphere, he became, before the birth of the Oxford Movement, a Roman Catholic—like many perverts—of a somewhat virulent type. As a writer he was never popular and his verses were not of a high order. His most notable book was *Mores Catholicæ*, in eleven volumes, and the writer of this memoir is candid enough to admit that it would not pay a publisher to reproduce it and he wants some wealthy man to come forward and bear the cost! We rather suspect he will be disappointed. The compiler of this memoir is delightfully frank. Take this as an example—"We may hold in principle, and with all our heart and mind, that the Church centred in the Chair of Peter is the one Catholic Church, outside which is no safety; but in practical discussion with non-Catholics, it is, perhaps, wiser to maintain it as the Central Church, without which there never has been, and never will be, any possibility of real unity." Comment is needless. It is not likely that a man who made but little impression on his own age can be made to effectively serve the interests of the Roman



Church to-day. It is almost amusing to be told that "content and social peace, so far as they can be found at all in this world by the 'exiled sons of Eve' will nowhere be found save in the Catholic religion." How was it that the Roman Church missed her chance in the Great War?

S. R. CAMBIE.

---

### REFLECTIONS ON RECONSTRUCTION.

THE CHURCH AND RECONSTRUCTION. By Stuart C. Parker, B.D. London: *Robert Scott.*

Mr. Parker, who, if we mistake not, is a Nonconformist, offers us in these pages some suggestive and inspiring reflections. There is no sectarian bias anywhere, and all that is written will be as acceptable to the average Churchman as to the dissenter, and indeed applies with equal force. He has some plain words upon the attempt to reach the non-churchgoing crowd by "attractive" services. "However the Church may face the problem of non-churchgoing, it must not seek to do so by entering into an undignified and futile competition with secular institutions." He devotes a chapter to the "Church and Press." He feels that the Church must make a larger use of the Press than it has done hitherto, and some, at least, of his proposals are well worth consideration. He discusses the vexed question of Reunion, but there is no indication that he sees the almost insuperable difficulties that lie in the path that leads to that most desirable end. On the one hand we have the arrogant claims of the Anglo Catholic party, and on the other the apparent indifference—with, of course, a few exceptions—of the great body of Free Churchmen. The title of this chapter—"Pending Reunion"—seems to indicate the fact that in Mr. Parker's opinion something in the way of agreement must be reached. The last chapter is a call to the work of witness-bearing as the business of every Christian, and a task not to be left for the representatives of organized religion. Taken as a whole, Mr. Parker has given us something to think about and much that can be translated into action.

---

### HIGHER FLIGHTS.

HIGHER FLIGHTS FOR AIRMEN. By Rev. W. T. Money, M.A., Chaplain R.A.F. With Introduction by Lieut.-Gen. the Hon. Sir H. A. Lawrence, K.C.B., Chief of Staff to Earl Haig. London: *Robert Scott.* 1s. 6d. net.

Anyone looking for a suitable gift for a man in the Air Service will hail the appearance of this little manual, in which Mr. Money lucidly and simply explains the meaning of Confirmation, the value of Prayer, and the purposes of Holy Communion. There are three illustrations, a Psalm for the Knights of the Air, and a suitable Collect. We heartily commend this little volume, so urgent in its appeal and so scriptural in its teaching.



## CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

82 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.1.

ARRANGEMENTS are being made for the republication of *The Acts of the Apostles*, *The Children of the Church*, and *The Young Churchman*, three sets of Sunday School lessons by the Rev. G. R. Balleine, M.A.; **Sunday School Lessons.** The two latter will, it is hoped, be published in October at the price of 1s. 6d. net each, and *The Acts of the Apostles* early in the new year. This volume consists of 53 lessons which deal largely with the journeys of St. Paul and the Near East, in which so much interest centres, especially now that so many fathers and elder brothers of the scholars have come in personal touch with these lands. *The Children of the Church* contains lessons on the Church Catechism. Mr. Balleine's writings are well known, and his excellent arrangement of these lessons will, we are sure, be a great help to Sunday School teachers. As he states in his Foreword, "the twelve months covered by the lessons will be spent in carefully considering what a Christian must give up, what a Christian must believe, how a Christian must pray, and what help God gives in the Sacraments, and must surely be a profitable time for all." *The Young Churchman* is the story of our National Church, which is told in a bright attractive fashion. Mr. Balleine's style is simple, his method progressive, and he never loses sight of the main object of all Sunday School or Children's Service work.

