

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE CHURCHMAN

January, 1917.

The Month.

“*Sursum
Corda.*”

IN what spirit shall we who believe in God, and in His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, step out to face the hidden events of the New Year 1917? It is impossible to ignore the fact that every sign of the times that is open to us seems to show that it will be a year of stress and strain unparalleled in our nation's story. The war, which has already made heavy toll upon the young life of the nation and has saddened many thousands of hearts and homes, is to be prosecuted still more vigorously until victory crowns the efforts of Great Britain and her Allies, and this will mean much further sacrifice on the battlefields abroad and in the homes of England—alike in the stately homes of the aristocracy, and in the humble dwelling-places of the poor. The people, we believe, are fully prepared for all this, and are ready to bear whatever is demanded of them with the same heroic fortitude which has characterized them hitherto. Nor would they, or we, have it otherwise. Not for one moment can peace talk be listened to until, by God's good help, the forces of the King and his Allies have crushed the infamy of German militarism and secured reparation for the woes it has inflicted upon the world. But, whatever the future may have in store for us, there is every reason for thankfulness and hope. The splendid spontaneity of the response which has been made to the call of the war, witnesses to the existence of a spirit of patriotism—noble in its outlook, self-sacrificing in its expression—which in due time may be moulded to serve the highest interests of the nation. Then, as a result of the National Mission of Repentance and Hope, we see, in all parts of the country, the birth in many

hearts and homes of a new spirit towards [religion. The Mission may not have accomplished all that was expected of it, but do let us be thankful for what has been effected, remembering that the special effort made during the last few months was not an end in itself, but only the starting-point of a spiritual movement which, it may well be believed, will gather strength and depth as the months go by. We see, therefore, no reason for pessimism, but every ground for confidence and cheerfulness. There may be dark clouds on the horizon, but we know enough to believe that each one of them has a silver lining. The Lord rules and the Lord reigneth, and His purposes cannot be changed by any of the machinations of man. And then, always shining out in lustrous fullness amid the darkest gloom, is "that blessed hope," which was the inspiration of the Church in the earliest age, has been the strength and comfort of believers in all time, and is to-day the surest and most steadying factor in the Christian's life—the hope of the Lord's return. The events of our time surely indicate that there are special reasons why we should now take more diligent heed than we have ever done to the Lord's own exhortation, "What I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch!" Let us then, as we enter 1917, lift up our heads, yea lift up our hearts, for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed.

We use the phrase "after the Mission" for convenience' sake, although we know that it is desired that the National Mission shall be a continuing process ever seeking to make the fact of God and the claims of God more real to human life. But the special services and meetings which were generally regarded as constituting the National Mission are practically over, and the Church has to prepare for the next step. The Archbishops have not left us long in doubt, and their Joint Letter issued towards the end of November gave the Church a lead for which we are thankful. The introductory paragraph is noteworthy :—

There is already evidence from all parts of the country that the Church has been really moved by the call of an inexpressibly solemn time, and that the heart of the people is open to receive the Message which is being spoken in Christ's Name. These signs of a deep desire, both in Church and nation, to rise to the height of a great occasion bid us thank God and take courage.

But there is a danger lest it should be thought that the Mission will be

over when its Message has been delivered. The truth is that only then will the main work of the Mission begin. Were it to end in December, 1916, it would be a failure. It will fulfil its purpose only if January, 1917, finds us girding up the loins of our mind for a new start. Therefore, even before the Message has been fully delivered, we feel bound to guard against the dangers of any time of reaction, listlessness, or uncertainty. The work of the National Mission will not have been accomplished until the National Church stands as the living witness that the leaven of Christianity has indeed penetrated every department of our national life. We look forward to a time when the Kingdom of God shall be in actual truth the goal of all effort and desire, and the thought of the Kingdom of God the controlling thought in our minds. We look forward to a time when the particular interests of the various sections of the community shall be harmonized in service for the good of all, and the Christian law of fellowship and mutual help shall visibly govern the whole operation of our social system, whether it be viewed in its moral, political, or economic aspect. The vision is yet for many days, yet we dare believe that its fulfilment is not unattainable if we seize the opportunity of the present to start afresh. And if we would assure our progress towards our goal we must, even as we continue to pass on from stage to stage, constantly find guidance for our next advance in securing and surveying the gains which are already ours. Even now the lessons which the Mission has taught us with new clearness and force seem to indicate some of the lines along which our immediate move forward must be directed.

The Archbishops then indicated that they propose to appoint five separate Committees of Enquiry to report upon the following Terms of Reference :—1. " A Committee to consider and report upon methods by which the teaching office of the Church can be more effectively exercised. 2. A Committee to consider and report upon ways in which the public worship of the Church can be more directly related to the felt needs of actual life at the present time. It is desired that this Committee should pay special attention : (a) To recent Reports of Convocation and its Committees on the Revision of the Prayer Book ; (b) to opinions and desires expressed by chaplains in the Navy and in the Army. 3. A Committee to consider and report upon the facts and lessons which the experience of the National Mission has brought to light as to the evangelistic work of the Church at home, and the best methods of improving and extending it. 4. A Committee to consider and report upon the following questions : (i.) What matters in the existing administrative system of the Church, including patronage and endowments, seem to them to hinder the spiritual work of the Church ; and (ii.) How can the reform or the removal of such hindrances be most effectively promoted ? 5. A Committee to consider and report upon the ways in which the Church may best commend the teaching of Christ to those who are seeking to solve the problems of industrial life." We

recognize the grave importance of the issues thus raised, and shall await with the deepest interest and the fullest hope the reports of these various bodies which are already in process of formation. But, important as these questions are in connection with the successful development of the Church's work, it is important to remember that they do not cover the whole ground, nor are they related in any other than an indirect way to the definitely spiritual appeal of the National Mission.

We hardly like to talk of "failure" in connection with an effort which in many directions was so manifestly blessed of God as the National Mission, but the fact remains that, in too many cases, while Bishops, clergy, church-workers, communicants and, to a large extent, ordinary churchgoers have received definite help and blessing, the Mission failed to reach in any appreciable degree the outsiders. They remain where they were—outside, careless and indifferent to the claims of God. Now, this is a position with which the Church cannot and must not remain satisfied. If in the past the Church has forgotten or neglected its commission to go out into the highways and byways and compel them to come in it can be indifferent no longer. As a result of the Mission the Church, using the phrase quite broadly, has received a wonderful uplift in its spiritual life. Spiritual claims and spiritual responsibilities have been brought home to individual consciences with a power rarely felt before. The outcome of this renewed life must be greater service, and we trust that the call to service will be pressed home with the deepest possible earnestness. Our one fear about the Archbishops' Committees is, that they may so engross the attention of Churchpeople, that the definitely evangelistic work which is waiting to be done may again be overlooked. It would be a calamity of the first magnitude if the idea were to gain currency, that the first stage of the National Mission being over, all that is now required is to reform the Church's machinery with a view to more effective administration. Such reform is needed—greatly needed, but it is only one phase—and, if we may say so, by no means the most important phase—of the Church's work which needs attention. The pressing need, as it seems to us, is that the Church should recover its sense of the importance of the call to evangelize the nations, and, not least our own nation. We rejoice that a Missionary Week will

be held this month to press the claims of Foreign Missions, but we do most earnestly hope that the claims of Home Missions will not be overlooked. In the revived life of the Church let it be remembered that the Divine order of service is "beginning at Jerusalem" and no amount of zeal for Foreign Missions can atone for the neglect of Home needs. It is no answer to say that the unconverted masses at home have only themselves to blame, that there are clergy and churches and chapels within their reach and that they can profit by them if they will. We know they can, but they don't and they won't, until the Church changes its attitude towards them. The fact that so many thousands of our people are outside and remain outside all religious influence is largely due to the Church's failure to grasp the Home Mission problem with determination and zeal. The National Mission, as it seems to us, calls most assuredly for a new appreciation of the importance of this question and a new departure in methods of service. We are greatly pleased to find that the Bishop of Chelmsford, at any rate, is alive to the seriousness of the position. In a letter to his diocese he writes:—"The Church as yet has not left the upper room with converting power. There are few signs, if any, that the Mission has reached the outsider—there are few indications that what is known as the 'man in the street' has been moved at all by the Mission. No matter whether the Church has been known as High, Evangelical, or Broad—all alike seem to have failed to bring in the outsider. That clergy and communicants have received a blessing there can be no doubt, but equally is it true that the 'ingathering' has yet to come. That is the next phase of the Mission. How is this to be obtained? By going forthwith into the street or by 'tarrying' yet a while longer in the upper room. The Lord of the vineyard alone can direct us. We must preserve the listening ear. 'Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth,' must still be our cry."

This is not the place in which to indulge in any political references to the New Government, either in regard to the manner in which it was brought into existence, or to its *personnel*, but there are other aspects of the situation which call for a word of comment. It will be, for example, something of a novelty for a pronounced Nonconformist such as Mr. Lloyd George

The New
Government.

to have the nomination of bishops for the Church of England. But we gladly acknowledge that we have no fears on this score. We believe Mr. Lloyd George to be a man of strong religious spirit, and whatever his views may be upon questions of Establishment, we are quite confident that he will fulfil his new responsibility towards the Church wisely and well. We may be permitted, however, to express the earnest hope, that in the matter of the choice of Bishops, what we may call the Asquith tradition may be continued. If we except the nomination of Bishop Gore to the See of Oxford—which, be it remembered, was a translation and not an original appointment—Mr. Asquith's bishops have, for the most part, been men of essentially moderate views. When we recall the names of the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of Birmingham, the Bishop of Bristol, the Bishop of Chelmsford, the Bishop of Lichfield, the Bishop of Newcastle, the Bishop of Norwich, the Bishop of Peterborough, the Bishop of Ripon, the Bishop of Salisbury, the Bishop of Sheffield, the Bishop of Sodor and Man, and the Bishop of Southwark—all of whom were nominated by the late Prime Minister—we have reason to be thankful for the wisdom and foresight of Mr. Asquith's choice. We hope that Mr. Lloyd George may be equally successful in his nominations. Another matter which interests us is to know what will be the attitude of the new Government towards the Drink Traffic. The restrictions and regulations now in force are believed to have been due very largely to Mr. Lloyd George's influence. Will he now go further and suppress the sale of drink altogether, at least for the period of the war? We believe he would have a large section of the country with him if he did. There are other social reforms which need to be taken in hand, but these will probably have to wait until after the war. The Drink Traffic, however, stands on a different footing; its relationship to the waging of war and the production of munitions is so close and intimate that it cannot safely be neglected.

But the question of all others, upon which Church-
The Welsh Church. men will watch with anxious interest the attitude of the new Government is the position of the Welsh Church. It may be pointed out that while both the Home Rule Bill and the Welsh Church Bill were literally forced on to the Statute Book under the pressure of the war, the two issues did not receive the same equality of treatment. The operation of the Home Rule

Act was wholly suspended : the Welsh Church Act was, in respect of some of its important provisions, brought into operation at once, the date of disestablishment alone being suspended till the close of the war ; and the day on which peace is declared will witness the spoliation of the ancient endowments of the Church in Wales, involving a loss in income of about £157,000 per annum. Now this, as the *National Church*, the organ of the Central Church Committee for Defence and Instruction, points out, is a very grave matter indeed, and it is impossible to ignore the fact that large sections of the country feel deeply that a cruel wrong has been done to the Church, and are smarting under a sense of the injustice, which has been inflicted. It is not for the good of the nation that this feeling of bitter resentment, suppressed though it be in deference to the claims of the war, should be allowed to continue, and it is believed that the new Government would be well advised to give the matter their immediate attention with a view to the removal, if possible, of this deep-seated indignation. It would not be practicable, of course, to re-open the question at this juncture, but there is no reason why the new Government should not at once pass a short measure postponing absolutely the operation of the Welsh Church Act until after the war. This could be done without injury to a single interest of any kind, and it would give unalloyed satisfaction to the great majority of the British people. But, says some one, Mr. Lloyd George would never consent. We are not so sure. Although in his Radical days—he is not a party politician now—he was a vehement supporter of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church in Wales, his more recent utterances have at least raised the hope that the exigencies of the war have caused him to look at such questions from a wider and more enlightened point of view. His speech at the Eisteddfod last August may well be recalled at this juncture. He was speaking of the danger of materialism. “ There is,” he said, “ nothing more fatal to a people than that it should narrow its vision to the material needs of the hour.” We should need at the end of the war better workshops ; “ but we shall also need more than ever,” he added, “ every institution that will exalt the vision of the people above and beyond the workshop and the counting-house.” And in another passage he said, “ You do not improve the *moral* of a people by snubbing their shrines.” The significance of these words when applied to the Welsh Church Act can

hardly be mistaken, and it would be not only a gracious but a righteous thing if the Prime Minister should himself take the initiative in getting the operation of the Welsh Church Act postponed.

Another Split. Will the Temperance party never learn the wisdom of unity? The General Council of the Church of England Temperance Society lately passed, not unanimously but by a substantial majority, a resolution in favour of the State Purchase and State Control of the Liquor Traffic. Whereupon the Bishop of Croydon, Chairman of the Society, has resigned, and other resignations are expected. In a letter to the *Guardian* the Bishop explains why he and his friends dislike State Purchase :—

“ Because it is our conviction that the Trade will always be a dangerous and harmful vice by whomsoever it may be administered and carried on. We believe that State Purchase would make every citizen a partner in the business, a sharer in its profits, and a partaker in the evils which we believe would still be inseparable from it. We believe that facilities to obtain drink result in more drinking, and that the establishment by the State of the places where it is sold would put the seal of its approval upon them, and induce many who now would not think of entering a public-house to do so. As believers in the wisdom and advisability of total abstinence, we are convinced that the new policy would militate strongly against it. For us, therefore, who hold these views it would be impossible to hold office in a Society which advocates and supports the policy of State Purchase.”

We do not deny there is force in the Bishop's contention, but there is much more to be said on the other side. It is only necessary to name one point : if the Drink Traffic were owned by the State, it would be more easy for temperance folk to press for drastic reform. At present vested interests block the way. But, however that may be, we deeply regret that a man in the position of the Bishop of Croydon should abandon the Chairmanship of a Society where he was doing much useful work, on a mere difference of opinion. So long as divided counsels prevail in temperance ranks, anything like real temperance reform becomes almost an impossibility.



Malachi.

(*The first of a series of three addresses given in Westminster Abbey by the Rt. Rev. H. E. RYLE, D.D., C.V.O., Dean of Westminster.*)

THE Old Testament in our English Bible closes with a short book of prophecy which, from very early times, has been called "Malachi." "Malachi," however, is not a proper name, but only the Hebrew word, meaning "my messenger." Very probably, Malachi, "my messenger," was given as a title to our little group of prophecies, because it is the key, or the most distinctive, word in the central passage of the book, "Behold! I send *my messenger*, and he shall prepare the way before me" (Mal. iii. 1).

If we follow the less probable opinion that it is a proper name, then Malachi must be regarded as an abbreviation for the full name Malachiah, or Malachijah, meaning "The Messenger, or Angel, of Jehovah." It is noteworthy that there is no proper name "Malachi" to be found in the contemporary writings and lists of Ezra and Nehemiah.

