

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE CHURCHMAN

March, 1917.

The Month

Anglo-Catholic Theology. ARE we about to witness an approximation towards unity between the two great parties in the Church? We ask the question because we have been immensely struck by what seems to us the remarkable similarity of view in connexion with the Holy Communion to be found on the one hand in an article by the Bishop of Oxford in the February issue of the *English Church Review*, and on the other in the chapter on "The Sacramental Life" in the recently published Manual, *The Creed of a Churchman*. We give the two passages that our readers may compare them. First the Bishop of Oxford, who is the greatest living exponent of "Anglo-Catholic" theology:—

It is the doctrine of the Church, based on the teaching of the New Testament, that Christ is present in us. And the word "Christ" signifies the Eternal Son of God as incarnate. When we say that Christ is present in us we mean something more than that He is present in us as God, Who is present everywhere; and something more than that He is present in us by the gift of His Spirit. We mean that He is present in us also in respect of His sacred and glorified humanity. . . . It is, no doubt, the doctrine of the Church that the humanity of our Lord is not omnipresent. It is "circumscribed." . . . But in His Body the Church, and in every member of it, the presence of Christ means His presence in manhood as well as in Godhead.

The most cogent ground of this conviction is to be found in the Sacrament of Holy Communion. Christ had taught His disciples that they could only have eternal life through eating the flesh of the Son of man and drinking His blood, and so abiding in Him, as He in them (St. John vi. 53, 56); and no words could express more vividly participation in His humanity. Thus were they prepared in a measure for the institution of the Holy Sacrament, when He pronounced the bread to be His body and the wine to be His blood, and bade them eat and drink. These words "body" and "blood" must certainly mean His humanity. So the Church has believed that Christ is present in that Blessed Sacrament according to His humanity; and that by receiving His body or blood, under the humble form of bread or wine, they

receive Him, the incarnate Person, Who comes to dwell in them by an abiding union, mingling His humanity with theirs. It is thus that the Church is "the extension of the Incarnation," and the Holy Sacrament is the chief instrument of this extension. It is true that we are to receive the Blessed Sacrament again and again. In this way the method of the Divine bestowal is adapted to our human need for reiteration. But the purpose of the reiterated bestowal is that the gift of the inward presence may be perpetual in us : that He may dwell or abide in us, and we in Him.

This doctrine of the permanent presence of Christ in us in respect of His humanity, and of the Blessed Sacrament of the altar *as the special instrument by which this inward presence is effected*, has been the common Catholic doctrine.

The italics in the last two lines are our own, and we have so distinguished the words that they may be the more easily compared with similar words that we have italicized in the subjoined extract which is quoted from *The Creed of a Churchman* (pp. 84 and 85).

Just as the Bishop of Oxford represents the "Anglo-Catholic" School, so may the authors of that Manual *"The Creed of a Churchman,"*—the Bishops of Peterborough and Barrow, and the Revs. Cyril C. B. Bardsley, E. A. Burroughs, and E. S. Woods—be taken to represent the modern Evangelical School. The authors are jointly responsible for the whole Manual, and, therefore, for this passage from it:—

The life which is begun in Baptism is continued and nourished in fellowship with God. There are many aids to this fellowship : prayer, the study of the Bible, the services of the Church. But pre-eminent among them all is the Holy Communion, with its many aspects, one or other of which may come to the front according to the circumstances of life and the stage of spiritual experience which we have reached. It is first and foremost a commemoration ; "Do this in remembrance of Me." It is a kind of enacted picture—the bread broken and the wine poured out—of the event which has changed the history of the world—the death of Jesus Christ upon the Cross—the "one perfect and sufficient Sacrifice" offered on the Cross for the sins of the whole world. In it we make glad remembrance before God and man of the work of the great High Priest. Further, with this commemoration of the one great Sacrifice is blended the sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies. Such sacrifice can only be made when we have first identified ourselves with His sacrifice for us. This is made clear in our Service, where the act of reception precedes the act of self-consecration. It is inspiring to remember that since the Holy Ghost came down upon the Church at Pentecost not a Sunday has gone by without a Celebration of the Holy Communion taking place somewhere. The very fact of the Service, therefore, links us by a golden chain across the centuries to Calvary. The bread broken and the wine poured out *are the channels, the media, through which the supernatural life of the glorified Christ streams forth into His members*, cleansing their hearts, converting their wills, strengthening their characters. The Bread of Life is there to be taken and received by those who draw near to the Holy

Feast. The earthly minister alone is visible, but in reality the risen Christ is present in Person to bestow upon all who hunger and thirst for Him that Life which is Himself. In what way, or by what method, the elements of the bread and wine become to us the channels of His life—in what sense they are His Body and His Blood—the New Testament does not define, nor does our Church ever attempt to explain.

We make no comment upon either of these passages ; we are content to let them speak for themselves, but no one can mistake their significance.

The purpose of the Bishop of Oxford's article is "In the Tabernacle," very clear. It is written to show that "this doctrine, really apprehended and suffered to possess us, effectually tends to check the desire for a shrine of the sacred humanity, external to ourselves, the tabernacle or the monstrance, where we can adore Jesus Christ in His manhood and hold, as it were, external intercourse with Him." The need for pressing this view just now upon his friends is seen from the debate on "Reservation" which took place in the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury on February 9, to which we refer later. The Bishop is particular to emphasize his point of view, for he adds : "If I believe that He in His manhood is within me, as near to me as I am to myself, and that I can within the tabernacle of my own heart hold closest intercourse with Him in His glorified manhood, I shall indeed entertain the deepest reverence for the Blessed Sacrament, which is the instrument of this indwelling, and adore Him Who is there present, and I shall receive, as often as I may, by Holy Communion, the sacred presence within me ; but it seems to me almost impossible that, when I hold Him within me and am permanently joined to Him in His manhood, I should passionately desire the opportunity of greeting Him in the tabernacle under conditions in which He is obviously further from me and external to me, while at the same time I cannot see Him or hear Him as the first disciples could, 'in the flesh.' The closer and more intimate union with Christ within me must surely throw into the shade the external and more remote access."

"Really Catholic" or "Roman Catholic." "The external and more remote access"—these are strange words, and to many would seem to carry the idea of the transubstantiation of the elements. But no ; the Bishop of Oxford draws a sharp distinction between

the Roman Catholic and the "really Catholic" view of the Eucharist :—

Christ is, according to the Roman Catholic theologians, in His manhood locally in heaven and, supralocally, in the Host on earth. Receiving the Blessed Sacrament, the communicant has Him within himself. But not for a permanent spiritual presence, only for a few minutes, as a visitor. The ancient, really Catholic, doctrine of the Eucharist, admitting as it does that the outward and visible elements of bread and wine remain in their natural substances after the Eucharistic consecration, leaves them to go their natural way in the physical system, while the spiritual realities, the body and blood of Christ, of which they are the vehicle, go their spiritual way into the soul of the receiver, and so into his whole nature. But according to the Roman doctrine the bread and wine are transubstantiated into the body and blood. There remain only the body and blood under the outward species or appearances of bread and wine. And this only for a few minutes after the Sacrament has been received by a communicant. As soon as the process of digestion begins, a re-conversion takes place.

We have quoted this passage because it differentiates more clearly than we remember to have seen anywhere else between the Roman Catholic view and that held by those in the Church of England who are known as Anglo-Catholics. But the most important point is, What is the Bible view?

Reservation and Adoration. The Convocation debate on Reservation is painful reading. The Bishops in 1914 (before the war) agreed to allow Reservation for the Sick and for no other purpose whatsoever. It is now known that in numbers of churches the Reserved Sacrament is kept under such conditions that members of the congregation may, and do in fact, visit it and say their prayers before it. In some dioceses this is done with the tacit acquiescence of the Bishops, who apparently feel, as the Bishop of London said he felt, that "you might just as well have stood in Palestine in the path of 50,000 who thought our Lord was in a certain house, as resist what is at least the same number of people who wish to lay their burdens at His feet to-day." The illustration is sufficiently realistic, but it is extraordinary that an English Bishop could use it without qualification or protest. It is clear, of course, that the Bishops as a body could not tolerate such a wholesale repudiation of their regulations, and the Bishop of Oxford accordingly moved a resolution reaffirming their previous decision. A remarkable debate ensued. If there is one subject upon which the English Bishops might be expected to speak with united voice it is surely that of visits to and adoration of the Reserved Sacrament, but to

our surprise a very marked difference of opinion was manifested. No bishop voted against the Bishop of Oxford's resolution, but some abstained from voting altogether. Were they terrorized? Perhaps that is too strong a word to use, but they were certainly influenced by a Memorial, declared by the Archbishop of Canterbury to be "deplorable" in character, which had been sent round to the Bishops, signed by no fewer than one thousand priests, declaring that compliance with any restriction upon the faithful in the matter of devotion to the Reserved Sacrament "cannot rightly be demanded and will not be given." It is strange that such a disgraceful threat was not treated with the contempt it deserved.

We cannot congratulate the Convocations, and still less the House of Laymen upon their treatment of the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on the relations of Church and State. The Report has been in the hands of Churchmen since last June, yet in the sessions held in February—eight months afterwards—the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury had nothing whatever to say about it, and the Lower House referred it to a Committee for consideration and report without expressing one word of approval of the principle enshrined in the Report. But the discussion in the House of Laymen for the Southern Province was the feeblest of all. They passed a resolution to "receive" the Report, which might quite easily have been done at the special sitting held last November. Such weakness and ineptitude fill us with despair; they certainly go a long way to explain why it is the House of Laymen has never really won the confidence of the Church. In the Convocation of the Northern Province the Report was treated with more wisdom, but the resolutions did not go very far. The Church rarely gets much light or leading from its so-called "representative" bodies, and in this instance they have failed us absolutely. But the general body of Churchmen outside these sacrosanct bodies are studying the Report for themselves, and the more they study it the clearer they become that the scheme proposed, amended though it may need to be in some of its details, will effect a most salutary reform in the government of the Church of England.



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

A GREAT many theological, as well as other questions are practically decided by means of tacit assumptions. The present paper is an attempt to show that the question of the absolute necessity of Episcopacy at all times, and under all circumstances, has been frequently decided on such grounds. It will be our endeavour to examine the question not from later Ecclesiastical History, but from the contents of the Christian Scriptures, which have from the first been held in the Church to be very early and authentic records of the facts recorded in them.

Writers of the High Church school have been, as a rule, content to accept the verdict of the great eighteenth-century scholar Bentley on this matter. The Apostles, he says, were the earliest rulers of the Christian Church. The Bishops were their successors. With a commendable modesty, the first of these successors refused to take the title of those who were appointed to their work by Christ Himself. So they took one of the titles of the *second* order of the ministry—that of Bishop, leaving the other (Presbyter or Elder) to be retained by the second order. Thus the Episcopate was ordained from the very first, and the *name* of the Order only was changed. This is Bentley's argument. To it the contention has been added that Episcopacy was therefore a fundamental principle of the Universal Church, and that no community of Christians which is not under Episcopal rule can be a part of the Universal Church. To this yet another principle has been added in later times. The most clear and intelligible expression of this is found in the words of the hymn :

" His twelve Apostles first He made
His Ministers of grace ;
And they their hands on others laid,
To fill in turn their place."

It is unfortunate that the controversy on these three points has been on grounds rather ecclesiastical than Scriptural. As far as I know, it has never yet taken the form of an investigation into the earliest records of the Church of Christ. It has always commenced with the second century of the Christian era, or the last ten years of the first.

It should be noted that there are three assumptions here :—

1. That the Bishops of the sub-Apostolic age, i.e., the age which succeeded the death of the last of Christ's Apostles, exercised precisely the same functions as were exercised during their lives by the Apostles themselves
2. That Episcopacy was therefore a necessary condition of the existence of all local Churches, under all possible circumstances.
3. That no Bishop could, under any circumstances whatever, succeed to the Episcopate without the laying on of the hands of one or more persons who were themselves Bishops.

It will be seen that there is *no evidence whatever* for any of these propositions in the first two centuries. Yet if these propositions be necessary principles of Christ's Church, we shall expect to find them distinctly laid down by Christ, and proclaimed and acted upon by His Apostles. I think we shall find, on examination of the Acts of the Apostles and the Apostolic Epistles, that no such necessary principles were ever laid down there. And if that be the case, then, if amid the fierce struggles among Christians in later years any communities should have arisen which could not or did not fulfil these primary conditions, such communities cannot be pronounced to be outside the Covenant of Grace, or incapable of being regarded as parts of the Christian Church. I proceed to discuss these points in order.

1. *Were the duties of the Bishops in the second and following centuries precisely identical with those of the first Apostles of the Lord ?* To answer these questions we had better ask what those duties were. Of the original twelve (regarding Matthias as having taken from the first the place of Judas) we know very little. Ecclesiastical history tells us that some of them, in later years, preached the Gospel either to the heathen, or to Jews resident among the heathen. But all we know from the account of St. Luke is, that they remained in Palestine, and confined their ministrations to the converts from Judaism. But, strange to say, they seem to have exercised *no authority whatever* among the Jewish converts of St. Paul, though Peter is said to have gone *once* to Antioch, and to have taken part in the work of the Church there (Gal. ii. 11-15). Therefore we may take it that the whole of Christ's Church throughout the world, save Judæa, Samaria, and Galilee, was practically under the supervision of St. Paul alone. That he did exercise such a supervision, he states (2 Cor. xii. 28). But it is impossible to suppose that such

supervision was more than a *general* one. On matters of great importance we know that he received letters from the Churches, and either settled difficulties himself or sent others with authority from him to settle them. In *two* cases, as we shall find later on, he delegated his authority to others. But if it is contended that he discharged the duties of the Bishops of later days, we must ask whether he confirmed all the young people, ordained all the clergy, and took part in the consecration of the Bishops (as we now understand the word), if there were such Bishops in his days. That he did, sometimes, at least, "ordain elders in every Church" is clear from Acts xiv. 23. But this must refer to Galatia only (supposing, as seems most probable, that the *Roman province* is meant). It is not said that at Philippi, Thessalonica or Athens, elders were ordained. The Greek word translated *ordain*, let it be remembered, seems rather to indicate *choice by show of hands* rather than the *laying on* of hands. In the case of the Thessalonian Church (see 1 Thess. v. 12), its members had evidently been placed under *some* superintendence, though probably¹ informally. It must not be forgotten that the Apostle's stay at Thessalonica was very short indeed—probably under a month. Of course, during his stay at Corinth and later, at Ephesus, he could, and possibly did, ordain Presbyters. But did such ordinations by him continue after he had left Corinth and Ephesus? Was he ever consulted about them? Of this there is no evidence. If St. Paul did ordain elders, and confirm the baptized when *resident* in a place, and we know that he once did the latter at Ephesus (Acts xix. 1-7), it does not necessarily follow that he, and *no one else*, did the work which is now entrusted to Bishops. How, for instance, did St. Paul manage to confirm the young, and ordain Presbyters for all the Gentile Churches from Antioch to Rome during his two years' imprisonment in Judæa, and during the two years' imprisonment at Rome (Acts xxiv., xxviii.)? Were the candidates for Ordination and Confirmation sent to him? Or did he ordain one or more Missionary Suffragans, and sent them round the world to fulfil the duties which he could not fulfil himself? Of course he *might* have done so. But how is it that we never get so much as a hint in the Scriptures of such a fact for the guidance of future

¹ If I use the word "probably" here, it is because we have no definite evidence how the superintendents were appointed.

ages? And if St. Paul did not, and could not do this, who did? Then, again, there is the case of the Roman Church, which has always been a *crux* to the advocates of the rigid theory of Episcopacy. That Church was not founded by an Apostle. St. Paul addresses to it one of his longest and certainly his most important Epistle before he had ever been there. He does not describe it as a body of believers which, in consequence of its having no ministers who had received Episcopal Ordination, was as yet no part of the Universal Church of Christ. On the contrary, he describes its members as "called to be Jesus Christ's," as "beloved of God," and "called to be saints" (i. 6, 7). He does not, it is true, happen to call it a "Church." But what more could he say (or *does* he say), of other churches (or, as the Greek word is also correctly translated, "congregations") than he says of the disciples at Rome? Yet the Roman Church at that time could only have consisted of individual Christians—some of whom had possibly been living there since the first Whit-Sunday (Acts ii. 10—"sojourners from Rome," R.V.), and who had organized themselves into a community for worship and works of mutual loving-kindness. The Apostle Paul never hints that the Roman branch of the Church universal was in any sense inferior to any other local Church throughout the world. It is true that he does say that he desires to visit them in order that he may "impart unto them some spiritual gift," and this has been explained as meaning that he would impart proper form to that which, at the moment he was writing, must be considered "*without form, and void.*" He may, of course, have *meant* this. But he does not *say* it. And if he does not say it, and say it explicitly, it can be no necessary "principle of the doctrine of Christ."

