

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

December, 1917.

The Month.

At Last! AT last the Government has seen fit to recommend His Majesty the King to publish a Royal Proclamation appointing Sunday, January 6, as a National Day of Prayer and Thanksgiving in connection with the War. The long delay—for which, of course, the King was in no way responsible—has been much regretted; and, perhaps, some day we may learn exactly where the difficulty lay. But let us forget all that for the time being; and, whatever our own feelings regarding the terms of the Call to Prayer, let us put them aside, in order that we may do everything possible to promote the fullest and deepest observance of the appointed Day. The King's Proclamation calls the nation—and not the nation only, but the Dominions—to devote a special day to prayer "that we may have the clear-sightedness and strength necessary to the victory of our cause," and then, in words as strong as they are true, he says that "this victory will be gained only if we steadfastly remember the responsibility which rests upon us, and in a spirit of reverent obedience ask the blessing of Almighty God upon our endeavours." His Majesty calls the nation to acknowledge its dependence upon God, Who is "the only Giver of Victory," and in Him is our trust. With prayer will also be joined thanksgiving. The nation has been granted many mercies, and these demand the most thankful recognition, for it is "the Divine guidance which has led us so far towards our goal." But if this Day of National Prayer and Thanksgiving is to be rightly and fully observed it must be adequately prepared for, and we trust that steps may soon be taken to bring home to the nation the greatness of the opportunity. It will be for central authority to give the necessary guidance and directions. The December issues of the Diocesan Maga-

zines will doubtless contain Letters from the respective Bishops to the clergy and laity of their dioceses, but what is needed is a Joint Manifesto from the whole episcopate to the English people. The Archbishop of York in his mid-monthly letter makes a brief yet very hearty reference to the question. The Proclamation was issued just as his Letter was going to press and his Grace says:—“I have only time now to say that I rejoice with all my heart that at last this step has been taken, and that next month I hope to be able to make suggestions as to the ways in which we can make our response to this call.” But why wait a day longer than is necessary? Preparation for the observance of that Day ought to begin at once.

The Church Missionary Society has been passing through troublesome times, but as the result of the discussion at the meeting of the General Committee on November 13 there is reason to hope and believe that it will emerge all the stronger and the better for the upset. It is unfortunate that the C.M.S. should be made the storm-centre in the struggle between the representatives of the Older and the Newer Order among Evangelicals. It has its own distinctive work to do, and that work is not helped by party controversy. It is not necessary or desirable to refer at length in these pages to the questions raised; it is enough to say that a Memorial, signed by a large number of influential friends of the Society, was presented to the Committee by the Bishop of Chelmsford, who moved that it be received and entered upon the minutes. To this the Bishop of Manchester moved an amendment, and the forces were set in battle array. But the wise and statesmanlike action of the President saved the situation, for “by the decision arrived at”—we quote the *English Churchman*—“the whole matter was referred to a select committee composed of seven members to be nominated by the Bishop of Manchester, seven by the Memorialists and seven by the Patronage Committee of the C.M.S.” “This solution,” adds the *English Churchman*, “only postpones the inevitable rupture which the Modernist and Sacerdotalist movement will inflict upon the C.M.S.” We do not in the least agree. If there are men on either side who are bent on bringing about a “rupture,” let them come out into the open and definitely say so, and we shall know where we stand.

But we believe better things of the Memorialists and of those who oppose them. There is on both sides an honest loyalty and love for the C.M.S. and still more for the cause it represents, and that being so we cannot but believe that this Select Committee of twenty-one—if they begin, continue and end their work in a spirit of absolute dependence upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit—will find the right way out of the difficulties which have arisen. Rupture indeed! These are not the days when religious men can afford to talk of, or think about, “rupture.” These are great days, days of opportunity, and they call for a joining of forces and for unity.

**Church
Franchise.**

The feeling is growing that the franchise proposed in the Report of the Archbishops’ Church and State Committee is too narrow. We believe the criticism to be quite unreasonable. One would imagine from the arguments advanced that all control of Parliament is to be taken away. But this is not so. The legislative power of the proposed Church Council is to be “subject always to a veto on the part of the Crown and of Parliament.” How, then, can it be urged, as a “Correspondent” of *The Times* has done, that in assenting to this scheme Parliament would “hand over its interests in the National Church to an electorate entirely restricted to communicants or those who have the status of communicants, that is, those who are baptized and confirmed”? The attack upon the franchise suggested by the Committee is clearly made under a misapprehension. It would obviously be incongruous for the electors to a “Church” Council to be other than Church-people, that is, those who have been baptized and confirmed, and the franchise agreed upon by the Committee is the one that has the best chance of general acceptance. To open the door more widely would be to court disaster. The rights of the “unconfirmed” Parliamentary elector are by no means infringed by the Report. What those are now, they will continue to be after the Report becomes effective.

**Progress in
Palestine.**

The progress made by our brave troops under General Allenby against the enemy in Palestine is of the most gratifying character, and it may be hoped that it will soon be possible to send relief to the many thousands of victims of Turkish misrule. Dr. Rennie MacInnes, Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem, who owing to the war has not yet been able

to set foot in the city with which the name of his See is associated, writes :—

Tens of thousands have already died, but though it is impossible to realise what appalling suffering this means, we can at least stretch out a helping hand. . . . Until Palestine is once more open it is of course impossible to administer relief as we should like to do, but much preliminary work has to be done, and during the past six months active preparations have been going on in Cairo. The Syria and Palestine Relief Fund is managed by a strong London Committee, with offices at 110 Victoria Street, S.W.1, of which Sir Henry McMahon, G.C.M.G., etc., late High Commissioner in Egypt, is Chairman. . . . Though we cannot yet take relief into Palestine as a whole, we are getting opportunities of giving welcome help to a number of those who have already suffered much privation in the south. It is well to add that none of this work could have been done but for the kind and willing assistance of the military authorities concerned. Valuable information and experience have thus been gained, in regard both to the provision of clothing and also that of medical assistance, so that plans can now be worked out for the proper equipment of relief parties who will carry on similar work, though on a larger scale, when Palestine is once more open. May the day soon come !

We all re-echo the Bishop's wish. In the meantime we can show sympathy and interest by subscribing to the Syrian and Palestine Relief Fund.

A Great Movement. The Pocket Testament League is described as "a world-wide, soul-saving and Bible Study movement," and it is undoubtedly doing a great work. The chief interest of its operators just now is among the troops both in the camps at home and on the various battle-fronts. The simple conditions of membership are embodied in the League Pledge :— "I hereby accept Membership in the Pocket Testament League by making it the rule of my life to read at least one chapter in the Bible each day, and to carry a Bible or Testament with me wherever I go." Thousands upon thousands of men in the Army have joined the League, and, what is better, have been led to sign the "A.C." (i.e. Accepted Christ) Declaration. Particulars and membership cards can be obtained free of charge from Miss E. Wakefield MacGill, Hon. Secretary, Pocket Testament League Headquarters, 24, 25, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.4.

The Science and Art of Preaching.

[NOTE.—The following article represents the substance of an address given at several Conferences for the training of Missionary Workers, held in various Northern towns during the spring of this year. This fact will account for the type of illustrations which are used in connexion with some of the points. The points themselves, however, are perfectly general, and are applicable to the preparation and presentation of any sermon or address. Hence the adoption of a generalized title for the paper.]

WHEN the greatest of apostolic preachers was giving some practical advice to a young lieutenant, he wrote, "Take heed to thyself and thy teaching." The order of words is noteworthy. It brings out the vitally important truth that the preparation of the preacher is more important than the preparation of the sermon. This is indeed true in more ways than one. In very many cases the effect of the message delivered depends largely upon the general estimate of the character of the preacher which his life has caused to be formed in the minds of the people among whom he lives. "What you are speaks so loudly that I cannot hear what you say." But the truth is also directly applicable to the preparation of the message. The preacher must prepare himself first. This is well brought out in that famous definition of a sermon which we owe to Bishop Phillips Brooks. He writes in his *Lectures on Preaching* (pp. 5-9): "Preaching is the communication of truth by man to men. It has in it two essential elements, truth and personality. Neither of those can it spare and still be preaching. . . . Preaching is the bringing of truth through personality. It must have both elements. It is in the different proportion in which the two are mingled that the difference between two great classes of sermons and preaching lies. . . . The truth must come really through the person, not merely over his lips, not merely into his understanding and out through his pen. It must come through his character, his affections, his whole intellectual and moral being. . . . This decrees for us in general what the preparation for the ministry is. It must be nothing less than the making of a man. It cannot be the mere training to certain tricks." If all this be true, as it most profoundly is, there is no need to apologize for spending a little time first on the preparation of the messenger before we study the principles of preparing a message.

THE PREPARATION OF THE MESSENGER.

We are familiar with the threefold division of the spiritual side of human nature into thought, will, and desire. The preacher and his audience alike share this nature. It is his aim to reach his audience in all three departments of their being, and if he is to do this successfully, his own nature must be similarly prepared. This preparation is obviously something which cannot be crowded into half an hour or half a week. It is a life-long process. It may be conscious or it may be unconscious, but it is going on all the time, being indeed part of the general development of character. There is, however, a good deal that may, and indeed must, be consciously and definitely done. Let us consider the preparation of intellect, of emotion and of will.

(i) *Intellect.* The first thing required is undoubtedly fullness of knowledge. It has been aptly said that a speaker at the opening of an address ought to bear a resemblance to a full sponge. Wherever you press the sponge, water will flow forth. The speaker ought to be equally full of his subject, able to deal with it at any point. To put the same truth in other words, a speaker ought really always to know more than he intends to say. It is seldom possible in a single address to deal with more than one aspect of a great subject. But this does not mean that a speaker can be content to know merely that one aspect. If he knows that and no more, there is always the danger of an inadequate because one-sided and unbalanced presentation. How great this danger is, the history of Theology witnesses. Calvin, for example, was so keen on emphasizing his great truth of the Sovereignty of God that he forgot the equally great truth, for which Arminius stood, of human freedom and responsibility. Even in missionary addresses there is the danger of onesidedness. We may be so obsessed with the blackness of darkness of heathenism as to forget the gleams of light, the partial revelations of God to those who from without the chosen races have been seeking after God if haply they may find Him. To-day it is possible that the opposite danger may be more serious. Some of us are so keen to find the good points in heathenism as to forget its horrors. What we want, and what will really do most good and run least risk of doing harm, is a fair and balanced statement, and this implies a reserve of knowledge.

Constant reading, therefore, is a part of our intellectual

preparation. And here we are faced with the universal difficulty of lack of time. We are undoubtedly all very busy. At least we think we are. The only thing that can be said is that, generally speaking, the busiest man is the most likely man to find time to do extra work. Nor is the reason far to seek. The busy man has usually learnt the supreme art of not wasting little spaces of time. It is astonishing how many little intervals we have during the day. Some of us waste these. Some of us have learnt to put them to good use, and thus we get more work done without lengthening our day at the two ends. It is good to have a book or a magazine on hand, and to cultivate the art of turning to it at odd moments. I was interested the other day to hear a Secretary of a Missionary Society tell me how many volumes of Theology he had read during the time spent in the train or tram on his daily journey to and from his office.

The other thing required in preparation of intellect is the cultivation of freshness of outlook. The danger of getting into a groove is proverbial. It is an insidious danger. We may be in a groove almost without knowing it. But it is a danger to be avoided. Somehow we must keep alive within ourselves the capacity to take in new ideas. We need to retain intellectual sympathy. Constant contact with others from whom we differ is a great help in this direction. Most of all, perhaps, it is good for us to be in contact with men of a younger generation. They look at things with different eyes from ourselves. The freshness of outlook is very much needed in the world of missionary workers. Missionary methods abroad have not remained unaltered in the last twenty-five years. Nor are methods of missionary propaganda at home the same. There is no reason why freshness of outlook and sympathy with new ideas and new methods should not be combined with that ripeness of judgment which is the crown of the experience of a long life.

(ii) *Emotions*. The candid critic is apt to talk sometimes of "uninspiring" sermons. If he is brutal as well as candid, he may even accuse the preacher of talking "dry rot." The "rot," if rot there be, is a matter for the intellect. The lack of inspiring power and the dryness fall within the sphere of the emotions. It is possible to have the best and most carefully prepared matter, but to present it in a dull and lifeless and uninspiring way. There

is therefore real need to cultivate the emotions as well as the mind. No doubt we are not all made alike. Our temperaments differ considerably, as our intellectual powers do. But even if we cannot by nature be classed as emotional, none of us ought to let ourselves deserve the epithet of "dry." Sir John Seeley wrote: "No heart is pure that is not passionate. No virtue is safe that is not enthusiastic." And certainly no sermon or address will be effective unless the matter is shot through with emotion. In other words, our facts want to have got down from our heads to our hearts. We need to have felt them as well as to have grasped them. They must be poured forth with the force of a passionate conviction. The warmth in ourselves will create a warmth in our audience which will make them receptive.

Much can be done to cultivate and refine the emotions. Such things as music and art appeal directly to them. Or again, real help is to be found sometimes in letting the soul go out in response to the appeal of a glorious landscape. The regular reading of *Punch* was even suggested by a well-known authority in these matters. Contact with human life in its joys and its sorrows will do much for us. The great thing is to give ourselves time to feel. The play of emotion cannot be hurried or systematized. But the time thus spent is well spent. We all know the marvellous effect of an address coming through a personality whose emotions have been really cultivated and chastened. On the other hand, unless the emotion of an audience is touched by emotion in the speaker, the facts communicated to the intellect have little effect.