We should, therefore, probably regard the book as anonymous. The writer's message, not the writer's name in history, has given this work its place among the Minor Prophets.

It was evidently written some considerable time after the Return from the Exile, and after the completion of the Second Temple. A tone of deep depression had succeeded to the enthusiasm which had accompanied that event. No golden era had yet dawned upon the little Jewish community. Samaritans in the North, Edomites in the South, had omitted no opportunity of harassing the Jews, raiding their borders, intercepting trade, carrying off slaves, and ill-treating innocent people. Agriculture had suffered from a series of disastrous years. The people were threatened with starvation. A spirit of doubt and discontent had become general. There were three evil, ugly symptoms, against which Ezra and Nehemiah had to take action: the neglect of the Temple worship, the corruption of the priesthood, and the gross cruelty of the Jews towards their wives, whom they put away in order to marry the idolatrous daughters of foreigners. All three ugly symptoms are found in the stern denunciations contained in this book.

It is, therefore, practically certain that the writer was a contemporary of Ezra and Nehemiah. More than that it would be

rash to affirm. But it is reasonable to assume that the book Malachi was intended independently to give support to the policy which those two great reformers sought to carry out.

"It may be," says Dr. Pusey, "that times like those of Malachi, apathetic, self-justifying, murmuring, self-complacent needed a sterner, abrupter, more startling voice to awaken them."

I like to regard "God's love in dark days" as the Message of the prophet. "I have loved you, saith the LORD" (ver. 1) are the opening words. The people reply, "Wherein has Thou loved us?" Suffering had turned their faith cold. Doubt had given rise to murmuring and despair. Hardship and trouble seemed to them only to prove that God did not love them. The prophet's work is to point them higher. He wishes to show them that God had not ceased to love them, but they had ceased to love God. Their own unbelief, moral failure, spiritual indifference had been allowed to grow up as a barrier, shutting out from their hearts the sunshine of His love and rendering them powerless to realize its blessing.

Our first section consists of the first chapter and the first nine verses of the second.

The first lesson which we should draw from it is that *God teaches mankind by the lessons of history*. In order to meet the people's murmuring question, "Wherein hast Thou loved us?", the prophet points them to the history of a neighbouring people. He bids them contrast the fortunes of Israel with those of Edom. Jacob and Esau were twin brothers. Allied in origin, similar in speech, neighbours in territory, Israel and Edom had for centuries been bitter rivals. Edom had exulted in the overthrow of Israel by the Babylonians and in the destruction of Jerusalem: Edom had massacred the fugitives of Judah, and had pressed up triumphantly to the ruined walls of her hated foe. Nevertheless, Israel had returned from captivity. The temple of Jerusalem had been rebuilt; those city walls had been restored. Jehovah had never ceased to love Israel.

On the other hand, the overthrow of Edom was her annihilation. Her savagery, her pride, her perfidy, her cupidity, pervaded the whole nation. There were no elements of survival in her. She disappeared utterly in the whirlpool of a great catastrophe.

Doubtless, the prophet ascribes to Jehovah the same fierce hatred towards Edom which was felt by the people of Israel. It is a shock to us to find the words, "I hated Esau," put into the mouth

of Jehovah. But the revelation of the Old Testament prophet partakes not of the fulness of "grace and truth" of Jesus Christ. He speaks from a far lower level of moral and spiritual life than that of the New Testament. He bids his countrymen look away from themselves. Look at another nation; look, he says, at God's dealings with the people to which you are akin. The fire of God's indignation against the sins which are hateful in His sight shall utterly consume them. There was ever in Israel the nucleus of spiritual vitality. It was the seed of moral purity, slowly expanding and seeking to throw off the outer sheathe of Oriental corruption. Divine Love ever tenderly watched over the remnant of the true Israel, and saved it from destruction. The history of nations is our warning; it is also our encouragement. There was no history like that of Israel as a proof of God's enduring affection. The Jews could not see that. They were absorbed in little miseries. They could not step back and see themselves in their true colours, or view their shortcomings in their right proportion. The great picture of history, so far as Israel was concerned, might be summarized in the famous words of Lamentations (iii. 22), "It is of the LORD's mercies that we are not consumed, because His compassions fail not"; and of the Psalmist (cxlvii. 20), "He hath not dealt so with any nation."

The second lesson which the prophet would convey in the remaining verses of this chapter seems to be that *failure in religious duty brings forfeiture of religious privilege*. Did the Jews complain that they could not see God's love to them, or experience its blessing? What do you expect? says the prophet; you claim to be His sons and His servants, and you give Him neither the honour of a son nor the reverence of a servant. You would not treat your own Persian Governor with such scant courtesy or such discreditable meanness. The Jew offered for sacrifice a maimed, blind, or otherwise defective, animal, instead of one without blemish, as the sacred law required. The Jew said within himself: There is no harm: it will cost less: does God either know or care?

Our little religious duties are the test of religious sincerity. If a man's belief in God's existence or in God's love is failing, he may, indeed, make his offering still, because public opinion will demand it. But, instead of giving of his best, he will give of his worst. In times of poverty and trouble, he will give that of which he will not feel the loss. This is the temptation of the doubter; this is the impulse of

the murmurer. It has, in every age, been the characteristic of the mere formalist, as well in the support of the Church of God and her worship, as in the relief of the sick and needy, when their cause is little known, or not fashionable. He will give a little for appearances; nothing for God. It is not God of whom he thinks.

"It is not surprising," the prophet seems to say, "that you have forfeited the joy of feeling God's love. If you dedicate to His service that which costs you least, you must not expect the fulness of blessing, which only crowns the surrender of that which you will feel the most. The experience of spiritual privilege for which you crave never fails to reward the honest offering of religious duty." It was where there was deadness of unbelief, the Son of God could do no mighty work. But, where there is true sacrifice to God's service, there is always some realization of the blessing of His love.

The first nine verses of the second chapter consist of a vehement indictment of the priesthood. The laity were apathetic and faithless. But the guilt of the priests was far more serious. The lesson which we derive from the passage is that *the faults of the priesthood are the reproach of the nation*. A priesthood, if well and honourably conducted, in the fear of God, and not of man, can confer upon a people untold blessings. But a corrupt or insincere priesthood is the source of moral depravity and national weakness.

The priests, of whom the prophet speaks, are not the ministers of an obscure or intricate ceremonial. They are God's spokesmen, the spiritual guides appointed to give counsel and direction to the people on all questions of perplexity. Their decisions should make for truth and justice, consolation and help, purity and peace. Verses 6, 7: "My covenant was with him of life and peace . . . the law of truth was in his mouth . . . he walked with me in peace and uprightness, and did turn many from iniquity." Observe well the sentences, "The priest's lips should keep knowledge, for he is the messenger of the LORD of hosts." Are they not great and tremendous descriptions of the priest's pastoral responsibility? They have been endorsed by the experience of Christendom. Whatever the priesthood of Jerusalem should have been, that, and something infinitely more, more efficient and more spiritual, should be the ordained ministry of Christendom. They are more than the executants of a sacred ceremonial; they are friends of the souls of the people, teachers

of morality, guides in the things of eternal life, workers under God for the spiritual peace and happiness of mankind.

Among the causes of infidelity, few have been so fatal as the spiritual deadness and the elaborate unreality of the priesthood. None have given more cause of offence to the weaker brethren than the ignorant priestly counsellor, who has bound on the backs of those who have sought his counsel, burdens too heavy to be borne ; none have brought such reproach upon the Church as the immoral priest, who has claimed that, because he dispenses the sacraments, he is freed from the moral responsibilities of the layman.

We need not wonder that the writer of this little book of prophecy speaks plainly upon a subject of reproach, which was accountable in great measure for the falling off in the people's faith. He faces the displeasure of those in authority. He anticipates the resentment of the clique whom he denounces. The truth must be told. Foremost among the misfortunes of the people, who complained that God did not love them, was this failure of their priesthood to do its spiritual duty. Instead of being the source of inspiration, knowledge, guidance and comfort to the nation, they had led the way in the sacrifice of truth to popularity, in the glorification of their own privileges, and in the degradation of the public conscience.

"Ye are turned aside out of the way," says the Lord's Messenger, "ye have caused many to stumble in the law ; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord of hosts" (Mal. ii. 8).

(To be continued.)



Might We not Do the Same ?

MAY I venture to trespass upon the valuable space of the CHURCHMAN by referring to a matter that is much upon the hearts of many at the present time? I am quite aware that at the beginning of the War there was a strong feeling against using the word "Humiliation," for various reasons, but have we not arrived at a stage in this world-wide War when it would seem that these feelings should be a thing of the past ?

The other day I came across an extremely interesting incident—more—an historic fact, and because it seems to be at this juncture so much to the point, I will venture to ask to be allowed to quote it in full, in order that it may possibly come as a suggestion to those in authority, and serve as a powerful incentive to us as a Nation to do likewise :—

In parts of America, on several occasions, there have been plagues of grasshoppers—Rocky Mountain locusts. Farms were devastated, and ruin was widespread. Perhaps the worst visitation of this character was in the years 1873 to 1877. In 1873 a few Minnesota counties were affected. In 1874 it seemed to observers as if there were a thousand times as many of the destroying insects. Everything green in their track was destroyed ; trees, fields, gardens all were bare as in winter. A much larger portion of the state was involved.

In the spring of 1875 the locusts again descended on the fields and extended their operations to still other sections until the whole of Southern Minnesota was groaning under the visitation. An ineffective campaign of extermination was conducted. Efforts were made to kill the insects by coal oil, and a bounty was offered to boys who would gather locusts and take them to the appointed official of the county in which they lived.

The effect of the state law authorizing the payment of these bounties was thus vividly described in *The Saturday Evening Post* by one who was a locust-collector at the time :—

"With men and boys by the hundred chasing over the fields in every township in the southern part of the State and catching from a few pounds to several bushels of grasshoppers a day, the sum that the counties were called upon to pay soon became enormous. One county, Blue Earth, was on the rapid road to bankruptcy ; and now, instead of crying for aid to destroy the grasshoppers, its treasurer called for relief from those who were destroying the insects. An appeal was made to the Governor, asking that the law be suspended. He complied, for, although such immense quantities had been destroyed, apparently no headway was being made against the overwhelming hordes that came forth from the ground in increasing numbers every spring. They had so increased that they had covered and laid waste thirty-two counties. They had spread into Dakota, and northern Iowa was also being affected."

The observer who wrote these facts went on to say :—

"By the close of the summer of 1876 the situation was one almost to cause despair. But in the hope that something might result from a wider

discussion of the situation, Governor Pillsbury, of Minnesota, invited a conference of the governors of adjoining and nearby States. Accordingly, in October, 1876, the Governors of Iowa, Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, and Minnesota assembled at Omaha. Some noted entomologists were also present, on invitation, for it was thought that they might advance some plan for the destruction of the grasshoppers. This consultation, however, brought out little that was new. Every remedy that was suggested had already been tried—every remedy but one.

“When the conference was drawing to a close the Governor of Dakota suggested that a Day of Prayer be appointed, for possibly relief to the stricken State would come from a higher power than had yet been invoked. This thought was received lightly by some, though it found lodgment in the mind of Governor Pillsbury. But, apparently, the Council of Governors was profitless.”

In the meantime suffering among the farmers had become so acute that the legislature appropriated money for their relief, and the Governor issued an appeal for aid. That winter six thousand people were fed and clothed by the State.

The wonderful story of what followed is given in the words of the writer already quoted, who wrote after refreshing his memory by conference with the Hon. John S. Pillsbury, Governor of Minnesota at the time. He said :—

“This was the condition that prevailed in thirty-two counties of Minnesota, and which was extending into Dakota and Iowa, when the fourth winter of the plague of locusts came. Every means that could be devised for the destruction of the grasshoppers had been tried, yet they had steadily increased ; the actual suffering in the impoverished districts had been pointed out to the world, and relief had been given ; yet the conditions that confronted the afflicted State were unchanged. Millions upon millions of grasshoppers had perforated the earth the summer before, and therein planted their billions of eggs, which, with the genial warmth of an April sun, would hatch out little, hopping, devouring things, to swarm over the State and the adjoining States—and why not over the country ? As they had spread out from two or three to thirty-two counties, what could stay them from going on and devouring as many States ? Why might there not be 6,000,000 people to feed and clothe instead of 6,000 ?

“Everything else had been tried—would the prayers of the people avail when the work of their hands had gone for naught ? This was a question that the Governor was now asked to deliberate upon. Some ministers of the State began to importune him to issue a proclamation appointing a day for prayer throughout the State. He listened to them attentively and gave their proposition consideration. Finally, towards the spring, he made a proposal to some of the ministers.

“‘Get up a petition,’ said he, ‘setting forth just what it is that you propose, and have it general, and if it meets with my approval I will do as you wish.’

“This was done, and a petition from many of the ministers of the State, requesting that a day be appointed for fasting and prayer, was handed to the Governor.

“Upon this he decided to act, and a proclamation, of which the following is a copy, was issued :—

‘State of Minnesota, Executive Department,

‘St. Paul, April 9, 1877.

‘A general desire having been expressed by various religious bodies in this State, for an official designation of a day of fasting, humiliation, and

prayer, in view of the threatened continuation of the grasshopper scourge, I do hereby, in recognition of our dependence upon the power and wisdom of Almighty God, appoint Thursday, the twenty-sixth day of April, instant, to be observed for such purpose throughout the State; and I invite the people, on the day thus set apart, to withdraw from their ordinary pursuits, and in their homes and places of public worship, with contrite hearts, to beseech the mercy of God for the sins of the past and His blessing upon the worthier aims of the future.

'In the shadow of the locust plague, whose impending renewal threatens desolation of the land, let us humbly invoke, for the efforts we make in our defence, the guidance of that hand which alone is adequate to stay "the pestilence that walketh in darkness, and the destruction that wasteth at noon-day." Let us pray for deliverance from an affliction which robs the earth of her bounties, and in behalf of the sufferers therefrom let us plead for comfort to the sorrowful, healing for the sick, succour for the perishing, and larger faith and love for all who are heavily laden.

'Let us, moreover, endeavour to deserve a new prosperity by a new realization of the opportunity vouchsafed us, and a new consecration to those things which make for the well-being of men and the glory of God.

'J. S. PILLSBURY, *Governor.*'

"Of course, this attracted widespread attention and caused much comment. In the State, the Governor's action was in general heartily endorsed, though a few so-called liberal leagues ridiculed his proclamation. One member of such a society wrote to the Governor and asked him carefully to take note of the condition of the grasshoppers the day before the Day of Prayer, and again the day after, to see the effect of the invocations which would go up from all the churches.

"Among the God-fearing people the proclamation created a profound impression. Though not prepared to hazard an opinion as to the probable effect of their united prayers, they resolved to observe the day in the most devout manner. I well remember hearing one minister read the proclamation from the pulpit, and then in solemn tones exhort his people to assemble in the house of worship on the twenty-sixth day of April, and there lend their voices to the general appeal for relief from an evil against which the power of man was helpless.

