

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

April, 1917.

The Month.

The Food Shortage. WHAT is the remedy for our food shortage? Sunday labour on the land? or a deeper recognition of the over-ruling providence of God? The Archbishop of Canterbury, replying to Mr. Prothero, has written the following letter :—

“ Our inheritance of the English Sunday with its privilege of abstention from all ordinary work is a God-given boon of inestimable value, and I desire to maintain and safeguard it in every reasonable way, but occasions may arise when for the well-being of the people of our land exceptional obligations are laid upon us. As Minister of Agriculture you assure us that such an emergency has now arisen, and that the security of the nation's food supply may largely depend upon the labour which can be devoted to the land in the next few weeks. This being so, we are, I think, following the guidance given in the Gospel if in such a case we make a temporary departure from our rule. I have no hesitation in saying that in the need which these weeks present men and women may with a clear conscience do field work on Sundays. Care would of course be taken to safeguard from compulsion those who would feel such action on their part to be wrong, or whose health would be seriously endangered by the extra strain.”

The Church of England, of which the Archbishop of Canterbury is chief minister, suggests “ in the time of Dearth and Famine ” the use of the following prayer :—

“ O God, heavenly Father, whose gift it is, that the rain doth fall, the earth is fruitful, beasts increase, and fishes do multiply ; Behold, we beseech Thee, the afflictions of Thy people ; and grant that the scarcity and dearth, which we do now most justly suffer for our iniquity, may through Thy goodness be mercifully turned into cheapness and plenty ; for the love of Jesus Christ our Lord, to Whom with Thee and the Holy Ghost be all honour and glory, now and for ever. *Amen.*”

Which of these two is the more excellent way? It is an amazing omission on the part of the Church, the facts being what they are, that there has been as yet no general call to prayer. We hope sincerely that, even before these lines appear the omission may be repaired.

The Memorial of the Rebellious Thousand, that is **The Rebellious Thousand.** of the thousand clergy who have come out in open rebellion against the decision of the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury on the question of Reservation, has not excited much attention outside certain circles, but it would be a mistake to minimize its significance or its importance. If the signatories mean business, and if the Bishops adhere to their decision, a crisis will be set up which cannot but have momentous results for the Church of England. The Bishop of Oxford who, just now, is much out of favour with the extreme party, says in his *Diocesan Magazine* that the language used by the Memorialists fills him with "something like despair." But he is evidently not afraid, and in the clearest possible terms he "warns" the clergy who signed the Memorial—about 100 of whom are connected with his Diocese—that so far as he is concerned "there will be no change." He continues :—

I shall act in conformity with the intention so expressed by the bishops in general; and I cannot but treat the matter as of serious moment. I renew the regulations which I made two years ago. There is no general permission of reservation. I propose to allow it freely in particular cases where good reason is shown for going beyond the directions of the Prayer Book. I believe I have "lawful authority" so to do. But in no case can it be allowed to reserve the blessed sacrament so as to be accessible for extra-liturgical worship. I make this restriction

(1) because the bishops of the province have decided that it shall be made: and I know that only on this basis is any provincial sanction for reservation obtainable:

(2) because I feel sure that without this restriction the sanction of reservation will imperil seriously our corporate cohesion:

(3) because the extra-liturgical cultus of the blessed sacrament was unknown to the ancient and undivided church and is unknown to the Eastern church. Thus it cannot be called a catholic practice:

(4) because, so far from its being the case that the extra-liturgical cultus, as it developed in the later mediæval Western church, was the logical expression of the doctrine of the Real Presence, it was the outcome of a particular form of eucharistic doctrine which seriously impaired the really catholic doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the holy sacrament.

The Bishop of Oxford is to be commended for his courage, and we hope that other bishops will show the same determination not to surrender to the challenge of the Memorialists.

Passionate Pressure. The Bishop of London's excuse that it is dangerous to interfere with the devotional aspirations of the people will not bear examination. The Bishop of Oxford allows, of course, that "it is indeed very painful to resist

any passionate pressure of religious emotion," but, as he so well points out, "passionate pressure" is being brought to bear from other quarters in relation to difficult questions. Obviously, therefore, if it is yielded to in one direction concessions must be made in others, and the result would be—chaos. No one desires to restrain the legitimate expression of the heart's devotion; it should be encouraged in every possible way, but when it oversteps well-defined bounds and ceases to be legitimate, the devotee is bound to conform to recognized standards or seek a home in a more congenial communion. No other course is open, consistent with honour. If, therefore—to take the case before us—a member of the Church of England desires to have access to the Reserved Sacrament for devotional purposes, he comes at once into conflict with the Church's rule, and he must either abandon his idea or join the Church of Rome—the only body in all Christendom where such devotions are allowed. The issue is very simple and very clear, and we hope the Bishops will not allow it to become obscured by temporizing compromises.

The Case for the Reservationists. It is right, in view of all the circumstances, that the case for the Reservationists should be adequately put forward. Those who want to know the real position of the question should read Dr. Darwell Stone's new volume, *The Reserved Sacrament* (Robert Scott, 2s. 6d. net). It is a most able production and everything that can be said in support of the practice of Reservation is said clearly and well. But we are bound to add that a careful reader will not be long in discovering from Dr. Darwell Stone's pages that the practice is absolutely out of harmony with the principles of the Church of England as expressed at the Reformation. The historical chapters are very interesting and very full, but it is perfectly clear that the only authority for the practice is to be found in pre-Reformation times. Much stress is laid by the author upon the practice of the thirteenth century, a period we should be inclined to regard as one of the darkest in the history of the English Church. Dr. Darwell Stone examines the Lambeth "Opinions," expressed by Archbishops Temple and Maclagan, which laid it down very clearly that (in Dr. Temple's words) "the Church of England does not at present allow reservation in any form," and against this view he sets the fact that "the

constitution of Archbishop Peecham directing reservation in every parish church, however its operation may have been affected by many enactments in the Church legislation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, has never been expressly repealed." The argument is more ingenious than weighty and cannot be used against the express terms of the Rubric in the Communion Office. In regard to Article XXIX Dr. Darwell Stone admits that "such words are not likely to have been written by those who approved of any method of reserving the Sacrament," but he urges that "so far as the obligatory character of the Articles is concerned, they cannot rightly be interpreted as binding those who receive them to more than that reservation, and the other practices mentioned are not of the essence of the Eucharist." But how does this argument help him? The practice of reservation is not only "not of" but absolutely foreign to "the essence of the Eucharist." Dr. Darwell Stone pleads for reservation for the sick; he contends also for the permission of approach to the place where the Sacrament is reserved; and, while to him personally "there is no spiritual gain in being able to see the Sacrament in addition to knowing it is there," he "does not see any weighty reason against" Exposition of the Sacrament. He seems to be more doubtful about the expediency of Processions of the Sacrament and Benediction, but he holds they need "the most careful consideration from English Churchpeople and from the English episcopate."

But what is Dr. Darwell Stone's attitude on the
 The Doctrinal Question. doctrinal question? We quote from the chapter on Doctrinal Considerations the following passage which gives the key to the whole position:—

"If the Sacrament is reserved there are practical and devotional inferences which follow. There must be a reverent method of reservation. There must be due care about the custody and renewal of the Sacrament. Those who enter the place where the Sacrament is reserved are called to acts of worship. He Who is there present is the divine Lord Who was born of Mary, and baptized and tempted, Who taught and healed and suffered, Who died and rose and ascended, Who is now at the right hand of the Father. All that He can claim of honour, love and adoration is due to Him in His sacramental presence. The worship which the Christian soul pays to Him when the Sacrament is consecrated is paid also as it is reserved. It includes the utmost response of which the soul is capable. If it differs at all from the worship which would be His if He were to manifest His visible presence, the difference is not because of anything in Him but only because the soul might attain to something higher if the sight of the Lord were vouchsafed."

We have read this passage with regret. The doctrine of the Presence in the Sacramental Elements has surely never been advanced with greater boldness by any responsible English Churchman. It may be the doctrine of the Roman Church or of the Greek Church, but assuredly we fail to recognize it as in any way answering to the authoritative doctrine of the English Church.

We have received the following letter :—

**In Arrest of
Judgment.**

SIR,—I venture as a member of the House of Laymen for the Province of Canterbury to address you in arrest of the severe judgment on that body contained in your March number at p. 133.

I read the paragraph with attention from the commonplace meiosis with which it begins to the mouth-filling but meaningless "Sacrosanct" at the conclusion, and I began to think you did not like the House of Laymen. But I also came to the conclusion that you had been so absorbed in what Mrs. Malaprop used to call "a nice derangement of epitaphs" as to pay only scant attention to facts. Otherwise you would hardly have placed in the concluding lines that which in fact shows that the ineptitude which fills you with despair is quite possibly a quality of another character.

The House of Laymen is a "so-called representative body": granted—in the sense that its members are selected by other persons. "The general body of Churchmen are studying the report for themselves, and the more they study it the clearer they become that the scheme proposed, amended though it may need to be in some of its details, will effect a most salutary reform in the government of the Church of England." How, sir, do you know this? Is it collected from any deliberate and expressed opinion of the general body of Churchmen, or is it only a guess on your part founded upon the twofold assumption that in the first place the general body of Churchmen have given and are giving to the Report that close attention which you yourself have given it and which it undoubtedly merits, and in the second place that their attention has produced in their minds results identical with those produced in your own?

Now I venture to doubt the first of these two assumptions, and if the first is illegitimate the second has no grounds. The general body of Churchmen are (I adopt your own grammar) at the present time much occupied with other things than the government of the Church: thousands of younger Churchmen and of those who in ordinary times would be counted almost middle-aged are in distant parts of the world making it possible by the goodness of God that such questions should even be considered by their elders at home: even those elders are loyally giving their minds and bodies to urgent National Service. Under these conditions is it accurate to say that "the general body of Churchmen are studying the Report for themselves"?

But, sir, though such facts must be known to you, you still think that the "so-called 'representative' bodies" ought to give light and leading on the matter to the Church. Is that their duty as 'representatives': is not that duty already performed by the Committee who produced the Report? Leading is not merely going in front, it is going in front and getting men to follow. And the functions of a representative body are, just in so far as it is representative, to inform the leaders how far "the general body of Churchmen," for instance, are prepared to follow. I suggest that the House of Laymen has properly fulfilled its duty in this respect by adopting a resolu-

tion which indicated that the general body of Churchmen had not yet made up their mind on the Report.

For these reasons I suggest that the House of Laymen for the Province of Canterbury is not justly obnoxious to the criticisms of your paragraph.

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,

A MEMBER.

We gladly print this letter, as we claim no infallibility for our remarks whether of the "commonplace" or the "mouth-filling" variety; nor have we any special claim to a grammar that can justly be called "our own." We are open to be convinced on all points, but "A Member" convinces us on none. His letter evades—very cleverly, we grant him—the real point of the Note he sets out to criticize, which was that the House of Laymen having had a session last November when the Report was explained to members ought to have been in a position at the February session to do more than merely "receive" the Report. After three months deliberation most ordinary men would be in a position to say Aye or Nay whether they approved the main principles of the Report. The House of Laymen, however, with traditional ineptitude, could not bring itself to so momentous a decision. The phrase "the general body of Churchmen" was used in contradistinction to the House of Laymen, members of which seem to be a class apart. Our statement that Churchmen, of the general body, are studying the Report for themselves was based upon facts within our knowledge, and in the great majority of cases—there have been some exceptions—such study has led to the conclusion, as we said last month, that if the scheme of the Archbishops' Committee, with suitable amendments, were carried out, it would "effect a most salutary reform in the government of the Church of England." If "A Member" will make inquiries on his own account, and keep a steady eye upon all sections of the Church press, not excluding the Diocesan magazines, he will find that the study of this question is going forward much more quickly than he thinks.



"A Finite God."

IT is quite noteworthy, in reading almost every modern attack on Christianity (whether direct or casual, whether in the form of a system of Philosophy intended to replace the Gospel by something deemed more "adapted to the modern civilized world" like those of Bergson and Eucken, or in a magazine article or an up-to-date novel), to find that while the writer is denouncing "Orthodoxy" and "Christian Theology" as "obsolete, incomprehensibly narrow, and hopelessly opposed to the enlightened spirit and broad-minded liberality of the present age," he propounds a system of religion which—in the main, and apart from a few crudities and logical absurdities—is merely a somewhat clumsy restatement of some of the most vital and peculiar doctrines of the Christian Faith as held in all the ages. The propounder of such a theory fully believes himself to have made a great discovery, something never dreamt of before in the history of man. He states it sometimes in earnest terms, showing how deeply human happiness depends upon its wide acceptance. He contrasts this great new teaching of his with the absurdities of "Orthodox belief," very much to the disadvantage of the latter. But any well-read Christian believer, when he has mastered the often ill-chosen language in which the "new" discovery is set forth, finds to his amazement that it is nothing but what he has always known well. At least this is what I myself have noticed again and again.

That this should be so is a proof how ignorant even well educated people are of the real, genuine doctrines of the Gospel. For this there is absolutely no excuse. It is not even necessary to read Greek in order to be able to learn what the New Testament teaches on the most vital topics. It is quite possible to purchase an English version of the book. There still exist a few churches and chapels in England. Yet the great majority of writers, though devoid of any real knowledge of Christian Theology (which they have never taken the trouble to study), and even of the Bible itself, fancy that they know all about it, and are fully qualified not only to sit in judgment upon it but to expound its deepest doctrines and to hold them up to contempt. They would not venture to expose their ignorance by dealing in a similar way with Platonism or any other

philosophical or religious system, though their ignorance on such subjects may actually be less complete than it is regarding the teachings of the New Testament.

But the important fact to notice is that, opposed to and ignorant of Christianity as such writers often show themselves to be, they frequently insist upon certain leading doctrines of the Gospel as essential to men in order that they may in some degree understand the mysteries of existence, that they may find life worth living, that they may obtain comfort in sorrow and light on their " way to dusty death," yet all the time they have no idea that they are preaching the Gospel at all. What a testimony this is to the power of the truth and man's need of the Gospel message! If it is not irreverent to do so, we may say of the Truth what the poet says of Nature—

" Naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret."

An example of this fact is afforded by what Sir Oliver Lodge and Mr. H. G. Wells have in recent years written about " A Finite God." To deal only with the latter, we may turn to a book of his written since the present War began, entitled *Mr. Britling sees it Through*. Before the War, Britling, a man utterly destitute of religion, spends his Sundays in playing hockey with his family and friends. In the War he loses his idolized son Hugh. Almost heartbroken, he speaks thus to Letty, a young woman who is described as having been " a happy Atheist " until news of the death of her young husband Teddy in battle rendered her almost crazy with grief. She " had never given religion any thought but contemptuous thought for some years." Britling himself was by no means too moral a man. In his trouble Mr. Britling naturally finds himself destitute of hope or consolation, until he makes what he thinks a great discovery, which is stated in these words :

" The theologians . . . have had silly absolute ideas that He " (God) " is all powerful. That He is omni-everything. But the common sense of men knows better. Every real religious thought denies it. After all, the real God of the Christians is Christ, not God Almighty ; a poor mocked and wounded God nailed on a cross of matter. . . . Some day He will triumph. . . . But it is not fair to say that He causes all things now. You have been misled. It is a theologian's folly. God is not absolute ; God is finite. . . . A Finite God who struggles in His great and comprehensive way—who is *with* us—that is the essence of all real religion. . . . Necessity is a thing beyond God—beyond good and ill, beyond space and time, a mystery everlastingly impenetrable. God is nearer than that. Necessity is the utter.

most thing, but God is the innermost thing. ' Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.' . . . It is, you see, so easy to understand that there is a God, and how complex and wonderful and brotherly He is, when one thinks of those dear boys who by the thousand, by the hundred thousand, have laid down their lives. . . . If there was nothing else in all the world but our kindness for each other, or the love that made you weep in this kind October sunshine, or the love I bear Hugh—if there was nothing else at all, if everything else was cruelty and mockery and filthiness and bitterness, it would still be certain that there was a God of love and righteousness " (pp. 397, 398).

