

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

August, 1919.

THE MONTH.

The following are the "Findings" passed by the
Cheltenham Conference at the final session on June
26 :—

A.—THE BASIS OF REUNION.

The Conference strongly reaffirms the principles of its previous findings on Reunion, and feels that the time has come for definite action, since unity is demanded in obedience to the mind of Christ in the presence of a world that cannot be renovated apart from the power of the Gospel.

(1) That the ultimate goal of unity is one visible Church founded upon the Lord Jesus Christ, into which all Churches, without breach of continuity with their past, can bring their special gifts, thus providing the widest variety in unity.

(2) That, as a witness to the fact of spiritual unity, interchange of pulpits with the accredited ministers and reciprocal intercommunion with the members of the Evangelical Free Churches are desirable.

(3) That the Bishops of the National Church be requested to declare their sanction of the participation of the ministers of the Non-Episcopal Churches in the services at the celebration of peace in the Cathedrals and churches; and, further, that all baptised and recognized members of those Churches desirous of doing so should be invited to join in the Holy Communion on that occasion.

(4) The Conference desires to co-operate with all episcopal and non-episcopal workers for unity, and heartily endorses the findings of the Mansfield Conference. (See *Towards Reunion*, Macmillan, Appendix B.)

(5) That efforts should be made to instruct the laity and make effective the widespread feeling in support of Christian unity.

(6) The following was adopted from the findings of the 1917 Conference :
That no proposals for Reunion which would involve the re-Ordination of ministers would be welcome or practicable.

B.—CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

That this Conference, while desirous of facilitating necessary reform in the administrative machinery of the Church, can only support the Enabling Bill on the understanding that the national character of the Church be fully maintained, and that the words (and that they) "do not belong to any religious body which is not in communion with the Church of England" be deleted from the qualification for the initial franchise; and that the following matters be excluded from the powers to be conferred upon the Church Assembly:

- (a) The appointment by the Crown to bishoprics and other ecclesiastical positions.
- (b) The constitution of the Final Court of Appeal in ecclesiastical causes.
- (c) The baptismal franchise for electors.

C.—THE EVANGELISTIC WORK OF THE CHURCH.

- (1) The concentration upon Evangelistic work is the primary and immediate duty of the Church.
- (2) That all Churchmen should use their influence to promote Evangelistic Missions and Conventions in rural deaneries, archdeaconries, or dioceses, and, if necessary, separate Missions in their own parishes.
- (3) That special efforts should be made to win for Christ the young life in our parishes, especially in the day and Sunday schools, and to re-establish family religion.
- (4) That a concordat on religious teaching in the elementary schools of the country is long overdue, and that immediate action should be taken to settle the question.

D.—THE CHURCH AND LABOUR.

- (1) That in the Christian community human labour must be regarded in relation to those who labour, and not merely as a commodity to be bought and sold.
- (2) That in the present industrial conflict the Church should urge on employers and employed the impartial application of Christian principles, especially in the matter of adherence to agreements.
- (3) That the duty of the Church is not to lay down any economic theory, as that is the work of experts, but to advocate the application of Christian principles to the solution of industrial problems, and to do all in its power to remove the material conditions that make that solution impossible.
- (4) That the Church should maintain as a Christian duty the just distribution of the rewards of industry between employers and employees.

Rightly to understand the Findings of the Chel-

Cheltenham
Reviewed.

tenham Conference, it should be remembered that, as in previous years, they are to be taken as expressing the general sense of the Conference and not as representing in detail the views of individual members; and so read they form, we venture to say, a statement of policy of the utmost interest and value. They cover a wider variety of subjects than usual and they witness to the keen concern with which Evangelical Churchmen view some of the most pressing problems of the day. But the main business was Reunion, and it is with that question that the Cheltenham Conference has come to be prominently identified. Its Findings in this respect were referred to in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury at the July session, although the reference showed a singularly ill-informed idea of what had really been done. We were told that "the Conference was prepared to throw over the whole position of the Church of England!"

Our readers, however, can read the Findings for themselves and they will quickly see what a travesty of the true attitude of Cheltenham such a criticism really is. Of course those who approach the Reunion question timidly, half-heartedly and, perhaps, shamefacedly, will naturally be aghast at the firmness, decision and courage of the Cheltenham Findings. But then the Conference has never been in doubt that the goal in view is intercommunion with equality of ministry, and it is this which so many—even some with the most pious aspirations after unity—find it very difficult to concede; yet it must be conceded at once that without that recognition of equality there is not the smallest hope of making any successful appeal to Nonconformity. That has been made clear by Nonconformist leaders again and again and the principle was reasserted by Dr. Bartlet at Cheltenham. Reviewing the work of the Conference as a whole we can safely say that it was well worth all the thought and trouble and time expended upon it, and we believe that Churchmen—and particularly Evangelical Churchmen—have come to look upon this Annual Conference as fulfilling a distinct purpose in the life and work of the Church. They may not agree with all that is done there, still less with the “findings” which emanate from it; but they know that the Conference stands for thought as well as for action, and that no action is recommended or policy formulated that is not thoroughly thought out as an abstract proposition and carefully examined from the point of view of practical possibilities. The Conference does not profess to be more than it is. It is not a Conference of the Evangelical party, but it is clearly and emphatically representative of some of the wisest and most thoughtful members of the Evangelical School, and its Findings are not without interest from that point of view. It is true that its decisions do not bind individuals; the responsibility even of those who attend is of a distinctly limited character; but it is also true that conclusions reached after careful and thoughtful debate by a large body of men more or less in sympathy with each other’s ecclesiastical position are entitled to more than ordinary consideration; and we are glad to know that the weighty character of the “Findings” is becoming increasingly recognized—even by those not usually associated with the Evangelical School—and that from this point of view the influence of the Conference is steadily growing.

It is not within the province of a magazine to give a detailed report of the proceedings of a Conference such as that held at Cheltenham, but one or two outstanding features call for notice. And first, a word about the attendance. It was not quite so large as it was hoped it would be, for the reason that several clergy were anxious not to be away from their parishes when Peace was declared, and at the time of the Conference that event, since so happily realized, was expected at any moment. No fewer than sixteen of the signatories of the invitation to the Conference found themselves unable at the last moment, from this or some other cause, to be present. Their absence was a great loss, but in the circumstances it was inevitable. Coming now to the proceedings, great satisfaction must be expressed at the unqualified success of the preliminary public meeting, at which 1,500 people were present and stirring addresses were given by the Bishop of Sodor and Man, Dr. Guttery and Dr. Vernon Bartlet. It was a striking object-lesson in Christian unity, and if similar meetings could be held in other towns throughout England it would greatly strengthen the position. The Conference was fortunate in its Chairman. The Rector of Cheltenham, the Rev. H. A. Wilson, has a singularly full grasp of the Reunion problem, and his leadership, ever since the Conference was instituted, has proved a most valuable asset. That he is a man of action is clear from the following passage which we quote from his Presidential Address :—

“ Reunion is in the air,” so we are told in the hackneyed words which preface so many newspaper discussions of the subject. But we are not satisfied to leave it there, we want to bring it down to earth, to transform it from its vague and amorphous condition into a definite and tangible shape, we want “ to give to airy nothing a local habitation and a name.”

We believe that the Christian Church in our land is languishing for a better understanding between its component parts. But timidity, apathy, and prejudice are a great triple alliance against this *entente cordiale*. There is, therefore, great need for plain speaking and bold demands. Carefully pruned and ambiguous utterances are common. Nearly every Christian community has glutted us with them. But for one reason and another definite and decisive action is delayed. The debate, for instance, in the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation, upon a motion to permit non-episcopalian ministers to preach in our churches ended in a non-committal postponement. It certainly was a most impressive fact that the resolution was moved by the Bishop of Winchester, and it is not the least sign of his real greatness that he is able to take a more charitable view of these questions than he would have done ten years ago. We very thankfully record his wide charity and statesmanlike appreciation of the great need of to-day. So, too, we welcome the pronounce-

ments which have come from the Committee on Faith and Order. But we want to stoke up the fires and get a move on. The time for unctuous and ambiguous platitudes is over, and the men in high places who want to go forward will appreciate our determination, and, conceivably, thank us for it (though the latter does not matter).

Equally incisive were his criticisms upon the Enabling Bill. Nor was his description of the grave state of the country at the present time less effective:—

Under the pretext of "carrying on" and being brave under troubles, gaiety has degenerated into a frivolity approximating to that which characterized ancient nations before their fall. There is a love of pleasure and a diseased craving for new sensations which equals that which prevailed in the days of Lorenzo the Magnificent without the appreciation of the fine arts which partly redeemed that time. Graceful and dignified dancing has been displaced by "fox-trots," "bunny-hugs," and such-like unseemly prancings, performed to the semi-savage blare and jangle of jazz-bands. In our balls and dance-rooms the cult of the barbaric and the negro rules. Gentleness, refinement, delicacy in taste and expression are being supplanted by an absence of restraint and a daring familiarity in talk and behaviour between the sexes which is rapidly destroying the safeguards and lowering the whole tone of social life. These things are evidence of a rottenness at the heart of the nation—that rottenness and moral decay which ushered in the fall of great nations in days gone by. "The daughters of Zion are haughty and walk with stretched forth necks, walking and mincing as they go." Read to the end of the Third Chapter of Isaiah and see the fearful end foretold by the prophet. The tender charm and winsome modesty of women are being sacrificed to a bold and brazen fashion in dress and manner which appeals to the lowest in men. The divorce courts are besieged with unprecedented crowds of applicants. And all this is occurring after four years of nightmarish horror!

He referred with sympathy and understanding to the Labour problem and concluded by urging that "the Church is not called to get, but to give; not to rule, but to serve. And the Church can best serve this generation by teaching and living as did He Who girded Himself with a towel and washed His disciples' feet." The Address formed an admirable introduction to the Conference. It set a high standard which was maintained throughout. The discussions were most helpful and inspiring, and that on the last day added greatly to the dignity and weight of the Findings. In our last issue we gave the full text of the papers contributed by the Rev. J. R. Cohu, the Rev. T. J. Pulvertaft, the Rev. Alfred Fawkes, the Rev. C. H. K. Boughton, and the Rev. G. E. Ford. In this number we complete the series by the publication of the papers of the Bishop of Warrington, the Rev. C. W. Wilson, Canon Devereux, and the Rev. Henry Edwards. Together these two

issues of the CHURCHMAN will form a valuable and useful record of the proceedings of the Cheltenham Conference of 1919.

The Enabling Bill has passed through Committee in the House of Lords, but not without some very important amendments. Those moved by Lord Haldane were altogether rejected, but others were passed which will afford substantial safeguards, and the whole tone of the debate in Committee showed how useful has been the criticisms passed outside Parliament upon the Bill. We are far from saying that the Bill is perfect, but in its present form it will be much more acceptable to the general body of Churchmen than it was in its original shape. It has yet to encounter the stormy sea of the House of Commons, but the statement of the Lord Chancellor seemed to show that, although the members of the Government are divided about the measure, there is not likely to be any opposition from that quarter. They will probably leave the House free to vote as it likes. There is, however, the possibility that the measure will be reconsidered by the Cabinet, "perhaps a reconstituted Cabinet" (whatever that may mean), and it is not easy to forecast the course of events with any degree of certainty, but the outlook for the Bill is distinctly hopeful. The two amendments accepted by the promoters of the Bill and agreed to by the Lords are (1) that the Ecclesiastical Committee of the Privy Council will not advise, as the Bill originally proposed, whether the Royal Assent should be given to a measure submitted to them by the Church Assembly, but will report to the King the nature and legal effect of the measure and their views as to its expediency. "Such reports," said Lord Finlay, "would furnish Ministers, who were the constitutional advisers of His Majesty, with valuable material upon which to forward their advice to the Crown." On the motion of Lord Finlay it was also agreed (2) that after the report had been duly laid before both Houses of Parliament, "on an address from each House of Parliament asking that such measure should be presented to his Majesty," such measure should be so presented and should have the force and effect of an Act of Parliament on the Royal Assent being signified. This change makes it clear that both Houses of Parliament will have the opportunity of discussing any measure recommended in the report. Lord Muir-Mackenzie's

amendment to specify in the Bill the nature of the subjects with which such measures may deal, and to provide that no such measure shall deal with questions of doctrine nor modify in any way the relation between Church and State was withdrawn as the Archbishop of Canterbury urged that in view of the safeguards provided by the Bill in regard to the approval of measures by the Church Assembly, the Committee of the Privy Council, a Secretary of State, and both Houses of Parliament in succession, it would be better to leave the subjects which might be dealt with to the discretion of those authorities. The further progress of the Bill will be watched with interest, but it must frankly be recognised that it is within the bounds of possibility that it may be passed into law this session. And then—?

The two Convocations of Canterbury and York
 The Ministry
 of Women. have had before them Reports of Joint Committees on the Ministry of Women, but nothing has been done.

In the Northern Province the Lower House adopted the Report, but the Upper House has referred it back for further consideration. In the Southern Province, the Bishops referred the Report to the Lower House for discussion and report, but the Lower House was too obsessed by the importance of the matter to attend to it this session, and so the matter is blocked for the present. The resolutions appended to the Report of the Joint Committee of the Southern Province are as follows:—

(a) That in view of the Apostolic teaching that women equally with men are members of the one Body of Christ and partakers of the Holy Spirit, and in order that fuller use may be made in the Church's service of the gifts and experience of women, this House makes the following recommendation:

That under conditions laid down by the Bishop of the diocese it should be permissible for women duly qualified and approved by him to speak and pray in consecrated buildings at services or meetings for prayer or instruction other than the regular and appointed services of the Church.

(b) As to the exercise of the Bishop's discretion, the Committee further recommend:

(i.) That no woman should be permitted to speak or pray publicly in a consecrated building until she has produced evidence of having been baptised and confirmed, and of being a communicant.

(ii.) That no woman under the age of thirty should be permitted to address a mixed assembly in a consecrated building.