(iii) *Will*. The will is the practical part of us. Modern psychologists are even inclined to make it the innermost centre of personality. It also needs its cultivation because a speaker must exercise a real control over his audience by sheer force. He must compel them to listen. The force of will varies much in different persons. In some men it is so outstanding as to become a difficulty. Others are too pliant. The way to cultivate the will is to do things sometimes just because we intend to do them: to do them for the mere sake of doing them, though there may be no necessity to do them, nor anything very attractive about them when done. One or two efforts of sheer will are wonderfully strengthening to a weak man.

There is another aspect of this matter altogether. No man can

speak with real constraining force unless in his own mind he is conscious that he is practising what he preaches. Sincerity is an essential ingredient in the constitution of a successful speaker. Insincerity speedily brings failure in its train. No one can plead the claims of service in the Mission Field unless he is quite clear about the soundness of the reasons which have kept him at home. No one can urge home service in the Missionary cause unless he is doing his own full share. No one can plead for financial support unless he is himself giving in proportion to his means. The life of a speaker becomes a real factor in the helpfulness of his message, and life is a matter of conduct and will.

THE PREPARATION OF THE MESSAGE.

Let us now study the immediate preparation of a particular message. Before, however, we deal with questions of science and art, there is perhaps one not uncommon misconception which ought to be removed. It is by some people thought that there is a contradiction between the use of art and the practice of dependence upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit given in answer to prayer. The contradiction does not exist. The use of art and the dependence upon the Holy Spirit are complementary. Both are necessary. Kingsley used to say, "There is no more use in praying without practising than there is in practising without prayer." And Fleming wrote, "Pray as if everything depended upon God. Act as if everything depended upon yourself" (*Life*, p. 12). In what follows the prayer is assumed. Attention is directed solely to the art. There are four points to be considered.

A. *The Aim.* (i) It is necessary to have an aim in every address. Otherwise, as some one has remarked, if you aim at nothing, you will certainly hit it. There is a further use in an aim besides the primary one. It gives unity to an address. Unity is as necessary to an address as it is supposed to be to a Shakespearean play. Unless there is an aim to give unity, to form a centre round which all the matter falls into its due place, an address may fail through being disconnected and fragmentary. A theological student once criticized a brother beginner in preaching for having delivered an address which was "like a country ramble." There are others besides young preachers whose addresses approximate

to the "country ramble" type. These are apt to strike the audience as having no beginning and no end (sometimes the end is very long in coming!), and they are very difficult to carry away. Both for the preacher and for his audience a clearly conceived aim is necessary, and the very first step in preparation is to find the aim. Those who use the lessons in the magazine published by the Church of England Sunday School Institute will have noticed that each lesson begins with an aim. Preachers may take a hint from the teachers.

(ii) The aim of course varies enormously, but there are a few general remarks which can be made about it. The speaker is endeavouring to reach an audience whose nature, like his own, is composed of intellect, emotions and will. An address therefore ought to appeal to all these constituents, and the aim must always be three-sided. I think it was Cicero who said that the aim of an orator was "docere, placere, movere," to teach, to please, to move. In other words, we want to give knowledge, to rouse interest, and to cause action. In missionary addresses the giving of knowledge is of primary importance. We deplore the apathy which is so common among professing Churchmen and even among a large proportion of communicants, on the subject of Missions. The cause of the apathy is very largely sheer ignorance. Missionary instruction is apt to be confined in some parishes to an annual visit by a deputation, and the subject is never mentioned during the rest of the year. It ought really to form part of the ordinary round of preaching. Hence there is the greater need that when missionary addresses are being given, definite facts should be abundantly presented as mental food. Not that the need for instruction is confined to missionary topics. The average Churchgoer's knowledge of what are really the fundamentals of the faith is painfully limited. There is much truth in the accusation that our sermons have contained too much vague exhortation and too little definite instruction.

The knowledge must be imparted with such emotional power that it stirs up emotions in the hearers. It must rouse pity or sympathy or the desire to help or the desire for further information as the case may be. Then the emotions must be used as a stimulus to action. It is fatal to let emotion spend itself fruitlessly. That process leads only to the drying up of the springs of emotion. The

will must be invoked, and suggestions must be made for practical conduct.

The relative prominence of these three aspects of an aim will vary in each address with the subject and the audience, though they should probably all be present in some degree. If an audience is large and mixed, and its intellectual standard is varied, it becomes difficult proportionately to teach, and greater prominence has to be given to the appeal to emotion and will. Where the audience is small and the intellectual calibre is fairly equal, the aspect of pure instruction can be proportionately emphasized. The choice of the right aim is perhaps the most difficult part of the preparation of an address. But it is worth while to spend time and thought over it. Obviously it really presupposes some knowledge of the audience, and therein lies the difficulty of framing a suitable address for an audience one has never seen, and the composition of which is problematical. Such an address has to depend upon guess work, and may fail accordingly.

B. The Introduction. The aim is probably kept locked up in the speaker's own mind. The introduction is the first part of the address itself. It may be, and probably usually is, very short in proportion to the total length. It must be tremendously varied in form. But the principle which controls it in all its variations is a simple and yet vitally important one. The principle is that all education proceeds from the known to the unknown. The purpose of the introduction, therefore, is to find a point of contact between the known and the unknown, between the previous knowledge of the audience or class and the new knowledge which the address is to give them.

A common illustration may help. There is an indoor game the apparatus of which consists of a piece of cardboard carrying hoops to which are affixed the numbers one to thirteen, and a small supply of rubber rings. The game is to throw the rings from a distance so that they are caught on the hooks. Each successful throw scores a number of points identical with the number attached to the hook. Now the cardboard resembles the mind of man with its store of knowledge. The rings represent the new knowledge contained in the address. The problem is to attach the rings to a suitable hook. In the game, unless the ring catches on a hook it falls to the ground, and there is no score. In speaking, unless the point of contact be found,

the speech falls flat and is ineffective. No more need be said, surely, to prove the tremendous importance of the introduction. The selection of the right introduction, the finding of the point of contact, is a problem whose solution requires ever fresh ingenuity. One or two general remarks may be made.

If the audience be small and familiar, such as a Sunday school or Bible class, the problem is very much easier. In this case the teacher knows, or should know, a good deal about the personal and home and workaday life of his audience, and it ought not to be difficult to find something in one or other of these which would form a suitable opening. In other instances where the audience is unknown, or only partially known, as is the case with most congregations or meetings which a missionary speaker is called upon to address, a guess has to be made. It is well then to pitch upon some large matter of interest at the moment, with which most audiences may be presumed to have at least a measure of acquaintance. At the present time, for instance, a variety of points of contact can be constructed by selecting different aspects of the war situation.

The importance of finding a point of contact is not really confined to the introduction, although it is particularly urgent there. The more fully contact can be established all the way through an address, the better. An illustration from carpentry is of use here. The new matter contained in an address should be as perfectly united to the old as two pieces of board are dovetailed together by a carpenter. This is a high ideal, but it is worth aiming at. In the language of Herbart, we need to labour at "association" along with our "presentation." But this leads us on to the next stage.

C. The substance. This is of course the longest part of the address. It is also the centre of it, the part for which the rest exists. The introduction is intended to lead up to it: the application is intended to drive it home in all its bearings. There are perhaps three counsels which may be given concerning the form in which it is presented.

(i) It should be suitable to the audience. Some audiences are thoroughly mixed, and have to be dealt with accordingly. But some partake of a special character. If they do, the address ought to be suited to that character. We may have an audience of children. If so, the address would dwell upon the heroic or adventurous sides of missionary work, or upon the child life of other lands. We may

have an audience of women. If so, the situation of women in heathenism might well be considered; or if that particular topic be out of the question, reference might be made to the pitiable plight of the heathen, and an appeal lodged to the softer emotions. For a body of working men stress might be laid upon the social unrighteousness which is so common in heathen lands. A body of theological students would be interested in the comparisons between the theologies of the different religions. Each of these and similar classes may often be subdivided along other lines, for instance according to their familiarity with the subject or their keenness about it. With children the question of their age and so of their dominant mental characteristics is no unimportant one. The consideration of these types of audience in the preparation of any particular address may sound like a counsel of perfection. We must, however, at any rate pay some heed to it, and always regard it as an ideal to be kept before the mind.

(ii) The matter should be clearly divided, so that not only the speaker but also the listeners may be able easily to see the divisions or stages of the subject. No doubt there are some great sermons where the absence of division seems plain. Sermons of this type are intended rather to create a single impression than to convey definite instruction. But we may be forgiven for suggesting that most of us speakers of a humbler sort are on safer ground if our sermons can be easily and clearly analysed. There is then in them a series of connected and consecutive points. These points serve a double purpose. They assist the preacher in the orderly development of his matter, and should prevent him from being illogical or inconsequent. Their very name suggests also that they may find their way like arrows into the hearers' minds and stick there, so that there is something definite which can be carried away and thought over at leisure in hours and days to come. Some preachers always number their points; others have a great fondness for more or less successful alliteration. Neither of these things is necessary, nor even always desirable. But upon the need for the existence of clear points hardly too much stress can be laid.

(iii) The subject matter should be vividly presented. Concrete cases are usually better than abstract principles. It is a good rule that we should "think pictorially," so as to appeal to the imagination. A little reflection will show how largely the success of our

Lord's public teaching lay in its concrete and dramatic presentation. Consider how ineffective a discourse on the necessity and nature of repentance would have been in comparison with the beautiful story of the Prodigal Son, or a talk on the duty of kindness compared to the moving anecdote of the Good Samaritan. In missionary addresses particularly it seems to be the concrete which tells, and this is most of all true in the presentation of statistics. An illustration may be given from a foot-note in a recent missionary magazine. The writer said that if Christ had on Ascension Day set Himself the task of visiting one Indian village each day, and had persevered with it till now, so far from having exhausted the number, he would still have to go on for another seventy years before He had got round them once. This seems to present the population of India in a much more impressive way than the bald statement that it is about 300,000,000.

D. The application. If the substance of the address has been occupied with a statement of the facts, the function of the application is to show the bearing of the facts: to drive them home, and persuade the audience to act upon them. If the special purpose of the substance of the address has been to teach, the purpose now is chiefly to interest and to move. There is therefore, a special appeal to the emotions and the will. Nothing is so valuable for appealing to the emotions as a good story from human life which puts into a dramatic form the main lessons which have been taught. Such a story may well be modelled on the Lord's moving story of the Good Samaritan, which always stirs up a desire to "go and do likewise." The writer well remembers with what forcefulness a speaker in his hearing drove home an address on the appeal of the Mass Movements by a personal story. Happy is the speaker who has read so widely and wisely as to have at his disposal a suitable stock of illustrations.

Last comes the appeal to the will. Let it be said again that an appeal to the emotions without a following appeal to the will is dangerous. It can only produce spiritual callousness. Concerning appealing to the will, one wise rule may be mentioned. It is generally better to act by suggestion than by command. It is said of Yorkshire people "you can lead them, but you can't drive them." There is psychological truth at the back of this proverb. If an idea is suggested to a person, and he makes it his own, when he acts upon it he seems to act of his own accord, and therefore he acts the more

strenuously and willingly. There are, unfortunately, exceptions to this rule. Some people seem to be so constituted that they will not do things unless they are compelled. But despite these exceptions, the rule is a good one and worthy of extended trial.

THE PRESENTATION OF THE MESSAGE.

What rules are there for the delivery of an address? Very many and very few. Very few because people are made differently and a method which suits one will not suit another. Some people seem to do best when they have an address fully written out. Some have fairly full notes, giving carefully the substance of what they intend to say but leaving the choice of words and the framing of sentences to the moment of speaking. Some have only scanty notes, containing the broad divisions of the subject and any exceptional figures or quotations which cannot be safely trusted to memory. Some feel that any reference whatever to manuscript ties them, and prefer to depend upon memorized notes alone. Each man and woman must experiment and adopt the method which seems to yield the best results. The present writer can only speak for himself in advocating notes, and plead as a theoretical defence for this method that it gives the happy combination of a freedom of speech with a guarantee against wandering far from a prepared plan.

A few sentences may be quoted again from Phillips Brooks: "In the written sermon . . . there is deliberateness. There is the assurance of industry and the man's best work. The truth comes to the people with the weight that it gets from being evidently the preacher's serious conviction. There is self-restraint. There is some exemption from those foolish fluent things that slip so easily off the ready tongue. . . . On the other hand, the extemporaneous discourse has the advantage of alertness. It gives a sense of liveliness. It is more immediately striking. It possesses more activity and warmth" (*op. cit.*, 170, 171).

The principle which must decide the matter is that definition of preaching and teaching which was quoted at the outset. Truth must be given through personality. Whatever amount of manuscript is used, it must not be allowed to get between the speaker's personality and the audience. If the Holy Spirit has been training a personality during many years, He wants it to come into action for the recommending of the truth, which by it is being passed on.

And if fears of forgetfulness and nervousness arise, the antidote lies in an appeal to that same Holy Spirit, one of whose duties in connexion with Christ's disciples was to bring all things to their remembrance.

In missionary teaching, perhaps more than in teaching on any other subject, there is every need for the address to be thoroughly inspiring and stimulating, just because of the apathy and indifference which seems to be so deeply rooted in a large section of our communicants. But inspiration can only be engendered by contact with an inspiring man; and the thrilling appeal which missionary facts contain within themselves is doubly enhanced when those facts come through a personality whose sincerity, enthusiasm and passion are patent to all.

C. H. K. BOUGHTON.



The Christian Priesthood.

DOES there exist a Priesthood in the Christian Church? If so, of what nature is it? What relationship does it bear to the Jewish Priesthood? On what does its continuance depend? Who are those endowed with it, and on what does its transmission rest? This question is one which divides the professing Christian Church at the present time into two great parts, holding views quite incompatible with one another. And yet it is remarkable that the matter is not so much as mentioned in any one of the ancient Creeds, nor does it seem to have ever been a cause of controversy in early times.

