

three times! Most unprejudiced teachers could supply similar cases.

“Heaven knows,” says a thoughtful writer, “our Sunday-schools need reform. . . . The Church of England’s extremity is apt to be the Dissenter’s opportunity; but if that Church will really rouse herself, she may yet keep a large majority of the young within her fold. The Sunday-school will be the key of the Church’s position in the near future. What is imperative to-day is better methods, better teachers, better standards of efficiency.” And the Church of England “expects every man to do his duty”!



### The Missionary World.

TRUTH alone is eternal, but certainly error dies hard. The man who objects to Christian Missions because he disbelieves in Christianity has logic at least on his side. But the challenge of which the last few weeks has seen a recrudescence in the daily press is only remotely connected either with logic or with facts. Sir Hiram Maxim—whom the *C.M. Review* terms, with some justice, “an impenitent critic,” seeing that it answered his strictures on Chinese Missions only last December—has been writing again. His letters in the *Morning Post* either generalize from individual instances, unidentified, and therefore unanswerable, or else make sweeping statements which prove either nothing or else absurdly much. If it be true, for instance, as Sir Hiram Maxim asserts, that for every Chinaman who becomes a Christian a thousand Chinamen lose their lives, then it is also true, as Sir Ernest Satow said at a missionary meeting immediately after, that the whole Chinese race would have been exterminated ere now. The challenge has been ably met by letters from missionary experts, citing testimonies from many men of knowledge and weight. But the most striking product of the controversy has been the

leader in the *Morning Post* of March 20, a powerful and closely-reasoned argument for Chinese Missions of permanent value. We hope it may be reproduced in some more lasting form. It goes far to fulfil its sure prediction that "the final result of the criticism will be a strengthening rather than a weakening of the cause."

\* \* \* \* \*

A recent issue of the *Daily Mail* gave nearly half a column to quotations from a book published in England by an educated Chinese, who is strongly adverse to the presence of Christianity in China, and scathing in his criticism of the mental equipment of missionaries. Those who can distinguish truth from error may gain a needed warning from his words, but the pity of it is that so many readers are absolutely at the mercy of such crude statements and wholesale condemnations. Are we doing what in us lies to bring the true facts about foreign missions effectively before the man who reads the daily paper and little else? Are we even using what has been tersely called "potted apologetic" to meet the "potted objections" in vogue? A twopenny pamphlet by Dr. Stock—"Don't Support Foreign Missions! Why not?"—issued by the C.M.S., deserves to be widely known. Welsh's "Challenge to Christian Missions"—to be had for sixpence—is excellent in parts. But the real need is deeper far. We want a Christianity which manifests the power of the Invisible to lift men everywhere above the material plane. The "plain man in the street" can estimate home results, even if he cannot readily realize foreign conditions. A vitalized Church at home is the one missionary apologetic that will appeal and move.

\* \* \* \* \*

Meantime, we turn from the challenge to the work of Missions and trace the news from China through the April magazines. The Baptist *Missionary Herald* gives us a sketch of a Chinese fair, a study of Chinese building methods and implements, a Chinese melody, a record of early work in a new station, and the doings of Chinese Christians in conference.

*The Bible in the World* (British and Foreign Bible Society), deals with "Tribes and Tongues of Western China," and tells a wonderful story of Mrs. Sie's Chinese New Testament. *China's Millions* gives columns of latest news from the wide fields of the China Inland Mission, able editorial notes, a striking article on "The Chinese Church and Independence," a private letter about the plague at Chefoo, and a record of baptisms in fourteen different provinces. The *C.M. Review* has an article by Bishop Molony, of Mid-China, on the work of the twenty Chinese clergy in his diocese, and an obituary notice of the senior among them who has just gone to his rest. The *C.M. Gleaner* gives the story of a Chinese Archdeacon. Both papers, and also *Mercy and Truth*, contain numerous incidents from China. *India's Women* (C.E.Z.M.S.), has an "In Memoriam" notice by a devoted missionary in China, and reports the opening of a women's hospital. The *L.M.S. Chronicle*, besides various incidents, has a vivid record of the fight for Chi-meng's soul, and a descriptive paper on checking Chinese demons. The *S.P.G. Mission Field* has a note on the plague in North China, written by one of their missionaries "from a third-class railway carriage at Harbin, where he has been living." The *U.F. Missionary Record*, besides a reference to the heroic death of Dr. Jackson, gives "A Visit to a Doomed City"—Harbin—written by a doctor, in which the following statement is made :

