

The Fraternal.

Vol. X.

SEPTEMBER, 1916.

LITERARY CONTRIBUTIONS for the FRATERNAL should be addressed to the Editor, Rev. F. C. SPURR, Regent's Park Chapel, N.W., and all other communications to the Secretary, Rev. E. D. deRUSSETT, Baptist Church, Harrow.

From the Editor's Chair.

September, 1916.

Owing to the late appearance of the Spring number of the *Fraternal* (due entirely to War conditions) it was deemed wise not to issue a number in July, but to advance the publication of the Autumn number by one month, and to increase the size of the periodical for that month. Thus the present issue of the magazine is a double one.

The articles which appear in the present number will, we believe, be found to be of exceptional interest. Dr. Gould's study of the religious movement under Chalmers, is much more than an historical survey. It has in it a note of *actualité* which arrests by reason of its application to present conditions of Church life. Other articles dealing with the Sacramental side of religious life demand careful attention. Free Churchmen, as yet, appear to be only half awake to the real meaning of the Sacramental revival. Many reasons have been advanced to explain the drift from the Puritan to the Sacerdotal Churches, but one great reason, rarely dwelt upon, is that men and women have become dissatisfied with unmeaning baldness in worship and are turning again to symbolism. It is idle to merely denounce this. There is a deep reason for it and it will be well for us to try and understand it and to use what is of good in it.

In connection with the Anglican "National" Mission of Repentance and Hope Congregational "retreats" are being held in many centres, with a view to preparing the people for the work which lies before them. The idea is, surely, an excellent one, and one which we of the Free Churches might very well adopt. There need be no fear that we are "imitating the Anglican Church," since the authorities of that Church have themselves borrowed the idea from others. The sole point to consider is whether the summoning of the Church and Communicants for a retreat of one or two days might not be the means of inaugurating a revival of spiritual life in the congregation. Wherever the plan has been tried the results have been excellent. The object of a retreat, of course, is to bring people face to face with the great realities of life and of Christian service, and to seek complete fitness for the discharge of life's mission. A properly conducted retreat is a great auxiliary to the ordinary work of preaching and worship. The best time for holding a retreat is at the beginning of the winter's work.

I am asked to mention that a Sub-Committee has been appointed to consider the supply of books to our men upon special terms; also for giving them information as to facilities offered by special libraries to ministers. We shall be glad to receive communications upon the latter point from brethren who have experience of the matter.

There is also being discussed a scheme for a Circulating Library. It would have as its basis the idea of sending a box of books to groups, say of five or six ministers, periodically during the Year. Those who would care to participate in such a scheme, or who feel there is room for it, kindly address a post-card on receipt of the Magazine, to Mr. DeRussett, 17, Roxborough Park, Harrow.

The fate of the whole plan hangs upon the response to this appeal.

The following are new members of the Council:—
H. L. Staines, A. W. H. Streuli, J. G. Williams, C. G. Croome, F. Durbin, H. N. Patrick, J. Meredith Jones.

New members recently joined the Fraternal:—W. G. Bloomfield, R. W. Cameron, R. R. Clifford, J. P. Douglas, F. G. Exley, J. Ford, F. Hodgson, J. Meredith Jones, W. F. Price, F. G. Savage, A. A. Savage, H. H. Turner, E. W. Tweed.

The State and Citizenship.

By **Rev. P. T. THOMSON, M.A.**

Address given to the Fraternal at the Spring Meetings, 1916.

No discussion lends itself less to an unhistorical mode of treatment than the discussion of the State, its origin, and form and end, the kind of privilege it offers and the duties it demands, and the true balance between the two. Half or more than half of the theorising on Divine Right and Social Compact falls to the ground because of its utterly unhistorical character. To thread one's way through the complex tangle of social and national growths is a difficult task at the best, and hopeless unless a firm hold is kept on the Ariadne clue of historical investigation. The Ghibelline defenders of the Divine Right of the Emperor against the Papacy, and the apologists for our own Stuart Kings based their arguments on anything but the facts. Similarly, the framers of the theory of social consent mistook an account of how Government ought to work for an account of how in fact it came into being. Long before Hobbes and Locke and Rousseau elaborated their theories of government, with their widely dissimilar variations on the theme of the original contract, Shakespeare had anticipated them and reduced the theory to absurdity in "Loves' Labours Lost," with its obvious

moral that a State with no basis for its authority save the consent of the community that constitutes it is built on shifting sand. Consent given may be withdrawn. That contract cannot afford a firm basis for authority, is evidenced by the impotence of merely contractual relations to get themselves respected unless backed by law. The essence of law is command not contract. The theory of government by consent in its extreme form is essentially an xviiiith century product, and though the eloquence of Rousseau casts a glitter upon its arid formulæ, it is no more than one of those modes of rationalistic explanation of facts that are at least in part ultra-rational, which were so characteristic of the period. Of course, as Burke pointed out, society is indeed a contract, but in a loftier sense. There is a partnership in all science, art, virtue and perfection. There is a contract between the living and the dead, and the unborn. And in that sense the State may be said to be in Burke's words a clause in the great primeval contract of eternal society. But to state it thus is to remove it far enough from the solid pragmatism of the apologist of the English Revolution or the fanatical sophistication of the inspirer of the French Revolution.

There is a mystery, with whom relation
Durst never meddle, in the soul of state,
Which hath an operation more divine
Than breath or pen can give expressure to.

The theory of social contract derives from two diametrically opposed views of human nature. Hobbes started from the standpoint that man is an unsocial animal; Locke from the standpoint that man is a social animal. In the one case consent becomes the bulwark of all against the wolfish propensities of each; in the other it is the outcome of the pressure of social proclivities. But either standing alone is incapable of explaining a human polity. There could be no stability in a community held together by laws enforced from without; nor on the other hand, is the reason for the need of

a legally organised society clear amongst beings altogether social. The dilemma indicates the limits of State activity on the one hand, and of Utopian theory on the other. Man is neither merely social nor merely unsocial; he is both. He is socially unsociable as Kant has reminded us; there are capacities that make for social organisation, and capacities which tend to disintegrate social organisation; human individuality on the one hand and social instinct on the other. The State stands between the two; neither imposing an absolute fetter on the one, nor giving free play to the other. To erect a theory of the State on the one points straight to absolutism, and to erect a theory of the State on the other, to anarchy.

For while Anarchy seems to make its goal the unlimited expansion of individuality, it does so by postulating an unreal world in which all men will live at peace, without a thought of self, and freely forming co-operative groups. It is not without significance that the roseate dream of philosophic anarchy has a Christian ancestry in the mystics and Anabaptists. The State was an evil thing; no Christian could hold civil office. Society should be organised on the basis of Christian liberty. Echoes of this noble anarchy still reverberate in Quakerism and Pacificism, which if carried to their logical issue, end in a virtual denial of any moral authority in the State. We cannot refuse a tribute to so fair a dream, but having regard to the world we know and human nature as it is, with whatever reluctance, we have to confess the futility of *à priori* applications of Christian ethic to a world that is under law and not under grace. The State has to organise into social relationship human nature as it is with social capacities it is true, but also egoistic and unregenerate; its weapon is Law backed by Force, and in the discharge of its task it may justly be regarded as a minister of God.

Formed to make life possible, the State exists, as Aristotle said, to make life good. In words that echo Aristotle, Locke

said that the end of all government is the good of mankind. In an interview that Riviere had with Catharine of Russia he was asked by the Empress, "To what then do you reduce the science of government?" "To studying carefully" he answered, "recognising and setting forth the laws which God has so manifestly graven in the very organisation of men, when He called them into existence." To set forth the ends served by government is the best, indeed the only justification of the State, as well as the true ground of its authority. How it arose is a question of secondary importance. All kinds of theories have been put forward ranging from the view that it was the instrument forged by the few to make the many subservient to their selfish ends, to the theory that it was not merely ordained but instituted by God. Its validity in no wise depends upon its origin, any more than the worth of the Christian family is contingent on primitive modes of marriage. The State is here, and a world in the present stage of progress without it is inconceivable. At birth we are committed to a State of social relation; the family itself is a polity. Unless the story of man on the earth has no relation to a Providential order at all, the obligations imposed by the State must be regarded in the light not of legal conventions but of moral demands.

The authority at the basis of these demands is guaranteed by the ends which the State fulfils. The administration of justice, the organisation of social life, the defence against enemy aggression, these and similar functions belong to Government, and without their discharge it would be impossible for man to realise the true end of his being, which is incapable of realisation save in a regulated social relation. So long as we firmly hold to the fact that the State serves human ends, that the State was made for man and not man for the State, we are in little danger of pitching on too high a note the obligation we owe to it. Indeed it would appear that the only valid ground of obligation imposed on the citizen by the State, *i.e.* on the part by the whole, is the fact

that to a greater or less degree the State embodies and organises the obligation of the whole to the part. The State, as Machiavelli conceived it, as the highest kind of existence, untrammelled by moral or legal considerations in the demands it makes, is a State without a vestige of authority over moral beings. In that it fails to be loyal to the royal in itself, its royalty merits no loyalty from others. Treitschke followed Machiavelli in identifying the State with Power, but Power with a moral content, power directed to the preservation of the State as the organ of culture. It is Treitschke's concession to a fundamental fact which stubbornly refuses to fit in with an absolutist doctrine of government, viz., the fact that neither human nature nor history allows the State to pass from the realm of means to the realm of ends. Obligation to the State derives from the human good to which the State contributes.