(iii.) That the Bishop should require written evidence of unblemished character from three competent persons, one of whom must be in Holy Orders.

(iv.) That the Bishop should require proof of adequate knowledge and ability.

(v.) That the Bishop should require a declaration of assent to the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds and to the teaching of the Book of Common Prayer.

(vi.) That some simple form of distinctive dress should be worn by women speaking or praying in a consecrated building.

Neither Convocation has come to a decision upon the reports of the Joint Committees on Relations with Nonconformists. In the North the Lower House referred the Report back to the Committee, a decision in which the Upper House had to acquiesce; and in the Southern Province the Lower House, after some hostile speeches, one of which must frankly be characterised as disgraceful, passed the following resolution: "That this House, while unable to agree to the resolutions contained in the Report of the Joint Committee on Co-operation in Christian Teaching and Prayer between Churchpeople and Nonconformists, is anxious that the subject of united fellowship and worship with those who are separated from us should receive fuller consideration, and requests that a larger Joint Committee be appointed by the Archbishop to consider how greater unity with Nonconformists in fellowship and worship may be promoted consistently with Catholic order." The Resolutions with which the Lower House were "unable to agree" were as follows:—

1. That upon special occasions of public importance, or in gatherings for common devotion and mutual edification, members of Christian communions separated from the Church of England may, from time to time, be invited, by the incumbent and Churchwardens, with the approval of the Church Council (where such exists), to join in speaking and in offering prayer in consecrated buildings, provided—

(a) that in all cases what is so done is outside the regular and appointed services of the Church.

(b) that *before* any invitation is issued by the incumbent, the consent of the Bishop has been in each case previously obtained.

2. That, similarly, clergy of the Church of England may accept invitations to take part in services other than those of the Church provided—

(a) that such services are of a special character and not part of the *ordinary* worship of other communions;

(b) that the approval of the Bishop has been *first* obtained;

(c) that in parishes other than their own (except in the case of places held by the Bishop to be extra-parochial) the incumbent has first given his consent.

THE GREAT PRAYER.

SHORT CHAPTERS ON JOHN XVII.

BY THE BISHOP OF DURHAM.

III.

THE Theism of the Great Prayer was the matter of our last study. The results were presented in a summary not only brief but slight, as regards any sort of meditative development. We gathered up from a cluster of quotations the primal certainty that, to our Lord Jesus Christ, the ultimate and Sovereign Existence, "the Power that alone is great," is personal and is good; not a transcendental somewhat "higher than deity" but the Intercessor's Father; His Holy Father, His Righteous Father; the Father Who loved the Intercessor before finite being began to be.

Short and meagre as our account of this had to be, it was enough, I venture to think, to help the reverent student, the thinker who has found, or begun to find, rest in the recorded thoughts of Christ. It will remind him that he may look up, *through the eyes of his Lord*, into the Invisible, conscious of immeasurable mysteries around him and above him yet able peacefully to "endure, as seeing HIM that is invisible."³ He may, in Christ, through Christ, discern a living countenance, shining through darkness however vast with the pure regard of right and of love. He may recollect, till he begins in some degree to realize, what lies as an instinctive conviction at the heart of our consciousness, that mind, will, love, are greater than material bulk, necessarily and for ever; above all, that the law of moral right is eternally stable, as the material heavens are not; that their order, their *cosmos*, points upward beyond them, and within them, to mind; and now that the witness of the Seer Who died and rose again tells us that that mind is the mind of His Father, Holy, Righteous, Blessed for ever.

One of Tennyson's latest pieces, short and deep (*God and the Universe*), may be quoted here:

"Will my tiny spark of being wholly vanish in your deeps and heights?
Must my day be dark by reason, O ye Heavens, of your boundless nights,
Rush of suns, and roll of systems, and your fiery clash of meteorites?"

" Spirit, nearing yon dark portal at the limit of thy human state,
 Fear not thou the hidden purpose of that Power which alone is great,
 Nor the myriad world, His shadow, nor the silent Opener of the Gate."

The poet's son tells us that when the old man lay dying, October 5, 1892, he exclaimed, " I have opened it." It seemed possible, to those who knew the motions of his mind, that he had in his thought that last line just quoted; that he felt himself to be pushing apart the folding doors of what is to us the unseen but which the released spirit finds as the wonderfully visible. Let us read into those pregnant verses, as their writer certainly would have us do, not Theism only but Christ, and we shall almost anticipate the moment of our own transition. With our eternal Brother, as if using His eyes, let us " lift up our eyes unto heaven." We shall spiritually see then the profound truth that one " Power alone is great." It is incommensurable in its greatness with the Galaxy, aye, with whatever of stellar vastness lies beyond the Galaxy. And this Power is Abba, Father; the holy Father, the righteous Father, of our Lord Jesus Christ.

I said that we should read in those quoted lines not Theism only but Christ. We greatly need to do so if we would rise to a true joy of theistic faith, and to that sort of certainty in it which can only come, as to the greatest things, when reason and the deepest heart converge in sight and witness. I read the other day in a well-known weekly journal a letter, signed " A Theist." The letter set out in noble terms the vital importance, to the development of high character, of " the awakening of the consciousness that there is a Creator, a loving Creator, with Whom man must co-operate; the constant recognition that there is an all-powerful and loving Creator, Who sees all things and knows all things:—this is the surest basis of goodness." Then further, after a few lines: " Never yet has any substitute been found for the love of God, although *God may be spelt Christ, or Mohammed, or the rest.*" I hope it was not bigotry that gave me a shudder as I read those last words. Partly, I think, it was the startling mistake of thought which suggested that Mohammed, even by the most ardent Moslem, was ever taken as a " spelling " for God. Confusion of facts could hardly go further than in that collocation of his name with Christ's, as one of varied " spellings of God," and that God a God of love. But the chief sadness was due to the implied failure to see the glory of Him Who could say,

with all His character, all His life, all His death and resurrection in the words, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; I and the Father are one."

Let me, in a spirit the very opposite to the controversial, take up this "Theist's" words about Him, and appropriate them to our holy and happy creed. Yes, let us "spell God, *Christ*." Let us recite again to our souls the mighty Creed of the Communion, and confess out of the depth of those souls Him Who is very God of very God, and think with joy that in Him we have the supreme Idea made invisible, tangible, lovable; robbed of not one bright iota of its eternal glory, while incarnated into our Saviour, our Friend, our Brother. Let us "spell God, Christ," and then look up into the heavens. As is the Son, so is the Father; as is the Father, so is the Son. "Jesus is the visible God; God is the invisible Jesus"; so said, not long ago, a new convert to the faith, a cultured Indian. Knowing God in Christ Jesus we need not, and we will not, "fear the hidden purpose of the Power that alone is great."

Almost in despite of the aim with which this chapter was begun I have thus detained our thoughts upon the Theism of the Lord Jesus Christ. The reflections have glided, insensibly but not carelessly, from His Theism, in its sight of the glory of the Father, to our Theism, as it shapes itself by a true confession of the glory of the Son. In a subsequent study I hope to take up more directly and distinctly that latter theme, and to gather up what the Great Prayer reveals to us, in manifold assertion or suggestion, of the holy Intercessor's being and dignity. The little said here already will leave ample room for that more explicit study.

For the present, let us come back to where, in the last chapter, we placed ourselves as searchers after God; at the side of the Lord Jesus Christ as He, looking up into heaven, utters the Great Prayer. Let us humbly move up to His side, and stand there amidst His apostles, who will surely welcome us, with a love learnt from Him, into "fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ." We have just come in from the night and its shadows. We have been gazing up to the burning constellations of the Syrian sky. For the time they have spoken to our "modern" thoughts not of the glory of the creating Mind, but of the overwhelming, dismaying, soul-oppressing vastness of the universe of matter. We have been pierced and shaken by the question, what are we in the midst

of it but grains of sand on the shore, flecks of foam on the water? Aye, and we have come in also from the city and the night, with eyes and ears that have felt the moral miseries of human life. The streets have shown us the mysteries of vice and violence. We have heard hopeless cries and yet more hopeless laughter in the gloom. Our own hearts have felt all too often the deadly stress of temptation, not without failure. And they have known losses and sorrows which have chilled and shadowed earth and sky for us, withering the bloom of yesterday and of to-day. So we enter the sanctuary of the Great Prayer, so we approach the Intercessor, and overhear His utterance as He looks up to the invisible. What comes to us as we listen? No reasoned solution of one single problem either of intellect or heart. No, but the power of a Personality which asserts itself as wholly good, wholly wise, and which invites the whole weight of us men's absolute reliance; on the eve, as we know now so well, of a suffering and a victory which bespeak Him Redeemer and Lord of the dead and living. He knows all that we know, and immensely more, of both material and moral mystery. He knows it immeasurably better than we. And through it all He says, looking up to heaven, with a certainty immediate and absolute, "Father, Holy Father, Righteous Father." In Him, and in His vision, we rest, we live, we overcome.

HANDLEY DUNELM.

STUDIES IN TEXTS.

Suggestions for Sermons from Current Literature.

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

VIII. FOUR PASTORAL RELATIONSHIPS.

Texts.—"I was like the mother that lovingly nurses her own children."—I Thess. ii. 7 (A.S. Way).

"As a father with his own children."—ii. 11. R.V.

"We were babes in the midst of you."—ii. 7. R.V.M.

"Ye remember, brothers, our labour."—ii. 9.

[Book of the Month: Plummer's "First Thessalonians"¹ = P.

¹ Published by Robert Scott, 6s. Clear, illuminating, spiritual, like all Dr. Plummer's Commentaries. These notes, too full for a sermon, might well form basis for clerical Quiet Day, or Ruridecanal Chapter devotional study.

Other Commentaries, Milligan = M. Moffatt in Expos. Gr. Test = E.G.T.⁴ H. C. Lees in "Bible Hour Series" = H.C.L. Deissmann, Bible Studies = D. Hastings' Dictionary of Bible = D.B. Hastings' Dictionary of Christ and Gospels = D.C.G.]

"Here alone in the Pauline writings we are brought face to face with a young Christian community in all the freshness and bloom of its first faith" (M. xlvi). Note "the closeness of the bonds between St. Paul and his Thessalonian converts: to be parted from them was to suffer 'bereavement' (ii. 71) of the acutest kind" (M. xlv), to be an 'orphan.' "The striking expression occurs nowhere else in New Testament. The three teachers felt like orphans" (P. 38). "In Greek may apply to loss of friends and of children as well as to loss of parents. The parental relationship is probably in the writer's mind" (P. 38). We see him "with the authority of a father, and the tenderness of a mother, dealing with their individual needs" (M. xlv). "A mother's affection and a father's thought, in both as 'their own children'" (P. 26). "Exceptionally affectionate in tone: has the address 'Brethren' more frequently in proportion than any other Epistle of St. Paul" (P. 24). "The minister of God will try to be *father* (ver. 11), *mother* (ver. 7), and *brother* (ver. 9) to his flock" (H.C.L. 31). And we may add with Plummer 'child' as well among children (v. 7).

I. A MOTHER IN TENDERNESS (v. 7).

"'As if a nurse were cherishing her own children.' The attitude is described as that of a 'nurse,' or rather a 'nursing-mother' towards her children" (M. 22). "In the love of a brave and faithful man there is always a strain of maternal tenderness; he gives out again those beams of protecting fondness which were shed on him as he lay on his mother's knee" (George Eliot; quoted E.G.T. 27). The Minister of Christ like his Master (Matt. xxiii. 37) longs to "mother" the souls he has brought to new birth. "Three thoughts are implied in the words used here, sacrifice (*children*, 'things born') sustenance ('*nurse*,') and tenderness ('*cherishes*')" (H.C.L. 31).

(a) **Sacrifice for their well-being** (v. 8). "His letters were, indeed, the life-blood of a noble spirit, ever ready to be poured forth to nourish its spiritual offspring" (D.B. i. 730).

(b) **Sustenance** (v. 8). "He must find them the strong meat, and the milk of the word" (Heb. v. 12).

(c) **Tenderness** (v. 8). "With all a mother's yearning" (P. 23).

2. A FATHER IN WISDOM (v. II).

"Every individual was an object of paternal care; not one was overlooked or neglected. This would not be difficult. The number of converts was probably only a few hundreds" (P. 26). "An appropriate change from the figure of the nursing-mother in view of the thought of instruction" (M. 25). "If the mother furnishes the tenderness, the father gives the counsel, and with that, too, this many-sided minister of Christ is equipped" (H.C.L. 32).

"*'We exhorted.'* The word means to encourage to further effort one whose record is satisfactory.

'We comforted.' This implies rather a stirring up to spiritual ambition one who has rather lagged in the Christian walk. Addressed to the feelings rather than to the will.

'We charged.' This is the solemn appeal, sometimes the protest and warning given to the stumbler" (H.C.L. 32).

"Macedonians were always eager to maintain their prestige. He bids them remember their heavenly stock, and live worthily of their Royal parentage" v. 12 (H.C.L. 33).

3. A BROTHER IN HELPFULNESS (frequently, see ii. 9).

"The affectionate address, 'Brethren,' is remarkably frequent in this letter" (P. 9): "eighteen times in the first epistle and nine times in the second" (H.C.L. 33).

"Brother, also occurs in the usage of religious associations of the imperial period as applied to the members" (D. 88). "Was probably taken over from Judaism (Ac. ii. 29, 37; iii. 17, etc.), and from the practice of the Lord Himself (cf. Mt. xii. 48, xxiii. 8); but it can also be illustrated from the ordinary language of the Apostles' time (M. 8). According to Harnack, fell into general disuse in the course of the third cent." (M. 8).

Note "its fervent tone in the New Testament, its importance as suggesting a fulfilment of such words of Jesus as John xiii. 35 concerning mutual love" (D.C.G. 160). "Even the man who is showing signs of setting aside his authority is still a 'brother.'" Paul never starts a new line of thought without reminding them of the term (M. xlv). Certain features of all brotherhood traceable:

(a) **Independence**: "We would not be chargeable," v. 9.