It seems to me that, if we wish to arrive at a correct answer to the question, we must in the first place lay aside all party feeling and examine the matter quietly, with a due sense of its importance. As Sallust represents one of his characters declaring, we must agree that, "*Omnes homines, . . . qui de rebus dubiis consultant, ab odio, amicitia, ira, atque misericordia vacuos esse decet.*"

In dealing with any system of religion or philosophy, if we really wish to ascertain correctly what its genuine teachings are, we must study the works of the founder or founders of the system, being careful to distinguish between the authentic doctrines taught by these men and the developments or corruptions or additions which have originated in later times. Only so can we attain to a scholarly knowledge of the subject. Thus we do not accept the writings of Porphyrius, Iamblicus, Proculus and other Neo-Platonist philosophers as fully and fairly representing Plato's teaching, but turn back to his own writings for information on the subject. Nor would any true scholar dream for a moment of taking Modern Hindûism as an exponent of Vedic beliefs, or Neo-Muhammadanism as correctly expounding what Muhammad himself taught. On the contrary, in the name of exact Scholarship, we study the Vedas (especially the Rig-Veda) and the Qur'an. To do otherwise would be to show ourselves destitute of anything worthy of the name of scholarship: it would infallibly lead us hopelessly astray, and would render us blind leaders of the blind. We should all agree that anything not taught in the original documents upon which all reliable knowledge of any religion or philosophy depends cannot be deemed part of that system. The same principle must be applied to the

study of Christianity. This is well expressed in the Sixth Article of the Church of England: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith."

Hence, for information regarding the Christian Doctrine of the Priesthood (*ιερωσύνη*) we turn to the New Testament. Even were we Non-Christian students of the Faith, that would be our only permissible course. Anything added by later writers, if not a clear and logical deduction from the New Testament, must be devoid of authority, and, as such, no true part of the Christian religion. We cannot even argue that it is perhaps a necessary development of the faith. It is well known that Newman himself retracted his "Doctrine of Development," and it was rightly condemned by the Pope as opening the door to every form of error.

I.

The New Testament tells us that the ordinances of the Mosaic Law were, speaking generally, "shadows of the things to come," the New Covenant being intended to fulfil the promises which they implied, to accomplish for all believers what the Law could only foreshadow. In themselves the forms of the Ceremonial Law were of no value whatever: their value consisted in their being types of great realities which were to be revealed under the New Dispensation. But, as there can be no shadow without a substance, the shadow would not be needed to prove the reality of the substance when once the substance was manifested. The shadow would pass away when no longer required, its purpose being ended. To endeavour to preserve it after that might do harm, but could not conceivably do good; just as the flower fades away and vanishes when the fruit is formed, for otherwise the growth and ripening of the latter might be arrested. Yet the reality borne witness to by the type would never fade away or be lost. Hence to answer the question which we are considering it is necessary to glance at Priesthood in the Old Testament among the Israelites.

Going back to early days we find only what may be called the Patriarchal Priesthood, according to which the father of the family or head of the clan or tribe was the priest, offering sacrifice for the family in virtue of his position. Later we find this supplemented

by the specially and Divinely ordained Levitical Priesthood of Aaron and his sons, the latter inheriting the Priesthood solely in virtue of their descent from him. The former patriarchal Priesthood was not fully abrogated by the Aaronic but became, so to speak, a Lay Priesthood, continuing principally in the Passover sacrifice and family sacrifices. Though the Aaronic Priesthood was of Divine appointment, yet it was not an end in itself, but was to continue until the accomplishment of God's purpose that the whole nation should become "a kingdom of priests and an holy people."¹

The New Testament teaches us that the High Priest was typical of Christ, the sons of Aaron typifying the priesthood of all who received the New Birth through faith in Him. Hence, St. Peter declares that true Christians are "a royal Priesthood, a holy nation a people for God's own possession."² Thus the anti-type corresponds to the type. As under the Law no one could possibly attain the Aaronic Priesthood except through natural descent from the High Priest Aaron, so under the Gospel no one can possibly become a priest except through receiving the New Birth from Christ. As *all* males born of Aaron's line were priests in virtue of that birth, so all persons, whether male or female (for such distinctions, just as distinctions of nationality, are done away in spiritual things in Christ), on receiving the New Spiritual birth through our One High Priest, become "priests of God and of Christ."³

Under the New Covenant the spiritual priesthood thus takes the place of the Aaronic. So too material sacrifices disappear because "that which is perfect is come," and therefore "that which is in part" is done away. In themselves we are told, they had no value, could have none. They may be compared to the cheque, which has entirely lost its value when the sum is once paid, except indeed in showing that it was really due and *has* been paid. In the same way in the Christian dispensation the only temple is a spiritual temple, the only altar is spiritual, the only true worship is "in spirit and in truth." Even our Divine Lord's sacrifice of Himself for the sins of the whole world was of value only because it was in essence spiritual: "Lo! I come to do Thy will, O God."

A priori therefore, from a general view of the principles which are the foundations of the Christian system as taught in the New Testament, it would seem that the possibility of the existence of a

¹ Exod. xix. 6.

² 1 Peter ii. 9.

³ Rev. xx. 6.

Sacerdotal caste, so to speak, under the new covenant is precluded.

But it is quite possible that a fuller consideration of the subject may lead to some modification of this opinion. There may, for instance, be certain terms, such as Priest (*ἱερεύς*), Altar (*θυσιαστήριον*), Priesthood (*ἱεράτευμα*, *ἱερωσύνη*), Sacrifice (*θυσία*), High Priest (*ἀρχιερεύς*), etc., employed in reference to offices and duties to be performed in connexion with the Christian Church. There may be some account of the institution of a sacerdotal order which would continue to discharge, with the requisite modifications, the religious duties performed under the Law by the Priests and Levites. All these and other matters require careful examination before we are justified in coming to a conclusion and giving an answer to the question under consideration. It is a question of such deep and far-reaching importance that it deserves the most earnest and attentive study.

The fact is that *all*¹ these sacerdotal terms are employed in the New Testament in connexion with the Christian Church. We must therefore inquire how and in what sense they are used, and how far their use implies the existence of a Christian Priesthood, distinct from the Spiritual priesthood of all believers.

(1) "Priests" (*ἱερεῖς*), are often mentioned in the New Testament, but only *Jewish* or *heathen* priests are thus spoken of, except in the Apocalypse, where the word is distinctly and indisputably applied to Christians, and that no less than three times (Rev. i. 6; v. 10; xx. 6). But in each such verse the term is used not of any special order or class, but of *all true Christians*. In the singular the same word is applied to a Jewish priest, a heathen priest, to Melchizedek, and to Christ, but to no apostle, bishop, or presbyter (the latter two words are of course interchangeable in the New Testament), or any other official of the Church. This is hardly to be wondered at, because the worship of the Church was modelled on that of the *synagogue*, not of the temple:—in fact the Epistle of James calls the Christian congregation "your synagogue" (Jas. ii. 2), and, in the synagogue, worship was conducted by the elders (presbyters), not by priests (*ἱερεῖς*).

(2) Two words are employed for "priesthood," *ἱεράτευμα* and *ἱερωσύνη*. The former is used only by St. Peter (1 Pet. ii. 5, 9), the

¹ Except perhaps "Altar" (a disputed point), see below.

latter by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. vii. 11, 12, 14, with another reading, 24). The former is used in the concrete sense of "a body of priests," the latter in Hebrews means the priestly office. But the term *ἱεράτευμα* is applied to the whole body of believers in Christ, not to any special section or order among them. The other word refers only to the Levitical priesthood, and the priesthood "after the order of Melchizedek" which Christ alone can possess. It is not mentioned as belonging to any order in the Christian Church.

(3) "High Priest" (*ἀρχιερεύς*) is used of the Jewish hierarch and also of our Lord, but not of any member of the Christian community.

(4) "Altar" (*θυσιαστήριον*) occurs fairly often in the New Testament; but with one possible exception (Heb. xiii. 10), it denotes (a) Abraham's altar; (b) The altar in the Temple; or (c) The heavenly altar in John's apocalyptic vision. It is at least highly improbable that the passage in Hebrews xiii. 10, can mean that the Christians at that time had *one* altar somewhere on earth, like the Jewish altar of incense or that of burnt sacrifice, or that they had church-buildings and an altar of some kind in each. Of neither does history contain the slightest hint for generations afterwards, nor does their synagogue-worship tend to confirm such a supposition. Without a priestly order (of which, as we have seen, we find no trace) a literal altar would not be admissible. Hence, if the passage does not mean "we Israelites have an altar" (and the temple was still standing when the Epistle was written), then the word must be used in a spiritual or metaphorical sense.

(5) "Sacrifices" (*θυσίαι*) are often mentioned in the New Testament. But when the word does not refer to Jewish or heathen offerings, it denotes either (a) Christ's one sacrifice offered on the Cross, or (b) what St. Peter (1 Pet. ii. 5), terms "spiritual sacrifices," or (c) is used metaphorically in the latter sense (cf. Rom. xii. 1). The New Testament nowhere applies the word to any material offering made by Christians. Not only so, but the Epistle to the Hebrews (*passim*) clearly and repeatedly declares that all material sacrifices are in themselves worthless, and also shows that Christ's sacrifice of Himself on the Cross was so perfect and complete that it left no room for any sacrifice, Jewish or Christian, except the offering of ourselves as "a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto

God, which is your reasonable service" (*λατρεία*, i.e. method of worship).

The natural conclusion from all this is exactly the same that we reached by our previous examination of the general fundamental principles which underlie the Christian Faith.

We thus see that not only is the idea of the existence of a sacerdotal order in the Christian Church contrary to its distinctive principles, but also that, whereas words of sacerdotal significance in both the Jewish and the heathen religious systems are not infrequently used in the New Testament in reference to things Christian, they are always there employed in a higher, spiritual sense, thus raising them to a higher plane and precluding the possibility of their use in the Church in the lower signification which they had previously had.

But let us examine the matter from another, a third, point of view—the negative. That is to say, let us inquire what terms are *not* used in the New Testament as descriptive of the officiating ministers and the ceremonies of the Church.

That the New Testament does recognize the existence of a special body of persons with special functions in a large measure distinct from the general mass of Christians is indisputable. To different members of this body the titles of apostles, prophets, presbyters, deacons, deaconesses, etc., are assigned. There are also certain ordinances of Divine appointment, especially Baptism and the Lord's Supper, otherwise called at times "the breaking of bread." We have distinct accounts of the institution of the two Sacrament and of the appointment of certain persons to some of these offices. But the point to notice here is that nowhere is the Lord's Supper entitled a Sacrifice; nowhere is the title "priest" (*ιερεύς*) given to any one holding any one of these offices, nowhere is a hint given of the existence of any "priesthood" (*ιεράτευμα, ιερωσύνη*) in the Church other than that common to all believers. Christ is the only true High Priest, and His priesthood is unchangeable, not passing from Him to any successor, like the Jewish priesthood and high priesthood (*ἀπαράβατον*). No directions are given for a special attire for the Christian "clergy" (to use by anticipation a term employed in the New Testament—I Pet. v. 3—in quite another sense). In all these matters the contrast between the Aaronic priesthood and

the Christian ministry is absolute and unmistakable. It is worthy of mention that, even to the present day, the garments which some clergy value as denoting their possession of a distinctive "priesthood" (*ιερωσύνη, sacerdotium*) superior to that possessed in common by all true Christians are historically known to be derived, not from the priestly attire of either the Jewish or the heathen sacrificial priest (*ιερεύς*), but from the dress of the Roman gentleman, heathen or Christian, in the time of the Empire. This fact is in itself sufficient to show that there never was in the Christian Church any special sacerdotal dress,¹ as there was in the Jewish, simply because there was, originally at least, no sacerdotal order, as there were no sacerdotal functions, in the Church of Christ.

From this standpoint too we are led to the same conclusion as before.

We have learnt that in New Testament times there was no trace of the existence of a "priesthood" belonging to the "clergy" as such, and not to the laity. It *may*, of course, be urged that the thing may have existed, though not named; in fact that its not being mentioned is due to its being so universally recognized that there was not the slightest reason to insist upon it. Such an assertion cannot be seriously taken as an argument, for any imaginable practice or doctrine might be "proved" in the same way. It might, for instance, be argued that for the same reason the Book of Mormon was revered by the early Church. In fact it would be much easier to maintain the latter thesis on these grounds than the former.

There can, however, be no question that the doctrine of a special "priesthood" of the clergy is now widely held by many Christians, and that it holds a leading place in the belief—we might almost say in the Creed—of certain Churches. This being the case the idea must have had an origin, and it should be possible to discover *whence* it originated, and perhaps also *when*, just as one can learn by carefully examining Roman Catholic literature at what particular period and how the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Pope, or of the Papal Supremacy, or of Transubstantiation, arose and obtained acceptance. In respect to other religions and philosophies, such as

¹ What Polycrates, an Asian bishop, says about St. John's being a *ιερεύς* and wearing the *πέραλον* (Eusebius, *Hist. Ecc.* v. 24) is not accepted as literally correct by scholars.

Buddhism, Hindûism, or Islâm, one cannot lay claim to be a real student of any of these systems unless he has devoted considerable attention to the changes which have gradually and in process of time taken place in them, so as to learn the origin of such changes and under what circumstances and influences they occurred.

Surely the same method of study is not only possible but necessary with reference to the Christian Faith. With regard to the doctrine of a special "priesthood" of the clergy as distinct from the Christian laity, we have seen that it has no foundation in Holy Scripture, nor does even a single trace of such a belief occur in the New Testament. Let us now examine the works of the "Apostolic Fathers," in order to see whether any of them taught it, though their authority must be admitted to be at the very least far inferior to that of the writers of the Canonical Books of the New Testament. Even if they held the doctrine (as they did not), it could not be accepted, being contrary to New Testament teaching.