Yet withal "there is a mystery in the soul of State, which hath an operation more divine than breath or pen can give expressure to." Shakespeare has a way of hitting the centre, while the experts are registering outers. As a rule discussions on State authority keep close to the operation of laws, and to the limits of the authority of law in controlling the egoistic or non-social parts of man. It is always law with a small 'l', rather than Law in the sense of the expression of the conscience of the community; Law as glanced at by Riviere when he spoke of the science of government being the setting forth of "the laws which God has graven in the very organization of men, when He called them into existence." This is the mystery in the soul of State; the transcendent element in human society, organised to give expression to the common will. For the common will cannot be emptied of ethical content, seeing it is derived from the wills of individual men in whose organisation God has graven the moral law. Not otherwise would it be possible to account for the play on personality made by Public Law, in the development of independence, and the heightened sense of

personal value, or to explain the fact that even those against whom it is enforced assimilate its verdicts. The citizen himself is implicated in the acts of government, not necessarily by any contractual or electoral consent, but by the harmony between his own moral being and the ethical quality of State action. Making due allowance for the imperfections of Government, remembering Gibbon's verdict that the reigns of the Antonines was the only period in history in which the happiness of the people was made the sole end of government, it is surely permissible for those who believe in a Divine Government of men, to find the explanation of the mystery in the soul of State in a magistracy derived from the moral Law. No earthly parent wields without alloy of error or passion the august authority with which he is invested, yet it is surely true that such authority as he wields derives from a source more divine than breath or pen can give expression to. By parity of reasoning we may deduce that the reason for men feeling themselves to be implicated in the obligations of the law of the State, is traceable to the fact that though only broken and imperfect it is still a medium for the conveyance of the Fatherly Will for mankind.

If this be so, we are encouraged to essay the attempt to assign the place it occupies in relation to Christian ethic. The State stands mid-way between nature and grace. As the legalized expression of social relations it is in advance of nature, but because it is legalized is it short of grace. On the one hand it carries men beyond the unsocial, anti-social or merely instinctive social relations of a state of nature, into a community under the reign of Law. On the other hand by virtue of Law being the regulative principle, it forbids our attempting the impossible task of pouring the new wine of Christian ethic into the old bottles of State Forms. That must not be taken to mean that within the sphere of State activity there is no room for the free play of Christian ethics, or of personalities swayed by Christian precept, or better still, regenerated by the Christian

redemption; only it condemns to hopeless failure all attempts to make the State conform to methods and principles borrowed from a plane which utterly transcends it. Its end is to make life good, but regeneration is beyond it, and the limits imposed by the ends it serves, preclude the application of principles which belong to quite another order of experience. A policeman may be a Christian, but it would be vain for him to endeavour to justify his calling on the principles of the sermon on the Mount. It only leads to confusion, when we fail to make clear to ourselves that institutions which serve inferior if necessary ends cannot be run on principles that are native to a higher kind of experience. When Gibbon said: "A sin, a vice, a crime are the objects of theology, ethics and jurisprudence," he set forth by implication the impassable gulf between the principles applicable to governmental action and those which apply to society regarded in its relation to God. Were jurisprudence to mistake its function and legislate for a sin instead of a crime: if Justice deflected its aim from acts to motives, it could only end in anarchy. Still more clearly is this the case, on the supposition that Law were free to invade the territory of Grace and vice-versa. Such attempts have been made and history has supplied the answer. A Christian State in any logical sense of the term is a union of incompatible things, for either a State would include unregenerate citizens or it would not. If it did the Christianity were a fiction; if it did not, the State *qua* State *de facto* would cease to be.

None the less is the State capable of performing services that are in the line of the Christian task of building up the Kingdom of God. In the present stage of being, indeed, Christian progress could not be conceived as possible, apart from the order imposed by State action. Further, Law is a schoolmaster. It renders incalculable service in the education and development of personality. Because it is the reflection of the Holy Will of God, it reinforces the law

written in the conscience and directly contributes to the preparation of the seed-plot in which the gospel germinates. If the State brings men only part of the way, its direction is right. Zeal for the Christian view of life takes a wrong turning when it makes demands on the State that by its very nature the State cannot possibly meet, or by applying to Government principles that have no kind of relevancy either to the plane on which Government proceeds, or to the methods by which it proceeds.

The purely anarchist objection to the employment by the State of force to ensure compliance springs from such misconceptions. The State is based on law and employs force, and it is sometimes loosely deduced that it rests on force. This is surely a misconception. If Authority employs the sword we must not identify its sanction with the weapon it wields. Law is prior to force. Law organises force, not force law. A father's authority does not derive from the cane he resorts to on occasion to enforce it. And if the State is free to apply force for just ends in internal administration, no casuistry avails to stave off the conclusion that in external politics the same weapon is open to it. The pacifist objection to war would strike this weapon from the hand of Government. That carries a long way. It cannot stop short of dethroning law in human communities by depriving it of the right to compel compliance. Compelled compliance is of course a very minor good indeed, but when it secures home and liberty and fatherland it is worth while being thankful that the anarchists have always been a minority.

Because the State has arisen out of the needs of mankind, and by the organisation of society in forms of law, has, in greater or less measure, embodied the Eternal law, which is expressed to Christian thought in a Fatherly Will, the rights of the State to obedience are quite independent of its power to command it. For as the communal expression of the conscience of the individual, it is not an alien thing, but

his own moral personality writ large. Only in the measure, of course, in which man is an ethical creature and no more, and not always expressing the whole of that. The claim to allegiance arises from the human ethos, which has been the organising principle of the State. As the individual ethic aims at the good of the individual, the State ethic has its end in the good of the whole. That constitutes a claim over the obedience of the individual to which it is difficult to set limits. For the ends of the public good it can justly restrict the liberty of the citizen, take his money, compel him so far as it can to be clean, educate him, and in the final resort demand his life. Of the men of Thermopylae the epitaph was written: "They died for the Laws," and the Laws had the right to ask them to die for them. To deny it is to dissolve the bonds of civil society altogether.

Resistance and revolt against constituted authority is not thus ruled out, only its limits are clearly defined by the ethical constitution of human nature. When the State places itself above the moral Law, it destroys its own Authority. Its claim over me is that it is my ethical self organised for the ends of Public Good. When that claim is overstepped, it may be my duty to resist its aggression, but only in such ways as will safeguard and enhance the sacredness of the Law of which the State is or ought to be God's minister. I have to make sure that my resistance is related to those ethical sanctions which I have a right to expect to be embodied in Government. If my resistance is inspired by principles borrowed from a higher kind of ethic, or an ethic only capable of expression in individual lives, I am making a demand of the State it is impossible to realise. Green has put the sphere and limits of State interference well when he has said: "Only such acts should be made compulsory as had better take place from any motive than not take place at all."

It is on that ground that the State has the right to ask its citizens to put aside their distaste for war when the safety

and well-being of the State are threatened. Independent States stand in the same relation to one another as men in a state of nature or unlimited freedom. International Law is at this stage of advance little more than a convention, liable as we have seen to be set aside in the interests of aggression and conquest. In the world as we know it, war is inevitable, and will be until International Law is capable of being enforced by precisely the same weapon as that by which State Law enforces itself now. In a world partly regenerate, Force will always be a necessity, and until a community of States wise enough to bind themselves by Law, and strong enough to enforce it by the common will arises, there will be wars and rumours of wars. The line of progress is indicated not by impossible ethical standards but by a patient advance along the historical line of the bringing of ever larger communities of men under the sway of a common Law. The Prime Minister said a thing infinitely nearer to things as they are and with a more solid ground for hope than any Pacifist dream, when he said that the idea of public right meant the substitution for force, for the clashing of competing ambition, for groupings and allowances and a precarious equipoise the substitution for all these things of a real European partnership based on the recognition of equal right and established and enforced by a common will."

Christ's religion has an interest in national or political organisation just so far as that organisation is an instrument of righteousness. The State is based on Law and if it were always and only true to its only valid authority it would fulfil its function as such an instrument. In point of fact States fail and have failed. Governments like those of the City States of Greece and of the Roman Empire came to naught. Even in their ruins we see the bewired outlines of that ethical framework which made them what they were, the destruction of which involved them in defeat. Christian citizens stand in the modern state as the trustees of that better side of Government which alone makes for

permanency, and the atrophy of which ends in dissolution. Where there is a progressive diminution of Christian character in a nation leavening its life, there is only one possible issue, viz., failure. Forms of Government are doomed in which the Christian ethic is not present to infuse a living spirit into the forms under which public right clothes itself. Because the State authority is precariously built upon the corporate sense of right in a community that is only in small part regenerate, a special responsibility falls upon Christian citizenship to keep the salt of the State from losing its savour.

Suggestions toward the Improvement of our Public Worship.

By **Rev. H. J. WICKS, B.A., D.D.**

"WORSHIP," by the Rev. B. H. Streeter, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Hereford. (An article in the book "Concerning Prayer."—Macmillan & Co., 1916.)

Canon Streeter's recently published article on worship is one that must delight the soul of a Nonconformist reader. He is so entirely free from all sectarian bias and littleness, so concerned to promote the high ends for which public worship exists, so judicial in all his pronouncements as to the methods in vogue in various Churches, that it is a great pleasure to read his pages. He considers that Hooker and other well-known writers devoted themselves too exclusively to a defence or rationale of existing liturgies to be of much service to us for present day needs. He has a keen eye to discern the advantages and disadvantages which are inherent in both Anglican and Nonconformist methods. He is Catholic in the true meaning of that sorely abused word.

Affirming the need for a Philosophy and Psychology of Public Worship in view of the decline in Church attendance,

he modestly declines that task for himself as outside his capacity, and limits himself to the work of laying down certain general principles and making some practical suggestions. In the present article I propose to confine myself to thoughts which arise from what he has to say about prayer in the congregation.

1. And in the first place I would call attention to his candid and wise words about liturgical prayer. In an article written as this is for my brother ministers, I may be allowed to make a personal confession. Dr. Dale once said that before a man has been long in the Free Church Ministry, he is likely to find that his public prayers occasion him great perplexity and humiliation. I suppose every minister recognizes how true that is, though it should be added that public prayer is often a great joy and blessedness. We all feel that at times it is especially difficult. Eager to learn how to do the work better, thinking that one might be taught by a Church whose methods were so radically different from our own, I have sometimes gone on holiday Sundays to the Church of England. Once, on three consecutive Sunday mornings, I attended the ministry of a loveable Evangelical Vicar. On the first occasion, I was deeply impressed by the reverential behaviour of the people as well as by the great beauty and helpfulness of the whole service. On the second Sunday, the impression was not quite so favourable—the sameness, the unvarying order, the repetition began to pall upon me. And, on the third Sunday, I felt profoundly thankful for our Free Church liberty, devoutly glad that I was not doomed to tread that mill horse round week by week, certain that our Nonconformist way is much wiser and more helpful. I realized that there was great charm and beauty and dignity in the worship. That was admonitory, because one could not but feel that by contrast we Nonconformists are sometimes found wanting in the matters of dignity and reverence in our services. Yet I also said to myself as I came away that I was a confirmed believer in Nonconformist ideals, that

on no account would I exchange my freedom for that bondage to forms and ceremonies.