(b) **Helpfulness** : ' We preached the Gospel ' (9). (c) **Example** : ' Ye are witnesses how we behaved,' ver. 10. A *holy* life Godward, a *just* life manward, and a walk *unblamed* by his own conscience " (H.C.L. 33, 34). " The man of God then gives the service of his *heart*, his *head*, and his hands in his threefold relationship to the souls he tends " (H.C.L. 34).

4. A CHILD IN SIMPLICITY, v. 7. R.V.M.

It is only fair to note that there is a slight variety in reading here, but this is adopted by R.V.M. " ' Nay, we went further, for to establish a sure bond of sympathy with you we showed ourselves ready to act the part of children in your midst ' " (M. 31).

" ' Children, like a mother ' looks incongruous, but is beautifully correct. A mother fondling her children comes down to their level, uses their language, and plays their games. The Apostle compares himself to a mother in Galatians iv. 19 " (P. 23). " Rutherford happily renders : ' On the contrary, we carried ourselves among you with a childish simplicity, as a mother becomes a child again when she fondles her children ' " (Quoted E.G.T. 27). " As children to children, speaking what St. Augustine describes as ' *decurtata et mutilata verba*,' baby-language to those who were still babes in the faith " (M. 21).

But as mother or father, brother or child St. Paul never forgets the main aim and fact. Faith, Hope, Love abide, but the greatest is Love, maternal, paternal, fraternal, filial, many-sided, but always Love.

" Yes, without cheer of sister or of daughter,
Yes, without stay of father, or of son,
Lone on the land, and homeless on the water,
Pass I in patience till the work be done.

" Hearts I have won of sister or of brother,
Quick on the earth, or hidden in the sod,
Lo, every heart awaiteth me, another
Friend in the blameless family of God.

Myers, St. Paul.



HARRISON'S DESCRIPTION OF THE CHURCH UNDER ELIZABETH.

BY THE REV. HAROLD SMITH, D.D., Tutor of the London
College of Divinity.

WILLIAM HARRISON, the author of the "Description of England" prefixed to Holinshed's *Chronicle* (ed. 1, 1577; ed. 2, 1587), was born in Bow Lane, Cheapside, April 18, 1534. He was educated at St. Paul's School, where he was when the English Litany first appeared in 1544, and at Westminster under Alexander Nowell. He was at both Universities (M.A., Oxford; B.D., Cambridge). At the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, February 16, 1558-9, he was instituted to the living of Radwinter, in the north-west of Essex, at the presentation of William Brooke, Lord Cobham, whose Chaplain he was; this he held till his death in 1593. For some ten years, 1571-1581, he also had the adjoining parish of Wimbish. He became Canon of Windsor in 1586, where he died. His wife survived him a few months; he left two daughters and a son.

The work to which he devoted most of his time, the "Chronologie," was never published, the MS. is in the Library of the Bishops of Derry. Thus he is best known by his "Description." Dr. Furnivall, who brought out a new edition of this for the New Shakespeare Society, says: "His racy accounts of our forefathers' dress, food, houses, have made Harrison one of the most often quoted and trusted authorities on the condition of England in Elizabeth's and Shakespeare's day."—(*Dict. National Biography*.)

He appears a diligent parochial clergyman. He had the great qualifications of insight, sympathy and humour. His name does not appear in a "black list" of unpreaching ministers in Essex, drawn up by the Puritans about 1585; in fact, he seems in some sympathy with the moderate Puritan position. He has a keen sense of social injustice, especially in engrossing (or, as we should say, cornering) corn and articles of food, and in turning arable land into parks. "Certes, if it be not one curse of the Lord to have our country converted in such sort from the furniture of mankind into the walks and shrouds of wild beasts, I know not what is one!" His attitude towards the destruction of small holdings reminds one strongly of Goldsmith's "Deserted Village." While recognizing

many improvements of recent years, he regards covetousness as greatly on the increase.

“ I would I might live no longer than to see four things in the land reformed : that is, the want of discipline in the Church ; the covetous dealing of most of our merchants in the preferment of the commodities of other countries, and hindrance of their own ; the holding of fairs and markets on the Sunday to be abolished and referred to the Wednesday ” (and that every man with forty or more acres shall be required to plant one acre with wood). “ But I fear me that I should then live too long, and so long, that I should either be weary of the world, or the world of me ; and yet they are not such things but they may easily be brought to pass.”

He devotes the opening chapters of his second book to a description of the Church. This has special value, as coming from a keen observer, not from a partizan.

Cathedrals, he says, have now become, especially in the nether parts, rather markets and shops for merchandize than solemn places of prayer whereunto they were first erected.

He speaks well of bishops, except that he does not like their frequent translations. “ They be not idle in their callings . . . they so apply their minds to the setting forth of the word that there are very few of them which do not every Sunday or oftener resort to some place or other within their jurisdictions where they expound the Scriptures with much gravity and skill.”

On the discipline of the Church, he says :

“ They have under them also their archdeacons . . . which archdeacons are termed in law the Bishops’ Eyes ; and these (besides their ordinary courts, which are holden within so many or more of their several deaneries, by themselves or their officials, once in a month at the least) do keep yearly two visitations or synods (as the bishop doth in every third year, wherein he confirmeth some children, though most care but a little for that ceremony) in which they make diligent inquisition and search as well for the doctrine and behaviour of the ministers as the orderly dealing of the parishoners in resorting to their parish churches and conformity with religion.”

Harrison takes a moderate view on the question of faculties for pluralities. He thinks the inhabitants of the second parish get more profit in a short time as regards preaching, than they would otherwise

have in many years. (Small livings were then normally held by non-preaching ministers, who merely read Homilies from the book.) The practice, he says, is attacked as if there were more good preachers than vacant livings; this might seem borne out by the number of applicants for every vacancy; but when the merits of these applicants are weighed, most will be found quite unfit. There would be much to be said against pluralities were it not for the present necessity; but there are more livings vacant annually than the universities produce preachers to fill them. Harrison's remedy is that much in favour now, especially with dignitaries, "If in country towns and cities, yea even in London itself, four or five of the little churches were brought into one, the inconvenience would in great part be redressed." He adds that very often a small living is of so little value as not to be able to maintain a mean scholar, much less a learned man.

He maintains that the clergy are over-taxed—out of all proportions to laymen. Their contributions to subsidies run to six shillings in the pound. In fact a man with a benefice of £20 a year thinks himself well off if after meeting all ordinary payments he has £13 6s. 8d. left towards the maintenance of himself and family (he puts his own income at £40 "*computatis computandis*"). "As if the church were now become the ass whereon every market man is to ride and cast his wallet."

He defends the marriage of bishops and clergy, meeting a criticism that "their wives be fond after the decease of their husbands, and bestow themselves not so advisedly as their calling requireth," by declaring that the same holds good sometimes of duchesses, countesses, and the wives of barons and knights, for "Eve will be Eve, though Adam would say nay."

He denounces the greed of patrons. "Not a few also find fault with our threadbare gowns, as if not our patrons but our wives were the cause of our woe. But if it were known to all, what I know to have been performed of late in Essex, when a minister taking a benefice of less than twenty pounds in the Queen's books, so far as I remember, was forced to pay to his patron twenty quarters of oats, ten quarters of wheat and sixteen yearly of barley, which he called *hawks' meat* . . . the cause of our threadbare gowns would easily appear, for such patrons do scrape the wool from our clokes."

He gives a description of the Sunday services. After speaking

of Morning Prayer, in which he lays stress on the Psalms and Lessons, he speaks of the "Letanie and suffrages, an invocation in my opinion not devised without the great assistance of the Spirit of God, although many curious mindsick persons utterly condemn it as superstitious and savouring of conjuration and sorcery." (This was the line taken by the Frankfort Puritans in their letter to Calvin.) "This being done we proceed to the Communion, if any communicants be to receive the Eucharist; if not, we read the decalog, epistle, and gospel, with the Nicene creed (of some in derision called the dry communion), and then finish with a homily or sermon, which hath a psalm before and after it, and finally with the baptism of such infants as on every Sabbath day (if occasion so require) are brought unto the churches; and thus is the forenoon bestowed. In the afternoon likewise we meet again, and after the psalms and lessons ended we have commonly a sermon, or at the least our youth catechised by the space of an hour. And thus do we spend the Sabbath day in good and godly exercises, all done in our vulgar tongue, that each one present may hear and understand the same.

"As for our churches themselves, bells and times of morning and evening prayer remain as in times past, saving that all images shrines, tabernacles, roodlofts and monuments of idolatry are removed, taken down, and defaced, only the stories in glass windows excepted, which for want of sufficient store of new stuff, and by reason of extreme charge that should grow by the alteration of the same into white panes throughout the realm, are not altogether abolished in most places at once, but by little and little suffered to decay, that white glass may be provided and set up in their rooms. Finally, whereas there was wont to be a great partition between the quire and the body of the church, now it is either very small or none at all, and, to say the truth, altogether needless, sith the minister saith his service commonly in the body of the church, with his face toward the people, in a little tabernacle of wainscot provided for the purpose, by which means the ignorant do not only learn divers of the psalms and usual prayers, by heart, but also such as can read do pray together with him, so that the whole congregation at one instant pour out their petitions unto the living God for the whole estate of his church in most earnest and fervent manner."

Harrison is not over fond of holy days. "Our holy and festival days are very well reduced also unto a less number; for whereas

not long since we had under the pope fourscore and fifteen called festival, and thirty *profesti*, beside the Sundays, they are all brought unto seven and twenty ; and with them the superfluous numbers of idle wakes, guilds, fraternities, church-ales, help-ales and soul-ales, called also dirge-ales, with the heathenish rioting at bride-ales, are well diminished and laid aside. And no great matter were it if the feasts of all our apostles, evangelists and martyrs with that of all saints, were brought to the holy days that follow upon Christmas, Easter and Whitsuntide ; and those of the Virgin Mary, with the rest, utterly removed from the calendars, as neither necessary nor commendable in a reformed church."

Harrison gives what is probably our best account of the clerical meetings or "prophesyings" (so called from the presumed Scripture precedents, 1 Samuel x. 5-13, and other places where "the sons of the prophets" are mentioned ; also 1 Cor. xiv. 31). These were favoured by a number of bishops, as tending to promote Scripture knowledge and to train preachers ; Archbishop Grindal, recognising possible misuse, issued rules for their regulation. But the Queen, who thought three or four preachers quite enough for a county, ordered him to suppress them. He wrote a respectful but manly remonstrance (given in full by Thomas Fuller—another main source of our knowledge of the subject). The result was his suspension. When at the Hampton Court Conference the Puritans asked for meetings and prophesyings, the King retorted that they aimed at a Scottish presbytery "which as well agreeth with a monarchy as God and the Devil. Then Jack and Tom and Dick and Will shall meet, and at their pleasure censure me and my council, and all our proceedings."

Harrison thinks these conferences admirable. "In many of our archdeaconies we have an exercise lately begun, which for the most part is called a prophesy or conference, and enacted only for the examinations or trial of the diligence of the clergy in their study of holy Scriptures. Howbeit, such is the thirsty desire of the people in these days to hear the word of God, that they also have as it were with zealous violence intruded themselves among them (but as hearers only) to come by more knowledge through their presence at the same. Herein also (for the most part) two of the younger sort of ministers do expound, each after other, some piece of the scriptures ordinarily appointed unto them in their courses (wherein they

orderly go through with some one of the evangelists, or of the apostles, as it pleaseth the whole assembly to choose at the first in every of these conferences) ; and when they have spent an hour or a little more between them, then cometh one of the better learned sort, who being a graduate for the most part, or known to be a preacher sufficiently authorised and of a sound judgement, supplieth the room of a moderator, making first a brief rehearsal of their discourses, and then adding what him thinketh good of his own knowledge, whereby two hours are most commonly spent at this most profitable meeting. When all is done, if the first speakers have shewed any piece of diligence, they are commended for their travail, and encouraged to go forward. If they have been found to be slack, or not sound in delivery of their doctrine, their negligence and error is openly reprov'd before all their brethren, who go aside of purpose from the laity, after the exercise ended, to judge of these matters and consult of the next speakers and quantity of the text to be handled in that place. The laity never speak of course (except some vain and busy head will now and then intrude themselves with offence), but are only hearers ; and as it is used in some places weekly, in others once in fourteen days, in divers monthly, and elsewhere twice in the year, so is it a notable spur unto all the ministers thereby to apply their books, which otherwise (as in times past) would give themselves to hawking, hunting, tables, cards, dice, tipping at the alehouse, shooting of matches and other like vanities, nothing commendable in such as should be godly and zealous stewards of the good gifts of God, faithful distributors of the word unto the people, and diligent pastors according to their calling."

These conferences were fiercely attacked when the second edition of this work appeared. It contains an additional paragraph, ascribing the opposition to "Satan, the author of all mischief," who has "stirred up adversaries of late unto this most profitable exercise, who not regarding the commodity that groweth thereby so well to the hearers as speakers, but either stumbling (I cannot tell now) at words and terms, or at the leastwise not liking to hear of the reprehension of vice, or peradventure taking a misliking at the slender dimensions of such negligent ministers as now and then in their courses do occupy the rooms, have either by their own practice, their sinister information, or suggestions made upon surmises unto

other, procured the suppression of these conferences, condemning them as hurtful, pernicious and daily breeders of no small hurt and inconvenience. But hereof let God be judge, unto whom the cause belongeth."