"In our recent Council meetings the medical missionaries felt bound to advise the withdrawal of all who were not likely to be actively engaged in the work of battling with the epidemic. . . . Man, after man, and—what was finer—woman after woman, declared they would not leave their native brethren and sisters in this the time of their visitation . . . in our common manhood we quietly gave thanks in our hearts for such a spirit."

Last, but not least, among our April papers, comes the *Wesleyan Foreign Field*, with a sketch of work at a station in Hunan—11,995 miles by waterways from headquarters—and of a "happy Christmas" at Wusueh. We should like Sir Hiram Maxim to read all these. At least we would commend to his

notice the following summary of the progress of Missions in China, which we take from *China's Millions* :

"The first issue (1910) of 'The China Mission Year-Book,' edited by the Rev. Donald MacGillivray, D.D., contains an interesting table of statistics of the work of Protestant Missions in China for 1908-1909, which we summarize as follows :

Missionary Societies	...	...	...	91
Foreign missionaries (including medical missionaries —217 men and 66 women)	...	...	...	4,299
Chinese workers (including 487 ordained pastors)	...	...	...	11,661
Stations (670 with resident missionary)	...	...	...	3,485
Primary schools	...	...	...	2,029
Scholars	...	...	...	45,730
Intermediate, high schools, and colleges	...	...	...	1,116
Students	...	...	...	34,064
Number of congregations	...	...	...	2,341
Baptized Christian community	...	...	...	195,905
Catechumens	...	...	...	49,172
Total Christian community	...	...	...	278,628
Chinese contributions to Church	...	...	Mex. \$298,687.56	
Hospitals	...	...	...	170
Dispensaries	...	...	...	133
In-patients	...	...	...	45,188
Out-patients	...	...	...	197,011

"These figures indicate that since the Martyr Year (1900) there has been a quite remarkable progress in the work of Protestant Missions in China. During the past ten years, as will be seen by a comparison of the statistics given by Professor Harlan Beach in 'The Hills of T'ang' and the Year-Book mentioned above, the number of communicants has increased from 80,682 to 195,905; day schools have grown from 1,766 to 2,029, and pupils from 30,046 to 45,730; higher institutions of learning from 105 with 4,285 pupils, to 1,116 with 34,064 students. Foreign mission workers have increased from 2,461 to 4,299, and Chinese mission-workers from 5,071 to 11,661. Truly 'the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church.'"

\* \* \* \* \*

Dr. Weitbrecht's article in the *C.M. Review* on the Lucknow Conference on Missions to Moslems should be carefully read. The whole situation is full of significance—so great that a realization of it would stir the Church to action forthwith. The changes in the Moslem world since the Cairo Conference was held five years ago are startling in their extent. There has been no parallel change in the attitude of the Christian Church towards Islam.

How many persons—even ardent Scotsmen—have read through eight numbers of the *Missionary Record* of the United Free Church of Scotland in one afternoon, and felt some impatience at having to wait for the issue of a ninth? To ensure efficient survey of missionary progress, it is well now and then to take a selected topic and trace it through several numbers of one magazine. This is a somewhat severe test of the editor's sequence of thought and of the purpose and policy of the organization concerned. In the special case before us the test has been met. The reticent and closely-printed official organ of the United Free Church of Scotland is not attractive to the outward eye; but it offers itself as a good basis for an investigation of the influence of the Edinburgh Conference upon existing missionary work. Is that influence waning or deepening ten months after date?