Of most of the sacerdotal terms mentioned above the use in the Apostolic Fathers is very limited indeed. This is true also of the "Didachê" or "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." Our limits will not permit us to deal at any length with them, but we may briefly mention that:—

In the Apostolic Fathers we find the words *ἀρχιερεῖς* and *ιερεῖς* only in Clement of Rome and Ignatius. Clement uses the words only in his Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. xl. and there, writing before the destruction of the Temple, he applies them only to the Jewish High Priests and the Aaronic priests.

Ignatius, too, uses them (*Ad Philadelphenos*, cap. 9), speaking of the Jewish priests and high priest. He then goes on to speak of Christ as our High Priest, in accordance with the Epistle to the Hebrews. Thus nowhere are the Christian clergy given such titles in these ancient Christian writings.

In the *Didachê* the word *ιερεῖς* does not occur at all, though a full account is given of the way in which the Holy Communion was then administered. The word *ἀρχιερεῖς* occurs but once, and it applies to an order no longer extant in our time—that of the prophets. It is enjoined that the first-fruits be given to the prophets, as among the Jews to the high ¹ Priest and the others who assisted

¹ Especially in Deut. xxvi. 2-11: See also Lev. xxiii. 10; Numbers xviii. 12; Deut. xviii. 4.

him for their sustenance, because "they are your high priests." This is instructive as showing not only that the word is used metaphorically, so to speak, but also as proving that the presbyters (still called *ἐπίσκοποι*) were *not* deemed to hold an office analogous to that of the Aaronic priests.

The term *θυσία* does not seem to occur at all, except in a spiritual sense, in the Apostolic Fathers. In the *Didachê* it is found only in chap. xiv. 1, 2, 3,¹ where too it is employed in a spiritual sense, as in the New Testament.

The word "Altar" is met with some five times in the Apostolic Fathers. Clement (*Ep. ad Cor.*, chap. xli.), uses it only once, and then of the Jewish altar in the Temple. Ignatius employs it figuratively three times. He says: "Let no one err; unless one be within the altar, he lacks God's bread" (*Ep. ad Ephes.* 5). He uses the word in a like figurative sense, also in *Ep. ad Magnes*, 7, and in *Ep. ad Philadelphenos*, 4. Polycarp employs the word only once, when he says that well-conducted widows "are God's altar (*v.l.* altars)" in *Ep. ad Philipp.*, 4.

To find *ἱερεύς* or *ἀρχιερεύς* applied to any Christian minister we must turn in the first place to the heathen satirist Lucian, and in the second to the falsely so-called *Apostolic Constitutions*. In the Pseudo-Clementine Liturgy contained in the latter work, dating probably about 260 A.D. at earliest, the "elected bishop" (*χειροτονηθεὶς ἐπίσκοπος*) is in a rubric styled *ὁ ἀρχιερεύς* (Neale and Littledale's *Primitive Liturgies*, pp. 85, 86, 92). Neither of these can be deemed high authorities from a Christian standpoint. In striking contrast with the Pseudo-Clementine Liturgy we find Minucius Felix, an Orthodox writer (about 230 A.D.), using the word "Sacerdotes" of heathen priests only, repudiating the idea of a Christian altar, and speaking of only "spiritual sacrifices" among Christians.

II.

We must now consider some objections which have been raised to the conclusion that the early Church recognized no sacrificial priesthood as existing in the Church, other than the *ἱερωσύνη* of all true believers in Christ.

(1) "If the Jews (in spite of the fact that in Exodus xix. 6, the same title of 'a kingdom of priests' is applied to the whole nation

that St. Peter applies to the whole body of Christians) yet had a sacerdotal priesthood, why should not the Christians too have one? ”

Among other reasons, because the title *was never applied* to the Jewish nation. Exodus xix. 5, 6, speaks of the *future* (as the Hebrew text explicitly states, and as the Targum and the Hebrew commentators explain it), saying distinctly that, *if* the nation fulfilled certain conditions, which it *did not* fulfil, then it *would* become what St. Peter says the Christian Church *has* become, “ a royal priesthood ” (1 Peter ii. 9.)

To prove the existence of the special Levitical *sacerdotium* among the Jews we have in the Law of Moses a detailed account of its Divine appointment. It would require a similar account of Divine appointment to prove that a similar “ priesthood ” exists in the Christian Church. But we have seen that no such account occurs ; therefore no such separate sacerdotal class can exist in the Church of Christ.

Again, the establishment of such a class would be a *step backward*. Even among the Jews it was fading away long before our Lord’s time. To take away from all Christians their spiritual priesthood in order to establish a sacerdotal priesthood on the Jewish model would be a downward step. It would be a distinct *degradation* to the clergy to put them in such a position, on a far lower plane than the laity, if the laity were to retain the higher spiritual priesthood while the clergy were merely sacrificial priests.

Were there a sacrificial class in the Christian Church, there must be prescribed a ceremonial dress, ritual, altar, sacrifices, etc. None of these are so much as mentioned in the New Testament or in the early Christian literature.

(2) “ But in Romans xv. 16, St. Paul uses the verb *ιερουργειν* (to officiate as a sacrificial priest) of himself.”

The passage runs thus : “ Ministering-in-sacrifice (R.V. margin) the Gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be made acceptable.” Here the thing offered in sacrifice is “ the Gospel of God.” Of course no material sacrifice is meant, none of the Gospels having yet been written. How such metaphorical language can be fancied adequate to support the claim that St. Paul was a sacrificial priest it is hard to see. The “ offering up of the Gentiles ” was their own work, according to Romans xii. 1, as no one else could possibly do it but those personally concerned.

(3) “ The Christian presbyter represents the Christian people,

who are 'a royal priesthood (*ἱεράτευμα*),' according to 1 Peter ii. 9: Hence, as the representative of a body of sacrificial priests he is evidently a sacrificial priest (*ἱερεὺς*) himself."

If he is in any true sense a Christian believer, of course he shares in the "royal priesthood," just as truly as any of the laity. He does not need to claim it as representing the laity collectively. But the theory of the objector here is that the presbyter, as representing the laity, can claim as their representative *an office which they do not possess*, viz., that of an offerer of material sacrifices, like the Aaronic priests. The argument is, so to speak, that an English elector, as representing a body of English electors, has a right to sit in the French Parliament. How can holders of the English franchise give one of their number a right to an office which they are not qualified to hold themselves? How can a number of persons forming a "spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood (*ἱεράτευμα*), to offer up *spiritual sacrifices*" (1 Pet. ii. 5), as St. Peter says—how can they possibly authorize one of their number to offer *material* sacrifices for them, and constitute him their representative in doing what they have no right to do?

Again, to delegate any one as our representative implies our resigning our rights into his hands. He and we cannot both exercise them at the same time. Were Christians generally to delegate their spiritual priesthood to the clergy, that would practically amount to giving it up entirely, which would mean giving up the right to pray, the right to approach God through Christ—in a word it would be ceasing to be Christians in any true meaning of the word. But even then the resignation of our *spiritual* priesthood into the hands of one of our number, were such a thing possible, would not make him a *sacrificial* priest in an entirely different *and much lower* sense.

Once more, as a matter of fact the laity are never asked to delegate, nor have they ever delegated, their spiritual priesthood to the clergy. The spiritual priesthood, in the nature of the case, is incapable of being delegated. Moreover, whoever heard of the laity electing one of their number as their "priest"? The theory is based upon a more patent fiction than even the hypothesis of "the Social compact."

Strangely enough, those who support the theory that the clergy have a "priesthood" as representing the laity are the very people

who rightly urge the laity to exercise their "spiritual priesthood." But this is a contradiction in terms. How can the laity exercise it, if they have chosen the clergy as their delegates for that purpose? Or, is the matter made more logical by holding that the laity have delegated to the clergy the office of sacrificial priests, which the laity do not themselves possess?

(4) "The words *λειτουργός*, *λειτουργεῖν*, which are used of the Christian ministry in the New Testament (Acts. xiii. 2; Rom. xv. 16) are technical words for priestly ministry, both Jewish and Pagan." ¹

The fact is that *λειτουργός* means, first of all, one who does service to the public in any way. Polybius uses the word as denoting "a workman." Then it came to denote one who served God, in any capacity, in connexion with Divine worship in the Temple or anywhere else. Thus in Romans xiii. 6, even heathen rulers are called *λειτουργοὶ Θεοῦ*, "God's ministers." This is sufficient to show that a sacrificial meaning is not by any means necessarily attached to the word in the New Testament. The persons referred to in Acts xiii. 2, are not Christian presbyters but laymen; to wit Barnabas, Symeon Niger, Lucius of Cyrene and Manaen. One only of these *afterwards* became an "apostle" of a Church, but not in the full meaning of the term Apostle. In Romans xv. 16, St. Paul is "a minister (*λειτουργός*) of Jesus Christ unto the Gentiles," surely without a sacrificial sense. The angels are "ministering (*λειτουργικὰ*) spirits" in Hebrews i. 14, not because they exercise "priestly ministry" but because they "do service." The verb is used of the service of a priest in the Temple in Hebrews x. 11, but is distinguished in some measure from "offering sacrifices." Hence it is hardly correct to say that the words are used "technically," in connexion with "priestly ministry." They certainly do not prove any sacerdotal office to belong to the persons to whom they refer.

(5) "In 1 Corinthians xi. 25, the verb rendered 'do' (*ποιεῖτε*) has a sacrificial sense."

This is a mere assertion, contrary to all the circumstances attending the Institution of the Lord's Supper. It was not in the Temple, nor at an altar, nor was our Lord a sacrificial priest on earth (Hebrews viii. 4).

It is interesting to notice that even Bishop Gore (*Orders and Unity*, p. 65) admits that "There is not found in the New Testament

¹Bishop Gore, *Orders and Unity*, p. 161, note.

any basis for the idea of a priestly class in the Church occupying any nearer position to God than the rest of their brethren." He agrees with Dr. Denney in saying "There is not—as in the nature of the case there could not be—any trace in the New Testament of a Christian priest making sacrifice for sin and mediating *again* . . . between God and men" (p. 159). Yet the Bishop holds that the Church "was continually exercising its priesthood; offering up spiritual sacrifices . . . as one body, acting through its appointed officers; and these officers came to be called priests,¹ as being, like the Old Testament priests, agents and officers of a priestly body, by a Divine appointment." But we have already seen that the argument implied in the latter part of this statement is in error; for in Exodus xix. 6, the Jewish Church is *not* declared to be "a priestly body." A promise was given it of becoming "a kingdom of priests," *if* it fulfilled certain conditions. These it did *not* fulfil. They were fulfilled by our Lord, and hence all who are "in Christ" are "a royal priesthood" (1 Peter ii. 9). In the case of the Aaronic priesthood there is recorded a "Divine appointment"; but it is precisely this that is lacking to create a sacrificial priestly body in the Christian Church. Undoubtedly the presbyters of the Church were in the third century (rarely and doubtfully in the second) called *ιερείς*, but without Scriptural authority, and hence wrongly, through heathen influences and misconceptions. This fact by no means justifies the title being given them. Neither the length of time that has since elapsed nor the wide extent of the prevalence of the error can ever make it right. No amount of antiquity, no degree of popular prejudice, can make right that which is wrong.

In conclusion: we have ascertained, as a matter of history, that

¹Though defending the view that the word "priest," in the sense of "a sacrificial priest" (*ιερείς*) may legitimately be applied to a Christian presbyter, Bishop Gore nevertheless says: "In the Church the idea of the priest has been at certain periods and in certain regions allowed to become too simply that of a man who in virtue of his ordination has the power to offer sacrifices for the quick and the dead, and to absolve his fellow-men. This definition of his office by a specific power to perform certain rites, having efficacy with God on behalf of others, brings the idea of a Christian priest perilously near to the pagan standard of priesthood which Christianity superseded" (*Orders and Unity*, p. 164).

This being so, surely we should be careful not to use such a title as "priest" in the sense of *hierēus* in reference to a Christian presbyter. It is not justified by Holy Scripture, it is contrary to the practice of the early Church, and it cannot be defended by exact scholarship, while its heathen origin is historically evident, and the effect of the use of such an incorrect term has been evil in every age since it was first introduced.

the doctrine of the sacrificial priesthood of the clergy arose and spread in the Church during the third and succeeding centuries. The terms *ιερεύς* and *ἀρχιερεύς* were first applied to a presbyter and a bishop respectively only in a figurative sense. The metaphor was afterwards taken as expressing a literal fact. This took place through the influence of heathen sacerdotal ideas, which prevailed especially in Syria,¹ but also in other places, and was aided by the entrance of large numbers of converts from heathenism into the Church in every land. The orders of bishop, presbyter and deacon came in time to be at first compared and afterwards gradually confounded with the three orders of high priest, priest, and levite among the Jews, though this was contrary to the whole spirit of the New Testament. Cyprian (probably through what we may frankly call ignorance) fell into this mistake, and through his great influence the error spread more rapidly than it might otherwise have done. It continued to prevail almost universally until the revived study of the Greek New Testament at the Reformation once more revealed the true spiritual nature of the Christian religion and the fact of the spiritual priesthood of all true Christians, thus restoring us in this great matter to "the liberty of the glory of the children of God."

W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL.

P.S. It is not always remembered that the word *priest* in the Prayer Book is derived from the Greek *presbyteros* through the latinized *presbyter* and the old French *prestre* (modern *prêtre*), the term rendered *elder* in the New Testament, and is therefore strictly correct, not originally meaning a sacrificial minister, which in Greek is *hierews*. Unfortunately, however, there is in English no word to express *hierews* (in Hebrew *kôhên*). Hence in both Old Testament and New Testament "priest" is used to translate the latter word, and this has caused confusion even in the minds of educated men.

¹Bishop Lightfoot, *Dissertation on the Christian Ministry*.