The pathos of this scene is moving, and the truth of the argument for the existence of a loving and righteous God founded upon the very existence of such attributes, in a limited degree, among men, though by no means new, is obvious. The absurdity of postulating a blind Necessity in order to get rid of the idea of an Almighty Ruler of the Universe is not less clear. So is the apparent ignorance of the fact that Christianity absolutely *denies* (instead of teaching, as Mr. Britling fancies) that God is responsible for all moral and physical evil. The Book of Job, if it stood alone, would demonstrate this. The Bible ascribes all evil, even physical death itself, to the Devil, not to God. Our Lord's miracles of healing are described as " destroying the works of the Devil." Christ " groans in anger " (as the Greek denotes) at Lazarus' death, when approaching his tomb with the weeping sisters. Regarding evil in the world He says in a parable, " An enemy hath done this." Christ is to reign until " He hath put all enemies under His feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is Death." Of course it is the fashion—or was before the War—to deny the Devil's existence; but that is not the fault of Christianity, nor is it one of " the silly absolute ideas " of the theologians. By negating what not only Scripture but reason and common sense, and even experience, teaches, men have got into a terrible moral difficulty, which they are incapable of solving.

But the main point to which we wish to call attention here is the " discovery " that God is " finite," not Infinite and not Almighty. By the latter term Mr. Wells seems to mean responsible for all moral and physical suffering. Leaving this aside as already dealt with, it should be observed that God's Infinity is a philosophic rather than a Biblical doctrine. We have no reason to doubt its abstract truth, but it is not taught, or at least is not insisted on, in those Books which form the literary foundation and authoritative

expression of the Christian Faith.¹ But what the Bible does insist upon is that God is the Living God, that He is Personal, and that He may be known to men, if not fully, at least very really. Now a Person by virtue of his personality is necessarily conceived of as finite. True, Herbert Spencer has clearly seen that God must be " *at least* personal," though doubtless as far superior to mere personality as the personal is superior to the mineral. But, looking at the matter from a philosophical point of view, the greater must include the less. The infinite must include the finite. Hence it is not necessary to prove that God is not infinite in order to prove His Personality, which is one of the things on which Mr. Wells most earnestly insists, and rightly, in the passage we have quoted above. It suffices to show, as the Fact of Christ does show most convincingly, that God has revealed Himself to us as a Person, as one that understands us, feels for us, loves us. This is just what is imperatively needed to satisfy the earnest yearnings of the human heart in such times of trouble, anxiety, sorrow, as those in which we live. *Now* at least, if never before, the Gospel is able, and alone is able, to give us what all of us are longing for. Without in the least intending to do so, Mr. Wells has produced a very strong argument in favour of the Faith at which he rails.

Reason teaches us that Almighty God *must* limit Himself, so to speak, in order to reveal Himself to His finite creatures. For instance, He must limit His might, if He does not wish to destroy their freedom of will and action. But that He should wish to destroy this freedom is unthinkable. For He would not have created man's will free had He had the intention of depriving him of such liberty. By destroying freedom of will, He would be destroying not merely the possibility of vice, cruelty, vileness, but also that of virtue, kindness, purity, goodness, self-devotion for the good of others, fidelity to one's plighted word at whatever cost to oneself, the laying down of one's own life to save that of a friend, or even of a helpless foe. There could be no good if there were no liberty to choose and do evil. Scripture, though not teaching this in so many words, distinctly does so in the whole history of God's dealings with the human race. Not only is evil prohibited and revealed in its true hideousness, but it is forbidden in the clearest

¹ Apart from quotations from the Septuagint, the title Πατοκράτωρ is applied to God only once in the New Testament. In the Old Testament "Almighty" is hardly a correct rendering of the Hebrew *Shaddai*.

and sternest language. Every noble feeling in man is appealed to in order to induce him to choose good and be a “ worker together with God ” in doing it.

As man’s being is finite, so too is his understanding. As one has to become a child, so to speak, in order to understand a child, and still more in order to make a child feel that you understand and sympathize with him, so God, in order to be able to reveal Himself helpfully to man, must in the nature of things—owing to the limitations of man’s nature—reveal Himself as a man, *become a man*, in what is the true essence of man’s nature as originally created. God must therefore in a measure and for a time in relation to man limit His own infinitude and become finite. This He did in the Incarnation.

Hence we see that Reason demands what Orthodox Christianity teaches. It is, of course, well known that such a thing was never even thought of in pre-Christian religious or philosophical systems. Had it been, it would have been of no practical avail. For what men needed then, and what they need now, was not and is not a theory, however beautiful, but a fact : the “ Fact of Christ.” This is what Holy Scripture presents to us as promised, as foreshadowed, as fulfilled.

From this point of view, at any rate, Christian Theology is by no means irrational or obsolete. On the contrary, it is thoroughly reasonable and up to date, in the sense of being in complete accordance with human requirements to-day, as in all ages. This we must admit, even though it teaches the “ old, old story,” the “ faith once for all delivered unto the saints.” It does not require to be modified or “ modernized ” ; much less does it deserve to be scoffed at or rejected. But it does deserve and require to be carefully and reverently studied in the authoritative books in which it is so clearly taught, and above all in the life and character of Him Who alone can reveal, and has revealed, His Father to us men, in as far as He can be understood and known by finite human beings. For, as Orthodox Theology teaches and has always taught, the Lord Jesus Christ actually is “ Immanuel, *God with us.*” As St. Paul writes, He, “ being ” (originally and essentially) “ in the form of God, thought it not a thing to be grasped at to be equal with God, but made Himself of no reputation, and, being found in fashion as a man, humbled Himself and became obedient unto death, even the

death of the Cross." That is why Christ is "the real God of the Christians," not as being another God, but as being one with His Father. That is why "there is none other Name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved," if we are willing to know God and to be saved at all. Therefore it is that He Himself declared, "No man cometh unto the Father but by Me."

As God limits His infinite power in order to enable man to possess freedom of will, and to a large extent of action, so there is nothing illogical in holding that He has also limited His power in order to permit something of the same kind to other beings higher than man in their spiritual nature, as Scripture asserts. The Bible does not fully explain the origin of Evil, nor is it necessary (or probably even possible) for us to understand it completely. What in fact *can* we fully understand? Even such an ordinary matter as the method in which our will affects our own movements is far from having been clearly discovered. But, though not explaining the origin of Evil, Holy Scripture reveals at least enough to enable us to perceive that Evil does not originate in God, that He is not its Author; on the contrary, that He is so far from willing or causing it that He hates it and offers us help to overcome it, without in any way constraining our freedom of will in the matter. He warns us, and helps us, if we will, because He cares for us infinitely. Evil is opposed to our original nature as made in His image, just as it is to His. Moral evil is, in the long run, if persisted in, fatal to us. Hence it must be overcome. Therefore it is that we are warned, nay entreated, to shun it. At least this is what Orthodox Christianity teaches. Surely it is easier to grasp and believe this than to hold that God is responsible for all the evil in the world, that He is the Author of Evil as well as of Good, which is the only alternative to accepting the Christian doctrine on the subject. The latter is not only God's own revelation but also commends itself to the reason with which He has endowed us. Hence St. Paul well says, "Since God is with us, who can be against us?"—effectively, that is.

In the extract above quoted from Mr. Wells, God is represented as sharing in our struggle against "Necessity." As, however, Necessity is but a bogey, we do not find the suggestion very helpful. But the Christian Revelation teaches us that there is a real struggle going on with a very real foe—Evil in its many forms. Against that foe Scripture tells us that we are not left to struggle alone. God

Incarnate is with us in the stern and painful contest, sharing our human nature once and for ever, uniting it indissolubly with His own Divine Nature, so that He styles Himself the Son of Man, while at the same time revealing Himself by every act and word as also most truly the Son of God, One with His Father. So “ we have not an high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmity, but one who was in all points tried like as we are, yet without sin.” Of Him it is said that “ His goings forth are from of old, from everlasting,” that He is “ The First and the Last and the Living One,” Who, though He once was “ nailed on a cross of matter ” and there died for us all, can say, “ Behold, I am alive again for evermore,” being “ Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.”

In time of peace and comfort men used too often to scoff at this “ dogmatism,” as they called it. Now many are beginning to feel that such teaching must in the very nature of things be true, everlastingly true, because so much needed. Yet some seem to fancy that they have themselves evolved the doctrine from their inner consciousness, and that it is a new and true religion, far better than the Christian Faith! It is indeed ever new, ever true; but it is none the less the old, clear and distinct teaching of the Word of God. It is the most vital part of Christianity, the essence of the Gospel, the “ Good News,” which Christ revealed.

Accepting this, we Christians have peace and comfort in God, “ the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and the God of all comfort,” and therefore believe that God is Love, that a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without our Father, that “ all things work together for good to those that love God.” We need not to accept the doctrine because a novelist, or even a man of science, has newly propounded it. We have long known it, because we have the Fact of Christ.

The teaching of our theologians may have many defects, inasmuch as theologians are but human. But the main doctrines of our faith, being founded on the Word of God, are as true to-day as they were of old, and, when reverently studied and properly understood, they are as much needed and as comforting and strengthening in our modern trials, sorrows, and perplexities, as they proved themselves to be in the days of the martyrs, whose blood was the seed of the Church of God.

An Obsolete Rubric.

IN the notices of the Easter Services it is by many considered the proper thing to emphasize the Easter Communion by quoting verbatim the penultimate Rubric from the Order of the Administration.

The Rubric runs thus: “¶ *And note, that every Parishioner shall communicate at the least three times in the year, of which Easter to be one.*”

The intention of the quoters of this Rubric is admirable. It is a laudable desire to lay stress on the duty of Communion more especially at the great feast of the Resurrection. In some cases indeed it may be feared that hereby there is an attempt to increase the roll of Easter Communicants irrespective of quality or fitness; but the great majority, we trust, are superior to the seductive influence of numbers and are solely actuated by the highest motives. Is it well, however, to quote this Rubric without preface or explanation, as an Authority? In the opinion of the writer of this article (and perhaps a little thought will induce the readers to assent) the Rubric, however desirable, is wholly obsolete—a relic of a bygone age, utterly inapplicable to present circumstances, and necessarily more honoured in the breach than in the observance.

Unfortunately it is characteristic of the Church's reluctance to adapt herself to new conditions that she persistently clings to ancient Rubrics, long after these Rubrics have fallen out of date. Even when she has the opportunity of modifying them, she disregards the opportunity. The Canterbury Houses of Convocation in their Revision of the Prayer Book propose to leave this Rubric just as it is.¹ But they also propose to leave untouched other Rubrics in the Communion Office which are equally obsolete. For instance, we may inquire what meaning in the present time have the words which immediately follow: “And yearly at Easter every Parishioner shall reckon with the Parson . . . and pay to him all Ecclesiastical duties, accustomedly due, then and that time to be paid”? What clergyman receives these duties at

¹ The present stage of revision is not final. What is criticized in this article is the last recension of the Rubrics by the Canterbury Convocation. It is to be hoped that wiser counsels may ultimately prevail.

Easter more than at any other time? It may of course be maintained that Easter Offerings, which are now more or less common, are hereby understood. This would be reasonable, if the clergy had not been for the last few years appealing against the taxation of Easter Offerings *on the express ground that they are in no sense anything of the nature of a "duty" or a debt, but the free-will offering of the contributors.* We cannot have it both ways. Either the offering is "due," and is therefore taxable; or, it is not, and then the Rubric is obsolete.

A similar clinging to an obsolete rule is supplied by the Rubric which bids intending partakers to signify their names to the Curate. This too is commonly effete. Scarcely any Churches require its observance, and, where they do, it is not observed for the early but for the late Celebration, with the questionable object of discouraging midday Communicants. Yet the Revision, as at present decided, is to leave this Rubric practically intact. Indeed, in Rubrical matters Convocation seems blindly wedded to the past. Even the Rubric about the "North Side" is to be left, though more than half the Bishops disregard it. "West is West," says Mr. Rudyard Kipling; but according to the Canterbury Convocation "North is West"—at least for those who choose to think so. The writer has no objection to standing on the West side, and for some years he has observed the "Eastward" position. To him it is a matter of complete indifference where he stands. But he feels strongly that to continue to maintain the words "North Side" when two-thirds stand on the "West" is an anachronism, an anomaly and a blunder. Surely it would be a simple matter, which ought to satisfy all parties, if "North or West" were substituted.

We must, however, limit our attention in this article to the Rubric about *Easter*. And, as it stands in its naked literalness, two propositions may be safely affirmed: (1) It is impracticable; (2) It is undesirable.

IT IS IMPRACTICABLE.

The words "Every Parishioner *shall*" evidently point, not to an ideal impossible of even approximate fulfilment, but, to a general duty with which there is a reasonable hope of compliance. At the time when these words were inserted (1552) such a presumption was in a fair way of accomplishment. The Church of England

was the only recognized Church. Dissent, as we know it now, did not exist. Roman Catholicism had not yet become schismatical. Every Parishioner was a Churchman. Parliament was then and for long after wholly composed of Churchpeople. The rules of the Church could be enforced by severe and drastic penalties. "Shall" in the Rubric was practically synonymous with "must." In the years before the Reformation everybody of proper age, with few exceptions, was a Communicant (though the great majority were content with a single Communion in the year). If people did not communicate they were liable to ecclesiastical censure and penalty. After the Reformation it was impossible to maintain the same stringency; but still obedience to Rubrics could be secured in a way impossible now, and any one who has studied the reign of Elizabeth knows how the Statute Book bristles with edicts against Nonconformity.

It is otherwise in the present time. No Churchman, however much he may incur the Divine Judgment, is penalized for not being a Communicant, beyond incurring the criticism of the more devout among his co-religionists. Indeed, he may even be regarded as a *bona fide* Churchman and allowed to vote for representation in Parochial or Diocesan Councils, though he has never gone to Communion at Easter or any other time. For, according to the franchise recently adopted at such Elections, *the electors need not be Communicants*. They must have been confirmed (that is the meaning of the cumbrous and stupid phrase "having the status of a Communicant"), but they may have never actually communicated. Yet, in spite of this condonation of laxity, we continue to retain the order that all our people "shall" communicate at Easter and at least on two other occasions in the year.

But Churchpeople, nominal or real, do not now exhaust all our Parishioners. A considerable portion in every Parish do not belong to us, and, although they may as Parishioners have a claim on our ministrations, we have certainly no claim on them. In the absence of a religious census we cannot define the exact porportion. But in the Army 70 per cent. are entered as "Church of England," which shows that the remaining 30 per cent. is alienated from us, while any one who is acquainted with the Army is well aware that much of the 70 per cent. is purely nominal, and that in an average Parish the porportion would be less favourable to the Church of

England. We have to face the fact that from 30 to 50 per cent. of the population have drifted from us even in name, and that of the portion which profess to belong to us a large number have the most shadowy conception of their duty. In these circumstances it seems foolish to maintain a Rubric which is not observed by more than one-tenth of our people and which, even if desirable, it is impossible to enforce. To allow a man or woman to exercise the rights of Churchmanship and to vote in Parochial elections, while he flagrantly neglects the primary duties of Churchmanship, is an anomaly which needs correction. The time has come to draw a distinction between a Parishioner and a Churchman. The two were much the same in 1552; they are not in 1917.