That our Church, in her Ordinal, rightly states that diocesan Episcopacy was from the very first recognized in the Church, must be admitted. Every mention of James, "the Lord's brother," in the Acts, speaks of him just as we should speak of any diocesan Bishop now (Acts xii. 17; xv. 13; xxi. 18; also Gal. ii. 9, 12, and note that James takes *precedence* of Peter and John). It may safely be assumed that no presbyters would be ordained without his sanction. Therefore, to speak lightly of an institution which is nearly as old as Christianity, and which, at a very early period, was adopted in the mother of all Churches, is clearly inadmissible. But it is one thing to speak with reverence of the

Episcopate as a primitive institution, and quite another to insist that no body of Christians anywhere which does not possess Bishops who can specify every link in the chain of Episcopal consecrations going back from the present time to that of the Apostles can, under any circumstances whatever, be recognized as a part of Christ's Church. Again, there can be no doubt that Timothy and Titus, who were sent by St. Paul to Ephesus and Crete, exercised there the precise functions which local Bishops have exercised from the second (or, looking at the example of St. James, we might say the first) century of the Christian era to the twentieth. But this is not to affirm the proposition to which I have just taken exception. For (1) it is never said that St. Paul *consecrated* them to the Episcopate, as we now understand the word; (2) we have no contemporary evidence that their commission was a *permanent* one,¹ and (3) there is no evidence that the Diocesan Episcopate was established before the concluding years of the first century (and therefore long after the death of the Apostles Peter and Paul) *except at Jerusalem*. Once more, therefore, the rigoristic theory of Episcopacy comes before us, not as a *principle*, but as an *inference*.

Our last point under this head will be the theory that the angels of the Churches in Revelation ii. iii. were their Bishops. No doubt a very vast number of high authorities can be pleaded for this opinion. Still, it is but an opinion, and cannot possibly be represented as a fact. It is clearly a perfectly reasonable view to take of the angels of the seven Churches that they were angels in the ordinary sense of the term, spiritual beings who were entrusted with a mystic supervision of those Churches. When we remember that the Apocalypse is full of references of all kinds to angelic ministrations it cannot be altogether unreasonable to suppose that among them the superintendence of the Churches of God might find a place. Once more, then, it is clear that *no one has a right to assume* that by the time the Apocalypse was written (about 95 A.D.), each of the Churches named in the letters was under the supervision of a Diocesan Bishop. *Probable* it may be, *certain* it most clearly is not.

J. J. LIAS.

¹ The words "Tychicus I sent to Ephesus" (Tim. iv. 12 R.V.) seems clearly to indicate that, as the Apostle (vv. 9-11) urgently needed Timothy to minister to his various needs, he had sent Tychicus to Ephesus to fill Timothy's place there during the absence of the latter.

(To be concluded.)

The Place of the Lord's Supper in Divine Worship.

AN ADDRESS GIVEN BY THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER AT THE CHURCH HOUSE, WESTMINSTER, ON JANUARY 30.

THE place of the Lord's Supper in Divine worship depends ultimately on our conception of worship. For not only is worship anterior in point of time to the institution of the Lord's Supper, but it is also the larger and wider category in which the Lord's Supper must find its place. It is, of course, not only conceivable, but very probable, that our Lord instituted this ordinance with the express purpose of amplifying and clarifying our conception of worship. But it is not supposed by any one that it was His intention that it should supersede and abolish all other forms of worship. Private prayer, family prayer and even congregational prayer may be offered without any celebration of the Eucharist. However great the value that we assign to this particular service, it is one of many means of approach to God. It must, therefore, be in its essence and conception subject to the general laws which govern the access of man to his Maker.

Now, it is admitted by all that it rests with God and with God alone to prescribe the terms and modes upon and through which we, as sinful beings, and by sin cut off from communion with Him, may yet be restored to such communion. There is also a widespread, though not unanimous, consent, through many ages and races of mankind, that sacrifice is an essential condition of right approach to God. For the purposes of our inquiry we may accept this consent or instinct as true, for it is not at this point that difficulties about the Lord's Supper arise. It is also agreed that the only true and effective Sacrifice by which man can offer worship acceptable to God is the Sacrifice wrought once for all by our Lord Jesus Christ upon the Cross of Calvary. But the cleavage arises at this point. Is that Sacrifice upon the Cross efficacious for all times to all who rest their faith on it, so that no repetition or re-presentation of it is in harmony with the Will of God, or is it ordained by God that this Sacrifice should be repeated, as the Roman Catholics teach, or re-presented, as Anglo-Catholics teach, and be of avail with God, only, or at all events most effectively, through such

repetition or re-presentation? If the former view is true, two consequences follow :

1. The access of each sinner to God is direct, and is not mediated by any human agency.

2. The condition of access is a spiritual condition, namely, faith which is not a bare assent to intellectual propositions, but a relation between God and the soul, carrying with it certain moral consequences, commonly called fruits.

If the latter is true, it would follow that :

1. No true sacrifice can be offered except through a priesthood ordained by God.

2. The sacrifice rightly offered has an efficacy independent of the faith of the worshippers, if a rightly ordained priest has the right intention.

It is here that our whole conception of worship is called into play and tested. For it is in fact this conception which largely determines men in their choice between these two views, more than the arguments commonly adduced in support of them. Judged on their merits as purely rational arguments, the Scriptural pleas urged on behalf of an order of priests ordained by Christ to repeat or re-present His Sacrifice upon the Cross are utterly unconvincing. The evidence is scanty, and the whole of it admits of another and perfectly natural explanation. The same is not true of the other class of views. However much preconceptions may lead men to embrace them, they do find very adequate support in the New Testament. But the mind which demands that Christ should have established an order of sacrificing priests, and a continuation of His Sacrifice, will have no difficulty in satisfying itself that the Scriptural pleas are sufficient, at all events when supplemented by tradition. Nor is the mind which makes this demand abnormal. On the contrary, the primary and elemental laws of worship are found historically to demand (1) the establishment of right relations with God by means of sacrifice, and (2) habitations of the Deity on earth, where He manifests Himself to His worshippers through the medium of external objects, so that these objects themselves become entitled to veneration. The only voice—if we except the few Atheists of the old world—the only voice raised in protest against these conceptions was that of the Hebrew prophets. Their **insistence (1) on the inefficacy of any sacrifice that man could offer,**

and (2) on the truth that the Almighty dwelt, not in temples made by hands, but in humble and contrite hearts, was, and always has been; unwelcome to popular theology. The prophetic teaching has seemed cold and unlovely. It does violence to two of the strongest instincts of human nature in its relations with God, violence to the desire of man to make atonement in some shape or form for his own sins, and violence to his desire to stimulate his religious emotions by æsthetic accessories. The Puritanism of the prophets never has been, and never will be, popular, and it must fail if it is to be judged before the tribunal of the *orbis terrarum*. But that tribunal is not quite so secure as it imagines itself to be.

It condemned the Christ once at least, and has, it may be, rejected Him more than once since that first condemnation.

Still, to those who carry these two instincts into their worship, there is no doubt that the Eucharist will furnish a full satisfaction of their ideal of worship, interpreting the service as they interpret it. For in it man approaches God with an objective sacrifice in his hands. That the sacrifice is not costly matters little. Its nature is such that it must compel the mercy of the Almighty Father, seeing that it is the Sacrifice of His dearly beloved Son. It is offered by the hierarchy whom Christ appointed for the purpose of offering it. The Roman Catholic claims that he is repeating the Sacrifice, and that it is propitiatory. The Anglo-Catholic claims that as Christ is for ever presenting it to the Father, so he, the earthly priest, is re-presenting it on earth, and hesitates, though he does not quite refuse, to call it propitiatory. He believes that by his act he is making an appeal which influences the Father. The principle of a material sacrifice offered by man is there, and the necessity for an earthly hierarchy is there.

Further, the Eucharist satisfies the instinct of stimulating devotion by æsthetic accessories, for in it He Who is very God as well as very man, being invoked in the right way and by the right person, presents Himself under or through the consecrated Bread and Wine to be worshipped or venerated. The exact spot where He is, is known. No gestures, no prostrations, no richness of accompaniments of music or of scene can be too extravagant to greet Him, and to pay Him the honour which is His due. It is not the Upper Room in Jerusalem, nor even the Cross of Calvary which this holy Ordinance presents. The sanctuary (as it is called) of the Church has become

for the time an ante-room, or rather a Presence Chamber, of the Court of Heaven, and the King of Glory is there upon His Throne. "Let all the earth stand in awe of Him." That is worship at its highest to this class of mind, and the fascination of it is unquestionable. It is adoration of an objective and localized Presence of the Deity manifested in or through the medium of sensuous objects.

What is more, the devotion of worshippers will not let it rest there. Why should the courts of the sanctuary ever be robbed of the presence of their King? Why should He not be retained there always through the reservation of the consecrated elements upon the altar? Then the sanctuary would be always hallowed, prayers could always be offered in His Presence, and the heart rejoice itself in frequent adoration. It seems to me that the demand for reservation for purpose of adoration is an irresistible corollary of the Anglo-Catholic view of the Eucharist, and that the devotion of worshippers must in the end triumph over the timid reluctance of those in authority to accept the logical and devotional outcome of their own teachings.

But amid all this veneration what has become of the origin of this mystery—of the command, "Take, eat," "drink ye all of this?" The emotions excited by the appearance of the King upon His Throne have in fact carried us away from the Cross of Calvary. The consecrated elements have become associated with His glorified and no longer with His crucified body. We draw near to partake of material objects which are no longer purely material—objects so transformed by association with a spiritual Presence that no unbelief or unworthiness of the recipient can do away with that Presence. It is an awful responsibility under such conditions either to give or to receive. The priest may well shrink from admitting to Communion one whom he has not, after full confession, absolved; and the worshipper may well hesitate to press with his teeth and receive into his body Him Whom he has been worshipping. Solitary Masses and infrequent Communions are the logical outcome of Roman Catholic and Anglo-Catholic teachings.

That the practice of frequent Communion persists among Anglo-Catholics is due to teaching which they are rapidly outliving. It is a survival—a survival of the attempt to do honour to the Sacraments as a protest against those who were supposed to disparage

them. Now, a Sacrament is no Sacrament at all unless it is received.¹ The earlier Tractarians put the receiving of the Sacrament in the forefront of their teachings. They insisted on the reality of the gift received, but, following Hooker, were content to accept the Real Presence without defining the mode of that Presence. But the logic of Rome has been too strong for them, and the devotion of their less learned followers. These two wings of their body, the logical and the unlearned, have insisted on defining the Presence, on locating it on the Altar, and, in the elements, have insisted that an Altar means a sacrifice, and that the sacrifice is offered on earth as well as in Heaven. But the more the Sacrifice is taught, the more will the Sacrament be thrown into the background.

The prophetic conception of worship, on the other hand, while true in its main concepts, was not by itself adequate to the spiritual needs of man. The soul cannot subsist on negations. Let it be granted that man cannot offer acceptable sacrifice, nor build temples to contain the Almighty—let it be granted that His dwelling-place is the lowly and contrite spirit, of what use is this when the lowly and contrite are not to be found? The work of our Lord was to reveal, and Himself to make, the only Sacrifice that can be acceptable to God, and also to create out of sinful hearts a dwelling-place for the Almighty.

With that act of Sacrifice before Him, He of His great love instituted this holy Ordinance in the first place as a pledge to mankind for all time of the eternal efficacy of that Sacrifice. For if we dare to enter into speculations so lofty we must remind ourselves that for the Almighty time is not. In the eternal "Now" the act of reconciliation never has been, never can be, absent, the consent, that is, of the Eternal Son to be the sin-bearer of the world. The Sacrifice of the Cross was accepted in Heaven before it was offered on earth. The High Priest, after the order of Melchizedec, is without beginning or end of days. The thought of pleading the Sacrifice of Calvary before the Father thus becomes an unworthy conception of the Majesty on high. It was the Father's will, before the world was, that the Son should offer Himself, and it was the will of the Son so to offer Himself. We can add nothing to that; we cannot make that act in any way more vivid before God.

¹ "In such only as worthily receive the same have they a wholesome effect or operation" (Article XXV).

It is the sinner who needs the perpetual assurance of his Saviour's dying love, and to the sinner Christ gave it in the perpetuation of the Last Supper till He comes. Here is the pledge to man, that while he can offer no sacrifice acceptable to God, the Sacrifice that is acceptable has been offered once for all, and once for all accepted by Him, for the sins of the whole world. It is a mistake to speak of the Lord's Supper thus viewed as a mere institution or custom by which men remind and assure themselves of the love of God. It is rather like the bow in the heavens, God's reminder to man that though the world were to last for millenniums immeasurable, yet the love of God in Christ Jesus would never lose its power with God. We receive the bread, we drink the cup. But it is not we who speak to ourselves. It is God Who speaks to us—*i.e.*, to all who rightly receive, not to those who gaze, and the word spoken is the message of pardon and peace.

We rightly receiving the Bread and Wine, discern the Lord's Body, and all that His death and self-surrender are to us; we become partakers of His most precious Body and Blood. We spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood. We dwell in Christ, and Christ in us. We are one with Christ and Christ with us. Our faith rests once more on His perfect atonement, on the Lamb of God Who to all time taketh away the sins of the world. We have no plea for our sins, but that He died for us. We have no righteousness but His. We are His and He is ours. In the joy of that communion we offer ourselves body, soul, and spirit, a living sacrifice, to Him Who died for us. In the words of angelic hymns, with all the host of heaven we offer our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

Thus our communion is a communion of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. But this is not all. Our worship is in a yet fuller sense an act of communion, an act so solemn that we may well pause for a moment to consider with all reverence what is implied in it.

We have spoken of the Cross as the great act of reconciliation, and so it is. But the Cross was made possible only by the Incarnation—the stupendous mystery of Godhead and Manhood united in one Person, and that Person one Person in the Blessed Trinity. This also, though for our sakes it was an act in time, yet belongs by Divine Will to the Eternal Now, from everlasting to everlasting. We have as our intercessor with God not the Mother of

our Lord, not an angelic being, not even the highest of archangels, bending in supplication before His Throne, but seated at the right hand of God, enjoying, that is, the fulness of His Power and Glory, a High Priest, Who, though He be very God, is also very Man. In His Manhood the Lord Jesus Christ is above all angels, principalities, and powers, and above every Name that is named in Heaven, or on earth.¹ His Manhood in virtue of union with His Godhead pleads with authority there. His intercession is not of supplication but of authority. "Father, I will."

Next, be it remembered that it is through His Holy Spirit that He communicates Himself to us ; and, by His Holy Spirit, according to His own most true promise, both Father and Son come to him that loves Christ and keep His word, and with such an one They make their abode. (St. John xiv. 23.) It is not questioned that this abiding Presence is first communicated to us in the new Birth, of which the Sacrament is Holy Baptism, and is renewed and refreshed in each believing child of God through the self-imparting of the Lord Jesus Christ, of which the Sacrament is Holy Communion. We approach that Sacrament not as slaves, but as sons ; we receive what Christ is pleased to give, by faith obeying His command, "Take, eat," "Drink ye all of this." What the Water is in Holy Baptism, the Bread and Wine are in the Holy Communion, not symbols arbitrarily appointed by man, but means appointed by Christ Himself, effectual signs of grace, "insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ." In other words, the Holy Spirit Who dwells in us enables us by the act of communion to draw into closer fellowship with God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, one God in Three Persons, the holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity.