Religion and the Future:

A RETROSPECT AND A FORECAST.

II.

THE Nature and Constitution of the Christian Church has been disputed for centuries amongst controversial theologians; but one fact at least is generally admitted, though not by any means acted upon to the extent that is necessary if the Church is to fulfil her destiny;—and that is the Church as a Society does not consist only of the Clergy, but of the Laity as well. That fact must cease to be a latent opinion and must become a dominating principle. The Laity of the Future must not be half in and half out of the Church. If they are members of the Church then they must share her humiliations as well as her triumphs. They must not march with the crowd, and then as soon as the Church comes under fire hang back and commence to criticize. We seem almost constitutionally incapable of grasping the nature of New Testament Churchmanship. Look, for example, at St. Paul's strictures in 1 Corinthians v. St. Paul commands no half measures there against any layman who by his sins endangers the prestige of the Christian Society. It may be objected that in actual practice any such conception of corporate discipline would inevitably tend towards hypocrisy. It may do so in some cases, but no more than the position of a magistrate who condemns his fellows tends to hypocrisy in the character of its occupant. It is a risk that must be run. We must at all costs preserve the dignity and responsibility of Christian Fellowship. We have lost the ideal for a variety of reasons, but there is no reason why we should not strive to recover it. We do not want a revival of Excommunication which can be so easily abused, but we do want a better appreciation on the part of the Laity of their responsibilities for maintaining the Christian standard of conduct in business and public affairs. That is the only way in which we can ever change some of the unprincipled methods of modern business.

We must now turn to discover the elements of hope in the present situation. And we will consider first the problem of the attitude of modern Scientists touched upon earlier in this paper. And here

we meet with distinctly hopeful signs. For the old idea that Science had destroyed by its discoveries the possibility of revelation has been entirely abandoned. Religion and Science move in different spheres. It is not the object of Religion to teach Science any more than it is the object of Science to teach Religion. Science deals with the phenomena provided by nature, religion with the realities of spiritual experience. The supposed conflict has arisen because men did not clearly see the difference of aims and methods between the two. A certain amount of friction will probably always be inevitable between them if only because to some extent their "spheres of influence" overlap. Another fruitful source of confusion has been the misunderstanding of the nature of Scientific conclusions. For most of the supposed conclusions of Science are really only theories of which no proof by demonstration can be offered. Take for example the electrical theory of matter. It may be true that "matter" is made up of molecules which are composed of atoms which in turn consist of electrons, but even so we are to understand "that this electrical theory of matter," according to Professor Arthur Thomson, "is far beyond verification, that it makes big assumptions, and that it leaves many difficulties."¹ Its value lies in its being a working hypothesis. But such an hypothesis does not mean that Science is encroaching any more than before upon the domain of Religion. Science has vastly illuminated our ideas of matter, but she has carefully refrained from saying anything as to the cause of the original electrons. Such discoveries enlarge our knowledge, but they cannot shake our faith. And even for a moment supposing that Scientists did succeed in producing life from matter, "the right conclusion would not be that life is less wonderful, but that matter is more wonderful than we supposed." And as Professor Gwatkin proceeds to point out the mystery of life is still unsolved, and the only gain would be that we should "cease to speak of matter as inert."² Again we may take Evolution as representing one of the most popular ideas of our time. What is the real truth as to the conclusions of modern Scientists? Here again we fail to find that dogmatic assertion as to the origin of life which much popular opinion would lead us to expect. We find an almost surprising amount of reticence and caution: "In regard to

¹ *Introduction to Science*, p. 136.

² *The Knowledge of God*. Gifford Lectures, vol. 1. p. 18.

a problem like the origin of life the only scientific position is one of agnosticism."¹ And in referring to Evolution it must always be remembered that what the word implies is not a theory of the origin of life, but an explanation of the method by which all life operates. "Evolution," writes Professor Gwatkin, "only denotes a method of action and tells us nothing of the power that acts, except that it acts in this way and not in that."² So then we fail to find that scientific disproof of Religion which is popularly supposed to have occurred. Instead we find a far more cautious spirit prevailing amongst Scientists, which is a hopeful sign for the future and may go far to help in the reconciliation of the thinking public with the forms of organized religion.

We turn now to another problem which at first does not appear to bear very directly upon our subject, the Problem of Education. But as the "child is father to the man," so the degree in which the child is genuinely touched by religion in its earliest years largely determines whether he will cling to the Church in the more difficult years that follow. Now here again happily we meet with hopeful signs. We have appeared to awake at last to the seriousness of the position into which we have been steadily drifting. For there was a serious danger that while we were becoming as a people thoroughly democratic, we were failing to provide that standard of true education which alone can fit men for the exercise of the privilege of the Vote. But that has not been our only fault. We have possessed a wrong because a purely utilitarian³ idea of Education. We have thought too much about technical results and too little about the development of character. In the spirit of reaction against the crude conception of Education as consisting only of the three "Rs" we have gone to the opposite extreme of trying to inculcate into restless and immature beings a range of subjects more fit for the Academy than the School. And yet what is the general result of our Educational system? A love of books, of study, of reading? Not at all, rather a fierce hatred of them all. We possess as Lord Macaulay told the Government of India in a Minute which Sir George Otto Trevelyan has well described as "long enough for an article in a quarterly review, and as businesslike as a Report of a Royal Com-

¹ Thomson, p. 140.

² p. 54, vol. 1.

³ Using that word not in the philosophic sense but in the lower sense of that which aims only at immediate usefulness in practical affairs.

mission," a literature "more valuable than that of classical antiquity."¹ And yet how many in proportion even of the sons of the "leisured" class, learn to read, still less to love this priceless heritage of our race? The neglect of the reading of English classical literature has been one of the blots upon our educational system, and as yet there seems to be no very clear determination that this reproach shall be removed. Though novels of a sensational kind are widely read and a certain amount of biographical literature, especially if it be of the nature of "revelations," greedily devoured, yet there does not seem to have been much improvement since Ruskin wrote that fierce paragraph where he says: "It is simply and sternly impossible for the English public, at this moment, to understand any thoughtful writing,—so incapable of thought has it become in its insanity of avarice."² Stern words those and not likely to be popular in these days, but they go to the root of the problem. For the note of avarice is still prevalent in the popular idea that our education for the future must be predominantly scientific, and for what purpose? Simply to enable us to adequately cope with any nation that is rash enough to try to share with England the economic spoils of victory! But we hope and believe that better counsels will prevail, especially with regard to that aspect of the educational problem with which we are more immediately concerned.

The religious side of the problem of education in England has long presented the unhappy spectacle of the followers of Jesus Christ unable to agree as to what the little children of our land should be taught about Jesus of Nazareth. The fear of dogma and a suspicion of the privileged ecclesiastical position of the Church of England, have hitherto combined to prevent the co-operation of the Nonconformists in any considerable scheme of religious education, thus preventing the rising generation—the Democracy of to-morrow—from receiving those religious impressions and Christian principles of life which are so essential for the development of character. But surely in the light of the revelations of this war as to the inevitable tendencies of secular education they can no longer tolerate a system which deprives men of the truest source of guidance. Unhappy country shall we be if we cannot find opportunity to teach that

¹ *Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay* (Silver Library ed.), p. 291.

² *Sesame and Lilies*, p. 62. Some of Ruskin's works might well be included in the curriculum of the higher classes in schools.

Word which should be always "the ground of every argument and the test of every action." Undenominationalism has failed because "simple Bible teaching" can mean almost anything or nothing. It is not sufficient to fill a child's mind merely with the bare "facts" of the life of Christ unless those "facts" are presented in a fashion and with a faith which by the method of its sympathetic presentation wins the admiration and stirs the soul of the child itself. In this connexion Professor J. J. Findlay, in his work on *The School*, makes a useful suggestion. After asserting that "what most men desire is not less religion, but more," he goes on to say that "I would rather urge in place of right of entry, the parent should demand a right of substitution. For the proper venue for religious instruction is not the public . . . but the church building, the house of God itself," and he then maintains that the clergyman himself is the fittest teacher and "not the public school teacher who . . . finds his allegiance divided between Church and State." And since they are now sent to "swimming baths and playfields"¹ such an arrangement ought not to be difficult to initiate and carry out. At all events we cannot any longer tolerate as a nominally Christian people a condition of affairs which reduces the instruction in the most important of all subjects to a contemptible minimum.

And here then in these and other indications of a better appreciation of the urgent necessity that the rising generation shall be men of faith as well as men of knowledge, we see one of the possibilities by means of which the men and women of the future will be more in harmony with the Church and more disposed to recognize in religion a necessary constituent of life.

We must now turn to consider the urgent and important problem of the future relation of the Church to the problem of the "condition of England." Again there are not wanting signs that the consciences of Churchmen are at last being stirred to realize that the Church cannot any longer remain indifferent to a state of affairs which cannot possibly be considered as Christian. On every hand we are realizing that comfort and healthy conditions of life ought not to be the privileges of the few, but the legitimate possession of

¹ *The School*, pp. 110, 112. Space will not permit of a discussion of Sunday Schools. As a whole they do not appear to be overwhelmingly successful in keeping their scholars faithful to the Church in after life. The Church Lads' Brigade and similar organizations appear far more successful in this direction and might be vastly extended.

the many. If Christ hallowed all human life that is innocent then the proper "extension of the Incarnation" is to see that the conditions of existence are such that all life may be fashioned after the great pattern of the Gospel. And so long as the Church never forgets that the salvation of men is her first concern, she must strive her utmost to elevate the oppressed by providing those conditions of life which can help though they cannot achieve the ultimate redemption of men. We are all influenced by our surroundings, and it is unfair to expect of those whose life is perpetually confined within a base and depressing environment to become a very virtuous or even industrious people. Yet we need to be on our guard against ascribing to environment a potentiality for righteousness which it certainly does not possess. "We must beware at any cost of that cheap fatalism, which issues in the false doctrine of the predestination of man by matter, and of election unto salvation by a mysterious environment."¹ But such considerations, important though they may be, must not allow us ever to become apathetic in this noblest of all secular causes. The Social problem is with us and we as members of Christ's Church must always remember the example of Christ Himself. "When we look out on the world and on history we are continually confronted by the urgent question whether the purpose of human life and the aim of human effort is to be the exaltation, the advantage, the progress of a few, or whether Christian and honourable men must set before themselves the good, the progress and advantage of all."² For a Christian there can surely be only one reply to that challenge; for Jesus Christ Himself never limited even His ministrations of the body to the few. "He fed the multitudes," not merely the Disciples and Apostles. And one of the criterions of faith is to be the measure of our consideration for the hungry, the naked and the forsaken. To achieve this may sometimes involve a participation in politics distasteful to some devout Churchmen. But in a State where so much depends upon combination for the attainment of common ends and where the ballot box has such an enormous power in determining the actions of politicians the course is inevitable. And in this connexion it is

¹ Ernest Barker: *Political Thought in England from Spencer to to-day*, p. 147.

² Dr. A. J. Carlyle: *The Influence of Christianity upon Social and Political Ideas*, pp. 124, 125.

above all things imperative that the high standard expected of a Christian should never be lowered or surrendered in the performance of any political action. The Church has not always set the world the highest example in this respect.¹

But after all what we chiefly want is to recover the Social Ideal of the Early Church. "The Gospel was a social power from the very first; for the power which claimed the whole man had to cleanse all the relations of life."² St. Paul, the greatest of all bishops, if such we may regard him, was a worker as well as an Apostle. He it was who stoutly declared that if a man would not work neither should he eat.³ Nearly all the Apostles were workers and artisans. And there can be no doubt about the inherent dignity of manual labour to a Christian when our Lord could labour in a carpenter's shop and St. Paul maintain himself with the work of his hands. Yet in recent years we have failed somehow to co-ordinate the fervour of faith with the industry of the world. The man who is working all day in the heat and confusion of a great factory will easily believe that the Church has no message for him if he never hears that work well done is genuine worship and one of the elementary principles of Christian life. Doubtless in some cases the force of this appeal is negatived by the artificial restrictions of output for political or trade unions reasons. But it nevertheless remains true. And is it not a blot upon our democracy that this easy compliance with any standard of work but the very highest which Ruskin deplored as the "special characteristic of modern work," should be actually systematized in some cases by the workers themselves? "Let us have done with this kind of work at once."⁴ Herein perhaps lies the secret of the Church's success in this great problem—if only she will proclaim a Gospel of Work for all classes as part of religion itself, giving it that dignity and worth which belongs to all human effort faithfully performed. The signs of the time are full of hope in this as in the other problems that we have discussed. Our leaders seem alive to the urgency of these problems, as the Report of the Archbishop's Committee on Church and State⁵

¹ See Dr. Forrest: *The Authority of Christ*, p. 235 and note. The whole chapter is useful in this connexion.

² Prof. H. M. Gwatkin: *Early Church History to A.D. 313*, p. 226, vol. ii.

³ Thess. iii, 10., cf. 1 Tim. v. 8. ⁴ *Seven Lamps of Architecture*.

⁵ Space forbids a reference to the question of self-government for the Church, but it is obvious that it must come, and the sooner the better.

and the National Mission Committees recently appointed clearly show.