But there is yet another class which must be excepted from the Rubric—viz., the large number of children who have not reached the usual age for Confirmation.

These are Parishioners, for they live in the Parish. Can we allege of them that "every" one of them shall communicate at least three times a year? The only way by which the Rubric can be made practicable in their case is by a reversion to Infant Confirmation and Infant Communion. Are we prepared for this? In the absence of such reversion it is futile to maintain a bare rule which cannot possibly be observed with anything amounting to general or universal obedience.

But even if the Rubric were practicable, and we have shown that it is not,

IT IS UNDESIRABLE.

The Sacraments of the Church were given to be used not to be abused, and it is the duty of their responsible custodians to guard them from profanation. In the case of the Sacrament of Baptism there are searchings of heart in many quarters whether we are right in encouraging the indiscriminate baptism of any child brought to the font by enthusiastic district visitors or disreputable parents, when there is no probability of their receiving any Christian training at home. No missionary to-day would surreptitiously baptize the infants of heathenism in a vague hope that the Sacrament might somehow benefit the child, apart from any likelihood of it being followed up by Christian teaching or Christian example; and the environment of some children in England to-day is not so very far removed from heathenism.

In the case of the Holy Communion there are still stronger reasons against an indiscriminate use, because the warnings in Scripture against an "unworthy" reception are both more explicit and more ominous. Our Catechism enforces this truth by declaring that self-examination should precede reception. The Articles emphasize the peril of a careless approach. The Communion Service itself in the last of the three Exhortations is equally stern in its language. And yet, in the face of all these warnings, the Rubric without any qualifications whatsoever asserts that "every Parishioner" shall communicate at Easter. Imagine what it would mean if the injunction were to be literally obeyed. Suppose that next Easter "every Parishioner" were to present himself. This means that every Nonconformist shall come. Are those who went into a panic over the Kikuyu controversy, and were appalled at the not unreasonable suggestion that Nonconformists in the Mission Fields might under exceptional circumstances be admitted to our altars—are they likely to contemplate such a result with equanimity? It might indeed be an excellent demonstration of Home-Reunion and from many points of view a consummation devoutly to be wished; but we imagine that many of the people who print this Rubric in their Easter notices would stand aghast at the very idea. But "every Parishioner, etc.," means more than this. It means that thousands of people, living dissolute and immoral lives, are invited. It implies that no discrimination is needed. The invitation is broadcast—"Whosoever will," let him come.

Of course it will be assumed that certain restrictions are tacitly implied, and that these restrictions are supplied in other parts of the Prayer Book. It may also be alleged that the *Vulgus Profanum* is not by any means likely to accept the invitation thus widely offered. But if it be so, why is there no suggestion of reserve in the Rubric and why is it to be allowed to stand in its bold and uncompromising audacity? Much harm in the writer's opinion is caused to religion by exaggerated statements which will not bear the searchlight of truth, or fail to correspond with the observation of experience. The statement, for instance, in the *Quicumque Vult* that except a man keep the creed "whole and undefiled" (*integram inviolatamque*) "he shall *without doubt* perish everlastingly" has done not a little to repel devout and thoughtful men who have

considerable hesitation in making such affirmations. Even the bare statement in the Catechism that the *two* Sacraments are "generally (i.e. universally) necessary to Salvation" cannot be maintained, if we think of our unconfirmed children or such persons as George Fox, Elizabeth Fry and many others, who from the strange perversity of their system rejected both, though the deficiency was apparently supplied in some other way. Is it wise to issue formulas such as these, when we know that without large exceptions they cannot be maintained?

It would not be a difficult matter to frame a new Rubric suitable for present circumstances. The Irish Prayer Book has in place of ours: "*All Ministers shall exhort their people to communicate frequently.*"

This would answer the purpose; and, if it be desired to emphasize the Easter Communion, some words such as these might be added: "And all Communicants of the Church should after due preparation partake of the Holy Communion at Easter."

These words would be equally efficacious with the present Rubric and less liable to misinterpretation.

The worst of the Rubric as it stands is that it gives encouragement to that "whip-up" of Communicants before Easter which in *some* Parishes is done without discrimination or warning, as though there were a certain undefined magic in an Easter Communion which made up for neglect of it at other times. We know a Parish where the Vicar has repeatedly proclaimed it to be one of the aims of his life to reach 1,000 Communicants at Easter. He is getting near it, and one can imagine that it only wants a little extra push to induce kind-hearted and obliging people to gladden his heart, by completing the desired figure. Bishops, it may be feared, are sometimes apt to form their impressions of the success of Parish work from statistics of Easter Communicants, and when the figures are exceptionally large the fact is advertised in the press. To some extent the number may be an index of a Church's prosperity; but many other things need also to be taken into consideration, and the Churches which have the largest roll are not always those who are foremost in missionary zeal or philanthropic endeavour.

The Origin of the Episcopate: Was it a Fundamental Principle or a Development?

[Concluded from the CHURCHMAN of March, p. 138.]

OUR next question is, *Were all the Bishops of the Apostolic age diocesan Bishops of the type of the Bishops of later times?* Now it is clear that the *terms Bishop and Presbyter* (or *Elder*) were at first *convertible terms*. This is clear from St. Paul's address to the Ephesian elders recorded in Acts xx., where those who are in verse 17 called *presbyters* or elders (see R.V. text and margin) are called bishops in verse 28 (in the Greek), see R.V. text and margin. The same language is found in Titus i. 5, 7. He was instructed, verse 5 tells us, to ordain *elders* (Greek, *presbyters*) in "every city" in the island of Crete. But in verse 7 the persons called elders are called *Bishops*. In 1 Timothy iii. 3, 4, when compared with v. 1, 17, we learn that the elders placed under Timothy's control were a *body* of men, and not men who presided single handed over a Church. In Philippians i. 1 we find *only two* orders mentioned by St. Paul, *bishops* and deacons. From what has been said before it is clear that these "bishops" were Presbyters or Elders. *Diocesan Bishops they certainly were not*. For Philippi was but a single city, and it is quite impossible to suppose that so large a number of its inhabitants had joined the Church there as would constitute more than one modern diocese. And besides, St. Paul evidently had them under his control. Thus we seem driven to the conclusion that local Churches, in St. Paul's time, were governed in ordinary matters by *colleges of Presbyters*, who confirmed the baptized, and selected the candidates for Holy Orders, laying hands on them *when the members of the Church were present*, as a sign of the consent of the Church, rather than as the necessary conveyers of the grace of Holy Orders. The solemn setting apart of Paul and Barnabas recorded in Acts xiii. to their missionary work may be taken as a proof of this. Paul and Barnabas had been called by the Holy Spirit, how and when we know not, to that work. But they did not start on their errand until they were solemnly recommended to God by the heads of the Church at Antioch. *Not one of these was an Apostle*. Yet they "separated Barnabas and Saul for their work," and "laid their hands on them" before they were

“sent away.” It is extremely curious that we have a survival to this very day among us of this Presbyterian rule of the Churches in Apostolic times. The Bishop in our own Ordinal ordains the deacons alone. But when he ordains the Presbyter or elder, *every presbyter* or elder (or *priest*, which is only a contraction of presbyter) *present officially lays his hands upon the candidate*. I have many times (not alone, of course, but as one among many) ordained, or rather *helped* to ordain, elders in this way.¹ It may be well to add that in the Church of Rome, which is certainly not regarded as lax in laying down its doctrines, her leading theologians state that by far the most prevalent opinion among her divines was that Bishops were originally presbyters, and were afterwards placed over the presbyters, not as a distinct Order, but as Presbyters of higher dignity and authority than the rest. Chrysostom and Jerome stand at the head of the long list of doctors of the Church who held this opinion.²

One more reference to ecclesiastical history will conclude this section. Clement’s Epistle to the Corinthian Church, a work of the first century A.D., is written on account of dissensions “concerning the Episcopate” in that Church. It must have been written some little time before the Epistles of Ignatius, in which it is clear that a *diocesan* Episcopate had for some time existed in Asia Minor.³ No mention of a diocesan Bishop appears in it, though Clement was no doubt Bishop of Rome when it was written. Some writers have contended that the see of Corinth was then vacant. But no allusion to this fact is found, and had it *been* a fact it were scarcely probable that Clement would have made no allusion to it. Wherefore it seems that we are once more driven to the conclusion that Corinth was at that time governed by a college of Presbyters, between whom serious dissensions had arisen. This is Bishop Lightfoot’s view, and there is no ecclesiastical scholar who is saner, soberer, more cautious, or more impartial than he. It may be necessary to add that I do not, as many seem to do, regard an impartial person as one who has no opinion of his own, but as one

¹ St. Paul speaks to Timothy twice about his Ordination (1 Tim. iv. 14, 2 Tim. i. 6). The first time it is clearly his Ordination as presbyter; the second probably refers to the same thing. But probability is not certainty.

² I have not Martene at hand. But if I remember rightly, it is he who states this fact.

³ The earliest date attributed to the Epistles of Ignatius is 107, the latest 116.

who does not arrive at his conclusion without a fair and candid consideration of the views of other people. I may also be allowed to add that no record is found of any disastrous collapse in the work of the Gentile Churches after the death of St. Paul, nor any wholesale creation of diocesan Bishops. Therefore it must be regarded as *not proven* that any interference was attempted with the Presbyterian character of Church government till near the end of the first century. I may add that we have no list of the Episcopal consecrators who initiated the succession of diocesan Bishops of Corinth after St. Paul's death.

Our third question is, *Can it be proved that every diocesan Bishop mentioned as existing in the early part of the second century was consecrated by imposition of hands?* I do not wish to deny that it is extremely probable that they *may* have been so consecrated, though even then the consecrators may not have been diocesan Bishops. But a fundamental doctrine of the Church cannot be a question of mere probability. It requires definite proof. That such proof can be given is, I may venture to say, altogether impossible. It is true that we have Irenaeus, who lived and died in the second century, and Tertullian who survived till the beginning of the third, telling their contemporaries that if they desired security against false doctrine they must *trace the successions of their rulers up to Apostolic times*. But that is not the same thing as declaring that *each Bishop* must be able to *trace his Episcopal succession through his consecrators* up to Apostolic times. Each successive Bishop of a see vacated it *before his successor was consecrated*. So that a list in chronological order of the Bishops of a see tells us *nothing whatever* about the *transmitters* of the gift. The names of the consecrators in the first or second century are in no case given. It seems clear, as will be seen presently, that St. John *did* appoint Ignatius Bishop of Antioch, and Polycarp Bishop of Smyrna.¹ It is moreover clear that the Episcopate in the later sense of the word existed widely in Asia Minor before the death of Ignatius. But we do not know whether St. John laid his hands on these Bishops or not. He *may* have done so. But we do not *know* that he did so. On the contrary, Ignatius and Polycarp may have been set apart for their work respectively at Antioch and

¹ Ignatius, before his martyrdom (see note above) addressed seven letters to Churches in Asia Minor which were under Episcopal superintendence.

Smyrna, on the nomination of St. John, just as Paul and Barnabas were set apart to theirs at Antioch (Acts xiii. 2, 3). On the theory of the hymn already quoted, the "successions of the Bishops" ought to mean the *names of their consecrators*, and *their* successions up to the Apostles. It is therefore clear that it must be the *continuity of the community* which is meant by the expression "successions of the Churches," just as the continuity of a republic may be inferred from the successions of its presidents. The Bishops in the first two centuries, by whomsoever selected for their office, may therefore have been solemnly set apart for it by the Church to the oversight of which they had been appointed, the "presbytery" laying their hands upon them in token that they had been lawfully chosen for their office. It is noteworthy that *this is the way in which the Popes are appointed*, unless the advocates of the actual transmission theory are prepared to contend that each Pope is consecrated to his office by his predecessor. We do not find the Episcopal consecrators mentioned till about the end of the second century, and this is stated to have become the rule in consequence of frequent *disputed elections*. The Bishops present were required to be there in order to testify that the election was a valid one. And as late as the age of Cyprian (A.D. 258) we find him saying that the practice was even then not universal.¹ Mr. Norman Maclean, himself, I presume, a Scotch Presbyterian, tells us that, "in his opinion, it is hopeless to think of organizing the African Church of the future permanently on any basis except that of Uganda" (which is Episcopal). The "troubles" of various "missions in Africa are," he says, "in the main traceable to the fact that the black presbyter came to deem himself as good as the white presbyter, and there was no spiritual chief to teach him otherwise."² So there can be little doubt that in St. John's neighbourhood the presbyter just ordained sometimes deemed himself "quite as good" as the presbyter of years and experience (we sometimes, strange to say, find such young men in the ministry after twenty centuries of Christianity), and there was then "no spiritual chief to teach him otherwise." So the most probable alternative is that in the later years of the first century St. John strongly urged the election of a pres-

¹ See Ep. lxvii., ch. v. He says the presence of other Bishops was the custom in *almost* all the provinces.

² *Africa in Transformation*, p. 229.

byter of age and experience to preside over the rest, and that the system was found to work well, and so it spread everywhere in the end. The Epistle of Clement, already alluded to, was called forth by the fact that such troubles *did* occur, and we may be sure that there were many other instances of a similar kind. But the Episcopate, like many other things, became corrupted before the Reformation, and in many countries it had become a scandal instead of a benefit to the Church. So in *some* countries it was cast aside. Has it been proved altogether impossible for portions of Christ's Church to exist without it?

Just a few words in conclusion. The theory of the absolute necessity of Bishops in every Christian community has been supported by the argument that our Lord is stated by St. Luke (Acts i. 3) to have spent much of the time between the Resurrection and the Ascension in discussing with His disciples matters "concerning the kingdom of God," and that this necessarily involved precise information concerning the form Church organization should take. There is no such necessity. The term "kingdom of God" suggests matters of far more consequence than mere rules of organization, nor is there any subsequent hint that our Lord straitly enjoined His disciples to have from the first three orders of clergy, and no more, and ordained that every Bishop should of necessity receive his commission at the hands of one or more Bishops. Moreover there is considerable reason to suppose that our Lord left the external organization of the Church to circumstances, of course under the direction of the Holy Spirit. We may note also that in no sense were the diocesan Bishops of the first or second century Apostles. *Successors* of the Apostles they undoubtedly were. But they were not *founders* of Churches: their functions were simply administrative, and confined to a definite area; and as we have seen, there are vastly preponderating reasons for the belief that while the Apostles lived the Churches were locally governed by the presbyters who were then also called Bishops. If any general authority to define matters of faith or morals existed, it resided in the *whole Church*, of which, in later days, the voice of the collective Episcopate was usually taken as the expression.¹ Thus it appears quite certain

¹ Cyprian, *De Imitate Ecclesiae*, ch. ii, *Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*. The meaning is that the Episcopate formed a *solid whole* throughout the world, and every individual Bishop was a part of that whole.

that the rigorist theory of the absolute necessity of an Episcopate transmitted from one Bishop to another by imposition of hands is no necessary first principle in every local Church, but is at most simply a probable opinion. And the serious corruptions existing in the Church of later times, and the violence and harshness of those who exercised Church authority, may have justified those who felt compelled by the circumstances of their time to organize on other lines, and does *not* justify us in treating those who have done so as "aliens from the Christian commonwealth" and "strangers from the covenant of promise," however desirable it may be that the Episcopal regimen, so early and so long universal in the Church, and so clearly in accordance with Apostolic practice, should be retained as far as possible.