Harrison finishes his account of the Church by expressing his ideas for the training of the clergy in connection with the cathedrals. His idea, not altogether correct, of the working of the catechetical schools in the great Sees of the primitive Church, and of the training of junior clergy by the bishops, is that from these schools the Bishops with the rest of the elders chose out the ripest scholars who were willing to serve in the ministry "whom they placed also in their cathedral cities, there not only to be further instructed in the knowledge of the Word, but also to inure them to the delivery of the same unto the people in sound manner, to minister the sacraments, to visit the sick and brethren imprisoned, and to perform such other duties as then belonged to their charges. . . . Being in process of time found meet workmen for the Lord's harvest, they were forthwith sent abroad, after imposition of hands and prayer generally made for their good proceeding, to some place or other then destitute of her pastor, and others taken from the school also placed in their rooms." Harrison would like this restored; in some respects he remarkably anticipates diocesan theological colleges adjacent to cathedrals. We have already, he says, schools and universities; it would be good to train in the cathedral cities men already educated. This would make the cathedrals of real use; "the stalls in their quires would be better filled, which now for the most part are empty; and prebends should be prebends indeed, there to live till they were preferred to some ecclesiastical function, whereas now prebends are but superfluous additaments unto former excesses, and perpetual commodities to the owners." . . . One hindrance is the general contempt of the ministry, "the greatest part of the more excellent wits choose rather to employ their studies unto physic and the laws, utterly giving over the study of the Scriptures, for fear lest they should in time not get their bread by the same." "But as I have good leisure to wish for these things, so it shall be a longer time before it will be brought to pass."

HAROLD SMITH.

CHURCH SELF-GOVERNMENT IN ACTION.

BY THE REV. J. D. MULLINS, M.A., D.D.

IT is common nowadays to clamour for the self-government of the Church as the panacea for all the ills, real and supposed, from which the Church is suffering. Many Evangelical Churchmen have been carried off their feet by this wave of popular sentiment. Evangelicals are a minority of the Church of England as a whole ; but they claim, and surely with justice, that the teaching they represent is essential to the well-being of the Church. It may therefore be not untimely to submit a few facts as to some effects of Church self-government as seen in action. In the great over-sea dominions the Church is unestablished or has been disestablished, and it is self-governing. We have therefore in the Colonial Church an object lesson ready to hand.

A favourite point of attack on the present constitution of the Church is the method of appointing Bishops. In regularly constituted colonial dioceses the bishop is elected by the diocesan synod of clergy and lay delegates, except where the number of self-supporting parishes within the dioceses falls below a number decided upon by the General Synod. In the latter case the selection is made by the house of bishops of the province or of the whole colony.¹

A generation or so ago, colonial diocesan synods often deputed some of their number or authorized some trusted persons in England to select an English clergyman as bishop whenever a vacancy occurred. This practice has not yet entirely died out, but is more and more rarely resorted to, and will probably cease before long. It has given to the Colonial Church a number of distinguished men ; but with the growth of national consciousness, the implied superiority of English to local clergy is increasingly resented, with the resulting tendency to look for the new bishops within the borders of the colony itself. One disadvantage under which the imported bishop suffered was that by coming into a radically new type of life in middle age he often found difficulty in acclimatizing himself

¹ Missionary bishops in Crown Colonies or outside the Empire are usually appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury from lists supplied by the Society or Societies concerned. Bishops of the Indian Establishment are appointed by the State.

to the new conditions, either in his person, his modes of thought, or his methods of administration. Unfortunately the tendency now goes too far in the other direction. Too often the diocese narrows its choice within its own borders. Alas! in some dioceses, the office of bishop seems to be looked upon as a prize which ought not to be let slip out of the hands of those who have it to bestow. Hence either the "old-timer" or some man of popular gifts or one possessed of good private means or able to pull most wires, has the best chance of election. These influences operate even where the clergy entitled to vote in the synod are few and the number of self-supporting parishes is only a little above the qualifying minimum. The likelihood that a real leader of the Church will be found amongst them is correspondingly remote. As a fact, some very weak and few strong bishops have been appointed under this system.

Nor is this all. The vices of popular election and political intrigue are only too frequently manifest. A few illustrations may be given. In a certain diocese two names emerged from the crowd of promiscuous nominations after the first ballots. One was a strong man, an undoubted leader, so much so that the clergy of the opposite party feared him. Ballots were frequent, wire-pulling and lobbying went on vigorously. At last both sides became convinced that they were too nearly equal to command the requisite majority, and so they compromised on a man of inferior parts who happened to be generally unobjectionable. In another case the lobbying for the bishopric was so flagrant and so prolonged that many of the laity left the synod; and a disappointed candidate exhibited his chagrin by means of a letter in the Church papers. Can any "scandal" of an appointment under our English system compare with such as these?

I am reluctantly driven to the opinion that under the system of popular election, there is no great likelihood that the best men and the strongest leaders will be chosen. Certainly the able man attached to unpopular causes or unpossessed of popular gifts would have no chance. It would be easy to name many men raised to the English episcopate under our much-abused system in the face of popular clamour or astonishment, of whom the Church has afterwards been proud. Such men would never become bishops by popular election.

Furthermore, the tendency of popular election is to reduce the number of Evangelical bishops. Evangelical clergy are often in the minority in a colonial diocese, and still oftener are unorganized or not alert. The result has been to substitute High Churchmen for Evangelicals in diocese after diocese. In the whole of Australia there are now not more than five Evangelical bishops, in New Zealand perhaps only one, in South Africa not even one. In how many English dioceses should we have Evangelical bishops if the choice were made by diocesan synods?

The importance of this change lies in the all-powerful influence exerted by the bishop. Sooner or later, the diocese takes its colour from the bishop. The protection of the Evangelical party within the Church has been its trustee patronage, devised originally by the far-seeing Charles Simeon, together with such openings as are afforded by private, collegiate and occasional Crown patronage. Under the self-government of the Church all such modes of patronage are swept away. Appointments to livings in the over-sea dominions are vested either in the people or in the bishop, or in both jointly. In practice this usually means that the bishop finds the incumbent, for even when they have a voice in the matter the parishioners have seldom wide enough knowledge of clergy to enable them to make an independent choice. Thus the bishop gradually fills the diocese with men of his own colour, and others rarely have any chance. In one High Church diocese in Canada a single parish consisting of sturdy Evangelicals insisted on having a man of their own way of thinking, but the exception was so marked as to prove the rule. The result is the extinction of Evangelical Churchmanship over wide areas. In the whole of South Africa no Evangelical has the slightest chance of preferment except in the three churches of Capetown, which still stand outside the Church of South Africa, and in one church in Kimberley. Whole dioceses in Canada and Australia are similarly closed to Evangelicals; and the same would be true of English dioceses under a similar system.

On another point, although it does not specially affect Evangelicals, English clergy ought to realize a result of Church self-government which nearly touches them. Disendowment would inevitably follow ecclesiastical independence, whether the promoters of these schemes intend it or not. Disendowment means placing the power of the purse in the hands of the laity, which again means

that the clergy may be starved out if they fail to please their congregations. The "parson's freehold" has many disadvantages, but at any rate under it the clergyman has an independent position which enables him to take an unpopular line when conscience or duty require it. I could name a Continental chaplaincy controlled by its lay congregation in a manner similar to that of a colonial parish, where the incumbent dared not speak against certain glaring abuses which prevailed amongst his people; or knew that if he did it was at the peril of his stipend. "No, I am not the Independent minister," old Mr. Lepine of Abingdon used to say, "I am the minister of the Independent congregation."

It will have been gathered that in my opinion Evangelicals at least have nothing to gain and much to lose by the proposed schemes. They may well pause and consider whether it would not be better to bear the ills they have—most of which could be remedied by reform in detail—than fly to others that they know not of.

J. D. MULLINS.

CHRIST AS KING.

"THE mark of what a Kingdom is, is to be seen in the King. Christ now reigns as God and man on the throne of the Father. On earth there is no embodiment or external manifestation of the Kingdom; its power is seen in the lives of those in whom it rules. It is only in the Church, the members of Christ, that the united Body can be seen and known. Christ lives and dwells and rules in their hearts. Our Lord Himself taught how close the relationship would be. "In that day ye shall know that I am in My Father, and ye in Me, and I in you." Next to the faith of His oneness with God, and His omnipotent power, would be the knowledge that they lived in Him and He in them. This must be our first lesson if we are to follow in the steps of the disciples and to share their blessing, that we must know that Christ actually as King, dwells and rules in our hearts. We must know that we live in Him, and in His power are able to accomplish all that He would have us do. Our whole life is to be devoted to our King and the service of His Kingdom. This blessed relationship to Christ will mean above all a daily fellowship with Him in prayer. The prayer life is to be a continuous and unbroken exercise. It is thus that His people can rejoice in their King, and in Him can be more than conquerors."—ANDREW MURRAY.

[Cheltenham Conference Paper.]

LIMITS OF VARIATION IN A UNITED CHURCH.

BY THE BISHOP OF WARRINGTON.

MY subject this morning is of a very speculative nature ; I can picture a writer, blessed with a more vivid imagination than myself, revelling in the opportunity which such a subject affords of drawing fancy sketches of a purely visionary Church, Utopian in the truest sense of the word, realizable only in the Millennial period, which, as far as one can judge from the utterances of those who talk most about it, is to be that happy time when every one has come to be in complete agreement to the very last detail with the particular person who is indulging in the vision.

I cannot put before you any such Turneresque picture ; the colours on my palette are the more drab hues of daily life ; and I want to keep, not indeed to the realized, but at least to the realizable, when the varied factors are taken into account : our problem is surely this, the relation between unity and variety ; our question, how far can a strong and vital unity in structure be combined with a wide variety of function and expression ?

I do not think that we can do better than start with the definition of the Church in the Nicene, or rather Constantinopolitan, Creed, as One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic ; for I believe that we shall find, in the attempts which have been made to realize this, warnings as to certain roads which have led men astray.

The fact that I am asked to deal with variations in a *united* Church absolves me from the necessity of any argument as to whether the *one* Church refers to a visible or invisible unity ; in the light of the invitation to speak upon such a topic, I can safely assume that we are agreed that the Unity which is the ideal of the Church is a visible unity of organization, not a vaguer unity of intention and aspiration.

Now the history of the Church shows clearly that unity has often been confused with uniformity ; the great difficulty which lies before us at the present time is the situation which was mainly created in English Christendom by the Act of Uniformity ; and this is but one of the many warnings that history gives of the fatal

danger of that confusion ; until the Church can make room within her borders for all the variations due to race, culture, heredity, and temperament, she can never be really *one*.

When we turn to the second mark, that of sanctity, we find it less directly germane to our purpose ; but while the developments of monasticism warn us of the dangers of an official recognition of two standards of holiness, one for the workaday life of the world and the other possible only in the seclusion of the cloister, on the other hand the schisms of Donatus and Novatian, and in our own day the existence of such bodies as the Plymouth Brethren, are standing admonitions against a narrow and pharisaical application of the Christian ethic.

Catholicity is more to our purpose ; the contrast of the derivation of the word with its popular connotation is provocative of thought ; it is commonly used now of a narrow, rigid and exclusive system, thoroughly logical in its development, once its premises are granted, and, with the confidence of all deductions, flatly denying the reality of all facts which do not fit into its frame ; it is essentially exclusive, drawing a definite limit and excluding all that is without ; that such a system should arrogate to itself the name of Catholic is surely its condemnation. But it is due to the exclusive policy which the Church has pursued in its career, an exclusiveness which may have had justification when it was fighting for its existence, not only with the political powers of the day but also with competing syncretistic rivals, who would have destroyed it by permeation, but which is now an outworn and an injurious policy. I venture to suggest that the exclusive theory of the Church, which is by no means combined to so-called Catholics, is the outcome of conditions which have now passed away, and that the true Catholicity of the future will be inclusive in principle.

The mark of Apostolicity raises problems of rather a different order ; it might be possible to treat them along the lines suggested by that favourite quotation of the late Archbishop Temple : "*Vindicamus nobis Apostolorum, non honores, sed labores,*" and to interpret the word as purely qualitative, not as historical : yet I cannot help feeling that such a treatment would be a deliberate discarding of the meaning of the word as it stands in the creed, and, what is more serious, an ignoring of the strength and cohesion which are given by continuity ; and this reminds us that one side of our pro-

blem is the combination of catholicity in the true sense of the word with continuity.

Another conclusion which may, I think, be drawn legitimately from the subject prescribed me is that I am not to consider any scheme of mere federation between separate bodies or Churches, but an attempt to forecast the variety within one great society.

If we are going to proceed upon inclusive lines, we have got to get down to essentials, to the absolute differentia of Christianity in worship, doctrine and polity; these must be insisted upon, and all else be left for a wide variety of practice and belief.

Worship. Is there anything which can be insisted upon as distinctively and essentially Christian in worship in the *agenda* as contrasted with the *credenda*, save the two sacraments of the Gospel? Baptism with water in the Name, and the Common Meal, normally of bread and wine, set apart by prayer in which the words of Institution have been used, are the distinctively Christian rites. What beyond this can be insisted on as essential? Neither free prayer nor set forms belong to the essence of Christian worship. Venerable liturgies have their place, but they themselves are outcome of years of free prayer; free prayer has its place, but it is subject to the inevitable tendency to drift into set formulæ. I want to suggest that we must get into the way of going right down to essentials, when we are considering the question of "limits of variation," that the limit must be rather that set by a common centre, than circumferential delimitation, however widely the bounds may be cast.

If we turn from worship to doctrine, the matter would appear upon the surface to be much more complicated; the creeds are so detailed and explicit, the confessions of the various communions so elaborate that it would seem at first sight almost impossible to find any single dominating principle, the acceptance of which could be allowed to stand as the one essential of membership. And yet I venture to suggest that this is not so hopeless as at first appears. The creeds and confessions of Christendom are, all of them, explications or safeguards of the primitive and apostolic formula, "Jesus is Lord." The distinguishing feature of Christian belief is the worthiness of Jesus of Nazareth to receive *worship*. Even the Athanasian Creed testifies to this aspect: "The Catholic Faith is . . . that we *worship*." A man may from mental obliquity or lack of logical precision decline to call Him God; but if he wor-

ships Him, he gives in act what he refuses in word. Here is the differentiating feature of Christianity as contrasted with simple Theism, and this would seem to be the supreme test of Christian doctrine.