¹ St. John's vision of "the Lamb as it had been slain" may be conceived and explained in a manner that is wholly misleading. The Heaven of the Book of Revelation is that definite, almost material, locality, which in popular Jewish belief was the seat of councils, of wars, of temptations, the Heaven to which the Evil One had access, from which He must needs be cast out, the Heaven which was to be consumed and pass away that the new Heaven might take its place. As such it needed cleansing and atonement, and therefore the Lamb, as it had been slain, is very appropriately seen there. But the Lord Jesus Christ in His glory is exalted far above that Heaven, He has taken our nature into the fulness of His Father's glory. He is seated with the Father on His Throne.

The place of Holy Communion in Divine Worship is from this point of view very clear and well-defined. It is the great corrective of spiritual selfishness. Without it a devout man might seek to establish communion with God by retirement from the rest of the world, seeking to be alone, that he might be nearer to God. The Lord's Supper corrects that very natural desire. The would-be solitary worshipper is like one of the disciples of old disputing which of them should be greatest, and corrected by the institution of that holy feast. Not in isolation, not in solitary devotion, but in the assembly of fellow-partakers of the Lord's Table, and in the exercise of the love which that fellowship involves, will the believer receive in fullest measure the indwelling of his Lord. For God is Love, and Love in solitude is a mere unprofitable sentiment. "He that loveth not his brother, whom he hath seen, how can he love God, Whom he hath not seen?" Hence the absolute necessity of being in charity with all men, if we would be meet partakers of that holy Sacrament. Hence also the absolute necessity that all present should be partakers. For to be present without partaking is to stand out of fellowship; it is to fail to discern the Body of Christ by rending that Body in the very act that above all others establishes its unity.

But it will be urged that those two views of worship are not mutually exclusive, and, indeed, that they are rather complementary the one to the other, so that neither by itself corresponds to truth. For as God is both transcendent and immanent, so it is fitting that worship should combine the lowliest adoration with the closest fellowship, and what could God have given us more fitted to excite our adoration than this, His solemn and objective drawing near to us through the consecrated elements in a manner that was outside and beyond ourselves; of His choosing, not of ours; a sovereign act of His grace that was not dependent on our faith? It will be further alleged that it was thus that the Church in the writings of the Fathers, and in most of the Liturgies, regarded the consecrated elements as having a sacred character of their own through association with His Presence, and quite apart from the use of them for purposes of communion. In fact, it will be argued that for the perfection of worship in the Lord's Supper we should first adore and then receive.

It is not enough to reply that our Communion Service is de-

liberately constructed so as to depart from the early Liturgies on this point, changing the old-established Canon of the Mass into a service of Holy Communion, making it to be, after the Prayer for the Church Militant, a service for communicants only, addressed to them and to them exclusively, and making it clear that no others should attend by ordering that the Holy Communion be ministered to Priests and Deacons, and after that to the people (N.B.—Not the communicants), all meekly kneeling.¹ The mind of the Church of England is so plain that to secure the element of adoration it has been necessary to introduce vestments which are not vestments of Holy Communion, to use incense, though thuribles are admitted to have been abolished, to write special hymns, to introduce genuflexions and prostrations—and even then, the service being clearly inappropriate, to set to work to remodel it according to the service of the Mass. About the mind of our Church as tested by her Communion Service there is no doubt. But we have to do more than this. We have to establish the soundness of the lines on which our service is constructed. For that it was constructed carefully by men ignorant of the Fathers or early Liturgies only the very ignorant will dare to assert. You had to be learned when ignorance might lead you to the stake.

To establish such a point as this in detail would be impossible within the space of a paper. But in principle it is not difficult to establish if it is once granted that the authority of Our Lord and His Apostles is to outweigh that of the Fathers and the Liturgies. To Our Lord and His Apostles there was only one spot in all the world that was associated with the Presence of God, the innermost shrine of the Temple, the Holy of Holies. Every other association of God's Presence with material objects was to them simply idolatry. When it is suggested that Our Lord intended, and that the Apostles held and taught, that a new Shechinah had been established by Him, it is clear that the accusation of not being faithful to the Temple and the law of Moses, which the Apostles indignantly repudiated, was a perfectly just accusation. It is also certain that the existence

¹ It has been urged that the rubrics of the Communion Office imply non-communicating attendance, because they mention "them that come to receive the Holy Communion," "those that are minded to receive the Holy Communion," "them that shall receive the Communion," and also in other rubrics "the people." But this distinction would involve that those who had not confessed their sins should be absolved, and that the non-communicants should be communicated.

of the new Shechinah must have found a place in the Epistle to the Hebrews. This is not a mere argument from silence. For believing Jews there could be no greater shock than that the Shechinah was superseded by the Eucharist. But of that shock there is no trace in the New Testament. Multitudes of Christian Jews continued to worship in the Temple. On the other hand, the spiritual Presence of Christ in the hearts of His people is affirmed and reaffirmed in every form.

If we are asked how it came to pass that teaching not held by the Apostles found its way into the writings of the Fathers and the early Liturgies, the answer is not difficult. Both Jew and Gentile, accustomed to the idea of sacrifice, and associating the Eucharist with the sacrifice of the death of Christ, would read into that service more than they had received. They would seek by so doing to escape the charge that they were atheists. A religion without idols, altars, and sacrifices would hardly seem in those days to be a religion at all. The language which the early Fathers used was figurative, not dogmatic, devotional, not theological. Nor was this very injurious so long as the whole congregation were communicants. The use of the elements for their proper purpose left room for a worship in which the Presence of Christ was associated with the whole sacrament rather than with the consecrated elements. The position of the Tractarian was, in fact, the Patristic position.

But with non-communicating attendance the whole balance of doctrine was changed. For if the non-communicants were to escape the reproach of dividing the Body of Christ, of destroying the fellowship of the Church, some strong reason must be found for their presence during the service. What better reason could be given than the suggestion that the service was a Sacrifice offered or represented to God and that adoration was the great end of the Eucharist? What better means of expressing this could there be than the elaboration of ceremonial, the withdrawal of the altar into the dim distance of a Gothic chancel, the surrounding it with all the artifices of art, music, and architecture that could inspire the sense of mystery? In vain did theologians try to combat the trend of popular theology. The appeal of a mysterious Presence of God manifested through definite external objects is an appeal to which man responds instinctively, but it is the instinct of his lower nature, of his emotions, not of his spirit.

It is incumbent on us to maintain that true doctrine of worship which our Reformers grasped so firmly in the Prayer Book of 1552, which is substantially the Communion Office of to-day. They recognized as the ideal set forth by our Lord the gathering of a band of faithful disciples drawn into closer communion with one another by communion with Him through the Sacrifice of the Cross by means of His appointed sign the perpetuation of the Last Supper till His return. "Of faithful disciples"—for this reason they distinguished between the ordinary service then obligatory by law on all citizens, and the meeting together of those whose hearts were prepared to meet their Lord.¹ Of the Communion so celebrated all present were to be partakers, and the gathering was to be really representative of the whole congregation. Even in parishes where there were only twenty communicants three at least must be present, and presumably in larger parishes a like proportion. The occasions of Communion, with the exception of Easter, were left to the discretion of the parish priest, who was to give solemn warning of his intention to celebrate. In the service he was to consecrate only enough for those present, and before leaving the Church to consume any portions that remained of the consecrated elements. Of consecration or reservation for the purposes of adoration, or even of communicating the sick, not a trace was left, and even the act of kneeling was explained to be an act of gratitude or humility, and not of adoration.

We are being plainly challenged to take a retrograde step and to restore the Mass. If we do so we shall be guilty of disobedience to our Lord. Under pretext of doing Him reverence we shall go back from the high ideal of worship as an act of communion with God through the Sacrifice offered once for all, which communion cannot be fully realized in solitude but only in fellowship with one another, in the Holy Sacrament which He has given us, and returned to the lower and more primitive ideas of worship as influence exercised through Sacrifice upon God presenting Himself to us through material objects. In religion development is often retrogression. Neither antiquity nor continuity are alone proofs of the purity of religious conceptions. Concerning these we easily lose our way when we forsake the guidance of our Lord and His Apostles.

¹ The only possible room left for non-communicants was in Cathedrals where the choir-boy might be unconfirmed and the adult chorister was not obliged to communicate at each celebration.

Dr. Scott Lidgett's Proposal.

A GREAT deal of attention is very properly being given to the interesting article which Dr. Scott Lidgett has written in the *Contemporary Review*, partly because of its origin, for the writer is one of the foremost men among Free Churchmen, but more particularly because of its intrinsic value. For the benefit of those who have not read the article, it is necessary to call attention to its main argument, before passing on to comment upon it.

Those of us who have been striving for years to bring about a better understanding between the various religious forces in England, will have noted that a preliminary difficulty has frequently been the opinion that divisions and separation were not necessarily mischievous, that if we each ploughed our own fields and planted and tended our own vineyards faithfully the result would be quite satisfactory. A great change has taken place in recent years among Free Churchmen on this point. There has been a steady drawing together of their forces, which has brought into being the National Free Church Council. Dr. Scott Lidgett is one of the many who wish to see the extension of this unifying spirit in the direction of our Church. He expresses in the article under consideration the opinion that the witness of Christianity has been weak and has suffered loss, as well as causing scandal, through the divisions among Christians. He points out that political and social differences have been composed in face of the great national crisis, and pleads that, in view of the tremendous service which Christianity would render to the nation if it could present an undivided front, an advisory council should be called together under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury to pave the way for a better understanding between ourselves and the Evangelical Free Churches.

As we have indicated already, a great many Churchmen have for long held this opinion. We have felt the need of better understanding and of close co-operation and of frequent religious intercourse with those who are not of our communion. To us, the argument that religion has suffered gravely because of our mutual antipathy (for that is really not too strong a word) is so obvious that it needs scarcely to be mentioned, much less to be laboured. The desire for closer fellowship is growing rapidly, and despite the

various obstacles which lie in the path we feel that such suggestions as those made by Dr. Scott Lidgett are most helpful and designed to do great good. There are difficulties in the way, and to these we shall turn in due course. But first of all, it may be well to remind him that proposals akin to his own have been made frequently by the authorities in our Church. The suggestions made by the Lambeth Conference some thirty years ago and repeated since at each of its sessions, that Churchmen and Nonconformists should meet together in friendly discussion of their points of difference, has fallen largely upon deaf ears. In every place where the experiment has been made, it has been found most helpful and productive of better feeling. In some districts, it has resulted in united evidential lectures, which have done a great deal of good. But these places have been few, such conferences sadly unusual. The blame for this must be equally divided. The Bishops are most sympathetic towards this movement, one of them recently inquiring at his Visitation to what extent the suggestion of the Lambeth Conference had been followed out, and with what results. This particular Bishop's attitude is by no means an isolated case of genuine interest in the possibility of *rapprochement* between Church and Dissent.

To say that Dr. Scott Lidgett's suggestion is welcome to Evangelical Churchmen is to express very mildly and inadequately our feelings. We have worked and prayed for this better understanding because we have not only fully realized the loss which the Christian Church suffers in energy through misunderstanding and overlapping, but also because we recognize, despite the questions which separate us and which we do not in the least underestimate, that the orthodox non-episcopalians generally speaking are aiming to achieve the same purpose as ourselves.

Evangelical Churchmen have indeed not waited for a lead from elsewhere; for years past they have been working along the lines of reconciliation. The mention of the Keswick Convention, the Evangelical Week of Prayer, the Edinburgh Conference, and Kikuyu movements which either originated among Evangelicals or else were immediately backed by them, completely justifies this statement.

But unhappily Evangelicals are frequently inarticulate, or are, even more commonly, disregarded as not quite representative of

the Church of England. Their efforts along the line of Dr. Scott Lidgett's proposal have either been overlooked or else pooh-poohed, not only in the Church of England but also in Nonconformist circles. Whether it is an instinct, inherited from their ancestors of 250 years ago, or due to some other cause, the fact remains that High Anglicanism is usually regarded by Free Churchmen to-day as the genuine representation of the Church of England. Perhaps, however, it is attributable to the fact that the clamorous party wins the most attention.

This disregard of Evangelical endeavour is illustrated in the article under consideration. Dr. Scott Lidgett refers hopefully to certain cautious and guarded words uttered by the Bishops of Winchester and Oxford (which really amount to very little indeed), rather vague conclusions by the Conference of Faith and Order (which mean little if anything more), but makes no allusion to the most significant incident in this direction which has occurred during the last hundred years or more, the Kikuyu Conference.

Dr. Scott Lidgett, and those who think with him, are not helping the cause of reunion as much as they might do, while they delude themselves by exaggerating the empty ambiguities of High Anglicans and disregard the overtures of Evangelicals. We are the natural allies of the Evangelical Free Churches, and the Methodist Churches, in particular, should never forget what we are glad and proud to remember, that they and we have sprung from a common stock.

Coming now to a more definite examination of Dr. Scott Lidgett's suggestion, two questions emerge: Is the calling of a Council such as he suggests at all likely? If called, is it probable that it would produce any practical results?

To the former question we reply, that in the present and prevalent religious frame of mind if representative men among Free Churchmen were to approach the authorities in our Church, we cannot doubt that such a request would be answered in the most sympathetic way. The Council would most probably be called. The crisis which has made strong party men in political life subordinate their differences from one another to their points of agreement has had a similar effect in religion. Churchmen and Nonconformists have begun to see things in a different perspective, and the time is ripe for a Council which will consider how to bring about a genuine

and more dignified *modus vivendi* between the various Christian Churches in the land.

But when we pass on to ask whether such an advisory body would be able to achieve much, we are on more difficult ground. The kind of conference which we love but little is that which results in a series of high-sounding but really meaningless ambiguities, which are useless in practice. Of pious exhortations to work together in social work, padded with hackneyed and somewhat fulsome phrases of appreciation of the excellent work done by those who differ from us, we have had more than enough. These polite platitudes leave us quite cold.

If something really helpful and practical is aimed at then certain facts must be clearly borne in mind from the start. Dr. Scott Lidgett quite recognizes that the extreme men on either side will be a source of difficulty. This is beyond all doubt, but there need be no fear that opposition from such quarters will wreck the scheme provided the main body of sane opinion on both sides is determined that such a disaster shall not occur. The essential preliminary to the success of such a Conference is to gauge the mind of "the vast body of the men of good-will, who constitute the majority in every Church." If they are in earnest something will result, if not nothing can come of it.

Now it must be frankly recognized that there are certain obstacles to a good understanding which lie at the back of the minds of this "vast body of men of good-will" on both sides. There is no sense in blinding our eyes to these things. Frank statement of these questions is the first step to their removal.

First of all, the Free Churchman is made suspicious of the Church because of the general attitude of superiority and patronage assumed towards him. He resents the terms in which he, and his institutions, are spoken of. He dislikes his places of worship being called "chapels," and he is deeply offended when his communions are described as "religious bodies," or "sects." He has selected as his title the term "Free Churchman," and the refusal to call him what he calls himself is a constant irritant.

The wisdom of the selection of a new name may be questioned. "Nonconformist" is a grand old word: it has gathered around it fine and noble traditions of sacrifice for the sake of principle and conscience, and in the ears of people who have read history, it is a

word which has no little romance attaching to it. Many people would shrink from discarding a name with such historical associations; we may be unable to appreciate why the name by which Bunyan, Baxter, Calamy, Howe, the Pilgrim Fathers, and all the saints honoured among English Non-episcopalians, were known, should be cast into oblivion, but that is their business, not ours. "Free Churchmen" they call themselves; then so let us call them.

There is some gain in the new title. It emphasizes that those who bear it are members of the Church of Christ, and if we use it in sincerity it means that we so recognize them, and acknowledge their status and Baptism. This sincere appreciation of their position and standing as Christians and members of the Church Catholic is a fundamental necessity before any hope of the establishment of a really good understanding is possible. These are but illustrations of the things which make Free Churchmen suspicious of our Church. There is nothing very tangible of which they complain, but a general attitude which suggests that they are regarded as only quasi-Christians of doubtful credentials.

English Churchmen, on the other hand, find very concrete reasons for doubting the sincerity of all offers of friendship from Free Churchmen. We cannot enter into the large questions of Education and Disestablishment in detail. The former is not acute at the moment, and in any case it is overshadowed by the latter.