Into the question that, in England at least, the non-Episcopal bodies are schismatic, I do not intend to enter at length. But it must be confessed that the methods of conversion adopted in the sixteenth and previous centuries were not altogether persuasive, and that the guilt of the schism was not always entirely on one side.

J. J. LIAS.



Confession.

A SERMON PREACHED BY THE REV. CANON TREDENNICK,
AT CHRIST CHURCH, SPARKBROOK, BIRMINGHAM.

"Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much."—St. James v. 16.

THE subject of the Confessional is the question of the hour in the religious world. It is very unfortunate that we should be obliged to use a term around which so much controversy has raged, and in connexion with which so much evil has arisen, in dealing with a problem upon which probably all religious people are agreed fundamentally.

We all agree that sin is the evil which we have to face, that it must be faced, recognized, confessed, forsaken, and if necessary reparation made, before there can be the highest life and service. We all recognize the difficulty and complexity of the situation. The duties which we have just enumerated are of the most elementary and obvious character and yet they are just those from which we either revolt with our whole mind or which we ignore and neglect according to our varying temperament.

We further agree that while in one sense religion is absolutely a matter between the individual Soul and God, there is another sense in which no man can either be saved or serve apart from his fellow men. The two sides are beautifully expressed in Psalm xlix. 7 (P.B.V.) "But no man may deliver his Brother: nor make agreement unto God for him: for it cost more to redeem their souls: so that he must let that alone for ever;" and on the other hand Proverbs xxiv. 11, 12. (R.V.) "Deliver them that are carried away unto death, and those that are ready to be slain see that thou hold back. If thou sayest, Behold we knew not this; doth not he that weigheth the hearts consider it? and he that keepeth thy soul doth not he know it? and shall not he render to every man according to his work?" We dare not neglect either injunction. Speaking broadly the Catholic ideal ignores the first principle by interfering between the individual soul and God: the Protestant ideal ignores the second by saying in effect, it is no business of mine.

At the present moment this question and all that lies behind it has become crucial. We have all been stirred up to realize the

depths of iniquity which lie within and around us, and those who have been enlightened by the Spirit of God are keenly anxious to lead the highest life which is possible in the sinful world, and to help to lead others into it. We also know one another better than ever before. The War has broken down many barriers between nations and individuals. We think very differently of Frenchmen and Russians on the one hand and of Germans and Turks on the other now than we did a few years ago.

The same may be said of religious opinions. While we all probably hold our own convictions more strongly than ever, because we are morally stronger as a result of the discipline through which we have been passing, we can understand and appreciate other people's conscientious opinions and practices much better. We are learning to see that if we demand to be regarded as conscientious ourselves, by that very claim we must admit the same right to the other man.

A leading Free Church Minister said to me a few days ago, "Although the principles lying behind the practice of the Confessional are not officially recognized by Nonconformity, there is hardly a Nonconformist Minister who does not in some form or another carry out the idea." At a recent Conference of Men held for the purpose of combating moral evils, which was not specifically a religious meeting at all, the lecturer, speaking as a philosopher and belonging to neither the Roman nor the Anglican Church, said that he regarded the Confessional in some form as one of the most essential methods of checking immorality.

Now I think you will agree with me that we cannot afford to ignore the question. As thinkers who want to be abreast of the times we cannot shut our minds to it. As patriots who want to do the best we can for our country, we cannot refuse to discuss it. Above all as spiritual workers we must have a sound judgment and definite policy unless we are content to be mere negations at a time when every one who is worthy of God's call desires to be intensely positive and constructive.

What then is the fundamental principle underlying the system known as the Confessional?

It has two sides as all religious movements have, viz., a Divine and a human. It is adopted by religious men as a method of stirring up people to recognize the evil of sin, to move them to repentance

and discipline and to help them with advice coming from spiritual knowledge and experience.

On the other hand of course there is a subtle tendency in us all and not least in religious leaders, to be busybodies in other men's matters, to consider ourselves experts in spiritual matters and rather to patronize the layman, to try to force our own opinions upon others, to endeavour to use mechanical means for spiritual ends, to find an unsanctified pleasure in having dominion over other men's faith.

Those are the two sides put briefly, and you cannot have an intelligent conception of the question at issue unless you keep both in mind. You must not treat the religious advocate of the Confessional as if he were a designing monster who is trying to allure you into a sort of inquisition, where his one purpose is to destroy you body and soul. That this has been done goes without saying. Exactly the same disastrous results have followed from neglect of the souls of others, and neither statement closes the question.

The conscientious spiritually minded confessor knows that the accusation brought against the system is not true of him or his methods, and what is more important, his converts know that it is not true to their relationship to him and deeply resent it.

On the other hand those who believe in the Confessional must not assume that those who do not practice it are not alive to the evil of sin or are not endeavouring to grapple with it and overcome it in their own way.

Nothing is gained by despising or reviling your opponent. In fact everything is lost that way. This is specially true of religious controversy. Now I am an out and out Protestant: *i.e.*, I accept, as I have always accepted without reserve, every Article of the Protestant interpretation of Scripture teaching, but I do not hesitate to say that the official Protestant attitude or policy to-day is a hopeless one. I mean this, that we must distinguish between principles and methods. If I find that I can learn a lesson in tactics from Mr. Lloyd George, I must not say I will have nothing to do with his policy because I differ from him in almost every question of party politics. If I see that a Roman Catholic or Ritualist or Rationalist has grasped a situation, which I have failed to handle, I must not argue that his methods are useless or depraved simply because I reject his doctrines.

I have frequently pointed out that the Church has had to learn constantly from the world in recent times. So I say without hesitation that we as Evangelicals have much to learn from Roman Catholics and Ritualists. General Booth is reported to have said, or perhaps it was Moody, "Why should we let the Devil have all the best tunes?" Why should we let Romanists and Ritualists have all the best machinery to grind chaff, while we attempt to grind wheat with the old mill stone?

Again I look across at my brother clergyman who works the Confessional, and I find first that he knows intimately all his people's troubles, trials and sins and therefore he is able immediately to sympathize, to help, to advise. More than that, he gets to know of abuses and even crimes close to his own door, and by prompt and private influence can remedy diseases which all the law courts, the police, and even the soldiery could not touch. Moreover, he is at once able to mobilize his spiritual forces either for regular work or great crises. He knows exactly what spiritual work each soul can undertake according to its degree of enlightenment and progress.

Now take my own case, and I fear it is a typical one. I hardly know what half a dozen of my people really feel about the deepest things of the soul. I am sure I often put the square peg in the round hole through sheer ignorance. I feel the greatest difficulty in getting any considerable body of people to take up any united and concentrated line of action. I do not even know what to pray for on behalf of the majority of my flock. In short I do not know them, and therefore how can there be full spiritual sympathy? I fancy I hear some one saying "You have neglected pastoral visitation. That is the way to gain knowledge of and sympathy with your people." I agree, but the difficulties are great. I am serving at the present time on over fifty committees and in most cases have much executive work in connexion with them, besides innumerable other duties national, diocesan, and parochial. Effective visitation is impossible, though I could prove that it has been much more seriously attempted than perhaps many realize. Next there is the difficulty that people are more than often either out or engaged when one does call, or circumstances are unfavourable to close spiritual converse.

The Church is obviously the right and best place for all spiritual

converse. It was built for the purpose. It should always be available. It is quiet, retired, and sufficiently public to preclude the idea of secrecy. It has hallowed and hallowing associations for all of us, and this is a vital point. I could think and say and do things in Church which I could not rise to under ordinary conditions because of the calming and uplifting sense which arises from the knowledge that God is here in a special sense when we meet in His name for mutual prayer, meditation and praise. It is infinitely easier to arrange times when you can see any one who wishes to consult you, in Church, than to arrange separate private interviews in different houses. Much time is wasted in going to and fro and in the necessary preliminaries. The whole thing is unbusinesslike, while the interview at Church is dignified, systematic, inspiring and free from all objection.

Now we come to possible abuses. A clergyman may be ignorant, injudicious or even criminal. Granted, and if so you are undone, precisely as you would be in the case of a doctor who was unworthy. He might make mistakes. He might abuse your confidence. He might betray you. Just so with your lawyer. But in all organized life you have to take that risk and go upon the assumption that people are honest unless you have absolute proof to the contrary.

It is strange that many people fear to speak personally to their spiritual pastor from the feeling that they are giving themselves away: putting themselves unreservedly in his hands. Has it ever struck you that the very reverse is the case? By every law of honour, religion, morality and common sense he is precluded from betraying you or making a wrong use of his knowledge. He cannot repeat or even hint at what you have said to him even to his closest confidant. On the other hand there is nothing to prevent you from retailing every word he says to you to every one you meet. There is no reason why you should not do so. Hence arises your protection. If you do not agree with or do not like what he says or does, it is perfectly open to you to discuss it, contradict it, oppose it or neglect it. Consequently he in a very real sense puts himself in your power. You need not come at all; you leave at any moment; you are not obliged to say or leave unsaid anything in particular; you need not follow the advice given. He must first be present, and we clergy are no more desirous of being obliged to do things than the laity. He must more or less await

your time and claims. He may have to listen to many wearisome or petty details. He is sure to meet with much disappointment. I can assure you that my feeling for the conscientious confessor is one of sympathy, not criticism. I can imagine no more thankless or trying task. In some cases the spiritual peril is far greater to the confessor than to the penitent. I have already said, that if the former is a bad man no more horrible engine of iniquity can be imagined, but that applies with equal force to the very office of the Ministry.

But it is time to give you some practical and positive indication of my ideas on the subject. In the first place, any such spiritual machinery as we have been considering must be perfectly voluntary. It must not be made the condition of any spiritual privileges or a medium of any spiritual tyranny. Too frequent use of such a means should be definitely discouraged. The object is to help each soul to be strong and self-reliant, not to lean upon others, however good. No set questions should be asked of any one, least of all on some of the most sacred and delicate questions of life. Neurotic and sentimental people should be gently but firmly repulsed. The greatest reverence and reserve must be exercised in all interviews with women. I may say frankly, I do not want women to come and consult me about their spiritual affairs as a rule. Let them consult their husbands at home or other experienced friends. I do not understand them very well and might not be able to give them much help. May I say here that I would never listen to any confidences relating to their mutual affairs from either a wife or a husband. I consider any interference here is a crime. I would see them both together in cases of need, and have done so with good results.

What I do want is to talk to men as a brother man not only about politics, business, recreation, but about the deep things of the soul; about the fight that we have in common with the world, the flesh and the Devil: our victories and failures, hopes and fears. Especially do I feel that young men need this help, as they set out in life with strong passions, unformed wills and unenlightened judgments. I am sure many a pitfall might be avoided, many a mistake averted, many a fall saved by a frank and sympathetic talk from one who has been over the course and knows the ropes, I think there is no more holy or happy experience than to grasp the hand of a brother

and tell him you know all he feels, all he dreads, all he hopes for, all he tries to be and do and how often he fails; to tell him you have been through it all; that you know the bitter humiliation of defeat; the glad freedom of victory; the joy of sacrifice and service. It is worth taking some risks, to be able really to help another soul who is wrestling with life's troubled sea to find a footing on the Rock of ages; to find a real Friend in the unseen Christ, as a business man put it at a recent meeting.

Remember He is the only true Confessor. Absolutely the only One Who can give absolution, because He alone can forgive and cleanse and sanctify. May I say then that my idea of the Confessional is precisely what is commonly understood by the enquiry room in connexion with a Mission: only that it is a permanent arrangement, not dependent upon the emotions of the moment or passing feelings, but an opportunity ever ready to meet any sudden emergency which may arise, or to provide ready sympathy for the ordinary trivial round and common task.

The object is to bring the soul straight to the Lord Himself, to administer the comfort, rebuke or advice of His own Word. No absolution is authorized by our Church for private use except in the instance of the visitation of the sick in an extreme case, and it would certainly never be used otherwise by me. I could give no absolution to any one except the assurance that "if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." I have frequently refused to do so when asked for many reasons. It is an encouragement to the soul to lean on man rather than on God. You cannot be sure that a real confession has been made—in fact you may be quite sure that it has not, and to absolve a soul on a false or inadequate confession is a terrible crime. Again, you may let off too easily the guilty whom God would condemn, and, conversely, treat too harshly the smoking flax or flickering torch.

No, what is wanted is to bring the soul by prayer into the very presence of God, to pour out its needs to Him. In most cases details of sin or experience should be avoided. It is reality that is wanted. That is all.

It might be asked—what about discipline and penance? Well, I should certainly advise discipline where it seemed to be needed, and restitution where wrong had been done to another, but in

regard to technical penances I do not know of any authorized by Holy Scripture, and I have no desire to invent needless mortifications of the body, which is crucified enough to-day by the necessities of life. But self-discipline is very needful, especially in the case of the young, and much guidance is really required in most cases.

I imagine some one is now asking "Why have you used the term Confessional about a principle which, as you have defined it, is almost entirely free from all the characteristics of what is known as Auricular Confession?" Well, for this reason, that I know of no other term which would serve to indicate the matter under consideration. Next, I would much rather appear to say more than I mean, than have it suspected that I mean more than I say. To put it plainly, I would much rather run the risk of a little personal abuse by using a strong word, than beat about the bush and say, "Oh, I only mean a little ordinary talk with a spiritual application," and have people saying, "Ah, we all know he means something more than that and is only trying to take us in by using soft words."

Moreover, I do feel we have to meet all divergence of opinion with its own weapons. If you want to defeat a worldly or perverted Confessional you must set up a spiritual one. It is no use saying to people "Your system is wrong and useless," if they find that they need it and it helps them. Moreover, you are very apt to be misunderstood. I know for a fact that many Ritualists believe that we Protestants really do not trouble about sin or salvation, that we are Latitudinarians, who find our pleasure in throwing stones at others, and I must say I think we give them too much cause for this idea. Many of our Churches are closed, the Lord's Table is neglected, many of the appointments of our places of worship would not be tolerated in our own homes. Believe me there is real cause for scandal, and though I do not care what people say if it is not deserved, I do grieve that Christ and His Gospel should be discounted because those who profess to be His purest followers will not take the trouble about these spiritual affairs which even the most ignorant and perverted Romanist or Ritualist would regard as a matter of course.

I know I am to blame. I am not scolding you, but I do want to do better and I do want you to help me, to pray for me, to respond to my appeals, to work together and cast aside all unworthy suspicions, jealousies and rivalries and to realize that we are in the midst

of an unexampled crisis, of an unparalleled opportunity. If we lose it, posterity will have a right to rise up and call us cravens. On the other hand, if we can say, " Though I missed my highest destiny through ignorance, bad influences, inadequate training ; yet I made it easier for my sons and daughters to lead nobler, purer, happier, more useful lives, and I did my little part in helping to rear up a better England, to make the world a little brighter by my brief sojourn in it," then we shall not have lived in vain.

God help us all so to give our hearts to Christ that we may become by the power of His Spirit what He intended us to be when He made us in His image and likeness, redeemed us by His precious blood and gave us the glorious commission " As My Father hath sent me even so send I you."