"In recalling that day, recently, Governor Pillsbury said: 'I never saw a stiller day in Minneapolis.'

"On this day all denominations forgot their creeds for the moment, and the prayers of Protestant and Roman Catholic mingled in one fervent appeal for relief from the visible enemy that was destroying their State.

"The twenty-seventh day of April, the day following the Day of Prayer, the sun shone clear and hot over Minnesota, and an almost summerlike warmth penetrated the moist earth, down to the larvæ of the myriads of grasshoppers. Quickened by this genial warmth, the young locusts crawled to the surface in numbers that made the countless swarms of the preceding summer seem insignificant; in numbers sufficient to destroy the crops and hopes of half a dozen States. For a day or two the mild and balmy weather lasted, then it grew colder, and one night the moist earth was frozen, and with it the unhatched larvæ and the young and crawling locusts above ground. And though the earth thawed again in a few days, the locusts, with the exception of a scattering few, had disappeared. 'And,' to quote Governor Pillsbury, 'we have never seen any grasshoppers since.'"

May not this come as a clarion call to our Nation?

ARTHUR MERCER.

Sophia Nugent and the Ministry of Women in the Church.

THE death of Sophia Nugent on the eve of the National Mission left on my heart a pain of peculiar intensity. She left us at a moment when a movement likely to affect our Nation for a long time was nearing its inauguration; and when Christian women were putting forth in temperate and reverend fashion a plea to help the world. She left us, too, when that plea was met with a clamour at once sordid and unkind. She thus departed from us as if with a note of incompleteness in her earthly end. That she had been long and intimately concerned with the advancement of religion in England and in Ireland, and in the Mission field, is known to many besides the many who had the joy of personal knowledge. That she would have used fine gifts and ripe experience to advance the National Mission cannot be doubted. That she would have been one of the women whose activities for the good of souls would have been curbed by the ill-timed clamour of a sacerdotal minority is also certain.

To one who like myself knew her very well for many years, it is a gracious task, almost an act of reparation, to set down some account of her work and character, and to derive thence some reflections on the wider question of the right of women to minister in the Church. For several years she was a member of my congregation at Belgrave Chapel. I thus came into relations with her, varied and intimate, and I am sure that what I set down here will be read by many with a grateful if regretful recollection of a life singularly beautiful and fruitful in good works. I have elsewhere detailed the leading features of her life, and I need now do no more than put the reader in possession of the facts that are required to make the matter intelligible.

Sophia Nugent was of Irish birth. Her family was ancient and distinguished. It traced itself back to periods of that island story which are chequered with sorrow, guilt, and glory. Through life she retained the love for Ireland, for its brilliant children, its wild beauties, its saintly memories, its mountains, lakes, and flowers,

that passion which none but Irish natures can feel for Ireland, and which no Irish nature can ever wholly eradicate from the texture of its life, and its frame. Daffodils from her native village adorned the chamber where she breathed her last. Irish holidays were always the holidays which did her most good. The genius of her native land was traceable in her soft eloquence, her warm sympathies, her tender playfulness, her ardour for all that is adventurous and enterprising in causes great and good. For many years she, with a devoted sister, annually raised a large sum in aid of the poor parishes of the disestablished church. Irish orphanages and Irish schools had warm places in her affection. Without presumption it may be hoped that the name of Sophia Nugent will be added to the illustrious catalogue of saints which from a remote and splendid antiquity has adorned the chronicles of the Irish Church. Her life was passed chiefly in London. It was thence that radiated the many influences that made the modest house in Eaton Terrace so familiar to many who in all ranks loved the Christian cause and laboured for it.

From devout and cultivated parents she received the elements of the Evangelical faith. Teachers of eminence helped her mind to expand in many directions. Social opportunities peculiarly fortunate added polish and breadth of view. Thus to the service of her Lord she brought treasures both natural and acquired, which, collected with care and preserved with discretion, were spent during many years with a liberal abundance. She might have been a second Catharine Marsh or a second Florence Nightingale, had her circumstances led elsewhere than they did. In the circumstances, however, which were allotted to her by Providence, she shone with mild and mellow lustre not less beautiful or beneficent than that which was shed by those more notable women. Thousands heard her speak, read her books, felt the personal spell or indirect influence of her character, and will in the last and best of days rise and call her blessed.

But her interests were not confined to Ireland. She worked strenuously for the Y.W.C.A. She was a recognized authority on its Council. When in later years she joined herself to the congregation of my dear friend, the Rev. C. A. Fox, at Eaton Chapel, she threw herself into the women's work with all the ardour of her nature. The C.M.S. Auxiliary of Eaton Chapel became her special

department of the work. The Auxiliary has survived the demolition of the Chapel, and is still a flourishing organization with an annual income of near four hundred. At Keswick she was a notable figure. She took in many ways a part in that movement which has so powerfully aided the deepening of spiritual life. She was, in fact, what some of the habituées of Keswick are not, a living advertisement of its joy and its reality. It is not strange that a life so full of spirituality of many kinds, should suggest to the thoughtful Christian the inquiry, can there be any reason why such women as Sophia Nugent should be debarred from exercising spiritual gifts, under sanction and guidance, in the places of worship set apart for spiritual purposes?

The feminist question is ubiquitous. The women of the world are feeling after a fuller recognition in all spheres of life. Is the Church of Christ alone to shut the gates of mercy on womankind? What the views of Sophia Nugent were on this question I do not know. I do know that she is another of the many women whose virtues, graces, and talents have for three generations conspicuously done much to relieve the misery, dishonour, and injustice of the world. The very reserve and comparative seclusion of her life only adds weight to the argument which it suggests. To associate her with revolutionary and violent methods would be equally absurd and malevolent. I trust, therefore, that no one will suspect me of exploiting a name connoting all that is modest and womanly, if taking her story as the point of departure, I proceed to discuss large issues belonging very closely to what belonged most closely to her.

THE CHURCHMAN has consistently supported a view of this subject which is at once generous and just. It has advocated that women should be heard in their own defence of a plea which is, *prima facie*, reasonable and good. It has not, indeed, committed itself to any definite policy, but it has refused to be cowed by a clamour combining in itself the evils of reaction and timidity. It has not figured before the world as the sponsor of Evangelical orthodoxy on this matter, but it has decisively declined to allow to pass unchallenged the claim of those who pose as the national guardians of Catholic order.

Let me recall the facts. When on the eve of the National Mission some Bishops gave a modified and conservative sanction to women

to conduct specific services in Church during the period of the Mission, and when two of the Bishops marked for exceptional courage and insight appeared to enlarge that sanction to the widest limits possible under the circumstances, there arose first ominous mutterings, and then a clamour extremely violent and minatory in its terms. The cry was sent out that unless the sanction was withdrawn the National Mission would be wrecked, and that the opponents would do all that they could to wreck the Mission. The Episcopate wavered. The two Bishops who were in the van withdrew their sanction in the interests of peace and efficiency. The victory for the hour remained with a reactionary minority styling itself the guardian of the Church's primitive deposit. Many of us regretted the retreat of the Bishops. But we must allow that the Bishops are in a much better position than we can be to say how far the recalcitrants were in a position to damage the National Mission so seriously, that to persist in the quarrel would have been more than impolitic.

We are, however, in a position to examine the arguments by which these recalcitrants supported their hostility to the ministry of women in the Church. In any case the Mediæval Recalcitrants have been responsible for largely denationalizing the National Mission. They have silenced the representatives of more than half of the members of the Church. At any time this would have been a mischief. At the present time the mischief is largely augmented, because the claim put forth by Christian women to be allowed to help the National Mission under official sanction was made at a time when the women of the world are everywhere coming to their own. By silencing women now, the Church has tacitly admitted that she is out of harmony with a mighty movement distinctive of our era. The Church has thus once more dug a chasm between herself and the mind of the age.

The Mediæval Recalcitrants have done even worse than this. They have, by their adhesion to a sectional view of the Church, made the Church an ally of the masculine spirit which, in its Prussian form, has deluged the earth with torrents of blood and tears. They have done worse, even, than this. They have helped to identify the Church of England with the spirit and the policy of the Roman Pontiff. He and his celibate clergy have for centuries been fighting to maintain their control over the Church, its life, and its doctrines,

against all interference and every rival. In actual if not in overt sympathy with Roman views, the sacerdotal opponents of women's ministry in the Church have once more successfully resisted the endeavour to grant a claim which, if granted, would certainly tend to diminish the exclusive prerogatives of what is called the priesthood. If the fruit of this unfortunate interposition is not to have quenched the Spirit, is not to have damped down the fires of purity, power and tenderness, at a moment when the world is aching with brute selfishness of male force, the mercy of God alone will have saved us from the disaster.

While I am bound to believe that the retreat of the Bench was strategic, and that in September last they gave way in order to avert what appeared to be a greater danger from the National Mission, yet I surmise that probably other motives co-operated. Full agreement on the merits of women's ministry was probably not reached. Fears, too, existed, lest if an inch were given an ell would be taken. Misgivings, too, may have been entertained as to the arguments in favour that could be drawn from antiquity and from Scripture. The fear that if the sanction were adhered to, women would take all sorts of unauthorized liberties in Church, was unworthy and without a vestige of evidence. There was, indeed, said to exist a correspondence revealing a conspiracy to capture the priesthood. But the conspiracy was either a bogus one, or seems to have been got up by persons small and of no reputation. Good and gifted women enjoying a Bishop's sanction to speak in Churches on some subjects at some times, will certainly avail themselves of that sanction without incurring the suspicion that they are only using the sanction as an excuse for speaking in Churches on all subjects at all times. To doubt this is to identify the seed of the serpent with the daughters of Eve.

I am not advocating a women's priesthood. That is to say, I am no advocate for a feminine presbyterate. Priesthood in the New Testament means a character and a grace conferred on the Christian believer by Holy Baptism. It belongs equally to all; it cannot be conferred except by the Christian body, and it cannot be withdrawn except by the body which conferred it. In this sacred function women no less than men participate. This is what St. Paul means when he says that in Christ Jesus there is no male and female. When St. Peter says, "Ye are a royal priesthood," he includes both

sexes ; just as when he says, " Ye are a people of God's special possession," he includes all classes.

What is really at stake in the present controversy is this : Have not women some spiritual gifts immediately granted by the Holy Spirit, and is not the Church consequently bound in wisdom, charity and loyalty to recognize those gifts and to find appropriate scope for the exercise of those gifts ?

That from the dawn of the Gospel there has been a succession of women who have ministered in the Church, any tyro in Church history knows well. That succession stretching, with scarcely a break, from Priscilla and Phoebe and the Elect Lady, to Madame Kruedner and Catharine Marsh, bears solemn witness to the sacred right of the sex to serve the Saviour. Justin, the Broad Churchman of the second century, acknowledges that both sexes served the Church in his day. Tertullian, a few decades later than Justin, witnesses to the same fact. The Montanist heresy to which that illustrious Christian at last succumbed was partly redeemed from fault by the recognition which it gave to the ministry of women. Monica had no small share in the training of St. Augustine. Paula ministered to St. Jerome. Women of noble status and piety like St. Hilda, St. Hildegard, St. Katharine of Sienna, St. Bridget of Ireland, Jeanne of Orleans, lighted the dark annals of the Middle Ages. The beautiful succession is prolonged through Jeanne D'Albret, Lady Jane Grey, the mother of George Herbert, Mère Angélique, Madame Guyon, the mother of the Wesleys, Hannah More, Elizabeth Fry, Mrs. Sewell, Florence Nightingale, Sister Dora, Miss Beale. These are but a selection of the names that most readily recur.

But they are but samples ; they are not exhaustive. Belonging to different forms of the faith, serving the Church in different ways, conspicuously animated with the love of the one Lord, and filled with the gifts of His Spirit, these are but representative of that innumerable throng of devoted women, who in all parts of the Church and at all times of its history have served the world as domestic saints, as missionaries, as teachers, as ministrants to sick bodies and suffering souls, as district visitors, as social leaders, almoners of wealth. To ignore this body of evidence is not less a folly than a wrong. To distort or to evade its bearing on the point now under discussion is part of the discreditable tactics which are

alleged to mark the debates of theologians.. The truth is that there never has been an age when the Church has not somehow acknowledged the ministry of women. It follows from this, that to advance a claim that women may minister in things divine in the Church of England to-day is to claim no more than what the Church has always conceded, and to infringe in no way primitive or catholic order.

We are not, however, all equally solicitous about conforming to the models and measures of the past. Antiquity, indeed, has its lawful claims. Futurity has its claims also. The coming years will bring new wants. The vanished years supplied their own necessities as they best could; it is ours to prepare to meet the fresh emergencies as best we may. There are in Christianity developments no less than fixtures. To the living hand of past goodness we owe ourselves gratefully indebted. But to the dead hand of past errors, makeshifts, expedients, we are under no obligation at all. In the delicate arbitration between the claims of the past and the needs of the future, we turn for guidance to the living oracles of God. Here our mediæval opponents are weak. They must always be weak, for they hold a doctrine about Scripture which is alternately rigid and fluid according as their difficulties lead them to want a loose or a tight rein.

The strength of the contention of those who advocate the rights of women to minister in the Church is at its highest in Holy Scripture. The Old Testament offers examples of that ministry in Miriam, in Deborah, in Huldah, in the wife of Isaiah. The mother of the Baptist and Anna the widowed prophetess who spoke of our Lord to all who looked for Redemption in Jerusalem, continue the succession. The Blessed Virgin herself has left in the Magnificat a sample of woman's utterance rich and venerable in an eminent degree. It would therefore have been strange, if, on the Day of Pentecost, the Holy Spirit should have been silent on a theme so momentous, and have broken in upon a catena so illustrious. But the very first announcement of the prophetic spirit in the new dispensation is that the outpouring of the Holy Ghost shall be equal on men and women, on daughters as well as on sons, on bondmaidens as well as on bondmen of the Lord. Neither sex nor station was to be a bar to the fullness of the Holy Spirit. The prophecy of Joel is the Magna Charta of woman under the Gospel. Standing where it does, and

being what it is, nothing can abrogate or alter that great declaration. The by-laws of St. Paul must be taken in its light, and be included in its scope. No silences in the sacred narrative can prohibit what first prophet and then apostle declare to be the hall-mark of Christianity.

Prophecy is an inalienable right inherent in every Christian; it is part of the seal of the Spirit which adheres unto the day of Redemption. Like every Christian right, this must be exercised with decorum and charity; it must not infringe the peace and order of the Church. It must not be abused to ends frivolous or vain. But it is there, and none can restrain it without risking the grieving of the Holy Spirit of God. This fact duly considered is really decisive. I am astonished that it has not been more generally acknowledged. The reason for its not being so is not far to seek.

Among the postulates of modern rationalism none is more foolish than that which assumes the inferiority of St. Peter to St. Paul. The truth is that the apostle Peter was at least as clear-seeing and as far-seeing as his brother apostle of the Gentiles. There is no passage in all the writings of St. Paul that is more profound, elevated and world-wide than these words of St. Peter, "There is no other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved." There is no utterance of St. Paul recorded in the Acts which sees so far into the future as does the announcement of St. Peter, "Whom the heavens must receive until the times of the restoration." There is no passage in St. Paul which can for a moment be held to alter the Petrine declaration made on the day of Pentecost, "Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy."