But it is the clearest teaching of experience that different men will interpret the same fact in different ways, ways so different as to appear diametrically opposed; mental training and outlook, temperament, social conditions, and many other factors, all combine to vary the way in which different men look at the same fact, and the deductions which they draw from it; nowhere has this been more true than in the sphere of religion; and the intensity of their religious convictions has led men to maintain them against the conclusions of others with a vigour, which has been a fruitful source of division; men have not been content with the affirmation, "I am right"; they have gone on to the negation, "You are wrong." And unity will never be really possible till men have abandoned the "magnifying of their certainties to condemn all differences." Dogma will always be divisive.

When we come to the question of polity, we find ourselves faced by a different problem; I do not think that we can claim that any form of organization has the right to be regarded as the one authoritative Christian type; for while episcopacy was for centuries the universal polity, it was only evolved gradually in the Church; and no one who is willing to give facts their true value can deny that Christian Churches have flourished, and do flourish, with other forms of organization. But on the other hand the unity of a society finds its expression in the organs through which it functions; and the officials of any society, whatever theories may be put forward as to their origin, or the source of their authority, are, by differentiation of function, the organs of that society. Consequently the question of the ministry comes very near to being fundamental to reunion,

But the lessons of history and experience cannot be ignored; in the course of history the Christian Church evolved the threefold ministry as that best suited to its needs; and I want to suggest that the experience of the present shows how Churches which have formed themselves on what they believed to be a more primitive model are being driven by force of circumstances in the same direction; think of the Bishops of the Lutheran Churches of Scandi-

navia, of the Superintendents of the German Lutheran Church ; watch the development of the superintendent ministers in the Baptist and Independent churches, and study the map of their districts ; and perhaps most striking of all listen to the confession from strong Presbyterians of the weakness which they feel as the result of a system of annually elected moderators, due to the facts, that the office of oversight is held only for a year, and that the holder is not freed from his particular charge, to exercise oversight.

But the essential function of the historic episcopate is oversight, as its name implies ; all sorts of theories have grown up round it in the course of centuries, as to its origin and authority ; these have greater or less value in the eyes of different sections of the Christian Church ; and here I venture to differ from the reader of the first paper this morning ; I am not prepared to insist that we must "decide which" of the various conflicting theories "is right." The Church of England has been wise in her generation in fastening no theory upon her members, but leaving them free to interpret the fact in the way which subserves best their spiritual life. I want to emphasize the point that the historic episcopate, or better, the historic threefold ministry, preserves that continuity with the past which it would be rash to sacrifice ; we can accept it, not indeed, as is sometimes loosely stated, without any theory as to its nature, but without enforcing any *one* theory as to its nature ; we can accept the fact, and vary in our interpretation of its significance (cp. Monarchy). But on the value of continuity in the service of unity I cannot do better than quote from Dr. Garbie's very important essay on the Reformed Episcopate in the recently published volume *Towards Reunion* ; he is examining the Essays in Dr. Swete's volume on *The Early History of the Church and Ministry*, and in summing up his criticism of Dean Armitage Robinson's contribution he says : "I can accept the statement that he makes in support of the threefold ministry, even in the later sense of the terms which he has in view. 'It is for the unity of the whole that the Historic Threefold Ministry stands. It grew out of the need for preservation of unity when the Apostles themselves were withdrawn. . . . This is not to say that a particular doctrine of Apostolic Succession must needs be held by all Christians alike. But the principle of transmission of ministerial authority makes for unity.' "

I may seem to have trenched somewhat on the province of the

previous speaker ; but I have ventured to do so because I am convinced that limitations must be found in the common consent to a few fundamentals, in worship, creed, and organization ; and under the last head the ministry is the essential factor.

I do not suppose that the many variations which would naturally exist in common with loyalty to the few fundamentals would be simply individual variations ; I take it that there would be combinations of those who worshipped, or taught, or organized upon similar lines ; the present divisions would largely reproduce themselves in the new order, representing as they do the varying emphasis on aspects of Christian teaching laid by men of varying temperament or environment ; the Baptist would still insist upon the baptism of believers, and organize himself with those who held the same views ; the Congregationalist might still retain his democratic system of government, and emphasis on the independence of each congregation ; the Connexional or Conciliar communions would still if so desired retain their carefully balanced system of Church Courts. While there would probably be a large central community, content with a considerable agreement in worship and doctrine, and without special leanings to any highly specialized system of Church government, there would be considerable freedom in, to use a phrase rendered familiar by much recent legislation, "contracting out." Bodies would be formed and recognized, bearing much the same relationship to the whole Church that her various orders do at the present moment to the Church of Rome. Such contracting out might work in other directions ; why should not those who desire a more elaborate ritual, a more cohesive system of doctrine, and whose theory of the ministry takes a rigid and, to our mind, mechanical form, group themselves into an order, or orders, within the reunited Church, provided that the ministry of that Church retained that connecting link with the past which is essential upon their theories ? To lose their contribution to the United Church would be a disaster ; it would be equally disastrous, were the attempt at Reunion to result in emphasizing the line of cleavage between the Institutional and Experimental aspects of religion, between, to use the common language of the day, Catholic and Protestant Christianity.

To sum up, the Sacraments of the Gospel in Worship, the Lordship of Jesus in creed, and the Common Ministry, as the expres-

sion and organ of a differentiated but continuous life, in polity, would seem to be the common ground of the United Church. These once agreed upon and safe-guarded there seems but little limit to the variations of worship, belief, and organization, to which the Church might be led by the diverse operations of the One Spirit of the One Lord.

M. L. WARRINGTON.

[*Cheltenham Conference Paper.*]

PROBLEMS OF EVANGELISTIC WORK.

BY THE REV. C. W. WILSON, M.A., Rector of Walcot, Bath.

THE Church has a Divine commission given it by its Divine Lord—"Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." This is accompanied by Divine power, for He Who gave the command said "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore." It is followed also by Divine assurance of success, for He said, too, "Lo, I am with you all the days, even unto the end of the world." Yet after nearly twenty centuries we are faced in the Archbishops' Report on Evangelistic work with a condition of things in the Church which is deplorable and which many of us know all too well is lamentably true. The people do not come to Church. They hold aloof from organized religion, and personal religion is, we are told, on the wane. Surely this is due to failure on the part of those to whom the command and enablement were given. Obedience, fearlessness and triumphant confidence are not the characteristics of our lives and work as they ought to be. The endeavour of this paper is to examine these problems of Evangelistic work and to attempt to suggest some solution.

When Christ was upon earth, multitudes hung upon His words and the common people heard Him gladly. It was because He knew men and knew what was in man, and because when He spoke "He taught with authority," and that, not the least, the authority of understandable truth. Many reasons might be given for non-attendance at public worship so common to-day, and indeed are given in the Report, but is not the truest reason that clergy are out of touch with the people?

They do not know men. By their very training and by circumstances they live aloof and apart until they really dwell in a world of their own imagination and creation. The education that it has been to some of us to work with the troops has been an eye-opener. The halo which surrounded us evaporated, the pedestal was broken down, and to have to meet men on the same level and to "make good" has left an impression for which we can never be too thankful. The Bishops who visited the front have not been so fortunate. The halo accompanied them, the aura went with them, and they never knew what the men said and thought behind their backs after they had spoken at special parade services got up in their honour. They departed satisfied with cheers ringing in their ears.

To know men we must share their lives not only on Sundays but on weekdays. It is necessary to see them not only in the parlour and drawing-room but at their work in the everyday life, and that means constant pastoral visitation, not merely of the congregation, but of the parish. It would be an appalling mistake to speak lightly or think lightly of sin, but have we not made many things sin which are not sin at all? They may be to us undesirable, unhelpful, even objectionable, but have we been right in placing them in the category of sins? It is only necessary to give one illustration—the question of smoking. It may be a dirty habit, a wasteful habit, an unnecessary luxury, but is it sin? Yet it has been denounced on many a convention platform, and sometimes by those who thought a glass of whisky a necessity to their bodily health. We need to know men, make allowances for men who have not been brought up in the school of the strictest Pharisees, see the good, always to be found, in men, and we shall soon find ourselves heart to heart with men, speaking of the things which matter most.

There are clergy in parishes whose churches are full and who have a great influence for God in the town where they live. Is it personality which accomplishes this result? Is it popular services which seem so much in demand, or is it just obedience to the command "Preach the Gospel," fearlessness through the power of Christ's Spirit, and confident optimism arising from the Master's companionship? The only personality that can continue to attract is the personality of Christ through the man who yields himself for service. Less ecclesiasticism, more humanity; less religiousness,

more Christianity; less importance, more sincerity—is our need to-day if we are to “compel them to come in.”

2. *They hold aloof from organized Christianity.* We Evangelicals have an evangel or we have nothing. We do not stand for a special type of service, conducted in any particular way. Our contribution to the Church is our message—the all-important message of the Gospel—life through Christ’s death. Conviction and experience are the essentials for its delivery, and it is the lack of these, conspicuously absent, which makes for aloofness from organized Christianity. Men feel these are lacking in the Church though they recognize them in Christ. Here we have a glorious opportunity. Let us cease quibbling over non-essentials, precious as they are to some of us, and apply ourselves, in the strength which Christ supplies, to our message.

We need no new Gospel. The old has the transforming power, and if it has transformed us and men recognize the fact, they will not long stand aloof. But let us see that we speak in a language “understood of the people,” and not in archaic phrases and ancient shibboleths which none but the initiated understand. Our witness must be twofold—the witness of a life which bears the hallmark of reconciliation to God and the message recorded by the apostle “We pray you in Christ’s stead be ye reconciled to God.” This message must pass, not merely from the pulpit, but from lip to lip as in the early days of Christianity.

We Evangelicals do not pose as a priestly caste separate and apart from our fellow men. We profess to believe in the priesthood of the laity and yet do little to encourage laymen to exercise their priestly functions except when we are shorthanded and hard pressed in the Mission Hall. Our people do not welcome laymen in the pulpit, possibly because they contract or suspect something of our estimate of them. Is this really the best work laymen can do? Is there not a greater work that all our people ought to do? To secure those who stand aloof there must be some work to call them to. We have not generally and effectively taught our congregations that the first duty of a Christian is to “bear witness of Me.” It is not an easy task that is before us, for some of our best and kindest friends live on past experiences. Once five, ten, fifteen, fifty years ago they had a real experience of Christ, and on that they have lived ever since. Now the worker’s experience, as every

Christian's, should be a daily experience of Christ. We cannot *live* in the full sense of the word³ on past experiences. The reason for the lack of workers in our organizations, for the lack of LIFE in the Church to-day, must be largely put down to past experiences. Our teaching has tended in this direction. Once saved always saved, instead of saved from guilt, being saved from power, shall be saved from presence of sin, and saved to serve.

Present experience of Christ's love and power are absolutely necessary for a live sermon, a living message, and an abundantly living worker. Here again our need is met by obedience to the command, fearlessness in consciousness of power and triumphant confidence in the victory He will give.

3. *Personal religion is on the wane.* Evangelicals stand for personal conversion, and the man who has not regular conversions in his work needs earnestly to seek the cause. The Gospel has the transforming power, Christ gives the enabling power and His presence ensures success. One of the saddest sentences in the Report is that "Evidence from all sides proves that our services but rarely possess the converting power which accompanies all worship that is reverent and real." Of what use is a full church, a beautiful service and a balance in the bank on the parish funds if souls are not being saved. Our Lord was the physician of the soul, and we in turn are to be physicians likewise. A true diagnosis is the first essential of a good doctor. We know that all men need Christ, and it is our chief business to bring Him with all His attractive power before our people.

This war has taught us many things, and amongst others what a very small thing may stand between a man, apparently hopelessly crippled and perfect health. At a military hospital the other day a man was brought in, a paraplegia, quivering and shaking in every limb, a pitiable sight. Taken prisoner at Mons, he had been subjected to ghastly cruelty, under which he had developed into the helpless cripple that he was. Repatriated as a human wreck, for three and a half years he had been on crutches, and it looked as if he must spend the remainder of his days in helpless misery. The doctor, who was to treat him before an audience of medical men, spoke to him with a tenderness, helpfulness, and confident assurance, such as one could have imagined coming from the lips of the Master. He reminded him that the past with its horrors was over.

There was no more reason for fear. The enemy had been beaten and victory won. His cure was a certainty. He then explained the working of the human body, the effect of the brain in control of the limbs, the use of muscles, etc. In twenty minutes that man took his first three steps for three and a half years without crutches, and with but little human support, and in thirty-five minutes he was walking and running alone in the passage of the hospital. It was a functional case. He needed only re-education—to be taught that the apparently impossible was not only possible but real. His very first ejaculation when he learned, was "Thank God." This is only one of hundreds of such cases being cured to-day.

It is our business to endeavour to understand the human soul as the doctor does the human body. Modern psychology gives us valuable assistance towards this knowledge in its analysis of the human mentality. Diagrammatically we may describe it thus, though the psychologist will reject the word will for intellectual mental process. The top plane or highest level of the human mentality is the will. Under it comes the plane of the emotions, and under it again, the lowest level, the subconscious mind, these all being inextricably interlaced.

It is our mission to *appeal* to that mind, instructing it, setting forth the personal need and recalling experiences, rather than fiercely denouncing sin either in the abstract or concrete—compare our Lord's treatment of the woman at the well of Sychar—to stimulate the emotions with the high ideal and gloriously attractive character of Christ, setting forth the certain hope and possibility of likeness to Him through the cure that He works, and then to urge the will's obedience and surrender to Him, "Wilt thou be made whole?" This is the method of working of the Holy Spirit Who convinces of sin, i.e., illuminates the mind; Who convinces of righteousness, i.e., stimulates the emotions always influenced by right and hope; and Who convinces of judgment, i.e., appeals to the will to judge and decide. Tenderness, gentleness and, above all, knowledge of human nature and the wondrous love of Christ are essential to this end.