" Confess your faults one to another." Well, I have tried to do my part. Will you do yours? " Pray one for another that ye may be healed." Here is our mutual strength and joy. Will you make more use of it? " The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous Man availeth much." Shall we all try then to be more righteous that we may have more power?

I have purposely refrained from suggesting details. We must not be in a hurry, but we cannot afford to waste time. " The night is far spent—the day is at hand. Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light."



Parochial Vignettes.

IV. OUR BRETHREN THE LAITY.

PERHAPS it would be better if a Layman himself discussed this subject rather than a mere Parson who is more than likely to lean towards his caste and to print his prejudices. Only it will occur to most people that the Layman is likely to have his prejudices too and, if he have suffered, probably his hostilities as well. Moreover, he will only be able to see one side of the subject, whereas the Parson, having himself been once upon a time a Layman, and mingling with Laymen all his life, can see both sides. Besides, knowing his personal prepossessions, he can be on his guard against them, and in his honesty will at least try to keep the scales from tilting. And so I venture to launch out upon a somewhat stormy sea, and, with many rocks ahead, to say my say on the burning topic of Our Brethren the Laity. Our Sisters the Laity is quite another subject.

And, first, a few general facts about the Laity. That they are as much a portion of the Church of Christ as the Clergy is the first great outstanding fact in which we shall all agree. The popular expression that a man who is ordained "goes into the Church" is utterly untrue, inasmuch as he is in the Church already, so that the Parson is not more "in the Church" than the Layman. Whatever some Laymen may think, and whatever some Parsons may claim, neither is superior to the other in the point of Church membership.

And the Layman is a priest, too, being a member of that kingdom of which all members are priests, yea, "a royal priesthood." Neither does he surrender his priesthood when he accepts the ministries of an ordained man. The Parson represents him; that is all. They are spiritual equals.

There are differences, of course, but they lie not here, nor in the question of character and attainable holiness of the two, for office carries no character with it of necessity.

Just as clear too is the fact that the Layman has a distinct right to place and power in the Church of Christ. He is not intended to be ruled out as an inferior, to be displaced from his lawful position, or to be treated as a baby for whom all is done without his consent or co-operation. Our Brethren the Laity are many, while the

Parson is one. He is there on their behalf, and he certainly has no monopoly of wisdom. On all such scores the Laity do well not to consent to be relegated to an obscure corner, or to be expected to swallow all that the Parson sets before them with their eyes shut.

The Laity, too, will not forget that their interests come first, that Church and ministry exist for their spiritual good, and that apart from the Laity all is meaningless. It is they who constitute the Church in that particular place and not the building or the Clergy or the Church Universal. So that if the Parson ignores them, or hurts them by innovations against which their highest principles revolt, or if he plays the tyrant in spiritual things, it is they who have the right to rise in insurrection. Of course, I am speaking of the Laity as a whole, and not of some crotchety individual who thinks that all are outraged because he is.

All these plain facts are not disputed, I believe, by anybody, lay or clerical, and if they have been forgotten or relegated to some obscure corner it is well to drag them into the full light and keep them there, for they are the charter of our Brethren the Laity. The best way to keep the peace in the Church is to maintain our rights.

It will be of advantage, I think, in the clearing of our subject to deal with a few common mistakes about the lay brethren of our Church ; mistakes which are not only common but pernicious.

They are supposed, for one thing, to lack interest in religious things. And outward appearances would almost seem to confirm the idea. They fight shy of the Clergy, and keep a steady reserve on religious topics in their presence. They are infrequent in their attendance at church. They seem wholly immersed in secularities. They even indulge in queer little smiles when others contend for this theological side or that. But appearances are ever deceitful, and the Parson who holds the opinion that our Brethren the Laity are indifferent to religious matters is wrong. They are not so silent on such subjects at home or in the company of their fellows. They read books quite recondite on deep subjects. They think more than they say about eternal things. And we may be assured that no fiction, however widespread among the Clergy, is more false. They may be, and are, uninterested in our clerical niceties, but on the deeper aspects of religion itself they feel more concerned than we know.

Then they are supposed to be shallow in their religious judg-

ments, and to be very babes in theological depths. And, were it not so sad, it would be a ridiculous position to assume. Why, there are men in our congregations listening to the crude discourses of ill-read Clergy who have thought far more deeply and read far more widely than the preacher himself has ever done. Run your eye over their bookshelves, and you will be surprised. Tap their minds on subjects of science and literature and their bearing on religious questions, and more surprises are in store. In truth, to many a Layman it is the Clergy who are the babes. It is humbling, but it is true.

Then it is supposed that their silence spells agreement, and that because they make no protests they consent to things parochial and ecclesiastical. But a great deal of revolt can lurk under a calm demeanour, and many of our Laymen are not so acquiescent as they seem to be under new *régimes* and novelties in doctrine and ceremonial. Our British Layman is long-suffering and tolerant to a degree, but there comes a time when the flash-point is reached and the inevitable explosion occurs. He just lets things go until they become intolerable, and then he "lets out" to the offender's extreme surprise.

There is one feature about our more intelligent Laity which is also a matter of misunderstanding. We Clergy do not see clearly enough that they have as a rule a greater breadth of thought than professional religionists. They give hospitality to theories and views which the Clergy call by hard and intolerant names. I do not mean that they believe them, but that they are quite willing to give them a hearing, and to test their value. They do not reject on sight, or refuse to consider what their Parsons condemn. They keep their minds open longer than the Cleric, and insist on giving the stranger a modified welcome. It may be playing with fire; it often is. But it certainly gives the man acquaintance with the depths of a subject which must be unknown to the more superficial glance. Now and then our plain lay brother breaks silence and publishes a book, and those who knew him, as they thought, well are surprised at the depth and illumination of the offspring of a mind which they deemed dormant and unconcerned. It is clear that we Clergy will have to revise some of our misapprehensions concerning our Brethren the Laity.

All this preliminary talk leads naturally to a question which

is bound to be asked and answered, and that is, What shall we do with our Laity ?

It is not merely the question of crushing a quite lawful discontent, but of using a power which the Church needs. No Layman cares to have a conciliatory sop thrown to him to keep him quiet, but, having powers which the Clergy lack, he naturally wants to be of service to the Church he really cares for at the bottom. We Clergy are very much like some of the old monarchs who, preferring to keep government in their own hands, fought for long against admitting their subjects to a share in constitutional affairs. And certain it is that, having gained a voice in the State, they are not to be denied it for long in Church affairs and Parochial Councils. And so we ask again, What shall be done with our Brethren the Laity ?

Well, as it is the Layman's Church as well as the Clergy's, treat him as a partner. That is all. Give him the chance of using his undoubted gifts. He is a better man of affairs than most of the Clergy, and he has business instincts which we have had little chance of acquiring. His common sense is not clouded by prepossessions such as ours. Tied and bound with conservative notions, fond of power and supremacy, we fancy foolishly that we shall be shelved by a too energetic Layman and reduced to impotence in our own preserves. These are idle fears. Why are we not equally afraid of crushing out his rights and silencing his voice ? This is the present danger. If we want to have lay echoes of ourselves in the parish we shall be obliged to seek out lay nonentities, and this will leave us in a worse position than before.

The truth is that our parochial danger lies infinitely more from idle, unemployed Laymen than from the busy ones. Leave them nothing to do, and their powers for mischief may develop, but keep them hard at it, and their charity will enlarge, and any dangerous qualities that lurk in the background will be stifled for want of material to keep them alive. It is the idle who are the worst critics.

Neither should we be content to give them only office work. As treasurers, secretaries, and members of committees they will shine, but some of our gifted spiritual Laymen are capable of higher work, having distinct spiritual powers. A wise Parson will seek to discover and develop these, and will see that some sphere for their exercise may be given them. Let him lay aside all fears of a possible rival in his own domain. If they clash, which can only hap-

pen if the Parson be too sensitive and self-centred, a wise Layman will see the danger and avoid it.

Let the lay brethren be consulted in meditated changes in the parish or the Church. It is better to consult them before a change than to be obliged to fight them after it has been made. Changes can only be healthy when there is a healthy public opinion in a parish to sustain them. For the Parson to change on his own initiative is only to invite dissensions and mischief. The Church is not the Clergyman's but the Church of the parish, and to ignore sensitive souls by pin-pricking changes is to nullify his influence for the whole tenure of his ministry in the place. Nobody cares to be ridden over either rough-shod or in felt slippers. It is the ignoring of their wishes, the hurting of their susceptibilities, which they resent.

The only atmosphere in which to grow good parochial plants is the atmosphere of good-will and harmony and full accord. Storms and frosts are disastrous and ruinous. And this atmosphere is generated by a mutual good-will between a Parson and his people fostered by mutual confidence.

It is probable that I have been conveying the idea that the fault is mostly on the side of the Parson for any friction which occurs between the Parson and his Brethren the Laity. Let me hasten to erase that impression in part. No doubt, it often is so, but it is by no means always so. The Laymen must bear their fair share of the blame too, if you please. Not all Laymen are easy to work with. Not all are of that pleasant sort who can collide against you without hurting. Some are undoubtedly queer and cantankerous to a degree.

Let us pass a few of the more difficult of this sort in review.

The Squire is often a considerable help to the Parson, and will stand by him in all weathers. But sometimes he is of quite another complexion. A small king in his way, the monarch of all he surveys, appointing the Parson himself perhaps, constant deference being paid him on all hands, yet a resolute Parson may prove too much for him. And resolute the Parson must be when the spiritual preserve is attempted to be shot over as well as his own secular ones. Tact will go a long way, a gentleman and a Christian will yield whenever possible, and trifles will not be magnified by a wise Vicar. But, given all this, a point may come where the tension will be too

great and too vital, and a rupture will ensue. Here is a use for the Bishop, to appoint the assailed man to another sphere, if possible, for it is no edifying spectacle this of a Squire and a Parson lodged in the same little spot at loggerheads.

Tyranny of a similar kind may easily come when some big subscriber who, having been wont to call for the tune because he paid the piper, calls too loudly and too tyrannously. It is the merit of our good Church of England that money as a rule does not make a bid for the mastery in our parishes, and, if it did, has not the same chance of success as in some more dependent body. But there are exceptions. Parishioners are very human, and there are few who will not welcome the services of some big giver to save their pockets. It is a kind of parochial suicide to do so, for they are giving up their manhood and their independence, to say nothing of putting shackles on the wrists of their Parson. For the day is sure to come when, the will of the big subscriber being thwarted, he rounds on the unhappy parish by threatening to withdraw his subscriptions. Squirming under the threat, they shamefacedly sidle away from the Parson, who in their heart of hearts they love and admire for his courage in resisting tyranny, and leave him. And then he leaves them, if he be a wise man, for the day of his usefulness has closed in that place. He might stay and fight it out, but it is better not to strive. And the man of money stays and crows, believing himself to be a conqueror rather than a bully.

But there are managing lay brothers who are neither Squires nor big subscribers, but who by long wont have climbed into the seat of the driver, and have so long held the reins that they find a difficulty in giving them up even to the lawful driver. And woe betide the poor Parson who finds himself in the predicament of being made one of the team in his own new parish. There are elements here of a pretty quarrel, which the most peaceable man in the world can scarcely refuse, unless at a payment too large for honesty and independence to pay. And the first act of independence will be the first spark in the powder barrel. The managing brother, strong in his integrity, will be outraged and surprised, and will proceed to put him in the wrong for all that he is worth. And because explanations are lengthy, and the people know him better than they know the Parson, and because they have been so long used to the *régime* of the lay brother, the victory will probably lie with him as he

shakes the dust from his violated feet and leaves the Church to see what the parish will do without him. Of course the Parson will live it down, but it is probable that for many years the sparks from that first collision will fly about.

In every parish, too, there is sure to be an opposition like the House of Commons. The Vicar, being a mature man, we will say, has his theological prepossessions already fixed; and so have his parishioners. He cannot possibly agree with all. And so he will be either too high, or not Evangelical enough, or too broad, or too changeable. Theology is everybody's subject, and the washerwoman prides herself on knowing as much about truth as the Parson. And when he comes among his new people he finds himself in constant collision with somebody's views, and all their owners, being quite convinced that they are right and he is wrong, keep him in perpetual hot water. Curiously enough, the greatest friction will come from those who are nearest to the Parson in opinion, just as relations or members of the same family when they quarrel do so more rancorously than unrelated neighbours. There is, to be sure, a way of keeping the peace and allaying opposition, and that is by being dead and insensitive to truth at all, or by playing the hypocrite and concealing your real views, making it your business to reflect everybody's views in turn. But then the possibility of being found out must be a constant dread. It is this certain bitterness of religious faction which puts sharp thorns in the parson's pillow and poisons his parochial cup.

Conservatives of the stiffer sort are often found among our Brethren the Laity who insist on always keeping the same level, the same colour, the same practice. The slightest suspicion of change, and they are up in arms. Thus, some parishes have been thrown into a convulsion by the very suggestion that it might improve the service if they sang David's Psalms in David's way. But not a bit of it. It is the thin edge of the wedge. We smile to-day as we remember the old struggle over the question of the black gown or the surplice. Every change which has brightened our services to-day has been won in the teeth of the bitterest opposition. Conservatism is an excellent drag, but it was never meant to overturn the coach or to stop its progress altogether. If a Parson be mad enough to head for a precipice, then on with every drag you have, but on matters which involve no principle it means nothing

but obstinacy to oppose changes. But no Parson is thoroughly trusted. The Conservative watchdog is ready to bay out at the least movement which implies a change. And not infrequently he barks at and bites the wrong man.

Face to face with Conservatives in our parish life we have the mild or headlong Reformer. He is all for changes, changes frequently, unwelcome changes. He wants to improve the services and run with the fashions in ecclesiastical millinery. Sometimes he wants to change in a more Protestant direction and to make the services simpler, as he would put it, but balder, as others would express it. Any way our Reformer is somewhat of an Anarchist, and heads towards a general upset of present conditions in order that he may build something which he thinks preferable. He fancies that out of the whirlwind which lays prostrate all that is familiar and old he may pluck something which he fancies is æsthetically or prosaically superior. And, being a bold fellow, he is ever to the front at Vestry meetings, and urging on his pet ideas at all costs. By and by, he gets a party around him, and, if the Parson be malleable, bit by bit he gets his way, and soon a stranger coming back to his old parish will wonder whether the Reformation has not been reversed and the Pope in possession, or, on the other hand, whether Geneva has not come back with its Puritan ways. It is astonishing what one bold Layman with a steady push will achieve in a parish of molluscs, and where the Parson has lost his backbone.

Sometimes the adverse lay element takes the form of unspirituality which, combined with ecclesiasticism, makes a sad mixture in the parochial cup. A spiritual Parson set over against this type of man will meet with some hard rubs. The external will fight to the death against the internal, and the moment the Parson tries to get below the surface this lay brother will promptly set up his back. His ideal is social, and he feels that the world must be dragged in neck and shoulders to aid and abet the welfare of the church and parish. Concerts, dances, card-parties, lotteries, and the whole kit of the world are to make the parish "go." And, if he gets his way, it does go . . . to the Devil. With this element in his midst, the Parson will find his Brother the Layman a continual opponent, and they will spring as far asunder as the poles.

It would be easy to multiply these lay cranks and oddities, but I

should be sorry to leave the impression that these form the staple of our Brethren the Laity. They are the exception, decidedly, but an exception, in such prominence and evidence that they seem to be more numerous than they are. And undoubtedly their power for discomfort is greater than that of any number of loyal, helpful friends is for good.