By-laws made by St. Paul at Corinth or elsewhere for temporary or local exigences are to be interpreted by it, not it by them. Doing this, we shall avoid the unscholarly shifts of exegesis which try to explain away his regulations about women keeping silent in Church.

It is, however, by no means certain that the great apostle to the Gentiles did direct that women should never speak or teach. In the epistle to Titus, indeed, he expressly commands that women shall be teachers of what is good and beautiful; at least to their younger sisters. In the second epistle to Timothy he reminds him what he owed to a faithful mother and grandmother for teaching him the Old Testament Scriptures, and for thus training him in the wisdom of salvation. In the first epistle to Timothy he gives direc-

tions how women should act when admitted to the office and work of the Diaconate. In the epistle to the Philippians he commends as objects of special care those women who had shared with him in the ministry of the Gospel. From the first epistle to the Corinthians are usually cited a few expressions on which the opponents of women's ministry rely most obstinately for their resistance to any change in the customary order of things. I incline to believe that throughout that epistle the word "woman" always means a married woman. There is in Greek one word which means equally woman and wife. This word is *Gunee*. In classical Greek of course there are many terms to express the difference, but in the Greek Testament this one word does duty for both the ideas. This rule of interpretation must, I think, be strictly applied to the first epistle of the Corinthians. When, in this epistle, St. Paul meant to distinguish between married and unmarried women, he does so by using the terms appropriate to each condition of the sex. This is well illustrated by a study of the seventh chapter of the epistle. This exegesis eases the situation for those who maintain that women who have the prophetic gift are not forbidden by St. Paul to exercise that gift. It also clears the apostle's reputation of some foolish slanders, invented by rationalists and repeated by believers who ought to have known better.

I have endeavoured in this article to refute the allegations of those, whose untimely and ignorant clamour caused the Bishops to recede from a position which, if maintained, would have put the Church into more close and living touch with a great movement widely diffused through the world and destined soon to dominate social progress. I have shown that both antiquity and Scripture are friendly to the cause of the ministry of women in the Church, and that therefore the aspirations of good women to-day to help the Church, especially at a time of National Mission, is legitimate, and essentially Christian. I have traced the succession of women ministering in divine things from the early days of the Jewish Church and passing down without break to our own age. I have specially emphasized that St. Paul does not really differ in this matter from St. Peter and the rest of the sacred writers. I have endeavoured to show that the claim that women should minister in Church is a part of the Pentecostal deposit, and that to resist that claim must be a very serious form of the sin of grieving the Holy Spirit of God Who has sealed His people till the day of Redemption. This is

clear from a candid reading of St. Peter's use of the prophecy of Joel in his sermon on the first Whit-Sunday, and is therefore coeval with Christianity itself.

The ministry of women is of course only a part of the larger question of the ministry of the laity. The hostility to the ministry of women is only a part of the hostility to lay ministry in general, always ready to spring to the front when the interests of the sacerdotal order seem to be menaced. I have no doubt that the battle of the future will be fought over this question in the area of theology. But at long last the laity will come to their own ; and with the laity Christian women will recover the right to exercise the gifts which has never indeed been overtly abrogated, but which has lived on in the Church with a precarious and fitful existence.

In the meantime something has been gained by the efforts and examples of holy women like Sophia Nugent. Their noble lives and saintly deaths show how sordid and shabby are the grounds on which are supposed to rest the opposition to the ministry of such women. These grounds are seen to be little better than an ungenerous prejudice. That blessed Lord Who ascended on high to give gifts to men will not finally allow His own purposes to be frustrated by the well-meant but ignorant opposition of some of His servants to the work of saintly women, who in private have for years edified His Church, and now seek some public sanction for the wider and fuller mode of ministering to the Lord Whom they love and to the souls for whom He died.

HERBERT MARSTON.



A Spiritual Church the Hope of the Nation.

WHEN you speak of anything being the hope of the nation, you mean that at present the condition of the nation is in some respect bad, but that given a certain factor there is hope of its regeneration in the future. You do not mean that it is all bad, nor do you mean that this factor will do all the regenerating, but that granting some bad elements, and given one good factor, hope emerges for the national life. And this is precisely the case. The nation is not all bad ; it would be ludicrous to assert this in face of its history for the past two years, but from one point of view it was not only bad before the war, but it shows few signs of being better since. That point of view is the nation as a Christian nation, and as *the* Christian nation of the world. Here we want more than patriotism, more than universal willingness to "do our bit," more than enforced restriction in drink and bridge-playing and horse-racing. We need more even than a righteous cause to fight for, or even what Mr. Asquith called a spiritual war, by which he meant a moral one, one in which the moral issues were the real ones. As a Christian nation we need personal and collective recognition of God as revealed in Christ. I for one as yet fail to see signs of our exhibiting this. And if it be true that before the war we were, as a nation, worldly, and Sabbath-breaking and pleasure-loving (which it will be hard to deny), if in addition the overwhelming solemnity of two years' warfare has only "scotched" but not killed all these, then surely we need to consider what is the hope of the future if God is to bless us at all.

The hope of the future of the nation is not so much in the nation as in the Church. In all ages the Church has been the strategic factor, has been constituted as conscience-keeper of the nation, and we who belong to the Established Church have officially laid upon us a supreme duty in this respect. Have we been doing it as we ought? The National Mission is the answer, frankly but humbly given by the Church herself. We have not. We have, thank God, done much ; we have done as much as any other body, but we have not done enough, and the Mission has said this to the Church. Clergy, communicants and churchgoers, it has called us to penitence that will rid us of the failings of the past ; then to hope that like an anchor of the soul will fix our faith, motives, and ideals beyond the

veil with God in Christ. It is then my profound conviction that (as said above) the regeneration of the nation lies in a regenerated Church.

I do not expect the war itself to produce a regenerated nation, at least not as we use the word. Beware of those who speak of the war having already regenerated France, of France having "found her soul" through this conflict. I think that she has indeed found that a soul is necessary which she officially denied before, but to find her soul in that sense and to be regenerated is not the same thing. The prodigal son might be said to have found his soul when he "came to himself" and saw how barren his life had been. He was not regenerated until he not only came to himself, but "came to his father." When France, aye, and England, have come to their Heavenly Father (through His Son Jesus Christ), I will believe that the nation is regenerated, but not before. It is the Church, however, which obviously must bring that about; she must be the given factor which will bring hope. And can she? Yes, she can; she can do this as no other agency can, if she but recover her original character as the spiritual factor in the national life. So it is a spiritual Church that is the hope of the nation, and our duty is to ask what constitutes a spiritual Church.

It goes without saying that a spiritual Church is a Church filled with the Spirit of God, but we need to get closer to it than that.

First of all, a spiritual Church will be *definite but not necessarily dogmatic*. Perhaps our weakness in modern times is that we see all round every subject to such an extent that we cannot arrive at a definite conclusion on any of them. That is true in secular and in sacred things, in High Church and in Low Church phases of thinking. But here is the difference: Some sections of Church life, in attempting to meet this undoubted evil, have become more and more dogmatic in teaching certain doctrines, their prophets borrow their thunder from an ecclesiastical Olympus, their parish priests fulminate their orders to their people with the authoritative urgency of a pope. And, be it well noted, some people love to have it so. It is the strangest of paradoxes, that an age that likes *audire alteram partem*, likes to look all round a subject, at the same time likes (in religious matters at least) to have a strong, even dogmatic lead. It may be that in these matters people feel unable to deal with the subject, and so, feeling that they are important, they like to have their thinking done for them. Now that is a strategic advantage

which must not be left to any one party. We must utilize it as well as others. Why should a spiritual Church not be a definite one? The Holy Spirit is definite enough; He leads into all truth. Surely then it is high time that Evangelicalism became much more constructive and instructive, much more positive and Churchmanlike. Not merely dogmatic, not merely protesting, not merely criticizing, not merely destructive. No; but solid, sound, and sane in the definite teaching of Church principles. More than that in the definite attitude as to Church problems. Just at the moment we should have a most definite lead as to the position which the Holy Communion is to hold in the worship of the future. And no mere negative attitude, if you please. To refuse the Holy Communion as the central service merely because certain people desire to make it so, is no sound policy for a spiritual Church. That is merely balancing partisanship by partisanship. A spiritual Church will ask, "What saith the Spirit?" and, basing its teaching on the New Testament, will decide its policy as to this fact, quite irrespective of any alleged unworthy motives that may animate others. It is quite unnecessary to win a party battle; the one thing needful is to get a definite line, and stick to it.

Again it is in the nature of things that a spiritual Church will be *powerful but not necessarily popular*. This is so both in regard to those within the Church and to those without. As regards those within, the trouble has been that, sad to relate, we have been neither powerful nor popular. We may as well face it, that Evangelical Churchmanship has not been the factor it ought to have been in the councils of the Church as a whole. Some say it is because we have no definite message, as above noted; that in simultaneous missions, for instance, the Evangelical missionaries are all exhortation and no instruction, or as a layman put it, "all fizz and no lemonade." Well, as one myself, I can scarcely be expected to agree with this, but there is no denying that there is something in the charge. Power cannot come along that line in a Mission or anywhere else. And in the counsels of the Church power is equally unlikely to follow such policy. Yet Evangelical Churchmanship should have more influence than any, for we believe it is the hereditary successor of the Church of all the ages. That is, Evangelical *Churchmanship*, mark you. I do not mean the type of Evangelicalism that imagines that all Church teaching is Romanism, and all soundness is bound up with a

semi-detached nonconformity. No, no, not that ; but Evangelical Churchmanship that is true to the Prayer Book, that keeps to the whole Prayer Book, including Saints' days and (if reasonable) daily service, and by this very loyalty is able to criticize and counteract those who are disloyal in that they add what is not there at all. And the matter applies to our relation to the world outside as well. The weakness of our position as a Church (every section is involved) is this : That in a worldly, material, pleasure-loving age, we have been too worldly, too material, and too pleasure-loving ourselves. You cannot counteract like with like, you cannot counteract a worldly nation with a worldly Church. If the age has been growing (until the war arrested it temporarily) worldly and material, we should have been growing unworldly and spiritual. Our only hope of being a power in the country rests on that, our unlikeness to the tendencies of the day. But that will not mean popularity ; it will mean power, but it can scarcely mean popularity in the ordinary acceptation of the word. It was even so with the Master. His teaching was not popular with the authorities, even the religious authorities. It was popular with the sad and sorrowing, no doubt ; love must always be so with such, but even with the masses it was not so. The longer Christ's ministry went on, the stronger His teaching grew ; and the stronger His teaching grew, the more the hostility of the masses was aroused. Calvary was but the climax of an inevitable alienation of mentality between divine and human thought. And the servant is not above his Lord. The Gospel as Christ gave it to us (and we have no other given us as yet) can never in the nature of things be actually popular. It must get in touch with the populace, it must be preached in a way that is winning and attractive ; but in the last analysis of things it can never be popular, because it cuts at the roots of human pride, it proclaims the fact of sin and failure in a way that man would rather forget. To the sin-laden, to the conscience-stricken, it will of course come as the veritable balm in Gilead, but that is one of the factors against us that so few are sin-laden, so few conscience-stricken. Therefore to the majority the Gospel must come not as good tidings to the meek or as comfort to the saddened heart, but as a challenge and an ultimatum : a challenge to give up sin straight away, and an ultimatum to choose, choose to-day, *instantly*, whom they will serve. " Ye cannot serve God and mammon " will never be really popular,

but power can come in no other way. Here, however, a *caveat* must be entered to this effect, that there is no merit in bluntness for its own sake; there are some people who gauge their truthfulness by their candour, their whole-heartedness by the amount of opposition they stir up. Such people are not wicked, of course; oh, no, they are merely confusing consecration with eccentricity. They are like those people who "make a wilderness and call it peace"; these make a nuisance of themselves and call it service. A spiritual Church will certainly consist of people who are sane, people who remember that while it is one thing to be what the world calls a fool, and that for Christ's sake, it is quite another thing to be a real fool, and that for the sake of folly.

Again, a spiritual Church will mean a Church that is *sound but not necessarily stagnant*. Mental soundness has too often been made synonymous with stagnation; truth too often confused with mere traditionalism. Now whatever it may be, it is not that in either case. There is no danger of Evangelicalism desiring to restore what is technically called Tradition, that is, giving it an equal place with Scripture. Not at all, the danger is rather in connexion with Scripture itself. Here it may be that (in some circles) there is a tendency to hold views as true that are merely traditional, and to refuse even to face what modern thought has to say thereon. Let me say at once that I am personally most conservative in my views, but then I am a general practitioner not a specialist, and I find that conservative views (that are true, of course) work best with the average soul. But that is not exactly the point. We are talking of the progress of modern thought, and its relation to the armoury of our warfare; the munition work, not so much the fight in the trenches. And we have to ask what is our attitude towards all this. It must be sound (or the shells won't fire at all), it must not be stagnant (or the right kind of shells will not be available). Stripping this, however, of metaphor, which is always dangerous, we come to the point, what is the attitude of a spiritual Church towards higher criticism as we find it to-day, and as it will be to-morrow. In that word "morrow" lies the hope. It is my profound conviction that criticism will not be to-morrow what it was yesterday or the day before. I believe the war has radically altered both the alleged utility of it and the imaginary authority of those who promulgated it. As to utility, the trenches have hit that hard; it can never be

asserted again (outside at least the walls of a University lecture room, and it will be objected to there) that higher critical views are necessary or even helpful to life in its most urgent stages. As to the authority of those promulgating it, remember it came largely (though not exclusively) from German professors, and I imagine that even the most advanced University don in England would be chary either of teaching or believing modern estimates of truth as made in Germany. But let us beware of going to the other extreme. Truth was true even if it came from Germany, and to imagine that all their theories were false, would be to out-Herod Herod, it would land us back in the days of Galileo, and on the wrong side of the table. No, truth is many sided, and it is absurd to say that our grandfathers saw the whole of it. The whole of it is there, in the Bible right enough, but God's plan seems to be that each age should elucidate its quota of it, and the coming age cannot omit its share in the task. What I hope and pray for is this, that not only a regenerated England but also a regenerated Germany will devote itself to interpreting eternal verities in the light of modern discoveries, not with a view to altering the verity but with a view to elucidating the many further facets of its truth not hitherto discovered by man. But a spiritual Church alone can do that adequately; I refuse point blank to allow any one not in sympathy with Christianity to decide the truth of it. He cannot do it. You might as well ask a "conscientious objector" to write up the battle of Verdun or the Kaiser to state accurately what chances Great Britain has of winning the war!