Churchmen are able to understand the desire for "religious equality," whatever that may mean. The claim for a fair field and no favour always meets with sympathy in the English heart. In demanding the removal of all "the unfair privileges of the Church" Free Churchmen are taking a legitimate line, and one which should not arouse any feelings of bitterness. We are of the opinion that these privileges are largely imaginary, or else rest upon a prestige which cannot be destroyed by any Act of Parliament; we are in pretty general agreement that Disestablishment would be a grave blow at national religion, and equally confident that the expectation that it would produce religious equality is quite illusory. But the point we wish now to make clear is, that if Free Church demands stopped short at Disestablishment, however much we should differ from them, and fiercely though we should fight them on the point, we should not lose our respect for them, nor regard them as really hostile to us. We should fight, but if we

lost the fight we should not lose our respect for an honourable foe.

But so long as Disestablishment carries with it Disendowment, the matter is quite different. The ordinary rank and file Churchman cannot see how those who call themselves friends can wish to see us weakened or impoverished. The argument that we hold endowments to which we are not entitled does not impress us when coming from a so-called friendly quarter. We are convinced that we have a good title to these moneys: we are using them to the best of our power in the cause of national religion; we, in common with the whole Church, need desperately more money than we have. And when those who call themselves friends originate and foment the demand that we shall be forced to surrender what we honestly believe is our own, and that our money shall be diverted from religious work to the formation of public libraries and swimming-baths, it is not surprising that we lightly esteem a friendship which shows itself in such a curious way.

If Free Churchmen would only abandon finally the Disendowment policy, they would prove their sincerity in the most convincing way. As things are, every attempt made by broad-minded Churchmen to bring about good feeling among their fellow-worshippers towards Free Churchmen is met by a caustic reference to the brotherly love which has clamoured for Welsh Disendowment, and fiercely opposed all concessions to that persecuted Church.

We would not like Dr. Scott Lidgett to misunderstand us for a moment. His suggestion is assured of the hearty support of all Evangelical Churchmen; we thank God for his large spirit and helpful suggestion. But the success or failure of such project rests, as he acknowledges in his article, with the vast body of worshippers on both sides, and we think it is only fair and honest that we should describe what the vast proportion of English Churchmen think and say concerning Free Church policy regarding their Church.

The present writer may be allowed to say that he is one who has worked in the cause of reunion for some years and still will continue to do so. He has arranged conferences for friendly discussion between the contending parties, and done all that can be done at this stage. And he is bound to confess that these efforts are always hampered among Churchmen by the feeling that Free Churchmen "speak friendly to their neighbours but imagine mischief in their hearts."

H. A. WILSON.

Malachi.

(The last of a series of three addresses given in Westminster Abbey by the Rt. Rev. H. E. RYLE, D.D., C.V.O., Dean of Westminster.)

THE last section of the Book of the Prophet Malachi is that which we discuss this afternoon, Mal. iii. 13–iv. 6. It deals with three recognizable topics. (1) iii. 13–15, the doubts and murmurings excited among the Jews by the prosperity of the wicked and the misfortunes of the faithful : (2) iii. 16–iv. 3, those who fear and love God are reassured that they are His “peculiar treasure,” and that the Day of the Lord will dissipate all fear of injustice, with its dawn of healing and happiness to His servants and of final discomfiture to His foes : (3) iv. 4–6, the book closes with a passage which brings into striking combination the two great names of Israel’s earlier religious life. Let the law of Moses be diligently observed ; let the coming of the prophet Elijah be eagerly expected. The Lord God, whose love the Jews could not realize, had ordained them the moral law of Moses which they failed to keep, and He would send to them the Forerunner of the Messiah, the Elijah, who, like his great predecessor, would bring new life to a hesitating and faithless people.

1. Our first lesson from this section seems to be this: that *selfish impatience is often a source of religious doubt.*

When the Jews to whom the prophet speaks saw some of their countrymen, in spite of their purity and integrity of life, down-trodden, distressed, and miserable, and others, who threw religion to the winds and flaunted their looseness of morals and their neglect of the sacred law, flourishing with prosperity and success, they were tempted to exclaim, “There is no God at all,” “God is unjust,” “It is vain to serve God: What profit is there that we have kept His charge?” (ver. 14). It is the same cause of doubt and perplexity which we find in the writings of Job and in some of the Psalms. It is not uncommon in our own time. Men take short views. They are impatient for immediate results. If a man is a good man, and there is a God of the Universe, why should he suffer misfortune, while a bad unscrupulous man is prosperous and happy? It required strong faith on the part of the Jewish prophet to trust God in the dark days as well as in the bright. But that is what he en-

courages his countrymen to do. He cannot explain all the puzzles of life. But he is confident that God is a God of love. Like the great writer of the 53rd Chapter of Isaiah, he could see that suffering and sacrifice on the part of the servant of God may be the appointed path of highest duty and may have a power of redeeming efficacy.

That which was utterly dark and bewildering to the devout Jewish prophet, has received light and meaning from the good news of the Cross of Christ and of His Resurrection. The Cross of Jesus Christ has shown that even in suffering there is a divine purpose, and that God's love has not been withdrawn, because fortune has vanished, or joy is swallowed up in pain, or bereavement has cut down the brightest flowers of earthly hope and promise. God's full purpose needs eternity for fulfilment. Earth is only a fragment. The Resurrection of Jesus Christ has shown that the inequalities, the distresses, the seeming injustices of earthly experience are not the final expression of God's Will. The tyrant, the perjured oppressor, the destroyer of faith and home, the corrupter of virtue, may seemingly pay no penalty on earth; but such immunity is no proof of God's favour.

People ask impatiently "What shall we get? Will virtue pay?" They think only of a temporal recompense. They have not learned to lift their eyes above the low level of earth's comforts and pleasures. When our Lord speaks of reward, it is of "reward in heaven."

Much religious doubt has its rise in the "topsy-turviness" of human affairs. The sin which results from man's grasping at selfish aims produces confusion and misery. We must resist the impulse to selfish impatience. The earth is a very little place, and life here a tiny prelude, in the whole Universe of the Divine Purpose of Perfect Love and Justice.

2. The Second Lesson is that "*the Communion of Saints is secure in God's Fatherly Protection.*" Very strikingly beautiful are the words of verses 16 and 17, "Then they that feared the Lord spake one with another; and the Lord hearkened and heard, and a book of remembrance was written before Him for them that feared the Lord and that thought upon His name. And they shall be Mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in the day that I do make, even a peculiar treasure; and I will spare them as a man spareth his own son that serveth him."

In spite of the inequalities and troubles which shake the faith of many, there are even in these very things materials for the spiritual sympathy and communion of God's servants. We know well that Christians "in dark days" can draw very close together. Unity of faith is a very real bond between those who are thrown together in common losses and common griefs. There is no promise to those who shut themselves up in the solitude of selfish introspection. It seems to be God's law; to which the prophet points, that spiritual life can grow and bring forth much fruit in the soil deepened and enriched by fellowship of sorrow. Encouragement comes from the sense of sharing the same hope and from obedience to the same duty of patient endurance. "They that fear the Lord, they that think upon His name," receive a wonderful promise. God is their father: He may chasten, but His love never fails. They are "His peculiar treasure." They are safe in His keeping. What concerns them, is not forgotten nor ignored by Him. Their troubles, their weakness, their depression, are His care. Their names are written in God's book of loving remembrance.

Here is a wonderful source of hope. Do we make enough of this treasure of brotherly intercourse and union? God blesses friendship and sympathy to be the means of consolation and help in a degree, which those cannot realize whose only hope is in this life, and whose only pleasures begin and end in bodily health and prosperity. We may not be able to explain the problems of our trials. But we may be sure of finding something fresh of God's love revealed to us in the words and lives of those who are dear to us in the faith, and who partially at least interpret to us the fullness of His goodness and compassion. Let us not take these privileges as if they were a matter of course. They are among God's precious gifts on earth to His saints. They grow larger by use and by thankful acknowledgment. They are signs of God's Fatherly Protection. They help us to bear sorrows more bravely. They teach us the Christian duty of cultivating acts and habits of sympathy. They encourage us to see in earthly friendships the symbol of the eternal and the heavenly. God comforts the stricken hearts of those who try to comfort others. There is no blessing on the selfishness of sorrow any more than on the selfishness of joy.

3. The last lesson which I have time to draw from our book is contained in the prophet's closing appeal to "the law and the pro-

phets." The work of the lawgiver and the inspiration of the Prophet can neither of them be neglected by the servants of the Lord. What is the lesson we learn from this exhortation to remember the law of Moses and to look for the coming of Elijah? Surely, it is this: *The discipline of the Moral Law must be combined with the freedom of the quickening Spirit.* The law is the bulwark of social order; and the temper of obedience will ever resist the irregularities which spring from a shallow love of change, or from the volcanic destructiveness of revolution. But the life of true religion wants something more than the observance of rule and law, something more than the preservation of truth and doctrine.

The work of Elijah is wanted as well as that of Moses. Religion is not merely an appeal to the force of sacred enactments or to the glory of traditional worship. The Church is a living society, not a museum of ecclesiastical antiquarianism. It needs to be fed by the Spirit, taught by the Spirit, inspired by the Spirit. "Quench not the Spirit," says St. Paul, "despise not prophesyings."

And so, before each coming of the Lord, the Prophet, the Forerunner, the Elijah, heralds the judgment of the Church or of the nations.

His greatest work is not that of menace and destruction, but of reconciliation and readjustment. Any little mind can undertake the task of fault-finding and denunciation. But the task of bringing together alienated and offended hearts is one that taxes the magnanimity of a true Prophet. "He shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers" (iv.6). The older generation rarely understands the younger; the younger rarely understands the older. The older hopes to train the younger after its own pattern; the younger is quite sure that the old ways are obsolete, and is impatient with any expression of doubt or dislike in reference to newer thought or policy.

In an age of transition the consequences are often disastrous. It is the work of a master mind to reconcile the jarring forces of experience and enthusiasm, and to blend their veneration for the past with their passion for the future. The Elijah-spirit makes ready for the coming of the Lord in the great epochs of the world's history and the Church's life. The rough steep ridges shall be levelled, the winding narrow turns shall be straightened. There shall be a highway for the Lord. And this vision of the ideal fills with hope

the mind of the true prophet who seeks to interpret the love of God to his countrymen. His prayer will ever be that in the new era there may be no obstruction or needless delay, no recklessness of innovating haste, no rejection of reform, and no overthrow of hallowed landmarks.

This, I believe, is the hope that burns brightly in the closing words of the "book Malachi." And we feel the appropriateness of its message to our own day.

In spite of coldness of faith and lack of spiritual zeal, the Messenger of the Lord proclaims in the new age of change, as in that of the Jews in the Persian Period, the assurance of "God's love in dark days."

It is a continual source of consolation to the Christian believer to find that the trials and troubles of modern experience were long ago cheerfully met and bravely resisted by the inspired prophets of the Old Testament. Their writings are an unflinching encouragement in times of depression. We never search them in vain to find the Word of God speaking to our hearts.



Parochial Vignettes.

III. STRAIN.

HE who knows how to manage himself has learned the secret of a long and happy life. Health of body, quietness of mind, and success in life all hang upon the question whether we are wise or fools about ourselves. For our lives are like our incomes; managed well, they keep us from want; managed ill, they land us in the workhouse. Now, in the one word with which I have headed this paper we find ourselves face to face with one of life's saddest tragedies. Most of the wrecks of life are due to just this strain. Not content with common effort we have pushed energy to the point of strain, and—we have snapped. Like the overstrung violin string, like the overstretched hawser, we have snapped.

Granted then the importance of the subject of strain we shall not do amiss to dwell upon it a little. It will be something gained to have understood it better. And if, in addition, it should lead us to relax the strain, we shall have done something to prevent a lamentable catastrophe. At any rate, we shall not be able to set our particular rupture down to ignorance. We shall have been warned.

Now what is this strain?

It is just an attempt to force nature beyond her powers. Mind, muscle, nerve and heart are warranted, like some machines, to do just a definite amount of work and no more. Keep within this measure, and you are safe. Go beyond it, and you may smell danger. We are like bridges, warranted to stand a certain strain roughly estimated, and so long as you subject them only to this strain and no more both you and the bridge will stand firm. But not beyond.

It is comparatively easy to give the strain point of a machine, for all its laws of resistance are known to a degree. For ourselves, we are too complicated to adjust it to a nicety, but there are rough measures even for the brain and the nerve which are good enough for common daily use and experience, and these are guides not to be despised. For symptoms of overstrain appear long before the breaking point, and nature runs up her danger signals in plenty of time to prevent a rupture. The wise man will attend to these and

relax at the summons. He is not a wise man, however earnest, who goes on until he drops. At the bar of God and man he is a fool, however well intentioned.

Nobody is likely to mistake the strained muscle with its fatigue and disinclination to move. We are tired, dog-tired perhaps, and we are under no delusions as to the rest it demands and deserves.

The strained brain is equally manifest, for when it strikes work, and refuses attention, and aches, and craves sleep, we know the symptoms well enough to lay aside our books and to take up some muscular exercise to balance matters a little.

And the tired nerve, strained by too strong emotions, betrays its condition in ways we cannot doubt, and demands rest from the excitement which has been the cause of its fatigue.

And if we do not rest because we cannot afford to rest, and if we go on, well, then, we pay the penalty. We may be carried to some narrow bed in some picturesque cemetery or churchyard, or we may be compelled to undergo a rest cure somewhere in silence, or we may become an inmate of some mental asylum.

Some, no doubt, escape, but not many. Outraged nature generally gets her revenge. The blow may hover over us for a time, but the longer it is withheld, the heavier it falls when it does come.

For some of us are more delicately made than others. The nature which is like a rough machine will bear more ill-treatment than one which is as delicate as a watch. And it is the best brains and the best nerves which break down the soonest, and are harder to recall to health again.

And what are the symptoms? let us now ask.

We may know that we are straining ourselves unnaturally when our inner being is thrown out of gear and the machine moves uneasily and with difficulty. No longer do the wheels move of themselves, but they drag and shriek, betraying friction. Instead of running to our tasks, we have to drag ourselves to them as an unwelcome duty. And what we generally achieve joyously, we now groan in the doing of it.

Perhaps we grow irritable in our tempers, and feel as if we have a quarrel with ourselves and with everybody else. It is a very common form of strain, and is generally unmistakable. The edginess which is ever ready to break out snappily, and to deal in exceedingly hot water, spells strain, and demands immediate treat-

ment. And when such temper is unnatural, let not its warning be disregarded.

Then we begin to imagine things, and it seems as if our minds had lost their sense of proportion, and as if we were endowed with a vision which is like an enlarging camera. We imagine difficulties ; we imagine slights ; we imagine opposition ; we imagine conspiracy.

A spirit of despair is apt to seize upon us when the strain comes, and then all our work is bad and useless, and we ourselves are mere cumberers of the ground and quite useless. A dark cloud covers us, and we go along under a pall which we cannot lift. We seem to ourselves to have had our day, and to be played out, and, like Jonah, we throw ourselves under some bush, shadeless and menacing.

Then we indulge in hard judgments of men and things which in our better moods we never utter or even think. Denunciations come easy to our lips, and we feel like Elijah that the faithful have vanished from the earth and that we stand alone. We scan the world, and see naught but faithless, decadent men. "I, even I only, am left."

In the case of a bad strain we even speak of the judgment of God against us because of our sins and imagine that we are deserted by Him Whom we are trying to serve. God's face is hidden, we say, and He has deserted His worthless servant.

And all the time the strain hurries us on to do more and still more, and we pile engagement upon engagement, as if we would fain relieve the pressure by doing still more violence to our poor nature. We whip the top that it may not fall, not realizing that the best thing would be to let it fall and rest.

The strange thing is that sensible men and women, who would recognize these symptoms in others, cultivate the blind eye towards themselves, and, even when the doctor warns them, will refuse to believe it until the worst comes. In their efforts to prevent the sin of unfaithfulness, they run upon the rocks and make shipwreck of themselves. Or they think that to rest is the temptation of the evil one, so they resist him and play the more into his terrible hands.

We should do better to remember that these symptoms of over-strain are given us, just as the driving clouds and falling barometer are given us, to hurry us into some restful, quiet port. And just

as it is no merit to defy the warnings and to keep at sea running a risk which may be fatal, so it is the height of folly to defy the penalty of an overstrained body or heart or nerve.