Neither are they as a rule such as may not be won over by patience, gentleness, tact and prayer. But they require careful handling, and only a clever, wise man can hope to steer their energies into pleasanter channels. Nettles can be handled with impunity by those who grasp them firmly, and it must never be forgotten that most of these angular Laymen mean well, have real goodness at the bottom of them, are like good watchdogs more ready with bark than bite, and are only noxious because they want to be very faithful and to scotch heresies and the beginnings of evil. And so, if we can only win their confidence and friendship, we shall often find them the very best of energetic helpers and the most loyal. If we can only suppress resentment and anger, and listen well, and, as far as conscience will allow, take their criticisms in good part, show them that we appreciate their interest in the parish and will be glad of their help, and give them something to do, we shall find that such treatment will avail much. But now and then our brother the Layman will have nothing but war, and war to the knife, and then the only thing to do is to let him alone and let him rage.

And what he will do can be pretty well anticipated.

He will probably try to make a party against the poor Parson, and gather as many irreconcilables together as he can. And he must be a man of poor resources who cannot raise a rattling battle-cry and invent some glaring banner of revolt.

If a Curate of feeble and disloyal nature be on the parochial premises, he will run him against the Vicar, pat him on the head and aggravate his grievances until they become a veritable revolt. And then is seen a parish divided against itself; one of the most unhappy of spectacles.

Of course, he will withdraw his subscriptions and seek to starve the parish funds. Should he be a wealthy rebel, this will be a serious matter, as he very well knows.

Very probably he will leave the church severely alone, and either

attend some rival one, unless it happens to be too far away, or else go to chapel.

And in many other ways which his ingenuity will invent he will try to starve the Parson out, or make things so uncomfortable that he will cut and run. It is all very malicious and very petty, but in a little parish one unkindly disposed man can do much damage to religion and peace. Then it is that we may thank God for our independence as a Church, for the little endowment there may be, and for the many who are left true and staunch to fill up the empty place. There is a healthy common sense in most parishes which sees where the right lies, and, however silent men's voices may be, they will show by their suggestive silence that though they cannot safely speak they are still friendly and sympathetic and understanding.

One last word or two to our Brethren the Laity. I have been speaking about them ; now let me speak directly to them.

I have tried to show your power for good or for evil. You know it for yourselves. I have tried to point out the legitimacy of your rights, and the propriety of your standing up for them. But, in your zeal for your rights, be heedful that you do not trample on the rights of others. And, above all, let the Parson's peculiar province be left to him and not invaded. There will be no differences if we all keep to our own line of metals. Give him credit for good intentions, and do not suspect too quickly. If you have your doubts about him, have them out quietly and courteously face to face, and until then put your finger on your lips and be silent. Half the suspected things of life are innocent both in their intentions and meaning. Give him the benefit of the doubt. Be careful not to magnify trifles and make mountains out of molehills. Remember in your zeal for orthodoxy that truth has many sides, and that he may be insisting on the side that is least familiar to you and therefore more necessary than you think. It is quite possible that you are fathering your Parson with views that he does not hold and forcing upon him conclusions that he has never thought of drawing from them. The same truths can be expressed very differently according to the mind through which they have passed, and yet they are the same truths. Remember too how difficult it is to listen correctly and to remember the turn of phrase which was used for the conveyance of the truth which you suspect to be outraged or denied. If in doubt,

go and ask him what he did say, and stop the wrong impression quickly. Perhaps you are too sensitive and too ready to take offence over trifles. Perhaps you are prone to a vivid imagination. Such a tendency is provocative of much misery to all. Do not surrender yourself to its alarms. A bit of real charity will work wonders in such cases. Half the troubles in life, parochial and personal, come from a too lively imagination. It is well not to jump to conclusions too hastily. Sleep over them. Things get balanced in course of time. More light comes as we wait for it to come. If you suffer from self-importance do not permit it to live. It is the fruitful parent of a bad offspring. Take a better measure of yourself. Humble people rarely take offence. If they are not consulted, they do not mind. If they are overlooked, they think it was a lapse of memory only. Neglect does not hurt them because they do not expect to be kow-towed to. They are a poor target to hit and hurt just because they do not expose themselves broadside on. And, whatever you do, keep on high ground. One is your Master, even Christ, not the parish or its Vicar or any council in the parish, but higher by far. And, realizing that, your ambition will be to bring glory to Him, to advance His Church and to lighten the burdens of His children your brethren in Christ. Littlenesses vanish when you get high enough, and, with the far horizon stretching out beyond you, you will not think so much of the many disturbing things of mundane life as of the great features of the eternal Kingdom.

A glorious sphere have our Brethren the Laity, a sphere which none but they can fill, and if all were as good and diligent as some are we should soon see prosperity abounding in our parishes and in the great world of human life.

CHARLES COURTENAY.

[The next article in this series—"Our Sisters the Laity"—will appear in the May number.]



The Missionary World.

THE Bishop of Madras has once more written notably on the Mass Movement in India. His paper in the *Church Missionary Review* for last month deserves the closest examination, and that not with a view to ascertaining whether the need be as urgent as previously represented, nor for the purpose of accumulating further stocks of knowledge, but to impel to swift and adequate action. Indeed such is the position, and so fully is the Church at home already in possession of all the information it can with any reason ask to receive, that to pile up convincing facts for any other purpose than that of getting to work is to pile up the condemnation of those who knew and yet did nothing. The Bishop reviews the situation in C.M.S. areas, quotes from the American Methodist Episcopal Church, from Wesleyans and Presbyterians. All that he extracts from their statements he illustrates by the pathetic plea of a poor villager in the United Provinces who came again and again to the missionary's camp asking that his village might be made Christian, and whose "constant cry was 'The crop is spoiling'". Remarkable figures are quoted from the report of the commissioners appointed by the A.M.E. Church to inquire into the Mass Movements of their own missions. In twelve months (1914-15) baptisms numbered 35,000, those turned away 40,000, waiting inquirers who have waited in vain 150,000, people who are now beginning to turn to Christ 1,000,000. What must profoundly move us is the fact of the numbers who wait for teaching and the numbers who are refused baptism. That the refusal is right, no one doubts, that it should be necessary is shocking. The Wesleyan Mission in Nizamabad presents the same conditions. "The whole country-side seems to be turning to God. Within eight weeks 2,000 people were received into the Church." So also with the Presbyterians—"hundreds are seeking baptism and thousands of baptized people are in sore need of further instruction." Another Presbyterian Mission says, "Practically all those belonging to the depressed classes may be regarded as candidates for baptism." The Bishop identifies himself with the remark of a Wesleyan missionary in view of all the facts the case presents: "It is a sin not to baptize

these people, but it is a greater sin to baptize them and then leave them in their ignorance."

* * * * *

It is this baptized ignorance (no less than 83 per cent. of the Christian population are illiterate) which is so serious, and it is this which indicates where help can be most wisely applied. The proportion of village schools to villages in which there are Christian congregations is startling. For instance, where in the whole of South India there are 2,549 villages of this description, there are only 1,155 schools. From his study of the relation of education to the Mass Movement in South India, the Bishop deduces that "the number of schools ought to be doubled in Tinnevely and the Telegu country and increased by two-thirds in Travancore and Cochin, and that the number of Christian children at school ought to be increased by more than a half in Tinnevely and doubled in the Telugu country." Here is something *to do* and to begin to work towards at once.

* * * * *

The Bishop of Madras indicates a possible course of action suggested at a conference held in London last autumn, by the establishing of institutions in India similar to the remarkable institutions of Hampton and Tuskegee in America for the education of negroes, in which Indians should themselves be trained to work as leaders in the redemption of Indian village life, and to deal with the problems of their own people as Europeans and Americans never can. More, no doubt, will be heard of this proposal; it seems to carry with it germs of fresh hope, and all who are familiar with the impressive results of the great American institutions will hail the suggestion approvingly. We may well ask, with so vast and urgent a question before us as the Mass Movements, what are we doing with practical statesmanship to adopt active measures commensurate with the opportunity and the need? Is fuller co-operation in missionary work being thrust on us by the vastness of our task? This is an idea which must now permeate all missionary thinking. Interpreting an address of the Rev. C. C. B. Bardsley's at the C.M.S. Training School recently held, the Rev. C. H. K. Boughton writes in the *Church Missionary Review* :—

"It will be quite agreed again that neither the C.M.S. nor any other

single society is adequate to meet the colossal missionary demands of our day, and that we must gladly recognize and welcome the contributions of others. Opinions will begin to diverge on the question how far co-operation with others is possible. They will diverge still more on the question whether our Lord's saying, 'He that loseth his life for My sake shall find it,' is applicable to societies as well as to individuals. These grave and difficult problems probably must await solution by consent under the guidance of God's Spirit."

* * * * *

"The doctrine of the one front is the foundation of success for the allied cause," so writes Mr. J. H. Oldham in a powerful statement of "The Importance of Co-operation in Missionary Work" in the *Foreign Field* for March. Clearly what is vital for the victory of the Allies is also a vital principle in the spread of the Christian faith; it has taken many painful months to secure the co-ordination of all the naval and military forces engaged in the war—how many more years must pass before we face adequately the problem of missionary co-operation? The difficulties in which the problem is involved, the obscurity of issues which it is conceivable might arise, are greater relatively even than those which involve the grouping of nationalities and political susceptibilities in the war. Nevertheless, if the latter did not daunt us, if the numberless anticipations of failure were not realized, neither should we be deterred from facing courageously the greater attempt. A just appreciation of the size of the missionary enterprise is what we need; were we to see as much and as far as we might we should turn from our task in the world as Christians to our co-operation as Christians, and illuminated by the larger vision the lesser vision would not be denied us in patient search. The whole subject falls into two simple parts, easily approached—What would co-operation attain? How should co-operation be attained? And this is the order for the search. No one, least of all an Anglican, can for a moment trifle with the difficulties involved, nor gloss over the underlying problems, nor evade the obstacles which lie in front. But after admitting all this, the fact remains that for the triumph of the Gospel the arguments for practical co-operation in missionary work are greater than any that can be urged against it. And the fact remains also that there are measures of co-operation which can be taken which involve no compromise of principle or of order, in the taking of which further light will come, measures which would rapidly advance the Kingdom of God.

Mr. Oldham argues that the missionary societies "must come to look upon co-operative work as being as real and integral part of their proper work as their own independent efforts." This is raising the issue of co-operation in the right place, first, because the societies are entrusted with the missionary work of the Church; second, because the societies are independent of one another in their operations, though fraternal in spirit. Co-operation is not a pious aspiration; it only exists when it is expressed in action, and it is therefore only—as things are at present—in the spheres of the societies' work that it can be practised. It would seem that the time has come in which the principle and theory of co-operation, its limits and its range, must be zealously and studiously discussed in all missionary centres; such measures of co-operation as may be immediately wise must be put into operation and the way cleared for all greater measures of co-ordinated effort which await us as the Church's mission to the world is unified. Mr. Oldham justifies his assertion that co-operation is an integral part of the societies' "proper work" by stating that "co-operation is necessary if we are to accomplish the large things to which we are called by the present situation in the mission field." He adds, "When I speak of 'large things' I mean that there must be nothing too great for us to attempt in the name of Christ. . . . In the mission field new and powerful forces are re-shaping the whole social, political, intellectual and religious life of the peoples. We must reckon with these conditions if we are to do our work successfully. We must not be afraid to face these mighty forces in the name of our Lord. We must be prepared to conceive larger objects of endeavour and to undertake larger tasks than the missionary movement has yet attempted."

* * * * *

In his concluding paragraph Mr. Oldham uses an argument which brings us back to his starting point, but which also moves the younger men and women among us—as well as many of the mature—as no other argument moves them. He says, "Under the conditions prevailing in the world to-day it is essential that the progress of Christianity in the great mission fields should be viewed as a single whole, and that the missionary societies should face in common the almost overwhelming problems with which in the providence of God they have been called to deal." There is a righteous passion abroad for viewing the "single whole," for release from any non-

natural barriers, for the removal of every removable hindrance to common action. Perhaps it is scarcely realized by us in our slow-moving ways that there is nowadays a holy impatience with unnecessary separations in the spreading of the Kingdom; we are expected to face every issue in the light of the hour in which we live and neither to perpetuate the past nor mortgage the future for lack of strenuous thought. Co-operation in missionary work arrests us with its possibilities; we must not refuse its call.

* * * * *

In his singularly interesting survey presented to the Annual Meeting of the S.P.G. in February, Bishop Montgomery gave valuable information as to the disposition of German missionaries and missions at the hands of the British and French authorities, details of which have already appeared in the Church press. This survey, as given in the *Mission Field*, is noted for its cordial references to information gained in contact with leaders of many missionary societies of many denominations. "It is difficult," says Bishop Montgomery, "to express adequately the advantages gained by contact with such leaders. It is for conference, remember, in order to make clear what are the greatest questions of the day." So again we find the note of brotherhood and good will. A phrase, new historically, but now on many lips is "the humanizing of industry." The humanizing of the missionary industry is proceeding also, as fresh contacts are created on all these matters where contacts can rightly be effected. No doubt as a result of that conference to which the Bishop refers other missionary societies will rejoice more heartily than ever on hearing that the income of the S.P.G. shows a total increase of £815. The increase occurs on what is popularly known as "living money," for owing to a falling off in legacies and in the payment of legacies, there is a decrease of £11,963, part of which will presently be made good when conditions permit the paying off of legacies to take place. But the cheering fact remains that, notwithstanding all, such a result should have been given in the third year of the war.

G.



Preachers' Pages.

HOMILETICAL HINTS AND OUTLINES.

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

The Sunday next Before Easter.

Text: He "made Himself of no reputation."—*Phil.* ii. 7 (Epistle).

Though the day is known to us as Palm Sunday there is no reference in the services to the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, it being reserved for reading in Holy week as forming part of the story of the Passion. But the epistle reminds us that there was even in this passing triumph another element—"meek and sitting upon an ass"—that of lowliness. The Saviour's humiliation was

I. AN ACT OF HIS VOLITION. "He made Himself of no reputation." Nothing of all that He endured was imposed upon Him. From first to last it was His own act and deed (*John* x. 11, 15).

II. AN ACT THAT INVOLVED: (a) *The Incarnation*. "Made in the likeness of men. He took not on Him the nature of angels, but He took upon Him the seed of Abraham" (*Heb.* ii. 16). (b) *Obedience*. Whatever else the Kenosis involved it at least necessitated His subjection to earthly authorities—e.g. to His parents (*Luke* ii. 51); to His Church, observance of the Passover, etc.; to the law of the land (*Matt.* xxii. 19). (c) *The Crucifixion*. "Even the death of the Cross." The ignominy of it was terrible: to a sensitive nature the suffering would be intense. Gethsemane shows that He was fully aware of what it would cost.¹

III. AN ACT NECESSARILY ANTECEDENT TO HIS EXALTATION. He more than once enunciated the principle. He did more—He exemplified it. "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted" (*Matt.* xviii. 4; xxiii. 12). "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him."

IV. AN ACT THAT CONSTITUTES HIM FOR EVER A PATTERN TO US—*1 Peter* v. 6. "Let this mind be in YOU."

Be Thou exalted Lord,

The highest name in earth or heaven:
Let angels sing Thy glorious love,

And bless the name to sinners given;
All earth and heaven their King proclaim;
Bow every knee to Jesu's name!