Again a spiritual Church will mean one that is *sensitive but not necessarily sensational*. Sensationalism is indeed foreign to the instincts of our Church, but in an emergency born of the war, and articulated in the National Mission, any sort of method might be tried to bring back the nation to God. It needs it, but I fondly hope that scare head-lines and American pulpit methods will be avoided. Yet we need "sensation," but, as Ruskin says, "sensation of the right sort." Sensation is really perception by the senses of what is going on around. In other words, sensitiveness to environment, that sensitiveness with human needs that will prevent the Church from either not seeing the poor traveller on the road to Jericho, or if she see him, passing by on the other side. It may as well be made clear straight away that any religious body that fails in the future to "see life steadily and see it whole" is doomed in the eyes of men,

and possibly in the eyes of God as well. The war has given a new view to the sweep of life, spiritual, social and material, and woe betide the Church that tries to stereotype its activity, to divide life once again into the watertight compartments in which it too often stagnated before. Yet we must be careful even here, we must beware of those who want to sweep away all distinction (as they say) between the sacred and the secular. Not so fast, please, there is an inherent distinction, though not necessarily in the ways we have made it. Secular means that which pertains to this *seculum*, that is "age or generation"; sacred that which is *sacer*, i.e. consecrated to divinity, in our case consecrated to the Eternal God. Obviously, therefore, a distinction must be maintained, but in addition we must note that between the two, between the secular and the sacred, there is the spiritual, that is the working of those particular factors that can use the present age with a view to the eternal ages. So we must be sensitive to present needs if only for the sake of the eternal possibilities. This in several directions.

(a) *Sensitive to the traits of individualism.* Here is where too many have failed. With the best intentions in the world, they have treated men and women as they would treat so many head of cattle, same brand, same pasture, and same end. But man refuses to be so treated; he says that God, if there be a God, made him an individuality, that Nature (if there is no God) evolved him as the resultant of a hundred forces that combined in the making of his personality. Either way it is impossible to treat all alike. Same Gospel of course, same need really at heart, same salvation by the same Lord, but, allowing all that, still a thousand different ways of approaching, of winning, of developing and utilizing all who are to be won. Perhaps we have all forgotten this too largely.

(b) *Sensitive to social problems.* Ah, here is a delicate but urgent point which a spiritual Church cannot overlook. No one appreciates more than I do the danger of merely social and still more of socialistic tendencies in the Church's life. Our message is spiritual, and addressed primarily to the spirit of a man. But God gave him also a mind and a body, and the Gospel cannot save the whole man unless it saves all that God gave him to start with. But the difficulties are immense. I have watched clergy who felt the need of applying the Gospel to the social needs of the age, go down by steady declension in their life and power. On the other hand I have seen

men who said they "worked on spiritual lines" live ten and fifteen years completely out of touch with the main streams of life around them. It was no answer on the one hand to say that even if he had declined in spiritual power he was getting into touch with men. What use is that if he has lost the power that will bring them into touch with God? That is little better than to be a relieving officer, and the official will do that more efficiently himself. On the other hand it is no answer to say: "I have kept my spirituality, and have ministered to a spiritually select few," if he has failed to make the influence of that spirituality tell on humanity around. Thus you see it is a delicate problem in itself, but it is one that we must face if we are to be any real power in the national life.

(c) *Sensitive to world-wide plans.* The day is gone when a Bishop can say, "My dear sir, if God wants to save the world, He can do without you." He can, but He won't, as most of us have learned by now. Much, however, remains to be done, and a spiritual Church in a Christian nation means also in our case a Christian nation in a Christian Empire. And we have not even begun as a nation to consider the needs of the Empire from a spiritual point of view. We shall need a clerical Mr. Hughes to come from Australia and visualize the whole problem. And even then a vision will be needed of the world beyond. "Come over and help us" will need to come home to every member of the Church before the claims of the world at large can even be partially met. But all that may come, the war has caused us to "think in continents," while even to speak of five millions a day must enlarge one's mind. Surely we can hope and pray that some at least of this enlarged vision may be consecrated after the war to the enlargement of the Kingdom of Heaven.

To sum it all up then. A spiritual Church will be one that is definite in conviction, powerful in influence, sound in faith, sensitive in spirit. Therefore she will be the hope of the nation, because her *definiteness* will call the nation back to God, and then build up its character. Her powerful *influence* will educate the nation and mould it in the right direction. Her *soundness* will steady the nation, and counteract all the error and superstition always too prevalent. Finally her *sensitiveness* will feel the pulse of need in the nation and apply the remedy, and will surely continue to do so until not merely this nation but all nations are brought back to the feet of God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

L. GEORGE BUCHANAN.

The Clerical Subaltern.

FROM the time that he reads himself in shyly and self-consciously, to the day when he receives his presentation to a living, and removes, we may hope, to a more important sphere of independence, our subaltern is well before the limelight. "Our Curate" all call him, as if he were a parish institution and possession, which he is. And during this long or short interval he is made or marred, stamped with the hall-mark of popular approval, or damned as a ghastly failure and nonentity. Reputations are soon made, or lost, in the parochial world, and our Curate is no exception.

Now, like an old sea captain, who has travelled over many a mile of ocean, and loves to point out to some sea apprentice the perils of the way, its shoals and rocks, I would fain draw upon the past to help those whose feet are on the verge of the new life, or just beyond it.

Some of these rocks we have, maybe, struck upon ourselves, and much of our experience has been bought in dear markets, so, lest our knowledge should die with us, we must give it vent. We may misread our life's pages, or others may have read them better, but we are not absolved from the duty of saying the word which we think is good and helpful.

Like all lives, the Curate's life has its lights and shadows, and, like all other lives, the shadows are mostly of his own making. It should be light, it is meant to be light, and its lights when present are the brightest of all lights, but its shadows are darker too, when he turns to the left and plays the fool.

Perhaps the great outstanding fact in the history of the Curate is the change for the better which has come to his fortunes as a class. These are halcyon days for him compared with the past. Relatively, he is in clover.

His status is higher, for one thing. There must be few alive to-day who remember the old depressing days when a Curate was left on the Vicar's doorstep and treated as a menial, when the high and mighty Rector never thought of even shaking hands with him, when hospitality towards him was scanty. The Vicar treated him as the Bishop treated the Vicar, for all was of a piece in those humiliating days.

His stipend is higher too, happily. Not tearingly great even now, it has risen in our own days by leaps and bounds. And the end of this good improvement is not yet reached. A stipend which has wellnigh doubled in a generation points to a decided amelioration of a man's lot. There is no need now to speak of men "passing rich on forty pounds a year."

His value has increased even more, for we are treated to-day to the spectacle of Vicars running after Curates and not of Curates running after badgered Vicars. No one is more in request, more advertised for, or more treasured. And this too is something to be thankful for, unless it turns his head and makes him conceited. For he can pick and choose to his heart's content, and loftily say Yes or No to the panting hunters.

And it follows from all this that his independence is most fully assured in any parish where he may elect to work. He cannot be ordered about in the old unpleasant way, neither can he be bound down with his nose to the grindstone, and compelled to do allotted tasks about which he has not been consulted. He is certainly a freer and so far a more self-respecting man.

How much net gain for the Curate there is in all these changes it requires no very vivid imagination to appreciate.

But all changes bring their own special pitfalls, and in some ways the new ones are deeper and more threatening than the old.

He is no longer tempted to undue obsequiousness to the powers that be. He can lift his head with the best, and carry himself as a true freeman should. He has the opportunity now to remember that he too is a servant of the Lord with rights as palpable as a Bishop's, although in a different order. Spiritually, he is below none.

The fear now is lest he should think himself better than most, and, in his new-born democracy, lift his head too high. For he may imagine in his short-sightedness that his new value in the parish world is due to his personality rather than to his class. He is apt to forget that if his ranks were to be largely increased his value in the market would decline to the old level. Forgetting all this, he may too easily lose his head and mar his usefulness. A man is never so small a man as when he becomes too large for his place.

And it may be due to this that we hear so loud an outcry from some of our elder brethren that a change for the worse has come

over the Curate world or, as they put it, the breed is changed. It may be that they have not realized the changed condition of things to-day when they lament the good old times, but, even with this measure of discount applied, the possibility of a deterioration must be recognized. Other times, other men ; other men, other manners.

There is a justifiable expectation that a junior should not give himself airs, that he should be willing to receive orders as one under authority, and should not forget that age, larger experience, and perhaps larger culture should have their weight in establishing positions. The reins must be in somebody's hands if the ecclesiastical chariot is to go forward at all, and it appears more seemly that they should be in those of the Vicar than of the Curate.

Perhaps, too, the younger men are more apt than of old to stand upon their rights and to press them to an extremity. And this being so, they are more likely to take offence, imagine slights, and generally assert themselves. From which cause arise many sadnesses, for those of us who have lived longer in the world have discovered that fighting for one's own hand is a short cut to clenching other people's hands, and of possibly ensuring as many losses as gains. The partition between justice to ourselves and injustice to others is very thin.

This danger to which a present-day Curate is exposed is only one of many, and it will not be amiss if here we point out a few of the menacing things which our subaltern will have to reckon with.

In his freedom he may do less than his duty. This is evident.

A clerk in an office knows his hours to a stroke, and knows too what his day's work is. He is under his master's eye, and at his master's call. He cannot slacken off, even if he would. But a Curate is left necessarily very much to himself and his own initiative. He is not tied to hours or to duties, saving his regular church ones. Now a man who has all this liberty, and is trusted so implicitly, may waste his time enormously, and, if he wills, lead a pretty lazy life. Being left to his conscience, his energy will depend on whether his conscience is of the rigid or the slack sort.

Or he may do his work formally and thus fatally.

For a spiritual man cannot estimate the work he has done by the number of hours expended upon it, by the number of sermons he may preach, nor even by the number of visits he has paid. In reality, he may not have preached one satisfactory sermon, and all

his work may be so vitiated by the alien spirit in which it has been done as to amount to a simple cipher. What is his work in Christ's sight? How will it appear in the Great Day? How much life was there in it? It is this which makes formality so deadly. Days of seeming work will often be days altogether blank.

Our subaltern, like his fellows in the ministry, and even perhaps more so, may be shunted off on perilous courses. He is young, we will say, he is active in his temperament, he loves the society of his friends, male and female, and just for a diversion he takes his exercise in some manly game. Quite so. Who will gainsay him in all lawful exercise? No sensible man or woman. But suppose he overdoes it, repeats it too often, and makes it a business in his efforts to excel? Suppose it all diverts him from the profession which is his, and makes him less active in his duties. This is a nice point which has to be faced by every ardent young Curate, because he may be found crossing the line into forbidden land. If the Curate be swallowed up in the sportsman, it is the Curate who suffers, and the Curate's parish. And the cost will be found too large.

There is also a danger lest our Curate may be made a catspaw for party purposes. Once let him listen to the disaffected, and he gets upon an inclined plane which may lead him into absolute disloyalty. For where is the parish where some disaffected people are not found? And, being there, what more likely—yea, certain is it—than that these bitter people will be only too glad to find a leader so admirable as the Curate, and who will lay themselves out to corrupt him to their hands. They will praise him to the very eyes, they will extol his preaching as so much better than the Vicar's, they will try to find some sore place in his subaltern skin which is a little raw and rub it for all they are worth, they will ask his opinion as being worth so much more than his chief's, and so they will play upon the young mind until he is committed to some incriminating word or deed quite disloyal and rebellious.

You see, he is very young, very ductile, very open to flattery, and very inexperienced in the ways of a naughty world, and so he falls into the trap. But not, however, if he sees it and hates the spirit of disloyalty too much to take the first step in its direction.

A man once branded with disloyalty is blasted for life, and such a man is not only not a true Christian, he is not even a gentleman. Fly disloyalty, then, as you would fly the devil.

The danger of restlessness is not an unknown one in the Curate's life. No sooner are some men settled down in a parish than they fancy that they are led somewhere else. Tempted by a better stipend, by less wearing work, or by other inducements, they pack up and go. And so they fritter away their lives in moves. There is little good to be said of this constant unsettlement. It is apt to give a man a bad character, however undeserved. Patrons look doubtfully on the man of many moves. If a subaltern thinks that he will ever find a parochial Elysium in any diocese he may as well give up the idea at once. The perfect Vicar, the perfect congregation, the perfect climate have never yet appeared upon earth, and it is not likely that they ever will on this side of the Millenium. Besides, restlessness is an internal disease which no perfection of parish will ever cure. It is the organic disease of the Curate himself.

He will have his ambitions too, which may be lawful or not, though some he is bound to have. He must be on the look out lest they lead him astray and spoil his ministry. He may wish to excel, to become a fine and popular preacher, to be talked about, and to shine in the world's fine favour. And this may easily become a snare to him. Self will sit enshrined in all that he does under this kind of inspiration, and the lawful purposes of his life will be quenched and stifled. That he should wish for a living is quite lawful and natural; all Curates do. But he may wish it too strongly, wish it too absorbingly, wish it to the detriment of his work and the kindling of discontent with his present lot. He may wish for his independent sphere so much as to take strange ways to accomplish his longing, and badger patrons until they become sick of him. There is nothing which requires so strong a curb upon it as ambition. An ounce of contentment is worth a ton of it.

Perhaps it is useless to dissuade men from this inordinate craving for an independent sphere, but they will do well to remember that their life's main troubles will begin when they sit in the cherished seat of a Vicar. Vicars taste more poverty than Curates, and fat livings go not half so far as fat curacies. Expenses increase enormously; responsibilities are more galling; and half the Vicars wish themselves back in the old days when cares were few, and when, if they made mistakes, their Vicars had to bear the brunt of them. To exchange a good curacy for a meagre living is to leave a com-

parative palace for a workhouse. Of course the former Curate finds some bits of sunshine in his independence, and I would not deny it. He is no longer dependent on another's will, except that of the parish, which is often far more galling. He is a free man in his movements, and can if he likes tack another week on to his summer holiday, but he will have to find the money for it. He has something which he can call his own in a peculiar way, his own at first hand and not at second hand. Then he can have as much preaching as he likes and not be relegated to the background by a Vicar; probably he will wish for less before he has been a Vicar long. Still, there are charms in his new life, even though you deduct so many drawbacks. And then, if he wants to marry, which is more than likely, the advent of a living will probably facilitate that event. And this will, no doubt, outshine every other consideration in this bit of his ambition. And is it not an idea familiar to all such persons that two can live cheaper than one, and that love in a cottage is the cheapest and happiest thing on earth? Well, well; we have to find out things for ourselves, and so do before very long.

Our Curate, if he be wise, will be much on his guard against flattery. There are foolish people in every parish who will think to please by saying delightful things. They do not mind so much whether they are true, but that is a trifle. The best people know better than to play with such edged tools, and probably have opinions which it would not be so pleasant to listen to. But those who have axes which need grinding, those who wish to curry favour, those who wish to put a Vicar's nose out of joint, if they can, those who wish to be popular with the Curate, will pile on the flattery so thick that you cannot see the stale plain bread which it covers. And he is so willing to hear such delightful things and more than half ready to believe it all, being the echo of his own foolish thoughts, that he swallows it all without winking. Later on, he will probably discover that these flatterers have become his open foes. Let the clerical subaltern then hold the flatterer at arm's length, and further back still, if he can. They are an odious class, and exceedingly mischievous. Better have them for your enemies than your friends. They are safer so.