But then, those prayers are not hallowed to us by long and sacred associations as they are in the case of members of the Church of England. How do they feel about it? Canon Streeter tells us in the frankest language. He enumerates the familiar arguments in favour of a Liturgy, the spirituality and unsurpassed beauty of the Collects, the due proportion which it secures between the various elements in worship, the preparedness of the people to join in what is known to be coming, the absence of anything which in form or thought might jar upon the worshipper, the bond which it makes between the local congregation and the universal Church. All this is unquestionably true. But Mr. Streeter is far from being blind to the other side of the shield. "The Book of Common Prayer" he says, "in its incomparable beauty is one of the greatest assets of the Church of England, but its rigidity is her greatest burden. A type of service which can recognise the pressing needs of the hour only by the inclusion of a couple of collects in the course of a service of an hour's duration is inevitably tinged with unreality even in ordinary times, but in a time of desolation and calamity it is felt by many to be formal up to the verge of hypocrisy." Again, he says, "The human mind rebels against monotony and in practice the result of the continued repetition of so much of the service week after week and year after year is that a large proportion of the members of an average Sunday morning congregation are listless and inattentive during the greater part of the service."

2. With equal justice and keenness Canon Streeter discusses our method of worship. "Its outstanding merit of course is its complete freedom and adaptability."

"The topics of the hour, the needs of the moment are naturally and inevitably made a matter of confession, prayer or thanksgiving." He expresses the opinion that, if the minister is both truly spiritual and the possessor of a gift of

devotional expression, our type of service will draw forth much more real response than the liturgical method does. Where the minister is only an average man, he thinks there is not much to choose between the two methods. Where the minister is below the average of spiritual culture or gift of expression, he believes that a fixed liturgy is distinctly the more satisfactory of the two. One would much like to know whether this is a judgment based on any real experience of worship in our Churches, or whether it is purely theoretical on the part of the writer. However that may be, we must confess that there is much truth in his statement of the case, and his words impress upon us again the need of much spiritual culture on the part of ministers. His words are at first sight discouraging, because the best man amongst us would not claim to possess the high gifts which are desiderated, and we all fall at times below our best. But still, for my part, I firmly believe that worship on our method, even when conducted by a man of ordinary powers, will be more helpful than a fixed Liturgy *on the proviso* that a man is doing his best to be equipped for his office. But that is an all important proviso. It is a *sine quâ non*.

I may be permitted to offer sundry suggestions based on many years of experience. They will not be new, but they may usefully stir up pure minds by way of remembrance.

(1) Upon the whole, it may be confidently affirmed that one is likeliest to be at his best when his prayers are really extemporaneous. If the language is prepared, the prayer is likely to be stilted and artificial. If one thinks out his prayer in substance beforehand and is aiming to travel along the preconceived line, he is apt to find himself too much encumbered, and therefore hindered in his journey by the burden. He will be recalling what has been thought of, not speaking directly to God with the glad consciousness of real contact. He will not be so likely to help others to speak with God. Wiser it is to cast away all crutches and try to walk, asking God for strength to use one's own limbs. Spontaneity

is a precious thing in preaching. One comes to closer grip with one's people often when a certain generous heat is kindled in his soul and he can speak with liberty and force something that comes "burning hot into his mind." An able minister who read all his sermons told me once how persuaded he was that his was not the ideal way. The preacher should be a good man talking quite naturally at his best. And the same thing is true of public prayer. What is most natural, what smells least of the lamp, is best.

(2) But to say all this is not by any manner of means to imply that there will be no preparation. On the contrary, the whole life of the true minister will be preparation. We all know that he, and he alone, will lead a congregation helpfully in prayer who himself dwells much in the secret place of the Almighty. Otherwise, as Baxter said, he will publish his own spiritual distempers to his congregation. No service that we can render to the people who gather about us in Church surpasses in value and importance that which we do for them when we really lead them into the presence of God, and that service he *cannot* render, however great his genius or scholarship, who is himself a stranger to much personal intercourse with God.

(3) Yet a man of prayer may get into ruts, he may become too stereotyped in thought and expression, he may easily get unconsciously into the habit of using a liturgy of his own nearly as fixed though not as beautiful as the Collects in the Prayer Book. That is one of the besetting evils of our method. One of its correctives, I should say the most effectual corrective, is to study carefully the prayers of the saints in the Bible, to saturate oneself in the devotional language of Holy Scripture. One should get fuel from that blazing altar for his own fires continually. As Mr. Spurgeon puts it "Seeds of prayer thus sown in the memory will yield a constant golden harvest as the Spirit shall warm your soul with hallowed fire in the hour of congregational prayer." I am not sure whether Mr. Spurgeon would go with me quite

in what I am going to suggest now, but for myself I think the wise minister will familiarise himself with the great devotional literature which is not in the Bible, and most of all with that unparalleled manual of devotion, the Book of Common Prayer. Dignity and conciseness of expression are much to be desired, and to read great authors is to catch unconsciously something of their spirit and their manner. There is much justice in Canon Streeter's contention that it is one of our disadvantages that "an extemporary prayer may at any moment contain something which either in substance or in language jars upon any individual with the result that his mind assumes a critical attitude to what is being said which disturbs the current of his devotions." That, of course, may be due to some unreasonableness on the part of the individual, and we cannot provide against that. But we want to guard against the danger of giving reasonable cause of offence. What is wanted for that is just common sense, and an intimate acquaintance with the best models of devotion will do much to give elevation of thought and language. We shall pray best as we are under the influence of the Spirit of God, but that Spirit works through the wise use of means, otherwise we should have no function to discharge as Ministers.

(4) Canon Streeter criticises the long prayer in our worship as being psychologically a mistake. He thinks it makes too great a demand on the attention of people, and questions whether even a person in an advanced stage of religious development can meet that demand. One is obliged to admit, I think, that he is right in that contention. A friend of mine calls the long prayer "the children's horror," but it might quite as truly be called "the grown up people's horror." It is surely wiser to have three or four prayers in a service than one. "Churches with no fixed liturgy," says the essayist, "do not need to vindicate such liberty, but if an outsider may express an opinion it is one of astonishment that, in spite of the liberty of variation enjoyed, the average service in a Scotch Presbyterian Church or in an English Nonconformist

Church follows so closely certain stereotyped and conventional lines." This is most true, but why should it be so? It is good to have a brief prayer at the end of the first or only Lesson. One may sometimes offer a few words of supplication at the end of the children's address, asking them to join at least silently and using language adapted to their needs. Why not ask the people to join in prayer for a moment or two immediately before the sermon sometimes? And when devout thought and holy aspiration have been kindled by the sermon, the whole service may at times come to its highest point if just then minister and people unite in prayer. If there are several prayers in a service, one may devote each to a definite purpose, in one Thanksgiving, in another personal and local needs, in a third the Church and the nation and the world.

3. I conclude with one or two observations not based on Canon Streeter's article. It must be frankly owned that we cannot have in free prayer even at its best such completeness, such all round meeting of needs as Anglicans get with their liturgy. We are sometimes in danger of becoming too parochial. We shall minimise the danger if and as we live near to *men*. That is only second in importance to our need of living near to God. It will cause us to be in close touch with the needs of the men and women about us. We must be alive to the movements of our own time—to the happenings and the thoughts that are stirring men.

A practice which many find helpful is to begin a service by reading a brief selection of Scripture passages calling to worship, the congregation standing. How any one can object to this it is difficult to conceive. Our Nonconformist ancestors stood to pray, and I devoutly wish that we either did the same or else had our pews so arranged that our people could kneel without discomfort. We Nonconformists are prone to neglect too much the aid of the outward form and though it is possible to have the form of godliness without the power, some attention to form would be of assis-

tance to the spirit of worship. Nowadays much is being said about the need of some space for silent prayer, and a protest is made against the rush with which services are carried through. Certainly it is well if the minister sets the example of not rising from his knees immediately after the Amen.

Would it not be a good thing if somehow the worshipper in the pew could get some further opportunity for his self expression, if the people could take a more active part in the common worship? In our services, apart from the hymns, the man in the pew is a listener, except for his silent Amen to the prayers. I think this is a question which we ought to face. I tread dangerous ground here, but I am inclined to think that we who make so much use of prayers which we sing, reading them out of a book, might with advantage say together some common prayers. The Psalms and the Epistles would furnish us with good material for the purpose, and why should we not ask our people to unite in saying aloud such a prayer as the General Thanksgiving in the Prayer Book? Free prayer is our glory but it might be usefully supplemented. Probably we are not ready for that. In most of our Churches it would be met with indignant opposition. We have no Act of Uniformity, but great is the power of unwritten law and not unnatural is the fear of change. But one thing we may all do without opposition. It is to use the Lord's prayer habitually and to encourage our people to say it aloud with us. It is well either to make it a separate act of worship or to use it at the beginning instead of at the end of another prayer. If the people do not know it is coming, they fail to join in the opening sentence and are discouraged. It is a good thing to help them to say it unitedly by expressly asking them to do so at the beginning.

The Prayers of the Congregation.

By Rev. J. A. STUART, B.A.

I may be allowed to say at the outset that when I consented to note and follow up some of the very valuable points in Canon Streeter's article on *Worship* in the volume "*Concerning Prayer*," I did so with the protest that I am not an expert in the psychology of worship, but only a patient student of it. My conclusions are tentative, and this is only an attempt to open up a subject of very wide range and interest.

There is an immense literature in Liturgiology; and there are few problems in the history of the Roman, Greek and Anglican use that have not been discussed. But there is as yet no great work to guide us in the study of public worship in relation to the mind of the plain man. Such a work would need to be comprehensive, scientific and free from apologetic bias. It would probably raise as much irritation as has been aroused by every other endeavour to apply the teachings of psychology to our religious practice. The chief *datum* in all such attempts must be our own religious experience; and for that very reason we must be content with small advances, and be well satisfied if we can carry with us in our broad conclusions those whose religious training and outlook is similar to our own.