Good Friday.

Text : " He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."—*Phil.* ii. 8.

The Cross of Christ is at once the greatest tragedy and the greatest triumph of the ages. It has inspired poets, painters, sculptors, musicians, and much of the best that these have produced has been a setting forth of the Glory of the Crucified. Once more, in full sight of Calvary, let us gather together some of the more significant lessons it teaches.

I. THE CROSS REVEALS AN EVERLASTING ANTIPATHY. This is the intense hatred cherished by evil towards moral goodness. (a) *It had its genesis in hell.* Here, in the nether world, dwells one who kept not his first estate and who cherishes a malign hatred of righteousness. Early in human history he set himself to dethrone it, and seemingly with some measure of success. (b) *This hatred soon found expression in human life.* It was Abel's goodness that incensed Cain and incited him to murder his brother. This is distinctly stated in 1 John iii. 12. (c) *At the Cross this hatred secured but a passing triumph.* The enemies of Christ rejoiced, but their joy was destined to be shortlived. Christ is not vanquished, He is the Victor! When we are tempted to wonder if after all evil is more powerful than goodness, we find our answer in the Cross.

II. IT REVEALS THE DIVINE ATTITUDE TOWARDS HUMAN SIN. Here, again, is an everlasting antipathy—God hates sin. Text. If it were something of which He thought lightly or could condone, the Son of His Love would never have hung on the tree (Gal. iii. 13, Exod. xxxiv. 7).

III. IT REVEALS THE THOUGHTS OF GOD TOWARDS THE SINNER. True, His antipathy to sin is eternal, but so is His love for the sinner. He is "loved with everlasting love." (a) *Redemptive processes have been at work "from the foundation of the world"* (Rev. xiii. 8). These were freely and fully typified under the old covenant. See Genesis xxii., etc. (b) *The efficacy of the Cross operates in both directions—backward as well as forward.* It covers "the transgressions that were under the old covenant" (Heb. ix. 15), and reaches on to generations yet unborn.

Easter Day.

Text : " Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us."—1 Cor. v. 7.
We read to-day the account of the Passover in Exodus, and unite

in the Easter anthem in which St. Paul connects these two Sacraments of Redemption. [On the subject of the Passover and its significance Trumbull's *Threshold Covenant* will be found to contain much that is suggestive.]

Let us consider—

I. THE HEBREW PASSOVER. (a) A Feast of *Redemption*. The basis is atonement. The token of it is blood (Heb. ix. 22; 1 Peter i. 19). (b) A Feast of *Resurrection*. Egypt is not to be the grave of Israel: she came out of it in fulfilment of many promises (Ezek. xxx. 15; Hos. xiii. 14; Ps. xlix. 15). (c) A Feast of *Repentance and Renewal*. "With bitter herbs shall ye eat it" (xii. 8). "With unleavened bread" (1 Cor. v. 8). (d) A Feast of *Recollection*. "Ye shall keep it . . . for ever" (xii. 14, 17, 24, 26-7).

II. THE CHRISTIAN PASSOVER. "Christ our Passover" (1 Cor. v. 7). (a) A *Picture*. The scene on Calvary is enacted again. The Passover Lamb appears again (Isa. liii. 7). See Exod. xii. 46; John xix. 33, 36; cf. Ps. xxxiv. 20. (b) A *Partaking*. The flesh of the Pascal Lamb was to be eaten (John vi. 53). When the conditions are fulfilled—"rightly, worthily and with faith," Art. XXVIII)—there is "verily and indeed" (Catechism) a true partaking. (c) A *Prophecy*. (1) Of the Lord's return. "Till He come." (2) Of our own Home-coming (John xiv. 3). Every Eucharist points *back* to the Cross and on to the great feast on High.

Sweet memorials till the Lord
Call us round His heavenly board:
Some from Earth, from Glory some,
Severed only "Till He Come."

First Sunday After Easter.

Text: "Peace be unto you."—*John* xx. 19-23 (Gospel).

A strangely eventful day was drawing to a close—"the same day at evening"—and the disciples are assembled, or at least ten of them (St. Mark says "the eleven," but St. John notes the absence of Thomas). Possibly there were present, too, others. They would want to hear the experiences of the holy women and of the two disciples from Emmaus, as well as those of Simon Peter. We can hardly doubt that there was a good deal of anxious discussion. We notice—

I. THE COMING OF THE RISEN LORD. His presence was revealed to them. It was by a miracle. This is probably one of the reasons why St. John recorded the fact that "the doors were shut."

Thus our Lord reveals the potentiality of the "spiritual body" (1 Cor. xv. 46). It is free from the limitations to which the "natural body" is subject under existing conditions. But beyond this nothing is revealed. Observe the conditions under which He appeared. (a) *When their human hearts fainted within them.* The malignity of the foe had been demonstrated. It was little wonder that "fear of the Jews" (v. 19) helped to draw them together. Jesus knows when the flesh is weak, when courage is at a low ebb, and in such an hour is "at hand." (b) *When the doors were shut.* The outside world was shut off by the closed doors. It was probably an accustomed place for meeting "in His name." See Matthew vi. 7; xviii. 20.

II. THE COMMISSION OF THE RISEN LORD. "As . . . so send I you" (v. 21). This would not always mean recognition or acceptance (John xv. 20). There is power conferred for service. "He breathed on them." This symbolic act the Church has never adopted, but has substituted the laying on of hands. "What Jesus gives them is not a simple promise, but neither is it the fullness of the Spirit; it is an earnest. . . . By breathing on them now He associates them with His life as the Risen One" (*Godet*).

Second Sunday After Easter.

Text: "Ye were as sheep going astray."—1 *Pet.* ii. 25 (Epistle).

St. Peter has been addressing himself to persons set under authority—servants—and has been enjoining the duties of *obedience to all* (v. 18) and *patience through all* (vv. 19–20). The incentive is the example of Christ in Whose steps we are to follow (v. 21). He finally reminds them of the purpose of the Lord's death—to redeem men so that they might "live unto righteousness" (v. 24); they are to be "dead to sins"—a phrase which he most probably caught from St. Paul. He concludes with a comparison between the past and the present experience. Observe—

I. THE GRACELESS PAST OF THE UNCONVERTED. (a) A statement of fact. "Ye were . . . astray." (b) A similitude. "As sheep." Sheep going astray serve to illustrate (1) *The sheer stupidity of sin.* To be unmindful of privilege is to be guilty of folly. See Psalm xxiii. (2) *The evil influence of sin.* Watch a flock of sheep "going astray." The whole will blindly follow one wanderer: so great is the power of example.

II. THE SHEEP GATHERED IN BY THE SHEPHERD OF SOULS.

"Now returned" (v. 25). The methods of the Shepherd are described in John x. and Psalm xxiii.

And I ever hear Him say,
As He goes along His way,
O silly souls! come near Me,
My sheep should never fear Me;
I am the Shepherd true.

III. THE SHEEP GUIDED AND GOVERNED BY THE BISHOP OF SOULS. He is the Overseer and Guardian. He Who is the Saviour must be recognized as the LORD of the life.

Third Sunday After Easter.

Text: "Strangers and pilgrims."—I *Pet.* ii. 11 (Epistle).

The Apostle in the context enjoins purity of life. "All those three, which St. John speaks of (1 John ii. 16), the world's accursed trinity, are included under this name of 'fleshly lusts'" (*Archbishop Leighton*).

He invites them to consider their position, not citizens of this world, but "sojourners" (R.V.). See Genesis xxiii. 4 and Psalm xxxix. 12. And yet lest they should on this account consider themselves entitled to reject or disregard constituted authority, he enjoins on them the duty of obedience—"submit yourselves," etc. (vv. 13-17). The imagery of the text is both familiar and suggestive. We have—

I. A DEFINITE EXODUS. Every pilgrim life must have its starting-point. Abraham's exodus affords an example of this (Gen. xii. 4; cf. Heb. xi. 8-10). Such an exodus involves sacrifice, and only those who walk by faith rather than sight are ever likely to make the adventure and sing—

Lead me by Thine own hand,
Choose out the path for me.

II. A DEFINITE OBJECTIVE. Exodus vi. 4. These Old Testament worthies were not mindful of the country whence they came out. "The loom of the land of God" was no mirage in the desert, but a glorious reality of which they never lost sight (Heb. xi. 13-16). The expectation of the "better country" is a powerful incentive to holy living (1 John iii. 3). No "fleshly lusts" are there (Rev. xxi. 27).

Pilgrims here on earth and strangers,
Dwelling in the midst of foes,
Us and ours preserve from dangers,
In Thine arms may we repose:
And when life's short day is past,
Rest with Thee in heaven at last.

ILLUSTRATIONS.

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

The Danger Zone. In the autumn of 1915, an American liner was crossing the Atlantic, bound for England. As she approached the danger zone, where enemy submarines might be expected to appear, looks of anxiety were plainly depicted on the faces of those on board. But there was one man who betrayed no fear, who felt no anxiety. He was the Lord Chief Justice of England. He explained the reason of this in his speech at the Guildhall Banquet in London, when he told the story of his voyage home. He said : " There was a place appointed where, I had been told by telegram, Mr. Balfour (as First Lord of the Admiralty), in his kind solicitude for me, had arranged for me to be met and escorted by British destroyers ; and where they are to be seen, no German submarine is known. We approached the place, and about ten minutes before we were due, I went for'ard to see whether any signs were to be descried of a British ship. I saw nothing. But such was my confidence in the British Navy, that it did not cause me even the slightest trepidation. Within a moment or two I saw on the horizon far away two little specks appearing. I shall not easily forget the scene on board that liner, when men, women and children, recognizing they were warships, rejoiced and congratulated each other, never doubting for one moment that on that vast expanse of sea the vessels approaching were British warships. And so they were." A promise of security in the place of danger had been given to the Lord Chief Justice by Mr. Balfour, on behalf of the British Admiralty. He believed the promise would be kept, and his experience proved that his faith was justified. In our voyage across the ocean of life there are places where the soul will be exposed to the perils of temptation, in some form threatening its salvation. The wise man knows that he must pass through that danger-zone. He is fully aware of the craft and subtle cruelty of the spiritual foe that will meet him there, and also of his own powerlessness to avert the shaft of unbelief or the deadly strength of some overmastering passion. But if he commits himself to the keeping of Jesus Christ as his Almighty and loving Saviour, he carries in his heart the promise of being met when the hour of trial comes. And if his faith is strong enough, he will pass through the danger-zone

without fear, because he will be safeguarded by a Divine escort. Yea, the Presence of God Himself will be his shield of defence.

* * * * *

The Failure of Civilization. In the German Peace Note sent to the Allied nations in December, 1916, the Imperial Chancellor described the War as "a catastrophe which the bonds of a common civilization more than a thousand years old could not stop." We are not as a rule able to accept as true any statements made by Herr von Bethmann-Holwegg. But here he certainly uttered a truth which no one would think of controverting. These words of his are the confession of a great failure—the most colossal failure that has overtaken the human race since the Fall of our first parents. Civilization indeed has failed—or, we may put it otherwise and say that German Kultur, boastfully asserted to be the acme of civilization, has produced a ghastly and hideous failure, the cause of which is that civilization has been made to rely on the moral sense that is in man regardless of Divine Grace ; and so it has become the tool of a brutal materialism. Something else, something better and higher, is needed to save civilization itself from eventual suicide. There is one thing only which can do this. It is the full acceptance by nations and men of the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ—obedience to the Gospel of the Love of God. There alone can security be found for civilization to withstand the selfish ambitions and diplomatic mistakes and mutual misunderstandings by which nations are lured or driven to fight against one another.

* * * * *

The Bible "Anywhere." After the battle was over, among the slain on the field lay a dead officer. He was found there by a Chaplain to the Forces.¹ In his hand was a copy of the New Testament. On the front page were printed these familiar words "Appointed to be read in Churches." The word "Churches" had been crossed out, and above it was written the word "Anywhere." Yes, "anywhere" this book may be read : in the home as well as in the Church ; not only in public worship, but in solitude ; alike in the study of the scholar and the cottage of the poor ; by the mother training her children in purity of heart and strength of character ; by the broken-hearted in days of bereavement ; by the bedside of the sick and dying. That officer had learned

¹ The Rev. C. L. Perry.

this much before he went into battle ; and there in the hour of his greatest need he found comfort and hope in that Word of Life which is appointed by the Lord of Life to be read " Anywhere."

* * * * *

Original Sin. In a speech he made in London,¹ Viscount Grey said to his audience²: " I would ask you to recall that

we must never forget how the war came about. If we are to approach the subject in a proper spirit it can only be by recalling, and never forgetting for one moment, what was the real cause of the war. Some people say, ' You need not go back on the old ground now ; everybody knows it.' You cannot go back on it too often. It affects the conditions of peace." Would that every preacher were inspired by a similar conviction ! Nothing can be more important than to know the cause which originally brought so much suffering into the world. This unceasing struggle between good and evil—the stern battles being fought in every age between right and wrong—how did they commence at first in a world otherwise fair and beautiful ? They arose from one cause only, namely sin. Never has it been more necessary to recall this fact of human history than it is at the present time. People say " You need not go over the old ground now ; everybody knows it." Do they ? or is there not a serious danger, continually increasing, of its being forgotten ? Let not the preacher be misled by the spirit of the age. That spirit is antagonistic to the doctrine of original sin. Nothing would better serve the purpose of Satan than that the preacher should miss out of his message this cardinal fact that " sin entered into the world, and death by sin." ³ The purpose of the Incarnation was to save men from sin. If there had been no sin there would have been no need of a Saviour. The birth and death and resurrection of Jesus Christ were all parts of the divine plan to save us from the original cause of the warring elements in our human nature. " You cannot go back on the old ground too often ; it affects the conditions of peace."

* * * * *

A Parable from Nature. In the midst of a bare and turfless plain stands a lonely rock—itsself covered with verdure. Ferns and lichens and moss are growing all over it, concealing from the casual passer-by the seams and crevices by which its sides

¹ October 23, 1916. ² The Foreign Press Association. ³ Romans v. 12.

are rent. What is the reason of this? What is the secret of that young life which thrives and blossoms on the old rock? Years ago the plain was devastated by a storm of great fury. The big rock, standing high above the ground, attracted to itself the vivid lightning flashes. Again and again it was struck by bolts charged with electric fluid, which opened deep fissures in its top and sides. These formed cavities for soil and seeds blown into them by subsequent gales and watered by constant showers of rain. It was the great storm which really broke open the hard surface and lay bare the heart of the rock, and so made possible the life springing from within and covering it outside with a raiment of verdure. Like that rock England has been exposed to a storm of surpassing and unprecedented fury. The lightning flashes of this cruel war have struck at the heart of the nation, tearing open great seams of sorrow and suffering. What shall the future be? May the great rock with verdure clad be a parable in prophecy! If the lessons of the war are accepted in a right spirit, God will impart the soil of a new character and give us freely the seeds of Divine Truth, and water them with the grace of the Holy Spirit. Then our England of the future will be more glorious than ever she has been in the past, beautiful with the new life that shall spring out of her stricken heart.

THE STUDY TABLE.