If a Curate is married then he will have to look out for perils which his single brother will escape. For to his angles must be added

the angles of the lady. And where she has angles these are apt to be sharper than the man's. I mean no disrespect, but, having oftentimes a more definite and unrelieved character and disposition, she must perforce have corners of the same definite hardness and protrusiveness. Any way, experience shows that where a man alone can keep the peace, the man plus the wife finds it much harder. We may apportion the blame as we please.

The wife, you see, is an unpaid subaltern, and therefore under no constraints. And yet she has a semi-official position in the parish. Being coupled together by law, they are coupled also in the eye of the parish as one person like shadow and substance. Again no disrespect, but a plain fact which may be seen with the naked eye, the stronger one of the pair being, of course, the substance. And therefore they bear praise and blame more or less together.

Now the Curate's wife may get on excellently with the Vicar, but she may get on very badly with the Vicar's wife. On the other hand, they may be the best of friends, and then there can be no storms. But if they should happen by chance not to hit it off well together, then I am sorry for all persons concerned, and especially sorry for the parish and the husbands.

And there are so many things to disagree about, should they feel so disposed. She may think her husband badly treated, and very possibly will set this down to the interference of the Vicar's wife. Or she may imagine some slight or neglect, or some evil-disposed person may bring some tale attributed to the lips of the Vicar's wife, or a thousand other things of small or large calibre may arise. Given a Curate's wife of the sensitive order, or endowed with no small sense of her own importance, and you may expect anything from a storm in a teacup to a roaring hurricane. Things begin to hum ominously when the wives set up their backs. And then parties form and two camps are found in one parish.

The Curate's wife, having naturally the ear of the Curate, makes mischief there, and, being her natural ally, he enters the fray with more or less impetuosity, and the war clouds gather faster.

Now I am not saying that the Curate's wife may not be in the right all the time, and have just cause for indignation. She possibly may be right. I am only saying that the Curate's wife brings another element of risk into the parish circle, for were she not there that special storm centre would have had no existence. And I say

it, not with a view to lecture the wife, but just to set our friend the subaltern on his guard as to the possibility of trouble.

But what can he do, poor fellow, under the danger? Must he not take the risk and leave it to chance? Not necessarily. He may be a soothing influence for peace behind the scenes. He may be able to point out where his wife was wrong, if he is wise enough to think that she can ever be wrong. He may minimize small things, and reduce them to their right perspective. He may put some more charitable construction on what has given such dire offence. He may be able perhaps to limit the expression of his wife's woe by gently suggesting that the least said soonest mended. Or, as a last expedient, only to be used when the hopelessness of mending the breach is evident, he may carry her sobbing form out of the danger zone and get another curacy. She may do better in another parish with another Vicar's wife. But then, if our subaltern is of the malleable sort, who lives only to please and keep the peace at home by giving in on all occasions, and only lives to echo his wife's sentiments, then to all intents and purposes he ceases to exist as an element in the situation, and she is the supreme master.

Of course, the remedy for this danger is to be provided at an earlier date when our friend makes his choice, and if he could only be persuaded to look a little forward and imagine the future and its dangers he might also be advised to choose his bride not for her face so much as for her common sense and tact and peaceableness. A Curate's wife does not save parish situations by good looks and cleverness so much as by gentleness and good sense.

From all that has been said thus far it is evident that it takes a good all-round man to be a good Curate, and that only the best man is likely to come through so many perils unscathed. One thing is certain, that unless he has these necessary endowments within, all the Orders in the world are not going to make him fit. Orders give authority, but never fitness.

Let us then see what these inner fitnesses are.

Well, first and foremost, he must be able to set before himself the great Master Whom he serves. We serve the Lord Christ. His Master is not then so much any earthly authority as heavenly. Not the Vicar, or the Bishop, or the congregation, but Christ. He is a servant of the King.

This aspect of service lifts the whole atmosphere of it, for there will be no man-worship, no playing for popularity, no seeking to please and attract, but a lofty ambition to please His Great Master. How much this motive will save him from is incalculable. It will help to steer him through some of the most dangerous channels in his ministerial life. He will steer by a Star. It is when low motives disappear, and the highest take their place, that a man is at his best. And then, behold, he has pleased others too, so far as they are worth pleasing. This is through the bounty of Him Who thus honours the aim that is spiritual and lofty.

Then, while he is anxious to put Christ highest, he is just as anxious to eliminate self. The one is really a complement of the other, for we cannot hold self and Christ as objects of pursuit in the same heart. And when self is gone, what a blessed clearance for the heart and work! For more men go down through striking this rock of self than from any other cause. Self-love and self-pursuit are the subtlest poisons distilled in hell, and injected into a minister's soul-veins curse him absolutely. They paralyse all his higher centres, and turn his movements into those of an automaton, lifeless, dead and useless. They take the pith out of his sermons, the virtue out of his visits, and the power out of himself. But self goes when Christ comes.

It is of first importance, too, in his career that he should love it supremely. So long as there is a contest between our work and our pleasures, there is clearly lack of heart in spiritual matters. Our work ought to be our joy, and we should extract our best pleasure from it. To admit a rival is an act of treason. It is this which makes our ministry so delightful, because it chimes in with our taste and sets our hearts singing in a constant refrain while we are engaged in it. For in all the world there is nothing which gives such high delight as the pursuit of such a ministry as ours. On the other hand, of all the drudgeries and the drags nothing excels that of the daily round which is a daily treadmill, because we would prefer to be doing something more terrestrial. It is here that we make our discoveries. The moment that we lose heart in our work for God, that moment something within us has broken. The main-spring is out of order. We need treatment.

Then his fitness must be made fitter by all those many means which we all know. He must be a man of prayer, for certain He

must be a man of faith too, trusting our Lord for the supplies without which all natural gifts are unavailing. He must be a man of method, parcelling out his time with all wisdom. He must be hopeful, for how else can he preach the Gospel of hope? He must ever keep in touch with the Master Whom he must ever lean upon. Just as a gymnast keeps himself in condition by training day by day, so must the Curate and all we ministers see that we keep in good condition bodily, mentally, and, above all, spiritually. With such gorgeous supplies close at hand it is criminal to run alone and depend on self.

He Who called the man to the work does not send him unsupplied to his tasks, and does not grudge plenty and to spare for each task as it comes up. Let none then fail in the faith which sees and believes and takes and uses.

CHARLES COURTENAY.

[The next article in this series will be published in February, and will treat of " Party and Party Spirit."]



The Missionary World.

HUMBLE helps are often the most profitable, perhaps because the least expected. Out of a mass of missionary publications of all sorts and kinds, one appearing fortuitously must be selected with gratitude for its message on the eve of 1917. We look for messages in these days; the good news of peace after turmoil, of tranquillity after confusion, of release after arrest is still delayed, and we wait and listen for the slow advent of desires granted. We pick up a little Report—with its characteristically ugly blue cover, its poor paper, its well-worn type and its foreign imprint—and we open it to find that the headline on the first page is “Reasons for Thankfulness.” This is cheering. Still more so is what follows. It is the thirty-first year of work, we are told, and regret is frankly expressed in the opening sentence that the year had been entered upon “with at least a slight feeling of anxiety about the financial outlook.” The second sentence reads, “Our lack of faith has been clearly rebuked, and we can only thank God the more heartily that He has supplied all our financial needs in spite of our unworthiness.” So we learn then from our lowly teacher that it is unworthy to entertain even a “slight feeling of anxiety.” We may be told that the report of the Gifu Church Blind School stands for a very small institution, for an income under three and a half million *yen*, and that it does not compare with the large missionary enterprises on which we are engaged. And that is true in so far as the comparison of size is concerned. But we have to think of the other side of these comparisons and measure the fate of a sparrow against the volume of a heavenly Father’s love. Of the bigger institutions of the mission fields may we not even say, “Ye are of more value than many sparrows”? And even on the threshold of a threatening year are there not reasons for thankfulness beyond any the Church has ever known? We venture to affirm that were any missionary society to set forth its “Reasons for Thankfulness” in the past twelve months the Church would tremble with wonder at the boundless love of God and start forward with high hope into the dim light of the near future.

* * * * *

We anticipate that the “Missionary Survey of the Year 1916,”

once more promised to us in the January issue of the *International Review of Missions*, will furnish us with overwhelming reasons for thankfulness drawn from wide sources. While the Church bends again to receive the burden of need which must be laid upon her shoulders, let the Church also lift up her face and give praise to God for His incredible goodness in preserving the vitality of the missionary cause and committing it as a trust to His Church for another year. We shall await with deep interest this Survey.

* * * * *

Among the new missionary assets, as was pointed out recently in these notes, we must reckon the Territorials now in India in their thousands. That men of their intelligence should so unexpectedly have been sent to our great dependency helps us to discern the Hand that over-rules. From all that we can learn, missionary circles in India are alive to the facts of the situation, and notably has the Y.M.C.A. taken the leading part. The desire of the Territorials to understand the conditions and the needs of India is so keen that they have responded with heartiness and even eagerness to avail of all the arrangements made to bring them into touch with missionary work. We are told that the aim has been to return them to England "authorities on missions." Visits to missions have been systematically arranged, in some instances so as to secure that each man in a battalion should see the same mission twice during the winter. Indian hospitality is famous; added to this, lectures are given on India and study circles held, so that on the very spot and in the midst of the subject, India and the Christian Englishman's obligation to the great land can be studied. They have also had the opportunity of meeting Indian Christian leaders. Nor has India, or at least educated India, been blind to the opportunity. With swift discernment the Territorials have been termed "English voters," and effort has been made to acquaint them with Indian conditions. In some instances we learn that our sturdy men were garlanded on arrival, and a desire expressed to see what "best Englishmen" were like. All this is of vital importance. Let us not only think of Territorials as potential missionaries in coming days, let us think of them and pray for them as missionaries now. Who can tell also what the effect will be on our troops in Europe, home-born and from overseas, of the Christian Indian leaders who at the call of the Y.M.C.A. are working in huts and

camps? Prejudice and ignorance must dissolve in [the presence of these men] who are as well able to lead others in Europe as in India.

* * * * *

We have before us now the Synopsis of Services and Meetings of the Missionary Week, January 22-27. It is a fine programme worthy of a great occasion. An extract from the introduction to the programme should be given here :—

“The aim of this scheme of addresses and discussions is to bring home to awakened consciences the duty of the Church as Witness for Christ to the non-Christian world. . . . In the selection of topics, no attempt has been made to cover the whole ground, either as to countries or questions; but a few large fields and questions of primary importance have been chosen. For the purpose is . . . not a systematic exposition of the vast subject of missions, but an appeal to conscience.”

A right understanding of this aim will save the Week from criticism as to “omitted” countries or creeds. Conscience for Madagascar can be aroused by an appeal for Labrador; ultimately the need is the same, the locality is accidental. We understand that six or seven valuable missionary pamphlets will be published in connexion with this Week. Incidentally we should like to congratulate *India's Women and China's Daughters* (C.E.Z.M.S.) on the successful way in which this Missionary Week is announced in the December number.

* * * * *

The Archbishops of Canterbury and York, in issuing their Reminder to the clergy and laity of the Church of England about “The National Mission and After,” have, as might be expected, given prominence to foreign missions. After announcing the various Committees of Inquiry to be appointed they state :—

“Again, a necessary result of the prayers and efforts of this year must needs be the quickening of loyalty to the cause of the Kingdom of God throughout the world. But we have not thought it necessary to appoint a special committee on the missionary work of the Church abroad, because it is the special task of the Board of Missions to see that this paramount obligation holds its rightful place in the corporate life of the Church. During the coming year the Board of Missions will present its own plans for following out the Vision and call of the National Mission.”

* * * * *

Once again we are indebted to the *Chronicle* of the L.M.S. for grouping its chief contents, this time on the general subject of Woman and the World's Future. There is little doubt that a vivid mental impression is conveyed by such a method. The range of missionary subjects is obviously wide, and readers of

missionary magazines are frequently bewildered as they are taken in rapid succession from one subject to another in adjacent columns. It is a relief as well as an education to be allowed to concentrate. To illustrate the point: the *Chronicle* has able papers successively on "What Women are doing in China," "The World's Greatest Effort for Womanhood," "South Sea Sisterhood," "The Martyr's Daughter," "The Power of a Missionary's Wife," "Work amongst Women in the Benares Country District," all admirably illustrated together with an extract from a forthcoming pamphlet by the Misses Gollock on women's work called *Half-Done*. Of course to get this class of treatment in the magazine of a general missionary society must necessarily mean that attention will be directed in a marked degree to the condition of women's missionary work everywhere, and will secure for it something more than the secondary treatment which it has often received. There is no disparity whatever in the treatment of work for men and for women save in the strategical sense. It is here that women's work has too long been allowed to take a secondary place—a fatal mistake for the Church.

* * * * *

The *H.O.D.* (Home Organization Department) *Magazine* of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society for December is a special number on work among young people. The great value of an occasional use of magazine space in this way is that it brings to the notice of a whole missionary circle special subjects in which but a section are engaged. "Missionary work is in compartments" is a frequent charge brought against the home organization of missions; there is truth in it, but grouping and elucidation such as those just noticed in missionary publications do much to obviate the disadvantages.

* * * * *

News that persists in penetrating through all barriers confirms in detail the general fears which have haunted us concerning conditions in Syria and Palestine. Among the most complete of these records are two articles which appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly* for July and August, by Alexander Aaronsohn, an American Jew, who was in one of the flourishing Zionist Colonies near Acca at the outbreak of war. In addition to the political value of his story and the interest stirred by his personal hardships—considerably ameliorated at intervals by his command of money—a lurid light is thrown

on the action of the Turkish authorities. The pitiful meaning of "requisitioning" is brought out to the full and the penalties that fall on Jew, Christian and Arab alike. *Daughters of Syria* reprints a statement which has already appeared in *The Scotsman* from a Syrian who succeeded in escaping the vengeance of the Unionists. There is again in these days as in the old slavery times an "Underground" by which those driven desperate by ill-treatment can sometimes make good their escape. It appears that some of these men contrive to get to the coast by night, there embark in any kind of craft they can find, and trust themselves to the perilous sea, hoping to be picked up by some passing vessel. The position in the Lebanon is dark in the extreme, for there Enver Pasha is reported to be fulfilling his threat of starving the inhabitants to death as punishment for their pro-Ally sympathies. But suffering and appalling mortality are not limited to the Lebanon. Beirut, Damascus, Aleppo, Jerusalem are beset with famine, plague, fever and the rapacity of officials. When we turn to *Our Missions*, the Friends' missionary magazine, we find a further confirmation of these reports. In this instance there is, however, a note of hope—but distant hope at best—owing to the proposed formation of the United Relief Fund for Syria and Palestine which Bishop MacInnes has instituted in conjunction with the missionary societies.