\*                    \*                    \*                    \*                    \*

The August number of the *Missionary Record* contains a varied account of the lessons and impressions of the Conference—many a great Scotsman felt, with Professor Cairns, “the widening of the whole horizon before him and the clearing of the heavens overhead.” We find a sub-committee appointed by the Foreign Mission Committee to “see what could be done to diffuse the influence and stimulus of the Conference through the Church.” In September, together with further reports of the Conference, we read that “the Foreign Mission Committee is addressing itself very seriously” to the whole question, with “a full realization of the critical importance of a wise and strenuous and adequate campaign.” In the October number, the Moderator, Professor Denney, and Professor Cairns add fuel to the kindling fire. The conviction of shortcoming and inadequacy is strongly expressed. In November we find record of a significant conference of from 200 to 300 delegates, representing the various United Free Church agencies and presbyteries—a gathering full of purpose and humility. In this number begins a series of able summaries of the Edinburgh Reports. In December we find another summary of a report,

and another conference, summoned this time by the Women's Foreign Mission Committee. A big project begins now to emerge—based partly on a survey of the needs of the United Free Church Mission-Fields undertaken before the Edinburgh Conference—for a series of conferences “in all the presbyteries of the Church.” “The Scottish mind,” said a leading speaker, “works slowly, but it holds what it gets.” This is the record to the close of 1910.

\* \* \* \* \*

In the January number, it is clear the movement is gathering force. We find a summary of a third report; a vigorous article on the Layman's Missionary Movement, now well-rooted in Scotland, and a lively outbreak of suggestion and response. “The whole Church is facing the Forward Movement with expectation and hope.” An editorial note is headed “The Awakening of Interest.” Under the title “Our Forward Movement,” we find a well-ordered enterprise set forth. The missionaries, after careful survey of actual needs, appeal for ninety-nine new missionaries “as an irreducible minimum.” The Foreign Mission Committee, admitting the justice of the claim, set before themselves and the Church “as a policy, the immediate sending forth of twenty-five men and fifteen women,” involving “an increase in our congregational Foreign Mission contributions of £10,000 per annum—as an *urgent first instalment*,” both of missionaries and of means. The possibility—or impossibility—of this is faced, and results in a solemn call to prayer. Then follows a stirring record of what individuals, sessions, groups of congregations, and presbyteries are already being stirred to do, and of what is actually happening as the *Record* goes to press. In February “Our Extension Movement” carries on the inspiring tale. Of the “Call to Prayer,” 250,000 copies have been issued; the Foreign Mission Committees (men's and women's) have invited *all* presbyteries to organize conferences. “As we go to press many are devising ways.” Glasgow has already held a great gathering, to which 158 congregations sent official delegates. In another presbytery,

the resolutions passed have been printed, and a copy *sent to every family*. The closing paragraph is fine :

“What does it all mean? All this demands just so much as is required for the fulfilment of our task. Nothing more, nothing less. It demands that our dear Church shall awake at last to a due sense of her responsibility to Christ her Head and to the wide world for which He gave His life; boldly because believingly, heroically because self-sacrificingly, taking up her great task and doing it. That is what it means. If the Church, having been brought to face this great task, takes it up and performs it, not turning away, then it will be done, and there will come down blessing unspeakable to the Church and to the world. But if, having been brought face to face with the task, she shirks it, *that* will spell loss, and leanness of soul, and spiritual defeat; and from such a calamity the Church may well pray, ‘Good Lord, deliver us.’”

\* \* \* \* \*

In the March number we find still other conferences in other presbyteries, still endorsing a forward movement, still pledging themselves to support it, still sending copies of their resolutions through the kirk-sessions, “to every family.” Under “Our Responsibility,” it is urged that “the United Free Church is responsible for the evangelization of thirty millions of the heathen world.” Then comes this pregnant sentence: “We have told all the Churches of Christendom that this is our work, and the truth is that we are *not* doing it.” There is not much trace of waning interest yet!