We have now very briefly passed in review the various phases of religious life before the war ; we have noted the revolutionary effect of the war upon the social and religious life of the nation, and we have endeavoured very briefly to see in three great departments of thought and action what elements of hope exist for the Church. We have seen how before the war the Church seemed too afraid to launch out into the deep of the great and pressing problems of the hour, and appeared far too content to expend her surplus time and energy in disputes over the details of domestic affairs. Then came the call of the war which revealed unsuspected possibilities in human nature, possibilities which were supposed to have been eradicated long ago by the enervations of an effete civilization. This upheaval was accompanied by an insistent call for a Faith for the firing line, and suddenly we became aware that our Faith had lost that note of triumphant and victorious certainty which steels the heart against adversity, and which was certainly the predominant element of that fervent Christianity which overcame the Roman Empire. We had wrongly neglected the preaching of the Cross and almost unconsciously substituted tentative efforts to express the " teaching office of the Church," with the result that men had almost forgotten that Christianity is pre-eminently a religion of decision for time and eternity. Consequently we heard little about Assurance but much about Progress. We had edifying moral essays, but kept well clear of moral certainties.¹ So that it is not surprising that our age had become what Mr. Burroughs rightly terms " typically Laodicean—blending just a little of the warmth of the supernatural with the cold water of those material calculations which really determined all its actions." * We find ourselves therefore faced with a gigantic task, which is nothing less than the Christianizing of the social life of England by the action within the State of a consecrated Individualism. And to accomplish this the religious forces of England must be prepared to unite. If we allow our differences and jealousies to hinder so essential a condition of victory, we shall

¹ These are of necessity sweeping assertions, but they allow of many exceptions. Dr. Forsyth is even more emphatic in his *Justification of God*, quoted above.

* *The Fight for the Future*, p. 82.

be traitors to our cause. The dangers of secularization are great ; our country stands at the parting of the ways. To every Christian there comes the call, now more insistent than ever, to make the Christian ideal of life a practical force in everyday affairs. But in modern days the individual can achieve but little by himself. He must unite with others if his cause is to succeed. And why should the greatest of all causes suffer from the lack of such an obvious source of strength ? But while we emphasize the need for resolute corporate action, it must never be forgotten that after all it is the individual that counts and that the Church, humanly speaking, depends for her success in her welfare with the world upon the keenness and faithfulness of every member. If all Churchmen were filled with an almost fierce determination that the Christian law of life should become the law of England what a force for good the Church would become. Is this an ideal too remote from the world of prosaic facts to be even contemplated ? Surely not ! With God all things are possible. " Be of good cheer ; I have overcome the world." " This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our Faith." So said Master and disciple, and it is only faith in a living Lord which can give us the necessary power which will enable us to go forth into the future and by our earnestness, perseverance and " sweet reasonableness " commend to the toiling millions of industrial England the Eternal Gospel of the Son of God.

CLIFFORD J. OFFER.



Preachers' Pages.

HOMILETICAL HINTS AND OUTLINES.

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

Advent Sunday.

Text : " Behold I send my messenger before Thy face." " Among them that are born of women," etc.—*Matt.* xi. 10, 11.

The work of the forerunner may well engage our attention as the Advent season opens. The question with which John sent his disciples is rather outside the scope of our present study ; it is thoughtfully discussed in Mr. Bernard Lucas' *Conversations with Christ*. It is at least noteworthy that our Lord seems anxious to guard the reputation of the Baptist and to shield him from calumny and misunderstanding. He pronounced, finally, a eulogy which places him in a position of unique distinction—indeed sets him in the foremost place among the world's worthies. Notice—

I. THE AUSTERITY OF THE BAPTIST. He came " neither eating nor drinking " (*Matt.* xi. 18) ; he preached the simple life and practised it—(a) *In respect of his DIET*. It was such as was within his slender means but which was yet wholesome and sufficient for his needs. These are considerations which should guide us at all times but more especially in times like the present, when our country calls us to make every sacrifice and exercise the most rigid economy in the interests of personal safety and national security. (b) *In respect of his DRESS*. What else is there that so plainly reveals character ? The slovenly man displays a disorderliness in his apparel which will be found to reveal itself in everything he does. The over-dressed woman exhibits a vanity which often characterizes almost every act. John's attire was hardly fashionable—it was rough but useful.

II. THE AUDACITY OF THE BAPTIST. The world is tolerably full of men and women who may always be safely trusted to say and do what is called " the right thing "—that is to say the thing that will *pay* because it will *please*. But the Baptist was not one of these time-servers. Such persons will never " boldly rebuke vice "—they are too fearful of personal consequences. Study the Baptist's ministry and see how his proclamation of the Kingdom (a

popular idea upon which he fastened, making it his text and theme) (Matt. iii. 2), was accompanied by fierce denunciations of unrighteousness wherever he discerned it. It was a display of fine courage that at last cost him his life.

Second Sunday in Advent.

Text : " The Word of God which liveth and abideth for ever."—
1 *Pet.* i. 23.

The subject of Holy Scripture—its origin, its character and its functions—is brought before us to-day. This is because the ministry of the Word is one of the ways in which our Lord still has an advent—coming to heart and conscience. No other Church in Christendom gives such prominence to Holy Scripture in the public services. The attitude of our Church to the Bible is revealed in Article VI. Consider—

I. THE CLAIMS OF THE BIBLE. What has it to say about itself?
(a) As to its inspiration (2 Tim. iii. 16 ; Acts i. 16 ; Heb. iii. 7).
(b) As to its potentiality (Heb. iv. 12 ; cf. Ps. cxix. 50). (c) As to its permanence (see text, Ps. cxix. 89 ; Matt. v. 18, etc.).

II. THE CHARMS OF THE BIBLE. It enshrines the finest specimens of primitive literature, embracing history, poetry, law. Again, take the history alone and see how wide is the range, for it tells us the story of the universe, of the human family and of the Church of God. Yet these things constitute but a few of its many charms. Nor are they by any means the most prominent. Think of (a) *Its unique adaptability*. Written in the East it yet appeals forcibly to our Western minds. (b) *Its unflinching vitality*. Many attempts have been made to silence its witness but it still triumphantly meets every challenge of its foes. (c) *Its unsparing truthfulness*. In a series of portraits it reveals human nature in its true light, without respect of persons. (d) *Its undisputed accuracy*. Modern research confirms its testimony. Containing the Divine programme of the world's history, it shows how God has been steadily working His purpose out according to that programme. The past fulfilment of prophecy is the pledge of the ultimate accomplishment of God's plans.

III. THE CONQUESTS OF THE BIBLE. (a) *Some of these are recorded in the book itself*. E.g., in the time of Josiah (2 Chron. xxxiv. 14, etc.) ; in the days of Ezra (Neh. viii. 9). (b) *Others are recorded in the annals of the Church*. For example take the

Reformation, or the history of the Church in Uganda, or an annual report of the Bible Society.

Third Sunday in Advent.

Text: "Ministers . . . stewards."—I *Cor.* iv. 1.

General subject—the Christian Ministry. Consider—(a) its opportunities, (b) its obligations (I *Cor.* ix. 16). Observe the four judgments to which the Apostle finds himself exposed. Note the significance of the verbal imagery. Let us think of the ministry as—

I. A RECOGNIZED INSTITUTION. The Church had already a settled ministry and the three orders can be traced in the New Testament. "Whom shall we judge lawfully called and sent?" See Article XXXII.

II. AN HONOURABLE VOCATION. St. Paul said, "I magnify mine office" (Rom. xi. 13; see also 2 *Cor.* v. 18-20). Observe the Apostle's jealousy for its reputation as indicated by 2 Corinthians vi. 3, I Corinthians ix. 12, etc. (Are not the clergy too often shy of setting before our young men the claims of the ministry? We hear much of the shortage of candidates for Holy Orders, and there are signs, too, that they no longer, to any considerable extent, come from a class that once supplied large numbers. Even Christian parents discourage their sons from pursuing any course in life which holds out no pecuniary prospects. The subject for the day seems to afford a suitable opportunity for pleading for a consideration of the sacred ministry not as a profession but as a holy calling.)

III. A RESPONSIBLE POSITION. St. Paul, indifferent to praise or blame, had a fine sense of his personal unworthiness (I *Cor.* xv. 9) and responsibility. The world demands that a man be successful, but Christ requires faithfulness (I *Cor.* iv. 3).

To watch and pray, and never faint;
By day and night strict guard to keep;
To warn the sinner, cheer the saint,
Nourish Thy lambs, and feed Thy sheep.

Fourth Sunday in Advent.

Text: "Rejoice in the Lord alway, etc."—*Phil.* iv. 4-6 (Epistle).

This passage brings before us three subjects—all of them of the deepest importance.

I. CHRISTIAN JOYFULNESS. "Rejoice in the Lord alway," etc. One of the epistles of the captivity, we might expect to find here that depression and melancholy have settled down on the Apostle's soul. To our surprise we find that he is possessed by a spirit of joyousness (see chaps. i. 4, 8; ii. 16-18). He exhorts them to display a like spirit (see i. 26; ii. 2, 28, etc.). Who but the Christian has such abundant cause for rejoicing?

II. CHRISTIAN THOUGHTFULNESS. "Let your moderation be known unto all." The A.V. somewhat obscures the meaning. It is not abstemiousness that is in the writer's mind but gentle concession and forbearance—τὸ ἐπιεικές. "Not strictness of legal right, but consideration for one another" (Alford).

III. CHRISTIAN WATCHFULNESS. It is by no means certain that the words rendered, "The Lord is at hand," primarily refer to the second advent. Taking them in their plain and natural sense, they may mean no more than,—the Lord is near in all the dispensations of His providence, in all the affairs of men. He is ever revealing Himself. It is likewise true that He is "near" in the advent sense. "Blessed are those servants whom the Lord, when He cometh, shall find watching" (Luke xii. 37).

IV. CHRISTIAN PRAYERFULNESS. "Let your requests be made known unto God." These would seem to be *conditions*. The consequences that follow when the conditions are fulfilled are that our hearts and minds are to be kept as the citadel is kept, by the peace of God—καὶ. "And then" (Alford). Lose the spirit of holy gladness, of sweet thoughtfulness for others, of watchfulness and devotion and forfeit the blessing.

Christmas Day.

Text: "God . . . hath in these last days spoken to us by His Son."—*Heb.* i. (Epistle).

Jesus is at once the beginning and the end, the first and the last—the totality of God's revelation of Himself and His purposes for mankind.

I. JESUS IN THE HISTORY OF THE PAST. "There never was a time when He was not" (see John i. 1, 2; viii. 58). (a) Associated with the Father in the first acts of His Divine energy. "By whom also He made the worlds" (Heb. i. 2). (b) Occupied in the task of maintaining the unchanging order of the material universe

"Upholding all things by the word of His power" (Heb. i. 3; cf. John v. 17). (c) Exercising, even under the old dispensation, a redemptive ministry. Observe the retrospective aspect of the Cross (Heb. ix. 15).

II. JESUS IN THE HISTORY OF TO-DAY. (a) *In heaven*. Exercises a mediatorial ministry. "He ever liveth to make intercession" (Heb. vii. 25). (b) *On earth*. Present with His people—(1) In their worship (Matt. xviii. 20). (2) In their witness. "Teaching them . . . lo, I am with you always" (Matt. xxviii. 20).

III. JESUS IN THE WORLD'S TO-MORROW. (a) *Will be a greater force than ever*. "To Him shall endless prayer be made, and princes throng to crown His head." (b) *Will quicken the sleeping dead* (Rom. viii. 11; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 45).

Sunday after Christmas.

Text: "They shall call His name Emmanuel . . . God with us."—*Matt. i. 23* (Gospel).

"There is no other personage in human history, himself a moral miracle, heralded by a veritable foreshadowing in a complex literature of previous centuries" (Bp. H. C. G. Moule, *Epistle to the Romans*, p. 14). As we once more contemplate the mystery—"God with us" at Bethlehem—we see—

I. THE SUBJECT OF PROPHETIC ANNOUNCEMENT (Gen. iii. 15; Deut. xviii. 15, etc.). Note the frequent use of the phrase, "That it might be fulfilled which was written." "To Him give all the prophets witness" (Acts x. 43).

II. THE OBJECT OF THE FATHER'S LOVE. Mr. Moody once said that he never began to understand what the gift must have cost until he had a boy of his own. "His only-begotten Son" (John iii. 16). "My beloved Son" (Matt. iii. 17; cf. Luke xx. 13).

III. THE OBJECT OF SATANIC HATE. It was unjustifiable. "Without a cause" (John xv. 25). As in the case of Joseph, his brethren hated him (Gen. xxxvii. 5, 8; cf. John vii. 3-5; cf. 1 John ii. 11). Antagonisms are ever aroused by moral goodness.

IV. THE OBJECT OF HEAVEN'S WORSHIP. On earth they set Him "in the midst" between the malefactors. In heaven He is "in the midst" (Rev. v. 6; vii. 17), and the bright intelligences round about the Throne sing, "Thou art worthy."

The Missionary World.

THE year 1917 is closing still under the shadow of war. A year ago we hoped that by this time we should have been well on our way to missionary reconstruction in Africa and the Near East. Hope is deferred, but as faith looks upward the heart is not sick, for God is manifestly working out some great and mighty purpose whose lines we only dimly can discern, and the time of trial which to us seems endless is to Him but a fraction of an hour. The world-wide catastrophe is big with issues which cannot be hastened by any human power. The Judge of all the earth will do right and we bow before Him to learn the lessons He would teach. Meantime, while the year has shown once more the persistence of spiritual life in every mission field—that glorious record which demonstrates the living presence of the Lord in the midst of His Church, and while monetary contributions are being marvellously maintained—see the note of hope in the utterances both of C.M.S. and S.P.G.—it grows clearer every month that the first problem which will confront the Church when reconstruction and advance become possible is that of men and women for the work. The C.M.S. alone has lost 147 European missionaries since the beginning of the war, 111 by retirement (frequently on grounds of ill-health), and thirty-six by death, of whom four died at sea and five on war service. The reinforcements for 1917 number twenty-nine, and of these twenty-one are women who cannot sail till the Foreign Office is able to grant them passports.