Now we will listen to a few apologies for letting the strain continue, for, in spite of all the dangers of it, there are not a few who try to justify it by specious arguments.

“It is better to wear out than to rust out,” says one.

As if these two alternatives exhausted the list of possibilities. Why do either? we ask. It is quite possible to work up to safety point without breaking the machine by over-pressure. And if we work up to the level of our powers, and never beyond, there is no danger of rusting out either. What right has a workman to misuse his master's machine, and to wear it out before the time? We, too, are not our own, but, body, soul, and spirit, belong to our God in heaven. Where both such extremes are bad, why not seek a happy medium?

Here is another justification by way of necessity, “If I don't do it, who will?”

But are you so indispensable to God that He cannot do without you? And is He so short of workers in His kingdom that He must needs push to the death His willing ones? Why, those who say such a thing as an excuse for overdriving the poor human organism would be the very first to haul up before a magistrate some driver who cruelly pushed his tired horse on to labour. Besides, if God cannot do without you, why should you ever die, and why should He ordain that any one should die in their prime? It may flatter our pride to fancy ourselves Atlases with the responsibilities of the world upon our shoulders, but since when was this demanded of us?

“Can I serve such a Master with less than my best, and give less than my all?” This is another argument.

But are we giving of our best when we spoil the poor soul in the body in the giving? As well may a harpist say, “I must play my best before my King,” and then, as a preliminary, break a string or two to show his zeal. The fact is that an overstrained worker cannot give anything of real value with a broken instrument. And when the strain is on, the service, however abundant, is of the poorest possible quality. Because such a service must be forced service, soiled and spoiled service, for, with the edge blunted and the springs broken, how can it be acceptable or powerful? When we

are at our best, we can give of our best, but not when we are at our worst.

“Life is short, and souls are perishing. What else can I do than work to the last?”

The motive is splendid, and who can but commend it? But, if life is short, why make it shorter? If life is short, why not try to lengthen it out by proper care of the servant? To throw away life, because there is so little of it, is like a man with a small income spending it all in a fortnight. If you have little, why not husband that little? It seems most sensible, does it not? We have all heard of burning the candle at both ends. Is not this what such a man is doing? This is shortening the candle's natural term of life just as a man who is a victim of continual strain burns out his life.

“I put all my irons in the fire so that they may always be hot and ready when they are wanted.”

But my friend, you can only use one at a time, can you? And your white-hot, unused iron is meanwhile wasting away for naught. Is that wise? Is it good for your tools to heat them unnecessarily? It does not seem so very wise to me. If a great show of energy is good, if there be a comfort in the glare and heat of a busy fire, if there is something comforting in feeling that your instrument is always ready should you want it, then you may satisfy yourself by putting all your irons in the fire at the same time. But to most people this seems to be waste of good fire and a deterioration of good tools.

But how melancholy it is, this effort to bolster up a bad process with bad arguments. Nothing can ever justify this overstrain, this attempt to secure spiritual results by a *tour de force* which blunts the edge of the tool, and forces into decay what was intended to last for many a year of work.

And when those who give these counsels of prudence are called names, and are held to be lukewarm and lazy for their care of their own faculties, the proofs of the overstrain are evident in the attitude assumed. Is that alone earnestness which overdrives nature, which rushes into the fray, and drops on the field almost as soon as the task is reached, which dulls and stales the whole inner being in its attempts to do more than it can, which lashes itself into impotence, and which actually cuts itself in its frantic efforts to reap a speedy harvest? Since when has it been deemed wisdom

to lose sobriety and common sense in the work of the Lord? Surely, he is wiser who looks ever and anon at his safety-gauge to see whether the pressure at which the machine works is too great, and who at the first symptom of over-pressure allows his machine to cool down, and gives it rest for a while.

Now, seeing that it is better to check strain before it comes than after, it is advisable to consider some of the ways in which it may easily and rationally be prevented.

We should, in the first place, be quite clear how far we can go, and not attempt to pass that limit. It is no very hard task after all, for some of us have lived many years of life, and have all that amount of experience to guide us. It is in this sense that a man is either a physician or a fool by forty. If we can only walk a mile, why try to walk a mile and a quarter? Experiments are all very well when little or nothing is at stake, but when the human organism, with its health and powers, is at stake, trying it on is a pure bit of madness. The stake is too big for such gambling. So what we know we can do let us do cheerfully, and be wise enough to stop there.

Then we should manage ourselves better if we would avoid dangerous strain. Mismanagement is to blame for more than half our breakdowns. Thus a man runs for the train and drops dead upon the platform, because he was foolish enough to start five minutes late. So a parson will put off his Sunday preparation until Saturday night and strain his poor wits until the early hours of Sunday in getting some forced thoughts together. It is not the amount of work which kills, so much as the crowding the work into too short a time. If we looked ahead ever so little, prepared in advance, and took time by the forelock instead of the tail, we should be able to compass our life's labours with comparative ease. It is the rush and worry of forced actions which wear and tear the poor man to pieces. To see some man tearing along to overtake his work, and sweating at every pore in his frantic efforts to do so, is not an object so much of pity as of contempt, for he is in all this hurry because he began too late and frittered away the morning hours in nonentities. If a man is compelled to stay up late, it is probably because he got up late. In the calm of a well-arranged life the perils of strain are unknown.

It is important, too, to learn what we may with advantage drop in life. All things are not equally important and pressing, and

to fancy that they are is to thrust yourself into the clutches of strain. It is the person who has lost his sense of proportion who is in danger. If life is too short for all we have to do, or think we must do, then, in the interests of mental sanity and physical health, let some of it go for a time. It is better to let something slide than to slide under ourselves and render ourselves incapable of achieving anything.

It is good, too, to realize that things done under strain are almost invariably done badly. The restlessness of the strained mind somehow imparts itself to the quality of our work. It smells of the candle.

It is the leisurely work which is best, because it is the best thought out, the most carefully executed, the most elaborately finished. The feverishness of the work done against time makes it lack maturity and life. This is an element of the case which ought not lightly to be dismissed, and, if it be true, it ought to bring us to our bearings quickly, and compel us to see that rather than do bad work it is almost better to do nothing at all. For what gain is there in a work which to be presentable must be done all over again?

And supposing that we do gain by forced work, the amount gained we shall probably lose later on by enforced rest and longer holidays. So we shall have half ruined the machine, and secured no worthy results. Is it worth the candle?

It is better, too, to trust in God and do less than to trust yourself and do more. For a good deal of strain comes from the idea that we are indispensable, and cannot be done without. We feel ourselves of such vast importance that we imagine that if we fail the whole work must collapse. And so we strain ourselves to keep the measure full. Anxiety and painful, wearing suspense can only come by overlooking the relative place of self and God. Shift the emphasis to the true point, and the calm which comes from our faith will make all the difference to the inner feelings which chafe and fret. God blesses not so much the work we do as the spirit of calm and quiet in which we do it; not so much the abundance of our toil as the frictionless manner of our accomplishing it. One word spoken in calm assurance that God is at the back of it is infinitely better than a torrent of impetuous, laboured eloquence which is all of self. And so, if we can only get rid of our conceit, we shall get rid of a great deal of our strain in service.

A few words are needed now to show how fatal strain appears from others' point of view. It has the worst of effects on the on-lookers. It gives the impression that Christian service is hard. For we see the toil of the man who ought to set a good example of quiet rather breeding the idea that we serve a hard Taskmaster. We can generally judge a master by his servant, unless the servant belies the master. If I see such a servant in a constant state of agitation, afraid of not doing his work, and striving early and late to achieve the impossible, I am apt to judge the master wrongly. And if my impression turns out to be wrong, then I am bound to blame the servant for leading me to such a conclusion. He has belied the master, has he not ?

And those, too, to whom we direct our feverish labours are apt to resent the too energetic treatment which such a strained man is too prone to apply. Nobody is huffed by gentle handling, and a soft word is mostly welcome. But your strained man will be sure to overdo his action, and raise his voice and hustle. For with the overstrain is blent a tension, a hurry and a violence which sends men off at a tangent and in a tantrum. The swift interview in which you are led to believe that the shorter it is the better, the rapid handling of your case, the refusal to linger a moment longer than is absolutely necessary, the stinted courtesies, the cutting short of your perhaps somewhat long-winded story, the impatience, the slumbering sense of fever in the whole tension are not quieting to the interlocutor, and are apt to hurry him too out of all chance of receiving good. There is nothing soothing or pacifying about such treatment as this ; rather the opposite. It stultifies itself.

One last reflection. If we could only gather into one huge building the victims of strain, it would be an object lesson we should never forget. And if the overstrained minds, the overstrained nerves, the overstrained hearts which we should pass in review could give their note of warning, would it not be to rest more, to cultivate more the quiet mind, to rack ourselves less and to attempt to do no more than our capabilities will allow ?

CHARLES COURTENAY.

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



The Missionary World.

THAT this is a day of opportunity abroad is on every one's lips. Reliable statements show that while in certain mission fields such as Palestine, Mesopotamia and other parts of the Turkish Empire, in German East Africa and other war-disturbed districts, missionary work is absolutely suspended or seriously hindered, yet in other lands certain classes of persons—such as the outcastes of India—or sometimes even whole nations such as Japan and China present such an opportunity for giving the full message of the Gospel as has never been known before. And in many instances this opportunity may aptly be described as a "day," for time passes on and the night cometh when the opportunity will be past. Over against the opportunity abroad we set the day of responsibility at home. These two phrases sum up the missionary position for us. It is very interesting to look into the nature of the responsibility that rests on us now. It is primarily personal. We have been much occupied of late months in the Anglican Church in seeking to realize our corporate unity; to a preliminary extent we have succeeded, and that being so we are better prepared for the individual responsibility now thrown upon us. We can never safely be individualists till corporate unity has been burnt into our hearts. But, clearly, missionary work must go on with far fewer conventions, fewer deputations, fewer summer schools, fewer outside helps for such time as the war lasts. Each parish, each missionary union, each missionary work will be thrown upon individual resources. Is this to be regretted? Far from it. In years to come we may be able to look back and see that it was during this very period that the missionary cause became very part of our life, and that in pursuit of it we learned to be self-supporting, self-extending and self-denying. It may be also that in years to come we shall ask missionaries on furlough to come to our local missionary meetings not so much for work as for refreshment, and to receive inspiration from seeing the way the home Church does its own home base work. At any rate this is a day of glad and wholesome responsibility for every Union, every Study Circle, every collector, every prayer meeting, every working party, and every bit of parish work into which missionary interest is projected. It would not be amiss

to hold small local Responsibility Meetings in connexion with each form of missionary work, to face the practical issues, to divide responsibility for certain duties, and to arrange for intelligently prepared "under-studies" in case the exigencies of national service should deplete the missionary ranks in a parish. Perhaps we shall gain many new helpers when they realize that missions are the responsibility of the whole Church of Christ and that there is urgent need for help.

* * * * *

If we are to be cut off from missionary speakers to a considerable extent, let us be clear that in missionary books and pamphlets, missionary magazines and missionary study we have sources of information and inspiration second only to the best of missionary speakers. We have also the full possibility of postal communication. We can use these means as we have never used them before. It has been a surprise to many that reading has proved such an enormous attraction during the war. We may gain encouragement in particular from the National Mission publications. By the middle of November ten and a half millions of these had been sold—this astonishing figure being independent of the sales of the non-official mission publications of the Church Army, the Religious Tract Society, the National Church League and all the other numerous National Mission papers published locally in each diocese. The deduction is obvious—*people are reading*, and apparently they do not object now, as we have so long thought they did, to "tracts." In this day of responsibility, therefore, let us use missionary publications to the full. There are many which can be specially commended for present purposes.

* * * * *

The Church and the World Papers (S.P.C.K.), to which reference has already been made in these pages, will serve a valuable purpose, but besides these, two more of the Missionary Tracts for the Times (S.P.C.K.), edited by the Rev. J. O. F. Murray, D.D., have just appeared which deserve special notice. The Archbishop of Brisbane writes on *The State and Christian Missions*, in which he makes the bold plea that "we want Christian Governments all over Christendom to acknowledge the elementary principle which they have never yet acknowledged: *that the evangelization of the world is necessary to true human progress.*" The other tract which is of peculiar

significance is by the Rev. Dina Nath. The title is *Childhood, Boyhood, Manhood in the Life of a Church*. This truthful, reverential statement of Indian views concerning the "young and tender yet intelligent Church" of India is most opportune.

* * * * *

A psychological survey has recently been conducted in India in connexion with a periodical published by the Friends' High School staff at Hoshangabad, the results of which are given in *Our Missions* for February. They are a contribution to the question of religious or secular education for India. While the first aim of the investigation was to ascertain as definitely as possible the various stages of psychological development of Indian children, the second aim—and for our immediate purpose the relevant one—was "to examine the difference in the religious and moral ideas of the scholars of mission schools and secular schools." Eighteen questions were set as tests and marked discrepancies were apparent in the results. These are tabulated as "poor answers," "good answers," and "no answers" from mission and secular schools respectively. Three conclusions are appended: (1) It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that a secular education in India leaves the pupil very seriously deficient in the most fundamental elements of ethical and religious development. (2) It is clearly evident that the religious teaching given in mission schools, although it may not directly result in many conversions to Christianity, yet does very definitely supply the pupils with that store of fundamental, moral and religious ideas which secular education is powerless to provide. (3) The average non-Christian boy receives extremely little religious and moral instruction in his home or from any other source unless he studies in a mission school. It is pointed out that the religious conceptions dealt with in the investigation were general rather than definitely Christian. While no one would claim that this investigation rested on a sufficiently wide basis to secure for its conclusions final authority, yet there can be no doubt that a local investigation conducted in 224 mission schools, and in 81 secular schools of the Hoshangabad municipality, strengthens afresh the policy of religious education for India.

* * * * *

We are indebted to a correspondent of the *Near East* for a sketch of an important and interesting personality hitherto little known—

the King of the Hejaz. He has suddenly become prominent in the political arena by his rejection of Turkish sovereignty ; his prominence in religious affairs can as yet only be surmised. He is able to claim a lineage which is probably " the purest and the oldest " of all the crowned heads of the world. He is of the tribe of Koreish and can trace his descent in unbroken line to the Prophet Mohammed. This alone would invest him with singular importance in the eyes of the Arabs. He was born in Mecca and in his youth went to Constantinople, where he lived for nineteen years honoured by Abdul Hamid, and acquiring influence through his qualities of character and his sound judgment. From the time of his appointment as Shereef of Mecca he faithfully supported Turkish power even when the Arabs became alarmed and restive under the anti-Arab policy of the Unionists. When the war broke out he urged a policy of strict neutrality, but without effect, since the Unionists threw themselves into German hands. He sought in vain to repress the brutal conduct of Turks to Arabs in Syria and the wanton degradation of Arab officers and men fighting in the Turkish armies. Finally, the open anti-Islamic attitude of the Unionists caused him to break with Turkey, and the Allies have recognized him as King of the Hejaz. As the *Near East* says : " The struggle between the Arab world and Turkey for the defence of Islam must soon impose on all Mohammedans the duty of ranging themselves definitely against the agnostic clique now established in Constantinople." So the eastern littoral of the Red Sea and its victorious King, protector of the holy shrines of Islam, suddenly advance to our notice. The political interest of the situation is great ; the missionary interest is vital.

* * * * *

The return of the interned missionaries from German East Africa—U.M.C.A. and C.M.S.—has been the chief missionary incident of the past month. They would themselves be the last to wish that any political capital was made out of their two years of detention or that the fact that they were Christian missionaries—specially called to " endure hardness "—should enhance in any way the fact of their sufferings. They shared, alas, with multitudes of other guiltless victims the horrors of war and the barbarity of the war spirit when it is set loose ; it is a special characteristic of prisoners of war, civilian or military, that they bear their trials with

fortitude. So did these missionaries. We, their sympathizers, must recognize this and respect their reticence. The solemn Thanksgiving Service for the safe return of missionaries lately in captivity in Central Africa in St. Margaret's, Westminster, is a fitting expression of our attitude to them one and all. We trust they may be left in quiet to recuperate after their long strain, borne up by the thanksgiving and prayer of those to whom they and their work are dear. The one feature which it is legitimate and right to emphasize from the missionary standpoint is the Christian fortitude of the native people. The letter from one of them published in the *C.M. Review* for February is a moving document. It has even in it the apostolic ring: "We thanked our Lord God greatly Who had shown us a way by which we might travel. We were very greatly comforted, we obtained peace of mind." When the simple reality of the Christian faith meets tests such as those to which these native Christians were subjected, we can take fresh hope to ourselves for the future of the Church in Africa. A letter from Colonel Montgomery who went to Kisumu to meet the missionary party has also been published. He, too, refers to the "touching thanksgiving service at a celebration at 7.30 a.m." which the Bishop of Uganda took, having come specially to meet the U.M.C.A. and C.M.S. missionaries. Is there in this fellowship so strangely enforced the promise of a new day in Christian missions in Africa?