"We know little from exact information of the actual conditions [of members of the Friends' mission], and may perhaps believe that the level to which they have been lifted by the work of some of our missionaries may, to some extent, have raised them above the worst of the misery and destitution which are reported as having befallen the Syrian people generally. But, beyond question, they are needing our constant sympathetic support; and before long we may hope to be in a position to do something to relieve their urgent bodily needs, and to comfort them in the unspeakable sorrows they have been called to pass through. Steady progress is being made in the organization of the United Relief Fund for Syria and Palestine, introduced in our columns recently by Bishop MacInnes of Jerusalem; and we hope that its claims will not be overlooked by Friends amidst all other calls for help."

G.



Preachers' Pages.

ἵνα IN THE PASTORAL EPISTLES: A STUDY IN EXACT EXPRESSION.

ἵνα means "to the end that." It expresses what is expressed by the opening words of the Confirmation Service. It makes no reference to the means to be employed. In that respect it differs from its sister particle *ὅπως*. It is a particle of contemplation, and looks away to a future more or less remote.

In the Pastoral Epistles this little word appears thirty-two times. That in itself is an interesting fact. The distribution of the word is even more interesting. St. Paul uses this word fourteen times in what we call the First Epistle to Timothy, thirteen times in his Epistle to Titus, and five times in the epistle which we call the Second Epistle to Timothy. As the Epistle to Titus is only half the length of 1 Timothy, and as *ἵνα* occurs only once less in Titus than in 1 Timothy, it is obvious that it is much more frequent in the Epistle to Titus than in either of the other two Pastoral Epistles, speaking proportionately.

I make bold to say with emphasis that in every place where *ἵνα* is used in these epistles it conveys its strictly proper meaning, and expresses some end which the Apostle had in his mind at the moment of writing. It bears no other sense in these epistles anywhere.

Looking at the broad facts of the usage I suggest that St. Paul felt more free and confident about the future when writing to Titus than when writing to Timothy, and contemplated contingencies and prospective arrangements with greater equanimity in the Church of Crete than in that of Ephesus. When writing his "dying letter" the Apostle doubtless felt that long views were out of place, and were in fact merged in the prospect of the glory of his translation close at hand, and in the repose of a noble career well finished by the grace of his Lord. For that reason his gaze turned rather to the past when writing those last lines.

In Titus ii. 12, the meaning "to the end that" must not be weakened down into that of a quotation, as is done in the A.V. The same is true of *ἵνα* in 1 Timothy ii. 2.

HOMILETICAL HINTS AND OUTLINES

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

The Epiphany: Herod and the Magi.

Suggested text: "Thine eyes shall see the King in His beauty."

—*Isa. xxxiii. 17.*

Who may hope to see? "How is it that Thou wilt manifest Thyself unto us and not unto the world" (John xiv. 22). Note the answer.

I. HEROD: THE MAN WHO MISSES THE VISION.

"There is hardly any figure in history in whom the tragic irony of dreadful doom has been more vividly and terribly displayed than in that of Herod the Great."—*Canon Scott Holland.*

Possessing many of the characteristics and adopting many of the methods that appeal to Orientals he managed for a time to make himself somewhat of a popular idol. Yet he lacked those qualities which constitute true greatness.

There is no vision for such as he.

(a) *Insincere.* Pretended to a piety of which he knew nothing—"I will come and worship Him also."

(b) *Inhuman.* Ordered the massacre of the Holy Innocents.

(c) *Infamous life and inglorious end.* His wretched end was the penalty of a life of shameless Hedonism. "Choking as it were with blood, devising massacres in his very delirium, the soul of Herod passed forth into the night."—*Farrar.*

II. THE MAGI: THE MEN FOR WHOM THE VISION IS RESERVED.

Observe—

(1) *Their diligence.* (a) In watching for the star. They had a clue. Did it come from David? (b) In following its guidance. (c) In their inquiry for further information of Herod, who referred to the chief priests and Scribes.

(2) *Their deference.* (a) Magi, they yet bowed the knee to the Infant Redeemer. Thus they fulfilled Isaiah ix. 3. (b) They laid at his feet costly offerings, thus fulfilling Psalm lxxii. 10.

The perseverance and persistence of their faith was rewarded and they departed content with having seen the King in His beauty. Notice how men are evangelized by means of their ordinary occupations—the astrologers by a star so that the evening sky became an

apocalypse, the music-loving shepherds by the Angels' Song, the fisher-folk by the draught of fishes, etc. "Christ enters by the door that stands widest open."

First Sunday after Epiphany.

Text: "I beseech you therefore, brethren," etc.—*Rom. xii. 1* (Ep.).

The keywords of the passage are sacrifice and service—our duty to God and to our neighbour.

THE YIELDED LIFE: FELLOWSHIP WITH GOD.

(a) *The explanation of it.* "Present your bodies." (1) "The soul brings the body to the altar for the one High Priest to offer it acceptably to God."—*Vaughan*. Observe St. Paul's insistence upon the yielding of the body (1 Cor. vi. 15, 19, 20; vii. 34; 2 Cor. v. 10).

(b) *The expedience of it.* St. Paul felt it. "I beseech you." "Be not conformed to this world." Why? "The fashion of this world passeth away" (1 Cor. vii. 31). Considering all it involves, is it worth while? (See 2 Cor. iv. 17.)

(c) *The experience of it.* "That ye may prove." (2) Only those in fellowship with God can hope to know (Collect, "perceive and know, etc.) His will. The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him and He will show *them* His covenant." (Ps. xxv. 14). "If any man will do . . . he shall know" (John vii. 17).

(d) *The expression of it.* "Transformed." The word used of the Transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 2; Mark ix. 2). Also in 2 Cor. iii. 18, "are changed," lit. "are undergoing a gradual transformation."—*Vaughan*. This is how Jesus has his Epiphany in the world to-day.

Second Sunday after Epiphany.

Text: "Members one of another."—*Rom. xii. 5*.

Our text is really the closing verse of the Epistle for last Sunday, but we select it because the exhortations that follow are based upon this consideration. Last Sunday the subject was *Sacrifice*—the yielded Life; to-day the theme is *Service*, and religion is shown to be connected with secular as well as sacred things.

THE YOKED LIFE: FELLOWSHIP WITH THE SAINTS. In this life of communion there is—

(1) *Inequality of position.* "All members have not the same office." For fuller treatment of this subject, see 1 Cor. xii. 12-27.

(2) *Inequality of Endowment.* "Having then gifts differing" (v. 6). These gifts are bestowed by the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. xii. 11). Man has a part to play (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6).

(3) *Inequality of rewards.* These, however, are in proportion to the endowment and the use made of it (see Luke xix. 12-26; Ps. lxii. 12). "Every man according as his work shall be" (Rev. xxii. 12).

But there is also, on the other hand—

(1) *Equality of opportunity.* "To every man his work" (Mark xiii. 34; also Luke xix. 13).

(2) *Euaqlity of Responsibility.* "Opportunity" involves us in responsibility. Faithfulness is required in stewards (1 Cor. iv. 2).

Third Sunday after Epiphany.

Text: "Be not wise in your own conceits."—Rom. xii. 16 (Ep.).

St. Paul, in this paragraph, continues to deal with Christian ethics—faith in action. Who can truthfully say that justification by works—the evidence and outcome of faith (Arts. 11 and 12)—finds no place in the Apostle's teaching and that he is therefore at variance with St. James? He has already considered Christian Fellowship and its obligations—the yoked-life of the Church. He now reminds us that the Christian has an even wider sphere as a neighbour and as a citizen (next Sunday's Epistle). Note the expressions: "to no man" (17), "all men" (17, 18), "your enemy" (20).

I. THE CHRISTIAN IS CALLED TO A LIFE OF SEEMLY MODESTY. "Be not wise in your own conceits" (see Prov. iii. 7). "For fear you should attribute superior wisdom to yourselves" (see chap. xi. 25). Their notions might sometimes be quite wrong, but in any case their opinions should be stated without arrogance and with due consideration for those of others.

II. THE CHRISTIAN IS CALLED TO A LIFE OF SEEMLY PEACEABLENESS. "As much as lieth in you live peaceably."

(a) *The man of God is non-provocative.* "There is to be no contribution on his part to the making of a quarrel."—Campbell Morgan. "So far as it depends on you."—Weymouth.

(b) *The man of God denies himself the satisfaction of creating a breach of the peace by the old rule "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth."* Recompense to no man evil for evil. We catch here an echo of the Sermon on the Mount.

(c) *The man of God leaves vengeance to Him Who said, "I will repay."* The unregenerate says: "O retribution, how sweet thou art"; the saint says: "Mercy . . . blesseth him that gives and him that takes."

III. THE CHRISTIAN IS CALLED TO EXHIBIT A SEEMLY PROBITY. "Provide things honest in the sight of all men." St. Paul is jealous for the reputation of the Christian community. Notice that this is almost word for word with 2 Corinthians viii. 21, where he tells the Corinthians that he felt it was desirable that as he had been entrusted with a considerable sum, some one should be associated with him in the matter, lest blame should be thrown upon us in respect to these large and liberal contributions which are under our charge.—*Weymouth*. What an example of carefulness to those who handle money given for religious purposes or who deal with monies not their own. We knew a churchwarden who because of this passage would not count the offertory alone!

Fourth Sunday after Epiphany.

Text: "The powers that be are ordained of God."—*Rom. xiii. 1* (Ep.).

In this paragraph St. Paul continues to deal with conduct and sets forth *the obligations of Christian citizenship*. There was need for such counsel. The Christians were being freely charged with disloyalty and were, among themselves, inquiring as to the necessity for paying tribute. He now urges certain considerations.

I. THAT THERE IS A POWER BEHIND THE THRONE. The moral government of the world is under the direct control of the Almighty. "The powers . . . are ordained of God" (verses 1 and 2).

The great vessel ploughs her way across the sea. To the uninitiated it might seem as if nothing determined her course save the outer influences of wind and wave. But behind her movements is the controlling will of him whose hand is on the wheel. So God directs the course of human affairs even though sometimes men fail to discern Him or to comprehend His purposes.

(a) *In the world of nature this Power behind the Throne exhibits an orderliness of method.* Thomas Carlyle, asked by a friend on a starlight night what he thought about the heavens, replied, "A glorious muddle." He hardly did credit to his sagacity! The astronomer will tell you that there is no confusion but such orderliness and precision that the movements of the heavenly bodies can be calculated to a nicety. Examples of this may be given *ad infinitum*.

(b) *In the world of human affairs a like orderliness is according to the Divine purpose.* "By Me things reign" (Prov. viii. 15). "He putteth down one and setteth up another" (Dan. ii. 21, iv. 17). He who orders the stars in their courses and controls the motions of the heavenly bodies would hardly leave the world of men to take care of itself and lose itself in the attempt. He assigns to rulers the task of dispensing rewards and administering punishment: he thus associates them with Him in His purposes of mercy and judgment. "They are God's ministers," though possibly, like Cyrus, often unconscious of the fact.

II. THAT CHRISTIAN MEN, DISCERNING THE POWER BEHIND THE THRONE, ARE UNDER AN OBLIGATION TO RECOGNIZE DULY CONSTITUTED AUTHORITY. "Be subject unto the higher powers" (xiii. i).

(a) Because of our Lord's example and teaching (Luke xx. 20-24; Matt. xvii. 27).

(b) Because of Apostolic injunction, through the ministry of the Spirit. "Render therefore unto all their dues" (v. 7), (1 Pet. ii. 13, 17; Titus iii. 1). Prayer for rulers ordered (1 Tim. ii. 2).

ILLUSTRATIONS.

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

"There are three periods in war. There is the *Onset* of war, where swiftness of action is what tells the most; and there is the *Grip* of war, where numbers of trained men are what tell most; and there is the *Drag* of war, when what tells most is the purse."¹ Germany's initial successes were gained because she took advantage of her opportunity in seizing the first of these three.

¹ *Ordeal by Battle*, by F. S. Oliver (Macmillan), p. 263.

The whole principle suggests an emblem of the war waged by the Christian Church during the nineteen centuries of the Christian era. There was the *Onset* of war, when the Apostles and teachers of the early Church went forth, strong in faith and purpose and hope, eager to do battle with the legions of Satan in the pagan world of their day.

There was the *Grip* of war, when they victoriously assaulted the strongholds of sin in Rome and Greece, in Asia Minor and Western Europe.

Then came the *Drag* of war, when the Church grew to depend on the power and patronage of the State, and to draw her weapons from the armoury of heathen philosophy, and to lean for supplies on the material props of wealth and worldly position, courting the favour of the rich and great men of the earth.

We have begun to awaken to a consciousness of the folly and unworthiness of all this. Can we not get back once more to the better and healthier state? To do so is the supreme desire of all true hearts to-day.

The Apostles and disciples of the early Church went everywhere in the power of the Holy Ghost, preaching Christ Crucified, Risen, Ascended, and Returning. To repeat this Divine strategy vigorously and universally would mean such a fresh onset against the foe as would enable us to get a grip of the deadly sin that is ravaging poor fallen humanity in its civilized and non-civilized states alike. Then the drag of this awful spiritual war would soon come to an end in the final and complete triumph of good over evil.

The principle might equally well be applied, if desired, to illustrate the personal life and experience of many a Christian man.

* * * * *

Mr. Frederick Palmer, the American War Correspondent, paid a visit to the Grand Fleet in the late summer of 1915. He was much impressed by an expression which he heard used repeatedly; he calls it "a great phrase." An officer was describing the result of a successful action, and added by way of explanation, "*we had the range of them.*"

After the battle of the Falkland Islands, Mr. Palmer was told how our British sailors saved as many as they could of the Germans who floated when von Spee's squadron had been sunk. And when the dripping officers set foot on the deck of the *Inflexible*, the British

explained their own victory by saying "We had the range of you."¹

It all seemed to depend on this. Any amount of shot and shell might be fired; but so long as it fell short, or wide of the mark, or even near, without hitting, that was so much waste of powder and metal. The great thing was to find the range, and then to keep on driving the shots home.

It is the same thing in preaching. No sermon is worth delivering unless the preacher "gets the range" of his listeners. To reach the conscience and there strike the foe of unbelief or indifference or selfish greed or cruel lust—that should always be the great purpose in view. We sometimes wonder at the slow progress of Christianity in our own favoured land. And we think how hard must be the hearts of those who go to Church and listen to sermons without being impressed by what they hear. It would often be more fair to blame the preacher. He fails to "get the range" of his listeners, because he does not aim straight and true for their heart's stronghold. His feeble platitudes and lifeless utterances fall wide of the mark. But when the preacher does declare the truth boldly, when he proclaims the Saviour's love and power in the strength of a great faith and with the fervour of spiritual sympathy, then the shots will go home and the battered turrets of sin will be carried bodily into the sea, and the sinner will haul down his flag and make the great surrender.