Yet it is time we began to take the subject seriously and systematically. Canon Streeter calls attention to the decline in church-going which he connects directly with the prevailing neglect of psychological conditions in public worship. He counters those who set it all down to the irreligion of the age, by asking what regard we pay to the conditions which are known to determine interest and attention in a body of persons of differing temperament and circumstance. He lays stress on the need, first for a clearer vision of the great end of public worship, to make a congregation as a whole

receptive and responsive to the divine; and then for the need of variety combined with familiarity, a due mingling of activity and repose. He says that we are apt to give the impression of striving to gain the ear of a distant or reluctant God, and in our very importunity after God's presence, may give the impression of his distance. The suggestions he makes are mainly directed to gain for the Anglican services some of that freedom and elasticity which is our birthright, but there are many valuable *obiter dicta* for our consideration.

There are many disadvantages in the use of a liturgy, as Canon Streeter's instances show. I do not know that they can be avoided by the use of such a manual as Dr. Hunter's; and the self-consciousness of the printed prayers, say of Geo. Dawson and Dr. Martineau, may serve to warn us less gifted people from writing our liturgy. There are drawbacks to the sole use of extempore prayer, or as I should prefer to call it (less because of what it is than for what it seeks to be) inspirational prayer. Probably there cannot be found one order or method that will altogether satisfy every temperament, and the attempt to serve all temperaments in one service would make the whole a patchwork. We might well consider whether even now, we are not expected to include too much in each service. The Anglican Litany and the "long prayer" of our fathers' day certainly err in this way. There should be no difficulty in leading Christian men to acquiesce in services which are not just exactly those they would themselves adopt, if only the great fundamental experiences find recognition at some point, and there are other services from time to time at which a larger place is given to what appeals to their temperament. Our services are certainly apt to be too much of a type—generally the minister's type. We might well set ourselves, ministers and members, to remember the need, the presence—and the absence—of all types of men. Many suggested experiments in a wider appeal are ruled out from the first by somebody in a position of influence, with much use of the first personal

pronoun. More people cease from Church-going on grounds of temperament than from any other cause; and no rigid order can ever make a universal appeal.

If we are really to get to the root of the difficulties that beset every form of public worship, we must go back to a question that comes before all questions of form, and ask for what end we gather and seek to gather others together. I note one answer in passing, only to anathematize it: that we gather to hear the sermon. Such a spirit secularises the sermon as well as vitiates the devotional service. Nor do we come together "to say our prayers." Public worship is no mere aggregation of acts of private worship. Behind all public prayer lies, it is true, the private prayer both of him who leads and of those who follow. "It is the life that prays." But there is this distinction, sanctioned and guarded by our Lord Himself, that in the act of common prayer we pray as members one of another. It is a corporate act. Its purpose is to render the whole body sensitive and responsive to the Spirit of God. Its power lies in the recognition of a common need, a common guilt, a common salvation, a common responsibility for the work of the Kingdom. There has been much cheap sneering of late at the "miserable offenders" of the General Confession; but the experience of the Church is wider and truer than that of any individual. So Canon Streeter writes: "The sense of fellowship is the greatest of all aids to worship," and again, "The capacity for the highest worship will never be developed by the isolated individual." This needs no further proof than the central position of the Lord's Supper in the worship of the Christian Church in all ages.

This sense of fellowship is obviously one of the first things to aim at. The Church of England may be said to seek it by using the same liturgy in every parish, so that the worshipper may feel himself one of a mighty congregation, wide as the bounds of the Empire; and by basing that liturgy in large measure on the psalmody, prayers, symbolism and

confessions of the ancient Church. In its form, the service presents the national and the catholic outlook—to the man who understands. In our services, on the other hand, there is nothing *in the form* to help the plain man to realise that he is not an isolated unit, offering his private prayers under conditions of some inconvenience. That the conditions are inconvenient, from such a point of view, is evident. There are physical hindrances, and it is no easy thing to follow the utterances of another man, when you have not the slightest idea where he is going next. In prayer, the attention should be directed on God, the voice of the speaker is composed to a devotional note, and there is not always an obvious line of the thought or desire to follow. So he that filleth the place of the unlearned may say his *Amen* with a fervour quite worthy of his Corinthian prototype—but the latter said it most fervently when he had followed the prayer. What of the former?

So it seems to me that the first part of our problem is to attain to such an atmosphere in our public worship that the “unlearned” brother shall instinctively feel that he is praying, not as a unit, but as a member of a great priestly community. The prayers in which he is asked to join are the prayers of the Church Holy and Catholic, presented to God the Father through the Head of the Church by the voice of one who speaks for the whole Church no less than, and by the same right as, he speaks for the present congregation. (By the same right, because we are called by the one Spirit who is the life of the whole Church, and our orders are as Catholic as His activities). I do not say that this is to be set explicitly before *Idiotes* at each and every service. I admit that to many of our fellow-worshippers, it would seem to be mere mysticism, and to others, alas, Romanism in disguise. Yet we shall not regain the high spirituality of the early Baptist Churches, till we regain the conception of *the Church*, the one Holy Catholic Church, of which each of us is a member by a right that neither Pope nor Parliament can

deprive us of. The early Baptists were not schismatics, but we sadly need to re-work into the consciousness of our people the truth that we are both Churchmen and even the true High-Churchmen. By faith and destiny, we are the true protagonists in the coming conflict between the institutional and inspirational conceptions of the Church of Christ. The mediating views will not survive long, when once the battle is fairly joined.

In the meantime, we are trying to operate on an age immensely sensitive to new and larger conceptions of life (which it did not learn from the Church), in neglect of that larger, corporate, universal outlook which really offers us our best avenue into the mind of the day. That mind approaches all its ideal through their social, national, or universal aspect. The Anglican Prayer Book makes use of the conceptions of the universality and continuity of the Church, but not in ways that are readily felt by the ordinary worshipper. If ever its liturgy suited the psychological situation, which is doubtful, it was the situation three hundred years ago. Its outlook is venerable, but not contemporary. Yet may not the same be said in a large measure of our own outlook? We still follow unhesitatingly and unquestioningly, methods which were adopted in dissent, for a definite historic situation, and for limited groups of like-minded worshippers. They came down to us, not with the glamour of an ancient tradition, but sanctified by their use in the worship of congregations which had been sifted, even before they were gathered, by all sorts of disabilities; men and women to whom the simple order was really a most intense symbolism, who had counted the cost and often paid much of it before they assembled in the meeting-house. Does it follow that these methods are still the best? Our congregations come into a totally different atmosphere. They are not sifted by sacrifice, and while many of them may prefer simplicity of form, it is doubtful whether more than a very few interpret it as a symbol. Anglican worship seems

to be based on the theory of the spiritual immaturity of the worshipper; ours, on his spiritual maturity. The effect, as far as we are concerned, is that our services do not sufficiently appeal to the immature, nor instruct him. Many of our members are of course full-grown; others are "done growing." But the younger members and adherents are at once mature and immature. In many ways, they are as mature as we parsons are. In social applications of Christianity, they are often our masters; in their attitude to truth, they are free from that ecclesiastical bias which as easily besets the Baptist as the Jesuit. But evangelically, they are often immature to a degree. The bill for Cowper-Templeism has begun to come in. The popular conception of the Christian life as concerned with conduct rather than with grace, and the general abandonment of the Bible to the minister, have led to a decline in experience which to thinking men seems the most dangerous threat to the well-being of our Church life, and perhaps the prelude to a sacramentarian, even Romanist, reaction. These people with no spiritual history form, and I suppose always will form, the majority of the average congregation. Does our way of conducting public worship have due regard to their presence and their needs? Have we tried to meet them in our devotional exercises, as we do in our preaching? Is not the low tone of the Church life of the day proof that during a period of rapid change and deep unsettlement, we have been neglecting their devotional education?

We ought to face the great change which has passed over the general mind since the days of the Puritans. The Reformation made religion a personal matter; the plain man of to day regards it as an individual matter. Our forefathers claimed liberty to serve God; their children claim liberty without qualification. Protestantism has not yet assimilated the conception of Authority, which alone keeps Romanism alive, and for want of which the religion of Protestant communities shows a tendency to peter out into mere idealism. Deep

changes have been wrought on us all by the influence of the scientific conception of the world (which is far greater than the influence of science), both on ministers and laymen, traditionalist and modernist. The conception of immanence has reacted strongly on our thought of the divine nature and action. The new emphasis on personality has as notably affected our Christology; humanism, and the rise of the social conscience have affected our soteriology. Our Gospel is the same Gospel, but it is applied in a world very differently conceived. Such developments as these bring about more than a change of emphasis. They affect the type of religion, the psychology of the soul, the blend of its faith. We worship the God of our fathers, but the redemption in virtue of which we make our approach is a wider thing, applied in a more complex universe, and dealing with the need of a race vastly more self-conscious.

Is it possible that while the religious outlook has been thus modified, there should have arisen no need for adaptation in our methods of worship? One of the paradoxes of the day is the lack of liberty in the Free Churches. We have no Bishop to inhibit innovations, but we have the weak brother, who has emerged from the seclusion of the background, where we find him in the New Testament, and has attained to a prominence and power that would have astonished Paul. The weak brother of course is an individualist, and for that reason his influence on common worship is bad; for common worship must be the voice of the community, not of the individual. He has helped to keep our services in close touch with the mentality of the day before yesterday and is, beyond a doubt, responsible for the loss of many of our younger people to the Anglican Church. It is not honest to comfort ourselves by putting down all these losses to snobbery and other unworthy causes. In many cases they are the result of a craving for a larger outlook, for that element of spiritual elevation which is the reality that gives colour to all doctrines of hierarchy, and can never

be met where the average man dominates everything.

I am not pleading for a liturgy, or for æsthetic services. The introduction of a liturgical element in the services must depend on the feeling and conditions within the Church concerned. But whether we hold to the method of our forefathers, which is a symbol as well as a method, or whether we combine it with a wise use of the ancient prayers and hymns of the Church, let us at least remember that the common worship is in large part a training in devotion for many besides ourselves, and, for most of them, *the only training that they will ever get*. The one thing to be for ever deprecated is the assumption that we are never under any conditions to adopt a method or a feature that is used in the Church of England. If it is ritualism to use a beautiful musical service, it is ritualism to work up a fervour of feeling by singing Sankey's hymns for some time before the service. The two stand on precisely the same footing.