G.



Preachers' Pages.

HOMILETICAL HINTS AND OUTLINES

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

Second Sunday in Lent.

Text : "For this is the will of God even your sanctification."

—I *Thess.* iv. 3 (Epistle).

When the Crusaders went forth to rescue the Tomb of the Saviour from the hands of the infidel, they took as their motto these words : *Volonté de Dieu*, "It is God's Will." With this they met every objection—God wills it! We may have our doubts if it really was so, but we dare not hide from ourselves the fact that God wills our Sanctification.

Consider what this means—

I. POSITIVELY. (a) The Activity of the Spirit within us. This we may encourage or hinder by our own volition (I *Thess.* v. 19). When we will what God wills, the Spirit takes possession of us and works in us (Luke xi. 13). "Our wills are *ours* to make them *Thine*."

(b) The Activity of the Life quickened by the Spirit. "How ye ought to *walk*." This implies power and progress. The results are—(1) *So far as God is concerned*. It is a life of "pleasing Him." "To please God" (verse 1). (2) *So far as self is concerned*. It is a life of "purity." "Not unto uncleanness" (verse 6). (3) *So far as others are concerned*. It is a life of "probity." "That no man go beyond and defraud" (verse 6). [Note. This may have the widest possible application. Look at the Old Testament lesson (morning) for a terrible example of overreaching. Consider, too, the significance of our Lord's words in the Gospel : "It is not meet to take the children's bread," etc. The woman of Canaan defrauded no one!]

II. NEGATIVELY. It is the avoidance of those lusts which war against the soul. The activity of the flesh (Rom. vii. 18) is checked by the more potent activity of the Spirit. We should be influenced powerfully by two final considerations : (1) *By the fact of the judgment of God*. "He is the avenger in all such cases" (verse 6, Weymouth). Of this we are "solemnly warned." A

defiant spirit in such a case provokes not man but GOD." (2) *By the fact of the mercy of God.* He supplies not only the motive for right-doing but the power. Other systems provide us with precepts, Christianity alone supplies the inward power. God "hath given us His Holy Spirit" (verse 8). Here are moral injunctions *and* the Glad News of how they may be obeyed in the strength God gives (Rom. viii. 2).

Third Sunday in Lent.

Text: "Be ye therefore imitators (lit.) of God as dear children."
—*Eph. v. 1* (Epistle).

"Christ has translated the unimaginable Godhead into terms of our own well-known human nature. . . . For the Christian henceforth in quite a new sense God is imitable: He can become a pattern for actual human life. As children partly consciously and partly unconsciously imitate their parents, so we Christians as 'beloved children' are to become imitators of God" (*Gore*).
General subject—the walk of God's children. Consider—

I. ITS DEFINITE OBJECTIVE. Thoughts and steps instinctively turn in the direction of the Father's Home (John xiv. 1; Matt. vi. 21). "He hath prepared for them a city" (Heb. xi. 16; Rev. xxi. 2).

II. ITS DIVINE INSPIRATION. The love and life of Christ. "As Christ hath loved and given." Love is "its conscious motive" (*Gore*).

III. ITS DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS. Often, even in the distance, we recognize our friend "by his walk." So God and man recognize the Holy Walk. Notice: (a) It is according to the Divine pattern. "Imitators of GOD." (b) It is according to Apostolic example. "Walk so as ye have us for an ensample" (Phil. iii. 17). Moreover it is: (1) A walk in LOVE. It moves in and creates an atmosphere of love "Walk in love" (verse 2). (2) A walk in GRATITUDE. It becometh well the just to be thankful. "Giving of thanks" (verse 4). (3) A walk in PURITY. "Let it not be once named amongst you, as becometh saints" (verse 3). (4) A walk in the LIGHT. It has nothing to be ashamed of, but it exposes wrong-doing by contrast, and shames the evil-doer (verses 8-13). Light is essential to growth. The works of darkness are unfruitful—the conditions are unfavourable (see 1 John i. 7).

Fourth Sunday in Lent.

Text: "Corn in Egypt" (Gen. xlii. 1). (First morning lesson.)

In all literature there will be found no more romantic story than that of Joseph, nor does Scripture anywhere contain a more vivid and typical portrait of Jesus. Here tragedy and triumph are strangely intermingled. We see—

I. WHAT BECAME OF THE DREAMER (see chap. xxxvii. 20). In this and the preceding chapters we are allowed to follow the fortunes and misfortunes of Joseph, subsequent to the disgraceful transaction recorded in xxxvii. 36. We see that a watchful Providence guided his destinies. This he himself felt. "He hath made me" (chap. xlv. 8, 9). His strict integrity (xxxix. 21, 22), won for him favour, and his fine abilities were recognized (xli. 38-44; 48-56). The eye of his royal master rests upon him approvingly; but this is not what matters most: "The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous" (Ps. xxxiv. 15).

II. THE RESURRECTION OF THE FORGOTTEN PAST. Time may dull our recollection, but the lapse of years makes no difference—it cannot wipe out the terrible stains of sin or atone for our misdeeds. Now the mention of Egypt brings it all back, and these guilty souls may well "look one upon another." Who can tell how much they suffered? They would gladly have gone in any other direction rather than be confronted again by a past they had striven to forget. Their treachery to their brother, their base deception of their father, the remembrance of their heartless cruelty rises out of the grave in which it had long been buried. What a solemn warning we have here! Out of the dim shadows the spectre of the past will rise unbidden to shame and accuse us. There is no possibility of escape. Every foot of the path of penitence we must traverse with bleeding feet till we hear words of mercy from the lips of Him Who suffered by reason of our transgressions (chap. xlv. 16-20; Isa. liii. 6-8).

Fifth Sunday in Lent.

Text: "The angel of the Lord appeared to him (Moses)."

—*Exod.* iii. 2. (First lesson.)

To-day we commence to read a series of chapters in the life of Moses and the story of redemption. Joseph fell asleep in his hieroglyphed chamber in Egypt, not unmindful of whence he came, but fully sensible of the fact that he was a stranger in a strange

land, and that the promises of the Almighty could not fail (Gen. 1. 25 ; Heb. xi. 22). But though Joseph passes, the good succession cannot die, and Moses comes in the hour of need, specially fitted by the strange circumstances of his early life for the task assigned to him. Here see—

I. GOD'S GENTLEMAN. What a pleasing story is briefly told in chapter ii. 16–20. The courtier Moses demands fair play. He appears a gentleman in the best sense. Brought to Jethro's home he was "content" with humble fare, and here he won his Gentile bride. From that time Jethro's daughters seem to have handed over the care of their father's flock to Moses, and life was thenceforward occupied in the trivial round and the common task of a shepherd's uneventful life; but it was a task that, though he knew it not, was fitting him for the more important one of shepherding the people of Jehovah. The impetuous man who slew the Egyptian was turned into the tactful, quiet man who, as lawgiver, statesman, soldier and prophet, so long presided over the destinies of Israel.

II. GOD'S TIME. We are sometimes told that a man is too old at forty! So this story may serve as an inspiration to those who are approaching or have already reached that period which has been described as "the neglected period" of human life—middle age. It may not yet be too late to accomplish the task you dreamt of years ago. To learn the lesson that all work done in one's own strength and without the help of God is labour lost, is not easy (chap. ii. 11–14). As we look at Moses he cuts a pathetic figure—nurtured in a palace-home, waited upon hand and foot by devoted courtiers—he is now at "the back of the wilderness" (R.V.), tending a few sheep. Few who saw him knew of his romantic past, and those who *did*, probably pronounced him to be a man who had "missed it." But there are many classes in the School of Grace. John B. Gough, asked at a dinner-table at what University he took his degree, replied: "I graduated, sir, in the University of Adversity." So it was with Moses, and so has it been with many of the world's worthies. Such have no cause to be ashamed (1 Peter iv. 16).

III. GOD'S REVELATION. (a) *The Vision of the Burning Bush* (verses 1–12). As the acacia bush was preserved intact so would Israel be kept: she would come out of the furnace of Egypt preserving her national identity. (b) *The Revelation of the essential*

character of God. This is conveyed in the human terms by which He has made Himself known (verses 13, 14).

ILLUSTRATIONS.

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

**Misunderstand-
ings—Cleared
Away.** "EVERY great man must have critics and enemies, even in the Parliament of his country; and just before Lord Kitchener sailed (on H.M.S. *Hampshire*, sunk off the Orkneys, June 5, 1916) he sent for the members of the House of Commons and invited them to ask him any questions with regard to his policy, and to hear his explanations. The result of it was that he cleared up every doubt and left that room full of the confidence of Parliament, as he always possessed the confidence of the country" (Lord Rosebery). So then Lord Kitchener's last act was to remove the misunderstandings and differences that had arisen in public life between himself and his fellow-countrymen. This must have been a great source of satisfaction to him; it has also sweetened his memory in the minds of colleagues and critics alike. How do we stand in regard to those who know us? We have all made mistakes, and have perhaps been harshly judged for them. Unintentionally we have wronged others by misunderstanding them. It would be a great thing to remove all misconceptions while there is yet time, to break down any barrier of prejudice that has arisen between us and our friends, or those we do business with, or the members of our family. A few words spoken judiciously in the spirit of love and humility will nearly always succeed in dispersing these clouds of misunderstanding. And then our influence for good and happiness would be increased, and we should be better prepared with a mind at ease and a conscience at rest to meet death when it comes.

* * * * *

After many long and weary months of internment in Germany, as prisoners of war, a limited number of invalid soldiers, French and British, were allowed to accept the hospitality generously offered by the Swiss Government, and to sojourn in Switzerland until the war is over. Several convoys of British soldiers were in this way taken to that delightful retreat among the mountains—Chateau d'Oex.

The reception they met with from the moment they crossed the

frontier is said to baffle all powers of description. The kindly Swiss and English visitors lined the route in thousands, welcoming these broken warriors with shouts of joy and tears of sympathy. Fruit and cakes and flowers were pressed on them at every place where their train stopped. The men themselves were so overcome with emotion that few could help crying, and some of them even fainted. It was such a glorious surprise to them, after all the sufferings they had gone through. Chateau d'Oex itself seemed like a little bit of England, only much more beautiful—a land flowing with milk and honey. Much more wonderful and far more glorious will be the reception accorded to the children of the One Heavenly Father, when the frontier between this life and the life beyond is crossed. Through the gates of pearl angels and saints will come forth to welcome those "which came out of great tribulation" and have bravely fought and won the victory of Faith here below. In Chateau d'Oex there will [still be invalids, suffering from the effect of harsh treatment, men still walking on crutches, with no prospect of recovering their lost limbs, blind men unable to see the beauties of their surroundings; but in heaven all infirmities will have been left behind. "God Himself shall be with them and be their God." "And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away."

* * * * *

In *Land and Water* (March 30, 1916) appeared a **Humanity**. cartoon by Louis Raemackers which, like many other pictures by the famous Dutch artist, is allegorical. On the open sea are two boats: one a German submarine "U52"; the other unarmed, with her name painted on her side—*Humanity*. On board the latter is a group of men, in whose midst stands a figure of lofty stature, clothed in white, with an aureole of light around His head—evidently the Son of God. The hands of those on board are uplifted towards Him in supplication, as they plead with Him to save them in their hour of danger. His face is turned towards the pirate-ship with an expression of stern, dignified reproof. In the conning-tower of the submarine is an officer, examining the unarmed ship through his binoculars, and saying to a sailor beside him, "Seems to be a neutral; send him down." The design of the artist is seen at a glance. Germany is now the enemy of humanity.

God, in the Person of His Son, is the Friend and Saviour of men. But Germany can only see things through a distorted vision. Blinded by national pride and ambition, she fails to understand that in her war with Humanity she is fighting against the Lord. We may see here, as so often elsewhere, a parallel between nations and individuals. After long persistence in an evil course, the will and conscience become so perverted that a man fails to see how, in doing what is wrong towards his fellow-men, he is fighting against God. But there is something far more than this in Louis Ræmackers' picture. God has not left humanity to sink beneath the cold waves of sin and suffering. Through the mystery of the Incarnation His beloved Son entered our human nature, making Himself one with us. Jesus said, "the Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." It is for us to see Him with the eye of faith, as those men in the boat saw the Divine Figure standing among them. And if we cry out to Him, "Lord, save us, we perish," we shall not cry in vain, "for He is able to save to the uttermost them that come unto God by Him."

* * * * *

Early in August, 1914, an English liner steamed up the St. Lawrence River. The news that war had broken out was first conveyed to those on board by the bands and cheering with which their arrival at Quebec was greeted. Among the passengers was a young man who had just started on a great world-tour, every detail of which had been carefully arranged for months before. Life was opening out for him with golden promises of great things. Endowed with mental gifts and a forceful character he had become Prefect and head of his house at Winchester, and afterwards President of the Union at Oxford. His personal friendships and family connexions would also have helped to make his future career a certain success. But within six hours of landing at Quebec, Gilbert Talbot had taken his passage on the first homeward-bound steamer and was on his way back to England again. He had bravely accepted the new problem which had so unexpectedly confronted him, and without hesitation he had made the great renunciation. Putting aside all the alluring prospects of his old plans and ambitions, he responded at once to the call of duty, giving up everything for country, honour

The Eternal
Choice.

and freedom. After the necessary course of training in a Rifle Brigade he went out to France and, when leading his platoon into action at Hooge, was mortally wounded by a bullet, and died with a smile on his lips. In a very different way, perhaps, but none the less clearly, comes the call to most of us at some time to decide between the cherished hopes and ambitions of years on the one side and on the other some place, perhaps very humble, in the ranks of those who have enlisted under the banner of the King of kings. It is really a choice between God and self, between Christ and the world. Where do we stand, each one, to-day? Perhaps at this very time the eternal choice is before some of you. And it may seem very hard to do the right thing, very unwise to make the great sacrifice demanded. We must not think that bright young lives like Gilbert Talbot's were thrown away. They were not wasted, even though they were cut short, their example and influence weigh heavily on the side of right and truth. In some cases they have been saved from temptation or disappointment. And He Who calls upon all His disciples to take up the cross and follow Him, will not forget to find some higher service for them—one part of His reward hereafter for faithfulness in this life.

* * * * *

The story of a memorable Cabinet meeting at the **Prayer—In Public Life.** White House was told by a church official and transmitted from Washington by a "Reuter's" telegram (Oct. 6, 1915). Thus it ran: "When President Wilson arrived at the Cabinet meeting his face wore a solemn look. It was evident that serious affairs of the nation were on his mind. He said to the Cabinet members, 'I don't know whether you gentlemen believe in prayer or not; I do. Let us pray and ask the help of God.' And right there the President of the United States fell upon his knees, and the members of the Cabinet did the same, and the President offered up a prayer to God." Why should such an act as that be accounted a strange and unusual thing? We call ourselves a Christian nation. Have we any right to do so? If our public men had more of the faith and courage that flows from strong personal convictions, prayer even at Cabinet meetings would be felt to be a necessity, and the nation would reap the blessing.

[For "The Study Table," see over.]

THE STUDY TABLE.