* * * * *

One of the most stirring fights of the war took place
 Prayer—
 Hindered. in the North Sea on the morning of February 29,
 1916, when H.M. armed auxiliary cruiser *Alcantara*
 met and engaged the armed German raider *Greif*. The latter was
 disguised as a Norwegian merchant vessel. When the British
 auxiliary was near enough to the enemy ship to recognize her real
 character, at once she opened fire, and at the same time sent out a
 wireless warning call to the British Fleet, asking for help to aid her
 in the struggle. But the enemy also had a powerful wireless installation
 which he used with great skill. Watchful for the first vibration
 that would tell of the auxiliary's call for help, he succeeded at once
 in "synchronizing." The British ship soon discovered the hopelessness
 of overcoming the "jam," and had to continue the contest
 with an enemy superior in speed and strength of hull. A battle

¹ *My Year of the War* (Murray), p. 334.

royal followed which ended in the two ships sinking one another, but not before the *Alcantara* got home the shot which found the wireless room of the raider. That shot saved many lives, for the message now had freedom to travel, and some British destroyers speedily appeared on the scene, and picked up a large number of our own sailors, besides many Germans, who would otherwise have been drowned.

In the conflict of the soul struggling with some besetting sin prayer will bring the help that is needed. But the enemy knows this and often contrives to "synchronize," suggesting doubts about God—His power to save, and His love to care for the man or woman exposed to the assaults of temptation. Or wandering thoughts obtrude, dissipating the spiritual force of the suppliant's cry for help. To every one who knows what this means, and mourns over the hindrances that come when he is on his knees, I would say, "Pray without ceasing"; and as you pray continue to "fight the good fight of faith"; and you will find the enemy's power to hinder your prayers will be broken, and the answer will come, and the help you need will be provided—in God's good time.

* * * * *

The Future— "This is one of those moments in the history of
What? the world when it takes a plunge downwards, or a flight upwards." (David Lloyd-George, M.P.)

Which is it going to be?

"A plunge downwards?" Our hearts cry out agonizingly against that alternative. The passion for freedom among the progressive nations would seem to make it impossible.

And yet, is it so? We can hardly dare to be sure of that. Of one thing we are quite certain. This world can never be the same as it was before the War.

Is it then to be "a flight upwards?" If so, what is to be the ascending power? Where is it to be obtained? On what do our hopes of the future rest?

"After the War!" Many minds are already busy over the problems which shall then confront us. We hear of proposals for binding together by new ties the economic interests of the Allies, of a "League of Peace" to prevent Germany from ever imposing war on the world again. All these things may prove very useful. As Christian people our sympathies and prayers should

be given unstintedly to every earnest honest endeavour to make the world better and happier.

But such things alone are insufficient to give to the world its great uplifting. There is only one power which can impart to the world that buoyancy whereby to take its flight upwards; and that is the power of God. His grace alone can enable human nature to overcome the law of spiritual gravitation—sin—which drags it down, and to take that "flight upwards" which leads to Heaven and rest and peace in God Himself.

* * * * *

On the Amance plateau in Lorraine is the hill of **The Heritage Bequeathed.** St. Geneviève. A small square stone marks its highest point. There, legend tells us, "Jovin, a Christian and very faithful, vanquished the German barbarians, 366 A.D."

The descendants of those German barbarians in this present war strove in vain to break through the French lines of defence at this very place. After their failure to do so, a French colonel took an American friend up that hill one day, and standing there, and looking over to the woods on the other side of the valley where the Germans lay concealed, he said "We have to do as well in our day as Jovin did in his."

As we read the history of the Christian Church of early times, we learn with what constancy many a martyr fought and vanquished in his day the enemies of the Cross of Christ. The names of some of them are known to us. And we in our day have to fight against the same enemy that beset them. Aye, and the same principles for which they contended are again at stake. The battle must be fought once more on the same ground. They stood firm, vanquishing the foe, and bequeathing to us the heritage of a sacred trust. May we be as faithful as they were, our firm purpose being that, with God's help, we will do as well in our day as they did in theirs.

* * * * *

"The one fatal error was inertia; and inertia prevailed."

These words were written by Sir Ian Hamilton in his Dispatch describing the landing at Suvla Bay in the Gallipoli Peninsula. It is the story of a great failure, of splendid heroism

vainly expended, of humiliating defeat where success might have been achieved.

He went on to say that "strong clear leadership had not been promptly enough applied." Had the British Forces pushed forward vigorously on a certain night, then the coveted heights which dominated the Peninsula could have been scaled and won. But the golden opportunity was lost, owing to the lack of such leadership and the prevailing inertia. So all hopes of victory melted away, never again to be revived.

In the past history of nations and of the Church, many a high purpose has been frustrated, many a splendid enterprise robbed of success for the same two reasons. The Church of our day has a great task laid upon her—a great opportunity given to her. But if she is to conquer she must not repeat the failure of Suvla Bay. The call to a fearless forward movement in the name and strength of our Divine Captain Jesus Christ is sounding loudly in our ears. "Strong clear leadership" is needed.

We believe that in answer to prayer it is forthcoming. But the spirit of apathetic indifference still needs to be driven from the ranks of that army which we call "the Church Militant of Christ on earth." Shall the fatal error of inertia be allowed to prevail? or, shall we not rather press forward unitedly under the Divine Guidance of the Holy Spirit and in the name of our risen Lord and Saviour? That is the way to storm successfully the heights of sin and selfishness and scientific materialism. That is the way to gain the crest of the most divine ambition ever cherished; for it means to see the world at our feet, to be won for Christ.

THE STUDY TABLE.

The parish clergyman who has experienced blessing in his own soul, and whose people have been stirred, in and through the National Mission of Repentance and Hope, will be anxious that the impression thus made shall be deepened and that both he and they should be led on from strength to strength. He will find much help in the Bishop of Sodor and Man's new volume, *REVIVED CHURCHMANSHIP* (Longman's Green & Co., 2s. 6d. net). It is a very precious book, full of spiritual power, with just the appeal that is needed to follow

after the special message of the Mission. It is not a book to be read through and then laid aside; it is a book to be studied, to be thought over, and, above all, to be prayed over—a book that the spiritually-minded clergyman will like to have at hand on his study table, that he may turn to it whenever he feels he needs guidance and help. Like all the Bishop's work it is very thorough. In a series of six chapters after defining his terms and replying to objections to the plea for spiritual revival, he discusses the need for revival, the conditions of revival, the endowment of power, the means of revival, and the outcome of revival—a question of such importance that he devotes two chapters to it. We quote two pregnant passages from the concluding chapter. The first relates to the moral effect of the Pentecostal power and message upon the world. "Fear came upon every soul," and this led on to a feeling of "favour with all the people."

"A similar effect would be produced by a spiritual revival in our midst. Public opinion would be influenced in a greater degree than at present. The voice and influence of the Church, and the votes and activities of Churchmen, would count for much more than they do to-day in determining many questions of policy. At any rate, the creed of the Church would be more widely respected and her work would inspire greater reverence than is now the case. A healthy 'fear' would possess the public mind, and the people generally would be more favourably disposed towards the revived Church. All this would count to the good for our work in the future. Few, for example, would claim that at the present day there is a widespread 'fear' or awe of the Church, and yet, on the other hand, fewer still would deny that as an institution she is in 'favour' with the majority of the nation. In both directions, *i.e.* 'fear' and 'favour,' there is, however, room for and need for improvement, and a recovery of Pentecost would secure advance in both directions. The day is surely fast drawing near when the national Church will be severely tested whether she can make good her claim to be called national, and whether she ought to continue the established Church of the nation. A revived Churchmanship would assure our minds that she will stand the test, and go down to posterity immovably the religious organ of the State and increasingly the trusted Church of the people. With the recovery of Pentecost its spirit, power and message, the dear old Church of England by responding to the national needs and appealing to the heart of the nation, would embrace the people and by them be embraced, to the enlargement of the one and the enrichment of the other."

The second passage we quote relates to the first result of Pentecost seen in the increased life of the Church. "Many wonders and signs were done by the Apostles."

"If in these latter times (says the Bishop) we are to see spiritual 'wonders and signs' it can only be as we yield ourselves more unreservedly to the Holy Spirit, by whom the Lord works through us. It is He, and He alone, who can add to the Church those who through Spirit-filled men and women are brought

into a state of salvation. It is therefore only by such a recovery of Pentecost as would issue in a revived Churchmanship that we can hope for the extension of the Church at home and abroad by the conversion of souls. Human agency without the Divine power must fail. Only as our lives are fully consecrated to the Lord can we expect to see spiritual 'wonders and signs' in our midst, and only as He is pleased to work through us can souls be brought into a state of salvation."

The Bishop has given us an uplifting book.

Many volumes have been written on the Prayer Book, but there has long been need of one which should give in homely language the facts about its compilation, the sources of its prayers and so on. This need Miss Georgiana M. Forde has, to a large extent, supplied in a very interesting volume, *Heroes and Writers of the Book of Common Prayer* (S.P.C.K., 3s 6d. net). We do not feel able to vouch for the strict accuracy of all the historical statements; and doctrinally the lady's views are not ours, but those who can discriminate—and readers of the *CHURCHMAN* are well able to take care of themselves—will find in this volume much that is most useful. It does not pretend to be anything more than a compilation, and the writer acknowledges her indebtedness to over twenty books from which she has drawn her information. Among these we are glad to find the *Tutorial Prayer-Book*. The earlier chapters of the book treat of the Title Page, the Windsor Commission and the Preface. These, of course, are largely historical. The Calendar is principally biographical. In succeeding chapters the various services—regular and occasional—are examined in detail and history and biography, and most admirably intermixed. The chapter on the Psalter is most interesting. As a work of reference clergy will find it convenient and suggestive when preparing sermons or addresses on the Prayer Book—of which we hear far too little—but the book will appeal also to the general reader, who will find much to learn from it.



Short Notes on Recent Books.

Insertion under this heading neither precludes nor guarantees a further notice.

A VOLUME which contends for a renewed study of the almost lost science of Theology is very welcome at this time. We have been treated so often and so vehemently to disparagements of theology that not a few had come to think that the case for re-statement is unanswerable, but in *Essays in Orthodoxy* (Macmillan and Co., 6s. net), the Rev. Oliver Chase Quick, Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, puts in a well-sustained plea in quite another direction. "The first necessity is not to restate the creeds, but to explain them. Perhaps after the explanation the need for restatement will not seem so pressing." Mr. Quick approaches the questions with which he deals in the full light of the attacks made upon fundamentals. "The fabric of Christian faith has during recent years been shaken to its foundations." But he is not dismayed. In the undying hope which sustained Jeremiah in the greatest crisis in the history of Hebrew religion, and in the prophet's plea for "the old paths," Mr. Quick finds satisfaction. The prophet's message "is profoundly true to the history of religious reformations. No great religious revival has been really a new departure. Man has never made any great religious advance while turning his back upon the past." It is to re-discovery that Mr. Quick invites us. "The first need of our people is not for a new faith nor even for a new system. The first need is that we should all re-discover what are the treasures hidden in the old faith and the old system, yes, even the old Anglicanism if you will, which we have been neglecting in the past and now too often notice only to deride. It is not that no change is needed—God knows it is—but we can only change aright, if we will first be patient enough and humble enough to appreciate what we already have." Such is Mr. Quick's position and from it he discusses the great facts of the Christian faith in a series of chapters dealing with God the Father and Creator, Christ the Revealer, the Atonement, the Judgment, the Resurrection, the Holy Spirit and the Trinity, the Holy Spirit is witness, Sanctification and Ethics, and Sanctification and Devotion. It is a new line of thought in works of this description and challenges the profoundest attention. Those whose minds were troubled by *Foundations* should certainly read it.

* * * * *

The paper read by Dr. Sanday before the Modern Churchman's Union, "On Continuity of Thought and Relativity of Expression" excited considerable attention for the views it expressed on certain historical facts of the Christian faith. Before its appearance the Rev. N. P. Williams, Chaplain-Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, addressed to Dr. Sanday a closely-reasoned criticism of the paper. Thus a "friendly discussion" began, and it was thought the letters might be issued as a pamphlet, but it so developed that it has grown into a book and is now issued under the title *Form and Content in the Christian Tradition* (Longmans Green & Co, 6s. net). The volume is one of great value, dealing as it does with questions of the utmost moment. The weakness of Dr. Sanday's position—on Miracles for example, and on what he calls "the disputed clauses of the Creed"—is clearly shown. Yet his last word in the discussion is painfully inadequate. "As a spiritual system (the italics are his), Christianity remains for me just precisely what it has always been. There are not a few Christian beliefs in my interpretation of which I may be held to be behind the times. The Bible is still to me the

highest authority that I know. But it is true that I pin my faith not so much to what the Bible says as to what I believe that it means to say; in other words, not so much to what it said in the letter to those to whom it was first given as to what it says in the spirit to us now. It is in the Bible *considered as history* (again the italics are his), that the change is greatest. But even here, I would do no more than put that construction upon it that I should do without hesitation if it had been a less sacred book. Many will think that its sacredness precludes this. But it is just there—and I think, in principle only there—that I join issue with them.”

* * * * *

The Rev. E. A. Burroughs (Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College, Oxford, has come to be regarded as something of a prophet in relation to the spiritual issues of the war, and certainly there are few other men whose messages excite a wider measure of attention. His latest volume, *The Valley of Decision* (Longmans, Green & Co., 5s.), will do much to strengthen his hold upon the public mind, and particularly upon the Church mind. “This book,” he says in his Preface, “is an attempt to show that in the religion which, as a nation, we have long professed and never yet practised, we have . . . a working philosophy ready to hand. The war, so far from disturbing the claims of Christ on the world, has illustrated and reinforced them. . . . It is my hope and prayer that the argument which follows may help some who are still ‘halting between two opinions’ to find the right way out of ‘the valley of decision.’ There is, as it seems to us, good reason for such hope, for Mr. Burroughs gets into close touch with the reality of things, and discusses problems of life with reasonableness and force. He is severe upon “the failure of the churches.” He asserts that “the rank and file of the clergy have, to a large extent, retained the old authoritarian attitude; still, apparently, imagining that the average man is impressed by the vocable so frequent in their sermons, and interested in what ‘the Church’ has said. ‘We had another futile sermon from our *padre* this morning,’ wrote a midshipman on a battleship to the writer some years ago—the sort that begins, “This is the day when the Church teaches us to remember so-and-so.”’ He had previously groaned over a Whitsunday discourse which took as its theme ‘Our Mother’s Birthday.’ In a battleship! To seven or eight hundred British bluejackets!” We are not surprised at the notes of exclamation. But the whole book is worth reading. It has a message for these times which cannot safely be neglected.

* * * * *

Among other religious volumes we must mention *War: The Cross of the Nations*, by L. Swetenham (Robert Scott, 1s. 6d. net). The writer is a lady who in a previous volume (*Conquering Prayer*) has done much to emphasize the spiritual aspect of the war, and the Bishop of Edinburgh, who contributes an Introduction, gives the present volume high praise. The need which existed for some terrible discipline to awaken the nation is clearly shown, and the way of recovery is beautifully pointed out.

* * * * *

To turn to quite another class of book, we call attention to *The Moderns* by John Freeman (Robert Scott, 6s. net). The writer is a man of brilliant gifts, and he has given us a series of most delightful criticisms on modern literary influences. He passes in review George Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, Thomas Hardy, Maurice Maeterlinck, Henry James, Joseph Conrad, Coventry Patmore, Frances Thompson, and Robert Bridges. He plays the part of the candid friend, but he is always vivacious.