Behind all questions of method lies the question of aim. The first essential is that all present should feel the presence of God. Therefore we must enter on the service with reverence, and with a call for reverence. For reverence is but another name for that purity of heart that sees God. (See King: *The Ethics of Jesus*, page 223).

There is no doubt that we are deficient in this matter. It might be helped by some use of the "fellowship of silence," not necessarily at an early stage in the service, nor at every service. Canon Streeter believes that the impressive silences of the Roman Mass have much to do with the modern revival of sacramental worship. To some people, this statement will seem a good reason why intervals of silence should find no place with us; to others, it will argue that they should. It all depends whether we are ready to say, Let those who want that sort of thing go where they can get it. The thing has been said a thousand times before, and generally they have gone. As the mediæval world lost its finest spirits to monasticism, we have lost many whose influence would have

made for reverence in the atmosphere of our worship. By one means or another, we must stop that leakage. This leakage may grow in near years from exploitation of the spirit of nationalism. Young people will be told that "the Church" has rights over them analogous to those which the State has, but far more royal and inward.

Again, without making any drastic changes, we could educate our congregations in the sense of our common humanity. We must recover the priestly consciousness of the Church. Why let the claim of the sacerdotalist go unanswered? There is a Christian priesthood; and if the Church may not delegate priestly power to a clerical order, it must exercise it itself. But how little we hear of the priestly function of the Church. There should be nothing difficult in leading the minds of our people in this direction. I imagine that whenever a minister is thanked for some prayer he has offered, it is generally for an intercession. This is quite in accord with the prevailing temper of the day. Our people are more exercised in intercessory prayer than in any other, direct personal petition perhaps excepted. Many who lose us elsewhere, recover touch when we come to "all sorts and conditions of men."

It has for some time been my practice to use, before any actual intercessions are uttered, some sentences which recall that each is conscious, not only that he has needs and burdens, but that at his side there bow those whose hearts know their own bitterness or their own joy, that we are all alike needy children joining our prayers one with another to the Father of all. It is a great thing to get people out of themselves, if only into the "larger self" as William James calls it, of the family and the friendly circle. It is more to get them to remember the needs and aspirations which, all unknown to them, yet lie on the heart of fellow-worshippers whom they perhaps do not know at all. Such sympathies kill individualism, and surely develop the power of united prayer. But we have to advance yet further: out of the

larger self into the largest. The largest self of the praying church, is Christ; His standpoint is the point from which the Church as a praying unit must seek to make its priestly prayer.

We are sometimes told that our people undervalue the devotional service because it is not theirs. Why is it not theirs? We bear too much responsibility if we are content to make it an echo of our private prayer reinforced by recollections of the week's visiting. We need to educate ourselves in the world-view of Christ, and to recover the sense, which the early Baptists had, of being the mouth-piece of that Church before whose glory the dignity and glamour of Rome and of the State Church pale and fade. We need to educate the people to pray with us, to realize that they can give power to the prayers of others, and above all to the prayers of Christ, and that as they pray, the universal Church is exercising its priestly function through them. (Heb. XII. 22ff.)

The real problem is not of a choice between responsive prayer and our present order. It is rather, how to make whatever prayers be used, the prayer of the whole congregation. Some brethren, having regard to the nature of their congregation, will choose to develop on new lines; others, to retain the existing plan. But we should certainly give weight to the fact that there are people of many types in the assembly, and that the service is our great opportunity of educating them in reverent devotion, and of arousing them to the priestly privilege of the Church assembled for worship. I venture to make one suggestion in closing, which could, I think, be used with any order of service. It is not uncommon to hear a minister, at the outset of a prayer, mention some person or object for which the prayers of the congregation are desired. The value of the plan is evident. When the moment comes at which the prayer is uttered, every mind in the building is alert with recognition. The attention has been, as the psychologists say, pre-adjusted. Might we not

extend this method? If we had a prayer, say after the first lesson, kept to one line of thought, and introduced by a few words which would serve to indicate its scope, I believe we should lose touch with very few of our people. They would know as well as if they had a prayer-book in their hands, whither they were to be led; and yet they would not know so well as to find interest dulled by familiarity. This method might be applied at different points from time to time, and I imagine that it should prove especially helpful in pre-adjusting the minds of our fellow-worshippers to those prayers in which we take the largest views, and reach out towards the priestly prayer of the Church as a united whole. Could we lead them in this, we should regain our lost Church-consciousness, and discover that atmosphere which is more than all forms.

P.S.—Since writing the above, I have found this in an admirable little book, *Self-Training in Prayer*, by A. H. McNeile :—“Probably most Christians would admit that one of their greatest needs in the spiritual life is the self-training which will enable them to make public worship what it is intended to be. We must immerse ourselves, gradually, by practice, in the reality of the corporate life of the Church acting for mankind as one Whole in things pertaining to God.” This really says concisely what I have been seeking after in a more diffuse way.

Sacramental Grace.

By Rev. BERKELEY G. COLLINS, A.T.S., Bluntisham.)

I.

That the "ordinances" do not hold their rightful place, or the position they once held, in the thought and feeling of our people as a whole, is manifest. It is but rarely that the attendance at the Communion is any indication of the membership of our Churches, and the service itself, even when fortified by an address, is often unimpressive and formal. While as for Baptism, it is increasingly difficult to persuade even the young—especially those belonging to our more cultured families—to accept it; though in this case there is often a serious and considered doubt as to the wisdom and obligation of the form adopted by us, a doubt which is not dispelled by an excursion through the Lexicon. To some extent, no doubt, this indifference to the sacraments is only part of the whole religious situation with which we have to deal; and more particularly of the general distrust, not to say unbelief, in organised religion which is one of the gravest facts the Church has to face. But apart from these general causes, and possibly contributory to the lowered spiritual temperature of the Churches themselves, I would draw attention to the fact that we have no *doctrine of the sacraments*, no convictions as to their intrinsic value and importance, no real faith in them as "means of grace," and that this has not a little to do with the laxity we deplore.

The grounds on which their observance is generally urged among us are eloquent of our poverty in this respect. They are commended as divine enactments, ceremonial laws promulgated by Christ, and their legal authority is sometimes argued with so much fervour as almost to justify the taunt that the Baptists practise a form of Judaistic Christianity. Or, on the other hand, they are regarded as picture-lessons, didactic performances, useful as any striking figure is useful,

“especially to men of inferior cultivation,” as Dr. Pye-Smith would say. * How often, for example, is baptism urged *solely* on the ground that our Lord “commanded” it, and that therefore it is of the first importance to know the exact meaning of the Greek terms of the command, in order that our obedience shall be scrupulously exact? It ought to be unnecessary to do more than refer to such an attitude as this. It is worthier of a Jewish synagogue in the palmy days of Pharisaism than of any section of the Church of Christ. To obey any word of the Lord Jesus in this spirit is to disobey Him. And to refuse to obey for such reasons is to more closely follow Him who came to break legalism, not to perpetuate it. The Samaritan leper who turned back to thank his Healer, had more of the mind of Christ than the nine Jews who scrupulously kept the letter of His command and continued their journey to the priests. It was with the literalists that He had His great contention, and He who appealed to the reason and consciences of men was the last to require obedience to any rite which was solely a ceremony, and which did not justify itself to spiritual experience. And this is apart from the growing belief of many scholars that, as far as baptism is concerned, He gave no “commandment” at all; since, if anything is certain, it is that the *Great Commission*, in its present form at least, did not proceed from Him. In any case, it is a true instinct, the instinct for freedom from any yoke of legal bondage, which revolts against this defence and commendation of the sacraments. Where they are only “ordinances,”—rules established by authority—they can have no place in the spiritual order to which, as believers, we belong.

It is the consciousness of this fact that alone can account for the leanings toward Quakerism which are often confessed among us, even by some of our most revered leaders. They refer to the Society of Friends in such terms of wistful

*Quoted by Dale—“*Ecclesia*,” ‘*The Doctrine of the Real Presence*.’ p. 370.

admiration as to do more than suggest that, in their judgment, the Society occupies a higher and more "spiritual" position than their own. And these frequent tributes to the "Friends" and their unsacramental worship have not a little to do with the declining honour in which the holy symbols of our faith are held. It is possible that Charles Lamb is largely responsible for these envious glances toward the "simplicity" of the Quaker's Meeting, and the reign of silence. But though the Essayist was a most loveable and heroic soul, he was not an authority on Christian worship, or he would not have magnified the "loneliness to be felt" in the manner he did. One is naturally hesitant in speaking, except in terms of praise, of a Community which is the object of so much veneration. Yet I venture to dissociate myself entirely from these tributes to the Essenic "spirituality" of the Society, which have become so common as to be conventional. In my judgment, it is Christian neither in its distinctive quality nor in its common manifestations. It is non-evangelistic, ego-centric, and self-righteous. It is simply not true that the average Quaker is more spiritually-minded than his neighbour. He is rarely as humble. The instincts of Bunyan were not astray when he opposed the new teaching, and there is no need to apologise for him because there are beautiful spirits in the Society of Friends, as there are in every section of the Christian people. But it must be obvious that to confess leanings toward Quakerism is to admit that the sacraments have no integral place in our religious life. And if, remembering that there are many who still find them "helpful," we continue to maintain them, it is "for the sake of others"; which, as it may be the highest Christian motive, is more often the deadliest Pharisaism. Yet if the sacraments are mere enactments or bare ceremonies it is certain that they must lose ground increasingly in the life of our Churches. As Forsyth says, "We quench the mystery, and we lose the spell." *

**The Charter of the Church.* p. 22.

II.