Dr. Figgis is a writer who always commands attention. He is a vigorous thinker and expresses his thoughts in a clear and trenchant style. His new volume, *Some Defects in English Religion* (Robert Scott, 2s. 6d. net), consists of fourteen sermons. A course of four on "some defects of English religion"—sentimentalism, legalism, cowardice, complacency—was preached in August, 1916, at Grosvenor Chapel, Mayfair, and is reprinted from the *Church Times*. There is also a course of six Lenten sermons on the "Mysteries of Love"—helpless, contemplative, active, transfigured, acclaimed, triumphant—which have not been printed before. The bulk of the sermons is practical. For that reason let us quote an interesting passage from page 99 on the subject of "Love transfigured."

"Bishop Westcott made everything of the *Logos* doctrine. He was fundamentally Alexandrine, assimilative in his method. His Epistle to the Hebrew lays more stress in the life than the death of Christ, to say the least. Many followed this line. Crudities of expression and an undue emphasis on the Evangelical side led to a reaction which went too far. Now, however, the era which culminated in Moberly's book on the Atonement is at an end. Westcott and Moberly and McLeod Campbell and others will continue to make their contribution to religious thought. Some of their work is permanent. We need the other side no less. A stronger and more vital hold on the Cross will be the note of all effective religion in the age now beginning. His death marks not the close of a series, but the meaning and purpose of His life on earth."

This is very well said on the doctrinal side, and the practical teaching is also of real value. Dr. Sparrow Simpson has done well to secure these sermons for his series.

* * * *

The object of *The Prayer of Consecration*, by Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, with Preface by the Bishop of Oxford (Robert Scott, 2s. 6d. net), is to secure the permissive alteration of the order of the prayers in the Communion Service; in other words, to plead for an optional use of the Liturgy of 1549. The method is to state the essentials of the Eucharist and then to print a long catena of criticisms from Anglican writers during the centuries since the Reformation. We do not think Dr. Simpson is quite fair to the Greek text of the narratives of the Institution. He seems over anxious to read his own ideas into them, and too little disposed to go only as far as the evidence will take him. The catena of quotations will be extremely useful to any student of the subject, but we cannot help thinking that the selection has been unconsciously influenced by the doctrinal position of the author. For instance, it would have been fairer if Cranmer and others had been allowed to state their reasons for altering the 1549 order to that of 1552.

* * * *

In *Notes and Addresses to Confirmation Candidates*, by a Country Clergyman (Elliot Stock, 2s. 6d. net, 18s. per dozen), we have a manual which includes the Catechism, the Confirmation Service and the Communion Office all in clear type with red rubrics. The instructions are sound and simple. It is just the book for which many are looking. Our only fear is that the price may place it beyond the reach of those who have to pay for such gifts out of their own slender purse, which no clergyman ought to have to do, but it is well worth the money, and where it can be afforded it will be found useful and will constitute a valued remembrance of Confirmation.

* * * *

An excellent book is *Scripture Thoughts*, by Adeline Campbell (Elliot Stock, 2s. 6d. net). These "notes made in preparation for addresses" will be found most useful. There is no subject matter—only the headings—and many of these striking and suggestive—together with the passages to which they refer printed in full, so that the appropriateness can be seen at a glance.

* * * *

Other Little Ships, by the Rev. Stuart Robertson (R.T.S., 2s. 6d. net), contains excellent story-sermons for children, simple in construction, pleasant in exposition and appealing in illustration. A veritable treasury for preachers to young people.—*A Book for Little Soldiers*, by Lady Cunliffe (S.P.C.K., 1s. 6d. net), has readings for a month intended for young children. Parents will find this little book a real aid in their endeavour to train their children in the way they should go.—*Twelve Services of Family Prayer*, by a Layman (S.P.C.K., 1s. net), has much to commend it.

* * * *

It is not often that works of fiction come our way! Probably we are invited to express an opinion on *A Bishop's Unbending*, by Lester Everson (Robert Scott, 3s. 6d. net), because it is "for Bishops and Curates and all congregations committed to their charge." It is certainly both clever and entertaining. If any Bishop finds time to read it he will put it down no sadder but possibly a little wiser! The Curate—be he Incumbent or assistant—will most likely have a hearty laugh, and as for the congregation—laugh or no laugh, it will do them good.

Reviews of Books.

FORM AND CONTENT IN THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION. By W. Sanday, D.D., and N. P. Williams, M.A. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 6s. net.

Dr. Sanday contributed a paper at a meeting of the Churchmen's Union, which was printed in *The Modern Churchman* for June, 1915. Mr. Williams was provoked to a correspondence on Dr. Sanday's position, and the original paper with the full correspondence are here offered to the public.

The Lady Margaret Professor draws distinction between the Form and Content of the language of the Creeds. He perceives a relative rather than a real utterance of Truth. In reference to the Virgin-birth he does not deny, but also cannot affirm, the fact. "Imperious necessity compels us to loosen our hold upon it" (p. 8). "I do not think that a blank and unqualified denial—putting a 'not' into the Creed—is anywhere required of us" (p. 10). "I find myself able to subsume the idea of the Virgin-birth under the yet larger and more important idea of Supernatural Birth" (p. 9). These statements are full of interest. Two separable lines of discussion follow. (1) Is this a legitimate mode of interpretation, loyal to the Church? (2) Is the available evidence sufficient to refute this hesitancy upon the historical "fact"? Unfortunately these two independent issues are inextricably mixed in the book before us.

Urgency attaches to the first question. The progress of modern thought brings everything under review, and opinions change. Many instinctively feel that Dr. Sanday is transgressing permissible limits, and he is obviously uneasy. But if any one were to hold even more decidedly than Dr. Westcott of the passage John iii. 16-21 that "it is likely . . . that it contains the reflections of the Evangelist, and is not a continuation of the words of the Lord," is he to be excluded from the ministry of the Church of England, because therein he must say "Our Saviour Christ saith. . . . So God loved the world"? We all answer "No." But where can we find reasoned out the fundamental difference in the position of these great scholars? Mr. Williams gives us no help.

Nor upon the historicity of the Virgin-birth is the discussion satisfactory. There are many acute observations on either side: but, when Mr. Williams elected to take his stand upon the infallibility of the Church, the usefulness of the debate ceased. Arguing that all philosophy commences with certain assumptions or intuitions, he claims as an elementary postulate that the Ecumenical Councils were inspired in so full and plenary a manner by the Holy Spirit that the very words of their decrees are placed beyond dispute. But the intuitions of philosophy are inevitable, so inwrought in all human consciousness that no one doubts them: the assumption of Mr. Williams is by no means generally accepted.

In further illustration of the argument we may refer to his views upon miracles and Holy Scripture. Miracle is defined as "an event which involves the counteraction or neutralization of natural forces by causes belonging to the spiritual world" (p. 140). The cricket ball caught by the fieldsman is an instance of "a natural force being temporarily neutralized or counteracted by other forces set in motion by spiritual causes" ["a purely spiritual cause, namely, the will of Robinson to 'catch' Jones out"] (p. 131). How can this explain the miracle of the Virgin-birth? Again, the Church of England declares "The three Creeds . . . ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy

Scripture" (Art. VIII.). Mr. Williams, disputing Dr. Sanday's orthodoxy, says, "We appeal to the New Testament in support of the Creeds, *not* to prove them to ourselves (for they are already sufficiently guaranteed by our fundamental postulate of the infallibility of the Church) but to prove them to outsiders" (p. 89). The New Testament is of little use to the Christian, but "the Church, wherever she goes, carries about with her the New Testament in order to prove to the inquiring outsider . . ." (ditto)! Verily the kettle has not ceased to call the pan black.

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF THE CYMRY from the earliest period to the present time. By the Rev. William Hughes, Vicar of Llanuwchllyn and Rural Dean. New edition. Revised. With 72 illustrations. London: *Elliot Stock*. 10s. net.

A charming and most interesting volume, appearing as it does at a most appropriate time. The first edition came out in 1894, when, as many of our readers will remember, Mr. Asquith was bringing in a Bill for the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church in Wales. This edition, which won the cordial approval of Bishop Stubbs of Oxford, is very closely followed in the present issue. Mr. Hughes is well versed in the various incidents and details connected with the history of the Welsh Church in both ancient and modern times. He divides it into five periods as follows: I.—A.D. 200—450. The Period of the Roman Conquest. II.—A.D. 450—681. The Period of the Saxon Conquest. III.—A.D. 681—1295. The Saxon and Norman Periods to the Final Absorption of the Welsh Church in the English Church. IV.—A.D. 1295—1534. From the Period of the Final Absorption of the Welsh Church to the Period of the Reformation. V.—From the Period of the Reformation to the present time.

Although one cannot help noticing the just and natural pride which the author is bound to feel in the traditions and associations of his ancient Church, he nevertheless writes in a temperate and guarded style very far removed from the partisan or special pleader. Thus while showing the utmost interest in the names, dates, and localities of the early Welsh saints, a subject in which he is specially at home, he again and again rejects as improbable many of the incidents related of them even in cases where we should not have been sorry to have had them confirmed. All is written in a pre-eminently readable style, and whatever the period dealt with the book has a fascination of its own which makes it difficult to put it down. The account of Bishop Morgan in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and his struggles and difficulties in connexion with his translation of the Bible into the Welsh tongue is well told. The very accusations of his enemies, often Welsh people who feared that the translation would perpetuate the bi-lingual difficulty, caused him to be summoned into the presence of Archbishop Whitgift, who became his fast friend, helping him financially in his undertaking, without which assistance, as he himself stated, he would not have proceeded further than the five books of Moses. This is a remarkable instance of evil being overruled for good. It may be mentioned that Mr. Hughes is the author of a book entitled "Life and Times of Bishop William Morgan, the Translator of the Bible into the Welsh language," published by the S.P.C.K.

We see how very much the Church in Wales suffered from the fatal practice of the Hanoverian sovereigns, followed out from Walpole downwards until reversed by Gladstone, of appointing English-speaking bishops, ignorant of the native tongue, to Welsh sees. The early Welsh "Methodists" were almost to a man Churchmen at heart, and if properly handled might have

remained so. Even Nonconformists in Wales often speak of the Church as "Yr Hen Fam," or "the old Mother."

Apart from the interest which every Britisher ought to feel in the people of Wales as being the most ancient occupiers of the country and the most intensely British, all members of the Church of England should entertain the very highest affection for that portion of their Church which is able, as no other portion can, to trace back an unbroken continuity to Apostolic times.

Mr. Hughes is highly to be congratulated on his work, and it is to be earnestly hoped that it will be widely circulated and extensively read both in Wales and England.

THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST: An Essay in Interpretation. By the Rev.

S. P. T. Prideaux, B.D. London: *Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd.*
3s. net.

In his preface the author says: "The difficulties of the Apocalyptic element in the Gospels have long been a sore puzzle to many, and much light has recently been thrown upon its inner meaning and its perennial value by the world-catastrophe of the war." He has, he tells us, his own solution to offer. Later on he says, "All difficulties can be removed by an adequate appreciation of the Person of the Holy Spirit; their persistence and seriousness has been almost entirely due to men's failure in this appreciation." After such words as these what we find in the book itself is distinctly disappointing. The customary Advent hymns, even Charles Wesley's "Lo! He comes with clouds descending," are objected to. Men "feel that an intolerable burden is laid on them, an insult offered to their intelligence, even, and to the advance made by the human race in the apprehension and interpretation of reality, when they are asked to voice and to assent to the crude literalism and sensuous conceptions which previous ages have handed down." He admits "that the writers of these hymns, and the preachers who echo their sentiments, are but quoting or paraphrasing the words of our Lord and His Apostles as recorded in the New Testament." A great part of the work is occupied with comparing the words of our Saviour not only with the prophecies of the Old Testament but with such Apocalyptic literature as the Books of Esdras and of Enoch. He thinks our Lord took the current ideas as He found them and refined and worked up from them. After wading through a great many of these comparisons he comes to the conclusion that the promises of our Lord's return were largely fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, and that they are being fulfilled still. Of course this is to some extent true. We admit that the coming of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost was a coming but not the advent of the Saviour. The drift of the volume before us seems, in our opinion, to explain away, rather than to emphasize and bring into relief, the great hope of the Church as set forth by our Lord and His Apostles.

EARLY CHURCH CLASSICS. London: S.P.C.K. GREGORY OF NYSSA—LIFE OF ST. MACRINA, by the Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., formerly Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge. (1s. net.) This fascinating "life" has hitherto been inaccessible to all but scholars; it is now produced in a form that makes it available to all. Had this story been written in the Greek of the fourth century B.C. instead of that of the fourth century A.D., it would probably have been one of the 'world's classics. Macrina was the elder sister of Gregory of Nyssa. Losing her lover, early in life, she pledged herself to virginity that she might remain faithful to him; and, with her mother, devoted herself to the ascetic life. An interesting feature of the

record is "the double monastery"—the men presided over by a certain Peter, the women by Macrina. *ST. IRENÆUS AGAINST THE HERESIES*, by the Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, M.A., D.D., formerly Donnellan Lecturer of Dublin University and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Maloe. (Two vols., 2s. each.) To an excellent introduction there follows a good translation of the principal passages of the great work of St. Irenæus, with admirable notes. Where the passages are not translated, a summary is added, the result being the substance of the whole treatise in a small and readable compass. A complete index, at the end of Volume II., is of great assistance for the purposes of reference. At a time when the Church is being threatened by the grotesque speculations of spiritualism, clairvoyance, Swedenborgianism, theosophy, and Christian Science, it is good to have at hand the arguments used of old by St. Irenæus against the progenitor of them all—Gnosticism.

THE STEPS OF A DISCIPLE. By G. M. Bevan and A. E. Brewin, Licensed Teachers of Theology. London: S.P.C.K. 1s. net.

This is a simple course of teaching on the Gospels, designed primarily for those who hope to work for the Church at home or abroad. It is a manual which ought to be helpful to all who have entrusted to them the task of teaching young people their religion. Much of the instruction given is scrappy and disjointed, and there is great need for systematic instruction such as is outlined in this book. The authors, we notice, always refer to the Holy Communion as the Eucharist. We have no quarrel with this title, but why not be content with the titles used in the Prayer Book? We are told that the title "Eucharist" is "one of the oldest" given to the Sacrament. It is worthy of note that of ten titles given by Waterland, the Eucharist stands *sixth*! Then on page 44 we read: "The words 'This do in remembrance of Me,' *possibly* [the italics are ours] have a sacrificial significance. The word 'remembrance' was used of certain offerings of the Levitical Law, with the sense, it would seem, of pleading with God to remember the worshipper and his needs." But the whole weight of the most accurate scholarship is against this interpretation which the authors think "possible"! Wordsworth, Ellicott, Alford, Westcott, Gore, Plummer, and Meyrick (in his "Doctrine of the Holy Communion") demolish the theory. We read again that "Christ is ever presenting before His Father His Sacrifice." But nowhere in the New Testament is our Lord said to be "pleading" or "offering" His Sacrifice; and Westcott says, "The modern conception of Christ pleading in heaven His passion, offering His blood on behalf of man, has no foundation in this Epistle"—Hebrews.

But taken as a whole the book is well suited to its purpose, and not only those who are looking forward to being public teachers but parents will find here much valuable assistance in teaching the truths of our Faith to young persons in an orderly way.

THE MATERIAL IN SUPPORT OF THE SPIRITUAL. Compiled by the Rev. S. W. Key, M.A., Vicar of All Saints, Ipswich. London: S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d. net.

This is another useful collection of illustrations, culled from many sources from Luther to Father Bernard Vaughan, and designed for the aid of preachers in their pulpit preparation. Those who can make use of compilations of this kind will find here much that will be helpful.