The days are gone by for "God's ultimatum" and the threat of "eternal despair." We are not pleading for a system into which we wish to inveigle men or a society of which they are to become normal members. We should not set forth a code of doctrines and dogmas to which we seek their assent. For their own sake and

Christ's sake we want them on Christ's side. It is a personal matter between them and the Saviour—to them it means life abundant, joy unspeakable, and peace that passeth understanding, a better equipment for the life they have to live; to Him it means another warrior in the army that shall conquer the world. Christianity is for life, not death. If we learn to live we shall know how to die. As Christ wooed and won men so we too must woo and win by His Gospel which is the power of God unto salvation.

We come now to the greatest problem of evangelistic work, the problem of the personal life. I cannot write as though I "had already obtained or were already perfect." I am only a learner. *Who is sufficient for these things?* A high moral standard is not enough; an abounding energy will not suffice; a goodness and piety which prevents us from understanding the difficulties and temptations of our fellow-men will not make us efficient. Self-seeking, ambitious hopes of preferment, or disappointment that it does not come, are terrible hindrances. We are the slaves of Christ to work as He wills and where He wills. *How can we fit ourselves?* We can use our time with care; we can read and study certain books, but our *sufficiency is of God*. In obedience we shall have enthusiasm for Christ; in fearlessness we shall become magnetized and magnetic Christians, and confident assurance of His presence and power will make us unflinching optimists. If Evangelicals are faithful to their trust in their hands lies the solution of the Church's great problem of evangelistic work. May God make us and keep us faithful.

CECIL W. WILSON.



[*Cheltenham Conference Paper.*]

METHODS OF EVANGELISM.

BY THE REV. CANON DEVEREUX, M.A., LL.B., Vicar of Christ Church, Woking.

“ **B**EFORE the Church to-day lies an unparalleled opportunity.” “England is ready for evangelistic effort”—these are the words of the Archbishops’ Committee. Most of us will agree with the opinion these words express ; and would say not only that England is ready, but that the world also is ready—ready for that evangelization which is rightly defined as the “Presentation of Christ Jesus in the power of the Holy Spirit, that men may come to put their trust in God through Him, to accept Him as their Saviour, and to serve Him as their King in the fellowship of His Church.”

If England and the world are ready for the effort, the Church ought to be ready to make it. Is she? Does Divine fire for the conversion of England and the world to a conscious devotion to Christ burn within the soul of every communicant? Does the Church as a whole realize any corporate responsibility to evangelize? The souls of certain individuals burn with zeal ; and here and there are to be found groups of individuals filled with enthusiasm to proclaim the good news of Christ. Thanks be to God that it is so ; but unfortunately it is also true that the mass of individual Christians have little or no desire to propagate the Faith that is in them ; and the Church, as a whole, is asleep—or at least only rubbing her eyes from slumber—at the very moment when she ought to be most awake.

What can be done to rouse the Church to a full consciousness of her responsibility? What are the methods that we can adopt in order to wake each soul to give a living witness, both by lip and life, to the power of Christ, and to stir the whole body to a better daring for the sake of the Kingdom of God?

I. INTENSIVE WORK.—Intensive methods are required before extensive work can effectively be done.

(1) *Concentration* of the mind of the Church upon her evangelistic purpose is what is first required. The power that gathers in a process of concentration is always a power that causes things to be done.

It is so in the natural order. "Concentration precedes expansion, and is the condition of dynamic energy." And in the order of spiritual phenomena the same principle prevails. Distraction dissipates zeal. The Church had dissipated her zeal by the multiplicity of the objects of her work. She must surely return to a greater degree of concentration upon her first duty and primary purpose of existence. Evangelization must, somehow or other, be brought to the forefront of her thought. How can this be done?

A special call given by the Archbishops, summoning the Church by the all powerful aid of the Divine Spirit to focus its attention upon the evangelization of England and the English people, for a whole year at least, is one suggestion that has been made—and there is a great deal to be said for it. The time may not be ripe for such a call to be given at this moment, but there can be little doubt that should the call be made with impressiveness, there would be no inconsiderable response. It would be well worth while if, for a period, the Church's effort could be mainly directed to that which certainly is the greatest need. A good deal is already being done to stimulate attention to the matter. During recent months, as we know, the various Diocesan Evangelistic Councils have been at work. Here and there things have happened, and campaigns, with the single purpose of proclaiming the Evangel, have been organized. Not only has this been done, but in unobtrusive, yet effective ways, these diocesan councils have been promoting more definiteness of thought upon the spiritual opportunities that to-day are presenting themselves. In certain Rural Deaneries also, and in particular parishes since the publication of the Archbishops' Report, some special efforts have also been made. The pulpit possibly, on the whole, has been giving a more direct call to the necessity of Christian witness; but, when all has been said, the fact doubtless still remains that there is comparatively little concentration of the Church's mind upon the biggest and best thing that it has been created to do. What more can be done?

(2) *Education.* The education of all ranks of our workers and communicants must clearly be taken in hand. Speaking generally there can be little doubt but that the clergy are anxious to receive all the help they can, in order that their spiritual efficiency may be increased. There is, in many directions it would seem, no inconsiderable perplexity in the minds of the clergy as to the way that

the opportunities presented to-day in the nation and the world may be faced and dealt with. There is—who can doubt it?—a very widespread feeling among the clergy, of honest inability of themselves and in their own power to rise to the height of what is required of them. “Who is sufficient for these things?” is their constant question to themselves.

More conferences, retreats, and similar gatherings of clergy, on natural and wise lines, would surely be helpful. Good has already come from many such gatherings. The clergy are wanting opportunities in an atmosphere of freer spiritual fellowship to talk together, under the best leadership that can be discovered, about the things that matter most in their ministry to-day. How can the Christian message be best presented to the minds of different sections of the community to-day? What are the best avenues of approach to the people? What are the best methods of organizing evangelistic work? These are some questions the clergy are waiting to discuss.

Many men and women of the laity are also seeking similar opportunities to assist them in giving their Christian witness more faithfully. They are not wanting so much to be addressed and talked to, as to exchange thought with one another, and take counsel with those from whom they rightly expect they may get wise suggestions. The great mass of our Churchpeople, without doubt, want to be brought to see, by clearer Bible study and in united prayer, what is their first privilege as Christians, what may be done for the Kingdom of Heaven by united work, and what are to-day's conditions of the world's thought and life.

Many people who cannot come together to confer are willing to *read*. Are we seeing to-day that our people are being guided as to the literature that should be in their hands? Many are ready to study the problems which are associated with the propagation of the Christian gospel. Are we helping them? Are we providing them with the right books?

Big thoughts are to-day filling the minds of our people, and big endeavour will follow if only they receive big inspiration from those who are their appointed leaders. Big visions of a better England and a better world are in the minds of most people, and if only it can be shown by the Christian Church that all these can be realized only in the coming of the Kingdom of God amongst men, and

through the acceptance of Christianity as the great philosophy of life, the coming days may see such changes as will make them almost a new dispensation in the history of the world. The coming of the Kingdom of God upon earth must not be regarded as a far-off dream, but as a present possibility. The Church must see this and it will again live, and live abundantly, in the life of the nation and the world.

II. EXTENSIVE WORK.—It is not sufficient, however, that the Church should see. It must arise and do ; it must get out much more than it has done in the open, and go out amongst men. There is the necessity for *extensive* work as well as for intensive operations.

I. *Visiting*.—First, what about extensive work being done through visiting the homes of the people to deliver the evangelistic message? By the clergy? By lay people? Is visiting by clergy or by laity the more effective for evangelistic purposes? Should there not be more definite and thoughtful preparation for visiting? Should it not be more systematic—more frequent? Could there not be suitable literature provided for those who visit? Could not more be done to encourage each rank and class of person to visit those of their own rank and class? All with a definite evangelistic purpose. Somehow or other there must be, whether by visiting or otherwise, more definite contact of those who profess Christ, with those who profess Him not, and who, on the whole, stand outside the Christian Church.

2. *Outdoor Efforts*.—Then again, surely fresh efforts must be made by means of *open-air* speaking to deliver the great message. Doubtless it is true to say that many of the old methods of open-air work have become discredited. There is at least widespread scepticism prevailing as to the value of the method ; but should the effort to make known our Christian Gospel by means of open-air speaking be given up in consequence of all this? Lesser causes find the open-air the best place for their advocacy. Our Lord and Master, both in town and country, followed the method. It may be that we shall have to do things differently to the way in which we have done them in the past. We shall have to get our very best, intellectually and spiritually, to advocate the cause of Christ to the multitude. We may have to give up, and possibly with wisdom, our hymn singing and praying in the open air ; but that we should go on with it seems clear. It should be a way of giving our very best laity the opportunity of

service; it should be an especial opportunity of using our women as well as our men; it can be made the means of strengthening the courage and conviction of our people; and without doubt it can be, to a greater extent than it has ever been, an opportunity of securing real conversion of those outside the Christian Church to a full and enthusiastic devotion of life to Christ.

Those who had anything to do with pilgrimages of prayer in connexion with the National Mission, had quite a new idea given to them as to the value of the work that can be done in the open-air in the villages of England. Real new life has been given to many a village through the visit of a few prepared and devoted Christian women. This at least has been an experience in one particular Diocese. What has been done in the villages may well be attempted in the smaller towns, if only suitable organization is made, the right people chosen, and adequate preparation of each worker provided for. Extensive work for the Kingdom of God by means of speaking in the open-air must not be given up. Surely to this we all agree. We will say it must be done better—much better—but it still must be done. God, by His Spirit, is clearly owning it as of His own purpose.

3. *Special Campaigns.*—And what about evangelistic effort in our big towns? Is the Salvation Army to be the sole expression to the public mind of enthusiasm for the Christian Gospel? We have frequent evidence that many outside our churches are thinking deeply, and often very ideally. Surely our Church of England must come to their aid—and can, if it so chooses. *Special campaigns* to emphasize this purpose and desire have, in the experience of some of us, proved helpful in centres where the population is large and where various types of people congregate. Of course great preparation is needed for such campaigns. Regular visitation of every house within the area and over a period of several weeks is necessary. A well-chosen band of leaders, supported by hosts of campaigners, is of the utmost importance. The men and women who are chosen must be those with a message that is robust, thoughtful, and, above all, spiritual. They must be men and women not ashamed to own their Lord, and who are daring enough to face any audience and stand any heckling for their Master's sake. They must be those who are prepared to speak in church, or hall, or in the open-air, or to large bodies of men and girls in public works.

They must be filled with the zeal for the Kingdom of God. By such people inspired of the Spirit great things can be done. Mass meetings in picture palaces and theatres are worth while, for such meetings give the opportunity for some of the biggest in our Christian ranks to speak on the biggest problems of to-day. The experience of some of us goes to prove that there is no difficulty if proper steps are taken to secure large audiences at such gatherings. In big towns campaigns organized on these lines and enlisting the help of all the churches are well worth while. They seem to bring the "Parochial Mission" of the older order up-to-date. An impression is given through them that the Church is going out from itself to win the world, that it is really "seeking to save," and daring to do.

4. *The Press*.—Another method of evangelism which suggests itself is the method of *journalism*. The Press, as an organ of evangelistic propaganda, has almost entirely been overlooked. *The Times* during the last year or two has shown that the public Press can be used as a means of supplying the demand in the public mind for religious truth. The religious articles that have appeared week by week for some time have, without doubt, been greatly valued; otherwise they would not have been continued. The Church ought to be supremely thankful that so great a newspaper has given so good a lead. Could not the lead be followed up and further efforts made—efforts more directly towards evangelism? Those who use the monthly Prayer Paper of the C.M.S. will recall facts that were there recently related as to the results of newspaper evangelism in Japan. For instance, an American missionary is said to have heard from nearly 7,000 people in his country district during the five years of the journalistic campaign, and through it ninety-seven persons were baptized by the various missions in the particular area. Of course England is not Japan; but the thought does suggest itself that if the work of newspaper evangelism were really taken in hand with thoroughness and by some central and really strong committee, representative of all the Christian Churches, great things might be done. The work would require the best brains that could be found amongst the most devoted Christians—the work would require, of course, much money—but are we to say that neither the brains nor the money could be forthcoming? Should we fail to attempt such an enterprise because of the difficulties involved in it? Is not the pen of a ready writer to be used in the service of evangelism as much

as the lip of the fluent speaker? The pen is for witness as much as the platform.

5. *The Pulpit*.—And what about the pulpit? The service of the pulpit in the cause of evangelism requires an attention that cannot be given to it merely as a portion of a general paper upon the subject of methods generally. “Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel,” said the prophet of old; and every prophet worthy of the name is saying the same to-day. And yet who does not find it difficult to preach the Gospel? The most eloquent and able approach the task with diffidence, and those of us of the ordinary rank and file are ever conscious of the stupendous character of the responsibility cast upon us. “Ambassadors of Christ”—yes, yet how unworthy, how unskilled, how impotent in ourselves. To present Christ to men, and to men as they are and as they think to-day—this is our duty. Could any duty be greater, or with larger privilege?—and yet could any duty be more delicate and difficult? And yet it *can* be done. Men have done it—are doing it. The infirmities of the ambassadors must always be, but the infinite power of the Eternal Spirit always is. What cannot be by might or by power that is human, can be by God’s Spirit. From pulpit of Cathedral and Parish Church, God’s Prophets can speak, and can, and will, be heard. If, however, the pulpit is adequately to fulfil its evangelistic function, the Church must find it possible to do two things:—

- (i.) It must prepare men better for their prophetic work, and
- (ii.) It must give them greater liberty to do it.