The truth is that in our perfectly legitimate protest against a sacramentarianism which is magical, unethical and sacerdotal, we have reacted to the other extreme and have cultivated a rationalism which has reduced the sacraments to mere forms. It is nearly fifty years ago * since Dr. Dale raised a warning voice, and pleaded for a positive doctrine as being more Scriptural and truer to experience than a "Zwinglianism" which Zwingli himself would not have recognised. Unfortunately his advocacy of infant baptism made much of his exposition unintelligible, and left the door wide open for the superstitions he disavowed. But in the course of his argument he pointed out that, "as weeds reveal the quality of the soil," so the superstitious corruptions of both ordinances which began to appear in very early times could not have arisen if the original conception of them had been that which prevailed and still prevails in our Churches. His words have received striking confirmation from the most radical and rationalistic criticism of the New Testament as well as from the candid admissions of orthodox theologians. Schweitzer and Wrede, Denney and Bartlett, are one in their recognition of sacramental teaching in the primitive documents, however widely they may differ as to its significance. And indeed it is only by the exercise of an ingenuity worthy of a better cause, by a determination to compel the apostolic Church to wear the garments of English Nonconformity, that the New Testament can be made to support an unsacramental form of religion. If it is not "Catholic" in the common acceptance of the word, it is even less "Protestant." And it is much easier to prove that Catholicism has preserved, in a corrupt form, the earliest beliefs of the Church, than to prove that we continue the apostolic teaching and tradition. It would not occur to us to compare the two Christian "ordinances" to the passage of the Red Sea and to the supernatural bread which sustained the

*In *Ecclesia*.—The Doctrine of the Real Presence and of the Lord's Supper. See also his *Congregational Principles*, pp. 126 ff.

Israelites in the wilderness, or to say that any sickness and deaths in our midst were due to an irreverent partaking of the Lord's Supper. Yet Paul said both these things. Nor should we naturally say to one who had gone from the Lord's Table to the modern substitute for a heathen feast, that what made his behaviour so appalling was that he had participated in the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. We might say something else greatly to the point, but not this, and we should not say it in the same way and with the same horror. And the constant association of the Spirit with baptism which is too inwrought into the very texture of the New Testament to be denied by any unbiassed reader, is an embarrassment to us, a feature to be slurred over in our expositions of the meaning of the rite. And yet to a Baptist this connection of the Spirit with baptism ought not to be any difficulty, seeing that all modern expositors find the explanation in the conscious and believing spirit of the baptised persons. "We must never lose sight of the fact that when baptism is spoken of in the New Testament it is always adult baptism, baptism accompanied by a profession of faith, and a resolve to throw in one's lot with the Society," says Dr. Percy Gardner, "It does not at all correspond to infant baptism, which, whether right or wrong, stands for something quite different from a conscious acceptance of Christ." * Much that seems at first sight strange and magical becomes clear when this fact is recognised, as Baptists ought to have perceived. But to this I must return. If we distinguish between the New Testament *experience* of the sacraments and the *interpretation* the primitive Church put upon that experience, we shall find ourselves, as I have endeavoured to show elsewhere, † in the world of Jewish Apocalyptic, with its transcendental hopes and beliefs. The Spirit was conceived as an immortalising energy, renewing not only the soul but the body unto endless life, and making the whole

*The *Ephesian Gospel*, p. 202.

†*Expository Times*, Oct., Nov., Dec., 1915.

man, body, soul and spirit, meet for the coming Transformation of the visible creation. If the reference is not judged irreverent if was a hyper-physical power similar to the wheel of flame into which *She*, in Rider Haggard's romance, stepped and was rendered deathless and beautiful for ever. This is the key to the value that was put upon the physical manifestations of the Spirit, and to what Paul has to say about the quickening of our mortal body. Of course, this is not a complete account of the apostolic beliefs. In Paul especially we find other infinitely higher conceptions of the Spirit and His work in believers, and John carries the Pauline teaching to its glorious consummation. It is mentioned here partly to indicate the fact that there are elements in the primitive faith which can never be revived, as they belong to a world-view now impossible; but chiefly as illustrating the truth that the Sacraments were much more than mere forms to the men who wrote the New Testament, and those to whom it was first addressed. It was a fixed belief of the early Church that, except in most abnormal cases, the Spirit was given in baptism, and the Lord's Supper was as closely associated with the power of the Lord Who was present. It is open to us to reject the emphasis and teaching of the New Testament on this point. It is not open to us to explain away the facts, and so sin against truth.

III.

It is clear that, unless we are prepared to cut ourselves off altogether from the New Testament and from the faith of the overwhelming majority of our fellows in Christ, we must recover a belief in sacramental grace. The false sacramentarianism we oppose cannot be met and overcome, any more than any error can be overcome, by a mere negative. It can be met only by a true sacramentalism, a doctrine which gives full value to experience, and while avoiding those superstitions which would substitute the sacraments for Christ, retains for them the high and solemn

place which is rightly theirs. And why should we shrink from acknowledging a special divine power and grace in the sacraments? In the "sacraments," *not* in the "elements." The sacraments are not the water or the bread and wine, which are but symbols. They are the whole actions, in the one case the solemn confession and baptising, in the other case the blessing and the participating. The "sacrament" includes all that is done. It is the complete service, of which the symbolic actions are an essential part. * Is there then any reason why we should not admit and joyfully acclaim a special divine power and presence in the sacraments so defined? There is a passage in Illingworth's "*Divine Immanence*" in which he asks, "If a particular person realises the divine presence, which we believe to be latent everywhere, with exceptional vividness in a particular place, does not this constitute an actual manifestation of God to that person in that place?" † What is our answer to a question of that kind? Shall we deny the inference, and affirm that there is nothing but subjective feeling? Shall we say that the only activity is that of the man's own spirit and there is no movement in his spiritual environment which corresponds to his heightened consciousness of God? To say this is to affirm a Static God; a God to be apprehended, not One Who apprehends; a Presence to be felt, not a Love which feels and acts. It is this subjectivity which is the bane of our modern religious life, and sooner or later must end in the paralysis of faith. And in the last resort the question at issue here is not between a false and a true sacramentalism, but between conceptions of God which are poles asunder, the Static and the Dynamic. And surely we cannot hesitate in our choice. God is not the Great Passivity, but eternal action. He is always the first to move in all that concerns our good. We do not reflect His presence as the still waters of a mountain tarn reflect a stainless

*See the able discussion in Scott's *Evangelical Doctrine—Bible Truth*, ch. XI. †p. 75.

sky. We respond to it as to a Personal Power between Whom and ourselves there pass confidences and gifts. And when a sudden brightness falls upon us, and our souls glow with unaccustomed heat, when the reality of God needs no demonstration, and His nearness no other evidence than the quick beating of our hearts, it is because He has touched us and enfolded us with conscious and deliberate purpose.

It is along these lines we can interpret our experience of sacramental grace. In the hour when we seal our faith in baptism and an awe falls upon our spirits which is sometimes an ecstasy, or when we draw near to the table spread for us in the wilderness as the guests of Him whose word we keep, dare we say that our Lord has no part in the experience, that all the activity is on our side and none on His? Must we not say that our inward motion is a response to that Presence which overshadows us, and which joins Himself in mystic union with us, and that even when we feel nothing and yet have faith the divine gift is given and received? There is more than the reflex action of our own minds, or the impression made upon us by the thoughts suggested by the symbols. The Lord Himself is present in the *meaning of the symbols*, and His presence is power. If it be said that He is present in no other sense than He is present at all times, and that His Spirit is manifest in every assembly of His people, and in every crisis of the soul, the obvious answer is that the Presence may be the same but not the power or the blessing, that there is one Spirit but there are many operations. The God who speaks to the prepared heart in the loveliness of a dewy dawn speaks also in the prayer-meeting and in the hour of sorrow and loss, but though the Voice is one, the words are not one, nor is their power of the same kind. It is true that Christ is with us always and everywhere, and that where two or three are gathered together in His name His presence can be known. But He is present in another power and with another purpose when he claims us in baptism and meets us at the breaking of

bread. For us, at least, to whom baptism is not baptism without faith and conscious will, there can be no unethical and magic sacramentarianism. But all the more confidently should we affirm the positive truth of the Spirit's power in baptism and the real "communion of the Body and Blood." As baptism is not a form but a power, so that can be no mere memorial service where the Lord Himself is present to feed our souls with the power of His own surrendered life.

The Ministry of Dr. Chalmers in Glasgow: a Centennial Retrospect.

By the Rev. PRINCIPAL GOULD, M.A., D.D.

NOTE.—Dr. Gould has written the following article under conditions of great physical difficulty, and at a time when he was ordered to rest from all work. He places us, therefore, under a special obligation. The subject was selected by him as being especially appropriate to the present conditions of church life. It is a challenging article.—ED.

The appointment which summoned Thomas Chalmers from the retired parish of Kilmany to the Tron Church in Glasgow was made on November 25th, 1814; he was inducted into his new charge on July 21st, of the following year. In the interval between those dates he had to face a situation affording a striking parallel in many respects to that which confronts ourselves at this time. The country was nearing the conclusion of a long and exhausting war. Seriously minded men were arrested then as now by the problems which would demand solution in the new age upon which they were about to enter. Economically the situation was by no means clear: the war had involved serious dislocation of employment; but what would be the effect of the further dislocation which must ensue upon the discharge of immense numbers of men from naval and military service? Religiously the

out-look both fascinated and perplexed. The Church of Christ must have a great opportunity when the minds of men were released from the obsession of the war; but how was that opportunity best to be turned to account, by what adaptation of message and method to the new time? Amid our own questionings, of the religious sort, and amid the manifold and discordant advice which is so freely offered, it may not be amiss to recall the answers which Chalmers found for himself and which were expressed in that eight years' ministry which, commencing a month after Waterloo, proved in the best sense of the words more successful—more widely and more lastingly influential for good—than that of any other preacher of the same time.

An authentic human document from a situation with so much resemblance to our own may have more for us in the way of direction than much speculation.

The story of the Glasgow ministry is told with much fulness of detail in Dr. Hanna's "Memoirs of Dr. Chalmers." We attempt here no estimate of the gifts and graces of the great personality disclosed in the Memoirs. If we essay the simpler task of ascertaining what it was Chalmers purposed in going to Glasgow, three things at once start to view. He purposed a ministry which should be evangelic, which should be aggressive, and in which a prominent, if not a foremost, place should be given to the religious interests of the children. To that purpose he remained faithful amid all the complex of unanticipated work in which he became involved.