The coming of Lent has brought with it several new books of devotion. The Bishop of Durham gives us a beautiful volume, *The Call of Lent to Penitence, Discipline and Christ* (S.P.C.K., 2s. net), the steady perusal of which will be most helpful. There is a reading for every one of the forty days, but the Bishop does not stop there; he wisely carries his plea right into Easter Day, for assuredly without "the power of His Resurrection" much of the previous counsel would be impossible of fulfilment. The first reading is on Lent itself: "forty days annually of persistent appeal to think and to kneel down and to rise with the Cross upon our shoulder, are none too many." Then follow nineteen readings on sin and sins. The Bishop describes sin as "the discord of our will with the pure and perfect will of God," and from this point of view he leads us on in a succession of penetrating chapters to consider this "discord" as it manifests itself in the individual, in the community, in private life and in personal life. The book is addressed to "the Christian believer," and the need for penitence for all that is out of harmony with the Divine Will is pointed out. The repentant life will be the disciplined life, and the Bishop devotes nine very solemn chapters to questions of discipline, giving much loving counsel in regard to Bible-study, Prayer and Holy Communion. Thus the believer is brought on to consider the Passion which gives "a new inspiration" to "all acts and methods of sane and resolute discipline." The succeeding chapters—eight in number—treat of the Cross, and here indeed we are made to feel that we "are on the holiest ground." "The primary aspect of the Cross" is "its atoning efficacy," and when we have grasped with a living faith what atonement and redemption mean for us, we see how powerful is the claim which the Cross makes upon our self-surrender. We are shown on Good Friday how we may have "heart-communion with the Crucified," and on Easter Even we are brought "in worshipping love" to "the grave of our dear Lord Jesus Christ" and taught what it means to us. The forty-first reading—that on "the Power of His Resurrection"—is the most uplifting of all; it rings with the note of joyous triumph. The Bishop of Durham's contributions to devotional literature are very many, but never has he given us a more precious treasure than the *Call of Lent*.

* * * * *

The Bishop of London has made it a custom to recommend to his diocese a new book for Lenten reading. This year it is *Before the Morning Watch*, by the Rev. F. A. Iremonger (Longmans, Green & Co., 2s. 6d. net). We have read it with profound interest and profit. It is a study at once sympathetic, illuminating and powerful, of Psalm cxxx., and in a series of twelve chapters he draws from each verse the lessons for to-day. The teaching is as richly spiritual as it is severely practical. Let the concluding passage of the chapter on "There is forgiveness with Thee, that Thou mayest be feared" speak to us: "It were best to kneel as we meditate upon this verse: to think, upon our knees, of the sin of the world as it is in God's sight: and, while we wonder at the love which can forgive and forgive again, to let our thoughts pass with this prayer; that alike in the hatefulness of sin, in the blessedness of forgiveness, and in the joy of worship, we may be filled with the spirit of Holy Fear." Again the chapter on the verse "With Him is plenteous redemption" is not only happily phrased but sets out with admirable clearness the truth of our redemption through Christ crucified. Mr. Iremonger utters a salutary warning: "We cannot separate either Christ from His

Cross or His Cross from Christ"; and he rightly insists that "our redemption is to be found in Christ on the Cross, in Christ crucified." The chapter also brings out most clearly four great truths of the character of God—God is Holy: God is Righteous: God is Love: God is Life—and their bearing upon the work of redemption. The book is one for careful reading, and it will bring light and strength to many hearts.

* * * * *

A book which will amply repay much meditation is *Discipleship*, by A. H. McNeile, D.D., C.F. (S.P.C.K., 2s. net). It contains addresses given at various Quiet Days and Retreats, and its purpose is to take the experiences of the disciples who followed Christ and apply them to the Christians of to-day. Dr. McNeile's keen analysis and power of application make this little book a valuable companion.—Another very helpful book is *The Call to Prayer*, by the Rev. M. G. Archibald (Robert Scott, 6d.). The author writes with wisdom and sympathy, and the difficulties of souls anxious about prayer are smoothed away. There are six eloquent and suggestive chapters dealing first with the Call to Prayer, then with Prayer as a means of communion with God, of co-operation with God, of influence, of appropriating God's gifts, and finally with Prayer and Prayers—a distinction which is not always sufficiently recognized. The book is full of beautiful thoughts.—Canon Morrow's little book, *Christ Magnified* (Marshall Brothers, Ltd., 1s. net), is very refreshing reading. In days of much haziness it is a comfort to come upon a work which is so clear upon the great central fact of Christ. The volume is as suggestive for exposition as it is for devotional reading, and we cordially commend it.—*The Cross of Job*, by H. Wheeler Robinson (Student Christian Movement, 1s. 6d. net), is frankly critical, but the devotional spirit is tender and true, and as the writer deals with the problem of suffering in the light of the Cross of Christ we learn afresh the lessons of patience, faith, assurance and rest.

* * * * *

The "Three Hours" Service on Good Friday is more and more widely observed, and to clergy who are looking for some fresh treatment of the great theme we heartily commend *Thoughts on the Seven Words from the Cross*, by the Rev. W. Hendy Cock, L.C.P. (Robert Scott, 1s. net). The author has adopted quite an original line: he has put forward his ideas in forms cast by the poets, with the result that each sermon contains a large collection of quotations from standard authors, the verses being linked together by the slenderest chain. The general effect is impressive, and preachers will derive much help from these "Thoughts."

* * * * *

Dr. Oesterley's volume, *Studies in Isaiah xl.-lxvi.* (Robert Scott, 3s. 6d. net), will appeal strongly to theological students. In a succession of brilliantly written chapters he discusses "the composite character" of the book; the component parts of Isaiah xl.-lxvi.; their contents and date; their historical background; and the doctrinal standpoint of Isaiah xl.-lv., the Ebed-Jahwe Songs and Isaiah lvi.-lxvi. A collection of Exegetical, Archaeological and other studies follows. Like all Dr. Oesterley's work these "Studies" are marked by great reverence of tone, and although we may differ from him in his treatment of some of the problems of this remarkable book, we gladly recognize the strength and ability of his work.—*Isaiah: the Prophet and the Book* (Longmans, Green & Co., 1s. net), is the title also of the volume containing the lectures given by Canon Nairne in connexion with the Liverpool Diocesan Board of Divinity. The lectures are three in number, viz. (1) Isaiah of Jerusalem, (2) The Great Unnamed, and (3) The Servant of

the Lord. Canon Nairne assumes the accuracy of the Critical position, but in regard to the passage lii. 13-liii. it is interesting to note that he says "Nothing is more certain than that we read here a prophecy concerning our Lord Jesus Christ. A friend of mine, not inclined to orthodoxy in these matters, told me how he heard Isaiah lii. 13-liii. read in a country church, in that quiet, self-forgetting way which is happily frequent among our English clergy. And he said he felt that the upholders of verbal inspiration had a good deal to say for themselves." Assuredly they have.

* * * * *

Canon J. M. Wilson, of Worcester, is well known as a thoughtful and scholarly preacher, and his volume of seven sermons, *God's Progressive Revelations of Himself to Men* (S.P.C.K., 1s. net), is full of quiet suggestive teaching. If we cannot always follow his conclusions, we have nothing but admiration for the spirituality of his exposition and the earnestness of his appeals. —The Rev. T. E. Miller, of Dunfermline, has given us a delightful series of studies, *Portraits of Women of the New Testament* (H. R. Allenson, Ltd., 3s. 6d. net), and preachers will be glad to have the volume on their study table for frequent reference. Incidentally we notice that he combats the view that the woman in Simon's house, Mary Magdalene, and Mary of Bethany were one and the same person. "There is a measure of likeness," he concludes, "in these three women, not because they were one and the same individual, and not because they had similar experiences; but because they each came under the spell of the love of Jesus, and surrendered to it and to Him." —Canon Lancelot's volume, *Faith and Creed* (Howell, Liverpool, 1s. net), is well worth reading, for its clear expositions. "Intellectually in earnest you must be," he says in one of the lectures and this little volume will help to that end.

* * * * *

Dr. Oesterley and Canon Box are joint editors of an important series of textbooks which scholars will be glad to have, "Translations of Early Documents." Two volumes are before us, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and *The Book of Enoch* (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d. net each). Both are by Canon Charles, of Westminster, who prefaces the translation in each case with a learned introduction, dealing with date, authorship, language and contents of the book translated. The series promises to be a valuable one.

* * * * *

The papers which appeared in the later numbers of last year's *Churchman* on various questions of Church Reform have been collected into a handy volume with the title, *Religious Reconstruction after the War: A Cambridge Programme* (Robert Scott, 2s. 6d. net). The contributors are the Revs. James Plowden-Wardlaw (General Editor), C. T. Wood, J. F. Bethune-Baker, S. C. Carpenter, F. Conquest Clare, A. H. F. Boughey, A. H. M'Neile, W. Emery Barnes, J. K. Mozley, F. J. Foakes Jackson, J. R. S. Taylor, Arthur J. Tait, T. G. Bonney and the Master of Corpus. The volume is one that demands the attention of all who are anxious to see the Church grapple effectually with the many problems, which, even now, are beginning to be felt. For the breadth of its outlook, the boldness of its treatment, and the reasonableness of its proposals this Cambridge Programme is unequalled.



Reviews of Books.

THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY. SUPPLEMENTARY VOLUME, THE FOURTH. By Eugene Stock, D.C.L. London: C.M.S. 7s. 6d. net.

The fourth volume of Dr. Stock's History of the C.M.S. is a worthy sequel to its predecessors. Whenever we read anything written by the author of this work on the subject with which it deals, we are left with a feeling of amazed admiration for the minuteness of patient research, the care for accuracy of detail, the interest imparted to the record of events, and the sure touch and unerring instinct which go to the heart of far-reaching problems, all of which are certain to be found in it. The present volume possesses these excellences and more besides. It is no mere catch phrase of a reviewer to say it is indispensable as a source of information on modern Missions and is a mine full of illustrative matter for the preacher and speaker on missionary work.

The bulk of the book is occupied with the history of the foreign operations of the C.M.S., the fields being taken in order during the fifteen or sixteen years following the Centenary. But much light is shed in these chapters upon the general progress of Foreign Missions, the work of other Societies being mentioned wherever it is necessary, and every important combined movement being carefully recorded. There is also a considerable section allotted to Home {Organization in all its aspects. The author explains that the present volume does not contain any of those sketches of Church life at home which formed a feature of the other three (and a most attractive feature, too), yet it will not be found by any means devoid of interesting sidelights in this matter. But the most striking characteristic of the book is to be found in the extremely able discussions of those great missionary problems which have provided so much ground for anxious thought during recent years. Most people have to be content with being experts in one field (if in any!), but Dr. Stock can handle with perfect sureness any matter which may arise in any quarter of the globe, provided it is related to Missions. Here are a few examples from this volume—the unrest in India, native Church organization (in all countries), modern Hinduism, and the Kikuyu question. Several whole chapters are devoted to great subjects of this character, which are all discussed with a firmness and grasp that indicate the touch of a master, and render the possessor of such a solid source of information a happy man. Out of all these, we are inclined to give first place to the chapter on Kikuyu. We have read a good deal on this subject; but we believe there will nowhere be found so able, concise, and complete an account of the full circumstances and their sequel, up to date. Exactly the salient points are seized and amplified with perfect insight, and moreover with due balance. Particularly interesting and important is the discussion of what the Archbishop *did* say, as distinct from what he has been commonly supposed to mean, and the reminder to his critics that they are also criticizing a number of distinguished Bishops (including, e.g., the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Winchester). There are, too, some very telling points which will probably not be found so clearly emphasized elsewhere. The book is worth buying for this chapter alone, especially considering how largely the question looms in the future. Nor does the chapter stand by itself. In an earlier one on India—"The Anglican Church and Union Movements"—the author produces some most notable anticipations of the Kikuyu spirit in that country, and of the connexion therewith of some Indian Bishops.

The sections dealing in greater detail with progress abroad and management at home, which occupy the greater part of the book, provide invaluable and authoritative information for reference. We are sorry to note that there has been a serious depletion of the European staff of ordained men in India and Japan during the period under review. Africa and China have fared better, and show an increase. The case of India is particularly serious. No one can be surprised at the attention paid to China of recent years, and nobody would dream of suggesting it should be diminished; but these days of mass movements and awakening of thought in India are no time for deficits of men, and the Church must awake to perform all its tasks. These chapters on the various Mission Fields, and upon home organization, necessarily contain a good many names and statistics; but that does not mean they are only useful for reference. Any reader who might feel that such chapters could be "skipped" for reasons of this kind would be liable to miss many choice bits. For instance, there is Mr. Schaffter's story of the pariah Christian student walking down the chief Brahman street with a Brahman student on each side, whereas twenty years before separate benches had to be provided in the class-rooms; or the comparison between the confirmations by Bishop Tucker and Bishop Hodges in their first ten years (they were consecrated on the same day)—there were 7,580 and 7,461 respectively. Everybody talked about Uganda; but an older Mission like Travancore and Cochin is apt to be overlooked. Or there is the delightful story of the N.W. American Indians who asked to be taught about the Second Coming, because, they said, "We always hear of what God has done; we want to know what He is going to do"—or Mr. Walton's report that hardly a family of Indians and Eskimo in his district (600 miles long) neglects to have family prayers. On the organization side, we note with interest that, in spite of all deficits through expansion, the total contributions since the Centenary average at least from £100,000 to £120,000 a year more than in the corresponding period before; that the total individual publications of all kinds in the year ending 1915 was 5,500,963; that the Dominions supplied and supported 128 missionaries between 1892 and 1915 (besides many excluded for technical reasons); and numerous other striking facts.

There is an Appendix on "The War and the Missions," and the Index covers sixty pages of small type. It seems therefore even fuller than the remarkable one at the end of Vol. III, though it is difficult to compare them exactly. It is followed by a list of Corrigenda in the first three volumes, which were carefully recorded after their issue. Its brevity is significant of the extraordinary accuracy of the historian. We imagine there will not be much to correct in Vol. IV. We have noted a letter from the author in the *C.M. Review* for November, expressing a keen desire to correct an error into which he had been led by an apparently clear authority; and so he will probably be glad if we repeat the correction here. The Chinese Christians killed in the Boxer riots were "several thousand"; but certainly not 30,000, he says. We venture to add one small point of inquiry for the author's consideration. Is the statement with regard to those who accepted the Kikuyu proposals strictly accurate? We are under the impression that the head of the Nilotic Independent Mission also signed them.

CHRIST'S MESSAGE IN TIMES OF CRISIS. By E. C. Dewick, M.A., Principal of St. Aidan's College and Teacher in Ecclesiastical History in Liverpool University. London: *Sheffington and Son*. 3s. 6d. net.

We welcome this volume of twenty sermons from the pen of the new Principal of St. Aidan's College. These sermons were preached in the

College Chapel during 1911-16. They are practical and deal with problems which are likely to confront the younger clergy. As the author mentions in the Preface, two main thoughts run through the sermons: one the *inadequacy of the Church as she is* to meet the needs of the time; the other *the sufficiency of Christ*, "the conviction that in Christ, and all that He is and does and teaches, there is the secret of the world's redemption."

Unobtrusive scholarship, simplicity of diction, directness of appeal, and, above all, devotion to Christ, are main characteristics of these addresses. Frequently some apt illustration throws welcome light on a dim problem or obscure text. The sermon on the half-forgotten doctrine of the "Justification by Faith" is excellent. Mr. Dewick does not only meet objections but also points out some of the practical advantages of such a doctrine. "It gives new confidence, and takes away the feeling of constant anxiety and misgiving" (p. 39). "Believe me, it will make all the difference to your ministry whether you have a clear message on this point or no. When you are called to the bedside of a dying man, who perhaps has wasted all his past life, it will make all the difference whether you believe in Justification by Works or by Faith. If it be by works, I know not what you can say; for it is but mockery to tell a soul at the end of its earthly career that it must earn forgiveness by good works. How are they to be performed in the little while that remains? But if forgiveness is freely offered to every one that trusteth, then no crisis can be too urgent for the act of faith, and no time too short for the Divine response that redeems from the sense of sin" (p. 41).

On the subject of Christian Unity, Mr. Dewick suggests that "the keynote is to be found in the phrase 'mutual contribution.' The beliefs in which we differ are not to be merely surrendered or suppressed, but to be held as a trust from God, and (when the time is ripe) brought as a contribution towards the building-up of a wider truth" (p. 120).