* * * * *

Careful thought is being given to the question of the supply of future missionaries. Committees both within the societies and on co-operative lines are at work. Special plans for the preparation of those who offer after the war are being considered by the Board of Study for the Preparation of Missionaries in conjunction with the missionary societies. But the real problem lies in the true presentation of the call of the Lord, the need of the world, and the surpassing greatness of the opportunity which opens before a missionary, man or woman, in the new world of to-day. Those who sound the call to service need to be steeped in such knowledge of the modern situation as a book like *The World and the Gospel* gives, and to have in their own hearts a flame of conviction that only in Jesus Christ can the

revelation of the Father come home to men. The great verities of Holy Scripture, read in the light of the Spirit of Jesus and applied to the need of the world, need to be so set before the Church as to summon the best of our younger men and women to the missionary task. It is a day only when great calls will meet with a great response. And the call that men heed is not the mere shout of urgency but the still small voice which interprets the meaning of life in the light of the Cross.

* * * * *

The war, the Pacific, and missions, is a conjunction of thought which should have place in our minds. The coasts of the Pacific are mainly in the hands of the combatants, and on its broad bosom meet the interests of China, Russia, Japan, the United States and Great Britain. "The Asiatic races"—to quote an editorial in the *L.M.S. Chronicle*—"are, so to speak, pouring over the brim of the overflowing bowl of Asia and spreading, or seeking to spread, on every shore of North and South America, of Polynesia, and of New Zealand, Australia, and New Guinea." Trade is pushing vessels of all nations into every port, and unless trade and governmental relationships can be Christianized the existence of the more primitive races is imperilled. The full call of the Pacific is not merely to maintain and to extend missions among the islands—those missions so rich in romance and in reward—but to reach the great nations which encircle the ocean with the living message of the Gospel, so that they and we together may work in love and not for gain. The work of the South Sea Mission of the *L.M.S.* is a source of inspiration for the Christian Church to-day.

* * * * *

A slender incident in the *B.M.S. Herald* is charged with meaning and life. A dear old woman, member of that sect of Fakiri Mohammedans in India among whom so many have become Christians of late, has been in close touch with Baptist missionaries. She owns land on which they have been camping under the shade of some great jack-fruit trees, and she has been among the women whom they have taught the rudiments of the Christian faith. She learned the Lord's Prayer, but would always insist on inserting some words of her own. To the clause "Thy kingdom come" she always with persistence added "in this place." Is it not just this that so many of us in thought and prayer—aye, and in service too—have

left out? We hail the coming of the kingdom in the far parts of the earth, but do not lay hold of it with eagerness for our own land, our city, our parish, our home, our personal life. Is not the weakness of our up-building in the "uttermost parts" based too often upon our failure in "Jerusalem"? We who have world-wide vision need also to pray as did the Fakiri woman under the jack-fruit tree in Bengal.

* * * * *

Another picturesque paragraph in which old and new Japan appear side by side is found in the S.P.G. *Mission Field*. Near the missionary's home a site was chosen for a new spinning mill. So eager were the purchasers to get forward that the standing barley on the site, within a few weeks of harvest, was ruthlessly cut down while the ears were green, and a group of Shinto priests with gorgeous robes and elaborate ceremony were engaged to bless the site. The congregation were mostly men in Western dress, some of whom had come on bicycles. It is a picture of what is happening in Japan, where, notwithstanding curious survivals, the old agricultural life is passing into the new industrial life with startling rapidity. The country is hastening to be rich. Profits are enormous, and sweating, especially in home industries, is still extremely bad, notwithstanding the new Factory Act. We read that the children of the poor are pasting paper on match-boxes—both the outer cover and the drawer—for $2\frac{1}{2}d.$ per thousand and finding their own paste. Many Japanese companies are standing out on lines of social justice to their employees, and a social sense is growing strongly in the Christian Church, but new Japan has many perils unknown in earlier days.

* * * * *

There is perhaps no country in Asia which has more claim upon British sympathy and the aid of British prayer than Japan. The fact that none of the non-Anglican agencies has work in Japan throws special responsibility upon our own communion, yet it would probably be true to say that Japan appeals less widely and deeply to the mass of our communicants than any other mission field. The appeal of Japan lacks elements which impress the average mind, and we miss the vastness of China, the desire of India, and the appealing remoteness of Moslem lands. Yet the intellectual position of the Japanese needs far more than we give

in the way of the best and ripest of our Christian literature and thought, and we put far too little fellowship at her disposal in the social and industrial problems she has inherited from us and is now creating for herself. Further, it should never be forgotten that Japan is the only colonizing power in Asia, that in Korea and in Formosa, and, possibly, hereafter in the Pacific, she is facing problems of empire analogous to those we have had to face. In Korea the educational position is full of complex interest and needs the best thought of Great Britain as well as of North America. The many mistakes we have made ourselves as well as the unquestioned success of British colonization gives us a special duty to fulfil towards a nation stepping out into the empire problems which beset Japan.

* * * * *

The October issue of *The East and The West*, which arrived too late for notice in these pages in November, opens with papers by two women writers. Miss Maynard's "Lesson in the Progress of Ethics" is worth learning; Miss E. R. McNeile's study of "Theosophy and Gnosticism" is valuable and based on real knowledge. Bishop Cecil's paper on "The Bad Habit of Translating the Prayer Book" lets in fresh air upon heated controversies at home. Mr. Keable's ideal for "An African Ministry" is an instance of the kind of article which only a missionary can write, and of which, whether we agree with the writer or not, we can scarcely have too many. It is the thought beaten while molten by the fires of experience which is going in the end to shape the Church. Dr. Fyffe (Bishop of Rangoon) on "Mr. Gokhale's Testament and the Indian Church" is good but does not carry very far. The short paper on "The Society for Religious Liberty in China" brings up to last April our knowledge of that interesting combination of all the Christians in China, including the Roman Catholics, to arrest the movement to insert a clause making Confucianism the State religion in China. Since the article was written, the victory was won (in May); but owing to the political changes and the suspension of work on the constitution it appears probable that the fight will have to be fought all over again. A paper on "The Conversion of Europe" by the Editor is sure to be read by those who have previously benefited by Canon Robinson's extensive study of the subject. G.

Clubs and Institutes.

AT first sight, this may not seem a very pressing subject, while parishes are so depleted of men and every energy is bent upon the war. But a moment's reflection will show that at any time it may take its place among the most pressing. It is now permissible to *hope* that the final phase of the war has been reached, and before long the problem of dealing with the returning men may assume gigantic proportions. Clubs and institutes have always presented complicated perplexities in parochial organization, and these may soon have to be faced in an aggravated form. Those who are oppressed by ever-growing machinery, who cry out for the old simplicity of Gospel preaching and visitation, with time for unhurried prayer and study, who declare that spiritual life is crushed by the burden and rush of secondary aims, will then face afresh the seemingly unanswerable argument that it is a crime to leave any stone unturned while vast masses of both sexes are obviously beyond the pale of ordinary Christian ministrations, and while our own young people, with their many-sided needs, are liable to be led into temptation if we do not provide scope for their legitimate desires under Christian auspices.

Where equally earnest men differ so widely, it is evident that the subject is beset by no ordinary difficulties. The war and the National Mission have taught us all to examine our foundations *de novo*. It will help us most if we can once more approach the question with an open mind. No doubt we are between Charybdis and Scylla. The whirlpool of modern Church life has certainly tended to become a maelstrom of frenzied and fevered attempts to do the work of Christ in ways quite opposed to His own principles. But upon the other side of the narrow strait frowns the rock which threatens to wreck not only the ship we are trying to steer but also the lives that are in it, for lack of some reasonable precautions which common sense might have suggested. The matter is not to be settled with a wave of the hand by either section of opinion. Anybody faced with the problem of the masses is bound to give it prayerful attention; nor can he escape the responsibility of some sort of decision.

Once more, local circumstances differ so greatly that general

conclusions are most difficult. Yet this need not prevent a genuine attempt to arrive at some *principles* of unmistakably universal application, of which no local circumstances can justify the breach ; and then, with bated breath, to venture upon an examination of *methods* with a view to discovering any possible general guidance in details. Let this be our aim on the present occasion. The title is as wide as possible, and will cover all the varied organizations which stand outside directly spiritual ministrations and aim at reaching both sexes at any age—young men's institutes, girls' clubs and guilds, athletic clubs, boys' brigades or bands, scout patrols, etc. etc. Some of these, indeed, present special problems of their own, into which we cannot now enter. For instance, some people have feared that lads' brigades may foster militarism, though recent experiences and future prospects may modify such opinions. Others have questioned whether in some branches of athletics the degradation of sport has not reached such a pitch that Christians cannot touch them under the conditions usually required. But we must leave such subdivisions of the subject.

i. Following the plan thus broadly laid down, we seek for *leading principles* first.

i. One of the most important is *a due sense of proportion*. Even those who are most careful about the main aim may unconsciously be betrayed into disproportion of effort. We do not speak just now of personal effort, but of the whole scheme of Church work. In places where so much time is spent upon the institutional side that more directly spiritual work is crowded out, something is plainly wrong. However earnest the intention, and however valuable in themselves may be those secondary and auxiliary matters which have often been so keenly pursued, it is obvious that to lay every stress upon them while providing no parish prayer-meeting, no prayer-groups, scanty Bible classes, and deficient opportunities for deepening spiritual life and quickening missionary enthusiasm, is not to put first things first. Somehow or other a truer proportion must be found.

ii. The next principle involves more complicated discussion, though it looks simple enough in itself. *The right kind of aim* must be rigorously maintained. Probably everybody would agree to this in the abstract ; but some of the most obvious truths easily degenerate into platitudes. We want to get down to the root of

things as we see them in actual working. However convinced we may be that this, for example, is our consistent rule of action, let us test it by one or two questions. For instance, what is to be the immediate object—to draw in outsiders or to bind together those that are within? Or, if it be contended that both are possible, which is to predominate? It may be quite possible to maintain a spiritual standard with the former as chief aim; but it is unquestionably more difficult. If in any congregation there are a number of young people who feel that some kind of social bond would be a source of strength, and who are already accustomed to spiritual ideas and associations, they will be quite content with a definitely Christian atmosphere and a definitely Christian element in their gatherings: in fact, if properly trained, they will prefer them. But if we are going to start with the idea of getting hold of “the man in the street,” all kinds of practical difficulties at once make their influence felt. We shall be warned not to be too “pronounced,” or we shall frighten away the men we want. Perhaps we shall salve our consciences after the manner of the chairman at a concert who opens with prayer and closes with the blessing, while sandwiched between is a programme in which even scandalous items may, without the closest watchfulness, obtrude themselves. So may our clubs and institutes have a spice of prayer or a flavour of Gospel thrown in timidly and (let us not deceive ourselves) often uselessly if not with actual harmfulness. Or perhaps we shall cut the knot by having no religious element at all. But reflection will show that this is likely to injure our own young people while the very ones we seek to reach despise us for our methods. The world is not so easily hoodwinked. Young men may come and get all they can of enjoyment out of the Church’s athletic clubs and other organizations; but the very fact that these are recognized as baits will make them wary of spiritual approach. Another consideration is that the Church cannot compete with the world as a worldly entertainer. If this is all that is wanted, such fare as we can provide will soon seem insipid and feeble, and something more professional and better done (in its own way) is all too likely to be sought, even by some of our own people in whom we may ourselves have created a craving for it. Outsiders, too, will chafe under restrictions; and without restrictions where will our own young people be?

“But,” some one may say, “all this is very selfish. Do you

mean that we are to teach our young people to shut themselves up in smug security, singing their hymns and reading their Bibles, with not a thought for the tempted multitudes outside? " By no means. All that is meant is this—keep up the standard required for the training and help of young Christian people, and bid them to welcome and seek for all the outsiders they can get to join them *on these perfectly fair and open terms*. An illustration may be found in all properly managed Mission Colleges in India or China. It is understood that Bible instruction and Christian influence are the leading aims. Heathen and Mohammedan parents know this before they consent to their children's attendance. Everything is open and above-board. And the notable thing is that it does not prevent them from coming in large numbers !

Another question may test this matter of *aim* still further. What are we really after? Numbers or souls? Glory for our Master or fame for our Church as a popular and flourishing concern? Prosperous institutions or even crowded churches only, or converted souls and spiritual life? In the main, we get what we want, if we seek it on lines adapted to the aim. A certain class may be drawn within the four walls of the institute, or perhaps even of the Church, without being drawn a step nearer to Christ. And all the while a quieter sort, who might be won by more direct work, which is crowded out or timidly shunned, may be alienated by the element thus introduced. I am not speaking in generalities. I have a definite case in mind—an institute which began on quiet and humble lines, and, as I have been assured, was then a help to the young men attached to the Church. When I knew the parish later, more ambitious ideas had prevailed; questionable methods were in vogue; division and ill-feeling were caused, and the quieter men were driven out by the noisy element which they disliked. At one time that institute was a thorn in the side of the man who was responsible for it. Nor did outward evidences suggest that any were brought into really effective touch with Christian life by the policy adopted. If they had been, the matter might have seemed more open to debate.

The study of the methods of the Master compels the conviction that something is unsound in modern plans of campaign. His aim was always quality rather than quantity. He showed that it was better to have a handful of true disciples whose influence could

permeate with spiritual power the untouched masses than to attract a rabble of professed followers whose carnal ideals could only degrade His Name and render impotent His whole purpose. He actually sifted out the unreal by deliberate and searching tests ; and thereby, we may be quite sure, He attracted a larger number of real disciples than we do by fearing to make the test too searching. No wonder, then, that visible failure so often goes hand in hand with intricate machinery, and that even where there seems to be success, the uneasy sense of failure may lurk in the shadow of it.

The ideal of the Christian Church emphasizes the point. It does not exist to make this life pleasant, but to build up its members in the full exercise of spiritual life and influence here, and in preparation for a fuller life to come, while as regards outsiders it is to " witness "—and to witness in the power of the Holy Ghost. How does our Church machinery answer that test? Many things in themselves quite innocent may clearly be outside the Church's sphere—much more those which are dubious.