(1) It was with an *evangelic* ministry that Chalmers faced the new era. A hundred years ago it by no means went without saying that a Minister of the Church of Scotland would preach the Gospel. Chalmers himself for the first seven of his ministry at Kilmany was unaware that there was a Gospel to proclaim. He performed his ministerial duties as diligently as most "Moderates" of his day; but at most those duties sat on him lightly—their discharge cost him little, and was

without value to his parishioners. His discourses could be produced in a few hours on the Saturday, and his pastoral visits made no demand on his spiritual resources. The vials of his scorn were reserved for any demonstration of evangelical fervour. "The cant of enthusiasm, the effusion of zeal, the unintelligible jargon of pretended knowledge, are too often considered as the characteristics of a disciple of Jesus; whilst amid all these deceitful appearances, justice, charity, and mercy, the great topics of Christ's admonitions are entirely overlooked. . . . Let us tremble to think that anything but virtue can recommend us to the Almighty. He who has been rightly trained in his religious sentiments, by carefully perusing the Scriptures of truth, will learn thence that the law of God is benevolence to man, and an abiding sense of gratitude and piety." That extract may suffice to indicate the staple of Chalmers' preaching during the first six or seven years of his ministry at Kilmany. Looking back upon that time, when "Christ was hardly ever spoken of, or spoken of in such a way as stripped Him of all the importance of His character and His offices," he declared: "I am not sensible that all the vehemence with which I urged the virtues and the proprieties of social life, had the weight of a feather on the moral habits of my parishioners. And it was not until I got impressed by the utter alienation of the heart in all its desires and affections from God; it was not till reconciliation to Him became the distinct and prominent object of my ministerial exertions; it was not till the free offer of forgiveness through the blood of Christ was urged upon their acceptance, and the Holy Spirit given through the channel of Christ's mediatorship was set before them as the unceasing object of their dependence and their prayers . . . that I ever heard of any of those subordinate reformatations which I aforetime made the earnest and the zealous, but I am afraid at the same time the ultimate object of my earlier ministrations." How the great and abiding change took place in Chalmers in the course of a severe illness and a protracted

convalescence cannot be told here. Suffice it to say that, as soon as he was able to resume work, a total alteration was manifest in his preaching and all his intercourse with his parishioners. To arouse the ungodly, and to plead with all to give themselves up in absolute and entire dedication to the Redeemer, "these were the objects for which he was now seen to strive with such a severity of conviction as implied that he had *one thing to do*, and with such a concentration of his forces as to idle spectators looked like insanity." Opponents to his nomination for the vacancy at Glasgow did freely take up the cry that Chalmers was mad! The fact was that he had found the message which in the first age of the Church had been denounced as foolishness; and with that message, without abatement or compromise, he was prepared to face with unshakeable confidence the new era which was opening in 1815. Preaching a few years later in London he affirmed: "There is not one other expedient by which you will recover the olden character of England but by going forth with the gospel of Jesus Christ among its people. Nothing will subdue them but that regenerating power which goes along with the faith of the New Testament, and nothing will charm away the alienation of their spirits but the belief in the overtures of redeeming mercy."

(2) Dr. Chalmers' ministry was *aggressive*. With his transference to Glasgow he rapidly leapt to fame as a preacher. Crowds thronged to hear him at the Tron Church and later at St. John's. But he did not disguise from himself the fact that yet greater crowds of his parishioners never came within those Churches. It was clear to him that he must go to those who did not come to him. He determined to visit in one year, and did actually visit, every family in the populace of 10,000 committed to his charge. He obtained so a first-hand knowledge of the situation and the need. He found that "in many districts two-thirds of the adult population had cast the very form and profession of Christianity." It became clear to him that if the neglected plots were to be

brought under effective spiritual cultivation he must call to his aid a numerous band of fellow-labourers. The whole parish was parcelled out into districts of convenient size. To each district an Elder and a Deacon were appointed, charged with what amounted to pastoral oversight. With this agency (as it came to be called) of Elders and Deacons, Chalmers kept in close and constant contact; and meanwhile he carried out his own personal visitation of the districts in rotation. He laid the utmost stress upon this intercourse with the people of his charge. "This," he said, "is what I call preaching the gospel to every creature; that cannot be done by setting yourself up in a pulpit, as a centre of attraction, but by going forth and making aggressive movements upon the community, and by preaching from house to house." In connection with the visitation an evening address was given in each district. We are told that these "local week-day undress congregations assembled in a cotton-mill, or the workshop of a mechanic, or the kitchen of some kindly accommodating neighbour, with their picturesque exhibition of greasy jackets and unwashed countenances . . . had a special charm for Dr. Chalmers; and all alive to the peculiar interest and urgency of such opportunities, he stirred up every faculty that was in him while he urged upon the consciences and the hearts of such auditors the high claims of the Christian salvation." He believed in aggressive work, and he gave to it of his best.

If it be said that in this planning and doing Dr. Chalmers had the advantage of a Parish Minister, that is true. But it should also be said that he made a most uncommon use of his advantage; and further that in seeking out those who did not, or could not, come to him he followed a course which is assuredly open to every minister, whether established or free.

(3) The ministry of Dr. Chalmers gave a prominent place to the religious interests of the *children*. When he settled in Glasgow he was distressed to find that in his vast

parish not more than a hundred children were in attendance at the Sabbath schools. He forthwith devised a *local* Sabbath school system. The parish was divided into forty sections, with thirty or forty houses to each section. Teachers were put in charge of the several sections. The business of the teacher was to find as suitable accommodation as he could within his section, and then to visit every family, requesting the attendance of the children. "Instead of waiting for them to come to him, his part was to go to them, and induce the parents to send their children to the school." The plan of instituting these small local schools may seem too simple and even crude to those accustomed to more elaborate methods; but it was very effective. Within two years the scholars in attendance in Sabbath schools in the Tron parish rose from one hundred to twelve hundred. At a time when there is so marked a decline in the numbers of Sunday scholars it may be worth while to ask whether more may not be done in the way of taking schools to the scholars, and of seeking scholars for the schools.

Dr. Chalmers manifested unflinching interest in the work of "those humble and often despised seminaries." Monthly meetings of the teachers were held; and at these meetings, spite of thronging demands on his time and activity, he made a point of being present. "Our meetings," one of the teachers has left on record, "were very delightful. I never saw any set of men who were so animated by one spirit and whose zeal was so steadily sustained. The doctor was the life of the whole. There was no assuming of superiority; every one was free to make remarks or suggestions, Dr. Chalmers ever the most ready to receive a hint or a suggestion from the youngest or least experienced member. Although we had no set forms of teaching, yet we conversed over all the modes that we might find out the best." Chalmers was certain that his schools were suited to the needs and circumstances of the population, and that they might be made "to open up a way through a mass that would

be otherwise impenetrable." His heart was set upon the penetration of the unchristianised masses—which are with us still, only vaster—and with that end in view he spared neither thought nor effort to sustain a perfect ministry to the children.

Root Culture.

By Rev. W. J. ACOMB.

"I shall dig about it.—Luke 13, 8.

In this parable of the fruitless fig tree the cultivator intends to resort to root-pruning. What is wrong with the tree lies at the root rather than in the branches.

The efficiency of root-pruning was as well known to the ancients as it is to the moderns. They understood perhaps better than we, the proper treatment to apply to an irresponsible fig tree—a tree as common with them as an oak or elm with us.

Touching the process: a considerable trench is opened all round the tree, the grosser roots are severed, the whole mass detached from the cold, barren subsoil, the fibrous root-lets lifted nearer the warm surface, and embedded in generous fruit forming nutriment. Then the trench is filled up.

There is much in human life analogous to all this. A fruitless life is a blot on the moral landscape, a grief and offence to the Lord of the Vineyard, Who regards it expectantly, and complains reasonably. Planted amid congenial, favoured surroundings, growing to waste in wild energy year after year, it proves "unprofitable" to all most interested. Root pruning is the only remedy for such a life. Radical measures must be resorted to. It is not by manipulating *the branches* of a fruitless tree that it can be brought to fulfil its mission. It is not with an imperfect life a matter of

external ecclesiastical culture, reducing its habit and manner to this or that pattern, but is clearly a case for root-pruning, —root-pruning vigorous and severe.

When the roots of the physical constitution are wrong, we are unhealthy. When our root principles are wrong, we are immoral. When our root habits are wrong, we are in a bad way. When our root relationships are wrong we cannot prosper. It is clear that to rectify such a life it must be revolutionized. Nothing short of this will suffice. Many of our plans fail because not directed to the root of the disease. The fruit grower loses time by experiments in limb pruning, and syringing, and top dressing, while the roots of his tree stagnate at zero in wet clay. So we miss the mark by the superficial treatment of a lost soul. It is often a case for the surgeon rather than for the therapist. Nothing short of drastic measures are adequate for certain cases.

Suffer a few illustrations. Look at this Bon-Chrétien pear tree, once a sure cropper, now a cumberer of the ground, with its roots deep among the hungry, non-organic material, fit only for road making. Look at this vine, once vigorous, prolific, yielding a harvest of sloe-black Madresfield grapes, now sluggish, anæmic, reluctantly contributing a quota of fox-red fruit, mostly given to our poorer neighbours. Its roots have penetrated a sewer for fifty yards or more.

Life is full of this sort of thing. Look at this Christian—on this picture, and on that. Once a devoted disciple full of all goodness and sweetness; now cold, distant, negligent.

Roots have got into rationalistic literature, or, maybe, suspicious, “sources of gain, or doubtful social relationships. Conversion makes men upright, but they seek out many inventions, now, as in all the centuries.

National rootage may well be inquired into, as the Lord’s parable had this application. India can hardly expect to be healthy and tranquil while her revenue is so largely derived from the odious opium traffic. Lay the axe to the root of the tree! Japan, too, that promised so well, has

discovered the fatal mistake that her most intelligent student life is being rooted and grounded in the poisonous mud-flats of Nietzsche's philosophy. "It is a mad world, my masters!"

When our roots are right there will accrue health, fruitfulness, beauty—a consummation devoutly to be wished. To this end the cultivator of souls devotes his energies. The work of the minister must be largely concentrated (in many instances) upon barren lives. He must cut through the roots which wrongfully feed or starve the life, and encourage growth derived from resources nearer the sun-warmth of Heaven.

Root pruning must *precede* enrichment. To heap advantages upon an undisciplined life is to aggravate the evil. When the roots are pruned, then the enrichment will avail. The prophet complains that the more God had done for the Jewish nation the greater had been their scorn of Him. To highly manure a rank growing tree is to produce leaves, but not fruit. It is the sober tree which is most fruitful—the one which has, in its own way, learned the lesson that the whole duty of a fruit tree is to produce fruit. Leafage is all right. It acts as lungs to the tree, adds beauty to the landscape, affords shelter to a hundred song ministrants, but after all, the mission of a fig, or any other fruit tree, is not accomplished until fruit, luscious and ripe, gladdens the eye of the cultivator.