*The Catholic Faith*, by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., has been unfortunately out of print for the past six months, and in view of the large edition which would be necessary on republication, there has been some delay in the issue of the new edition. We are glad, however, to be able to announce the issue during the present month of a reprint of the book, which has been considerably revised. Some additional matter of importance, particularly in regard to the Holy Communion Service, has been added, and its value, we are assured, will secure a continued large circulation of the book, which has already had a sale of 25,000 copies. Dr. Griffith Thomas has compressed an amazing amount of information and instruction in this book. He answers exhaustively, and with reference to authorities, two questions, "What is the Church of England?" and "What does the Church of England teach?" The book is arranged in the order of the Book of Common Prayer. Starting from the realization of our individual consciousness and responsibility as taught by the Church Catechism, the order of the Prayer Book in the instruction and development of the Christian life is followed, and the Prayer Book is thus regarded, not only as a handbook of worship, but also as a rule or method of spiritual life. Part 1 deals with the relation of the individual Christian to God according to the Prayer Book, and how that relation is formed and maintained. Part 2 deals with the relation of the individual Churchman to his fellow Churchmen in regard to doctrine, worship and practice. Part 3 deals with the relation of the individual Churchman to some important questions of the day. These sectional headings only imperfectly suggest the wide range of subjects dealt with. We live in a time when spiritual men of all Churches should not only make their position intelligent to themselves, but be ready to define and defend it in view of all opposition. In Dr. Thomas' book the Evangelical Churchman will find just the guidance and assistance he requires. The price will be 1s. 6d. net and 2s. net.

A new reprint of Canon Girdlestone's valuable little pamphlet, *The Passover, the Communion, and the Mass*, is now ready, price 2d. net, or 14s. per hundred.

**The Passover, the Communion, and the Mass.** The pamphlet has now had a circulation of 30,000. As the title indicates, the service of Holy Communion as it is in the Church of England is compared with the Jewish Passover and the Roman Mass. The many demands which are received for copies of this booklet show that it is still required for distribution by all who desire to put a stop to the practices which are now misleading so many Church of England people as to the nature of the sacramental ordinance. It is popularly written, and is clear and concise.

A small remainder of *A Short Introduction to the Old Testament*, by the Rev. F. E. Spencer, M.A., has been purchased by the Church Book Room, and in

**A Short Introduction to the Old Testament.**

limp cloth the book is now offered at 1s. 6d. net. In the course of a very favourable review of the book by Chancellor Lias, he describes Mr. Spencer's book as "a great book," and states that it contains in its 224 pages more information than is found in many more pretentious volumes of 500 or 1000 pages. The book will be found as readable as it is learned. The work shows a breadth of learning on the part of the author and a profound acquaintance with his subject. Mr. Spencer states in his preface that he has endeavoured to make use of the fresh and recent papers of applied Archæology. The book will be found interesting not only to the theological student but to regular Bible readers. Some of Mr. Spencer's other books may be known to readers of these notes; *Old Testament History* in the Anglican Church Handbooks series, 1s. 3d. net, and *Did Moses write the Pentateuch after all?* 3s. net, are two of them.

Bishop D'Arcy, who has recently been elected Archbishop of Dublin, has written two of the books in this series, *Christian Ethics and Modern Thought*

**Anglican Church Handbooks.** and *Christianity and the Supernatural*, 1s. 3d. net each. In *Christianity and the Supernatural* the Bishop returns to the discussion of the place of Transcendence in Theology, and in popular language, with accuracy of expression, lays before his readers the root conception of Christianity as a supernatural religion. The headings of the chapters give some idea of the course taken in the book, such as, the Miracles, the Incarnation, Divine Immanence, the Atonement, the Future Life, the Supernatural in Christian Experience. The concluding chapters are most helpful to those who are accustomed to wrestle with modern problems. *Christian Ethics and Modern Thought* is written with the conviction that there is urgent need at the present time of a larger grasp of the moral teaching of Christianity to enable us to comprehend how it draws into itself all that is good in other ethical systems, and to find out how it corresponds to the needs and circumstances of the modern world. Dr. D'Arcy goes back to the fountain head itself, and follows out point by point the word and example of Christ, and in this way shows that so far from Christianity being an outworn creed, it still remains the true and most satisfying guide to conduct.

Another writer in this series is Dr. Guy Warman, the new Bishop of Truro, who contributed a volume entitled *New Testament Theology*. This book is not primarily intended for the student, though it is hoped it will be a help to him, but is written for the vast number of sons and daughters of the Church of England who are anxious to have an intelligent grasp of her doctrines. Difficult subjects are not avoided, but the author deals with them in the simplest possible way. The chapters on Justification, Repentance and Faith, Regeneration and Conversion, will be found most suggestive and helpful.