Moreover—to conclude this rather long discussion of general aims—results confirm the above conclusions. Which are the churches that are doing the most valuable work in winning young men and women to Christ, and where these form the largest proportion, not only at the Lord's Table and in the pews, but also among the ranks of workers? Are they not precisely those in which spiritual aims are really predominant? The most direct methods are the most successful, as they are also the most open. And even where large numbers are not definitely won—as they often are—we shall anyhow get *a few* by direct (though tactful) approach, even if it be, as our Lord Himself found, only a few. But we shall get none at all *to any real purpose* by any other means, however appearances may conceal the fact. A young man knows perfectly well when he is treated like a man, and not like a weakling who can be caught for spiritual ends by the pretext of worldly means. In fact, many may scorn this kind of treatment, even when the scorn is unexpressed or perhaps only subconsciously felt. But, if treated like a man, he may learn that true spirituality is the most manly thing on earth, and may come, by proper training and nourishment, to manifest it himself to the world.

iii. We can be briefer this time. "*Spiritual men for spiritual work*" is another of those maxims which are in danger of losing force

through sheer familiarity. And vital though its force really is, it is nowhere more commonly disregarded than in these matters. It is so great a relief to find *anybody* who will undertake onerous work like this that one is tempted to commit it to anybody's hands. There is even the further danger of thinking a high standard not so necessary in what is not so directly spiritual, or of viewing such work as an opportunity of drawing in helpers who would not undertake more direct tasks. Where there are the elements of sympathy with the main ideals, this latter argument may, with caution, be allowed some weight, at any rate with reference to subordinate offices. But the former one looks like giving the whole case away. For it looks as if, whatever our professions as to the aim of this side of work, it is not after all viewed as vitally connected with spiritual purposes; and there is nothing else with which Christian workers, as such, have any concern. Where there is tacit admission of a low ideal, where workers are out of sympathy with spiritual aims and therefore impotent for spiritual influence, can it be wondered that failure so commonly marks these efforts? The main defence of institutional work is its opportunity for a definite Christian atmosphere and for personal spiritual influence. What kind of atmosphere or influence can possibly go with agents who have no personal experience of either?

iv. This introduces us to one of the greatest problems in the whole subject. For, as our final principle, we must emphasize that *this is the work of laymen*. What was said before in general terms upon the question of due proportion applies with even greater force when considered particularly with reference to the duties of the ordained ministry. For, as far as the *details* are concerned, this is not the work of the ministry at all. Supervision and personal contact are a different matter; and we will return to this. But, from however high motives the clergy may suffer themselves to be involved in the machinery, it is with fatal results to their proper calling—especially the work of study and prayer and preparation, and of regular visitation—and often with fatal results also to patience and temper, worn by the constant friction of petty details, with resulting occasions of stumbling and offence. Those who are responsible for the highest of callings, which in itself places as much strain as anything else upon the physical and nervous system, have no rest for quiet spiritual refreshment, and are breaking down right

and left under a burden which even Apostles could not bear. The quotation of Apostolic example is by some of these good workers somewhat resented : one suspects that they think the term " serving tables " has ceased to be applicable because it is somewhat hackneyed. " Don't quote Acts vi. to me," said an earnest man ; " it's one of my favourite passages "—or words to that effect. Yet he certainly did not apply it to his own pet organization ! And there may be others like him—who see, presumably, the danger of becoming overwhelmed with secondary issues, but have some favourite exception in their own parish. Surely there is no more proper application of the principle than here ! The Apostles found that certain truly Christian and even necessary but not primary duties were likely to endanger their faithfulness in their own peculiar calling of prayer and ministry of the Word, or at any rate that these duties called for the appointment of others because they could not cope with both tasks. We are certainly not capable of doing more than inspired Apostles. We *must* get rid of it at all costs. Time is short ; and no man can do everything. The National Mission should at least have taught us to put our own special vows in their right place.

People laugh at any attempt to illustrate this in detail by transferring the Apostles, in imagination, to our own day. Circumstances are so different, they tell us, that it is impossible to say what they would have done, and it is therefore foolish to picture St. Paul or St. John presiding over a smoking concert, or drilling boys' brigades. We will therefore abstain from pressing the point ; yet it seems apposite to remark, in view of the fact that principles are eternal howsoever circumstances may alter, that if such pictures give a mental shock it may be wise to ask ourselves the real reason, and not be too confident that it is merely the result of the very different conditions of our age. We purposely avoid suggesting any more extreme examples than the above, because the present point is not the danger of importing doubtful elements of attraction but of diverting the clergy from their proper calling. Many of these things may be excellent work for a layman to do ; and we must somehow find the laymen to do them. Meanwhile, as was briefly suggested before, the ordained man need not, and indeed should not, hold himself aloof. All such work ought to be conducted in such a manner that he may find in it a useful means of personal

and spiritual intercourse with his own people. He ought to be frequently on the spot and moving amongst them: but that is a different thing from being personally responsible for petty details of machinery.

The problem of an adequate supply of laymen has in the past been the great *crux* of this question. Not merely the problem of a sufficient supply numerically but, as we have seen, a supply of the right kind of men. Not merely, again, a supply to start with, but one sufficient to maintain the work as years go by. There is undeniably a tendency for anything which cannot be otherwise provided for to fall upon the ordained man, and a work initiated under satisfactory conditions may by imperceptible degrees be laid upon him. But this great difficulty ought certainly to be lessened in the future. We claimed that the National Mission roused the Church, even if it has not so far roused the nation. Here is the opportunity for the Church layman to prove that it has roused him, by taking up exactly the work which calls for his activities. The war, again, ought surely to provide us with some awakened workers from the Front, who will devote a consecrated life to the welfare of lads and men when they are happily back amongst us once again. So may it be, if the Lord tarry!

2. It is not now possible to discuss *methods* anything like so fully. And perhaps it is scarcely so necessary, because much of what has been said already involves certain practical conclusions as to methods. But a few special points should not be omitted.

i. What is the best way of ensuring *the definitely religious element*? The whole work, under the principles already discussed, will partake of a religious character. But "spiritual atmosphere" and phrases of a similar kind (some of which have been already considered), while sounding very delightful, have a way of lending themselves to a real evasion of the one thing needful. Under the cloak of a general phrase, effective spiritual influence may be practically *nil*. In consideration for weak human nature, something more is called for. And first of all, some definitely religious conditions of membership. The worst degradation of athletic clubs and other parochial institutions is the presence of outsiders who have no connection whatever with the Church and do not mean to have any. The Church is then nothing but a stalking-horse. Some condition of attachment to religious observances is called for—perhaps attendance at a special

Bible Class—only let it be *in addition to* regular worship and not a substitute for it, as if worship were of no great account. And it is of the utmost importance that all such rules should be rigorously enforced. Too often they are a dead letter, for fear of losing members, or even weakening a cricket club in its league engagements! All this illustrates a difficulty already considered, into which we shall surely plunge ourselves if we begin to angle for the outsider *on any terms but our own*.

How far every gathering should be accompanied by prayer or an address is a matter which must be decided according to requirements. Certainly it is often advisable; certainly it should be done sometimes if not always; and certainly nothing should be admitted which would make it seem out of place if not hypocritical. On the other hand, this should never be allowed to appear in the light of the pill which is gilded by a certain amount of physical or mental enjoyment, and swallowed to secure that. In a word, let the religious element be a *real and natural and necessary* part of the whole organization. And do not let workers neglect their very special opportunities for *direct personal dealing*. These constitute the chief argument for institutional work.

ii. The general *maintenance of discipline* needs a word, not only for the sake of the special religious aims, but for the outward success of the organizations themselves. Young people are not a bit the less happy for being kept in order. In fact, a "rowdy" element will ruin not only the work, but the happiness of the other members. There are, however, two ways of doing things; and a tactless disciplinarian may do more harm than good. In nothing more than in this work do we need so much of the love and wisdom of Christ—except perhaps in the Sunday School; and many of us probably regret mistakes in these matters more than in anything else. But it *is* possible to maintain order, and to do it strictly, without repelling any, and so as to secure the respect of all and the advantage of the whole undertaking.

iii. Can anything at all be said about *matters of detail*? Clearly not much, where so many branches come under our title, each with its separate problems. But it would be foolish to gloss over the fact that some of them have caused great heart-searchings. What about cards and billiards, for instance? The former are often excluded where the latter are allowed: but some would include

both. It may be impossible logically to define wherein the difference lies between these and other games. Their advocates may be able to produce crushing superiority in argument. Yet why is careful supervision an acknowledged necessity? And even then private settlements cannot be prevented altogether. Nobody ever fears private settlements after chess, or suggests the need of supervising draughts. Whatever the logic, the facts are therefore plain. In view of the convictions of many earnest and good men of considerable experience, it is difficult to press the objection so strongly in the case of billiards as in that of cards. Yet the writer can never forget a young fellow who lapsed from the apparent promise of an earnest partaker in definitely spiritual work to the position of a perfectly hardened criminal, with repeated terms of imprisonment. It is quite likely that other influences would have brought about this fearful result in any case: but it is an undoubted fact that one of the pronounced early symptoms of his downfall was a mad craving for billiards, and the sting of the story is the further fact, apparently well established, that he had never seen the game till he joined a certain Church Institute. And even if others are able to produce cases of souls definitely helped by the permission of billiards, the teaching of Scripture about stumbling-blocks would seem to require more weight to be attached proportionately to one such case of offence.

Dances and theatricals are other causes of dispute: and the latter of them is a term needing definition which it is not possible to give without prayerful consideration of many perplexing details. We can suggest no more now upon such points, or others which may arise, than is necessarily covered by the principles with which we began. But in closing, it may be permissible to reiterate the conviction that in spiritual matters, spiritual methods are the only open methods; and they are likely moreover to be the most successful, if not as the world measures success, yet after the Master's standard, and as related to eternal issues. . . .

God will guide in method and enable in practice where His guidance and grace are faithfully sought. Direct, prayerful, spiritual, patient and painstaking dealing in these institutions will meet with its certain reward and crown.

W. S. HOOTON.

Religion and Æsthetics.

IN the October number of the *CHURCHMAN* appeared an article entitled "A Question of Æsthetics"; in which a plea was advanced for a larger recognition of Beauty in public Worship. The writer evidently felt the difficulty of his subject, and was most guarded in his advocacy. He laid great stress on the paramount importance of zeal and holiness, and even went as far as to admit "that a good and strong case could be made out for an attitude of entire renunciation of the Beautiful as expressed in Art."

To a plea so guardedly put forward it would, perhaps, be captious to take definite exception; and yet—and yet—in the actual sphere of Religion or Worship the difficulty does still remain as to whether the æsthetic element, Art, Beauty, is really helpful to spirituality. This difficulty has been felt in all ages, and is one of the hardest problems that beset us through life.

It is not intended here to suggest that there can be *no* place in a Christian community for the Beautiful—for the work of the Architect, the Painter, the Sculptor, the Poet. In refutation of such a theory the words of Hamlet immediately occur to one:

"Sure, He that made us with such large discourse,
Looking before and after, gave us not
That capability and godlike reason
To *rust* in us *unused*."

But, whatever place or places there may be, it will always be a question as to whether, or how far Religion is one of them. Indeed, as the writer of the article under consideration points out, many of the most earnest souls, from Savonarola to the Scottish Covenanter or English Quaker, have quite made up their minds on the subject, and have decided that Beauty and Holiness do not mate.

In the present times the tendency is all the other way. The function of Art *in Religion* is exalted. Art is its "handmaid"; and architecture, decoration, painting, music, dress, are very "helpful to devotion."

But, is this so? One is loth to suspect an idea which has found favour in every age and among many pious people. But, is there not some fallacy here, some confusion between the sensuous and the spiritual, between emotion and devotion? Would not the

truer way of putting the case be rather this : that, at best, all these so-called aids may be, to some saintly souls, possibly not hindrances ? Pugin was so fascinated with Gothic architecture that he claimed for it the title of " Christian," in contrast with classical architecture which he stigmatized as " pagan." The very idea of building a classical *church*, or worshipping in one, was to him profanation. But he was oblivious of the fact that the first Communion was held in a " large upper room " (possibly of an inn), and that the first Christian " church " (i.e. the material building) was also an " upper room "—not much art or ornament about it we may be quite sure ; and further, that the plain Roman basilica and dismantled Byzantine temple furnished Christian churches for centuries before " Gothic," with all its beautiful accessories, was thought of.

We read in the Old Testament of the beauty of holiness, but never of the holiness of beauty ; and in the New Testament Art, and all its works, are not, I think, alluded to except with reference to their perishable nature, or indeed positive antagonism to the spiritual life. Curiously enough the word " beauty " does not even occur in the New Testament (English Version) ; and it has been often observed that our Lord Himself makes little or no allusion to it—at any rate to the beauties of Art, and certainly none as to their value and " helpfulness " in spiritual things.

" No mere multiplication of forms (wrote an eminent theologian), nor a more æsthetic arrangement of them, will redeem worshippers from callousness. Ritual and sacrament (and all material means we add) are to the living God but as the wick of a candle to the light thereof. They *may* help to reveal Him ; but the process is not complete unless they themselves perish utterly from the thoughts to which they are intended to be the means of conveying Him."

But who is able to say honestly that all these things—these material means—do perish utterly from his thoughts ? Must he not rather be compelled to admit that the beauty of pillar, vault, tracery, glass, music, exercise a fearfully distracting influence over his imagination and thoughts, and, far from assisting sincere worship, are actually often destructive of it ? . . .

With all its attractions and inspirations, Art is yet of the earth earthy, and in actual relation to religion, it is an embarrassing ally and an indifferent servant.