The Meaning of a Retreat.

By THE EDITOR. (Written by request.)

The introduction of the Retreat Movement into the Free Churches is a sign of the times. It possesses a significance which demand the most careful consideration of all Christian ministers. Hitherto we have known "quiet days," some of which have been distinguished for their excessive chattering. The "quietness" has been their least marked feature. But for a long time there has been growing a sense of the need of something much deeper than that which a "quiet day" supplies. Outside the Church we have seen the rise of "New Thought" and "Christian Science" and kindred cults with their insistence upon mental control. These cults ought not to have arisen; that for which they stand, so far as it is true, should have been provided by the Church. The Roman Church has made such a provision in its "retreats" held for clergy and laity. The Anglican Church quickly followed the Roman way. And that, for some of our Free Churches, is the very reason why we should avoid it. But surely this is unwise. Why should the idea of a "retreat" be regarded with suspicion simply because it has hitherto been a "Catholic" monopoly? The sole question for us to settle is whether or not the "retreat" meets a real need of our spiritual life. And I for one believe that it does, and further, that it can be better expressed by Free Churchmen than by Catholics.

One distinguishing feature of our age is its lack of self control; its inability to enter into the depths of the things that matter *and remain there* for any length of time. And that feature characterizes the "Church" as well as the "world." To be quiet, to enter into ourselves, to compel the thoughts to cease from wandering, to bring all the faculties of the soul into a single unity and fix them upon

God is absolutely necessary if the powers of the Spiritual life are to be preserved from wastage and augmented to the greatest advantage. The "Retreat" aims at this grand goal. It is not a period of simple stillness, it is a period when stillness is organised, directed, focussed. For this purpose the "retreat" must of course, be not simply personal but corporate, social. And *it must have a leader*-- one who can bring souls together into a common focus. He must know souls, allow for the differences between souls, and find the common denominator between them all, and make all share *that* anew with the added force begotten of corporate communion. The last thing a retreat leader should do is to preach or to exhort or to clude. But he *must probe* and that not by speaking of specific sins, so much as by bringing the soul into the Light where all things are seen in their true character and proportions.

The retreat must be orderly, graded, progressive. It needs to be carefully prepared for. And one leader alone should see the retreat through from beginning to end. No second person should interfere, save in rare instances, and then only by harmonious arrangement with the first leader. Those who come to retreats must make up their minds to be led. If they cannot do that it is better to remain away. The leader must be trusted implicitly. If he be a man whom all can trust in advance there will be no difficulty. Then there needs to be self control in the meetings. Silence, absolute silence, when imposed, *must* be not only endured, but gladly accepted. The body must be compelled to obey the spirit. *Kneeling* seems to me to be essential for meditation. It will probably be painful to the flesh, but think of the compensation!

Then there should *be no criticism* of anything that has taken place. It is here that self control will be evidenced. Gossip, or criticism at the end of a solemn soul retreat. Think of it!

And the amount of food consumed at the retreat should

be reduced to the minimum. All that tends to make men drowsy or to interrupt the élan of the soul should be guarded against.

The retreat, if properly conducted, and properly "assisted" at, is capable of doing untold good.

Appended is a list of helpful books bearing upon Retreats.

Books helpful in preparing for Retreats.

NOTE.—There is practically no Protestant literature upon the subject of retreats. The Romans and Anglicans have been and are, the acknowledged masters in this art. Their books need reading by us with the greatest care. There is much chaff with their wheat. But wise men will know how to winnow.

ROMAN BOOKS.

The finest all-round book on the entire subject is in French. *Le Prêtre* (Berthier) 1248 pages—8/6. Delhomme & Briguët, Lyon.

*The Spiritual exercises of St. Ignatius (Bellegio's edition with comments)—1/-.

Retreats, by John Morris, S.J. (Burns & Oates)—3/6.

Joseph Rickaby, "Waters that go softly" (Burns & Oates)—3/6.

Reginald Buckler "A Spiritual Retreat" (Burns & Oates)—3/6.

*Faber, "All for Jesus."—2/6.

Fr. Plater, S.T., "Retreats for the People."
(Sands & Co.)

ANGLICAN BOOKS.

*The Missioner's Handbook, Paul Bull (C.R.) (Grant Richards)—2/6., invaluable.

*Heffer, "The fellowship of Silence."—4/-.

*Heffer, "The fruits of Silence."—4/-.

Treasury of Devotion (Carter). Longman's.—1/6.

Maturin, "Principles and practices of the Spiritual life."—2/6.

Maturin, "Laws of Spiritual life."—2/6.

*Law, "Serious Call."—1/-.

*Baxter, "Reformed Pastor."—1/-.

OTHERS.

*"Guiding Hand of God," Rendell Harris—1/6.

*"Open Secret," Horton.—1/6.

*Fosdick on "Prayer" (Students' Union).—1/6. (One of the finest books on prayer ever written).

W. J. Dawson, "Evangelistic Note," (preface)—3/6.
A remarkable revelation of a preacher's soul.

"Power of Silence" (Dresser).—1/-.
Guy & Hancock.
(A "new thought" book, containing many fallacies, but worth reading for its insistence upon the need of self control).

Henry S. Lunn, M.D., "Retreats of the Soul."—1/-.

Prayer Union Notes.

By Rev. J. W. EWING, M.A., D.D.

The need of prayer is being brought home to thousands of hearts just now, and to none more than to the ministers of the Gospel, who are daily face to face with the strain and sorrow and perplexity caused by the War. Life is seen to be uncertain, the world a transient thing, and its glory a fading splendour. There is thus a cry for the deeper reality, a hunger for the bread of the soul on which we may live ourselves, and which we may confidently hand on to others.

The trend towards prayerful fellowship and deepening spiritual experience is making itself evident in various denominations. The Congregational ministers of London have held some memorable meetings of late, in which the power of God has been felt, and men have been humbled in the August Presence.

The Baptist ministers of the Capital, too, in their meetings at Bloomsbury lately, were visited by a breath of the Heavenly Wind, and went away with a quickened sense of the nearness of the Lord and the glory of His service.

In the Summer gatherings of the London Baptist Association, also, there was expressed a longing for a closer contact of soul with soul, and of man with God; with the result that the ministers resolved to meet alone every quarter, in order that they might pour out their hearts freely before the Lord, and speak without reserve to one another about the things which are deepest and most sacred. Everywhere is a thirst for God becoming manifest.

At such a time there is surely a special call to members of the Prayer Union to be urgent and constant in prayer—not only for themselves, but for their brethren, and for the Churches and the land we love. Even for England, the man of prayer with his vision of eternal things, can do more in the hour of trial than most men realise.

In these circumstances I take as my devotional classic for this issue, "The Private Devotions" of Bishop Andrewes, a book which for 300 years has fed the spiritual life of innumerable ministers of Christ.

Lancelot Andrewes was born at Barking in 1555. Educated at the Merchant Taylors' School and at Cambridge University, he became Vicar of St. Giles', Cripplegate, and later Dean of Westminster, and Bishop in succession of the Sees of Chichester, Ely and Winchester. He was one of the Chaplains of Queen Elizabeth; he assisted in the coronation of James I., and his name appears first on the list of scholars appointed to prepare the Authorised Version of the Bible. He was one of the great preachers of his day and a writer of no little mark, but his renown arose chiefly from his saint-

hood, and his most enduring monument is his "Private Devotions."

The prayers of Bishop Andrewes are distinguished by their use of Scripture. Andrewes knew the Divine word deeply, and used it with singular appositeness in pleading with God. Every petition and every thanksgiving roots itself in some portion of Holy Writ.

Another feature of the prayers is their unveiling of the human heart. In sounding the depths of his own, Andrewes has unbared the universal heart. In his confessions one sees oneself, and in his cries to God one finds the expression of the desires one knew not how to utter.

But nothing, perhaps, is more characteristic of the "Devotions" than their comprehensiveness. Here is a man who is no recluse, but in close touch with his brother-men, aware of their thousand needs, and bearing them all, like Israel's high priest, upon his breast to God.

It is good to know that his contemporaries saw in the life of Andrewes the rich fruit of his secret prayers, and that, when in 1626 he passed into the higher sanctuary, it was widely recognised that a great light had passed from the earthly sky.

The greater part of the "Private Devotions" consists of prayers for the seven days of the week. On the First Day Andrewes begins with Praise—for the light of the sun, the glory of the Word, and the splendour which breaks forth upon us from the person of the Risen Saviour. Then follows the note of Confession. A penitent heart, echoing the deep note of the psalms, presents its plea, touched often with anguish.

"Merciful and pitying Lord,
Longsuffering and of great compassion,

I have sinned, against Thee, Lord, I have sinned :
 Unhappy am I.
 Yet remember what I am,
 That I am the work of Thy hands,
 The Image of Thy countenance :
 The price of Thy blood,
 The sheep of Thy pasture,
 The son of Thy covenant."

Confession passed into dependence on the great Atonement.

"Look upon the face of Thy Messiah,
 And upon the blood of Thy Covenant,
 Upon the propitiation for the whole world."

At length the forgiven soul, liberated from care of self,
 goes out in intercession for all men.

"Remember, Lord,
 Infants and children,
 Youths and men,
 The hungry, the thirsty,
 The naked, the sick,
 The captives, the strangers,
 The homeless, the unburied,
 Those beset by the evil one and driven to despair.
 The prisoner and the bound,
 The condemned to die,
 Orphans and widows,
 The traveller by land or by sea,
 The mother in her travail,
 The convict and the slave.
 The sons of men shall take refuge
 under the shadow of Thy wings."

My edition of the "Private Devotions" is in Greek and Latin, on parallel pages, with Scripture references. It is the result of the ripe toil of Henry Veale, who at the age of 79 issued this, his only published work, as a true "labour of love." There are also several English editions.

Bishop Andrewes was a High Churchman, and some of

his views are not ours, but one cannot read his prayers without feeling their reality and being drawn nearer to God oneself. I have gone through the "Private Devotions" morning by morning with my Bible, and have found them among the greatest of all helps to the spiritual life.