How inadequate has been the training of most men for their pulpit work—many a man has entered upon it without any study of the teaching art, and without any experience of addressing others. The taking of a degree and securing a smattering of elementary theology are not sufficient preparation for ordination. The days are over for men to be given prophetic work to do without that training which will equip them for it. And no less important is it that the prophet, when he is given his work to do, should be free to do it. The pulpit will never be a power for evangelism until those who are called to occupy the pulpit are freed from many of those duties which now absorb them. The laity of the Church of England must come to understand that their clergy must be freed to a far greater extent than they are from a mass of occupations that hinder them

from having that time for thought and reading and prayer that are paramount necessities for the accomplishment of that high task of proclaiming the gospel for which they were set apart. Times of special retreat and conferences and conventions can never take the place of that which should be done daily in the study, and in the inner sanctuary of the prophet's life. The pulpit method of evangelism is a primary method, and the Church as a whole must see that the primary method is made possible.

I conclude by recalling the fact as stated in the Archbishop's Report that 90 per cent. of the people of England are out of touch with organized Christianity, and this in spite of the fact that there is much inarticulate religion and a real searching after God. England and the world are in great religious need, and deep down in the hearts of men there never was a greater consciousness of this need than to-day. For the Evangel of Christ the multitudes are waiting and longing. When the Church concentrates on its first duty—the proclamation of the good news of Christ and the Establishment of the Kingdom of Christ ; when the Church educates itself through all its members to understand its task—the task of witness, and adequately trains its leaders and its rank and file for service ; when, depending on the Divine Spirit, it daringly, and in a spirit of selfless service for the nation, for the world, and for God, makes up its mind to go forth with a new enthusiasm, methods will be devised suitable to the new age, and the Kingdom of God will come. But to-day the Church as a whole must pray, as each individual must pray, “Renew a right spirit within me.” When that prayer is truly offered it will be answered, and we who call ourselves Christians will give ourselves, as our Master gave Himself, for the life of the world.

E. R. PRICE DEVEREUX.



ORGANIZED RELIGION AND LABOUR

BY THE REV. HENRY EDWARDS, Vicar of Gorleston.

SOME years ago I was talking to one of the largest Coal Owners in Northumberland about the attitude of the Church towards Labour. He thought it ought to be that which was adopted by the late Bishop of Durham, Dr. Westcott, when he settled the great coal strike. It should be that of getting employers and employed to see each other's point of view and to act together in the spirit of the Golden Rule. He went on to say that, if the Church did this, he thought she would regain her waning influence and be a great power for good in promoting peace and goodwill in the industrial world.

Now it seems to me, unless I entirely misread the signs of the times, that the outlook was never brighter for doing this than it is at present. Our Labour leaders for the most part acknowledge the principles of unselfish service, justice and goodwill, and are men of vision, courage and honesty of purpose. Our employers are increasingly ready to fulfil their obligations to their employees in the mutual recognition that both capital and labour are essential for the well-being of the community. The Government was never more sympathetic or willing to carry out recommendations of joint committees, and by the establishment of a National Industrial Council has shown its readiness to do all in its power to make possible a larger degree of self-government, improved conditions of employment, continuous co-operation and a higher standard of comfort in industry. Unofficial and semi-private conferences of representatives of employers and employed are being held up and down the country, which are creating an atmosphere in which it is easier to settle disputes. The Archbishops' Fifth Committee has issued its report on Christianity and Industrial Problems, wherein not only are guiding principles clearly stated, but also suggestions are made with regard to such thorny questions as shorter hours, adequate wages, co-operation, profit sharing, housing and unemployment.

Thus there are causes at work in these days for which to thank God, and which should encourage the Church to take a more active part in social life. These causes, I venture to think, would never

have been brought about had not public opinion been moulded by religious forces, and the consciousness of justice and brotherhood been awakened by those principles of the Gospel which it is the privilege of Christianity to propagate.

In such an atmosphere there is a unique opportunity for organized religion to mobilize her forces and to face the industrial situation in a spirit of adventure, that will subordinate private interests to the well-being of the whole society and boldly determine to find a permanent solution to this perennial problem.

One of the first steps in this direction, it seems to me, is for religion to hear the call of this Conference and to unite. A divided Church cannot preach peace to a warring world. Organized Christianity must work together as one to-day, in visible fellowship, if it is to make any impression on Labour. The Church's sectional antipathies have hindered her effective contribution to industry, perhaps more than anything else besides. A house divided against itself must inevitably fall, and only when each section of the community, religious, social, and political, recognizes its obligations to other parts of the community, can it possibly stand. I see very little hope of organized religion really influencing the industrial world till with one voice it speaks with the authority of a united Church, an authority that will then be recognized.

Perhaps scarcely less urgent is the necessity for religion to put her own house in order with regard to injustices, inconsistencies and inequalities in her own administration. There is needed the application of the accepted principles of Jesus Christ in the realms of His Church. Where, for instance, it is well known that highly-placed officials in parochial or Diocesan organizations are sweating labour and holding men and women in their work by ignorance or fear; where owners of disgraceful slum property and profiteers are violating the teachings of the golden rule; and—must it be again said;—where the Church's Bishops are apparently living every day in sumptuous palaces, and her priests are begging for starvelings at their doors, such must be made to reform themselves or be chased out. It seems to me organized religion will never put itself right with Labour, and indeed with its own conscience, till such things be regarded with abhorrence and be rectified. If the Church did this, it would be seen that she practised what she preached, and it would help more effectively to settle the housing and wage problems, as

well as be the pioneer in many another social reconstruction of a brighter, happier world.

Another fundamental need is honesty of motive in dealing with Labour. There is a suspicion in the minds of many workers that the interest of organized religion on behalf of Labour is inspired by the idea that it will get the men to attend a place of worship, or that when a Labour Government comes into power it will deal more sympathetically towards the privileges and the property of the Church—the way in which many religious leaders speak to-day gives cause for this suspicion and the Church loses her power and influence accordingly. It is not because of what the man in the street thinks that Christian forces must work, but because the Church is true to her gospel, that she takes an interest in all that concerns the welfare and happiness of humanity. If the Church can overcome her inertia and social distinctions, and show practical interest in all the aspirations that are ethically sound in Labour, with no other motive than the furthering of justice, she will win its respect and claim its allegiance in all her schemes for the doing of God's will on earth as it is done in heaven.

I think, too, that the position generally taken up by the Church, that it is the place of organized religion to teach principles upon which economic and political action shall be taken, without attempting to point out definitely which political or economic course of action is more righteous than another, must be modified. I know it is pointed out that Jesus Christ refused to take sides or to concern Himself with any particular theory of social reform; that He was content to lay down rules of fundamental righteousness, to teach the real value of man, of truth, and of justice, and to leave the precise application of these principles to the leaders of economic and political thought; but surely if these ideals of life mean anything, then organized Christianity can no longer acquiesce in conditions which make them impossible. The more deeply Christian principles are appropriated, the fiercer grows the anger against materialistic surroundings which prevent their realization. The indignation shown by our Lord against the evils of His day might well be more visible to-day amongst His followers in the Church. The world does not understand, in fact, it thinks it cowardice and weakness, that the Church should be considered worthy to teach great principles of life and conduct (and not to be thought inconsistent

when she takes sides, as apparently she did in the great war, or takes political action when her own interests are concerned, as she did in the campaign against the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church in Wales), and yet should not be considered worthy to apply her teaching and to take sides on its behalf in social and economic life. The claims of Labour, such as for instance, the demand for leisure in which men and women shall have time to develop their intellectual, physical and moral life ; houses wherein they can live decent lives ; better conditions of work ; recognition in control ; and a share in the profits of industry ; these are claims which seem to many of us consistent with the moral principles of justice and brotherhood taught by Jesus Christ. If they are, then it becomes the Church to join in any movement that shall, in the light of religious truth, bring them about. If organized religion is to save its own soul, and perhaps what is after all equally important, the soul of Labour, then, at least it seems to me, it must come out and, if needs be, take sides in practising its social teaching in the sphere where it should work. Certainly individual clergy and local religious organizations must come out of their pulpits, their societies, and unions, into the people's lives, their homes, their work, and translate into action the truths they believe concerning brotherhood, equality of opportunity, liberty and righteousness.

Then I venture also to think that organized religion must foster the new spirit of fellowship and service that is being awakened to-day in Church and Labour, in the whole scheme of life. The spirit of the Archbishops' Committee's Report which lays down a social programme for which many of us thank God, and the spirit of co-operation, of give and take, which is increasingly manifested by employers and employed, whereby many are ready to sacrifice their individual interests to the well-being of the community, must animate the whole religious and industrial world. Much yet remains to be done before the whole Church of God will rise in her full strength to combat the social evils ; the apathy, the indifference, and even the opposition as manifested in so many quarters towards the authoritative statement of the Archbishops' Committee on Christianity and Industrial Problems, show the leeway yet to be made up before organized religion will speak with one voice to Labour. Much yet remains to be done before Labour will take full advantage of the new spirit that animates so many employers

and employees; there are reactionaries amongst capitalists and labourers who refuse peaceful persuasion or disciplined control—some men are still out for anarchy whereby they selfishly hope to derive some benefit to their own class and whereby the whole social reconstruction is endangered—and among these, in Church and Labour, organized religion must boldly venture and permeate their whole life through and through with the spirit of unselfish service. Certainly my own experience in the north of England proves that it is being increasingly realized, even where it was once dormant or opposed, that this principle of the golden rule in Capital and Labour is essential to each, and that by working together for the other's good, both will best promote the welfare of all. In this new spirit all can glory. In fellowship and service all can co-operate for the spiritual and material well-being of the whole community, and once this prevails in every section of Religion and Labour, there will be such a unity of purpose in industry as will bring about the new heavens and the new earth.

How can this unity, this service, this spirit be brought about, in which, as I think, organized religion can help Labour to realize her highest ideals and the Church to build up the Kingdom of God? We want to know what we can do here and now to bring about this desired end.

In our parishes we may all begin at once to form social study circles amongst the employers and employees. Experience in both of these proves what a valuable means these round-table talks are of eliminating suspicion between Capital and Labour and of promoting friendliness and mutual understanding. It is surprising how extensive is this feeling of suspicion even between different Trade Unions as well as between Employers' Federations, and between even different trades in an industry. Only when confidence is restored can there be any hope of a better appreciation of each other's position. The study circle is a great help towards this end, it gives the necessary personal touch and human sympathy, enables a wise chairman to put the other's point of view and to direct the discussion along lines wherein each can see the justice of the other's claims. Employers are made to see the wisdom of giving their employees every privilege, comfort and pleasure, and that in so doing they need have no fear that their rights will be interfered with. Employees are taught to realize that training, discipline and

responsibility are necessary, and that in accepting these they are proving themselves worthy of confidence and of a share in partnership. Groups of workers can be shown how wrong it is to restrict the output or to scamp their work. Manufacturers can be taught how unjustifiable it is for them to raise prices above the level of fair profits and of the power of the community to pay. Keen Churchmen can be encouraged to qualify themselves for responsible positions, either amongst the handworkers or the brainworkers, and to apply their Church's principles there, and do much to harmonize the relations of employers and employed and to foster the spirit of fellowship and service. In this way the clergy may do much, quietly and unostentatiously, in forming public opinion along the lines of individual happiness and social welfare.

In our Urban Districts and Rural Deaneries, Councils of Christian social fellowship may be formed. Representatives of all the religious denominations might combine, not so much for passing pious resolutions as for hard thinking and active work. In this larger fellowship we should gather knowledge and have courage to act; from it deputations might be sent to Employers' Associations and to Trade Unions, to civic bodies and to County Councils, in order to impress upon these authorities the necessity of applying Christian principles to the concrete affairs which touch the life of the people. Somehow, it seems to me, such a Council of Christian Fellowship might do much to promote housing, child welfare, proper conditions of labour and so forth, if it worked wisely in its local area. Certainly the neighbourhood would begin to realize that organized religion was at work and had something to say concerning the everyday, matter-of-fact life of the people, and was at last seeking a remedy for some of its ills and woes.

Such study circles and fellowship councils might be affiliated to some central organization of religion—a cabinet of Christian social experts which would co-ordinate the work of parochial and district circles and councils. Such an organization would keep in touch with manufacturers, the Employers' Federations, and the Trade Unions, in order to inculcate the mind of organized religion with regard to their Labour problems. It could provide expert lecturers, well acquainted with the business the administration and the finances of great firms, well versed in the conditions, thoughts and operations of the workers, to give courses of addresses to the

management and to the workpeople, on their respective responsibilities and privileges and on the duty of both to the community. It would also be in immediate touch with the headquarters of Capital and Labour, with Joint Committees in Parliament, with the National Industrial Council, and even with the Cabinet itself, to influence legislation along the lines of Christian thought and to carry out the Church's teaching in regard to all the affairs of national and international life. Once organized religion gets a glimpse into the divine intention for the doing of God's will on earth as it is in Heaven, it can never rest satisfied till it has taught the whole social, economic and political world to think likewise.

There is just one other way that I would venture to emphasize along which religion may influence Labour and carry out in human life the ideals of Christianity, and that is by a longer and enlarged training of her clergy. Organized religion can only champion the weak and the oppressed, can only hope to influence industry, just in proportion as it is done intelligently and with a real grasp of the problem. Knowledge, experience and sympathy are needed, and these can only come of a more adequate training in economic and social science. Men whose bent seems to be along the lines I have advocated should be encouraged to take up studies that would better equip them for their work, and then sent by the Church into districts where they would have every opportunity of applying their specialised knowledge. There seems to me to be room for a School or Order of Prophets, which shall concentrate all its care and effort on winning Capital and Labour for the kingdom of God and seeking to apply the teaching of Christ to all the problems of social and industrial life.