\* \* \* \* \*

Now—at last—the April number is to hand. There is neither lessening of purpose nor of aim. The report on “The Preparation of Missionaries” is summarized by Miss A. H. Small (Principal of the United Free Church Women’s Missionary College), whose influence and whose ideals work widely amongst Anglicans of all schools of thought. Under “Our Extension Movement” there is an able paper on “The Call, and How to Answer It,” full of well-considered suggestion. It is evident that when the next General Assembly meets the United Free Church will have gathered force for a decision to go forward. It is this quiet, cumulative work which tells.

\* \* \* \* \*

The London Missionary Society are issuing a series of penny pamphlets on “The Lessons of Edinburgh.” Two of the

five now ready are so cogent that we cordially commend them for wider use: "The Need for a World Campaign," by Dr. Wardlaw Thompson, and "Our Sufficiency in God," by the Rev. Godfrey Phillips. The style is attractive, the arguments are impressive, the appeal is deep. We have seen nothing so likely to be of use amongst educated men. Except for the L.M.S. imprint, the two pamphlets are applicable to the needs of all Societies alike.

\*             \*             \*             \*             \*

The *Times* of April 1 records the formation of a Board of Study in Great Britain for the Preparation of Missionaries, as an outcome of the work of the Continuation Committee of the Edinburgh Conference. This is at once the goal of a long period of investigation and collaboration and the starting-point of a great endeavour. The members of the Commission dealing with Preparation came to the conclusion that no Society acting alone could adequately provide for the specialized training of its missionaries without overlapping and waste of expenditure and of force. Negotiations, now happily consummated, have been on foot to devise some means by which common action might be secured. The newly-formed Board is widely representative, and is receiving almost unanimous support from the Societies. Two of the C.M.S. delegates have seats on the Executive Committee. Its work should serve to increase knowledge of existing facilities, to advance schemes for specialized training at home and in the Mission-field, and to stimulate the production of necessary literature. Theological and ecclesiastical questions are expressly excluded from its sphere. We hail such wisely-directed joint action as one of the most hopeful results of the Edinburgh Conference. Though some expenditure is inevitable if the work is to be efficiently done, it will prove an economy in the end. The Board of Study should elicit our sympathy and support.

\*             \*             \*             \*             \*

Three days later—on April 4—the *Times* again had a note of interest—



"The International Continuation Committee of the World Missionary Conference will hold its first meeting from May 16 to 20 at Auckland Castle. The Committee, which consists of ten members each from America, the Continent, and Great Britain, will be the guests of the Bishop of Durham."

The Conference met at Edinburgh in a Presbyterian Assembly Hall. It is fitting that the first meeting of its Continuation Committee should receive hospitality in one of the historic centres of the National Church. The great men who have served their generation at Auckland would rejoice to see this day. The Committee has great and far-reaching projects before it. Let us pray.

G.



## Discussions.

### "THE PERMISSIVE USE OF THE VESTMENTS."

(*The Churchman, March, 1911, p. 169.*)

I UNDERSTAND that I am at liberty to make some reply to the courteous critics of my paper on "The Permissive Use of the Vestments." Mr. C. F. Russell goes with me a long way, but he pulls up in the usual place. He assumes that the Vestments in the minds of those who wear them imply disloyalty to Reformation principles, and so he has no difficulty in condemning them. But this assumption is the very thing against which I protested. It is no doubt true that those who use, or wish to use, Vestments take a somewhat different view of Eucharistic doctrine from those who resolutely oppose them. But the differences, whenever they have been examined, have been found to be less and less important than had been thought. They cannot be expressed by saying that the one party regards the Eucharist as a "sacrifice," while the other does not, for almost every view claims that the Eucharist is a sacrifice in some sense. The sense repudiated at the Reformation was that of a "propitiatory" sacrifice, and if Cranmer had held that the Vestments had this signification, as the Roman party asserted, and the counter-Reformation party still asserts, he would not have tolerated them for a moment, for he removed every suggestion of such a power in the English priesthood from his revised Ordinal. It is disappointing, then, to find Mr. Sydney Carter speaking of a "sacrificial" view of the Eucharist as though that expression conveyed an unambiguous and an untenable meaning. The Evangelical party would not, I am sure, wish to maintain that their view, what-