The last sermon in the book is on the "Boundless Sovereignty of Christ" and is admirably practical. Emphasis is laid on the fact that the ascended Christ is *the Lord of the whole man*. He claims not only the spiritual, but also the intellectual and physical life of man. In the case of mind, men fail to discharge their responsibility if, on the one hand, they "refuse to give the mind proper rest and sleep and recreation," or, on the other hand, "are too lazy to undertake any serious thinking, and take their opinions second-hand, repeating current phrases without troubling to think out their meaning" (p. 205).

FAITH OR FEAR. An Appeal to the Church of England by Donald Hankey ("A Student in Arms"), W. S. Palmer, H. Anson, F. L. Donaldson, and C. H. S. Matthews (Editor). London: *Macmillan and Co.* 3s. 6d. net.

The writers of this book are Socialists in outlook and Modernists in theology. They all claim to be loyal Churchmen. They all believe that the Church has failed to meet the needs of the nation in the hour of crisis, and that she must repent and then undertake the task of self-reformation if she is to draw to herself all men of good will. Mr. Donald Hankey contributes the first essay. After giving a sketch of an average man's beliefs, he goes on to show that "there is not a single feature of the average man's ideal which is not part and parcel of the ideal which Jesus Christ taught and embodied" (p. 20). He makes an appeal for simple and elastic church services.

The chapter on the Divinity of Christ is contributed by the Rev. Harold

Anson. Mr. Anson defines Divinity as "that unseen force which is at the back of all human goodness and love" (p. 95). "When we speak of Divinity," he goes on to say, "we mean just this Love which is striving to make itself known in the lives of the best of mankind." Christ is Divine because He "embodies in Himself those essentials of perfect manhood which are seen and known to us in glimpses here and there in human history" (p. 97). Again he says: "All people in so far as they are like Christ are in their degree divine" (p. 98).

The Rev. F. L. Donaldson writes on the Church and Labour and tells us that the working men are dissatisfied, not with Christ, but with the Church in its organized capacity.

The longest, and perhaps the most important, contribution is from the pen of the editor, the Rev. C. H. S. Matthews. Though an advanced High Churchman, Mr. Matthews lays great emphasis on the necessity of conversion, and would not unchurch spiritually-minded Nonconformists. "The Church," he says, "is the abode of the Spirit, whose fruit is 'love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance.' Surely, then, where these things are, there is the Church, and he who manifests this fruit in his life is of the Church without any kind of doubt" (p. 185). To those clergymen who assert that "the substitution of a sung Eucharist for Matins" would result in a large increase in church attendance, he says: "I wish I could agree with them, for I myself infinitely prefer a sung Eucharist to sung Matins. But unfortunately one knows of many parishes where the making of this change has emptied the Church instead of filling it, and one knows many earnest and devout communicants who love their Communion service in the early morning, but prefer Matins to a sung Eucharist at 11 a.m." (p. 172). In his modernism, Mr. Matthews is aggressive, and believes in preaching it to his village congregation. He seems to regard as non-essential a belief in the miraculous birth of our Lord and in the empty tomb.

Although there are many things in this book which we cannot endorse, yet we have no hesitation in saying that these essays are sincere and outspoken, and would repay a careful perusal.

KHODADAD E. KETH.

THE RENEWING OF CATHOLICISM: Evangelical Essays towards Religious Renewal and Unification. By Sinclair Burton. London: *Robert Scott*. 2s. net.

In these Essays Mr. Burton pleads for a "Federal Reunion" of Christendom, especially of the English-speaking Churchmen and Nonconformists, on the basis of a Catholicism which has Christ as its centre. The authority of any dogma to be accepted must be found "in the fact that it will be attested by conscience and spiritual experience of the modern believer" (p. 28). If our Bishops would officially dissociate themselves from sacerdotal idea of Episcopal functions, then a group of Free Church leaders "might be willing to receive conditional Episcopal consecration at the hands of some friendly (Gregorian or Nestorian) Bishop, and as such 'recognized' by the Anglican Episcopate." The Rev. Dr. W. B. Selbie, Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, in a Foreword to this book, rightly expresses our view when he says: "Though I cannot endorse all that he (Mr. Burton) says, I am in entire sympathy with his aims, and I believe that what he has written may help towards that better understanding which is a condition precedent of any closer co-operation among the Churches."

THE SHORT COURSE SERIES. Edinburgh: *T. and T. Clark*. 2s. per vol. Three new volumes of the "Short Course Series" are issued.

BELIEF AND LIFE STUDIES IN THE THOUGHT OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL is by the Rev. W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D. (Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford). The writer approaches his subject from the point of view that "The Gospel represents the witness of John, the son of Zebedee, to Christ as communicated to and set down by a disciple, or disciples, of His. It is thus two removes from the actual life and teaching of our Lord." The fourth Gospel conveys a message that is as needed in these days as when it was fresh delivered. The aim of this volume is to set forth some aspects of this message in modern terms. With deep spiritual insight, and reverent touch, the writer addresses himself to his task, dealing with "The Living Word," "Knowledge and Action," "The Shepherd of the Sheep," "The Way," "The Truth," "The Life," "Dying to Live," "The Life Beyond." Like all Dr. Selbie's work this is scholarly and rich in suggestive thought.

THE EXPOSITORY VALUE OF THE REVISED VERSION is by the Rev. George Milligan, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Glasgow. It is a useful and well-conceived addition to the Short Course Series, by an eminent scholar and reverent student of the Word of God. It is arranged in three parts. Part I. is A Sketch of the History of the English Versions from the Earliest Days down to the Revised Versions. Into the space of these forty pages an amazing amount of valuable information is packed. Part II. deals with the Practical Use of the Revised Version—negatively in removing difficulties; and positively in its advantages as compared with the Authorized Version. Part III. is concerned with the Doctrinal significance of the Revised Version, as illustrated in The Person and Work of Christ, The Christian Life, The Holy Spirit and Free Will, The Last Things. Dr. Milligan has rendered a valuable service to Bible students in producing and publishing this little volume.

THE PROPHECY OF MICAH is by the Rev. Arthur J. Tait, D.D., Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Liverpool. After a preliminary consideration of "The Word of the Lord" in the opening pages of the volume, the remaining seven chapters are devoted to the seven divisions of the prophet's message. Chapter I. is a valuable and concise treatment of the subject of "Revelation." "God and revelation are complementary terms. . . . Reason cannot rest satisfied with a conception of God from which the idea of revelation is eliminated." The author claims that "prediction has an established place in Israelite prophecy, and contributes a clear presentment of the relations of the prophet to the Church, and the chapter ends with these words, "This process did not constitute the Church the author of the writings: on the contrary, the writings were delivered to the Church, and are the supreme court of appeal by which her doctrine has to be tested." Chapter II.—"Judgment"—is a timely application of principles that are seen working in the pre-exile days of Israel. In Chapter III. the theme is "Sin." For this there is only one remedy—"a changed heart"; and when the appeal of love has been spurned, the only hope that remains is the "fire of catastrophe." Chapter IV. deals with "Responsibility"; Chapter V. with "The Faithfulness of God"; Chapter VI., "The Divine Method"; Chapter VII., "The Divine Pleading"; Chapter VIII., "The Response of the Child of God." Dr. Tait clearly has in mind the solemn days in which our lot is cast and the clear call that has been sounded in the National Mission, and he makes the message of this Hebrew prophet bear directly and with emphasis upon these times of national crisis.

OUR BRITISH CHURCH. SKETCHES OF ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY: SHOWING THE NATIONAL CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the Rev. Cecil E. Weston, M.A. London: *Robert Scott*. 2s. net.

This little volume of some 100 pages undoubtedly contains a vast amount of information. The object of the writer is to show that from the earliest times there have been reformers and reform movements in the English Church, and to show that "if Luther, Calvin and Zwingli had never been born" the Reformation of the sixteenth century would have come about. He has evidently no liking for the Continental Reformers, and though he is able to draw attention to advice given by them to Cranmer, which he declined to follow, we think he minimizes the extent of their influence upon religious thought in England and upon the formularies of our Church. It is noticeable that he deplors the "rearrangement" of the Communion Office in 1552. He seems inclined to disparage the Black Rubric by saying that it was not drawn up by Cranmer "and had no sanction from him." If by "no sanction" he means to imply that it did not coincide with Cranmer's opinions, then we reply that the suggestion is without foundation in fact. The rubric is entirely in agreement with the views set forth in Cranmer's treatise—"A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament."

Mr. Weston in a Note at the end of the book is disposed to stir up prejudice against the word Protestant because of its "purely German origin." He says that "strictly speaking the term Protestant when used as descriptive of the Church of England is theologically and historically inaccurate." But he adds—"if it is applied it must be accompanied by very careful explanation." Mr. Weston is apparently anxious to defend the use of the word "Altar," but the only argument he adduces in favour of it is from the account of Bishop Day's trial, which he tells us is "full of interest from the fact that it gives the true opinion of Cranmer, Ridley and the other English Reformers as to the use of the word Altar." He quotes Cranmer addressing Bishop Day (who had declined to comply with the order to substitute Tables for Altars) and saying—"There is no reason why you should not call the wooden table an altar, *if you like to do so*" (the italics are ours), etc. But does Mr. Weston wish to suggest that these Reformers all used the word Altar? If so why did they remove it from the Prayer Book in 1552?

Despite these criticisms we gladly recognize the fact that the author has given us a readable and in many respects useful handbook. He has told the story of Grossetete, Wyclif, the Lollards, and the Oxford Reformers clearly, tersely and as a rule fairly. The utility of the book would have been enhanced by an index.

THE SACRIFICE OF PRAYER. By R. M. Wills. London: *Elliot Stock*. 2s. 6d. net.

The fact that the Rev. D. Jenks, Director of the Society of the Sacred Mission, Kelham, contributes the Preface to this devotional manual, is sufficient to indicate the theological bias of the writer. Advanced Eucharistic doctrine considerably colours the book. In the Introduction, for example, we read—"All this being done *for* man, the Institution of the Holy Eucharist is a great means whereby the power and virtue of it all is imparted to him." But where is this in the New Testament? In another passage we are told that in the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar (*sic*) "each one receives the power of an endless life." There is undoubtedly much that a discriminating Christian might helpfully make use of, but it is not a book that we can recommend for the use of the uninstructed. The general arrangement is admirable—the Leading Thoughts are suggestive, the passages for Contemplation carefully selected, and the forms of Prayer and Intercession in most cases quite excellent.

Short Notes on Recent Books.

[Insertion under this heading neither precludes nor guarantees a further notice.]

AMONG recent War Books we must give the first place to *Turkey, Greece and the Great Powers*, by G. F. Abbott (Robert Scott, 7s. 6d. net). Described as a study in friendship and hate, it gives a masterly survey of the history of the Eastern question and explains with admirable lucidity the present position. The writer is quite unsparing in his exposition of what he considers the blunders of English diplomacy, both in regard to Turkey and to Greece. Whatever view is taken of his conclusions it will be agreed that this is a most remarkable book and a contribution of real value to the proper understanding of the position in the East.—*Under the French Flag*, by M. Macdonald (Robert Scott, 3s. 6d. net), tells the story of a Britisher in the French Army. The narrative is one of absorbing interest, full of incident, bright, and fresh and sparkling with humour. It is good for us to have a picture of the everyday life of the men in the army of our gallant Ally and Mr. Macdonald's picture is a charming one.—*Serbia to Kut*, by Canon J. T. Parfit (Hunter & Longhurst, Ltd, 1s. net), gives an account of the war in Bible lands, alike informing and interesting. We see from this narrative how very much England and the Allies owe to General Townshend and his 15,000 heroes. They "saved at a critical moment the British Empire from a most formidable menace."—*The Experiences of a Temporary C.F.*, by the Rev. F. Humphrey (Hunter & Longhurst, Ltd., 2s. net), has a value all its own. The writer is a Nonconformist chaplain, but "out there" these denominational differences count for little. The volume abounds in incidents, some gay, some grave, and others with a pathos which brings moisture to the eye and a lump in the throat.—*Bound in Khaki*, by Lillian Doyle (Elliot Stock, 2s. net), is a dainty little volume of war poems and songs appealing specially to Irish regiments. Sir Ignatius O'Brien contributes the Introduction, and the book is dedicated to Mr. John Redmond. The writer has caught the soldiers' lilt most happily and successfully.

* * * * *

The Bishop of Worcester's visit to the Triennial Convention of the Episcopal Church of America as the representative of the English Church was a notable event in the history of both Churches, and we are glad to have as a memorial of his visit *American Addresses* (Longmans, Green & Co., 1s. 6d. net), a little volume of some of the sermons and speeches delivered at various places. The report of the speeches at the Pilgrims' Luncheon is especially interesting at the present time as showing the closeness of the relationship which exists between the two countries.

* * * * *

The story of the Keswick Convention is well known, and we are glad to have now the Rev. Norman C. Macfarlane's volume *Scotland's Keswick* (Marshall Brothers, Ltd., 2s. 6d. net) full, as it is, of delightful sketches and reminiscences. The personal note runs all through these 200 pages, and gives a distinct charm to the narrative. We are introduced to the Chairmen, Conveners and Speakers—all men widely honoured in "Keswick" circles, yet the author has something fresh and inspiring to tell of each one. The note on Prebendary Webb-Peploe that "he is fitted for being the Bishop of all the Denominations" pleases us much. The more solid part of the book, dealing with the central teaching of Keswick, is well done, and, the

glimpse we get of the house-parties is very pleasing. This interesting volume should have many friends.

Of books of a more general character *Letters of the Rev. H. H. Jeaffreson*, edited by the Rev. C. E. Lambert (Longmans, Green & Co., 4s. 6d. net), will be valued by a wide circle. The Bishop of Winchester in a foreword speaks of the reverence and regard in which he held Mr. Jeaffreson. "The combination in him of thinker, priest, observer, friend, and even in some sense man of the world was very distinctive and very rare." The "Letters" breathe the spirit of sympathy and will be found really helpful for the discipline of life. They are written, however, from the viewpoint of the distinct High Churchman.—We are glad of the opportunity of saying a word for the impressive story, *Freely Forgiven*, by J. B. Horton and Kate Drew, because of the opportunity it gives us of commending most heartily the general work of Drummond's Tract Depot, Stirling, which publishes it. The immense influence of this agency in circulating books, pamphlets and tracts portraying the truths of the old Gospel is something to be thankful for.—The latest issue of "Lippincott's Home Manuals," *Clothing for Women*, by Laura I. Baldt, B.S. (J. B. Lippincott Coy., 8s. 6d. net), will be valued in the home.—*Nature Talks for Primary Workers*, by May Coley (H. R. Allenson, Ltd., 1s. net), has about it the rich aroma of garden flowers, and children will be deeply interested.—Of Nelson's re-issues we have received *Shadow Bells* by William Black, *The Country House* by John Galsworthy, and *The Black Bag* by Louis J. Vance—9d. each; and *Lives of the Hunted* by E. T. Seton, and *Episodes of the French Revolution in Brittany* by G. Lenotre—1s. 3d. each.

* * * * *

Quite the best monthly for those desirous of keeping abreast of the times is *The Review of Reviews*. We have known and valued this magazine from the time it was first started by the late Mr. W. T. Stead, but at no period of its existence has it been better done than it is to-day. The February number is of special interest, with articles on "The Hidden Plague," "The Truth about our Country's Food," and other current topics. The Notes on "The Progress of the World" and "The Progress of the War" are most illuminating. "The Leading Articles in the Reviews" and "The Reviews Reviewed" cover a wide range. "Foreign Opinions on the War" and "Current History in Caricature" are unique features. The magazine costs one shilling net; it is worth three times the amount.

BUSINESS.

The general meeting of the shareholders of the London City and Midland Bank, Limited, was held at the Cannon Street Hotel, London, E.C., on Friday, January 26.

Sir Edward H. Holden, Bart., who presided, remarked upon the general financial position of the country, and insisted upon the importance of the new War Loan being made a great success. [This it apparently has been, although at the time of writing the exact figures are not known.] Sir Edward Holden went on to comment on the leading figures of the London City and Midland Bank's balance-sheet and profit and loss account, remarking that their net profits for the year ending December 31 last amounted to £1,636,968, and that they were paying their usual dividend of 18 per cent. for the year, leaving to be carried forward £129,941, which, with the amount brought forward from last year of £113,597, made a total of £243,538 to be carried forward to the next account.