If organized religion is to work along these lines, which I have only very scappily indicated, for the elimination of all that is contrary to the kingdom of God in the realm of Labour, there is just one warning note I would venture to sound, and with that to bring my paper to a close. It is, that in taking this [more active interest in the social welfare of the community, we are concerned not with religion's highest ideals but with the results of these ideals in the department of labour to which they are applied. The only abiding remedy for the unrest in the world, for the moral breakdown in industry, for the evil in the hearts and wills of humanity, is the gospel of Jesus Christ. Economic readjustments, poli-

tical re-arrangements, or social programmes for the betterment of labour conditions, will of themselves never touch the root causes which are embodied in the "affections of sinful men," unless they proceed from and work through repentant lives, cleansed by God and empowered by the Holy Ghost. It should never be forgotten, even for the sake of its effectual working in industry, that the primary object of the Church of God is spiritual. It is, as we have been reminded, "so to present Christ Jesus in the power of the Holy Spirit, that men shall come to put their trust in God through Him, to accept Him as their Saviour and to serve Him as their King in the fellowship of His Church." Only, it seems to me, as we keep this ideal in view shall we be worthy of our birthright, shall organized religion effectively solve the problems of Labour, shall we really accomplish our purpose in establishing the kingdom of righteousness throughout the whole industrial world.

HENRY EDWARDS.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

THE SYSTEM OF CAPITALISM.

THE ECONOMIC ANTICHRIST: A STUDY IN SOCIAL POLITY. By W. Blissard, M.A., Rector of Bishopsbourne, in the Diocese of Canterbury. London: *George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.*, 6s. net.

The author of this interesting book died a few months ago at the age of eighty-two, greatly respected and deeply lamented by his parishioners and neighbours. His work bears the marks of deep thought and strong though restrained feeling rather than of wide reading of contemporary writers on economics. This gives additional weight to his conclusions as a piece of independent and original testimony to a position defended along other lines by other writers.

In the opening words of his preface he tells us "Christianity is usually judged by its power over the world. In the following pages the reasoning will be reversed, for the question is urgent: what is the power of the world over Christianity?" Reminding us that a system—known as economic—has been growing into power over human affairs, he says: "It is more than pertinent to consider how the Christian religion, which entered the world before the economic development, fares in its modern setting."

To summarize, since quotation would involve more space than is available, Mr. Blissard's contentions, in outline, amount to this:

Besides the militarism generally known as German which regards its human instruments as "cannon-fodder," there is another system, called by Mr. Blissard economic militarism, by whose directors their human instruments are regarded only as "hands," means to the ends of those who employ them. Peace has its casualties no less than war, in the form of avoidable fatal accidents, of avoidable infant mortality, and of a shortening of human life so great that in certain industries the average life is only thirty years as against sixty among the comfortable classes.

That system which socialists call "Capitalism" Mr. Blissard describes

as the Economic Antichrist, as Mammon, the god of this world, who has blinded the eyes and hardened the hearts of his worshippers in all classes. His criticism of the Church is that it has been too much a kind of R.A.M.C., picking up and caring for the casualties on the economic battlefield, instead of an army going forth to challenge and conquer the power of this Antichrist. It has, in his view, devoted itself too exclusively to denouncing personal sins and too little to attack upon the great social sin which expresses itself in our inequalities of wealth, and in the crushing power wielded by holders of land and capital over the landless and propertyless.

His ideas as to the direction in which we have gone wrong may be found in his remarks on conscription. He writes :

“ The conscription propaganda shows the weakness of the social consciousness as to the relative values of Life and Property. No argument is sound which places the man's life at the war service of the State unless it also places property in the same category. If we are to conscribe the really valuable possession of all men—their own lives—we are bound further to conscribe the secondary privileges of possession. If some are to be legally compelled to serve the State by not living at all, the argument is immeasurably stronger which would enforce the surrender for the same purpose of the balance of all incomes above that which is necessary for reasonable maintenance. Had the conscription clamour been made upon that basis it would have been respectable. Yet concurrently with it we have been scandalised by the exploiting of the war for private advantage. Human life, which is the most sacred property of all, is to be nationalised for the great end of the National Cause. But property is to be held too sacred for such hard usage. Private gains may be augmented, the public energies may be wantonly wasted in needless comforts and spectacular extravagance. But the drag is put on the political machinery which would deal as faithfully with the rights of property as it is urged to do with the rights of life. Here at its worst is shown that defect in sound consciousness which is the tap-root of labour unrest.”

If it had been urged that this defect is wide-spread, that the people, or at least a majority, love to have it so, Mr. Blissard would doubtless have answered that it was the duty of the Church to teach them to think differently, to love and to strive for another social order, inspired by a truer social consciousness.

This book should be carefully studied by all clergy who desire to apply Christian principles to our social problems and to find a way out of the moral anarchy of our present condition. That moral anarchy, if uncured, must lead to outward and visible anarchy, here as in other lands. Along with Mr. Blissard's book it would be useful to study the recent report of the Archbishops' Committee on industrial questions. Valuable suggestions might be gained for a course of sermons, which should stimulate people to think, and deliver some from the fatalism with which they are apt to regard the wrongs and the perils of these days.

C. W. S. M.

DICTIONARY OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

DICTIONARY OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH. Edited by James Hastings, D.D., with the assistance of John A. Selbie, D.D., and John C. Lambert, D.D. Vol. II. Macedonia—Zion. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Price 25s. net.

Dr. Hastings has already laid Bible students under great obligation by his various Dictionaries. *The Dictionary of the Apostolic Age* is really a continuation of the Editor's *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*. In reading a number of the articles, both short and long, one is struck by the sobriety

of judgment which is exhibited in every page. This volume is singularly free from those wild and fantastic speculations which sometimes mar the value of such works.

With a few exceptions, all the contributors are either British or American scholars. The exceptions are four: M. Batiffol of Paris writes on "Polycarp," Von Dobschutz of Breslau on "Philo," Dr. Mol of Christiania on "Moses," and Von Schlatter of Tübingen on "Paraclete."

Dr. Kohler, President of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, contributes two concise but very informing articles on "Sanhedrin" and on "Synagogue." He makes the interesting suggestion that "maran-atha" of 1 Corinthians xvi. 22 means "thou art accursed." This rendering is very tempting, but unfortunately he gives no reference to the Rabbinic writings where the formula is used in this sense. The fact also that "maran-atha" is found in Didache x. 6, in a context that cannot naturally mean "thou art accursed," seems against this rendering. Dr. J. C. Lambert advances the improbable theory that "the man of sin" in 2 Thessalonians ii. 3 is "Anti-Christian Judaism coming to a head in the person of a pseudo-Messiah."

The volume contains a number of long articles. Of these probably the most outstanding is that on the "Resurrection of Christ." It is written by J. M. Shaw, Professor of Apologetics and Church History in the Presbyterian College, Halifax, N.S., and covers about thirty-eight pages. Mr. Shaw shows that the Resurrection of our Lord held a supreme place in the Apostolic Church. "Apart from this the very existence of Apostolic Christianity as exhibited in the New Testament is unintelligible and inexplicable." He examines the primary and the documentary evidences for the fact of the Resurrection, and proceeds to discuss the nature of Christ's Resurrection Body and its evidential significance. He then subjects to a rigorous criticism the attempted naturalistic or semi-naturalistic explanations of the Apostolic belief. He pays special attention to the modernist theories which attempt to conserve a spiritual Resurrection while minimizing or denying a bodily resuscitation. This article is altogether admirable, and the Publishers would do well to re-issue it in a book form and at a reasonable price to secure for it a much wider circulation.

Other long articles are "Paul" by Prof. J. Stalker, "Persecution" by Principal T. Lewis, "Peter" by Prof. S. J. Case of Chicago, "Righteousness" and "War" by Prof. Moffatt, "Roads and Travel" and "Trade and Commerce" by Prof. Souter. Among the contributors of the shorter articles we are glad to see the names of Dr. A. Plummer and Prof. Dawson Walker.

The extra-canonical books receive adequate treatment. Prof. Moffatt's article on the "Sibylline Oracles" is one of the fullest and best we have seen. Prof. Margoliouth shows his vast and varied erudition in his articles on "Sirach" and "Wisdom of Solomon." He maintains that the Hebrew fragments which were discovered in an Egyptian *Genizah*, and published by Cowley and Neubauer in Oxford, and by Schechter and Taylor in Cambridge, are a retranslation from Greek and Syriac and do not represent the original Hebrew of Sirach.

Scholarly, sober and sound, this Dictionary ought to be found on the desk of every clergyman for constant use. KHODADAD E. KEITH.

THE PROBLEM OF ESCHATOLOGY.

THE WORLD TO COME AND FINAL DESTINY. By J. H. Leckie, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Price 10s. net.

The problem of Eschatology is admittedly difficult and perplexing. When Dr. Leckie was appointed to deliver, in 1917-18, the Kerr Lectures before the

United Free Church College, Glasgow, he chose for his subject the doctrine of the Last Things. The choice was eminently wise, for a discussion of such topics as the Second Advent, Resurrection, Judgment, Intermediate State, Gehenna, and Final Destiny is of absorbing interest at any time. At the present juncture it is more so, owing to the searching questions that the War has evoked. The author approaches these topics from a historical point of view. First, he tries to find out the current views of the contemporary Jewish apocalyptic writers. Then he ascertains the teaching of our Lord and of the Apostles and proceeds to examine the opinions of the ancient and the modern representatives of the Christian Church.

In a singularly informing chapter, he collects the views of Jewish Revelation writers and shows that these writers were no systematic theologians and that there was no uniformity of belief among them regarding the Last Things. "Apocalypse," he says, "is prophecy expressed in concrete terms of the imagination, and dealing with things that transcend knowledge and experience, and are thus incapable of logical proof or purely spiritual exposition. It is an 'unveiling,' a 'revealing,' but it is so after a peculiar fashion of its own. 'It does not declare doctrines; it tells visions. It does not teach principles; it paints pictures'" (p. 8).

In a chapter on the "Intermediate State," Dr. Leckie tells us that the doctrine of Hades does not hold any prominent place in the New Testament, because the early Christians lived in daily expectation of the Parousia and so did not devote much thought to the Intermediate State. He goes on to say: "since the New Testament asserts that there is no salvation except through Christ, it implies that every soul of man must have an opportunity of accepting Him" (p. 95); again: "This life is not the scene of a complete and final testing. . . the period of opportunity stretches out into the future state and endures until all have experienced the necessary discipline, have faced 'the hard task that man was made for,' and have, for good or for evil, attained to permanence of moral character" (pp. 97-8). Of Prayer for the Dead, he says: "Modern theology has largely departed from the dogmatic position which excludes intercession for the dead" (p. 100).

Schweitzer's wild theory about our Lord and His Apocalyptic sayings is subjected to a just and severe criticism.

On the subject of the Second Advent Dr. Leckie takes up a non-committal attitude. He says: "We need not be concerned to answer very definitely the question—What do you mean by the Second Advent? If we cherish the hope of a visible appearing of the Son of Man, no one can deny us our right to such an expectation. We believe that God intervened in the affairs of men once when Jesus came; and who shall say that He may not intervene again after another fashion? If, again, we cherish no such hope, but believe simply that a time will surely come when the Lordship of Christ shall be universally owned in spirit and in truth, no one can say us nay" (p. 66).

On the problem of Final Destiny, the author discusses, together with New Testament Doctrine, the theories of Conditional Immortality and of Universal Restoration.

Altogether this volume is a definite and valuable contribution to Eschatology.

K. E. K.

THE THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT.

THE PROBLEM OF THE CROSS. Vernon F. Storr, M.A., Rector of Bentley.
Hon. Canon of Winchester. London: *John Murray*. 5s. net.

Canon Storr has published a series of addresses given in the diocese of Winchester in connexion with the Diocesan Society for the Promotion of Higher

Education, rightly "thinking that in the new epoch which is dawning emphasis will be given to the doctrine of the Atonement." The lectures will be useful in clearing the ground of several modern interpretations, especially of the Representative and Ethical types, which scarcely give due importance to the statements of the New Testament. But in the rejection of the substitutionary idea, and in the construction of a theory based upon the Fatherhood of God, our author appears to fall himself into a similar error.

"A thing is not right because God wills it. That were to make the distinction between right and wrong arbitrary. But God wills the right because it is right and expresses His innermost nature. Right and God are 'co-equal and co-eternal.'" This places the moral order of the universe above God and denies His absoluteness. Is there room for caprice in the character of God? The mere theist must answer affirmatively, but the Christian faith in a Plurality of Persons in the one Godhead removes the possibility for caprice which would be destructive of the Unity. God is Absolute, His will is right, a sure and certain moral order prevails. The doctrine of the Trinity, mysterious as it is, is the guardian of truth and justice.

"We may banish entirely from our minds any view which would make St. Paul think that an angry God was appeased by the sacrifice of a loving Son." But, in the deliberate and judicious words of Sanday and Headlam (Ep. to Romans p. 130), "it is difficult to dissociate such words as *ἰλαστήριον*, *ἰλασμός*, from the idea of propitiating a person. There is frequent mention of the Anger of God as directed against sinners, not merely at the end of all things, but also at this present time. When that anger ceases to be so directed there is surely a change (or what we should be compelled to call a change) on the part of God as well as of man. We infer that the natural explanation of the passages which speak of enmity and reconciliation between God and man is that they are not on one side only, but are mutual." If the Lord tells us that He has gone "to prepare a place for us," if we are taught that "He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for us," a change is implied which is not only in the heart of man. The Ascension into Heaven illuminates the deep significance of the Cross. Insistence is needed upon this doctrine. The view which makes the Atonement only operative upon man reduces the immensity of the great Sacrifice on Calvary and tends towards religious laxity, for the human heart may be moved with comparative ease. The other, exalting the Death of Christ to the fulness of the revelation given in Holy Scripture, by surpassing our understanding, constrains the hearer to put reliance upon Christ only and not on efforts of his own.

With many recent writers Canon Storr refers much to "the sufferings of God." The impassibility of the Deity was the faith firmly held by the early Church and accepted by our own in the first Article. Nor is the phrase Scriptural. In the New Testament "suffering" is frequently attributed to the Son of Man, never to the Father. For this reason the tendency of modern discussion has been to revert to the propitiatory theory. We admit its difficulties: we do not think that human language will ever define the infinite mysteries of God: but we maintain that inspired teaching is most closely followed when Christ is evidently set forth as dying for the expiation of our guilt. "We have an Advocate with the Father . . . He is the propitiation of our sins."